Sheldon Zedeck

SIOP President 1986-1987

(This autobiography was first written in 1991 and updated in April 2020.)

EARLY DEVELOPMENTAL EXPERIENCES

I was born June 8, 1944 in the Brownsville section of Brooklyn, New York. In the 1940s and '50s, Brooklyn was a borough of a quite diverse population of all religions, ethnic groups, cultures, and values. Mentioning the section of Brooklyn is important since early childhood experiences predict later behaviors and attitudes. I believe that much of my early experiences, both in the streets of Brooklyn and at home shaped my interests and values. This autobiography will hopefully substantiate the belief.

My father came to the U.S. from Poland in 1929 to seek a better life for himself and his future bride, Judith. After working for five years at several laborer type jobs, such as painting ships, he became a citizen of the U.S. (1934), then went back to Poland to marry Judith (May 1935), and shortly thereafter return with her to the U.S. (1936).

I was the third son of Judith and Hyman Zedeck (the first-born son died as an infant, March 1939). My older brother, Morris, was born in January, 1940. When I was born, my mother and father were running a "Mom and Pop" type of neighborhood grocery store in Brownsville. For about the first 15 years of my life we lived in a two-bedroom apartment in a five-story (without an elevator) building; we then moved to another dwelling in the same neighborhood, an apartment in a three-story building that included a commercial operation on the lower level. Since my parents were working from about 6 AM to 8 PM in the store, I spent almost all my non-school time playing ball in the streets with the neighborhood kids. We played the typical New York City games such as stick ball, punch ball, stoop ball, "fence" basketball (where we tried to score points by throwing a "spaldeen" rubber ball between a fence and the gate door that was pushed back against the fence - the rules and the very small opening to shoot at did not permit dunking). When we weren't playing ball, we involved ourselves in games like "Johnny-on-the-pony" and other such team-oriented events. The point of this is that I was very much on my own, going home only to have meals, do my homework, and to sleep. Otherwise, we were a group of kids, occupying ourselves in group activities. We made up the rules, we lived by them, and we got along. We did not need referees or umpires or counselors to mediate disputes or encourage us to keep busy; we did not wear uniforms and we did not get to our play sites via carpools. This world was quite different from the one in which our children were raised. The other point is that we all got along - people from different backgrounds and cultures - and everything seemed to be fair.

When I did see my parents, it was usually at their store where I ate my meals. That is also where I learned about the value of education and a work ethic. My parents were always concerned about my preoccupation with sports and were constantly stressing the value of education. Neither of my parents had much formal education beyond high school in Poland, and they firmly believed that my brother and I had to go to college. My father had hoped that he could have gone to pharmacy school, but the economics of his family situation did not permit it. So, he and my mother constantly stressed that my brother and I would have a college education and that they were prepared to make all the necessary sacrifices to see that come true. (As a footnote, my brother Morris earned a degree in pharmacy (1961) and then a Ph.D. in Pharmacology (1965) from the University of Michigan.) And they certainly did make sacrifices. They worked all day long, six days a week. They worked without other help except when my brother and I were old enough to help out. One of my earliest recollections is when I was about 10 years old, had worked in the store during a holiday season, and my father gave me $5.00 for my efforts so that I could buy my first baseball glove (I've only owned two others that served me well as I played softball until I was about 55).

My early education was at P.S. 156 and Junior High School 263 in Brownsville; these were neighborhood schools to which I could walk. I was not involved much in extra-curricular school activities, since there were none to speak of; basically, when the bell rang we ran outside to the concrete playground and began playing our games. When I was about 11 years old, I began my "work career;" I helped out in my relatives' hardware and housewares store. This meant that I had to learn to juggle my school and recreational activities to fit working, but it also taught me how to juggle schedules - which for me has been operationalized these many years by no or minimal breaks in a schedule!

After several years working in my relatives' store and then moving on to high school (Thomas Jefferson High School), to which I had to take a bus or subway, I found other jobs that lasted for considerable periods of time. For one year, I replaced my brother in his job as a stock and counter person in a pharmacy. Then, for most of my high school career, I delivered meat for a butcher by bicycle to the consumers. The bike was used in all seasons - rain, snow, or shine.

None of the jobs that I held while going to school could be considered intrinsically interesting, but they did demonstrate to me that hard work had some rewards. The money that I earned contributed to my spending money as well as a savings for my education or some other highly valued object (I used my savings to buy a car when I was a senior in college).

Since I had to be at work every day immediately after my high school classes, I had no time to get involved with high school sports. That is one of my regrets, since I would have liked to have played baseball or football (the latter seemed like a good possibility since the high school coach was my friend's brother).

While working and playing through my teen-age years, I did enjoy school - particularly mathematics, history, and political science. The emphasis in my home was that I should be a "doctor" (doctor is in quotes since my parents knew "doctor" as basically a medical doctor). The pressure increased when my brother Morris pursued a pharmacy degree, and then, before ever practicing, went off to the University of Michigan to obtain a Ph.D. in Pharmacology.

In 1961 I entered the only school that was a realistic choice for me, Brooklyn College (part of the City University of New York (CUNY)), to pursue a pre-med undergraduate degree. The choice was limited to Brooklyn College for several reasons. First, there was the cost. When I started, the fees were $8.00 per semester (when I graduated, they were $32.00 per semester and my father was quite disturbed by this 400% increase). Second, I had never really been away from home when I applied, and I wasn't prepared to leave then; rather, I thought commuter life would be acceptable. My entire teen-age life was spent in Brooklyn, with occasional visits to Manhattan to go to the museums or to the Bronx to see the New York Yankees play. Most summers, for two weeks, my family and I would vacation in the Catskill Mountains in up-state New York, but it wasn't until I graduated from high school (1961) and visited my brother in Ann Arbor, Michigan did I leave NY. Third, in the 1950s and 1960s, Brooklyn College was *the* college to attend since it had an excellent reputation, and at that time it had produced (as part of the CUNY system) more Ph.Ds and physicians than any other undergraduate educational system in the country.

The summer of 1961, when I was 17, and before I was to begin Brooklyn College, I quit my job as meat deliverer and took the big step to go away from home and work in the Catskill Mountains at a summer resort (known as a "bungalow colony") as a "soda jerk" and short order cook. I had no experience at either of these, but it gave me an opportunity to earn an anticipated great deal of money (basically on tips since salary was replaced by room and board in the healthy climate of up-state New York). I also hoped the job would give me the opportunity to experience life away from home, be in the outdoors, and have a chance to play softball on a dirt/grass field rather than the concrete playgrounds in Brooklyn. Unfortunately, not much of the latter desires actually materialized since I worked from 10 AM to 10 PM five days a week, from 10 AM to midnight the sixth day, and on the seventh day off (Tuesdays), was involved in individual recreation since all my contemporaries (counselors and life guards) worked at their jobs on my day-off. In spite of the hours, I didn't mind the job. I liked keeping busy and the nature of the job allowed me to meet and talk with a lot of people (who were from different sections of New York). In some ways, I was like a bartender - people would come in for an "egg cream" (which only New Yorkers know the secret of) and spend time talking, and talking, and talking while I listened. One might get the impression that this would cause me to become a clinical psychologist!

Toward the end of that summer, and prior to beginning classes at Brooklyn College (a place I had not been to prior to my first day on campus), I left New York for the first time to visit my brother in Ann Arbor, Michigan, at the University of Michigan. This visit impressed me since there were so many buildings, wide open spaces, and a community sense that I had not seen or experienced before. So, it was a surprise when on my first day arriving at Brooklyn College, I found only two classroom buildings, an administration building, a gym, and a field to accommodate about 30,000 students who were going to college during the day and night.

At the outset, I did what my parents expected and began as a pre-med major. I enrolled in calculus, organic chemistry, anatomy, and other courses that would make me the next "Ben Casey" (a popular TV

medical show in the 1960's). Initially, all was going along well grade-wise, though I was not fulfilling my interests. It seemed that I was going to school for the sake of school. (While going to college, I worked as a cashier on the weekends in a supermarket.)

Several events occurred during college, however, that changed my focus and life. First, in my second year of college, I joined a "house plan," which at the time was like a "poor person's" fraternity. This gave me the opportunity to meet a group of guys who have turned out to be life-long friends. But, now being in an "organized" group that was involved in social and athletic events, I had the opportunity to spend time socializing (usually in the school cafeteria) and playing ball (finally, in an organization where they had official referees and umpires). Second, grades and interest in the courses I was taking diminished (I don't know which is the cause or the effect) such that I began to question whether I wanted to be a doctor (or continue education beyond the bachelor's degree). As I was questioning my direction, I frequently observed and listened to some friends while they were meeting to discuss their psychological statistics homework problems and their experimental psychology projects. These sounded interesting. At the completion of the Fall semester of my junior year, I and some of my psychology major and non-major friends decided to go to Miami, Florida for Winter break, and this turned out to be a third significant event.

This was going to be my second trip out of Brooklyn and what better way to do it than to take a Greyhound bus. It was an enlightening experience. It was just after my political hero, President John Kennedy, was assassinated, and there was more and more awakening with respect to civil rights. While on the bus trip through the South I could not believe the discrimination that existed - as an example, separate facilities for African-Americans and Caucasians. The unfairness in society that I was reading about was then blatantly before me. Given my prior experiences in Brownsville, the community in which I lived and interacted with, I found the conditions difficult to understand or to accept.

A fourth event that redirected my energies took place while I was in Miami - I called home to check on my grade in Physics (a course which gave me absolutely no pleasure). When my father informed me that it was less than a "C," the disappointment in his voice and my realization that medical school may be out of the picture caused me to re-think my major. So, I returned for the Spring Semester and began taking all of the psychology courses I could, which at Brooklyn College, were basically experimental, social, and abnormal psychologies. The classes that I enjoyed most were experimental and statistics.

Pursuing the new major was not easy for my parents to understand or accept. The most they knew about psychology was what they knew about Sigmund Freud. Nevertheless, when they learned that I planned to go to graduate school, with the possibility that I would pursue a doctorate, they were pleased, since I would become "some kind of doctor." They were more accepting of the notion that there were other kinds of doctors since my brother was at that time earning his Ph.D. in pharmacology.

There are two other events that shaped my life prior to entry into graduate school. First, in my sophomore year (1962-63) when I was involved in a college-wide social event, I met a first-year student, Marti Rosen. Though we dated once that year not much evolved out of the relationship until my senior year, when we began seeing each other more frequently. But I was planning to go off to graduate school and she still had another year at Brooklyn College, so the relationship was put on hold. Second, during my senior year (1964-65), the Viet Nam War was escalating and there was great concern that I and my classmates would be drafted after graduation. In those days, you could delay your military obligation if you volunteered for the National Guard or continued in school. The latter contingency reinforced my interest in going to graduate school.

The major decision that I faced was which graduate program in psychology to pursue. My assessment was that I was most interested in experimental aspects of psychology, in areas that involved statistical analysis and reasoning, and in problems that were encountered in work-life. I wasn't interested in clinical psychology, or in studying at a micro level short-term or long-term memory; rather I was interested in why and how people behaved and dealt with the activities in which they were most involved, work-life.

And so, I pursued the interest and learned that Industrial/Organizational (I/O) Psychology fit the bill. Unfortunately, there was no course in I/O psychology at Brooklyn College, but I did look at some texts that were in the library and found that given my "extensive" work history, I could relate to the issues presented in these books – e.g., job satisfaction, motivation, and selection.

The choice as to which particular university to apply to was relatively easy. I decided that I wanted to leave New York, and that given my very brief experience in visiting Ann Arbor, the Midwest would be a nice place. Also, I could not apply to too many places, since that would result in significant application expenditures. So, I did some more "research" and determined that Ohio State, Bowling Green State University (BGSU), and Case Western Reserve were the places to apply. It was not intentional that I applied to three universities all located in Ohio; perhaps I am like others who believe that every state west of New York is the West coast and that Ohio was the Midwest. The decision regarding which of these universities to enter was even easier - I was accepted by Bowling Green, rejected by Ohio State, and never heard from Case Western Reserve. And so, in Fall 1965, I went off to Bowling Green to see what life had in store for me.

GRADUATE TRAINING

My four years at Bowling Green went rather quickly. Upon arrival there, two incidents are most memorable. First, my rooming arrangements were in a family's home not far from the campus. I shared one room with another graduate student while there were two other rooms on the top floor of the home rented by other graduate students. On my second day there, I overheard one student telling another that he had been shopping for furniture for his room, and that he felt good about his purchases, since he had "Jewed" the seller down. I did not know what he meant, and when I inquired and learned the meaning, I began to wonder about my choice of living in the Midwest. A second, more positive early experience, occurred when I was walking to the local barber shop in town and I was waiting for the light to change at the crosswalk. While standing there, another pedestrian came up and said "Nice day, isn't it?" I immediately checked to see if I still had my wallet. Lo and behold, he was only being friendly, a prevailing disposition in this small town of about 15,000.

One other factor about my early experience at Bowling Green is that I was there without Marti. "Absence may make the heart grow fonder," or whatever, but I quickly realized that I missed her. Consequently, during my first year at Bowling Green I made frequent weekend and holiday trips back to Brooklyn. Eventually, we were engaged on April 1, 1966 and married on August 21, 1966. Now, 53+ years later (as of this writing), I can say that it was the best "selection" decision I ever made.

The BGSU Psychology program, in general and specifically in I/O, was emerging when I arrived in the Fall of 1965. Most of the faculty concentrated on experimental psychology. Initially, there was only a Master's program, though there were plans for a Ph.D. program to be implemented within about two years. The I/O faculty member was Robert (Bob) Guion, who had recently returned from his sabbatical at the University of California at Berkeley and had just completed his textbook on personnel testing (*Personnel Testing* (1965)). There were several students in the program at that time - among others, Frank Landy (who had started one year earlier), Nick Imparato, and Loren Appelbaum. Two particular recollections relate to our contact with Guion. First, we wondered if we could use his textbook as satisfaction of the foreign language requirement needed to earn a doctoral degree at the time! The book was impressive and overwhelming to new graduate students, and taking the course from the author did not make life easier. Second, the number of students in the I/O program was about a dozen, with some believing that they ultimately wanted to be consultants while the others looked forward to going into academics. The view held by the students was that you did not talk about entering consulting in front of Guion; he stressed research and an academic career and that's what we should be doing!

Two other faculty members who made an impression that first year were Max Freeburne and Pete Badia. Freeburne taught the statistics course and I have interesting memories of sitting at the mechanical calculators trying to determine the F ratios for the homework problems. Frustration came easily when there was a mechanical failure and I had to start re-entering the raw data (mechanical calculators did not store data!). Badia was the experimental psychologist interested in studying rat vocalizations. I never took a course from him, but I worked in his laboratory and learned a number of things. First, I learned good experimental design. Second, I learned that I was allergic to rats and would be better off working with people!

When I first entered BGSU I did not have any financial support. But I had some savings from all of my prior jobs and managed to get through by not spending much money except for food and lodging (in my second semester, I shared an apartment with fellow graduate students, Nick Imparato and Larry Allman). There simply wasn't much to do in Bowling Green, then a place with one movie theatre and little else in terms of cultural endeavor. For the Winter semester, however, I was awarded a research assistantship to work with Carol Vale who was joining the faculty that semester after receiving her Ph.D. in quantitative psychology

from the University of California at Berkeley. It was Carol Vale who taught me much in terms of psychological statistics and its theory, more than how to calculate an F ratio and sums of squares.

After my first year at BGSU I went back to Brooklyn to marry Marti and also to find a job for the summer. I applied at Psychological Corporation (located in Manhattan) for a summer position, took their Short Employment Tests, and then waited. Since no call came, I took the same job I had while attending Brooklyn College - cashier in a supermarket. A week after starting full-time at the supermarket, Psychological Corporation called and told me they had a job in test development. I accepted on the phone, told my supermarket employer that I had a job that was directly related to my career, but because I needed the money and felt some obligation to the chain, I would work there Friday evenings and Saturday. It was an agreeable arrangement and I looked forward to my work as a psychologist. After two summer months of proofing and scoring pilot tests of a typing exam being developed by Psychological Corporation, I realized that there may be something to realistic job previews. Nevertheless, the experience was valuable - I earned money and I spent lots of lunch breaks walking around Manhattan seeing the sights that I had not been able to see during my childhood.

My second year at Bowling Green, and now married (Marti obtained a job in Hancock County school district as a speech and hearing therapist) I was a Research Assistant, and we lived quite comfortably. Eventually, Marti entered the Speech program at BGSU and earned her Master's (1969).

Meanwhile, the program at BGSU was changing. A doctoral program was implemented and there were several new faculty additions. Patricia (Pat) Cain Smith and Olie Smith joined the faculty from Cornell as did Joe Cranny who was a recent Ph.D. from Iowa State. Initially I worked as a research assistant for Cranny, but I also took on additional work in Pete Badia's laboratory, and was involved in statistical consulting for various faculty and others. Overall the faculty at BGSU impressed upon me the notion of not to accept much at face value, but that instead research should be conducted to seek answers. Though I never took a course from Olie Smith, my frequent contacts with him while I was meeting with Pat, have had a lasting impression. It was Olie who always asked: "What do you think of ... ?" This meant we either had to have an answer or we should figure out a way to get one.

Bob Guion is one of three psychologists who had an extremely personal and significant early impact on my professional life. The other two are Pat Smith and Mary Tenopyr. With regard to Guion, aside from being able to study personnel psychology with one of the leading experts in that field, I was most impressed with his emphasis on research design and unwillingness to accept "conclusions" without a research basis. One of the first courses that I took from Guion was on research methodology, and it took me some time to understand why I did poorly on a course paper when I had lots of references from *secondary*, *non*-research sources.

The second psychologist who impacted me was Pat Smith. Pat was very supportive of me - I could work on any problem in which I was interested, and she participated as a mentor and colleague. Her inclination to discuss research at any time, day or night, at the office or her home, made graduate school fun. It was always a relief to know that if you had a question or problem dealing with research, that you could call Pat at home, and she would tell you to come right over to discuss it with her (and Olie). From Pat, too, I learned the value of statistics and its use as a tool to explore and answer questions and not as a means by itself. Yet another aspect of my training with Pat deals with my writing, or lack of writing, skills. When I submitted my Master's thesis to her for review, I was quite distressed to get it back all marked up - just about a comment per line. She realized the impact her comments were having on a young graduate student, and sat down with me and explained precision in writing. (As I write this autobiography, I am not sure that she would approve of the present prose and style, but my excuse is that this is cathartic and non-academic.)

(I will describe the impact of Mary Tenopyr as I go further into this autobiography, which is in somewhat of a chronological order.)

Exposure to the faculty at BGSU, the escalating Viet Nam War, and the urgings of Marti caused me to apply to the new Ph.D. program at BGSU (I believe it formally began in Fall 1967). When I was accepted it meant two more years in Bowling Green, but they were pleasurable. We spent our time at the library, socializing with many of our graduate student colleagues, and, for me, interacting with an excellent group of I/O graduate students, which included besides those mentioned above, Jim Goodale, Reggie Goodfellow, Jan Wijting, and Steve Wollack among others.

My research career stems from my personal experiences and my graduate school days. If I can trace a common theme, it deals with equity, fairness, and social justice. My first research project was my Master's thesis (supervised by Pat Smith) on fairness, or the determination of equitable pay. My Brooklyn College days, the experimental psychology courses, and reading Woodworth and Schlosberg's *Experimental Psychology* textbook (1955?), lead to my application of a psychophysical approach to the study of equity. Other research that I undertook at BGSU included a number of projects on moderator variables (with Joe Cranny, Pat Smith, and Carol Vale) – a topic that I worked on for my dissertation and early research career. The stimulus for this interest evolved, in part, from Guion's book that had a brief section on moderator variables and subgroup analysis. I assumed that there must be moderators that could address issues of equity or fairness in testing and selection and I spent my early research looking for moderator methodologies that could identify the differences that existed among groups (e.g., racial, ethnic, and gender) in terms of relationships to other sets of variables. My dissertation (supervised by Pat Smith) attempted to expand the moderated regression procedure, by identifying moderators using discriminant analysis in a multi-predictable group validation model, but it turned out like others - much promise, but little in the way of increasing prediction.

Another part of my career that evolved at BGSU dealt with consulting. I was fortunate that Bob Guion, who as mentioned above we all thought was negative toward consulting, modified his view somewhat and undertook a consulting project to benefit graduate students. It was Guion who gave me my first opportunity to consult and conduct research in industry. One of the first projects in which I was involved pertained to writing items for a test for the National Employment Agency Association. A second project provided the opportunity to work with the initial version of Ernest McCormick's Position Analysis Questionnaire (PAQ) in the Armco Steel plants in Ohio. The effect of these and other experiences was that I realized I wanted to do research for which I could see application and hopefully an immediate impact; that a company would take my product and be able to use it. This was just as interesting to me as tackling a research question that would contribute to our theoretical understanding of behavior. The way I have tried to combine the two foci is to conduct, when possible, research within a real setting - there would be a product for the company and findings that would contribute to the theoretical and practical literature.

During my final year at BGSU I began to think about the type of career I wanted; an academic position, a psychologist in a research organization, or an internal or external consulting. Given my mentors and training, I considered the first two options. Thus, one of my more memorable events is the interview with LIAMA, an insurance research organization. When I was interviewed, there was one particular member of LIAMA who put me through an orals exam on statistics, but not on the statistics that I had learned at BGSU. Rather, I was asked a series of questions about topics with which I was not that familiar, such as chi-square and other non-parametric statistics. There was also the question that I asked: What time do you need to come to work? The answer was that there were regular hours, which I believe were from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM. The point was that if someone, e.g., an insurance agent, in the field, who was working "normal business hours" in his/her organization had a question, someone had to be available to answer it on the spot. Though I certainly did not begrudge working regular, long hours, I had gotten used to the fact that as an academic researcher I could work when I wanted and for how long I wanted. Nevertheless, given my answers (and perhaps question), I did not receive an offer from LIAMA. But the lesson that I learned, which really reinforced what my father had always told me, was that it was better to be your own boss and not work for anyone else.

PROFESSIONAL ACADEMIC/RESEARCH CAREER

Thus, academics was my goal. Perhaps one of the best examples of a "chance" or "serendipity" theory of occupational choice is illustrated by how I obtained my first (and only) academic job. In Spring of 1969, Bob Guion was asked by the Psychology Department at the University of California at Berkeley (UCB) to again visit the Department. Unfortunately for Guion, but quite fortunate for me, he was at the beginning of his term as chair of the Department at BGSU and could not accept the invitation. But, he recommended a new Ph.D. to be the visitor - me; UCB agreed and I accepted. I was pleased to join a strong I/O group composed of Edwin Ghiselli, Bill Graham, and Milton Blood.

In Fall of 1969, Marti and I arrived in California with the expectation that we would be there for one year. We told our families that it was a one-year deal and that seemed to satisfy all concerned. (One of my biggest disappointments in life is that my father passed away in December 1968, just at the time I was proposing my dissertation topic, and thus never lived to see his youngest son also become a "doctor.") California was a new experience. I thought I was a liberal from New York, but we were in for a shock to

learn what "liberal" truly meant. We were fascinated by the city, region, geography, and overall life-style and for the first few months we spent just about every free moment and weekend sightseeing. Then in November 1969, I was asked if I was interested in a tenure track position at UCB. I took Ghiselli's advice and looked at other positions to "see if I had a really good offer or if there was a better job elsewhere." In December 1969 we accepted the UCB offer (and reduced our sightseeing since we were no longer on a short-term visit to the Bay area).

The early years at UCB were both enjoyable and frustrating. The opportunity to work with Ghiselli, Blood, and Graham was extremely rewarding. Blood, Graham, and I collaborated on research and consulting; Blood and I undertook the writing of a textbook, an experience from which I learned a great deal.

Contact with Ghiselli contributed to some of my fondest memories. First, he was one of the finest human beings I have known. When we first arrived at UCB, I had told Marti that I was looking forward to meeting the person who was the source of a number of references in my dissertation. Not only did he make me feel extremely welcome at UCB, but he and his wife, Louisa, went out of their way to make Marti feel comfortable. Second, I learned from Ghiselli that though you strive to design and conduct the cleanest research design, you need to accept what you have, and understand its limitations; you also can learn from less than perfect situations. Third, I learned that senior faculty need to serve as role models for others. Prior to going to teach my first class at UCB, Ghiselli "just happened to drop in to my office" to inquire how things were going. When I told him I was about to go give my first lecture, he said: "Just remember, you know more than the students." Whether that was true or not, it certainly provided some confidence and reduced anxiety.

My early research years at UCB were continuations of what I had started at BGSU. After spending a number of years on moderator variables, I wrote my *Psychological Bulletin* (1972) article on the topic. Though I did not attach much significance to it at the time, except that it was an opportunity to summarize all that I knew about the issue, I have been impressed with the impact it had on the field at the time, further research and understanding, and appropriate application.

A research topic that I undertook early on at UCB dealt with performance appraisals. I was fascinated by the fact that most evaluations are based on subjective impressions - could these be fair? Thus, I began a program that derived from Pat Smith's work on behavioral expectation scales. Whereas my early work focused on methodological issues related to performance appraisals, subsequent work focused on the factors that influence performance appraisal decisions and on the variables that explain differences in perceptions of others' performance. This work lead to an interest in the other side of the prediction equation, the predictors, and how they relate to performance.

Another early rewarding and learning experience was working with Milton Blood on a textbook that would focus on how/what questions can be asked and studied in the context of work situations. In 1974, we published "*Foundations of Behavioral Science Research in Organizations*."

There was a change at UCB in the early 1970's, however, that caused Marti and I to question whether we should stay at UCB. For starters, Ghiselli retired and Blood and Graham moved to other academic institutions, leaving me as the sole I/O representative in Psychology. Also, given faculty changes, UCB's Psychology Department was rethinking its commitment to I/O psychology. Thus, we pursued other opportunities. We had an offer to return to the east coast, to academics or to a research unit. However, we ultimately decided to stay at UCB because the quality of life for us and our new family (our daughter Cindy was born in 1970 and our son Jason in 1972) was best in California.

Another reason for the decision to remain at Berkeley was that I discovered that I could work with other I/O psychologists, even if they were not located in Berkeley. And, here is where I return to the influence of Mary Tenopyr (one of many I/O psychologists at AT&T). Early in the 1970's, when Guion was president of Division 14, he appointed me to the Committee on Education and Training, which was chaired by Mary Tenopyr. This was the beginning of a long professional and social relationship. Besides working with Mary on the committee's issues, she also gave me my first consulting job – with AT&T and the design and validation of a physical ability test. The new test was necessitated by the fact that few females were able to pass the then existing physical ability tests to climb poles, work in manholes, and overall perform the duties of installers, cable splicers, and construction technicians; the result of the research revealed test fairness for genders and increase in number of females passing. Mary taught me lots about interacting with clients,

working with the incumbents who perform the jobs we were interested in studying, about asking questions, and analyzing and interpreting data and implementing outcomes.

In 1976 I received tenure in the Psychology Department at UCB (and promoted to Full Professor in 1982). We were very pleased that we could now establish firm roots in Berkeley, but it was also frustrating at times that I was the only I/O psychologist at an institution that had a remarkable history and impact on our field. Being the lone I/O psychologist partly explains my interest in becoming active in the I/O division (American Psychological Association (APA) Division 14).

Another event, just prior to the tenure decision, that shaped my subsequent career was the birth of our third child, Elizabeth, on April 1, 1975. She was born with an undeveloped brain that effected vision, motor functioning, and every other faculty. The prognosis, which took about a year to determine, was that she would never see well, talk, or walk. This occurred just as I was going through the final stages of the tenure process. When tenure was awarded I was able to go on sabbatical, in Israel (1976-77), and spend time with our family, especially with Elizabeth. Before we went overseas, we learned from our physicians that Elizabeth's problem was a genetic defect on chromosome pair 21, and that in fact the prognosis was substantiated. The time spent with Elizabeth was especially meaningful since she died before her third birthday in February 1978.

While in Israel I continued to work and write on performance appraisals, conducted research there with Israeli colleagues, and began my collaboration with John Campbell on the revision of Ghiselli's "*Theory of Psychological Measurement*." It was an interesting experience working with Campbell, a brilliant scholar and thinker, via the mail and phones and the only regret that I have about this endeavor is that Ghiselli passed away shortly before the revision was published in 1981.

When we left Israel in May 1977, my desire to compensate for the lack of opportunity to travel when I was a child resulted in our undertaking a camping tour throughout Europe. We (myself, Marti, the three children, and my mother-in-law!) camped for two months in 10 European countries. We saw just about every church, stained glass window, statue or monument, museum, memorial, battlefield, etc. that had been described in the tourist books.

When I returned to UCB in Fall 1977, I continued my research on performance appraisals and picked up on policy capturing as a way of addressing questions as to how people make decisions and assessments. Policy capturing was a way in which I could use regression analysis (the topic emphasized in the Ghiselli revision) and individual differences to explore why people make different decisions when dealing with the same set of stimuli.

An interest that re-emerged in the late 1970s and early 1980s was in test fairness; this stemmed in part from my project with Mary Tenopyr (see earlier discussion of impact of Mary Tenopyr on my career) and Dick Reilly on physical ability testing and its fairness related to males and females. Issues of fairness and social justice became the theme of much of my subsequent research/consulting life. What interested me most were findings that a simulation device or strategy, such as the assessment center, minimized if not reduced differences between groups and adverse impact. Accordingly, I sought out an opportunity at AT&T for 1982-83 (another sabbatical, in New Jersey) where I spent time with the many psychologists involved in AT&T's assessment centers and testing. The opportunity to interact with Joel Moses, Dick Campbell, and Mary Tenopyr on particular projects and to have contact with Ed Adams, Doug Bray, Mirian Graddick, Ann Howard, Karen Lyness, Bob Ramos, Ken Pearlman, and others was invaluable in terms of my education and development. I believe that the experience at the AT&T assessment center has paid off numerous times with respect to my own research and consulting efforts - it is the model of the way things should be. I believe it has also fostered my belief that some of the differences we observe in test scores between ethnic groups can be explained in part by the stimulus used to assess those differences. The topic of test stimuli (paper-and-pencil multiple choice vs. simulations) and their impact on minorities has been a consistent interest of mine.

To briefly depart from my academic research career, I note that while on sabbatical at AT&T, in 1982, we added to our family a daughter, Tracy, who was born in Morristown, NJ. Focus on "family" becomes a subsequent research issue (see below for more detail).

When I returned in the Fall of 1983 from AT&T to UCB I undertook an analysis of assessment centers that is described, in part, in a chapter in the Staw and Cummings "*Research in Organization Behavior*" (1986) series and is reflected, in part, in my research project at Berkeley's Institute of Personality Assessment and Research (IPAR; which today is the Institute for Personality and Social Research (IPSR)), which I undertook with Ken Craik, Charles O'Reilly, Barry Staw, Phil Tetlock and others, which explored the construct validity of managerial performance dimensions in a sample of MBAs. This project, and interaction with the colleagues mentioned, furthered my interest in simulations as stimuli for selection, promotion, and evaluation – themes which I have pursued throughout my research career.

Also, soon after I returned from the AT&T sabbatical I began an interest in shift work and health, which is the precursor to my mid-career interest in "work and family." My interest in "work and family" stems from a personal introspective analysis. I am a self-described "workaholic," a characteristic that others agree is descriptive of me, but also invested in my family (which at the time was 3 children). I enjoy and like being busy and active. Why? I will leave that question to those readers who are clinically oriented. But, needless to say, I watched my parents work "all the time;" I have not known any other way to function. I appreciate the inquiries, invitations, and requests that I receive to contribute to my profession; I have always had a difficult time saying "no," especially when the project to which I was invited was "interesting." (But as Ben Schneider has told me, we work all of our lives to put ourselves in the position to be asked to do things, so that in the end there is a reason why we are so busy and so heavily involved.)

I had always tried to balance work and family; tried to take one of the weekend days off to spend time with my family, attend my childrens' school and extracurricular events, take vacations to interesting places in the U.S. and abroad – in other words: to have "work-family" balance. In the mid-1980's, as I studied the I/O literature, however, I noticed that few I/O types were studying "work-family" issues; the research that was being conducted at that time was mainly by clinical and family psychologists/therapists, who seemed to focus on the "family" without an appreciation of what is involved in and meant by "work." I have not figured out whether I am a "spillover" or "compensation" type, but for a number of years in the mid-80's to mid-90's, I worked on a project that would develop a means by which we can test "work and family" theories. My goal has been to be able to explain how we parcel our efforts and activities in the two spheres of organization and family.

As I was becoming more intrigued by "work-family" issues, it was at the same time as I needed to prepare my Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP) President's address (1987). Of all the interesting, innovative, and forward-looking talks of prior SIOP presidents, the one that had a lasting impact and impression was one by Lyman Porter (1976), on organizational politics. This topic – organizational politics – was one that at the time did not have much input from I/O psychologists – but after Porter's talk, the issue flourished in the literature. I thought I might have the same impact if I spoke on "work-family," and I did. The result of the talk and subsequent writing resulted in being asked by Ray Katzell to edit a volume on the topic for SIOP's *Frontiers Series*. I am pleased that I pursued the topic, and though I never had much opportunity to conduct research on the "work-family" relationship, it had a significant impact on my administrative roles that I subsequently held at the University (see section on "University Service"). In 1992, the SIOP *Frontiers* Series published a volume, "*Work, Families, and Organizations*," that I edited.

An aspect of my research career that I want to especially comment on and elaborate upon is my interest in data analysis and methodology, which began when I was an undergraduate and further developed while at BGSU. Here, too, I have no explanation for that interest except to state that I have firmly believed (and was taught by Guion and Smith) that if you are going to examine a phenomenon, you ought to study and analyze it correctly. Thus, different ways of addressing questions have always interested me. Can our stimuli, procedures, and analytical techniques be refined to provide a better understanding of that which we are studying? To respond to my own question, I have examined methods for determining the existence of moderator variables, and for refining the behaviorally anchored rating scale procedure: I have adapted policy capturing for problems in personnel and motivation, and promoted regression analysis as a technique for answering questions other than for the development of a prediction equation in a personnel psychology situation. I have conducted research and consulted on alternatives to multiply-choice cognitive ability tests, for admission to universities or hire into employment. My focus on statistics, methodology, and approach to researching questions is conveyed in the textbook, "*Data Analysis for Research Designs: Analysis of Variance and Multiple Regression/Correlation Approaches*" (1989) (co-authored with Geoffrey Keppel, my colleague and valued friend and mentor at UCB).

Another example of my research interest in data analysis and methodology, which is mentioned above, is demonstrated in the textbook, originally written by Edwin Ghiselli, entitled "*Measurement Theory for the Behavioral Sciences*" (1981) that I co-authored with Ghiselli and John Campbell. The culmination of my publishing on data analysis and research methods is the American Psychological Association *Dictionary of Statistics and Research Methods in Psychology* (2014) for which I was editor-in-chief. Working with associate editors Abigail Panter, Lisa Harlow, and Shelley Blozis was another learning experience that produced a volume that hopefully will enlighten readers about statistics and research methods.

Other milestones on the data analysis/research methodology focus include working with colleagues James Outtz, Wayne Cascio, and Irv Goldstein on projects that were concerned with reducing adverse impact against minorities. On the method front, we developed video-based tests for hire and promotion, to take the place of paper-and-pencil cognitively-oriented tests; the result was validity of selection instruments with reduced adverse impact. Of particular significance for me is our work on the "sliding band" strategy and concept (see Cascio, Outtz, Zedeck, and Goldstein, *Human Performance*, 1991, vol. 4, pp. 233-264) which was a procedure that we advocated for use of test results that allowed for selection of candidates from a band of scores within which all candidates were considered equivalent. This was a controversial plan that generated lots of professional disagreement; the strategy was part of a court case that eventually made its way to the attention of the Supreme Court; the strategy was upheld! What I consider my last research milestone is a project that began in the late 1990's and to some degree is still active. I have been working with my colleague from the Berkeley Law School, Marjorie Shultz (now Professor Emerita), on identifying supplements to the Law School Admissions Test (LSAT), which along with undergraduate grade point average (GPA), has heavy weight on admissions decisions for law school. Our research (see Shultz & Zedeck, (2011), *Law and Social Inquiry*, vol. 36, pp. 620-661) found that while the LSAT can predict first year GPA in law school, the results are less impressive for its prediction of effectiveness in practicing law. Our research further showed that there are tests – such as biographical data, situational judgment tests, and personality measures – that can predict effectiveness in the practice of law and do so with little to no adverse impact. As I write this autobiographical statement, the ultimate change in admissions to law schools is still being discussed and debated, but our research on the effectiveness components of the practice of law seem to have influenced clinical training in law school.

Before leaving this section on research experiences, where I have mentioned colleagues who were instrumental in my career, it is important to note the many graduate students who I worked with during my time at UC Berkeley. The graduate students with whom I worked, particularly on their Ph.D. committees, while some at the same time were collaborating with me on my projects of interest, include Wally Borman, Eunice Chang, Yochi Cohen-Charash, Kurt De Stigter, Sharon Green, Oren Harari, Rick Jacobs, Susan Jackson, Ditsa Kafry, Paul King, Moshe Krausz, Karen May, Kathy Mosier, Charles O'Reilly, Denise Rousseau, Kristi Whitney, Angela Song, Howard Tokunaga, and Pauline Velez – they made the path through my career rewarding and enjoyable.

EDITING

One of the first lessons learned in graduate school is that if you wanted to attain a tenured position in an academic institution, you had to publish in top tier, peer-reviewed journals – "publish or perish." So, one of my early professional interests was in how journals functioned and made accept/reject decisions; consequently, I was interested in serving on editorial review boards. Besides learning about the profession and publishing, there were two other reasons for an interest in serving. One, if you were asked to review, it reflected someone's opinion that you were somewhat of an expert on a topic and could evaluate research and its merits and impact. In other words, it was an "honor" to be asked to review and to serve on consulting or advisory editorial boards. Two, it provides an opportunity to "give back to the profession." Many years ago, Ben Schneider told me that "famous" people get asked to review manuscripts. So, the question is: how does someone become famous? One answer is that "he/she published." And, how does one publish in a peer-reviewed journal – by having other professionals review one's work. The message here is that it is a professional service to be a reviewer – it is giving back to the profession. Researchers become "famous" because other researchers take the time to review and comment upon your work – so, when asked to review for a journal, unless there are unusual circumstances, one should not decline but instead provide the same service that helped them attain whatever position of distinction they held.

With the above as background, I am pleased to have served on a number of editorial boards during the course of my career including the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *American Psychologist*, *Archives of Scientific Psychology*, *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *Industrial Relations*, *Management and Organization Review*, *Contemporary Psychology*, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, and *Applied*

Psychology: An International Review (Associate Editor); as well as being a frequent reviewer for the *Buros Mental Measurements Yearbook* series. In addition, I have served in editorial roles for the *Encyclopedia of Applied Psychology* (2014), *Encyclopedia of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (2007), and guest editor for the *Annual Review of Psychology* (2006).

Two instances particularly stand out, however with respect to journal editorial activities. First, I was honored to be selected to be the editor of the *Journal of Applied Psychology* (2003-2008), an APA publication, that in my opinion, is the premiere journal in the I/O field. Along with a terrific group of associate editors (Winfred Arthur, Jr., José Cortina, Jennifer George, Beryl Hesketh, Jerard Kehoe, Katherine Klein, Steve Kozlowski, Amy Kristof-Brown, Philip Podsakoff, and Lynn Shore), we further enhanced the journal's mission by including a special section on theory, generating interest in qualitative research, and overall doubling the number of submissions from the beginning to the end of our term. It was a terrific, time-consuming endeavor, but rewarding in being able to move the field along, provide feedback to authors, and to mentor others in writing and publishing.

The second significant journal activity involves my graduate school classmate and friend, Frank Landy (now deceased). In 1988 we produced the first issue of a new journal, *Human Performance*, initially published by Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates. Frank and I believed there was a void in the journal world in the 1980's, one that did not focus on the important aspect of "human performance," and so we developed a plan and convinced Erlbaum to start a new journal. He agreed and today the journal is still going strong.

Other noteworthy editorial assignments include serving on the SIOP *Frontiers Series* (1988-98), and editing a series (1986-95) published by Routledge, "*People and Organizations*," designed to advance research in I/O psychology and organizational behavior. These opportunities allowed me to work with many colleagues and to influence the field on future research directions.

Yet another special opportunity for me was the task of being the Editor-in-Chief for APA's first venture into publishing Handbooks. I was the Editor-in-Chief for the APA *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (2010) that came out in a 3-volume set, with 63 chapters, covering most, if not all major aspects of the field, from developing organizations, to selecting people to function in an organization, to maintaining organizations. Again, the invaluable experience of working with a group of associate editors (Herman Aguinis, Wayne Cascio, Michele Gelfand, Kwok Leung, Sharon Parker, and Jing Zhou) and chapter authors cannot be overstated in terms of the learning experience, the challenge of producing the opus, and the potential for influencing the field and future researchers.

A second Editor-in-Chief task, as mentioned earlier in this autobiography, was again for APA, who asked that I take on that role for APA's *Dictionary of Statistics and Research Methods in Psychology*. The idea of putting together a dictionary was intriguing and interesting and so I agreed to do so. The task became more than I expected. The goal was to generate a focused, specialty dictionary that would improve upon the coverage in the two vital and related areas of statistics and research methods by using the content-specific corpus from the *APA Dictionary of Psychology* as a base and doubling the coverage to between 4,000 and 5,000 statistics-specific and methods-specific entries (both new and rewrites). I and a team of associate editors (Shelley Blozis, Lisa Harlow, and Abigail Panter) reviewed approximately 8800 headterms that the APA Reference team had collected from multiple sources, including its own *Dictionary of Psychology*, other dictionaries, handbooks, articles in the APA journal, *Psychological Methods,* and other sources. The review process took several months and resulted in the determination that the *Dictionary of Statistics and Research Methods* should include the retention of approximately 4850 headterms. The team of myself and associate editors then reviewed, edited, and re-wrote or wrote new definitions and finally, in Spring 2012, the final batch of definitions was presented to the APA Reference team [market house] for compilation. As I stated, the task was intriguing and interesting in that though I have taught statistics and written texts on measurement theory and data analysis, there were many new terms and concepts that I became familiar with during this process – a true learning process! The *Dictionary of Statistics and Research Methods in Psychology* finally was published and released in 2014.

UNIVERSITY SERVICE

I want to note that the years at UCB have been quite rewarding and challenging. Besides allowing me to pursue a research career, I was able to assume a number of administrative and leadership roles on the Berkeley Campus. I was the Director of the Institute of Industrial Relations (1988-92), Department of Psychology Chair (1993-98; 2003-04), and Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Faculty Welfare (2007-10). In this latter role, I was able to implement policies and programs that stemmed from interest in work-family

balance such as a partner policy for hiring, emergency back-up child care for assistant professors, and the development of an office to facilitate hiring of faculty such that the potential recruit and partner can meet with a staff person to learn about the Berkeley area and its amenities (school, homes, shopping, and the like). In addition, I and my team implemented an electronic system to replace a "paper" system for the evaluation of faculty for hire and merit increases. (A snapshot of my role as Vice Provost can be seen in a 2013 documentary by Frederick Wiseman, entitled "At Berkeley.")

I also served on numerous UCB Academic Senate committees, such as the Committee on Educational Policy, Committee on Privilege and Tenure, Committee on Committees (which appointed Senate committee members), the Budget and Interdepartmental Relations Committee, Faculty Welfare Committee, and the UC system's Staff Personnel Board. Service was topped off with being elected Vice-Chair of the Academic Senate (2006-07). In recognition of my service to the campus, in 2006, I received the Distinguished Service Award from the UCB Academic Senate.

SABBATICALS

One of the many benefits of an academic career at UC Berkeley is the opportunity to take a sabbatical from your home university and spend a year trying to write, explore, and create without being absorbed in the daily life of an academic – teaching and meetings! During my 40+ years on the Berkeley faculty, I had the opportunity to take five sabbaticals – all of them away from UC Berkeley, and perhaps even better, 4 of the 5 were out of the country. (As an administrator – Department Chair – I often advised my colleagues to go away from Berkeley for their sabbatical, or otherwise, I might ask them to do something for or in the department, which would not serve the intended purpose of a sabbatical.) My sabbaticals were: (1) 1976-77; in Israel at Hebrew University (Dept. of Psychology) and Tel Aviv University (Graduate School of Business Administration; (2) 1982-83; in Basking Ridge, NJ, where AT&T headquarters were located; (3) 1992-93; in Stockholm (Arbetslivcentrum – Swedish Center for Working Life); in Amsterdam at the University of Amsterdam (Department of Psychology); and again in Israel, at Tel Aviv University (Graduate School of Business Administration); (4) 2000-01; in New York City, at Baruch College, CUNY (Department of Psychology); in Sydney, Australia, at University of Sydney (Department of Psychology); and in Beijing, China, at Beijing University (Department of Psychology); and (5) 2004-05; again in New York City at Baruch College (Department of Psychology); in Amsterdam at the University of Amsterdam (Department of Psychology); and in Hong Kong at Hong Kong Baptist University (Department of Psychology).

These sabbatical experiences allowed me to learn new and re-think old ideas, conduct research overseas with new colleagues, find time for writing, and overall to re-fresh myself. Though I had five sabbatical years, by splitting up a year into visits to different institutions and countries, I was able to gain greater perspective for international research and provide multiple, differing opportunities for my family in different cultures and countries.

CONSULTING CAREER

As mentioned above, one of my interests and goal has been in studying problems in functioning organizations with the anticipation that my results, techniques, strategies, and products would be used and would have a positive impact. This has been accomplished by being involved in consulting.

My first active consulting activities, post Ph.D., were with Milton Blood and Bill Graham in the early 1970s when we developed an entrance level examination for the firefighter position in San Francisco. This activity also introduced me to the legal arena, since the tests were challenged and required defense in District Court. After participating in depositions, testifying in court, and helping prepare briefs in the early 1970s, I almost decided to forego my career in psychology and go to law school. But better judgment prevailed!

As mentioned earlier, perhaps the most significant event in my consulting career occurred in about 1975 when Mary Tenopyr asked me to participate in the development and validation of a physical ability test for entrance into the AT&T positions of installer, cable splicer, and construction. Tenopyr is the third of the three psychologists that I previously mentioned that had a significant impact on my professional life. Not only did she introduce me to the start of a fruitful consulting career, but Tenopyr exhibited the best in terms of the scientist-practitioner model. She understood the realities of organizational life, and its complexities and politics, but at no time did professional standards and practices suffer to accommodate organizational desires for a "quick and dirty" study or "quick fix." I am forever grateful for the opportunities Tenopyr

provided for a number of years in AT&T consulting projects, which began as a newly degreed I/O psychologist and lasted until her passing in 2005.

Other consulting opportunities provided rewards, advances, and friendships. In 1988, I was asked by the City of San Francisco to help them with the consent decree pertaining to hiring in the San Francisco Fire Department; the decree addressed issues of gender and racial discrimination. As a result of this consent decree, a team representing all sides in the lawsuit – the City, the Department, the union, minority firefighters -- was put together to address the selection system – this team included me, Wayne Cascio, Irv Goldstein, Jim Outtz, Dick Barrett, and Joyce Hogan. As a result of our efforts, a video-based situational judgment test as well as a job-related physical ability test were developed that met challenges and the fire department was free of the consent decree. On a personal level, however, the project started a wonderful friendship with Cascio, Goldstein, and Outtz that included not only additional consulting and research collaborations, but friendships among our families.

And, for many years (1982-98), Larry Fogli and I consulted together within an organization called "CORE CORPORATION," with projects pertaining to testing, validation, surveys, etc. We have developed numerous products, systems, and strategies for clients that represented organizations, in the public and private sectors, involved with transportation, insurance, communications, medical fields, banking, marketing, protective services, sports, and engineering to name a few -- and I am pleased to say that we have had an impact.

One aspect of consulting that I want to note is that of serving as an expert witness in court cases. Over the years, I have had the opportunity to serve as an expert for the plaintiff (usually an employee or applicant denied a hire or promotion), for the defendant (usually an organization whose hiring/promotion system was being challenged), or as a friend of the court (advise the judicial system). I have had the opportunity to testify in District and Federal Courts and to write *Amicus* briefs in support of a position, all of which for me, furthered social justice. My approach to testifying and preparing briefs was to read the available documents, ask questions, collect data and conduct analyses where appropriate, educate the attorneys and court, and to prepare reports (and provide depositions). Over time, I began to dislike this aspect of consulting simply because of the nature of the process. In several cases, I was on the "other side" from a colleague, friend, or even former student. Though it is obvious that we can have different opinions, the legal system is one of advocacy, where the other side is intent on discrediting your views and positions in order to defend or justify their position. This can result in loss of respect for colleagues with whom you have worked in the past; and can impact friendships and relationships. The lesson learned from these experiences, and consistent with our code of ethics, is that as psychologists, we are seeking the "truth," whereas the judicial system requires the attorneys to convince or *advocate* for their client's position or best interest, regardless of the truth. I prefer the former code of ethics!

DIVISION 14 and SIOP Career

My introduction to Division 14 and SIOP came in 1972 when, as previously noted, Bob Guion appointed me to the Education and Training Committee, chaired by my future mentor, Mary Tenopyr. My desire to be part of Division 14 was twofold. First, it met my need to be involved and to keep busy. Second, when I went to UCB, as mentioned earlier, I was the fourth I/O psychologist. In the early 1970s, it looked as though I would be the only I/O psychologist remaining, and an important consideration for me was whether I could be nurtured and developed professionally in such an isolated environment. Accordingly, I decided to try to reduce my academic isolation by interacting with other I/O psychologists through active involvement in the Division and attending conventions and other society type meetings (for example, the Society for Organizational Behavior). In many ways, my involvement in Division 14 and SIOP has been an important influence in my career. It has provided me with an opportunity to be involved, and in addition, to meet some of the nicest, most dedicated, people, many of whom have become close personal friends.

After serving as a member of the Education and Training Committee, I served as its Chair in 1974-75. Then from 1975-76 and from 1977-79 I served on the Workshop Committee. But 1979 was an important year, in that Mary Tenopyr, then President of Division 14, asked me to edit *The Industrial and Organizational Psychologist* newsletter, or *TIP,* for a three-year term. I reluctantly accepted, and it turned out to be extremely rewarding. Not only did I attend all executive committee meetings with the goal to report back to the membership the significant events, but it gave me an opportunity to interact with many of the Division's members. I particularly enjoyed a column that I ran in each issue where I profiled one of our distinguished members. Interviewing them was extremely fascinating, especially for one who has developed a keen

interest in the history of I/O psychology (I currently have over 200 of what I consider classic I/O psychology and related subject matter books in my personal library).

Immediately after the editorship of *TIP* I was elected to the Member-at-Large position for a three-year term (1982-85). These were very exciting years as the Division began entertaining thoughts about a Society and, perhaps, independence from APA. This elected position meant service on the Long-Range Planning Committee, which was then involved with or initiated events such as examining our relationship with APA, particularly important since reorganization of APA was a hot issue at the time; a new organizational structure for the Division; and creation of two new committees, the Mid-Year Conference and Frontiers Series committees. In addition, we created an office and administrative position at the University of Maryland to support and undertake Division activities (this office subsequently moved to Bowling Green, Ohio).

From the Member-at-Large position I had the honor to be elected President of the Society (a three-year term, which includes being President-Elect and Past-President). My term as President can be described as one in which we played a waiting game to determine our future within APA. While I was President, the major area of interest was APA reorganization and what our role would be in it. My goal was to make us as independent as possible; if we had to leave APA that would have been acceptable, but my personal mission was to maintain our internal strength while co-existing with APA or any form it created. As I reflect back on the year as President, it seems that I spent most of my term in conversations with Milt Hakel, Dick Campbell, Irv Goldstein, and others on how APA reorganization was progressing (or regressing) and what our response should be. But there were also some proactive accomplishments, such as publication of the Society's third edition of its *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures,* the initiation of plans to develop a SIOP directory, follow-up of the first Society conference in Chicago with an equally successful meeting in Atlanta, holding of the first "strategic planning" session for the Society, among others.

Completing my term as President of SIOP did not end my involvement with the Society. From 1989-92, I served as a representative to the APA Council of Representatives and from 1988-98 I was on the *Frontiers Series* editorial board, chairing the board from 1993-98. And in the years following, I served on committees that reviewed members for special honors and recognition. My contributions to SIOP were recognized in 1997 with receipt of its Distinguished Service Award. This honor was a bonus to the rewarding and fulfilling experiences with others in SIOP.

I want to note that my involvement in Division 14/SIOP governance and service facilitated my involvement with other professional societies. For example, I was the division's representative to APA and its Committee on Psychological Tests and Assessment, the Board of Scientific Affairs, and on several task forces. For the Academy of Management, I served on the Executive Committee of the Personnel/Human Resources Division (1985-88) and served on the Executive Board of the Society of Organizational Behavior (1984-89).

HONORS AND AWARDS

The following are some honors that I have received over my career and about which I am especially proud: (1) April 2019 – Honored by SIOP with "*Scientist-Practitioner Presidential Recognition*;" (2) April 2018 - Creation of the *Zedeck-Jacobs Adverse Impact Reduction Research Initiative and Action (AIRRIA) Grants*; SIOP Foundation; Awards; provides funds for research on adverse impact; (3) March 2017 - *ATP (Association of Test Publishers) 2017 Professional Contributions and Service to Testing Award*; (4) February 2017 - Elected to the *Berkeley Fellows*; an honorific society of distinguished friends of the Berkeley campus; (5) December 2011 - *Israel Organizational Behavior Conference 2011 Life-time Achievement A*ward; (6) May 2011- *Smashing Bias Research Award* (with M. Shultz); *For the Promotion of Outstanding Research on Ensuring Fairness from the Classroom to the Boardroom*; awarded by the Level Playing Field Institute; (7) January 2011 - Creation of the *Sheldon Zedeck Program for Culture, Behavior and Management Study at UC Berkeley*; donation from individuals in China in honor of Sheldon Zedeck's retirement from UC Berkeley; (8) December 2010 - *The Berkeley Citation*; awarded for rendering distinguished service to the University; to faculty and administrators whose attainments significantly exceed the standards of excellence in their fields and whose contributions to UC Berkeley are manifestly above and beyond the call of duty; (9) April 2010 - *Bowling Green State University Centennial Award Recipient; 100 Distinguished Alumni*; (10) January 2009 - Creation of the "*Martha and Sheldon Zedeck Endowment Fund*," Department of Psychology; and (11) April 2007 - *Division III Award for Distinction in Industrial/Organizational Psychology*, California Psychological Association.

RETIREMENT

When I retired on December 31, 2010 from the University of California, as noted above, I received the *Berkeley Citation* for contributions to UC Berkeley. But this recognition and milestone did not mean that I would stop being active in the university or the I/O field. To this date, I continue to review for journals, serve on professional and organizational advisory boards (e.g., for Psychological Services Incorporated (PSI) science advisory board and the American Medical Colleges Admissions Initiative Expert Panel), and "consult" informally with attorneys on employment discrimination cases. And, I still go into my "office" at the university almost every day.

Two particular retirement activities, however, are my role in helping develop the Interdisciplinary Center for Healthy Workplaces (ICHW) on the Berkeley campus and my role in the UCB Emeriti Association (UCBEA). The ICHW is a campus center that brings together faculty and experts from the campus and other institutions and organizations to study how to define and measure "healthy workplaces" from multidisciplinary perspectives – the Center conducts research, reviews and presents findings pertinent to the generation and maintenance of a "healthy workplace," and conducts conferences that bring experts from different perspectives together to discuss the issue. Though in name, I am the associate director of the ICHW, the primary developer, facilitator, and leader of ICHW is Dr. Cristina Banks (who was an undergraduate in the UCB Psychology program in the 1970's); any success for the ICHW is due to Dr. Banks' efforts and her crew of committed professionals.

The second role in which I am still involved is with the UCBEA; I served as its President from 2015-2017 and currently serve on its Executive Committee. This organization is a social and advocacy group for the benefit of the 900 or so emeriti in the UCB system. This group has also been involved in providing workshops on how to make the transition from a faculty member to emeritus/a status and to preserving the history and legacy of emeriti – projects in which I have been heavily involved.

To sum up retirement, it is said that I "failed retirement 101."

FAMILY

As I conclude this updated autobiography, I need to acknowledge my family and their support throughout all of my "interesting" endeavors. The Zedeck organization has grown since I went off to graduate school at Bowling Green. Marti and I have partnered and shared, for 53+ years, wonderful times, experiences, and careers, and watched our children grow and become independent. Our oldest daughter, Cindy, is a health educator for a pediatric diabetes prevention program (married to Jason Singer, educator) and has 2 sons – Aidan and Noah. Our son Jason, is a lawyer in private practice (married to Stacey Skura Zedeck, nurse) and has three girls – Molly, Ella, and Lilly. And our youngest daughter, Tracy, is an aerial firefighter pilot. I wouldn't have accomplished as much as I did without their love and support. Thanks, and much love to all.

POSTSCRIPT

As I write this update in 2020, and as I look back over my 50+ years in the profession of I/O psychology and involvement in SIOP and my academic, research, administrative, and consulting careers, the facet that is most dominant in my mind is the people involved. Several years ago, Ben Schneider wrote that the people make the organization. He was correct. Throughout the many years, Marti and I have met numerous people in the Society who have become close and dear friends. Not only have our families spent time together at conferences, but we have celebrated special family events together, taken vacations together, provided support to each other at times of personal difficulties, and have established long-lasting relationships. The career and the people have made it a wonderful ride for this kid from Brooklyn.