

# Irwin L. Goldstein

## SIOP President 1985-86

---

I was born on October 4, 1937 in New York City, the first child of Benjamin and Molly Goldstein. My father had escaped from Russia and came to the United States in the late 1920's. My mother was born and raised in Hartford, Connecticut. Her parents had also left Russia, fleeing from the persecution of Jews which one generation later led my father to also leave his homeland. The fourth member of our immediate household was my sister who was born in 1944 when I was seven years old.

Shortly after my father's arrival, the great depression became a reality, leaving my father to attempt to earn a living by working in New York City candy stores. For the uninitiated, a New York candy store is a unique work organization which led to many early educational and work experiences for me. A candy store serves as the local neighborhood gathering place for workers who would stop by in the morning and evenings to buy the earliest and latest editions of newspapers as well as fill up on cigarettes and cigars. During the day, the store served as the local gathering place for mothers and their children who stopped for candies, sodas, ice cream and magazines. For me, the candy store was an important part of my life. In my early years, I would follow my father around in the store, enjoying being a part of the neighborhood. I learned to read by playing with comic books and eventually I worked for my father thereby learning about work and earning summer pay. All of the neighborhood knew I was Ben's son, both an advantage in meeting all sorts of people, and a disadvantage in that everyone knew where to go when I misbehaved either in school or on the street.

Even though my father had been admitted to College, he lost his opportunity for an education because as the major wage earner for his family, he took on the responsibility of bringing his mother, father, brothers, and sisters to New York from Russia. These events touched me in a variety of ways. First, because my father had lost his opportunity, he was totally dedicated to both my sister and I gaining a complete education. My sister graduated from City College of New York. She later earned a masters degree, and is a biology teacher in the New York City public school system. There was never any question for either of us about going to college, or following college with advanced education. Every conversation about education in our home emphasized its importance.

Another important factor in my early experience was that my father's entire family lived close by resulting in a wonderful extended family of aunts, uncles and cousins. My cousins all went on to interesting careers as architects, medical doctors and psychologists. My cousins and I, as a result of our early experiences together, are

closer today than most brothers and sisters resulting in all of us having an extended family even though we all live quite far from each other. Also, as a result of the persecution of many of my mothers and fathers family for being Jewish, all of our families sought out the synagogue as a place of education and support. Whatever free time my father had was spent in leadership positions in the synagogue community. My father and mother felt that it was a blessing to be able to give to the community and I have never forgotten the joy of that lesson. Finally, because my father was in a retail business and worked very long hours, my mother took on most of the responsibility for providing daily nourishing love and direction.

My educational accomplishments during elementary school and junior high school were not anything to write home about. I was much more successful as an athlete than as a student, and my parents would often "visit" with me at the local ballfields to remind me it was time to go home and relate to the textbooks. I also had an active role in synagogue and school activities and was elected to a number of positions including being elected president of my junior high school. Even more important, when I was 15 years old, I was lucky enough to meet the young lady, Micki Isaacson, who would become my wife and best friend.

Life changed dramatically for me when I took an intelligence test and somehow qualified for Stuyvesant High School. Stuyvesant over the years has graduated more students who have earned Westinghouse Scholarships, M.D.'s, Ph.D's, and Nobel Prizes than any high school in the nation. In every class, the teachers reminded the students that they were going to be the first group to embarrass Stuyvesant High School. I was not ready for Stuyvesant. In the middle of the first semester, my mother and father were told that if I could not perform better, I could return to my local high school. So began the three most difficult academic years of my life. When I graduated, I was the last person in the top half of the class. On the other hand, I knew how to study and learn and I had successfully completed advanced courses in science and math competing against some of the finest students in the country. My view of school had changed from fear of being unable to achieve to the joy of learning.

I took another exam and qualified for Queens College of what is now known as the City University of New York. I would have preferred to go out of town to school, but I chose not to apply because I knew that it would be very difficult for my more than willing father and mother. After the camaraderie of Stuyvesant, I found Queens College to be unfriendly and not particularly challenging. The final straw came in my third semester when I visited the Psychology Department only to be told that advising was not available until I was a junior. I called a close friend of mine, Larry Schiff, who was attending Baruch College which at that time was the downtown business school for City College. He described the kind of attention he was receiving at City College and arranged for me to visit with Professor Angelo Dispenzieri. The following day Angelo spent three hours giving me career guidance and counseling and advised me not to transfer because I would lose credits.

The next day, much to the horror of my parents, I filed transfer papers and I began my fourth semester at downtown City College. I did not realize it at the time I transferred but even though Baruch was the business school, it had a complete undergraduate Psychology Department with an Industrial Psychology specialty. Years later, Baruch was to become a separate college of the City University of New York. At the time I transferred, they had on their faculty many early industrial psychologists including Benjamin Balinsky, Milton Blum, Angelo Dispenzieri, and Mortimer Feinberg. Also, since City College was an undergraduate teaching institution without graduate students, they cherished their undergraduate students and provided exceptional laboratory experiences, jobs, and every kind of educational opportunity.

Angelo was my first mentor. I think he was surprised that I took the chance of transferring, but I also think he decided to watch over me. He was an exceptional teacher, and he provided continual opportunities to work closely with him on research projects. The faculty took great pride in their students and at the same time offered an extremely demanding and rigorous curriculum. The course in History and Systems and the Experimental Laboratory Course were infamous for their difficulty but every one of us who completed those required courses looked back with a sense of accomplishment. Also, as I look back on it, those courses and many which followed in graduate school led to my thinking of psychology in terms of being a broad discipline, rather than narrow specialties, and eventually led to my research perspective having a larger framework than just I-O Psychology.

My class of psychology majors consisted of about 15 students every one of whom went on to graduate school. I can not help but be indebted to the New York City School System which provided a superb high school and college education at basically no cost. For parents like my own, who were struggling economically to survive in their new homeland, the school system was a real blessing. If my class was faced with the present harsh realities of the costs of education, I am not sure how many of us would have made it to the careers we are in today.

My years at Baruch passed swiftly and I now knew I wanted to be an industrial psychologist. On the basis of the advice of the Baruch faculty, I applied to graduate schools. I was offered admission to a number of schools including the University of Maryland, New York University, and Lehigh University. It was a very difficult choice because New York University had offered me a full fellowship to study with Ray Katzell and my relationship with my wife to be made me want to stay in New York. However, the faculty at Baruch strongly advised me to attend graduate school out of town. They felt that students who had stayed in New York were taking a very long time to receive their degrees and they had sent several students on to Maryland who had successfully completed that program. The one thing which I had not realized at the time was how little the faculty tended to know about the characteristics of various graduate programs and what was happening on the national scene in graduate education. Thus, I missed the chance to work with Ray Katzell and I arrived at Maryland to discover that it did not have an I-O program.

Maryland had in its earlier history faculty such as Ed Ghiselli and a short time before had a strong program in applied psychology with faculty including Jack Jenkins. However, when I arrived, the program was much more an experimental psychology program than an applied program. Maryland, in those days, also had a philosophy of admitting large classes and losing large number of students along the way to the Ph.D. In addition, it had a very poor relationship between its department chair and faculty. As a result, I would not call it a high morale/high satisfaction department. However, at the time I attended, it did have an outstanding faculty who offered a wonderful education. Thus, I had the privilege of learning statistics from T.G. Andrews, sensory and perception from Hersh Lebowitz, learning and motivation from Lew Gollub, Matt Yarczower and Bill Verplanck, physiological psychology from Joe Brady, applied experimental from Nancy Anderson, and social psychology from Elliot McGinnies. Again, I was learning to be a psychologist first.

Most of all, the program had a new faculty member who arrived the day I arrived, Nancy Anderson, who cared a great deal about young students, and who guided much of my research including my doctoral dissertation on information processing. My masters thesis was on conformity in groups directed by McGinnies, and my research assistantships were often in Matt Yarczower's animal lab where I spent many hours with rats, pigeons, and baboons. Thus, while Maryland was not what I would call a happy place, its halls were filled with debates about theory and empirical research. Verplanck's year long history and systems course on the philosophy of science was a legend among graduate students and after he left, the next class of students wanted to pay to have him fly back and teach the course. In addition, the debates over behaviorism and Hull and Spence were in full bloom. You could not help but be caught up in the joy of science. As I think back, it is probably the case that my early interest in experimental learning had a lot to do with my eventual interest in training systems.

While there were many daily anxieties, my graduate education was completed swiftly, although stories of the number of times I needed to take a second foreign language examination in German were both legendary and true. Several other events occurred while I was at Maryland. The most important thing that happened was that after a year and a half of being separated from Micki, we were married. Separated is, of course, not a good description because I was spending most of my weekends traveling back and forth, studying on the train, between Maryland and New York. It was, in those days, hard to convince either parents it was a good idea to marry while I was a graduate student without any income. However, I think that everyone decided they were better off if we were married than they were listening to both of us being so unhappy all the time. Our relationship of love and support made graduate school and everything that followed seem much easier.

The other really important event was that Jack Bartlett arrived during my last year in graduate school to form an I-O program. It was too late for me as a student to study I-O at Maryland, although I did take some course work. More important we

became friends, a friendship which would grow to last a lifetime. Also, between Jack and Nan, they strongly recommended me to Ohio State University where I was offered a position as an assistant professor of psychology and a research associate in the Aviation Psychology lab. Micki and I will never forget the evening after I accepted the job at Ohio State. We partied in Jack's house while Nan, Jack and his wife Gloria, and other "Buckeyes" ran around the basement dancing, singing and cheering to all of the Ohio State football songs, with special renditions of "I don't give a damn for the whole state of Michigan." It was quite a send off.

Finally, in my last several months, I also learned how far I had to go. Up to that time, I thought I had learned to think and write logically. However, when I handed in my dissertation, Matt Yarczower invited my wife and I to visit him at Bryn Mawr where he was on sabbatical leave from Maryland. Little did we know that the purpose of the social visit was for Matt to take the next two days going through my thesis, word by word and line by line, showing me I did not know the first thing about writing a paper. Events which I will describe below confirmed that he was correct.

We arrived at Ohio State to begin my first academic job and I was in a state of awe. On this faculty in I-O Psychology and applied experimental psychology were among others, Bob Wherry Sr., Jim Naylor, George Briggs and Bill Howell. I was about to experience my second education. While teaching and being involved in research in the Aviation Psychology Lab, I soaked up everything that could be learned about I-O Psychology. My research was in what I would call my first phase. That is, I was becoming an engineering psychology or human factors person.

The lab was filled with ongoing research on complex vigilance studies, command and control simulations involving Bayesian decision theory, and team training. The lab was an incredibly exciting place with theoretical discussions concerning the usefulness of Bayesian theory, or the difference in theoretical and empirical evidence between simple and complex vigilance studies, being a daily occurrence. The lab was designed for each person to initially work on a number of projects, almost like a post-doc with strong encouragement to develop your own lines of research. There could not be a better learning experience. Bill Howell was an exceptional mentor for young psychologists, providing continual learning experiences and strong personal support. When Bill red-lined my write-up of my doctoral dissertation, which I was preparing for submission, I knew that I really did have a lot to learn. Many years later, when the first edition of my training book was published, I received a note from Bill telling me that I had really learned to communicate. That was a proud moment for me. I think I also tend to be more sympathetic to students who often have some of the same early difficulties.

As I reflect on those days at Ohio State, I feel that it really gave me both the training to be an I-O psychologists and the training to turn ideas into research. Also, because of its long history, Ohio State had a particular I-O tradition that is hard to explain but which you felt a part of the moment you stepped into the Department. The halls were filled with the thoughts and work of persons like Shartle, Fitts, Pressey, Toops,

Burt and Wherry. The "youngsters" on the faculty were persons like myself, Jim Naylor, and Bill Howell. There was a sense of pride that you were part of that Department and once you were there, either as a faculty member or student, you were considered part of that tradition. In both Maryland and Ohio State, I was extremely fortunate to be surrounded by exceptional people who were not only very thoughtful but also very helpful. They were also all driven to be excellent contributing psychologists and ideas, and debates about theories and research flowed through the halls. I now felt a part of that tradition.

In hind sight, I should have stayed at Ohio State. However, during three very productive work years, we were still lonely for the east coast. I had published a series of studies on complex vigilance, and information processing issues involving displays with large amounts of relevant and irrelevant information. Bill Howell and I were planning a book. Then, in our third year in Ohio, our son Harold had been born and the feeling that we were far from home intensified. Ohio State University had been wonderful to us but I went on the job market. There was not much available except that Jack Bartlett was building the I-O program at Maryland. He wanted me to come back as both an engineering psychologist and I-O psychologist in his new program. Even then, it was unusual to hire your own graduates. It always seemed ironic to me that Jack was able to hire me because I did not receive the I-O training at Maryland where I had gone for my I-O training in the first place. Even after Maryland made me an offer, I was uncertain about accepting. Suffice it to say that Maryland's department chair and his relationship with faculty worried me. After watching Bob Wherry as Chair, Jim Naylor as Assistant Chair, and Bill Howell as Director of the Lab, I had learned what support could really mean to young faculty. Then, a month after turning down Maryland's offer, Jack Bartlett called again to offer the job because the chair had resigned. My wife said "I don't know about you but I am going upstairs to pack" and so we returned to Maryland.

The first three years at Maryland were a disaster. It totally shaped my life in understanding everything that should not happen in an academic Department. As a matter of fact, it was the perfect learning experience for me in what not to do in working with faculty and students when I became department chair. The faculty did not feel like they had a role in anything that was important to the Department. As a result, there were bitter battles, and various persons who were selected in an acting role to be chair did not serve the Department well. Then, Charlie Cofer came from Pennsylvania State University only to resign six months later because he did not feel the administration was supporting the Department. Given the fact that the previous chair felt he was a representative of the administration, and saw his job as controlling the faculty, the university administration was not sure what to do with the Psychology Department. In the midst of this chaos, two senior faculty died of heart attacks increasing the sense of depression.

My career was in shambles. It was impossible to get work done at Maryland and the only thing that saved me was the research program I had begun at Ohio State, and my continuing association with faculty at Ohio State. Bill Howell and I coedited an

engineering psychology textbook and I set up a laboratory to continue my engineering psychology work on vigilance, and information processing. I had also become fascinated by research in the area of training systems which actually fit well into both engineering psychology and I-O psychology. However, a totally chaotic department and a brand new research area were too much to try to overcome. I prepared to leave as did nearly all of the young faculty. In my second year at Maryland, my daughter Beth was born and that pretty much confirmed my decision to leave. Raising two young children and attempting to build a career in such a non-supportive atmosphere was simply too much.

At that point, the young faculty met with the administration and suggested they choose someone from inside who was dedicated to the development of the Department. These "young turks," as we were referred to by the disillusioned senior faculty, suggested that unless the problems were resolved, we were going to leave. Much to our surprise, the administration listened and chose Jack Bartlett who proceeded to drive an extremely hard bargain with the university. Suddenly, we received financial resources, new positions and other support. Suffice it to say that Maryland's emergence as a Department began with Jack Bartlett and most of the faculty here today would not recognize (nor want to recognize) the old Department. Jack was merciless with the administration in demanding support. It was perfect timing because Maryland was beginning to think about its own dream in being an outstanding university. Jack was a tough task master and demanded excellence but his idea was to support faculty and help them develop. It became easier to recruit faculty and students wanted to come to Maryland. Also, the faculty totally redesigned its undergraduate and graduate programs resulting in decisions such as only accepting graduate students it expected to earn the Ph.D. The Department was beginning to become a place to be, and had a group of faculty who really wanted it to be both a good environment to work and an excellent Department.

Jack also was committed to building the I-O program. As a result, we expanded to what is now five faculty. Along the way, Jack recruited and hired outstanding young I-O psychologists such as Peter Dachler, Ken Smith, and Ben Schneider. Ben requires a special word. He was completing his Ph.D. with Jack at the time I arrived back at Maryland as a faculty member. Ben then went on to Yale's organizational behavior program and, several years later, Jack recruited Ben back to Maryland. After a number of years, Ben left to accept an endowed chair at Michigan State University. In the meantime, after about ten years, Jack decided it was time to rejoin the faculty full time and give up being Department Chair. Several years later, in 1980, I became chair. The first thing I did after becoming Department Chair was to recruit Ben back to Maryland. It may have been the best thing I have ever done.

Then, Jack Bartlett passed away from a heart attack while teaching a class to the whole I-O group. It took years to even begin to get over the tremendous sense of personal loss. However, at work, Ben became the leader of the I-O program. He also became my closest friend and valued colleague, a combination that few people have been fortunate enough to have. Ben's drive and caring about I-O Psychology had

established a "climate" within our program. As a result, the halls filled with the same theoretical and empirical debates about I-O Psychology that I had enjoyed so much as a young experimental psychologist. By 1988, exciting young faculty like Katherine Klein and Paul Hanges had joined us and Rick Guzzo was also being recruited. I guess my real feelings about how special a place Maryland had become are expressed by what happened when my own son, Harold, decided he was interested in I-O Psychology. Maryland was one of a number of places that recruited him. I am sure that it is not very wise for a son to attend a graduate program where his own father is on the faculty. On the other hand, Maryland was really an exciting place to be and Harold decided he wanted to study with Ben. If it was me, that would have been my choice, and so Harold is now here studying with us. It was quite a dramatic change from the institution that I attended as a graduate student thinking it had an I-O program. These positive changes have also permitted me to develop in a number of ways.

Most important for me in returning to Maryland from Ohio State was the chance to focus on training systems and finally become an I-O Psychologist. Jack gave me my first insights into doing research in work organizations. Up to that point, all of my work had been in laboratory facilities. He encouraged me to develop my interests in training systems. A few years after Jack became Department Chair, I went on sabbatical leave and wrote the 1974 edition of my training text. Much of my original interests were fueled by McGehee and Thayer's classic volume on training systems. My love affair with training systems and how they fit in organizations has continued with some shifts in emphases. Originally, my main interests were in how you design needs assessment systems to determine training needs. Since training needs assessment and job analysis for selection systems overlap, Jack often found places for me to explore those ideas in organizations where he was also working. This included our first large study together with one of the local police departments. We also teamed with Marv Dunnette & Leaetta Hough in a study for a federal government agency. That experience was one of my first opportunities to be involved in research involving teams of I-O psychologists which as I will describe below became very rewarding from both a professional and personal viewpoint.

Later, my interests shifted to the problems of how to conduct evaluation research on training systems in work organizations. A lot of these ideas were stimulated by John Campbell's early comments about the lack of empirical research on training systems. By that time, I had also been strongly influenced by Peter Dachler, Ken Smith and Ben Schneider, all at Maryland, who thought in large scale systems terms. So, I began to think of training systems as interventions into organizations and asked what kinds of evaluation models could be designed to help researchers collect information about the impact of a training program within an organization. This led to the 1986 edition of my training book which not only focused on needs assessment systems but also on intervention systems and evaluation models.

In addition, I began to think about training from a societal focus which led to discussions of training and second careers, aging and training, socialization and



training and fair employment practices and training. Some of this work appears in the 1986 volume and some in more recent articles and review chapters. These later influences are especially prominent in the edited training text for the 1989 SIOP Frontiers volume in which I had the opportunity to invite many thoughtful authors to discuss these issues. During all of this work, there were two persons, Paul Thayer and John Campbell, who strongly encouraged me and continually offered their insights. Paul Thayer's original work with Bill McGehee originally sparked my interest in this field and Paul always had new ideas to offer. John Campbell's wrote the first annual review chapter on the topic of training and his perceptive comments on research areas requiring attention sparked the interests of many of us. Regardless of how busy they were, both Paul and John were always willing to provide insightful and helpful comments on my books and articles. My hope is that my research and writing stimulates young investigators in the same way that Paul and John stimulated me.

As my research into training systems expanded, some of the areas of emphasis led me into other areas of I-O Psychology. This was especially true of the work in needs assessment/job analysis and evaluation methodology. I continued to be fascinated by how you could work with an organization when everything was not "good enough" to run a traditional study. Thus, I enjoyed asking questions like how could you use a content validity methodology to allow you to explore issues regarding the validity of selection systems. Often, that question was asked because sample sizes were not large enough, or because you could not collect criterion data for a criterion related validity study. I thought about it as gathering information that permitted inferences about the validity of your interventions. That also resulted in asking questions about what types of job analysis methodology were needed to support a foundation for the content validity of various interventions ranging from entry level selection system to a promotion system to a training system.

Some of this work was especially relevant to issues regarding fair employment practices and Title VII. Thus, I found the issues that we were concerned with to be interesting to both I-O Psychologists, and to attorneys who wanted our opinions about various ways of determining the validity of interventions that had been shown to have adverse impact. I have also enjoyed the opportunity to work with the many bright attorneys because they made me think about the public interest aspects of our field. The problems of discrimination in the workplace became a salient issue for me and I must thank the many attorneys I have worked with, especially those from the U.S. Department of Justice, for expanding my education. I found their questions forced me to expand the systems focus of my own thinking. Some I-O Psychologists felt that court cases negatively affected the advancement of our field. I feel otherwise. To me, this research was right at the intersection of practice and science and it tested our ingenuity in developing new ideas and approaches.

Thus, over recent years, I have found myself involved in various large scale projects in both public and private sectors where we attempted to advance the state of the

art. This included research conducted with Dick Barrett, Wiley Boyles, Wayne Cascio, Joyce Hogan, Bill Macey, Erich Prien, Jim Outtz, Paul Sackett, Neal Schmitt, Ben Schneider, Shelly Zedeck, and John Veres. In addition to challenging us to come up with new ideas, these studies also gave our academic program at Maryland many opportunities to provide research training in the field for our graduate students. It was quite an opportunity for them, but also for the faculty because it was a real example of how research and teaching went hand in hand. In addition, there is something special about the I-O community in that many of us who worked together also became friends and shared many social and family events together.

Another important part of my life as an I-O Psychologist has been my interaction with Division 14 and SIOP. Again, I owe my introduction to Jack Bartlett who introduced me to Lyman Porter who was about to become President. As a result, I was invited to serve on the Education and Training Committee. A few years later, I was given the assignment to help develop an individualized continuing education plan which would permit our members to earn continuing education credits. I ended up on the American Psychological Association Committee on Continuing Education and eventually we designed a plan which was appropriate for our membership. As a result, I was invited by Division 14 to serve on the Executive Committee as Chair of the Education and Training Committee. The opportunity to meet and interact with very thoughtful I-O Psychologists discussing the most critical issues facing us as a science, and as a profession is still a special thrill for me. Many years later, I still look forward to seeing the many friends I have made as a result of attending those meetings. It was even possible to joke with Ray Katzell over the fact that I had turned down a fellowship to study with him in order to attend Maryland's non-existent I-O program.

During my years on the executive committee, I have worked on a number of important topics such as the task force's analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of Division 14 becoming an incorporated society now known as SIOP. I also developed one of the first cost analyses comparing the cost for Division 14 members in belonging or not belong to APA. However, the two opportunities that I think about the most are our annual meeting and the Frontiers Series. As a member of the Long Range Planning Committee, I was involved in the original suggestions about having such a meeting and I was given the opportunity to perform an analysis to determine whether it was possible. In 1983, on the basis of questionnaire results and analyses of other scientific society meetings, I made a proposal to the executive committee to have an annual meeting and we formed a Society Conference Committee to make it happen. By 1984, we had designed a structure which included: myself as overall conference chair; a workshop committee chaired by Stan Silverman; a registration committee chaired by Ron Johnson; a program committee chaired by Rich Klimoski; and a local arrangements committee chaired by Bill Macey. We all worked very hard to make it happen and the sense of both excitement and anxiety over having a conference was at times overwhelming to everyone. As kind fate would have it, I had the honor of being elected President for 1985-86 with the Society's first conference scheduled for April 10-11, 1986. Thus, I resigned as

chair of the committee but had the thrill of being President during the first meeting. Fortunately, Stan Silverman took over as chair of the Committee and his organizational skills along with the extremely able committee members made it all happen. I will never forget the estimates we were all making about who would come to this conference. They ranged from virtually no one to some small number. We were astonished when 600 persons showed up in Chicago and the annual conference was born. It was a pleasure to continue to serve on the Conference Committee signing up the next five cities and wondering how much it would grow during that time period.

While the conference dominated our thoughts, there were many other exciting happenings during my term as President. The first volume in the Frontiers series was published with Ray Katzell as series editor and Tim Hall as volume editor. I was especially excited by that occurrence as I had the privilege of being selected to serve with Ray Katzell's as a member of the editorial board for the series. During that term, I edited the third volume on training. After Ray completed his term, I was further delighted when I was elected by the board to serve as its second series editor.

During my term as president, we also held, with the leadership of Ralph Alexander and his committee, our first doctoral consortium, and we published the third edition of the Principles with Neal Schmitt and Bill Owens as co-editor. There was also the continuing tensions with APA and whether we would remain a part of APA but the completion of that story did not occur during my term as President.

At this time, I am still actively involved in my work and in SIOP activities. I am preparing a chapter with Shelly Zedeck and Ben Schneider on content validation for a volume of the Frontiers Series edited by Neal Schmitt and Wally Borman. My handbook chapter on training has just been sent off to Marv Dunnette. I am completing a term as Council Representative to APA and I am looking forward to my term as series editor of the Frontiers Series. So, how do I finish this auto-biography? I am really not sure because I still feel that I am in the midst of a very exciting career and life. The whole thing has been a joy and if I had it to do all over again, I would choose the same career and hope for the same opportunities.

Professor and Chair  
Department of Psychology  
University of Maryland at College Park  
October 1990