

## Donald L. Grant

### SIOB President 1974-1975

If, when I graduated from high school, I had been informed that I would become an industrial-organizational psychologist, I would have asked "What is an industrial-organizational psychologist?" It is true, moreover, that my decision to become an industrial-organizational psychologist evolved over many years. While an undergraduate at Princeton (1937-41) I had vague notions of becoming a lawyer. Consequently, I majored in Public Affairs, an interdisciplinary program in what is now the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. I took a few psychology courses and was favorably impressed with some, especially Social Psychology with the late Hadley Cantril. For that matter, my prime academic interests focused on human problems. The majority of my undergraduate courses were in such fields as history, economics, political science, and psychology. To illustrate more specifically, my A.B. thesis dealt with the relations between a carpet company and its union. The data gathering involved interviewing many company and union officials plus the local newspaper editor. The files of the latter's newspaper provided most of the "hard" data obtained.

While in college I had my first job experiences. These included clerking in men's clothing stores during Christmas vacations and risking my neck climbing elm trees for the U. S. Department of Agriculture at .50 per hour during summer vacations. Extracurricularly, I devoted my major efforts to soliciting advertising for The Daily Princetonian.

World War II was in progress, though the U. S. was not yet involved when I graduated in 1941. With the draft staring me in the face it was no time to start law school! My dilemma was whether to volunteer for the armed services, or to postpone the fateful day and let the draft catch up with me. The latter course prevailed. Following interviews with a few prospective employers in the Spring of my senior year, I accepted an offer to become a management trainee with Sharp & Dohme (now Merck Sharp & Dohme), which then had its headquarters in Philadelphia.

Prior to joining Sharp & Dohme, however, I took advantage of a special course offered jointly by the Wharton School of Business and the Engineering School of the University of Pennsylvania. The objective of the course, which crammed what normally would have been one year of academic training into three months, was that of preparing people to be supervisors in the rapidly growing war industry. The program covered a variety of subjects, e.g., cost accounting, time and motion study, drafting, supervisory principles, and included periodic tours of local plants. I found the latter most interesting.

Following completion of the program I began my tour as a management trainee with Sharp & Dohme. The training was a bore! It consisted primarily of listening to people explain their job functions. Ironically, Pearl Harbor relieved me of the tedium. Expecting me to leave for the military shortly, the Personnel Director assigned me to his department, hoping, I presume, to gain some productive effort out of me before Uncle Sam sent me his greetings. While in Personnel I made a preliminary study for a prospective job evaluation plan. Then I was assigned to taking fingerprints of all employees in the Philadelphia and Glenolden offices and plants. I held nearly 2000 hands!

With the draft a daily possibility I volunteered for both the Navy and the Army Air Force, and was rejected by both. Taking the advice of an older brother, an Army captain, I traveled to Fort Sill,

Oklahoma and volunteered for the Field Artillery. I was accepted, went through basic training, then to officer candidate school, emerging as a 2nd lieutenant in November of 1942.

I was assigned to a new division, the 86th "Black Hawk" Division, located at Camp Howse, Texas. Being short of experienced officers, I was appointed assistant training and operations officer, normally a captain's position, of the 404th Field Artillery Battalion. In three months I was made training and operations officer of the battalion, succeeding a major, and subsequently promoted to 1st lieutenant. Six months later I was sent back to Fort Sill for advanced training. While there I was promoted to captain, thus getting my first lesson in "opportunity" factors.

Returning to the 404th, relocated to Camp Livingston, Louisiana, I was assigned as reconnaissance officer, my assignment finally catching up to my rank. I spent the remainder of World War II in this capacity, doing a lot of travelling and seeing only a few months of combat in Europe. Soon after VE Day I returned to the United States and was sent with my division to the Philippines, where I remained till returned to the States and released from active duty.

In addition to broadening my view of the world, the Army experience left me with several memories which were to be pertinent to my later career. I gained my first impressions of "leadership", both superior and mediocre. The systematic approach to training, i.e., transforming raw recruits into an efficient field artillery battalion, impressed me favorably. The term "red tape" also took on meaning.

Following my release from active duty I rejoined Sharp & Dohme and was assigned the position of employment manager for the entire company. My responsibilities included general employment, personally recruiting and screening candidates for managerial positions, advising line managers on company personnel policies and dealing with union representatives on matters involving grievances or potential ones. I gained my first experience at using psychological tests for employment purposes, being guided by the late Howard Maher. At the time Howard had a Master's degree in psychology from Temple University, later a Ph.D. from Ohio State, and had worked for Atlantic Refining prior to joining Sharp & Dohme. We became close friends. Howard stimulated my rapidly developing interest in Industrial-Organizational Psychology - then, of course, Industrial Psychology - and introduced me to Herman Copeland, Elliott Danzig and Carl Kujawski. With his encouragement I enrolled in evening courses in psychology at Temple, where I was introduced to such subjects as statistics, applied psychology, abnormal psychology and the history of psychology.

Early in 1947 I was promoted to Chief Job Analyst with responsibility for wage administration. This involved managing two job evaluation plans, one covering factory, the other office workers. The combined experiences at Sharp & Dohme and Temple had several consequences for me. I became convinced that I wanted to become an industrial-organizational psychologist and that I should seek a full-time graduate program. Consequently, following advice from Howard and others, I applied to the Psychology Department at Ohio State, was accepted, resigned from Sharp & Dohme and enrolled at OSU in the Fall of 1947.

Graduate work at Ohio State was one of the most rewarding experiences of my life. Not only was it intellectually stimulating but also socially very pleasant. During my first year I was graduate assistant to my major advisor, Harold Burt, who aided me in many ways during my years as a graduate student. In addition, I had the privilege and pleasure of sharing an office with Donald Campbell, who had just received his Ph.D. from Berkeley and was in his first academic position. I thoroughly enjoyed getting to

know Don and, also, his wife and two sons. I became acquainted with a number of graduate students, including Bernard Bass, John Barry, Ralph Canter, John Denton, Jack Parrish and the late James Trump. I enjoyed my courses, especially courses in statistics with the late Herbert Toops. Though I worked very hard at my studies, or so it seemed, I did find time during my first summer at OSU to improve my golf game playing with Robert Good and other high handicappers.

As research assistant to the late Herbert Toops during my second year I came to appreciate his many fine talents, especially his ability to approach problems creatively. It was during this year that I became good friends with the Perloffs, Evelyn and Robert, and with Joel Campbell and had my first courses with Robert Wherry. I completed my Master's thesis, which consisted of factorial analyses of the two job evaluation plans I had managed for Sharp & Dohme. Subsequently, the thesis became my first professional publication.

In my third and final year on the OSU campus I gained my first teaching experience by instructing an undergraduate course. I also completed course requirements, preliminary examinations and the language requirement. During this year I was graduate student representative to the Psychology Department faculty. My acquaintance with future I-O psychologists expanded through meeting Edwin Fleishman, Albert Glickman and Norman Gekoski.

Throughout my years at Ohio State I enjoyed my contacts with the faculty, both in and out of class. I made many good friends with fellow graduate students, a few of whom I have mentioned. While demanding, the academic work was enjoyable. Overall, I developed a strong identification with psychology as a science and a profession.

During the Winter of 1950 I accepted an offer of employment from The Prudential Insurance Company. In March of that year I became a Research Analyst in their Personnel Research Division. Robert Selover was Director of the Division with Reign Bittner, to whom I reported, as Associate Director. While with The Prudential I worked on a variety of projects, involving selection, training, job evaluation, performance evaluation and turnover. I worked closely with Bob and Reign and with Philip Kriedt, Robert Schaffer, Mary Skula and many others on the personnel research staff. While there, also, I became aware of the work of Rensis Likert and his associates at the University of Michigan. Pioneering studies at The Prudential were among the first carried out by these early "organizational behaviorists". The late Gilbert David was among this group. He joined The Prudential organization for a few years, and I became acquainted with him there.

Having accepted a position with The Prudential sans dissertation, one of my early objectives was to undertake an appropriate study and to complete the requirement. My first proposal was that of developing a questionnaire that would permit describing jobs objectively and, through the application of factor analysis to the data, provide a means of classifying jobs. I saw this as a possible replacement for or supplement to the more subjective methods of evaluating jobs. Despite my dream of thus upstaging Ernest McCormick's Position Analysis Questionnaire, the project didn't materialize. I settled for a less ambitious study, which involved analyzing a large amount of rating data to gain insights into halo effect in rating processes. In carrying out my dissertation research I was not only aided by my major adviser, Harold Burt, but received much useful advice from Robert Wherry, who at the time was working on developing a theory of rater bias. Following completion of my dissertation, I received the Ph.D. degree in December, 1952.

Following what turned out to be my final assignment at The Prudential, i.e., assisting in the establishment of a regional home office in Minneapolis, where I had the good fortune to meet the late Donald Patterson, I left the company to try my hand at teaching. I accepted an offer as Assistant Professor of Psychology at Western Reserve University, now Case Western Reserve University. At Western Reserve I became reacquainted with Joel Campbell and his family and established particularly close relationships with Calvin Hall, Jay Otis, and the late Erwin Taylor. Jack Denton and family came to Cleveland during this period, and we socialized frequently.

While at Western Reserve, where I was the only full-time faculty member in the Industrial Psychology program at the time, I focused my efforts on teaching, supervising dissertations and advising students. I had little time for research and/or consulting. While there, I taught eleven courses or seminars, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The subjects taught included not only several in industrial psychology but also statistics, measurement, applied psychology and, one summer, a course in the history of psychology. I was the major advisor on dissertations for Robert Gunn, Arthur Kellner and Henry Brenner, the latter completing his work with Joel Campbell. There were a good many outstanding graduate students majoring in Industrial Psychology at Western Reserve during my relatively short stay. I became well acquainted with several who subsequently have had illustrious careers in the profession, including, along with my advisees, Richard Barrett, Stanley Bolin, John Drake, William Flynn, Andrew Hilton, Theodore Kunin and William Walker.

During my last year at Western Reserve I decided to seek a position offering more opportunities for applied research. Therefore, while at Yale University being interviewed for a possible position there, I was asked by the late Carl Hovland whether I would be interested in being considered for a position with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. My agreement led to interviews and then a position in June, 1956 with the recently-formed Personnel Research Section at AT&T.

Up to this time my experience had been largely that of an "apprentice" industrial-organizational psychologist. I had joined the American Psychological Association, published a few articles, participated in a number of research projects and taught courses, but at AT&T I began to function as a full-fledged industrial-organizational psychologist.

My first assignment at AT&T was that of being a member of an assessment center staff for the Management Progress Study. The Management Progress Study was initiated in 1956 with Douglas Bray as its director. The study subsequently has become well known and is continuing under Bray's direction. The assessment center was set up as a means of obtaining data on the personal characteristics of the managers in the study sample. I had read about assessment centers, but had never participated in one. The first center was located in St. Clair, Michigan. At the center I worked very closely with John Hemphill who made many contributions to the methods used at the center, especially the group exercises and the in-basket exercise. Doug Bray directed the staff of eight psychologists. I look back on participating with this staff as one of my most stimulating learning experiences.

Subsequently, I contributed to the Management Progress Study by directing analyses of data and preparing reports, several of which were published with Bray and others as coauthors, including the book, *Formative Years in Business: A Long-Term AT&T Study of Managerial Lives*. In addition, I participated on several assessment center staffs and during the summer of 1975 directed a middle-management center for one of the Bell System telephone companies.

Experience with assessment centers shaped my views considerably regarding ways of measuring human behavior and also regarding the relative importance of various aspects of human behavior. Limitations of paper-and pencil tests and questionnaires became apparent to me. Furthermore, the importance of human functioning of interpersonal and other kinds of skills, which can't be measured adequately by means of conventional measuring instruments, impressed me. Though assessment centers have limitations, they make it possible to evaluate aspects of human behavior which play a major role in the lives of all of us.

Another of my major activities at AT&T was research on and with employee attitude surveys. The principal study I directed was one made of the periodic survey of management employees conducted by AT&T for the Bell System telephone companies. Both interviews and a questionnaire were employed in carrying out the study. The results provided much information about the impact of attitude surveys on large organizations. I believe that it may be the only attitude survey of an attitude survey to have been conducted! Though the findings bore on many aspects of conducting attitude surveys, the major finding of the study was a clear indication of employee disappointment over the apparent absence of actions taken to correct conditions revealed by the survey results. I also directed studies, using interviews, of lesser scope which focused on specific problems.

In addition to such studies, I was closely involved with the methodology of attitude surveys. Much of this effort was directed at improving the questionnaires then being used. It also led to the publication with Ann Clarke of an article describing the use of factorial methods in selecting questions for an attitude survey questionnaire.

Undoubtedly, however, psychological testing dominated my activities while with AT&T. It included both research and administrative responsibilities. Initially, my research focused on the testing of college graduates employed as management trainees for the Bell System telephone companies. Subsequently, I directed test studies for both the Engineering and Marketing departments of AT&T. In addition, I annually directed the construction of a "contemporary affairs" test, which was used in the Management Progress Study and operating assessment centers.

Looking back, however, the most crucial of my activities was involvement in the use of psychological tests for the employment of personnel for nonmanagement jobs in the Bell System telephone companies. This activity started in 1963 when AT&T and the telephone companies accepted commitments under Plans for Progress for employing minorities for such occupations as telephone operators, clerks, installation and maintenance personnel, and Business Office service representatives. When asked to help, I recommended that the first step be one of ascertaining the impact of test batteries then in use on the hiring of minorities. As a consequence, much data was collected from the employment offices of several telephone companies. Comparisons of test scores by ethnic group showed that minority applicants, especially black males, were much less likely than were nonminority applicants to meet employment test standards.

These findings led to recommendations for immediate revisions in the current test batteries and for test validation studies designed to permit comparisons between minorities and nonminorities with respect to both the predictive validities of tests and their prospective use in telephone company employment offices. In essence, these recommendation anticipated both the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the later decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Griggs v. Duke Power*.

In addition to these recommendations and in light of the initial finding in *Myart v. Motorola*, it was decided to evaluate the "cultural bias" of tests then being used or recommended by AT&T for use by the telephone companies. I directed a study which involved large samples of minority and nonminority job applicants. Average scores for both samples on three tests were compared, i.e., the School and College Ability Test, the Bennett Mechanical Aptitude Test and Cattell's "Culture Fair" Test. The resulting comparisons showed that the differences in average scores between ethnic groups for all three tests were nearly identical, i.e., approximately one standard deviation. These findings indicated that the content of the test had little effect on group performance.

Planning and conducting the proposed test validation studies spanned several years. Several minor and four major studies were carried out under my immediate direction or under my overall supervision. In this connection, I was fortunate in 1967 to have employed Sidney Gael, who carried the burden for several of the studies. The criterion problem was, of course, a major consideration. Following Doug Bray's advice, based on his experience as a psychologist with the U.S. Army Air Force in World War II, we opted for work sample criteria. These were constructed to directly measure proficiency in performing the required work following a period of training, or for simple tasks following instructions. Needless to say, constructing the work samples was time-consuming and expensive. The major studies have been published in the *Journal of Applied Psychology* and have been republished in a book by Mary and John Miner (*Employee Selection Within the Law*, Washington, D.C.: The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., 1978).

In addition to research on psychological tests, I undertook reshaping test administration policies and practices for the Bell System telephone companies. This became a major responsibility which involved me in frequent contact with representatives of the telephone companies and with test publishers. Furthermore, I directed a number of special studies ancillary to the major studies - for example:

A test validation study for selecting programmers.

Development of new tests for Bell System use.

Revisions of test norms.

Comparisons of tests previously used with more recently introduced tests.

While the above conveys the scope of activities in which I was involved, it fails to reflect the huge amount of time required for consulting on testing matters, holding conferences, preparing reports and administering the mass of detail involved. Fortunately, the support of sympathetic supervisors, including Doug Bray during many years, and excellent cooperation from AT&T and Bell System telephone company personnel made it possible to carry out what at times seemed to be more than a small staff could possibly handle.

Involvement with employment testing invariably led to involvement in the legal aspects of using tests. Included were:

Conducting correspondence and holding meetings with representatives of federal agencies (EEOC, OFCC) and of state and local human rights commissions regarding Bell System test studies, policies, and procedures.

Advising telephone company personnel on dealing with complaints concerning test practices.

Serving as an expert witness in a court case (Parham v. Southwestern Bell) and in hearings before the Federal Communications Commission.

The FCC hearings, arising from charges by the EEOC regarding alleged discriminatory practices by AT&T and the Bell System telephone companies, proved to be enormously time-consuming. Testing was only a minor aspect of the total case. Nevertheless, preparation of the case took an estimated year of my time. Without going into exhaustive detail I shall simply enumerate the most salient activities:

Working with attorneys having little or no knowledge of psychological testing.

Working with "outside" expert witnesses for the Bell System -Brent Baxter and Robert Guion.

Preparing written testimony, approximately 400 pages, which had to be rewritten several times.

Appearing at the hearings, both during cross-examination of EEOC witnesses (Phillip Ash, William Ennels, Felix Lopez) and during cross-examination of the AT&T witnesses, including myself.

As history records, the hearings were settled with a consent decree which didn't resolve all of the issues regarding the use of tests for employment and other purposes, but did provide that each Bell Company may continue to utilize test scores on validated tests along with other job-related considerations in assessing individual qualifications. (Wallace, P.A. Equal Employment Opportunity and the AT&T Case. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press, 1976, p. 288)

Each Bell Company may continue to utilize test scores on validated tests along with other job-related considerations in assessing individual qualifications. However, no Bell Company shall rely upon the minimum scores required or preferred on its preemployment aptitude test batteries as justification for its failure to meet its intermediate targets for any job classification.

While research on psychological tests consumed a major portion of my time and energies from 1960 through 1972 I did manage to participate in a number of other projects and activities. The Management Progress Study and assessment center activities studies have been mentioned. In addition, briefly,

I directed evaluations of three management development programs.

I directed several opinion questionnaire studies aimed at specific employee groups (e.g., recent college graduate hires).

I directed a survey of Bell System telephone company appraisal practices.

I participated in a task force studying turnover of personnel responsible for the installation and maintenance of telephone equipment.

I supervised varying numbers of personnel, clerical and professional.

In 1972 AT&T reorganized its Personnel Relations Department and my responsibilities were changed. I was given a choice of continuing research on and utilization of psychological tests in the employment of nonmanagement personnel or of working on the selection and development of managerial personnel. I chose the latter. In addition I continued to work with Douglas Bray on the Management Progress Study, was assigned responsibility for research on the selection of sales personnel, and was given administrative responsibility for the data processing staff. Further more, my past did not entirely escape

me. Frequent inquiries came to me regarding studies involving psychological tests and other matters involving tests for which I had been responsible.

With respect to management development, I provided overall supervision to a staff of three people in developing and implementing a program aimed at the development of persons employed for or promoted to managerial positions. The program was designed to train the supervisors of new managers to provide their subordinates with challenging job assignments, insure effective communications between the new manager and his or her supervisor, evaluate the performance of the new manager in fulfilling work objectives, and to appraise the potential of the new manager for advancing to higher level management positions.

In connection with management employment, I proposed but did not obtain the necessary financial support to develop and validate a comprehensive management selection program. With regards to sales selection, I developed plans for and directed coordination of studies to validate sales selection procedures, which included a general ability test, a "sales interest" interview and assessment center exercises. For a variety of reasons, data collection for these studies was delayed until a further reorganization of AT&T in 1976 relieved me of responsibility for this project.

I will not discuss the 1976 reorganization because I had decided to retire from AT&T at about the time the plans for reorganization, previously announced, were implemented. Instead, I will briefly introduce psychologists at AT&T with whom I worked and have mostly alighted, review my professional activities, and finally, take up my current status.

It was my good fortune while at AT&T to be associated with many fine psychologists as well as with a number of very able AT&T and Bell System telephone company executives. I won't attempt to name the latter, of whom there were literally hundreds, but would like to mention Robert Greenleaf. Bob organized and directed the Personnel Research Section at AT&T. He provided the necessary influence and support during a period when we psychologists, new to the organization, were referred to as "head-shrinkers."

Douglas Bray joined AT&T a few months prior to my employment. Throughout my twenty years he was, and still is, a fine friend, colleague, and for many years my supervisor. Incidentally, I helped Doug found the New York chapter of the Duke Ellington Jazz Society, which continues to thrive.

Though omitting the names of many other professional colleagues who contributed to my career at AT&T, I would like to recognize the following: H. Weston Clarke, Ann Vermillion Clarke, H. Oliver Holt, John Hopkins, Richard Campbell, Joseph Moses, Loren Appelbaum, Mary Tenopyr, Richard Peterson, Harry Shoemaker, Paul C. Ross, and Sheila Pfafflin.

My professional activities commenced while still a graduate student at Ohio State. I attended my first APA meeting in 1948 and joined the Psychometric Society during this period. Several years later I resigned from the Psychometric Society when the mathematical sophistication of the articles in *Psychometrika* exceeded my own. I became an Associate of APA in 1951 and a Member in 1958. I joined Division 14 as soon as possible after becoming an Associate of APA.

While with The Prudential Insurance Company I became a member of the New Jersey Psychological Association and attended their meetings. My first responsible professional role, however, came in 1953 when I chaired a Division 14 symposium at the APA meetings in Cleveland.



While at Western Reserve I joined and attended meetings of the Midwestern Psychological Association and of the Ohio Psychological Association. I was particularly active, however, in a local group, the Northeastern Ohio Personnel Research Association, which consisted primarily of industrial-organizational psychologists in Cleveland, though included some from Akron and other nearby cities.

My prime professional contribution while at Western Reserve was that of Validity Information Exchange Editor for Personnel Psychology. During my tenure in this capacity I reviewed over 400 validity studies, many submitted by the United States Employment Service. Our publication policy, instigated by the journal's editor, the late Erwin Taylor, was to publish all submitted reports. When I resigned the editorship in 1959, I proposed to Frederic Kuder, who had assumed the editorship of the journal, that standards for VIE reports be established and that Paul F. Ross succeed me as VIE editor. Paul accepted the appointment and established reasonable standards, which contributed to the demise of the Exchange. During this period I also edited the Normative Data Exchange, which was discontinued subsequently as being too costly. I remained on the editorial board of the journal, continued to review manuscripts regularly and to write occasional book reviews.

Following employment by AT&T I became active in the Metropolitan New York Association for Applied Psychology, an association founded during the 1930's. The association became dominated by industrial-organizational psychologists and remains so today. I also joined the Eastern Psychological Association.

Under a law passed in 1956 I was certified as a Psychologist in New York State in 1958. Shortly thereafter I applied for examination by the American Board of Examiners in Professional Psychology (now APPP), receiving the diploma as a specialist in Industrial Psychology (now Industrial-Organizational) in 1959. I shall always remember being administered the "field" portion of the examination by Robert Thorndike.

During the APA meetings in Cincinnati in 1959 I was invited to join an informal group of industrial-organizational psychologists which took the name of CINCON. The initial membership included Marvin Dunnette, William Mollenkopf, John Rapparlie, the late Joseph Weitz, Robert Dugan, Phillip Ash, Wayne Kirchner, Jerome Kornreich and Edwin Fleishman. I was very active in this compatible group for many years. The group continues its semi-annual meetings, though the membership has changed considerably.

For a few years I was a member of the New York State Psychological Association. Being a resident of New Jersey and working for a national organization limited my interest in the state association. A sharp increase in dues stimulated my resignation.

Though not strictly a professional organization, much of my growth as an industrial-organizational psychologist came from an active role in what initially was the Executive Study and later the Executive Study Conference. The Executive Study was initiated by Educational Testing Service as a mechanism for stimulating and coordinating research on executive selection. AT&T was a charter member of the Executive Study, which included a number of large business organizations. John Hemphill and Lewis Ward represented ETS and took responsibility for planning and coordinating relevant studies.

I was asked to represent AT&T to the Executive Study, so attended semi-annual meetings at which many topics of pertinence to the selection of executives were discussed. Unfortunately, progress on research languished, though proved very costly to ETS. Consequently, the Executive Study was abandoned. The meetings had been so rewarding, however, that the representatives of several companies involved in

the project put their heads together and founded the Executive Study Conference, which ETS agreed to sponsor. The Conference maintained the semi-annual meetings, which continue today. I was active in the organization for many years. This involved chairing meetings, presenting papers at meetings, and for two years (1965-67) chairing the Conference. The reports of these meetings, incidentally, contain much material of considerable current as well as historical interest. Though nonpsychologists represented some companies to the Conference, it was dominated during the 1960's by such industrial-organizational psychologists as Herbert Meyer, Walter McNamara, Felix Lopez, Robert Dawson, George Yoxall, Henry Meyer, William Mollenkopf, and Forrest Fryer.

Additional professional activities during the 1960's included membership on the program committee for EPA, including chairman for one year. For Division 14 I served on the Public Relations Committee and was chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Coordinated College Testing during Orlo Crissey's term as Division President. The report of this committee appeared in the *American Psychologist* in 1963 (pp. 674-5). I attended APA meetings regularly, participating in a number of symposia in various capacities, as chairman, speaker, and discussant. For three years I served on the APA Insurance Trust, which included Paul Thayer and Benjamin Shimberg, the latter being its chairman at the time.

Outside the "establishment" I appeared as a lecturer and workshop leader for the American Management Association and the American Association for Industrial Management. The topics for these sessions usually involved psychological testing or assessment centers. In addition, I taught a graduate industrial-organization psychology course at New York University and an introductory undergraduate course on the subject at Princeton University.

Though active professionally throughout the 1960's, the pace began to really accelerate in 1968. During that year I was elected to the Board of Trustees of the American Board of Professional Psychology (ABPP). For eight years I was to have the pleasure of serving with the late Alfred Marrow, President of the Board, the late Edwin Henry and other professional psychologists, including Noble Kelley, its Executive Officer since its founding in 1947. Board duties were quite demanding and occupied much of my "free" time. With appointment to the Board of the National Academy of Professional Psychologists (NAPP) in 1972, at the request of Alfred Marrow who founded NAPP, came additional responsibilities.

1969 brought me a major surprise. Despite my conviction that I didn't stand a prayer of winning, I was elected Secretary-Treasurer and Representative to Council for Division 14. With William Owens, Herbert Meyer and Douglas Bray as Presidents of the Division, serving as Secretary-Treasurer was a pleasure. Furthermore, despite the relatively heavy work load, the Secretary-Treasurer has considerable involvement in practically all Division activities. Through this activity I became acquainted with many fine industrial-organizational psychologists and was convinced that Division 14 is a dynamic organization. Serving on APA Council was an educational experience, though at times bewildering. This was my first experience with political processes, and I was not impressed with the rationality of many of my professional, other than Division 14, colleagues.

In 1971 I was honored by being elected a Fellow of Division 14 and of APA. Shortly thereafter, the American Association for the Advancement of Science conferred the same honor on me.

In 1973 I was again honored, this time by being elected President-Elect of Division 14, serving in that capacity with Edwin Fleishman as President. This year and continuing into my term as Division President was a year of considerable political activity. Most of it involved the efforts of the Equal Employment

Opportunity Coordinating Council to produce guidelines on employee selection which would be acceptable to all Federal Government agencies. The Division, through its Professional Affairs and Executive committees, took a very active role in seeking to guide the EEOCC toward professionally acceptable guidelines, without much initial success. At the APA meetings in 1974 The Executive Committee of the Division instructed me to establish an ad hoc committee that would draft guidelines which, we hoped, would serve as a model to the EEOCC in its efforts.

As President of the Division (1974-75) I named Robert Guion and Mary Tenopyr as co-chairpersons of a very large committee which proceeded to draft, using the APA Standards as a model, a suitable document. Following four drafts the ad hoc committee was authorized by the Executive Committee to publish the Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures. Though my role in the production of this document was limited, Bob and Mary having done the essential labor, I took great pride in the publication of this document.

As President it was my responsibility to coordinate the activities of the standing committees of the Division. This was a very pleasant task because of the interest in and efforts by the committee chairpersons and their members to accomplish the objectives they set for themselves or were asked to meet by the Executive Committee. The accomplishments of the committees are too numerous to recount, though I should note that the Membership Committee continued its vigorous drive to increase the membership of the Division.

During my term as President I joined the Association for the Advancement of Psychology and the American Society for Personnel Administration. The latter membership was instigated by the President of ASPA and came about during successful efforts by the two societies, Division 14 and ASPA, to establish relations on matters of mutual interest. It was also my pleasure during that year to serve on the planning committee for the Hawthorne Studies Symposium "Man and Work in Society" which was jointly sponsored by the Western Electric Company and the Harvard University School of Business Administration. The symposium was created to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the beginning of the Hawthorne studies. I had the pleasure of attending the symposium in November, 1976, at which there were many fine presentations, a large proportion by Division 14 members. Paul Patinka, incidentally, can be given much credit for the success of the conference.

As Past-President I chaired the Ad Hoc Committee on Legal Issues with Milton Blood and Robert Heckman as members. We worked with a firm of Atlanta attorneys in preparing a Division 14 amicus curiae brief which was submitted to the U.S. Supreme Court, along with many other such briefs, in the case of Washington vs. Davis.

My service on the Division 14 Executive Committee impressed me greatly with the quality of people serving the Division in various capacities and their dedication in so doing. I can't begin to name all of the people who rendered valuable service during this period. I was also most favorably impressed with the support given the Division by its members.

Shortly after completing my service on the Executive Committee, I was appointed to the APA Task Force on Legal Action. The Task Force, which had three lawyer-psychologists among its members, was charged with advising the APA Board of Directors regarding the provisions it should make to cope with the multiplicity of legal problems involving psychology as a science and a profession. The Board asked for guidance with respect to issues requiring reaction by APA and those on which the Association should

take a proactive stance. After considering the many aspects of what might be done, the Task Force recommended that the Board appoint a Commission on Legal Issues, reporting directly to the Board with authority to continually review matters of legal import and recommend appropriate actions to the Board.

Toward the end of 1976 my career changed rather abruptly. Looking back, I now realize that the seeds for the change occurred in 1962. In June of that year I attended a meeting of the Executive Study in Princeton. While there I made an appointment with Dr. Scarvia Anderson of the ETS staff in order to discuss a new form of the School and College Ability Test. AT&T had used "SCAT" for several years, and we were interested in obtaining information on a higher-level form of the test recently developed by ETS. I had been forewarned that Dr. Anderson was a lovely and charming young lady, which she is today, but being a hardened bachelor, I was unconcerned. My interest was in SCAT. We had a leisurely and delightful lunch on that day in June, 1962; and were married a year later.

We lived in Princeton till 1973. In that year Scarvia was asked to become director of a new ETS regional office in Atlanta. She was appointed Vice-President, the first woman in the history of ETS to achieve this distinction, and we moved to Atlanta in September. For the next three years I spent my weekends in Atlanta and the days between, when not travelling on AT&T business, in New York.

The ensuing life-style, which included "early-bird" flights on Monday mornings, was not very satisfying. Consequently, with eligibility for retirement coming up I searched for an appropriate position in the Atlanta area. The search led to my becoming Professor of Psychology and Chairman of the Measurement and Human Differences Program at the University of Georgia. AT&T rewarded my retirement with a truly fine luncheon, and I assumed my new position in January, 1977. My "commute" was thus reduced from eight hundred to sixty-five miles.

The Measurement and Human Differences Program had been established by William Owens in the latter part of the 1960's, at a time when Joseph Hammock was Head of the Psychology Department. My functions include administering the program, teaching, and research. My objective is to build an industrial-organizational psychology curriculum at the University of Georgia.

Though the change from AT&T to academe was somewhat traumatic, I quickly resumed my professional activities. I became licensed to practice psychology in Georgia and was elected a Fellow of the Georgia Psychological Association. I published an article, which Scarvia Anderson co-authored, on evaluation of training. With a prod from her, I edited an issue of a new journal titled *New Directions in Program Evaluation*, of which she is the general editor. I continued my interest in ABPP by chairing an examining committee. I am continuing the editing of manuscripts for *Personnel Psychology* and, occasionally, for the *Journal of Applied Psychology*. In addition, I am producing occasional book reviews. I continue to serve on Division 14 committees, attend APA meetings, and have joined the Academy of Management.

My consulting activities, some for fees and others gratis, have been varied and stimulating. They include the Macon Branch of Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corporation, the Marketing Department of AT&T, the City of Athens (Georgia), Souza Cruz (which occasioned a trip to Rio de Janeiro), and Alverno College.

My functions at the University of Georgia also have been varied and stimulating. They have included teaching graduate courses and seminars, advising on theses and dissertations, serving on committees,

and handling much administrative detail. Associations with my faculty colleagues and graduate students have been most enjoyable.

If asked how I have contributed and expect to continue contributing to industrial-organizational psychology, my answer would have to be "in multiple ways." For that matter, most of my efforts have been shared with others. Thus it is difficult for me to point to specific activities which have had or may have a lasting impact. Despite many frustrations along the way, I have found my career as an industrial-organizational psychologist challenging and enjoyable. If I were to identify a possible lasting "monument," however, I would select the publications with Douglas Bray and others emanating from the Management Progress Study. These publications have been referenced frequently, and I believe will become "classics" in the literature on management selection and development and on the evolution of assessment center methodology. What the future will hold is, of course, obscure, but I have no intention of rustication. I hope and expect to continue making whatever contributions to our profession that time and fate permit.

#### Publications

An analysis of a point rating job evaluation plan. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1951, 35, 236-240.

Validity Information Exchange Report No. 7-085. *Personnel Psychology*, 1954, 7, 557-558.

Validity Information Exchange Report No. 7-086. *Personnel Psychology*. 1954, 7, 559-560.

A factor analysis of managers' ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1955, 39, 283-286.

Studies in the reliability of the short-answer essay examination. *Journal of Educational Research*, 1957, 51, 109-116.

Application of a factorial method in selecting questions for an employee attitude survey (with A. V. Clarke). *Personnel Psychology*, 1961, 14, 131-139.

Situational tests in assessment of managers (with D. W. Bray). In *Management Games in Selection and Development*, The Executive Study Conference, May 5 & 6, 1964. Princeton, N. J., Educational Testing Service, 1964, 121-128.

The assessment center in the measurement of potential for business management (with D. W. Bray). *Psychological Monographs*. 1966, 80, (17, Whole No. 625).

Influence of motivation on progress in management, retention and development. In *Motivation of Managers*, The Executive Study Conference, Nov. 15 & 16, 1966. Princeton, N. J., Educational Testing Service, 1967, 61-73.

Contributions of projective techniques to assessment of management potential (with W. Katkovsky and D. W. Bray). *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1967, 519 226-232.

Contributions of the interview to assessment of management potential (with D. W. Bray). *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1969, 53, 24-34.

Validation of employment tests for telephone company installation and repair occupations (with D. W. Bray). *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1970, 54, 7-14.

Relevance of education to organizational requirements. In *Proceedings of the Western Regional Conference on Testing Problems*. Berkeley, Calif., Educational Testing Service, 1970, 14-21.

Validation of a general learning ability test for selecting telephone operators (with S. Gael). *Experimental Publication System*, 1971, 10 Ms. No. 351-2.

Employment test validation for minority and nonminority telephone company service representatives (with S. Gael). *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1972, 56, 135-139.

Studying careers and assessing ability (with D. W. Bray and R. J. Campbell). In Marrow, A. J. (Ed.), *The Failure of Success*. New York, American Management Association, 1972, 154-169.

*Formative Years in Business: A Long-Term AT&T Study of Managerial Lives* (with D. W. Bray and R. J. Campbell). New York, Wiley, 1974.

Utilizing the disadvantaged. *Personnel Psychology*, 1974, 27, 445-448.

Employment test validation for minority and nonminority telephone operators (with S. Gael and R. J. Ritchie). *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1975, 60, 411-419.

Employment test validation for minority and nonminority clerks with work sample criteria (with S. Gael and R. J. Ritchie). *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1975, 60, 420-426.

Issues in the evaluation of training (with S. B. Anderson). *Professional Psychology*, 1977, 8, 659-673.

Monitoring ongoing programs (Guest Ed.) *New Directions for Program Evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978 (No. 3).