



PERSONNEL SELECTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR: AN INTEGRATED VIEW

BENJAMIN SCHNEIDER

Research Report No. 14

December, 1976

The writing of this paper was supported by the Personnel and Training Research Programs, Psychological Sciences Division, Office of Naval Research under Contract No. N00014-75-C-0884, Contract Authority Identification Number, NR 151-375, Benjamin Schneider and C. J. Bartlett, Principal Investigators.

Reproduction in whole or part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government. Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

psychology



	REF	PORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
TTLE (and Searching) Integrated View Personnel: Selection and Organizational Behavior: An Integrated View Integrated View Senjamin/Schneider <	1. REPORT NUMBER Research Rec	2. GOVT A	CCESSION NO. 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
Personnel. Selection and Organizational Behavior: An Integrated View	TITLE (and Subtitie		S. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVE
FREFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Department of Psychology University of Maryland 20742 S. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Department of Psychology University of Maryland 20742 10. NO0014-75-C-0884 11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Personnel and Training Research Programs Office of Naval Research (Code 458) Arlington, Virginia 22217 11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Personnel and Training Research Programs Office of Naval Research (Code 458) Arlington, Virginia 22217 12. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Personnel and Training Research Programs Office of Naval Research (Code 458) Arlington, Virginia 22217 13. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS 14. UNITORING AGENCY MALE ADDRESS Arlington, Virginia 20217 15. SUPPLEMENT CLASS (or Male Address) 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Address of distribution unlimited. 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Address of distribution unlimited. 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Paper Served as a basis for talks presented at the Academy of Management Convention, Kanasa City, August, 1976 and at the American Institutes for Decision Sciences Convention, San Francisco, November, 1976. 18. KEV WORDS (Continue on reverse side if increasery and identify by block number) Personnel Selection, Person x Situation Interaction, Individual Differences, Predicting Performance 20. Additact (Continue on reverse side if increasery and identify by block number) 17. Distribution of each other's theories and findings. Specifically, it is argued that: (1) Personnel selection researchers and more situa- tionally-oriented organizational behaviorists can profit from an examination of each other's theories and findings. Specifically, it is argued that: (1) Personnel selection researchers will achieve increased levels of predictive validity when situational effects on a billity teactor and findings. Specifically, it is argued that: (1) Pe	Personnel. Se Behavior: A	lection and Organizational	(1) RR-14
Benjamin/Schneider Benjamin/Schneider Benjamin/Schneider Benjamin/Schneider Benjamin/Schneider Benjamin/Schneider Benjamin/Schneider Benfamin/Schneider Benfamin/Schneide		the second se	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBE
Senjamin/Schneider N00014-75-C-0884 S. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION HAME AND ADDRESS I. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, AREA WITH YUMBERS Solid Sender State S	10 INTHOR(.)		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(+)
 BERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Department of Psychology University of Maryland College Park, Maryland 20742 University of Maryland 20217 Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. University of Maryland 20217 Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. University of Maryland 20217 University of Maryland 20217 Oustraieurion statement (of the abstract mitered in Block 20, 11 different from Report) University of Maragement Convention, Kansas City, August, 1976 and at the American Institutes for Decision Sciences Convention, San Francisco, November, 1976. Key WORD (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Personnel Selection, Person x Situation Interaction, Individual Distract (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Abstract (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This paper presents the view that both more individual differences-oriented personnel selection researchers and more situa- Abstract (Continue on reverse side if necessary	Benjamin/Sch	ineider	N00014-75-C-0884
Department of Psychology 61153M University of Maryland 20742 College Park, Maryland 20742 DirotracLing office NAME AND ADDRESS 12. REPORT DATE Personnel and Training Research Programs 11. CONTROLLing OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Arlington, Virginia 2217 14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME A ADDRESS 21. December 1976 15. Distribution StateMet Notes 21. December 1976 16. Distribution StateMet Notes 21. December 1976 16. Distribution StateMet Notes 21. December 1976 17. Distribution StateMet Notes 21. December 1976 18. SUPPLEMENTARY MOTES 19. December 1976 18. SUPPLEMENTARY MOTES Paper served as a basis for talks presented at the Academy of Management Convention, Kansas City, August, 1976 and at the American Institutes for Decision Sciences Convention, San Francisco, November, 1976. 19. KEY WORD (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) 19. KEY WORD (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) 19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) 19. KEY WORD (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) 19. KEY WORD (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) 19. KEY WORD (Continu	9. PERFORMING ORG	ANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, T AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
College Park, Maryland 20742 IN CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Personnel and Training Research Programs Office of Naval Research (Code 458) Arlington, Virginia 22217 IL NONITORING AGENCY NAME A LODBESKUI differenting Controlling Office) IL MONITORING AGENCY NAME A LODBESKUI different from Report IL DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the aberrace intered in Block 20, If different from Report) IL SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Paper served as a basis for talks presented at the Academy of Management Convention, Kansas City, August, 1976 and at the American Institutes for Decision Sciences Convention, San Francisco, November, 1976. IL KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Personnel Selection, Person X Situation Interaction, Individual Differences, Predicting Performance 20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This paper presents the view that both more individual dif- ferences-oriented personnel selection researchers and more situa- tionally-oriented organizational behaviorists can profit from an examination of each other's theories and findings. Specifically, it is argued that: (1) Personnel selection researchers will achieve increased levels of predictive validity when situational offerto on ability performance considered will ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)	University c	of Psychology V	61153N BR 042-04: BR 042-04-0
 11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Personnel and Training Research Programs Office of Naval Research (Code 458) Arlington, Virginia 22217 12. MENDER OF PAOL 21. 2007 13. MONITORING AGENCY NAME A LODRESS/UT differenting Controlling Office) 14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME A LODRESS/UT differenting Controlling Office) 15. SECURITY CLASS (of this Advert Unclassified 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract missed in Block 20, if different from Report) 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract missed in Block 20, if different from Report) 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Paper served as a basis for talks presented at the Academy of Management Convention, Kansas City, August, 1976 and at the American Institutes for Decision Sciences Convention, San Francisco, November, 1976. 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Personnel Selection, Person x Situation Interaction, Individual Differences, Predicting Performance 20. ARSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This paper presents the view that both more individual differences, Predicting Performance 20. ARSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This paper presents the view that both more individual differences, Predicting Performance 20. ARSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This paper presents the view that both more individual differences or identify is not block number) This paper presents the view that both more individual differences or identify is block number) This paper presents the view that both more individual differences or identify is block number) This paper presents the view that both more individual differences or identify is block number) This paper presents the view that both more individual differenc	College Park	, Maryland 20742	NR 151-375
Office of Naval Research (Code 458) Arlington, Virginia 22217 14. WONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS/II differenting Controlling Office) 15. BECURITY CLASS (of the above of the second of the se	Personnel an	FICE NAME AND ADDRESS	12. REPORT DATE
Arlington, Virginia 22217 14. WONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (I different from Controlling Office) 15. SECURITY CLASS (of this advert Unclassified 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Black 20, If different from Report) 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Paper served as a basis for talks presented at the Academy of Management Convention, Kansas City, August, 1976 and at the American Institutes for Decision Sciences Convention, San Francisco, November, 1976. 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side If necessary and identify by block number) Personnel Selection, Person x Situation Interaction, Individual Differences, Predicting Performance 20. Adstract (Continue on reverse side If necessary and identify by block number) This paper presents the view that both more individual dif- ferences-oriented organizational behaviorists can profit from an examination of each other's theories and findings. Specifically, it is argued that: (1) Personnel selection researchers will achieve increased levels of predictive validity when situational offered on achieve contervents on the researcher and findings. Specifically, it is argued that: (1) Personnel selection researchers will achieve increased levels of predictive validity when situational offered on achieve contervents and profit from an examination of each other's theories and findings. Specifically, it is argued that: (1) Personnel selection researchers will achieve increased levels of predictive validity when situational offered on achieve contervents and profit from an examination of each other's theories and findings. Specifically, it is argued that: (1) Personnel selection researchers will achieve increased levels of predictive validity when situational	Office of Na	val Research (Code 458)	13 NUMBER OF PAGES
Unclassified ID R04204 ID R042040 Is. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Aberraci microd in Block 20, If different from Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. IT. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Aberraci microd in Block 20, If different from Report) IS. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Paper served as a basis for talks presented at the Academy of Management Convention, Kansas City, August, 1976 and at the American Institutes for Decision Sciences Convention, San Francisco, November, 1976. IS. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Personnel Selection, Person x Situation Interaction, Individual Differences, Predicting Performance IThis paper presents the view that both more individual dif- ferences-oriented personnel selection researchers and more situa- tionally-oriented organizational behaviorists can profit from an examination of each other's theories and findings. Specifically, it is argued that: (1) Personnel selection researchers will achieve increased levels of predictive validity when situational differences on a profit from an examination of each other's theories and findings. Specifically, it is argued that: (1) Personnel selection researchers will achieve increased levels of predictive validity when situational differences on a profit from an	Arlington, V 14. MONITORING AGE	Virginia 22217 NCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different top Contr	olling Office) 15. SECURITY CLASS (of this second)
 15. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Paper served as a basis for talks presented at the Academy of Management Convention, Kansas City, August, 1976 and at the American Institutes for Decision Sciences Convention, San Francisco, November, 1976. 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Personnel Selection, Person x Situation Interaction, Individual Differences, Predicting Performance 20. Adstract (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This paper presents the view that both more individual differences-oriented personnel selection researchers and more situational behaviorists can profit from an examination of each other's theories and findings. Specifically, it is argued that: (1) Personnel selection researchers will achieve increased levels of predictive validity when situational defendence and formation. 	C	16 R04204	Unclassified
 18. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Abetract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Abetract entered in Block 20, If different from Report) 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Paper served as a basis for talks presented at the Academy of Management Convention, Kansas City, August, 1976 and at the American Institutes for Decision Sciences Convention, San Francisco, November, 1976. 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side If necessary and Identify by block number) Personnel Selection, Person x Situation Interaction, Individual Differences, Predicting Performance 20. AdSTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and Identify by block number) This paper presents the view that both more individual differences-oriented personnel selection researchers and more situational performance 20. AdSTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and Identify by block number) This paper presents the view that both more individual differences-oriented personnel selection researchers and more situational performance 20. AdSTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and Identify by block number) This paper presents the view that both more individual differences-oriented personnel selection researchers and more situational performance 20. AdSTRACT (Continue on reverse side If necessary and Identify by block number) This paper presents the view that both more individual differences-oriented personnel selection researchers will achieve increased levels of predictive validity when situational offects on ability-oriented organizational behaviorists can profit from an examination of each other's theories and findings. Specifically, it is argued that: (1) Personnel selection researchers will achieve increased levels of predictive validity when situational offects on ability-performance relationships are considered. 	r	17 0 110 1100	15. DECLASSIFICATION DOWNGRADI
Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.	16. DISTRIBUTION ST	ATEMENT (OF THE Report)	
 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Paper served as a basis for talks presented at the Academy of Management Convention, Kansas City, August, 1976 and at the American Institutes for Decision Sciences Convention, San Francisco, November, 1976. 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Personnel Selection, Person x Situation Interaction, Individual Differences, Predicting Performance 20. ASTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This paper presents the view that both more individual differences-oriented personnel selection researchers and more situationally-oriented organizational behaviorists can profit from an examination of each other's theories and findings. Specifically, it is argued that: (1) Personnel selection researchers will achieve increased levels of predictive validity when situational afferences and billty performance 	Approved for	public release; distributi	on unlimited. Policiul
 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Paper served as a basis for talks presented at the Academy of Management Convention, Kansas City, August, 1976 and at the American Institutes for Decision Sciences Convention, San Francisco, November, 1976. 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde II necessary and identify by block number) Personnel Selection, Person x Situation Interaction, Individual Differences, Predicting Performance 20. AdSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde II necessary and identify by block number) This paper presents the view that both more individual differences-oriented personnel selection researchers and more situationally-oriented organizational behaviorists can profit from an examination of each other's theories and findings. Specifically, it is argued that: (1) Personnel selection researchers will achieve increased levels of predictive validity when situational effects on ability performance relationships are considered.	Approved for	public release; distributi	on unlimited. Der MAR 11 197
 Paper served as a basis for talks presented at the Academy of Management Convention, Kansas City, August, 1976 and at the American Institutes for Decision Sciences Convention, San Francisco, November, 1976. 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde II necessary and Identify by block number) Personnel Selection, Person x Situation Interaction, Individual Differences, Predicting Performance 20. AdSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde II necessary and Identify by block number) This paper presents the view that both more individual differences-oriented personnel selection researchers and more situationally-oriented organizational behaviorists can profit from an examination of each other's theories and findings. Specifically, it is argued that: (1) Personnel selection researchers will achieve increased levels of predictive validity when situational effects on ability-preformance relationships are considered; and 	Approved for	Public release; distribution	on unlimited.
 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Personnel Selection, Person x Situation Interaction, Individual Differences, Predicting Performance 20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This paper presents the view that both more individual differences-oriented personnel selection researchers and more situationally-oriented organizational behaviorists can profit from an examination of each other's theories and findings. Specifically, it is argued that: (1) Personnel selection researchers will achieve increased levels of predictive validity when situational effects on ability-performance relationships are considered; and 	Approved for 17. DISTRIBUTION ST 18. SUPPLEMENTARY	Public release; distribution ATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20	on unlimited.
Personnel Selection, Person x Situation Interaction, Individual Differences, Predicting Performance 20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This paper presents the view that both more individual dif- ferences-oriented personnel selection researchers and more situa- tionally-oriented organizational behaviorists can profit from an examination of each other's theories and findings. Specifically, it is argued that: (1) Personnel selection researchers will achieve increased levels of predictive validity when situational effects on ability-performance relationships are considered; and	Approved for 17. DISTRIBUTION ST 18. SUPPLEMENTARY Paper served Convention, Decision Sci	ATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20 NOTES as a basis for talks prese Kansas City, August, 1976 a ences Convention, San Franc	on unlimited. , if different from Report) nted at the Academy of Management nd at the American Institutes for isco, November, 1976.
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde il necessary and identify by block number) This paper presents the view that both more individual dif- ferences-oriented personnel selection researchers and more situa- tionally-oriented organizational behaviorists can profit from an examination of each other's theories and findings. Specifically, it is argued that: (1) Personnel selection researchers will achieve increased levels of predictive validity when situational effects on ability-performance relationships are considered; and	Approved for 17. DISTRIBUTION ST 18. SUPPLEMENTARY Paper served Convention, Decision Sci 19. KEY WORDS (Contact Contact 19. KEY WORDS (Contact Contact 19. KEY WORDS (Contact Contact 19. KEY WORDS (Contact Contact 19. KEY WORDS (Contact Cont	Public release; distribution ATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20 NOTES I as a basis for talks prese Kansas City, August, 1976 an iences Convention, San Franc	on unlimited. It different from Report) It different from Report It different from Rep
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This paper presents the view that both more individual dif- ferences-oriented personnel selection researchers and more situa- tionally-oriented organizational behaviorists can profit from an examination of each other's theories and findings. Specifically, it is argued that: (1) Personnel selection researchers will achieve increased levels of predictive validity when situational effects on ability-performance relationships are considered; and	Approved for 17. DISTRIBUTION ST 18. SUPPLEMENTARY Paper served Convention, Decision Sci 19. KEY WORDS (Contri Personnel Se Differences,	ATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20 ATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20 A as a basis for talks prese Kansas City, August, 1976 a iences Convention, San Franc Inue on reverse olde II necessary and identify b election, Person x Situation , Predicting Performance	on unlimited. When it different from Report) Inted at the Academy of Management isco, November, 1976. Photok number) Interaction, Individual
This paper presents the view that both more individual dif- ferences-oriented personnel selection researchers and more situa- tionally-oriented organizational behaviorists can profit from an examination of each other's theories and findings. Specifically, it is argued that: (1) Personnel selection researchers will achieve increased levels of predictive validity when situational effects on ability-performance relationships are considered; and	Approved for 17. DISTRIBUTION ST 18. SUPPLEMENTARY Paper served Convention, Decision Sci 19. KEY WORDS (Contri Personnel Se Differences,	ATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20 ATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20 A as a basis for talks prese Kansas City, August, 1976 a ences Convention, San Franc Inue on reverse olde II necessary and identify b election, Person x Situation , Predicting Performance	on unlimited. With the Academy of Management isco, November, 1976. block number) Interaction, Individual
examination of each other's theories and findings. Specifically, it is argued that: (1) Personnel selection researchers will achieve increased levels of predictive validity when situational	Approved for 17. DISTRIBUTION ST 18. SUPPLEMENTARY Paper Served Convention, Decision Sci 19. KEY WORDS (Contin Personnel Se Differences, 20. ABSTRACT (Contin	Public release; distribution ATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20 NOTES d as a basis for talks prese Kansas City, August, 1976 and iences Convention, San Franc Inue on reverse side if necessary and identify be election, Person x Situation predicting Performance	on unlimited. Hidilleront from Report) All different from Report) All different from Report) Interaction, Individual Plock number)
achieve increased levels of predictive validity when situational	Approved for 17. DISTRIBUTION ST 18. SUPPLEMENTARY Paper served Convention, Decision Sci 19. KEY WORDS (Contr Personnel Se Differences, 20. AdSTRACT (Contr This ferences-ori	Public release; distribution ATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20 NOTES d as a basis for talks prese Kansas City, August, 1976 and iences Convention, San France Inve on reverse elde II necessary and identify by election, Person x Situation predicting Performance nue on reverse elde II necessary and identify by paper presents the view that ented personnel selection re-	on unlimited.
	Approved for 17. DISTRIBUTION ST 18. SUPPLEMENTARY Paper served Convention, Decision Sci 19. KEY WORDS (Contr Personnel Se Differences; 20. ABSTRACT (Contr This ferences-ori tionally-ori examination it is arguent	ATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20 ATEMENT (of the obstract entered in Block 20 Kansas City, August, 1976 at iences Convention, San Franc Inue on reverse side if necessary and identify by election, Person x Situation Predicting Performance nue on reverse side if necessary and identify by paper presents the view that ented personnel selection re ented organizational behavio of each other's theories and that: (1) Personnel selection	on unlimited.

A A A

The Allowing

UNCLASSIFIED

CLURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date Entered)

2) Organizational behaviorists will better understand why organizational conditions can lead to increased average levels of production and satisfaction when they acknowledge the importance of individual differences in ability. Research evidence of both an empirical and logical nature is presented to support the integration.

ACCESSION for Maile Sortica Buil Souther D NTIS C 0:0 UNAMISUNCED JUSTIFICATION BY DISTRIBUTION/AVAILADILITY CODES LYALL and W SPECIAL Disi-

「おいた」を見ていたいないないないのである

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Dete Entered)

Personnel Selection and Organizational Behavior: An Integrated View¹

Benjamin Schneider

Department of Psychology and Bureau of Business and Economic Research University of Maryland, College Park

The major issue in personnel selection research is the accuracy of predictions made possible by the procedures used as a basis for making hiring decisions. In selection terms, accuracy is referred to as validity. In pursuit of increased validity, researchers have devoted their efforts to the development of more precise measurement techniques regarding both predictors (test, interview, simulation) and criteria (turnover, sales style, quality of production). Indeed, to improve prediction capabilities, multiple predictors and multiple or composite criteria are now regularly employed (Dunnette, 1966; Guion, 1965; Schneider, 1976). Of course, under the pressure of current federal legislation, differential validation studies are also required wherein the validity of a selection procedure is verified on, and for, different race and sex subgroups (cf. Guion, 1976) but this issue will not receive attention in the present paper

¹I would like to thank Chris Argyris, Gini Buxton, Miriam Erez and John Parkington for comments on an earlier version of this paper.

(but see Bartlett, Dachler, Goldstein, & Schneider, Note 1; Howard, Note 2).

Personnel psychologists, then, both academicians and practitioners, have been concerned with refining techniques for selecting a best person from a number of people; their interest has been in how one person differs from another. At the same time, organizational behaviorists have been promoting ideas suggesting that the properties of organizations, not the individual attributes of people, are the important data in predicting and understanding behavior in the work setting. Theory Y, System 4, Consideration, Participation in Decision-Making; we are told that these are the organizational styles that result in increased effort and performance, decreased absenteeism and turnover, increased organizational commitment, decreased worker frustration, increased satisfaction, etc. (cf. Schein, 1970).

Unfortunately, the personnel selection and organizational behavior orientations to understanding and predicting behavior in the work setting have been following parallel rather than overlapping or integrated tracks (Porter, 1966).² I shall argue here that there would be definite benefits for both selection and organizational researchers if an integrated view of the causes and correlates of employee behavior were developed. This integrated view would pay

²Lest one be misled to thinking this dichotomous approach only characterizes behavioral research on work, see Cronbach (1957) and Bowers (1973).

equal attention to individual differences (especially in ability) at the time of selection and to the general style of the organization in which the person will work. The integrated view should result in: (1) Improved validity for selection assessment procedures; and, (2) A basis for understanding why increased levels of performance and satisfaction are found in organizations when certain organizational changes are made.

Individual Differences in Ability³

The most glaring omission in some recent views of the determinants and correlates of performance and satisfaction in work organizations is the concern for individual differences in ability. People do differ from each other in their abilities and these differences are crucial for organizations so far as both employee productivity and satisfaction are concerned. Ability is crucial because its absence cannot be compensated for by increased attention to the social/emotional state of employees. The important point is that lack of ability puts an upper limit on the level of performance a person may attain and, consequently, on that person's chances of being rewarded; failure to be rewarded may lead to dissatisfaction (Lawler & Porter, 1967).

³I concentrate on ability here but similar arguments about person/situation interaction can be made with respect to other individual attributes (cf. Andrews, 1967; Erez, Note 3; Ilgen, Campbell, Peters, & Fisher, Note 4).

Organizations may gain some control over the productivity and satisfaction of a work force by having carefully developed staffing programs. These programs should include detailed job analyses as a basis for identifying the kinds of abilities people need to perform effectively, the specification of the kinds of performance that indicate effectiveness, development and validation of measures of ability (predictors) and indices of effectiveness (criteria), examination of relationships between predictors and criteria in racial, ethnic and sex subgroups, and utilization of those predictors that demonstrate non-biased validity in making staffing decisions.

These are not trivial matters. Careless electricians, executives with relatively weak administrative capabilities, receptionists with some fine personal assets but low interpersonal competence, and detail men with poor memories for names, may hinder organizational effectiveness through low performance. Such people probably also will experience low job satisfaction.

The techniques personnel researchers have developed for helping match jobs and people constitute the single best <u>proven</u> application of behavioral science technology to the world of work (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, & Weick, 1970). However, there has been little progress in the past 35 to 40 years in increasing the predictive accuracy (validity) obtainable through the use of this technology (Ghiselli, 1966; Guion, 1976). Organizations, and personnel researchers themselves, have tended to blame this lack of progress on poor predictors, poor criteria, or both. It may be time to look

beyond the person to the work situation for an explanation of why validity coefficients may be suppressed (Schneider, 1975, 1976).

Organizational Behavior

While personnel researchers have recently failed to make significant improvements in validity based on ability measurement, the past 35 years have seen a growth in attention to the socio/emotional side of employees. However, this focus has been on Man with a capital M; the emphasis has not been on how employees differ from each other but on how they are similar (cf. Argyris, 1976).

Beginning with the Hawthorne studies one finds a move away from a focus on individual differences in performance toward a view of what "employees" do, the organizational conditions under which "they" do these things, and attention to work-group, not individual, performance. Although some have been less than complimentary about them (cf. Carey, 1973), the Hawthorne studies are generally thought to have provided the impetus for the view that group pressure ("binging") can keep work-group performance down, while "attention" increases average performance (cf. Schein, 1970). Later commentaries on Man's social/emotional need states have also been thought of as emphasizing the similarities in people. Likert (1961, 1967) and his colleagues (cf. Katz & Kahn, 1966) after all, concentrated on Man's social needs; McGregor (1960), building on Maslow's (1954) writings, has clearly stressed Man's need for self-expression. However, these conceptual positions not only treat Man as having simi-

lar needs and desires, but, as practical theories, they concentrate on Man's socio/emotional needs as ways of "getting at" or "triggering" him to work up to his potential, to be what he <u>can</u> be.

I think this last idea of "triggering" or "getting at" potential is the critical lever to understanding how the sciences of personnel selection and organizational behavior may be integrated. Scholars of the Humanist orientation such as McGregor (1960), Argyris (1957), Likert (1961, 1967) and especially Maslow (1954), have not only been concerned with the emotional state of people. The emotional state was important to these authors because they assumed that negative affective states inhibit the display of man's <u>potential</u>. Organizational conditions, these commentators would note, can either facilitate or inhibit the display of ability and most organizations, through their practices and procedures, create jobs and climates which inhibit people from displaying their abilities. McGregor (1960, p. 48) for example, listed as two of his six Theory Y assumptions:

(a) "The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is <u>widely</u>, not narrowly, distributed in the population." (Italics mine)

(b) "Uncer the conditions of modern industrial life, the <u>intel-</u> <u>lectural potentialities of the average human being are only partially</u> <u>utilized</u>." (Italics mine)

Note here the emphasis in (a) on the distribution of ability

(Not everyone has equal ability) and, in (b) the constraints modern industrial life puts on those differences (if one has averages, one has differences) being allowed to be expressed.

Following our earlier logic, if people are not allowed to work up to their ability, or their maximum potential, then the very tests of ability used to predict their performance will not be as valid as they could be. We may now consider in detail how the situation may impact on the validity of an ability test.

Situational Effects on the Ability-Performance Relationship

I make the assumption that the cause of our inability to improve the level of validity coefficients obtained when predicting job performance is that most organizations do not reward, support or really even require people to display their maximum individual differences in ability on the job.

Consider the typical assembly-line factory job, for example. Each worker on the line is rewarded for doing the same thing as every other worker; indeed he or she is required to work at the same pace, he or she receives the same pay, reports for work at the same time, and so forth. Some pre-employment measure that reveals individual differences in ability cannot be expected to correlate very well with performance on the job because people on the job are required to behave in highly similar ways. And if the <u>organization</u> does not require similar behavior, then other workers already on the job, through social pressure, will. Here, recall again how co-workers

in the Relay Assembly Room at Hawthorne were able to keep everyone producing at the same level through "binging" and other forms of social pressure.

Lest we think the requiring of common behavior only applies to assembly line workers, picture the plight of new management trainees. Perhaps they were hired after an Assessment Center or a battery of tests and interviews. In the selection process, these new management trainees were probably encouraged to "do your best" on the various tests. But how many management trainees are actually placed in positions where they can "do their best?" Some are rather assigned to routine tasks with previously established routine solutions. Oddly enough, another frequent way of insuring that management trainees cannot do their best is to give them assignments which are at an extreme level of difficulty, almost certain to result in failure. These "socialization" experiences of new management trainees tend to insure similar behavior (Schein, 1971). Through the adoption of the organization's way of doing things deviance is minimized; people conform and behave alike.

A number of researchers have documented the generally high turnover rates of new college graduates because of the lack of stimulation and challenge they experience in their first jobs as management trainees (Porter, Crampon, & Smith, Note 5; Schein, 1971). Yet the basis for initial selection was most likely some prediction about how they would respond to challenge or how capable they were to handle a particular level of responsibility!

Asking the selection process to predict performance that is not the behavior required by the job is not a fair test of the ability to predict long-term individual job effectiveness. The job, and more importantly the job situation, must be one which rewards, supports, expects and encourages people to do their best.

Forehand (1968) has written about some interesting findings regarding this discussion. He obtained climate descriptions of government organizations regarding their tendency to be rulesoriented or to emphasize group participation in decision-making. In both kinds of organizations he obtained peer ratings of employees with respect to their innovativeness. He correlated nine different tests of intellectual capability with the peer ratings and found that 8 of the 9 were significantly correlated with innovativeness in the group-participation condition while none of them were significantly related to the criterion of effectiveness in the rulescentered condition. He (1968, p. 67) argued that our future research efforts

> ...should ask about the interaction of person variables and environmental variables, and should consider environmental variation in terms of the degree to which they demand or constrain the operation of personal characteristics.

Dunnette (Note 6, p. 25), a long-time advocate of an individual differences-oriented approach to understanding employee behavior, has recently reached a conclusion similar to Forehand's:

An employer's major goal, quite simply, should be to do everything he can to assure ("allow") each employee to give full expression to his abilities, skills, and aptitudes.

Dunnette reached this conclusion after reviewing a number of studies in which he (and others) showed that the best predictor of performance was an ability measure when organizational practices rewarded the display of individual differences in ability. When organizations rewarded people inequitably (either through under or overreward) or the reward system (pay) was on an hourly basis (rather than rewarding people for what they, as individuals, accomplished in the hour), ability was relatively uncorrelated with performance.

Schneider (Note 7) has recently shown that life insurance agencies can be clustered into types on the basis of their climate. One type of agency is reminiscent of McGregor's Theory Y and Likert's System 4 kind of organization--high on supervisory support, low on interpersonal conflict, high on individual autonomy and concern for the individual. The productivity and retention of new agents entering this type of Theory Y/System 4 agency was superior to the others. In keeping with my argument, the predictability of which agents would succeed was also better in this kind of agency.

Further evidence comes from a massive survey prepared by Ghiselli (1966, 1973) on the validity of tests in predicting performance in the work setting. Because Ghiselli found that tests were overwhelm-

ingly better predictors of training performance than for predicting on-the-job performance, he presented both kinds of data in his very useful monograph.

It seems reasonable to conceptualize the training situation as one which allows for the display of more individual differences than the job permits. Indeed there is a consistent finding that training increases the range of individual differences in a group of people. We can hypothesize that because training magnifies individual differences, tests <u>of</u> individual differences are able to predict training performance. Once on the job people may respond to a climate which requires routine rather than individualized behavior but, since the tests are designed to predict <u>differences</u> in job behavior, they are not useful when people must behave similarly. The difference between the behavior required in training, and behavior required on the job may also account for the low relationships found between training performance and on-the-job performance.

The job itself can impact on the predictability of performance. In an innovative study Howard (Note 2) compared the predictability of rated performance using ability test scores alone or in combination with ratings of the reward characteristics of the task at which the person worked. Using Hackman and Oldham's (1975) Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS), Howard showed that knowing the way a person viewed the job they worked at added significantly to the predictability of performance based on ability tests alone (see also Berlew & Hall, 1966).

Taken together these studies offer strong evidence for the idea that an organization's climate for individual differences can have a significant impact on the extent to which ability measures will be reflected in performance. In short, these results argue for the idea that the validity of selection and placement predictions depends on both the quality of the procedures used as a basis for the prediction and the climate in which the individual will eventually work.

On Understanding Increased Average Levels of Performance and Satisfaction

Achieving increased prediction-of-performance capability may be alright but most organizations are concerned with increasing average levels of performance and some are also interested in increased levels of job satisfaction. Interestingly, the kinds of conditions under which organizational behaviorists report such positive outcomes are very similar to those outlined above for increasing selection procedure validity coefficients: Reward for performance (Lawler, 1973), autonomy at work (Alderfer, 1972), lack of inter-personal conflict (Argyris, 1962), a climate of participation and support (Hall & Schneider, 1973), and so forth. Reference to Figure 1 helps provide an explanation for this complimentarity of findings.

Figure 1 presents two scatter diagrams that represent joint distributions of ability and performance. In one case, portrayed in



the bivariate distribution with the dotted line, the relationship between ability and performance is weak but positive. Also indicated with a dotted line is the average performance level for all people within the boundaries of the dotted line scattergram.

The second bivariate distribution in Figure 1, enclosed with a solid line, reveals a stronger ability-performance relationship. Note that this second distribution is narrower and extends higher on the performance dimension than the first distribution. That is, although the area within both distributions is similar, the distribution with the solid line represents a movement of people with higher levels of ability to higher levels of performance. Thus, low performing high ability people are now portrayed as high performers.

Note that this changes not only the strength of the relationship between ability and performance but also changes the average level of performance for the group. I hypothesize that this is precisely what happens when the kinds of organizational conditions discussed above exist in the work setting. Thus, what I propose is that under such conditions people are more likely to work up to their ability. Since work group performance is simply a function of how individuals perform, when those at the top of the ability distribution produce at a level that is commensurate with their potential then total work group performance must be generally higher than when high ability people perform below capacity.

Increased levels of satisfaction should also follow. The idea

that people will be more satisfied follows from the consistent finding that on challenging and enriching jobs, in more supportive organizations, and in organizations which reward people as individuals, employees tend to be more satisfied.

One suspects that organizations have defined rigid rules of behavior for their employees so that they can gain control over individual differences; so they can accurately predict the behavior of aggregates of employees. It is paradoxical, but nevertheless apparently true, that just the opposite kind of orientation towards people, i.e., creating a climate supporting and rewarding the display of their abilities, will yield the same predictability of behavior with the added benefit of having higher average production and a more satisfied work force. Thus, although the potential to control behavior will have been taken away from management in a climate for individual differences, because accurate predictions will be possible, control would seem to be less necessary. It is precisely this lack of organizationally imposed control that should yield the more satisfied work force.

In Conclusion

Wise personnel selection decisions are at the foundation of an effective organizational behavior program in the work setting. People without requisite abilities cannot do their jobs effectively; attention only to their social/emotional state will not be helpful in producing a productive and satisfied work force.

On the other hand, appropriate organizational behavior practices can reward, support and encourage people to display the abilities they have. A good personnel selection system in such an organization will more likely be valid with concommintant higher levels of production and satisfaction.

16

and the set of the set of the set of the set of the set

Reference Notes

- Bartlett, C. J., Dachler, H. P., Goldstein, I. L., & Schneider,
 B. <u>Enhancing the ability-performance relationship</u>: A study of some psychological and contextual factors affecting total group <u>and differential validity</u>. Unpublished manuscript, University of Maryland, Department of Psychology, 1974.
- Howard, A. <u>Intrinsic motivation and its determinants as factors</u> <u>enhancing the prediction of job performance from ability</u>. Unpublished manuscript, University of Maryland, Department of Psychology, 1976.
- Erez, M. <u>Feedback: A necessary condition for the goal-setting-</u> performance relationship. Unpublished manuscript, University of Maryland, Department of Psychology, 1976.
- Higen, D. R., Campbell, D. J., Peters, L. H., & Fisher, C. D. <u>Work role perceptions: Their affective and behavioral consequ-</u> <u>ences</u>. Unpublished manuscript, Purdue University, Department of Psychological Sciences, 1975.
- Porter, L. W., Crampon, W. J., & Smith, F. J. <u>Organizational</u> <u>commitment and managerial turnover: A longitudinal study</u>. Unpublished manuscript, University of California (Irvine), School of Administration, 1972.
- Dunnette, M. D. <u>Performance equals ability and what</u>? University of Minnesota, Department of Psychology, Technical Report No. 4009, 1973.

 Schneider, B. <u>Organizational type</u>, organizational success, and <u>the prediction of individual performance</u>. Unpublished manuscript, University of Maryland, Department of Psychology, 1974.

18

References

- Alderfer, C. P. <u>Human needs in organizational settings</u>. New York: Free Press, 1972.
- Andrews, J. D. W. The achievement motive and advancement in two types of organizations. <u>Journal of Personality and Social</u> <u>Psychology</u>, 1967, <u>6</u>, 163-168.
- Argyris, C. Personality and organization. New York: Harper, 1957.
- Argyris, C. <u>Interpersonal competence and organizational effective-</u> <u>ness</u>. Homewood, Ill.: Irwin, 1962.
- Argyris, C. Problems and new directions for industrial psychology. In, M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), <u>Handbook of industrial and organiza-</u> <u>tional psychology</u>. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.
- Berlew, D. E., & Hall, D. T. The socialization of managers: Effects of expectations on performance. <u>Administrative Science Quarterly</u>, 1966, <u>11</u>, 207-223.
- Bowers, K. S. Situationism in psychology: An analysis and critique. <u>Psychological Review</u>, 1973, <u>80</u>, 307-336.
- Campbell, J. P., Dunnette, M. D., Lawler, E. E., III, & Weick, K. E., Jr. <u>Managerial behavior, performance, and effectiveness</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.
- Carey, A. The Hawthorne studies: A radical criticism. <u>American</u> <u>Sociological Review</u>, 1967, <u>32</u>, 408-416.

Cronbach, L. J. The two disciplines of scientific psychology. American Psychologist, 1957, 12, 671-684.

- Dunnette, M. D. <u>Personnel selection and placement</u>. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1966.
- Forehand, G. A. On the interaction of persons and organizations. In, R. Taguiri and G. Litwin (Eds.), <u>Organizational climate</u>: <u>Explorations of a concept</u>. Boston: Division of Research, Harvard Business School, 1968.
- Ghiselli, E. E. <u>The validity of occupational aptitude tests</u>. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- Ghiselli, E. E. The validity of aptitude tests in personnel selection. Personnel Psychology, 1973, <u>26</u>, 461-478.

Guion, R. M. <u>Personnel testing</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
Guion, R. M. Recruiting, selection and job placement. In, M. D.
Dunnette (Ed.), <u>Handbook of industrial and organizational</u>
psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, <u>60</u>, 159-170.

Hall, D. T., & Schneider, B. <u>Organizational climates and careers</u>: The work lives of priests. New York: Seminar Press, 1973.

- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. <u>The social psychology of organizations</u>. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- Lawler, E. E., II!. <u>Motivation in work organizations</u>. Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole, 1973.

Lawler, E. E., III, & Porter, L. W. The effect of performance on job satisfaction. <u>Industrial Relations</u>, 1967, <u>7</u>, 20-28.

Likert, R. New patterns in management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Likert, R. The human organization: Its management and value. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Maslow, A. H. <u>Motivation and personality</u>. New York: Harper, 1954. McGregor, D. M. <u>The human side of enterprise</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

- Porter, L. W. Personnel management. <u>Annual Review of Psychology</u>, 1966, 17, 395-422.
- Schein, E. H. <u>Organizational psychology</u> (rev. ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Schein, E. H. Organizational socialization and the profession of management. In, D. A. Kolb, I. M. Rubin, and J. M. McIntyre (Eds.), <u>Organizational psychology: A book of readings</u>. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971.
- Schneider, B. Organizational climates: An essay. <u>Personnel</u> Psychology, 1975, <u>28</u>, 447-479.
- Schneider, B. <u>Staffing organizations</u>. Pacific Palisades, Calif.: Goodyear Publishing Co., 1976.

Distribution List

Navy

- 4 Dr. Marshall J. Farr, Director Personnel and Training Research Programs Office of Naval Research (Code 458) Arlington, VA 22217
- 1 ONR Branch Office 495 Summer Street Boston, MA 02210 ATTN: Dr. James Lester
- 1 ONR Branch Office 1030 East Green Street Pasadena, CA 91101 ATTN: Dr. Eugene Glove
- ONR Branch Office 536 South Clark Street Chicago, IL 60605 ATTN: Dr. Charles E. Davis
- Dr. M. A. Bertin, Scientific Director Office of Naval Research Scientific Liaison Group/Tokyo American Embassy APO San Francisco 96503
- 1 Office of Naval Research Code 200 Arlington, VA 22217
- 6 Director Naval Research Laboratory Code 2627 Washington, DC 20390
- 1 Technical Director Navy Personnel Research and Development Center San Diego, CA 92152
- 1 Special Assistant for Enlisted Force Analysis Sureau of Naval Personnel (Pers 2x) Room 2628, Arlington Annex Washington, DC 20370
- 1 Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Personnel for Retention Analysis and Coordination (Pers 12) Room 2403, Arlington Annex Washington, DC 20370
- 1 CDR J. L. Johnson, USN Naval Amphibious School Little Creek Naval Amphibious Base Norfolk, VA 23521
- 1 LCDR Charles J. Theisen, Jr., MSC, USN 1 Superintendent 4024 Naval Air Development Center Warminster, PA 18974
- 1 Commanding Officer U.S. Naval Amphibious School Coronado, CA 92155

- 1 CDR Paul D. Nelson, MSC, USN Naval Medical RSD Command (Code 44) National Naval Medical Center Sethesda, MD 20014
- 1 Commanding Officer Navai Health Research Center San Diego, CA 92152 ATTN: Library
- 1 Chairman Behavioral Science Department Naval Command & Management Division U.S. Naval Academy Annapolis, MD 21402
- 1 Chief of Naval Education & Training Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL 32508 ATTN: CAPT Bruce Stone, USN
- 1 Mr. Arnold I. Rubinstein Human Resources Program Manager Naval Material Command (0344) Room 1044, Crystal Plaza #5 Washington, DC 20360
- 1 Dr. Jack R. Borsting U.S. Naval Postgraduate School Department of Operations Research Monterey, CA 93940
- 1 Mr. Maurice Callahan NODAC (Code 2) Department of the Navy Bldg. 2, Washington Navy Yard (Anacostia) Washington, DC 20374
- 1 Office of Civilian Manpower Management Code 64 Washington, DC 20390 ATTN: Dr. Richard J. Niehaus
- 1 Office of Civilian Manpower Management Code 263 Washington, DC 20390

I Chief of Naval Reserve Code 3055 New Orleans, LA 70146

1 Assistant to the Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Manpower) Head, NAMPS Project Office Room 1606, Arlington Annex Washington, DC 20370 ATTN: Dr. Harry M. West

Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940 ATTN: Library (Code 2124)

1 Mr. George N. Graine Naval Sea Systems Command SEA 047C12 Washington, DC 20362

- Chief of Naval Technical Training Naval Air Station Memphis (75) Millington, TN 38054 ATTN: Dr. Norman J. Ker
- 1 Principal Civilian Advisor for Education and Training Naval Training Command, Code COA Pensacola, FL 32508 ATTN: Dr. William L. Maloy
- 1 Director Training Analysis & Evaluation Group Code N-00t Department of the Navy Orlando, FL 32813 ATTN: Dr. Alfred F. Smode
- 1 Chief of Naval Education and Training Support (OIA) Pensacola, FL 32509

1 LCDR C. F. Logan, USN F-14 Management System COMFITAEWWINGPAC NAS Miramar, CA 92145

1 Navy Personnel Research and Development Center Code 01 San Diego, CA 92152

5 Navy Personnel Research and Development Center Code 02 San Diego, CA 92152 ATTN: A. A. Sjoholm

2 Navy Personnel Research and Development Center Code 310 San Diego, CA 92152 ATTN: Dr. Martin F. Wiskoff

Dr. Robert Morrison Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, Code 301 San Diego, CA 32152

1 Navy Personnel Research and Development Center San Diego, CA 92152 ATTN: Library

1 D. M. Gragg, CAPT, MC, USN Head, Educational Programs Development Department Naval Health Sciences Education and Training Command Bethesda, MD 20014

1 Mr. Victor H. Brown, Director Career Training Analysis Group Chief of Naval Education and Training (Code N54) Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL 32507

Army

- Technical Director U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences 1300 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, VA 22209
- Headquarters U.S. Army Administration Center Personnel Administration Combat Development Activity ATCP-HRQ Ft. Benjamin Harrison, IN 46249
- 1 Armed Forces Staff College Norfolk, VA 23511 ATTN: Library
- Commandant U.S. Army Infantry School Fort Benning, GA 31905 ATTN: ATSH-DET
- Deputy Commander U.S. Army Institute of Administration Fort Benjamin Harrison, IN 46216 ATTN: EA
- Dr. Ralph Dusek
 U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences
 1300 Wilson Boulevard
 Arlington, VA 22209
- Dr. Joseph Ward
 U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences
 1300 Wilson Boulevard
 Arlington, VA 22209
- HQ USAREUR & 7th Army ODCSOPS USAREUR Director of GED APO New York 09403
- 1 ARI Field Unit Leavenworth Post Office Box 3122 Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027
- Dr. Ralph Canter U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences 1300 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, VA 22209
- Dr. Hilton S. Katz, Chief Individual Training & Performance Evaluation
 U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences
 1300 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, VA 22209

Air Force

- Research Branch AF/DPMYAR Randolph AFB, TX 78148
- 1 Dr. G. A. Eckstrand (AFHRL/AST) Wright-Patterson AFB Ohio 45433

- 1 AFHRL/DOJN Stop #63 Lackland AFB, TX 78236
- 1 Dr. Martin Rockway (AFHRL/TT) Lowry AFB Colorado 80230
- Instructional Technology Branch AF Human Resources Laboratory Lowry AFB, C0 80230
- 1 Dr. Alfred R. Fregly AFOSR/NL 1400 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, VA 22209
- 1 AFHRL/PED Stop #63 Lackland AFB, TX 78236
- Major Wayne S. Sellman Chief of Personnel Testing HQ USAF/DPMYP Randolph AFB, TX 78148
- 1 Air University Library AUL/LSE 76-443 Maxwell AFB, AL 36112

Marine Corps

- Director, Office of Manpower Utilization Headquarters, Marine Corps (Code M^pU) MCB (Building 2009) Quantico, VA 22134
- 1 Dr. A. L. Slafkosky Scientific Advisor (Code RD-1) Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps Washington, DC 20380
- Chief, Academic Department Education Center Marine Corps Development and Education Command Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA 22134
- Mr. E. A. Dover 2711 South Veitch Street Arlington, VA 22206

Coast Guard

Mr. Joseph J. Cowan, Chief Psychological Research Branch (G-P-1/62) U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters Washington, DC 20590

Other DOD

 Dr. Robert Young Advanced Research Projects Agency Cynbernetics Technology, Room 625 1400 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, VA 22209

- Mr. Frederick W. Suffa Chief, Recruiting and Retention Evaluation
 Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, MSRA
 Room 30970, Pentagon Washington, DC 20301
- 12 Defense Documentation Center Cameron Station, Building 5 Alexandria, VA 22314 ATTN: TC
- Military Assistant for Human Resources
 Office of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering Room 30129, The Pentagon Washington, DC 20301
- Director, Management Information Systems Office
 OSD (MSRA)
 3B917, The Pentagon
 Washington, DC 20301

Other Government

- Dr. Lorraine D. Eyde Personnel Research and Development Center U.S. Civil Service Commission 1900 E Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20415
- 1 Dr. William Gorham, Director Personnel Research and Development Center U.S. Civil Service Commission 1900 E Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20415
- Dr. Vern Urry Personnel Research and Development Center U.S. Civil Service Commission 1900 E Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20415
- 1 U.S. Civil Service Commission Federal Office Building Chicago Regional Staff Division Regional Psychologist 230 South Dearborn Street Chicago, IL 60604 ATTN: C. S. Winiewicz
- Dr. Carl Frederiksen Learning Division, Basic Skills Group National Institute of Education 1200 19th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20208
- 1 Dr. Joseph L. Young National Science Foundation 1800 G Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20550

Miscellaneous

- 1 Dr. Gerald V. Barrett University of Akron Department of Psychology Akron, CH 44325
- 1 Dr. Bernard M. Bass University of Rochester Graduate School of Management Rochester, NY 14627
- 1 Century Research Corporation 4113 Lee Highway Arlington, VA 22207
- 1 Dr. A. Charnes BEB 512 University of Texas Austin, TX 78712
- 1 Dr. Kenneth E. Clark University of Rochester College of Arts and Sciences River Campus Station Rochester, NY 14627
- 1 Dr. Norman Cliff University of Southern California Department of Psychology University Park Los Angeles, CA 90007
- 1 Dean W. W. Cooper Carnegie-Mellon University School of Urban and Public Affairs Pittsburgh, PA 15213
- Dr. Joseph E. Champoux School of Business & Administration The University of New Mexico Alburguergue, NM 87131
- 1 Dr. Rene¹ V. Dawis University of Minnesota Department of Psychology Minneapoils, MN 55455
- 1 Dr. Norman R. Dixon 200 South Craig Street University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, PA 15260
- Dr. Robert Dubin University of California Graduate School of Administration Irvine, CA 92664
- 1 Dr. Marvin D. Dunnette University of Minnesota Department of Psychology Minneapolis, MN 55455

- ERIC Processing and Reference Facility 4833 Rugby Avenue Bethesda, MD 20014
- Dr. Barry M. Feinberg Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc. 1990 M Street. N.W. Washington, DC 20036

- 1 Dr. Victor Fields Montgomery College Department of Psychology Rockville, MD 20850
- Dr. Edwin A. Fleishman Advanced Research Resources Organization #603
 8555 Sixteenth Street Silver Spring, MD 20910
- Dr. Robert Glaser, Co-Director University of Pittsburgh 3939 O'Hara Street Pittsburgh, PA 15213
- Dr. Richard S. Hatch Decision Systems Associates, Inc. 5640 Nicholson Lane Rockville, MD 20852
- 1 Dr. M. D. Havron Human Sciences Research, Inc. 7710 Old Spring House Road West Gate Industrial Park McLean, VA 22101
- HumRRO Central Division
 400 Plaza Building
 Pace Boulevard at Fairfield Drive
 Pensacola, FL 32505
- HumRRO/Western Division 27857 Berwick Drive Carmel, CA 93921 ATTN: Library
- HumRRO/Western Division 27857 Berwick Drive Carmel, CA 93921 ATTN: Dr. Robert Vineberg
- 1 Dr. Lawrence D. Jonnson Lawrence Johnson & Associates, Inc. 2001 S Street, N.W., Suite 502 Washington, DC 20009
- 1 Dr. Sigmund Tobias Ph.D. Programs in Education Graduate Center City University of New York 33 West 42nd Street New York, NY 10036
- Mr. W. E. Lassiter
 Data Solutions Corporation
 6849 Old Dominion Drive, Suite 211
 McLean, VA 22101
- 1 Dr. Frederick M. Lord Educational Testing Service Princeton, NJ 08540
- 1 Dr. Ernest J. McCormick Purdue University Department of Psychological Sciences Lafayette, IN 47907

- Dr. Robert R. Mackie
 Human Factors Research, Inc. 6780 Corton Drive
 Santa Barbara Research Park Goleta, CA 93017
- 1 Mr. Edmond Marks 315 Old Main Pennsylvania State University University Park, PA 16802
- Dr. Leo Munday, Vice President American College Testing Program P.O. Box 168 Iowa City, 1A 52240
- 1 Mr. Luigi Petrullo 2431 North Edgewood Street Arlington, VA 22207
- 1 Dr. Steven M. Pine University of Minnesota Department of Psychology Minneapolis, MN 55455
- Dr. Lyman W. Porter, Dean University of California Graduate School of Administration Irvine, CA 32650
- Dr. Diane M. Ramsey-Klee
 R-K Research & Systam Design
 3947 Ridgemont Drive
 Malibu, CA 90265
- Dr. Joseph W. Rigney University of Southern California Behavioral Technology Laboratorie: 3717 South Grand Los Angeles, CA 90007
- 1 Dr. Leonard L. Rosenbaum, Chairman Montgomery College Department of Psychology Rockville, MD 20850
- 1 Dr. George E. Rowland Rowland and Company, Inc. P.D. Box 61 Haddonfield, NJ 08033
- 1 Dr. Arthur I. Siegel Applied Psychological Services 404 East Lancaster Avenue Wayne, PA 19087
- 1 Dr. Henry P. Sims, Jr. Room 630-Business Indiana University Bloomington, IN 47401
- 1 Dr. C. Harold Stone 1428 Virginia Avenue Glendale, CA 91202
- Mr. Dennis J. Sullivan c/o HAISC, Building 119, M.S. 2 P.O. Box 90515 Los Angeles, CA 90009

- 1 Dr. John R. Frederiksen Bolt, Beranek & Newman, Inc. 50 Moulton Street Cambridge, MA 02133
- 1 Dr. David J. Weiss University of Minnesota Department of Psychology N660 Elliott Hall Minneapolis, MN 55455
- 1 Mr. George Wheaton American Institutes for Research 3301 New Mexico Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20016
- 1 Dr. K. Wescourt Stanford University Institute for Mathematical Studies in the Social Sciences Stanford, CA 94305
- 1 Richard T. Mowday College of Business Administration University of Nebrasks, Lincoln Lincoln, NE 68588
- 1 Dr. John J. Collins Vice President Essex Corporation 6305 Caminito Estrellado San Diego, CA 92120
- 1 Dr. Lyle Schoenfeldt School of Management Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Troy, NY 12181
- 1 Dr. Patrick Suppes, Director Institute for Mathematical Studies in the Social Sciences Stanford University Stanford, CA 94305
- 1 Dr. Andrew M. Rose American Institutes for Research 3301 New Mexico Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20016
- Major I. N. Evonic Canadian Forces Personnel Applied Research Unit 1107 Avenue Road Toronto, Ontario, Canada

A STATE AND A STATE