

AD-A007 667

THE PERSONNEL ASSESSMENT CENTER: AN
AID IN THE SELECTION OF PERSONNEL FOR
CROSS CULTURAL ASSIGNMENTS

Leonard Francis Zuga

Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California

March 1975

DISTRIBUTED BY:

NTIS

National Technical Information Service
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER <i>AD-A007 667</i>
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) The Personnel Assessment Center: An Aid in the Selection of Personnel for Cross Cultural Assignments		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Master's Thesis; March 1975
7. AUTHOR(s) Leonard Francis Zuga		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940		12. REPORT DATE March 1975
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 173
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Assessment Overseas selection Assessment center Simulation Development Overseas assignment Evaluation Situational tests Selection		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The assessment center is described as a method of personnel selection based on multiple personality assessment techniques. Through a review of literature, the reader is introduced to multiple assessment via a brief history of assessment center development and an overview of current assessment methods and applications. Next, the personality characteristics of personnel most likely to succeed in a cross-cultural environment		

20.

are investigated, followed by a review of recent military research which is aimed at improving selection and training of personnel for cross-cultural assignments.

Based on the assumption that the research conducted to improve selection and training for cross-cultural assignments is tending toward multiple assessment techniques, the writer proposes a prototype assessment program for the selection of personnel to be assigned overseas. The proposed program is based on existing knowledge of the psychology of the overseas adjustment problem and reflects the writer's opinions generated in the conduct of research for this project.

The anticipated benefit of the proposed assessment program is the improvement of overseas assignment selection procedures for the Navy, and the long run reduction of costs attributable to the premature rotation of those who fail in cross-cultural assignments.

The Personnel Assessment Center:
An Aid in the Selection of Personnel for
Cross-Cultural Assignments

by

Leonard F. Zuga
Lieutenant, United States Navy
B.A., Ohio State University, 1966

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
March 1975

Author:

Leonard F. Zuga

Approved by:

Robert L. Schellen

Thesis Advisor

William A. ...

Second Reader

William A. ...

Chairman, Department of Operations Research
and Administrative Sciences

Joseph R. Bunting

Academic Dean

ABSTRACT

The assessment center is described as a method of personnel selection based on multiple personality assessment techniques. Through a review of literature, the reader is introduced to multiple assessment via a brief history of assessment center development and an overview of current assessment methods and applications. Next, the personality characteristics of personnel most likely to succeed in a cross-cultural environment are investigated, followed by a review of recent military research which is aimed at improving selection and training of personnel for cross-cultural assignments.

Based on the assumption that the research conducted to improve selection and training for cross-cultural assignments is tending toward multiple assessment techniques, the writer proposes a prototype assessment program for the selection of personnel to be assigned overseas. The proposed program is based on existing knowledge of the psychology of the overseas adjustment problem and reflects the writer's opinions generated in the conduct of research for this project.

The anticipated benefit of the proposed assessment program is the improvement of overseas assignment selection procedures for the Navy, and the long run reduction of costs attributable to the premature rotation of those who fail in cross-cultural assignments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	9
II.	BACKGROUND	13
	A. THE GROWTH OF CONCERN	13
	1. The Peace Corps	13
	2. Business	15
	3. The Military	18
	a. The Army	18
	b. The Navy	22
	B. THE PERSONNEL ASSESSMENT CENTER	25
	1. Objective	26
	2. Concepts	27
	3. Assessment Variables	27
	4. Assessment Programs	28
	a. Program Lengths	28
	b. Program Content	28
	(1) Instrumentation	28
	(2) Interviews By Assessors	29
	(3) Written Assignments	29
	(4) Simulations and Role Playing	29
	c. Assessors	29
	d. Evaluations and Their Use	30
III.	PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS	32
	A. THE ASSESSMENT CENTER	32
	1. Modern Historical Development	32

2.	Two Important Concepts -----	38
a.	Validity -----	38
b.	Reliability -----	41
3.	Establishing a Center -----	41
a.	Elements of Success -----	44
b.	Task Analysis -----	44
c.	Assessment Variables -----	45
d.	Exercises and Their Selection -----	46
e.	Assessor Selection and Training -----	50
f.	Exercise Administration -----	56
g.	Candidate Evaluation and Feedback -----	61
h.	Establishing Predictive Validity -----	65
4.	Summary of Major Points: The Pro Assessment Center Argument -----	67
5.	Negative Considerations: The Con Assessment Center Argument -----	69
3.	THE OVERSEAS ADJUSTMENT PROBLEM (CULTURE SHOCK) AND SELECTION CRITERIA -----	75
1.	Culture Shock -----	76
a.	Cultural Self-Awareness -----	79
b.	Cultural Sensitivity -----	85
c.	Ethnocentrism -----	88
d.	Motivation and the Development of Interpersonal Skills -----	90
e.	Miscellaneous Possibilities -----	94
2.	In-Country Research, Vietnam and Greece (Task Analysis) -----	95
a.	The Navy Advisor Profile Report (NAPR) -----	96
b.	In-Country Experience: Navy Personnel Stationed in Greece -----	99

3.	Existing Instrumentation and Exercises ----	102
a.	Instrumentation -----	102
b.	Situational Exercises (Role Playing and Simulation) -----	108
c.	Interviewing -----	117
4.	Comment -----	120
IV.	A PROPOSED ASSESSMENT CENTER FOR THE SELECTION OF PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS DUTY -----	121
A.	COMPLETED STEPS TOWARD ASSESSMENT CENTER ESTABLISHMENT -----	121
1.	Elements of Success -----	121
2.	Task Analysis -----	122
3.	Exercise Selection/Development -----	123
4.	Assessor Selection and Training -----	123
B.	PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION (A PROPOSED PROGRAM) ---	124
C.	VALIDATION -----	126
D.	SUMMARY OF POINTS -----	127
E.	PROPOSED LOCATION -----	127
F.	CONCLUSION -----	130
1.	Speeding Up Progress -----	130
2.	Cost Effectiveness -----	131
	APPENDIX A -----	133
	BIBLIOGRAPHY -----	166
	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST -----	173

LIST OF TABLES

1. Summary of Interrater Reliability Studies of Assessment Procedures -----	43
2. Description of Exercises -----	47
3. Comparison of Assessment Center Method with Typical Use of Panel Interviews and Testing -----	70
4. Recommended Improvements In Navy Selection Procedures -----	128

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

A problem common to large multinational corporations, religious denominations and governments is the failure of their overseas agents to adequately perform their duties. Attendant with these inadequate performances are high costs due to premature termination of overseas assignments. A recent report estimates this dollar cost to the United States Navy at seventeen million dollars for fiscal year 1974 [80]. These costs can be lowered by reducing the high turnover rate of overseas assignments.

This writer believes that the high turnover rate in overseas assignments can be reduced by curtailing premature rotation which may be curbed with improvement of the screening and selection process by which Naval personnel are chosen for overseas duty. By screening out individuals who would have great difficulty adapting overseas and selecting those most likely to adjust and perform successfully, overseas operations could be enhanced and the high turnover rate reduced resulting in economic savings to our overseas staffing programs.

Current programs aimed at cross-cultural training and orientation have solved only a small segment of the overall problem. The rationale for improving screening is that some individuals cannot benefit from cross-cultural training and that such training is inadequate for others. Improved screening of personnel will lead to more effective and economical

training programs as well as more positive results in the field. Through adequate screening it would be possible to eliminate many potential problems before they were manifested in either training or actual operations.

The failure of individuals to adjust in a new environment abroad is the result of culture shock. The adjustment problem ranges from mild, short duration difficulties to severe and lasting inadequate behavior in the new environment. Culture shock can be likened to a very severe case of homesickness where the absence of familiar customs and the inability to interpret and anticipate new actions and reactions are found so frustrating that the individual cannot function effectively.

That the culture shock phenomenon accounts for a major portion of overseas failures is well documented in business and military literature. In describing the failure of managers abroad, Hayes [36] states:

The problems associated with culture shock, self reference tendencies, and national stereotyping do not constitute the totality of behavioral problems, but they certainly represent the root of a substantial portion of difficulties associated with international business.

On the same subject, Howard [41] feels that,

. . . most Americans fail abroad because of their inability to adapt themselves to the local culture which normally stems from their personal inadequacy and environmental ability.

From the military viewpoint, Dr. Yellen of the Navy Personnel Research and Development Laboratory states [89]:

. . . the advisory (Vietnam advisors) role encompasses a range of conditions not ordinarily found in the usual assignments of U. S. Naval officers and enlisted men.

The crucial feature of the advisory role is that it requires a transition from the familiar American and Navy setting to a foreign language and culture, unaccustomed working and living conditions, and unfamiliar climate and type of duty. While most advisors have excelled in their previous duty assignments, some of them prove unable to adjust to the necessary changes and, therefore, perform notably less effectively in their advisory assignment.

In his research for the Army, Robert Foster [25] presents this background:

Americans working in overseas assignments are constantly confronted with situations for which their own unicultural experience has not prepared them. Obvious cultural differences in language and customs are often considered to be the source of these problems; sources of difficulty that are more likely, but tend to be overlooked, are mental habits, attitudes, and assumptions acquired through experience in an individual's own social and cultural milieu.

Adequate screening of personnel being sent abroad will identify the more cross-culturally adaptable individual and select out those having low potential for adjustment to the new environment. The resultant benefits of such a program could save costs of attempting to train the untrainable and reduce the costs due to premature assignment termination. Hidden costs which cannot possibly be measured will also be saved. Such costs occur when a maladjusted individual disrupts the routine work of his associates thus reducing the overall efficiency of the overseas organization. Such a person also creates personal difficulties for his associates and the individual who is ordered to replace him earlier than scheduled.

Another significant hidden cost is that attributed to the effectiveness of the American Overseas Diplomacy Mission. Effective and successful overseas operations require harmonious and rewarding interpersonal relationships between Americans and their host nationals. Any degrading of these relationships

tends to degrade the image of the American abroad. Hence, more efficient screening of personnel prior to overseas assignment will reduce the cost of spreading the ugly American image abroad and improve relationships between Americans and host nationals in general.

The Navy's funding of the research done by the Center for Research and Education, and the cross-cultural research at the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego attests to the Navy's interest in reducing these identified and hidden costs. In the introductory comments of the Center for Research and Education (CRE) report [80], the situation is succinctly and dramatically summarized:

. . . very little definitive knowledge has been gained in this field [screening and selection of Navy personnel for successful performance overseas], and a fully operational personnel selection system with proven success does not presently exist for selecting personnel for overseas assignment. What this means is that there is much yet to be done and, for this reason, the Navy is now in an unusually advantageous position to take a leadership role in exploiting some exciting opportunities and making a unique contribution to this very important field.

This paper was devoted to the investigation of developing a method for selecting personnel to be assigned to overseas billets which would have adequate predictive validity. The personnel assessment center, widely used in industry to select personnel for management and other positions requiring a great deal of interpersonal facility, is a potential method for making such selections which offers great promise.

II. BACKGROUND

A. THE GROWTH OF CONCERN

The volume of cross-cultural research done in the Sixties evidences a growing concern for the quality of the American experience abroad on three fronts. The Peace Corps, sending large numbers of young people to work in underdeveloped countries, sponsored a great deal of the research. Business, although sponsoring relatively little scientific research, demonstrated concern for the quality of expatriate managers in multinational corporations. Finally, the deepening involvement of the Vietnam conflict caused the military to fund research in an attempt to improve the quality of advisor/counterpart interaction in host countries.

1. The Peace Corps

Tucker [80] has reviewed the literature relating to the cross-cultural adjustment and selection problem and reported them in a summarized format (see Appendix A). Among those studies are twenty-four separate publications written between 1964 and 1973 that report on Peace Corps Volunteer data. Attrition among Peace Corps Volunteers overseas is estimated to have increased from a low of 10% in 1961 to a high of 37% in 1968. Some studies also attempt to estimate costs and reasons for failure and some make efforts at devising predictors presenting attendant but inconclusive statistics.

In 1967 Gordon [31] published results of his research which investigated the predictive validity of an assessment program designed to predict success and failure rates of Peace Corps trainees. The assessment program lasted for one week and included individual situational tests, personality tests, projective tests, and work-sample language training. When compared with other predictive instruments, Gordon found that there was no significant difference between the assessment program and other predictors; thus he reasoned that less costly predictors should be used. Although the research project was of a short term nature, (not long enough or rigid enough to adequately evaluate the concept), it is the only evidence uncovered by this writer of such an attempt at a comprehensive and multi-faceted assessment program to select personnel for overseas duty.

Adopting the experiential aspect of situational testing, Wight and Casco [83] published a training and assessment manual for Peace Corps training. The method outlined relies heavily upon assessment of behavior during training. The observed and evaluated behavior is elicited through discussion groups, critical incident scenarios (which are evaluated by the trainee), role playing, and situational exercises. Assessment is concurrent with training and done by both the volunteer himself as well as the instructional staff. Through self assessment over an extended period, it is hoped that the potential poor adjuster will select himself out of the program during training. If he has not done so, the experience of the instructors/assessors affords a second opportunity to eliminate the poor adjuster prior to assignment.

The important aspect of this training and assessment program is the reliance on observable behavior. Actual behavior, rather than indicators of potential behavior, is used as the basis for predictors.

2. Business

Reviewing the studies of the business community for approximately the same time frame as those for the Peace Corps Tucker [80] (see Appendix A) lists ten studies specifically mentioning businessmen and/or their families living abroad. Typically, these were not empirical studies, but informal documentation of the problems of culture shock and ineffective performance of some American managers working abroad. Often authors suggested recommended desirable personality profiles of the typically effective American manager working abroad.

From a particularly voluminous work concerning personality profiles Torre [78] postulates a well-defined profile as proposed criterion areas for the selection of managers to be sent abroad. Although he offers no empirical data to support his recommended profile, the importance of his work is his stress on assessing potential for overseas assignment based on an extensive analysis of personality and background. In support of the need for this extensive analysis, Torre states:

The selector cannot place his faith in the rule of thumb that a person who has done a job successfully in the past will in all probability do a similar job equally well in a completely different cultural situation. Frequently, the candidate is being asked to do something he has never done before: to perform similar jobs under entirely different interpersonal and social conditions, or to act as a consultant when previously he has been primarily doing the work himself. To train others for a job is quite a

different psychological role from doing something oneself, and transition from one role to the other is hard for many otherwise competent people.

Torre goes on to say that the ideal solution to the selection problem is to select only those who have already shown skill in international work [observed behavior], but, this being rarely possible, managers must be selected on the basis of specified qualifications. The bulk of his work outlines those qualifications determined through selected past performance evaluation, interviews, psychological testing and medical and psychiatric screening. A key but underplayed point is made in the following paragraph:

There is general agreement on the desirability of a permanent team for making selections. Given the problems inherent in evaluating personality, some kind of center should be developed where experiences and experiments are pooled for the improvement of personnel examination at the center.

Concentrating on the selection problem more recently, Baker and Ivancevich [4] studied the selection programs of 326 Foreign Operations Managers of American-based multinational firms. The reason for their study was a feeling that improvement of selection practices in business was required. Their findings implied:

. . . a large number of selectors of overseas American managers believe that if a manager can perform within the United States he can perform as well abroad. This attitude is both overly optimistic and simplistic . . . from the results reported in aggregate form, it must be concluded that there is no such thing as systematic staffing programs for placing Americans in overseas positions.

In conclusion the authors state:

The staffing practices of the largest American companies in filling overseas executive positions are very infrequently systematic, too frequently haphazard, and

occasionally chaotic. For these companies to overcome what a National Industrial Conference Board survey of top executives shows to be the second most serious operational problem of multinational corporations--staffing overseas executive positions--a number of changes will have to be made in their recruitment and training policies. Among these changes the following are recommended:

- °A longer, more deliberate time span must be utilized in selecting and evaluating candidates for overseas training.
- °Selectors must rely on all sources for their candidates and not concentrate wholly on selection from within the company.
- °Scientific testing methods must be administered and the performance and predictability of these tests should be evaluated.

In still more recent writing Howard [41] discusses one business viewpoint towards improvement of selection procedures.

Many multinational giants questioned and doubted the economic feasibility, usefulness, and practicality of some of the formal and complex testing devices used in some firms to select their prospective overseas executives. Most available measuring devices, according to these giants, are inadequate to objectively and justifiably determine the suitability of potential expatriate managers to succeed abroad. Furthermore, they deemphasize the available personnel tests as screening devices for prospective overseas executives because, in their opinion, these tests tend to create the concept of the average executive.

To counter this argument, Howard states:

Psychological testing will not be able to measure all of the qualifications necessary for an overseas executive, but when used in conjunction with other methods, it should prove useful. Psychological testing must have a place in the selection process, but as one can readily see, the place it occupies should be well chosen and well defined. The results of the test should also be scrutinized in the light of other results obtained from methods such as personal interviews and examination of past and present performance and experience.

From the preceding selections it can be seen that the business world is aware of the problems in selection and staffing practices for overseas positions. The recurrent

theme through much of the writing is that the environmental change in the overseas assignment is so great that past performance alone is not a sufficient predictor of success in the new environment. More comprehensive and valid testing programs for the selection of overseas managers are being sought in the business world.

3. The Military

To the Peace Corps the risk of poor cross-cultural relationships is one of image and productivity, to business it is one of image and profit, to the military it is one of image and, frequently, human life. Summarizing over 2,000 years of cross-cultural military history, Affourtit [2] says of the Vietnam era:

Although the Vietnam experience generated a considerable amount of research, recommendations, and programs designed to win the "hearts and minds" of a more or less indifferent people, little evidence of positive behavioral response was recorded. One exception . . . , showed the response of locals to the Marine Corps Personal Response Program; a program designed to improve cross cultural relations. Not only did the Vietnamese people support the Marines operating in their area, but they placed their own lives in jeopardy by recovering weapons and providing information on enemy movements which helped save American lives.

Perhaps the concern for human life is a greater motivator than productivity and profit as the military appears to have funded the largest volume of cross-cultural research in recent years.

a. The Army

The Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) largely supported by U. S. Army funding, sponsored a great deal of research in intercultural relations during the Sixties. The Vietnam conflict stepped up the Army's modest research effort that began with the study of occupational forces

following World War II. Foster and Danielien [24] subtly introduced their research with the following comment:

Military personnel are being sent in ever-increasing numbers to developing nations in Asia, Africa and Latin America. In their role of advisors, technical agents, or trainers in various types of military missions, they often come into daily close contact with indigenous personnel whose speech, dress, eating habits, behavioral style, and underlying cultural values are vastly different from their own.

What knowledge or skills contribute to success in such overseas operations? At least three categories can be defined: technical competence, area knowledge and language skills, and communication and interpersonal skills. The first two are basic, concrete, and clearly relevant . . .

The third category, communication and interpersonal skills, represents a type of capability which has received far less attention.

Army research has centered on this third category, communication and interpersonal skills, through the Sixties and up to the present. However, the research, assuming assignment to such advisory duty was a given, concentrated on improving these skills rather than identifying persons who possessed a requisite minimum level as selectees for overseas duty. Speaking of present Army selection procedures Tucker [80] states:

The screening and selection procedures for enlisted personnel are highly computerized. The system is driven by a personnel requisition from some command. This requisition then goes through the computer system, and qualified personnel are selected from the data bank. These selections are made from personnel who are eligible for movement within the required time frame. The procedure is very similar for officers, except that there is more personal attention. Less of a computerized procedure is given for officers than for enlisted personnel.

The procedure consists essentially of selecting qualified people with proper training, skills, and background to complete the job, and matching this individual with job requirements. There are no particular criteria for selecting people for overseas positions related to intercultural adjustment.

In spite of these impersonal, computerized selection procedures, the Army's cross-cultural training research has indirectly assisted progress toward improved selection procedures. The thrust of much of the research was an effort to determine the complex nature of overseas work. Preceding his analysis of generalized constants of overseas work Foster [25] wrote:

There is a need for a systematic overview of the training goals that guide the preparation of personnel for overseas assignments. Such training has, for the most part, been modeled after the traditional academic education, even though studies in recent years have emphasized the special interpersonal and intercultural problems involved in working in overseas environments that are so different from situations in the past experiences of the individual . . .

The focus of this report is on Americans in government work, serving in technical advisory positions in developing nations. It offers a systematic overall perspective of the dimensions of preparing Americans for such work overseas, together with some suggestions for training.

The analysis portion of Foster's paper looked at the causes of ineffective cross-cultural relationships, and his suggestions for training proposed instruction in six specific interpersonal skill areas in order to improve such relationships. The importance of this work to selection improvement is that it, as much of the Army sponsored research, did not look simply for statistically correlated predictors, but rather attempted to analyze required skills. The Army's preliminary research which was aimed at improving training can best be characterized as job or task analysis.

Having determined training requirements the research eventually led to devising experiential training methods such as simulation, role playing and group workshops. Prefacing

his study of simulation, Stewart [71] notes:

Preparing American advisors to cope with cultural differences presents a difficult problem since cultural characteristics are deeply rooted determinants of behavior. It was felt that special techniques were needed for this type of training. Simulation was chosen as one of the most promising methods. It provides active participation or direct observation by students in a class; furthermore, it is a realistic procedure allowing students to learn about cultural differences in a live cross-cultural experience, and perhaps also achieving a latent training effect of which the student is not aware himself.

Stewart [72] also studied role playing as a training method stating:

. . . role playing exercises were designed to elicit selected assumptions and values of American and contrasting cultures. The purpose was to achieve a valid simulation of the psychological or experiential aspects of an instrumental encounter . . .

Kraemer [51] gives this explanation of the workshop exercise:

The objective of the workshop is to prepare Americans for such difficulties [in intercultural communications] by increasing their cultural self-awareness, that is, their ability to recognize cultural influences in their own thinking . . .

Cultural self-awareness is difficult to develop, particularly in persons who have not previously recognized that they are influenced by cultural factors in ways over which they have little control, and of which they are dimly aware . . .

Participants analyze video recordings of staged segments of conversations occurring overseas between an American and a host national, played by actors . . .

Simulation, role playing, and workshop training are all aimed at eliciting actual behaviors. These behaviors, as in the Peace Corps training program, can be considered samples of a person's actual behavior patterns. From these behaviors, inferences about how he will act abroad can be made.

Although the Army uses these exercises as training for selectees, critical evaluation of the elicited behavior might also be used as a selection aid in a more sophisticated program.

b. The Navy

The Navy's concern for identifying and selecting more adaptable personnel for overseas assignment became an issue only recently. Again, Vietnam had a great deal to do with that concern as evidenced by Yellen and McGanka's The Navy Advisor Profile Report [89] which is an empirically developed assessment instrument to be used by Navy detailers for selecting officers for advisory duty in Vietnam. Development of the instrument was based upon an investigation of desirable behavioral factors for advisory assignments. Due to its publication near the end of American involvement in that war, the instrument was never validated.

The Navy's overseas homeporting policy has prompted continuing research in cross-cultural adjustment and selection. Yellen and Hoover [88] have studied personnel stationed in Greece to identify those personal attributes that maximize positive interaction between Naval personnel and host-country nationals. Based on their findings, the authors offer these recommendations:

Rather than provide the traditional method of simply furnishing information, a different approach to cultural indoctrination and training is needed. It appears desirable to provide Navymen and their families with some situational experience prior to their actually being confronted with the real overseas situation. Such experience should be offered in indoctrination and training sessions which would simulate various representative and frequently

encountered conditions in the trainee's prospective overseas location. In addition, the participant would also be exposed to, and would use enough basic day-to-day host-country spoken language to enable him to communicate with minimum adequacy in his interactions with host-country nationals.

Yellen's research in this experiential form of training and evaluation led to the development of a Japanese Contact and Communication course. Yellen [87] explains its possibilities:

As part of a research program designed to develop a selection procedure for overseas assignment . . . the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center in conjunction with Simile II of La Jolla, California, developed the Japanese Contact and Communication Course. As originally conceived, the course was to serve as a criterion measure for overseas adjustment. However, as the simulation was being developed and tested with Navy personnel stationed in San Diego, it became apparent that it could also serve as an overseas training device.

Yellen further explains his plans for validation of simulation as an assessment exercise:

The validity of the assessment procedure will be determined by correlating the performance evaluations and NOAS scores [Navy Overseas Adjustment Scale, a self-evaluation instrument] with command and peer nominations. The command nomination procedure involves an overseas command in Japan providing a list of individuals who have come to the command's attention for detrimental reasons. Also, the command will provide the names of individuals who are doing an outstanding job in Japanese-American community relations affairs. The peer nomination procedure involves having personnel nominating individuals who they feel have adapted extremely well to living in Japan and also listing those that they feel are having an extremely difficult time adjusting. Individuals nominated as outstanding and those having adjustment problems, as well as individuals in between, will be requested to participate in the Japanese Contact and Communications Course exercise. These individuals will serve as the high and low criterion groups for the validation effort.

Yellen [86] has also been instrumental in the development of predictive instrumentation as a selection aid

for overseas assignment. From a 108 item survey administered to personnel serving in Japan, thirty-eight of the survey items differentiated with high accuracy between successful and unsuccessful adjusters in Japan. The items were incorporated into an instrument called the Cross Cultural Interaction Inventory, which is yet to be validated.

The forward of the draft report of the Cross Cultural Interaction Survey also lists a total of eight acculturation programs, screening instruments, and overseas data-gathering devices which have been developed and are in operational use or are ready for field test implementation. Among the eight are the Japanese Contact and Communication Course and the Cross Cultural Interaction Survey.

The importance of Yellen's work at San Diego is best summarized by Tucker [80] in his review of the Navy efforts to improve selection practices for overseas assignment:

This assessment [Tucker's assessment of the work at NPRDC San Diego], when considered in the context of this total report, has shown that the NPRDC research project is the first and only study of its kind designed by the military or any other large organization managing overseas personnel. Nowhere else has there been a project of this nature, whether it be accounts of past research, current efforts, or future plans. In view of the magnitude, consequences, and complexity of the problem addressed, this is an admirable effort.

. . . All things considered, this project has a high probability of contributing valuable knowledge to the overseas selection problem and useful products to the Navy.

Tucker, in his recommendations following this assessment of the situation accurately and succinctly states this writer's feelings and appraisal of the overseas assignment selection problem. He feels that:

The Navy should begin to establish a total systems procedure within BUPERS (Bureau of Naval Personnel) for an integrated personnel selection, preparation, and training system for overseas assignments. . . . The key principle throughout the implementation of such a system is rigorous documentation according to specified criteria, and constant feedback of information throughout the system The proposed integrated system should begin to operate anyway, making use of probable criteria These probable criteria can be replaced by proven ones as they become available through research and development.

. . . "Good selection rests with the skill of the selector" and, surely, Navy selection personnel could benefit from skill training in selection for overseas assignments. This could take place in phases, with courses being implemented immediately based on present knowledge and the state of the art. Additional training could be conducted as the proposed integrated system is operationalized, and as knowledge is gained through research and development.

Present screening and selection procedures should begin to also focus on the families of Navy personnel assigned overseas . . .

The previous recommendations are made for all Navy personnel assigned overseas, but it should be recognized that each recommendation should take into account the rank, job, and personal situation of each Navy member involved. This is rather obvious, but should be pointed out as a complicating factor in the recommendations. This is especially true of high impact personnel overseas Special attention should be given to these groups in several ways. These groups should be the "spearhead" of many of the recommendations, due to the special, high intensity involvement with foreign nationals overseas.

The next segment of this paper will briefly outline a vehicle for just such a comprehensive selection system as Tucker recommends, that is, the personnel assessment center.

B. THE PERSONNEL ASSESSMENT CENTER

The assessment center method of personnel evaluation can best be defined by looking at its underlying concepts and objectives, and how it operates. However, a general definition will introduce the reader to the concept. Byham and Wettengel

[10] define the assessment center as:

. . . a method, not a place. It involves multiple evaluation techniques, including various forms of job-related simulations, and may sometimes include interviews and psychological tests. Common job simulations include in-basket simulations, management games, group discussions, simulations of interviews with subordinates or clients, fact finding exercises, oral-presentation exercises and written communication exercises. The exercises are selected to bring out behavior related to the dimensions identified by research as important to job success in the target-level positions for which the participants are being considered.

Extending this definition to potential uses at various organizational level Macrae [56] says:

The assessment lab process has potential application at all levels of an organization. It is not unusual to see three levels of assessment within one organization, two levels are quite common. As the process has become understood and mastered, attention has been directed to the use of assessment labs for both entrance recruitment and promotion of blue-collar personnel.

The assessment center is an evaluation method or process designed to elicit behavioral responses by which a candidate for a position may be evaluated on his potential for success in that position. The break from traditional evaluation methods is the emphasis on observing samples of the candidate's behavioral patterns which may not have been previously demonstrated due to lack of opportunity.

1. Objective

Little [53] defines the primary objective of the assessment center as follows:

Assessment centres are primarily geared to selection situations, whether for external candidates or internal promotion, and they attempt to generate predictive data from the simulation of realistic aspects of the management process via a criterion sampling approach.

Additional objectives are development, placement, and research as can be seen in the introductory definition in this section. Underlying all three objectives is the motive of improving the predictive validity of selection and placement decisions.

Although assessment centers are most widely used for selection of managerial talent, research--and the flexibility of the techniques--have allowed, through technology transfer, the development of centers for the selection of firemen, policemen, military officers and other personnel of which special talents and skills are required. One company cited by Thoresen and Jaffee [77] even used an assessment center to select semi-skilled labor for jobs requiring special personality attributes in a highly automated factory.

2. Concepts

The general concept underlying assessment center evaluation techniques is the observation of human characteristics from a holistic, or total personality approach. The major assumption is that a single test or analysis is not representative of the true personality. Therefore, the candidate's behavior is observed in a complex situation to arrive at a holistic appraisal of his personality.

3. Assessment Variables

The aspects of the candidate's personality that are evaluated and measured are known as assessment variables. A list of commonly assessed variables presented in Howard's [40] review of current assessment programs consists of the following: "(a) leadership, (b) planning and organizing, (c) decision

making, (d) oral and written communications skills, (e) initiative, (f) energy, (g) analytical ability, (h) resistance to stress, (i) use of delegation, (j) behavior flexibility, (k) human relations competence, (l) originality, (m) controlling, (n) self direction, and (o) overall potential." This list is offered only as an example of the types of variables assessed and is representative of most managerial assessment programs. Centers developed to select candidates for positions requiring physical skills as well as managerial ones would include specific physical skills on such a list.

4. Assessment Programs

Assessment programs vary with respect to length, content, assessors, and evaluations and their use, and the following examples are typical or representative examples.

a. Program Lengths

The majority of management assessment programs are a five days in length. The first half of the period is used to observe the exercises performed by candidates, and the second half constitutes the evaluation period by the assessors.

b. Program Content

Program content depends greatly on the purpose of the center, its evolution through time and the philosophies of those administering the center. Generally, the following techniques will be represented to some degree.

(1) Instrumentation. Instrumentation is better known in assessment center parlance as paper and pencil tests.

The independently validated tests measure attitudes, interests, mental ability and potential or achievement in academic disciplines. Tests can also be projective in nature with a wide variety of projective personality tests available.

(2) Interviews By Assessors.

(3) Written Assignments. Written assignments, such as essays and evaluations or incidents of personnel problems. The topics are generally chosen or given to the candidate in advance and completed during free hours between group exercises.

(4) Simulations and Role Playing. Participants assume they are acting as managers in assigned roles. Simulations are less structured than role playing; the candidate is free to act as he instinctively would in a natural situation. In role playing the candidate is assigned a definite role such as city councilman for example, and is expected to portray that role as he interprets it.

c. Assessors

Assessors generally come from the ranks of the organization. They are persons familiar with the position for which the candidate is being assessed by virtue of having held a like position in the past. Additionally, some organizations employ clinical psychologists to interpret projective tests and other instrumentation. To augment their knowledge, assessors undergo a formal training program which often includes undergoing assessment themselves (if they have not previously done so), and making practice assessments on a

"norm group." The number of assessors employed in a center varies from a 1:1 to a 1:4 assessor to candidate ratio. Commonly a center will process a dozen candidates with three assessors evaluating each candidate on various aspects of the process. The evaluations are then considered by the assessors as a group and the candidates are rated with respect to their overall evaluation.

d. Evaluations and Their Use

By completion of the administration of the assessment exercises, each assessor has made individual candidate evaluations. It is at this point that candidate records are reviewed and each candidate is considered on the basis of all of the information that has been compiled with respect to his performance. Although any disparities in individual assessor opinions are further discussed, few organizations require an assessor to change a rating in order to achieve consensus. The intensity and extended duration of the assessment program generally provides a reliable profile on each candidate, with small variance, such that a consensus is forthcoming. The assessors make their reports to line management in narrative form sometimes accompanied with "pass-fail" recommendations.

The assessments are usually used to achieve the primary goal of a center, e.g., selection. However, the use of constructive and carefully worded feedback to the candidate can assist him in improving his weaknesses, taking advantage of his strong points and developing his career objectives based upon an objective appraisal of his capabilities.

Research for the improvement of predictive validity is another and very important use of assessment results. Assessment records are compared with the candidate's development and promotion record several years following his assessment, and validity studies are conducted using these data. Howard [40] emphasizes this key philosophy--dynamic and constant improvement of the assessment center--which meets Tucker's recommendation that, "these probable criteria can be replaced by proven ones as they become available through research and development." She makes her point in the following analogy:

For each organization, the key to raising its ideal building will be solid, individualized construction by well-qualified masons and carpenters. Moreover, there must be maintenance of an open system that will allow for refinements and improvements. The plumbing must be kept clear or the pipes will clog with outdated and invalid components. Constant monitoring with continuous research would seem to be of the utmost importance, or one of these days, as so often happens with behavioral science techniques, a Big Bad Wolf may blow the house down.

The next section of this paper is a detailed presentation of the assessment center emphasizing key points that support this dynamic and continuous updating philosophy.

III. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

A. THE ASSESSMENT CENTER

The assessment center method of personnel selection might be adaptable to evaluating personnel for overseas suitability for several reasons. These reasons are to be found in the underlying concepts, structure and development of assessment centers. This section will outline these aspects of the assessment center in greater detail through a review of current literature applying to selection in general as well as to the assessment center method. Byham and Wettengel [10], supporting the popularity of the assessment center, summarize the points to be emphasized by this section in the following paragraph:

The popularity of the assessment center method results from its great flexibility in adaptation to different jobs and job levels; inherent potential for higher degrees of content validity (job relatedness); potential for higher criterion-related validities than available from texts or interviews alone; and enthusiastic acceptance by involved participants and managers.

1. Modern Historical Development

A review of assessment center applications since World War II, can best illustrate, though not explain, its flexibility. The German Military has been credited with developing the multiple personality assessment procedures prior to World War II. However, neither the Germans nor the Japanese, who used similar methods according to Huck [43],

have reported any validity data. The unusual requirements demanded of military personnel during wartime missions precipitated similar undertakings by the British and Americans.

According to Huck:

In 1942 the British Army, realizing their traditional methods of officer selection were producing an alarming proportion of unsuccessful cadets in officer training, formed the British War Office Selection Boards (WOSB). In addition to adopting many of the principles and procedures used by the Germans, the WOSB devised additional assessment techniques for their program, such as leaderless group discussion as a basis for judging the social or interpersonal skills of the candidates.

The beginning of multiple assessment techniques in the U. S. is thoroughly documented in a work compiled by the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) [61], the agency that used assessment centers for the selection of recruits for undercover work in World War II. The Assessment of Men written by the OSS staff contains the following disclaimer that is also a statement regarding the flexibility and need for constant updating of technology:

The record of our work must then, perforce be a description of what we did as a service unit rather than a report of research findings. To be sure, variations both in the overall program and individual procedures were frequently introduced, first to improve the quality [predictive validity] of assessment, and second, where possible, to suggest the answers to theoretical questions. But no claim is made that an analysis of our conceptualizations and measurements of the variables can amount to more than a record of what was done . . .

Of all the above programs which were under military auspices by the close of World War II the British maintained an operational program, which evolved into current Royal Commissions Board (RCB). The civil service component of the British Government also made use of multiple assessment

techniques via the British Civil Service Selection Boards (CISSB). Both the WOSB (now RCB) and CISSB produced validation studies after the war with the CISSB concentrating on validation of individual techniques as well as the assessment concept as a whole.

The German Navy began again to use assessment centers following the war. The original program was six weeks long and screened officers for the rank of Commander. According to Allen [3], that program has recently been extended and merged into a tri-service officer course.

Both the Israeli military and the Australian Army use assessment centers for selection and development. The Australian program, rather than a one-time assessment at a given point in the officer's career, is a coordinated developmental program spread over time with officers being assessed at more than one point in their careers

The United States military has only sporadically paid attention to assessment center research and development since World War II, but Allen outlines the first major effort by the Army since then. In 1973 the Army chartered a one year pilot and evaluation program at the Fort Benning, Georgia U. S. Army Infantry School.

Huck [43] summarizes the military contribution to multiple assessment in the following:

Perhaps the greatest contribution of the multiple assessment approach as used by the military was the development of "real life" or simulated exercises. These situational methods offer the potential for adding to the scope of human behavior that can be observed and evaluated under standardized conditions. The OSS assessment experience highlighted the psychological problems inherent in

assessment and won many supporters for the value of combining multiple tests and observations by pooling the judgments of several assessors.

In the private sector, American industry has been the greatest proponent of assessment centers worldwide. In 1956, multiple assessment techniques were explored by industry. AT&T established a center to assess recent college graduates for their management potential. This program was a research study for the purpose of investigating the factors which determine the career progress of young managers. Huck [43] provides this description:

An initial assessment of personal characteristics hypothesized to be of importance to the individual's success in the Bell System was a major aspect of the Management Progress Study. The dimensions assessed were derived from a review of the literature and from discussions with managers in the Bell System Companies.

The sample in the Management Progress Study consisted of 422 men drawn from six Bell System operating companies. Approximately two-thirds of the sample were recruited as management trainees after graduation from college; the remaining third had been employed initially for non-management positions and had advanced into management relatively early in their careers. The technique used was a psychological assessment which included clinical interviews, projective tests, work samples, paper-and-pencil tests, and participation in group problems and leaderless group discussions. The subjects spent three and one half days at the assessment center in groups of 12. Immediately following, the assessment staff, consisting primarily of professionally trained persons, discussed each participant extensively and rated him on each of 25 dimensions plus an overall evaluation for potential to advance in management. The candidate's final rating represented the pooled judgments of all the assessors. After the evaluation, a narrative summary of each man's performance was prepared. The assessment phase of the Management Progress Study extended over a four-year span.

One unique feature of the Management Progress Study is that no information about any candidate's performance has ever been communicated to company officials. All information collected from these 422 subjects during assessment and subsequently has been held for research

purposes only. Thus, no contamination of subsequent criterion data by the assessment results has occurred and the judgments of the assessment staff had no influence on the careers of the men participating in the study.

This well-validated study was designed to investigate factors which determine the career progress of young men entering the management environment. All information collected from the subjects during assessment was used for research only and did not influence the careers of the assessor. Thus, the judgments of the assessors, having no influence on careers of the sample, did not contaminate subsequent criterion data. The methodology of this study established a design for the predictive validity research of assessment centers. However, most current assessment centers are operational rather than research oriented, and validity studies are conducted concurrently while using assessment results to make personnel decisions.

In 1958, Michigan Bell, which had participated in the AT&T study, established the first operational assessment center that used assessment results to make promotion decisions. The Management Progress Study's procedures were modified by Michigan Bell to enable the company to evaluate non-management employees for the position of first-level supervisors. Techniques which required clinical psychologists were not employed and all of the assessors were higher level managers. This assessment center was the prototype of those used throughout the Bell System today.

From these two parent centers, the multiple assessment technique has spread throughout American industry and government. As an example of the diversity of that dispersion, the following is a partial list of clients of Development Dimensions Inc., [18] a consulting firm supplying assessment center advisory services and materials:

- Blue Cross of Southern California
- Chase Manhattan Bank
- Dow Chemical
- U. S. Forest Service
- Knight Newspapers
- Lockheed Missiles and Space Company
- Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner and Smith
- Michigan Department of State
- U. S. Post Office Texas
- Quantas Airlines
- Sears Roebuck
- Shell Oil Company
- A. E. Staley Mfg. Company
- Union Carbide Corporation
- Western Electric

Governmental agencies are becoming increasingly aware of and using assessment center methods. With respect to assessment centers in government, Cohen and Jaffee [14] make the following observations:

A number of Government agencies have made use of assessment centers in selecting and developing supervisory personnel as well as non-supervisory personnel. Most of the applications are quite recent, beginning late in the 1960's.

They further predict.

Future Government assessment centers will become more prevalent at all Government levels and interest in assessment centers will markedly increase.

The trend toward increased Government activity in assessments will be most apparent after positive validity studies are reported (this has been the trend in private industry).

Moreover, non-managerial assessments probably will become more commonplace. Possible innovations, for example, might include assessing the vocational fitness of rehabilitation clients, assessing the managerial potential of minority entrepreneurs applying for Federal assistance, or assessing the managerial capabilities of volunteer recruits enlisting in the armed services.

As a final note on the flexibility of American business applications, Thorensen and Jaffee [77] describe a unique application of an assessment center:

A small, highly automated chemical plant needed blue collar workers for seven-man teams in an "enriched" work environment; no foreman, 100% job rotation, and a rotating lead-man position. A mini-assessment center helped to identify the candidates to meet such unusual blue-collar requirements.

Although business adopted the assessment center for selecting personnel with managerial potential, extensive research and refinements of method have broadened its use to include assessments of almost any special skills including the physical and interpersonal skills required of firemen, policemen and, as shown by Thorensen and Jaffee, certain blue-collar workers.

2. Two Important Concepts

A literature review of representative studies of assessment center results will highlight two very important concepts in personnel selection and their relationship to multiple assessment namely validity and reliability.

a. Validity

In Byham's [8] descriptions of validity studies conducted at AT&T, the benefit of improved predictive validity is emphasized:

Because of the difficulty of determining supervisory skills in most non-management jobs, the greatest use of assessment centers is the identification of potential for first-level supervision. AT&T alone has assessed about 70,000 candidates for first-level management, and about one half of the assessment center operations in the United States are aimed at identifying supervisory potential.

Looking at operational validity studies, studies conducted where assessment evaluations influence promotions rather than being withheld, Byham reviews AT&T and Bell Company results:

Most large organizations that have operated centers for any significant length of time have some validity data on their ongoing centers. To various extents, these studies all suffer from methodological flaws caused by the fact that use was made of the data in the organization. To the extent that good performance in a center affected the criterion used, e.g., promotion, use of the criterion as a measure of validity is impaired. The extent of this contamination remains a mystery; but through various statistical and experimental design methods, most of the reported studies have minimized the effect.

Being the first to apply the technique, AT&T has also conducted the most impressive operational validity studies. An early study conducted at Michigan Bell compared an assessed group promoted to management with a group promoted before the assessment center program. But unfortunately, the groups were not matched. Results revealed nearly twice as many high performance and potential men at first-level management in assessed as in non-assessed groups. Another study conducted by New England Bell Company compared "acceptable" and "nonacceptable" assessed groups consisting of craftsmen promoted to first-level management and first-level managers promoted to second level. The acceptable group was "definitely superior" to the non-acceptable group according to the researcher. A large follow-up study, using four other Bell companies, compared three groups (N = 223) of first-level candidates assessed "acceptable," "questionable" and "not acceptable" and subsequently promoted to management, to non-assessed groups (N = 283) promoted before and after the assessment program. As in the other follow-up studies, this study was also limited to recently promoted managers in the assessed group; but unlike the other studies, by denoting a "not acceptable" assessed group of those promoted, the false negative rate could be determined. Moreover, by studying the two non-assessed groups, possible halo bias due to promotion before, versus after, the assessment center could be determined.

An attempt was made to match the assessed and non-assessed groups but was not entirely successful.

While use of the assessment center obviously improved the selection odds, it was by no means perfect as indicated by the fact that nearly 50 percent of those thought to be non acceptable actually succeeded on the job. This research and most other research indicates that assessment centers are better at predicting ratings of management potential and actual advancement than performance at first-level. This is probably caused by the increasing importance of the management component of jobs as individuals rise in an organization. It is this management component that is most commonly and accurately measured in an assessment center.

Among his conclusions following an extensive review of validity studies of currently operating industrial and business assessment centers, Huck [43] makes the following observations:

Procedures unique to the assessment center approach, essentially situational exercises, contribute a substantial element to the prediction of managerial performance, beyond that which is found in paper-and-pencil measures alone. However, multiple assessment procedures provide a number of data sources, and the contribution of each to the assessment dimensions, the final assessment rating, and multiple criterion must be further clarified

Operational assessment centers use assessments for selection decisions rather than for research purposes only, as did the management progress study of AT&T. By using the assessments and the predictions for each candidate, then following up the candidate's career progress, a feedback loop is established. Validation information is constantly fed back into the center and instruments and exercises are corrected as required thereby increasing the validity of future predictions.

Frequently, previously validated instrumentation or exercises are used by operational centers when suitable materials are available. This is especially true in the case

of instrumentation, so much of which has been developed by researchers for study of interpersonal relations. However, when suitable material is not available, centers will devise exercises which appear to measure assessment variables and refine them with information gleaned from the validation studies, via the feedback system.

b. Reliability

In her study of assessment centers, Howard [40] includes the following section on reliability.

In many assessment center exercises and in the final evaluations each participant is evaluated by more than one assessor. Accordingly, interrater reliability becomes a matter of some importance, in addition to the reliability of individual measures. A summary of reliability data is shown in Table 1.

It should be noted that the AT&T studies of the i-basket, projective tests and interviews probably had inflated reliability estimates, since the interrater reliability was determined for the written report of a procedure, not the procedure itself. Two raters in high agreement on what a report says is a far less potent finding than two raters in high agreement on how a candidate performs in a situational exercise. The reliability coefficients do indicate, however, that the reports presented clear evaluations from which consistent ratings could be made.

These studies indicate that the criteria of improved predictive validity and attendant reliability for a selection system might be met through multiple assessment techniques.

3. Establishing a Center

By drawing upon examples from literature to illustrate the various steps and components of assessment center establishment, this section will present a model assessment center.

Table 1

Summary of Interrater Reliability Studies of Assessment Procedures

Source	Company	Variables	Assessors	Interrater Reliability
Thomson (N = 71)	SOHIO	13 dimensions	2 psychologists	Ratings, .73-.93, $\bar{r}$ = .85
Thomson (N = 71)	SOHIO	13 dimensions	3 managers	Ratings, .78-.95, $\bar{r}$ = .89
Thomson (N = 71)	SOHIO	Potential	2 psychologists	Ratings, .89 ^a
Thomson (N = 71)	SOHIO	Potential	3 managers	Ratings, .93 ^a
McConnell & Parker (N = 12)	AMA client	a) 12 categor. b) Potential	5 managers 5 managers	Ratings, .64-.90 ^a Ratings, .83 ^a
McConnell & Parker (N = 12-48)	6 AMA clients	Overall mgt. ability	5 managers	Ratings, .85-.98 ^a
Greenwood & McNamara (N = 228)	IBM	a) Task force game b) Leaderless group c) Mfg. problem	All pairs of 3 alternating observers	a) Ratings, .70 Rankings, .71 b) Ratings, .66 Rankings, .64 c) Ratings, .74 Rankings, .75
Bray & Grant (N = 355)	AT&T	a) Leaderless b) Mfg. problem c) In-basket	2 psychologists 2 psychologists 2 psychologists	Ratings, .75 Rankings, .75 Ratings, .60 Rankings, .69 Ratings, .92

(cont.)

Table 1 (cont.)

Source	Company	Variables	Assessors	Interrater Reliability
Grant, Katkovsky & Bray (N = 355)	AT&T	9 variables from pro- jective tests	2 psychologists	Ratings, .85-.94 ^a
Grant & Bray (N = 355)	AT&T	18 variables - from inter- view data	2 psychologists	Median = .82 college, .72 non-college

^aInternal consistency estimates, correction for number of assessors.

Source: Howard [40]

a. Elements of Success

Byham and Wettengel [10] stipulate that good management and competent assessors are primary ingredients of a successful program:

An important element of a successful assessment center program is a well-planned and complete assessor training program. (To be discussed later) . . .

Another important element is the need for a highly-trained administrator who can command the respect of the assessors in the program. The administration of an assessment center is no easy task . . .

Good management implies planning. The Development Dimensions Catalogue [18] offers the following advice:

Planning is the key to a successful and valid assessment operation. Planning must concern all aspects of the center from identification of dimensions to feedback of assessment information to participants and management. Assessment centers themselves are relatively simple to plan and organize but the fitting of the center program into an organization's current personnel programs and practices and the need to be sensitive to the attitudes of center participants require much thought and often some difficult decisions.

b. Task Analysis

Before selecting or devising exercises to be used in evaluating a candidate's behavior, the characteristics sought must first be defined. This is done through a task analysis which studies present and future job requirements by any means available which will adequately define them. The Development Dimensions Catalogue [18] explains this step:

Some or all of the following steps should be taken to determine the dimensions to be observed in the assessment center: (a) survey professional literature and company records, (b) conduct a professional job analysis, (c) have a professional observe a sample of individuals doing the job and interview higher management about the needed dimensions, (d) conduct a questionnaire survey of management's view of job requirements, (e) arrange a "brainstorming" meeting of key managers familiar with the

position or positions for which the candidates are being assessed and (f) obtain "critical incidents" of behavior leading to particularly successful or unsuccessful behavior. The more methods the better. At all times the focus should not only be on present job requirements but on those anticipated in the future.

Kraut's [52] viewpoint of what actually passes for this task analysis is somewhat less idealistic than the above as he states:

. . ., we might ask if we are really measuring relevant characteristics. It seems likely that we are doing so only in part. Most assessment programs are not based on an empirical study of the manager's role, as might be done through a careful job analysis or a critical incident study. At best, they are based largely on a review of the research literature and the judgment of the executives in the organization as to what makes for an effective manager. At worst, they tend to be copies of programs in other companies.

c. Assessment Variables

The assessment variables (characteristics to be assessed by observation and evaluation of the candidate's behavior) are determined by the results of the task analysis. They are the "dimensions to be observed" and the "characteristics" mentioned above by Development Dimensions and Kraut respectively. For a representative listing of the variables assessed in management potential assessment centers, the reader may refer back to Section II B 3. By means of contrast the OSS [61] compiled a final listing of eleven variables to be assessed in their candidates. The eleven variables were:

- (1) Motivation for Assignment, (2) Energy and Initiative, (3) Effective Intelligence, (4) Emotional Stability, (5) Social Relations, (6) Leadership, (7) Physical Ability, (8) Security (ability to safeguard classified information), (9) Observing and Reporting, (10) Propaganda Skills and (11) Overall.

By contrasting the two lists, several overlapping skills can be found, but the more specialized nature of the OSS's requirements requires Physical Ability and Security, not found on many management assessment scales.

This contrast is meant to point out the wide variety of assessable human skills that can be assessed. However, some traits which are better evaluated through prolonged observation of the candidate over long periods, cannot be accurately assessed in the relatively short assessment center exercises. Those traits, if they are considered to have a bearing on job success, are best evaluated through a review of past performance appraisal data and considered together with assessment center performance.

d. Exercises and Their Selection

Exercises are chosen or developed to elicit behavior which is evidence of measurable assessment variables. Allen [3] thoroughly reviews the basic considerations in choosing exercises and offers detailed descriptions of such exercises. Section II B 4 b of this paper lists the types of common exercises in brief. With exception of the interview, which is self-explanatory, Table 2 from Byham and Wettengel [10] provides a summary of exercises used by the state of Wisconsin in a program called the Career Executive Program. The descriptions represent all other exercise categories and provide good examples of management selection and development program exercises. This paper defers the rationale of the selection or development of any particular type of exercise to the

Table 2

Description of Exercises

Assigned Role Group Discussion (Role Playing)

In this leaderless group discussion, participants, acting as a city council of a hypothetical city, must allocate a one-million-dollar federal grant in the time allotted or make other judgments on the varying proposals offered. Each participant is assigned a point of view to sell to the other team members and is provided with a choice of projects to back and the opportunity to bargain and trade off projects for support.

Non-assigned Role Group Discussion (Simulation)

This exercise is a cooperative, leaderless group discussion in which four short case studies dealing with problems faced by executives working in state government agencies are presented to a group of six participants. The participants act as consultants who must make group recommendations on each of the problems. Assessors observe the participant's role in the group and the handling of the content of the discussion.

In-basket Exercise (Simulation)

Problems that challenge middle- and upper-level executives in state government are simulated in the in-basket exercise. These include relationships with departmental superiors, subordinates and peers, representatives of other departments, representatives of executive and legislative branches, the public, and the news media. Taking over a new job, the participant must deal with memos, letters, policies, bills, etc., found in the in-basket. After the in-basket has been completed, the participant is interviewed by an assessor concerning his/her handling of the various in-basket items.

Speech and Writing Exercises (Written Assignment)

Each participant is given a written, narrative description of a policy, event, situation, etc. and three specific situational problems related to the narrative, each requiring a written response. The participant is also required to make a formal oral presentation, based upon the background narrative description, before a simulated news conference attended by the Capitol Press Corps and interested government officials and citizens (assessors).

Analysis Problem (Written Assignment)

The analysis problem is an individual analysis exercise. The participant is given a considerable amount of data regarding

Table 2 (cont.)

a state agency's field operations, which he/she must analyze and about which he/she must make a number of management recommendations. The exercise is designed to elicit behaviors related to various dimensions of managerial effectiveness. The primary area of behavior evaluated in this exercise is the ability to sift through data and find pertinent information to reach a logical and practical conclusion.

Paper and Pencil Tests (Instrumentation)

Three different commercially-available objectively scoreable tests are included in the assessment: a reading test used for self-development purposes, a reasoning-ability test, and a personality test. The latter two are being used experimentally at present, and as with the reading test, are not made available during assessor discussion.

Source: Byham and Wettengel [10]

section dealing with research in selecting personnel for overseas positions (Section IIIB). As a relevant general comment, however, Byham's [8] note on exercise development is important at this point:

Many jobs have a unique but highly important aspect, and if this can be simulated, the company ought to develop a special exercise.

The advantage of such simulation is that it is easily adaptable to eliciting many different kinds of behavior. In the same article as mentioned above, Byham uses the Peace Corps as an example of this special adaptation of simulation exercises. The purpose of one particular simulation used by the Peace Corps is to determine the extent to which a person will exercise his own judgment when being heavily influenced from two different viewpoints. The ultimate test of the candidate undergoing this exercise is to assess his ability to interact harmoniously with the host nationals.

With respect to the careful selection of exercises to be used and the overall makeup of the test battery, Byham [9] gives this caution:

Management must also take extreme care in generalizing about the relative importance of various exercises. Depending on the objectives of the center and the content of the exercises (all games are not equally effective or appropriate), the relative importance of various assessment activities may vary greatly.

Certainly each exercise chosen for any prototype assessment center should be independently validated on its own merit before inclusion in the program. But care should be taken on the emphasis placed upon individual exercise results.

Huck's [43] studies report the difficulty in determining the exact relationship of exercises to each other when combining them into an overall rating:

The degree of increase in managerial responsibility was the criterion measure [in the program and study being discussed in the article] used in rating 94 lower and middle level managers who had been assessed approximately three years previously. The assessment predictors were classified into three composites: tests, exercises, and characteristics. Multiple correlations were then computed for each predictor composite with the following results: .45 for tests alone, .41 for characteristics alone, and .39 for exercises alone. When all three of the measures or predictor composites were included in the regression equation, the resulting multiple correlation was increased substantially to .62 (not cross-validated). Inclusion of techniques unique to the assessment center procedure, essentially the situational exercises, nearly doubled the criterion variance accounted for . . . all three types of predictor composites (tests, exercises, and characteristics) each contribute a substantially unique element to the prediction of management success.

. . . multiple assessment procedures provide a number of data sources, and the contribution of each to the assessment dimensions, the final assessment rating, and multiple criterion measures must be further clarified.

The caution from this study would be to guard against invalidated weighting of any particular exercise when compiling the overall assessment rating. This would especially hold true in any new or prototype assessment center undergoing initial validation. Assessors should strive for objectivity and balance. Since the interplay of situational exercises with respect to the overall assessment has yet to be clarified, assessors should be cautioned against allowing one exercise to be more influential than another.

e. Assessor Selection and Training

Assessors are generally selected from a pool of in-house managers. The rationale for this in-house choice

is that managers, temporarily acting as assessors, are familiar with the positions under consideration. The assessors are usually two to three levels above the assessees in the hierarchy and not in a supervisory position over any of the assessees. Trained psychologists and other outsiders are sometimes used to promote objectivity and add special skills to the team, such as the ability to interpret projective instrumentation. Byham [9] provides a concise picture of the considerations in making up an assessor pool:

Choosing the Assessors

Typically, assessors are line managers working two or three levels above the man being assessed. A group of junior foremen, for example, might be assessed by a team that includes division superintendents to whom the senior foremen report. These are the individuals who are responsible for promotion and who know most thoroughly the job requirements of the positions one level above the candidate's.

The job background of the assessor, of course, depends on the purpose of the specific assessment center. Where broader management aptitudes are being assessed, it is common for the assessors to be drawn from a number of areas in a company. This not only brings in a number of viewpoints, but exposes the candidate to representatives of a number of areas where he may find promotional opportunity. Having representatives of different areas also increases the acceptance of the findings throughout the company.

Assessors from management, like the candidates themselves, are usually nominated by their superiors (although in a few companies the center administrator makes an effort to recruit them). Naturally, the practice has its dangers. After a center has passed from the experimental to the operational phase, "purity" controls may be relaxed somewhat, and senior management may be tempted to send "cooperative" managers to centers to act as assessors. This temptation is particularly strong where the assessors serve for extended terms.

Center administrators have chosen to react to this problem in various ways. Some companies rely on their assessor training programs to screen out assessors who

are unacceptable in the role, for one reason or another. The rationale here is that it is easy to spot an unqualified assessor during training and ease him out without bloodshed. As a fine point of strategy, for example, many center administrators suggest that it is wise to establish a pool of assessors, rather than train assessors for specific assignments. With the pooling arrangement, it is easy for the administrator to bypass unqualified assessors.

A major point of controversy among operators of assessment centers is the desirability of using professional psychologists rather than specially trained managers as assessors. Most arguments for using psychologists are based on their skills in observation; they are trained to recognize behavior not obvious to the untrained eye. While this argument is plausible, it has yet to be demonstrated in an operational center. Three studies have found no differences.

However, the superiority of psychologists over completely untrained managers is well established. Because of this superiority, companies often use psychologists as assessors in experimental or pilot programs, where training management assessors would be difficult. Psychologists are also used extensively for assessing higher levels of company management; at high levels, it is difficult to get and train managers who do not know the candidates personally, and the objective, independent psychologist is seen as the fairest evaluator.

By and large, companies now prefer to establish a pool of trained manager-assessors, each of whom serves more than once. Individual assessors are usually drawn from the pool to serve once or twice a year--a few companies ask assessors to serve only once. AT&T's practice is exceptional--it assigns assessors for six-month terms and center administrators for one year.

There are advantages and disadvantages to brief assignments. On the one hand, brief assignments usually mean that better men can be recruited, their enthusiasm and effort will be greater, more managers will benefit from the training involved in becoming an assessor, and more managers will be well prepared, after their tour of duty is over, to make judicious use of assessment reports. On the other hand, more managers must be trained and kept off their jobs; and those who serve briefly will not have as comprehensive an experience as assessors as they would if they had served a longer period.

Where the appointment is for an extended period of six months or so, of course, more rigorous and lengthy assessor training is feasible--AT&T trains managers for a month--and longer experience in the role is very valuable to an assessor. One substantial disadvantage of the long assignment is that assessment becomes a routine matter, which it never should. Reports from fatigued assessors read like computer output, and it is hard to think of them as anything more. Currently, only AT&T appoints assessors for prolonged periods.

As to the use of outside-assessors (those employed for the assessment center only and not previously members of the organization), Byham and Wettengel [10] make these observations:

Government jurisdictions seem to be more interested than industry in having outsiders act as assessors in their programs. The assessors may be professional psychologists or retired government executives. Aside from administrative simplification provided by this arrangement, the objectivity of outsiders seems to have particular appeal.

Outsiders may suffer from a lack of knowledge of the organization and its management and many may or may not command the same respect from the participants as would internal assessors. In some situations, outside assessors can provide a more professional assessment at a cheaper cost because of the savings in training and administration expenditures. However, the use of outside assessors deprives the organization's management of the substantial developmental benefits that come from being schooled as assessors.

These two excerpts imply that the smaller the organization the more difficult it is to assemble an objective pool of assessors without going outside the organization. An organization as diverse and as large as the military has no difficulty assembling in-house talent. Allen [3] found in his research that the United States Army Infantry School assigns assessors for a normal tour of duty--about two years--and they can be considered long-term in contrast to short-term

assessors prevalent in industry. Describing assessor requirements of another military organization, Allen's research revealed that in the Federal German Navy:

The only requirement for assessors was that one assessor for each group of ten candidates had to have completed Admiral's Staff training [undergone assessment for selection as an Admiral Staff Officer himself]. Thus, assessors typically possessed broad operational experience and were expected to have a sense of responsibility for their fellow officers and the capability of making pragmatic decisions.

Operational experience or intimate knowledge of requirements unique to military assignments is a prime consideration when selecting assessors for such military centers. This stipulation naturally requires a large pool of in-house assessors who have undergone these operational experiences in the real world.

Training of the assessor is another important consideration as noted by Howard [40]:

Most importantly, the assessors are trained for their job. They become familiar with the exercises by participating themselves, watching videotapes, or observing actual performances as nonvoting members of the assessment team. The behavioral dimensions to be assessed are defined, and assessors are given practice and instruction in how to recognize these behaviors. Assessor training varies widely in duration, from brief orientations to two or three weeks of intensive training. Companies highly interested in training managers in appraisal techniques will change assessors frequently, while those most interested in producing a stable selection program or in saving money on training will make changes less often.

Development Dimensions [18] outlines the following ideal training program for assessors:

Assessor training is extremely important. Minimum training for a typical center would include: (a) discussion of definitions of dimensions, (b) participation as a participant in all exercises in the assessment center, (c) practice in observing, recording behavior, and writing reports on at least one group exercise, (d) practice in

pre-planning and conducting background interview, (e) discussion of various methods of handling each item of the in-basket, and (f) familiarization with the procedure for reaching final decisions.

This may appear to be an extensive training program for a group of managers or professionals supposedly familiar with the job requirements, but Byham [8] counters with this argument:

In the companies now operating assessment centers, there is a notable difference in the emphasis placed on training assessors. Some companies give new assessors as little as one hour of training, which really amounts to just an orientation to the whole procedure, while most others spend three or four days.

One can argue that the task of an assessor is similar to the requirements of most managers' jobs--a manager must interview individuals, observe groups, and evaluate presentations. Assessing requires skill in these same areas, and hence many feel that there is little justification for further training.

The principal rebuttal to these arguments is this: because a man has been doing something, he has not necessarily been doing it well. Companies report marked improvements in the reliability of supervisory ratings after the supervisors have been trained to work as assessors. Non-professionals need to be shown what to look for in observing group discussions and individual presentations, or they may focus on purely surface characteristics. While rigid scientific studies are lacking, it is obvious from comparing the reports presented by experienced and inexperienced assessors that training makes a very big difference in the quality of performance.

Disregarding all other benefits, training in-house assessors also generates the side-benefit of improving the overall competence of the current management staff. Byham offers the following list of management skills that are improved by undergoing assessment training.

1. Improvement of interviewing skills.
2. Broadening of observation skills.

3. Increased appreciation of group dynamics and leadership skills.
4. New insights into behavior.
5. Strengthening of management skills through repeated working with in-basket case problems and other simulations.
6. Broadening of repertory of response to problems.
7. Establishment of normative standards by which to evaluate performance.
8. Development of a more precise vocabulary with which to describe behavior.

f. Exercise Administration

Assessment programs generally come in two lengths. First, there is the one-day or "mini-program," such as the American Management Association's (AMA) package developed for use by small companies who cannot afford the expense nor possess the talent for developing their own program. McConnell [57] describes the program and the administration of exercises:

The AMA assessment centre is unique in that it provides an organization with the full capability of establishing and implementing their own assessment centre programme including a method for adapting the programme to reflect individual organization environments and management characteristics . . .

Once the assessors are trained, a management simulation workshop is conducted. This is one day in length and consists of eight exercises. Twelve participants are selected to go through the eight exercises and are observed in these exercises by the assessors. The assessor's role in the workshop is to observe and record the behavior of the participants. Following the one day workshop, the participants are allowed to return to their jobs.

The second variety is generally two and one half days to three days long with the remainder of a five day week used to evaluate candidates. As an example of the nature of exercises and the program administration of a week long assessment center, Byham [9] offers the following schedule. The schedule is arranged informally in time frames only and is largely derived from a program administered by the J. C. Penney Co., but is intended to reflect the schedules of many of the larger centers.

Sunday

Six management assessors meet at a conveniently located motel and organize materials for the week's activities. Late in the day, twelve candidates, all of them of comparable rank in the company, arrive and settle in.

Monday Morning

Period 1: After orientation announcements the candidates are divided into teams of four, for participation in a management game. Each team is given a limited amount of capital to purchase raw materials, make a product, and sell it. The raw materials are usually tinker-toy parts which can be assembled into a variety of products of different complexity, each of which has a different, prescribed market value.

The players must first decide how to invest their capital to maximize profits and then organize the purchasing, manufacturing, and selling operations. Assessors observe the players for signs of leadership, organizational ability, financial acumen, quickness of thinking, and efficiency under stress.

Suddenly the players are notified that the prices of the raw materials and the products have been radically changed, requiring drastic redeployment of capital and extensive operational reorganization. As soon as they have regrouped, these prices are abruptly changed again. The actions the players take allow the assessors to estimate their adaptability.

The game is then halted, and each candidate is asked to write a report evaluating his own performance and that of his fellow players.

Period 2: The candidates are divided into groups of six. While one group takes written psychological tests, the members of the other group are interviewed individually by the assessors. The assessors have been provided with detailed background information on each man, and they use this to probe for evidence of drive, motivation, and sense of self-development. This Assessment Interview, so called, is ordinarily the only exercise in the assessment process that focuses on the candidate's past behavior.

Monday Afternoon

Period 1: The testing and interviewing groups are reversed.

Period 2: In two leaderless groups of six, the candidates join in discussion of a promotion decision. Here the candidates play the role of supervisors brought together on short notice by their boss to pick one man from a pool of six for advancement. Each candidate receives the file of one of the men in the pool, whom he is then to "champion" for the promotion. After each candidate has studied his protege's folder, the group meets for an hour's discussion to choose the man it will recommend. Assessors observe the candidates' exchanges in the meeting for signs of aggressiveness, persuasiveness, expository skill, energy, flexibility, self-confidence, and the like.

Alternative exercise: In leaderless groups of six, candidates discuss the 20 most critical functions of a manager and list them in order of importance. (This forces them to think about the qualities on which they are being assessed.) Each group then chooses a spokesman who presents the list and the rationale behind it to the whole group of assessors and candidates.

Monday Evening

Each candidate receives material on how best to conduct employment interviews and also the resume of a job applicant. He studies these for use in one of the exercises on the following day. He may also receive special phone calls--for example, theirate Customer Phone Call.

Tuesday Morning

Tuesday morning is devoted to the In-Basket Exercise. This simulates the experience a candidate would have if he were suddenly and unexpectedly promoted a grade or two and arrived at work one morning to find his in-basket full of unfamiliar material typical of the sort he would then have to handle. He is instructed to go through this material and deal with the problems, answer the inquiries, request additional information where he needs it, delegate tasks to proper subordinates, and generally organize and plan just as he would if he had actually been promoted.

Tuesday Afternoon

Period 1: The candidates conduct the employment interviews for which they prepared the night before, each interview taking place in the presence of an assessor. The applicants are college students who have been especially trained in the applicant's role. The interview itself lasts roughly half an hour, after which the applicant leaves and the assessor quizzes the candidate to determine what insights he has obtained about the candidate.

Period 2: The next exercise is the resolution of disciplinary cases. In groups of four, candidates decide how to allocate their time between three such cases and then decide the cases themselves, within one hour. This exercise provides the assessors with information on a candidate's appreciation of personnel problems and his sensitivity to subordinate's views of events and actions, as well as insight into his behavior within a group.

Alternative exercise: The candidates are assigned roles as city councilmen who meet to allocate a \$1 million federal grant to the city departments. Each "councilman" interprets a briefing document provided by a city agency--the police department, and so on--and tries to get as much of the grant allocated to this agency as possible. Again, effective discussion is limited to one hour.

Tuesday Evening

Detailed data on a company are provided to all the candidates. Each is asked to examine its financial and marketing situation from the viewpoint of a consultant and to prepare a written recommendation for its board of directors on the future expansion of a particular part of its product line.

At the same time, also in preparation for the next day's activities, the assessors study the results of the candidate's In-Basket tests in detail.

Wednesday

Period 1: Four groups are formed, each consisting of three candidates and an assessor. Each candidate takes his turn presenting his oral analysis of the company data studied the night before and submitting written recommendations.

Period 2: These three candidates work together for an hour to reconcile and consolidate the recommendations.

Period 3: The In-Basket Interview follows, in which an assessor discusses with a candidate the various actions he took. This further defines each man's grasp of typical problems and opportunities.

Wednesday Afternoon

In a final group session, the candidates rate each other and ask any questions they may have. They then leave for home.

Wednesday Afternoon to Friday

The assessors discuss the candidates and prepare their ratings and reports.

Throughout all the exercises, the assessors have been rotated so that as many as possible have had a chance to observe each candidate closely. Thus, in these discussions, the assessor who conducted Jones' personal interview summarizes his background and his own impressions of his behavior in the interview; next the assessor who checked what Jones did in his In-Basket Exercise and interviewed him on it presents his impressions; and so on. Each assessor attempts to keep these descriptions nonevaluative and objective.

Only when all the assessors who have observed Jones have spoken does the group begin to judge his behavior from the viewpoint of his management potential and the directions in which he needs to develop. After they have reached a consensus, they prepare a final report.

Within two weeks a manager who has had experience as an assessor meets with Jones to communicate the results. In this meeting, he lays stress on the areas in which Jones needs to develop himself and encourages him to set appropriate goals.

The above schedule is intended to be an example to familiarize the reader with a possible assessment center schedule. The sequence of events is important, as a well administered center injects realism into the simulations.

As an example of candidate reaction to the atmosphere and the realism of the exercises, the following interviews appeared in The Civilian Manpower Management magazine [19]. The journal interviewed participants in the Federal Executive Development Program, an assessment center sponsored by the Office of Management and Budget. One candidate reported:

. . . there was nothing fake about the management gaming. In every exercise the academic approach to it was completely erased about 30 seconds after we began. It was an honest to God management problem to be solved, and we quickly forgot that it was a game. We also quickly forgot that the assessors were there. We were fighting, as best we could, to solve the problem, and I truly feel that it was an accurate reflection of our capabilities in a management environment.

A second candidate offers a more detailed description:

In one such exercise we were told, "There is a sum of money--let's say a million dollars--in excess in the budget. As cabinet level department heads, in a certain country, you and the other participants are to reach a decision on how to distribute that money." There is a piece of paper on which is listed some of the projects on which your particular cabinet office is desiring to spend the million dollars. You are given the job of negotiating with your fellow cabinet level officers for a division of the million dollars. You are to try and get some of your programs budgeted. Once the decision has been made as to how this money is to be divided, you're put on the spot in a "press conference" and asked to justify why the division was made in that manner. You are forced to literally think on your feet because they throw some questions at you for which there are no answers. You are vulnerable at that "press conference."

g. Candidate Evaluation and Feedback

The requirement for well-trained, high-caliber assessors can best be understood by looking at the entire evaluation task. As the training objectives and the benefits of assessor training imply, assessors must be alert, objective and quite literate observers in order to compose meaningful evaluations. Byham and Wettengel [10] describe the general evaluation process in the following:

As participants go through the exercises they are observed by assessors who are usually specially trained, higher-level managers. A typical center has one assessor for every two participants, with a 6-to-12 ratio most common. Assignments of assessors to participants are organized so assessors see different participants in each exercise and so all assessors see each participant at least once. Assessors record observations of assigned participants on specially-developed "Assessor Report Forms."

After the center, the participants return to their jobs while the assessors spend from one to two and one half hours discussing individual observations of each participant. In the post-center discussion of a participant, each assessor reads the report of his or her observations of the participant to the other assessors, and the similarities and differences of performance in the various exercises relative to the dimensions are thoroughly discussed. Considering all the observations of behavior during the center, assessors eventually agree on an evaluation of the participant's strengths and weaknesses relative to each of the dimensions sought. After his profile of strengths and weaknesses has been developed, the assessors individually, and then as a group, evaluate the overall potential of the individual or make whatever global decision the center may be designed to elicit. A written report of the center results is prepared by the center administrator and is distributed to the participant and/or higher level management, depending on the intended use of the center. The participants in an assessment center almost always receive some kind of written or oral feedback relative to their performance.

Assessment center results relate to the future performance of a candidate at higher management levels, not to current job performance. By observing a participant handling the problems and challenges of the higher level jobs simulated in the exercises, assessors are able to get a feeling for how the individual would perform in a higher-level job-- before the promotion.

Note the final paragraph of the above explanation. The evaluation relates to predictions of future performance; this is one of the key aspects of the assessment center method. As the candidate's current job does not include tasks and behavior required in the higher level job, the simulated conditions are designed to allow the candidate to evidence behavior that is not a part of his current daily performance and therefore cannot be evaluated "on the job."

Campbell and Bray [11] carry the evaluation description one step further and give an indication of its possible use at the candidate's local unit.

The final step is the staff evaluation conference, in which each candidate is considered in turn. The main objective of the evaluation session is to rate the candidate's

potential for promotion, assigning him to one of three categories: "acceptable for promotion now," "questionable," and "not acceptable now and unlikely to become acceptable." The evaluation begins with a presentation of the reports prepared by the various staff members on the candidate's performance in each exercise so that all members of the assessment center staff gain a complete picture of the man's behavior during his time at the assessment center. The candidate is then rated on approximately 20 variables relevant to success in management, such as skill in planning and organizing, decision-making ability, and leadership skills. The staff members then make independent ratings of the man's potential for management, and the evaluation concludes with a discussion of any differences that may appear. The director later prepares a descriptive report on the candidate outlining and documenting his strengths and weaknesses as seen at the center.

The assessment results are then fed back to management. The line organization integrates the assessment center data with appraisal information (based on the man's job performance) to make a decision on the candidate's promotion. Local management is expected to make a careful comparison of the description of the man provided by the assessment center process and the man's performance on his present job. The assessment center information can be overridden, but it cannot be lightly ignored.

The assessment evaluations are also used to inform the candidates of their strengths and weaknesses in order to enable candidates to make more effective self appraisals. This is known as the developmental function of assessment centers and is important for organizations attempting to fill higher management requirements from the pool of talent available within the organization. Byham [8] presents another generalized but representative picture of the uses of feedback for developmental purposes.

Participation in an assessment center is a developmental experience. As can be quickly recognized, many assessment exercises such as the in-basket, management games and leaderless group discussions also are training exercises. Thus, to the extent that performance feedback is provided, participation in an assessment center is a developmental experience. In most centers above the lowest level of management, considerable performance feedback is provided

during the assessment program. A good example of the kinds of feedback provided is the assessment center program of the Autolite Division of the Ford Motor Company. Participants take part in professionally led critiques of their performance in group activities, and they watch their performance in groups by means of videotape. After individually taking the in-basket for assessment purposes, they meet in small groups to share their decisions and actions with each other, to evaluate their reasoning and to broaden their repertory of responses.

Even without special feedback opportunities built in, there is a great deal of evidence that most participants gain in self-insight from participating in assessment exercises and that this insight is fairly accurate. The evidence comes from comparing participant responses on self-evaluation questionnaires given after exercises with assessor evaluations. Correlations of .6 and higher based on large samples from several organizations have been found.

While self-insight gained from taking part in assessment center exercises is important, it is secondary to the insights gained from receiving feedback of the assessor observations. Almost all assessment centers provide feedback to participants. The amount and detail of the feedback vary greatly but are largely related to organizational level. Higher-level participants get much more information than lower-level participants. Career counseling and planning discussions are often combined with assessor feedback for higher-level participants. Most feedback interviewing ends in a written commitment to action on the part of the participant and sometimes the organization.

However, feedback need not be a part of the program in the case of centers used only for selection. In one such assessment center for selecting specially skilled laborers, Thoresen and Jaffee [77] felt that since there was no developmental obligation to the job applicants there was not need for a feedback session. Instead of a detailed evaluation of his performance, each applicant was sent a letter advising him if he had been hired or not.

As with many other aspects of the assessment center, the purpose of the center determines the nature and method of

to the candidates. Even in the case of the center selecting laborers, notification of being hired or not was a form of feedback.

h. Establishing Predictive Validity

The preceding review of assessment centers has focused on the considerations and procedures in establishing an operational center. Representative descriptions have kept the narrative general in nature in order to present the reader with a comprehensive picture of the assessment center method. A final consideration of all assessment centers should be a rigorous research program for the establishment and improvement of predictive validity.

By means of the task analysis the designers of the assessment center analyze the dimensions required in the positions being tested for and choose or design exercises which measure those characteristics. But the pitfall of this initial step is the difficulty of accurately analyzing the job requirements. The task analysis, although it has identified those traits and behaviors which appear to contribute to success, may be in error and the true success requirements may actually be somewhat different.

The predictive validity of the assessment program is often measured by means of a longitudinal study. In this design, the degree of correlation between the assessment program results and some later criteria judgments is obtained. A high correlation corresponds to a high degree of validity, and vice versa. The task of selecting the criteria is a

difficult one, and the quality of the criteria chosen are crucial to the validation effort. Measures such as supervisor evaluations, advancement, and salary increases are often used, however, each of these has serious limitations. Another alternative would be to obtain superior, peer and subordinate ratings on instruments designed specifically for the purpose of validation. Although this would be more costly than using off-the-shelf measures, the improvement in quality might well be worth the added expense.

At the outset, the task analysis results and the subjective judgment of the center designers will establish the initial criteria so that the center may commence processing candidates. Validation should begin with follow-up studies of the first candidates processed and generate a feedback loop aimed at continuous program refinement.

Byham and Wettengel [10] allude to the necessity of establishing predictive validity:

Establishing content validity for a center is only the first step in establishing its validity. It is very important that the planning for an assessment center also include plans for the eventual establishment of criterion-related validity The first step is to assure the collection and retention of all needed data from the center. The second is the establishment of appropriate criteria

A well designed validation effort is a difficult and time-consuming undertaking, but it is the only means of measuring program success with any degree of objectivity. It also offers the feedback loop for continuous refinement of the assessment program. As the program is refined through corrective feedback, predictive validity should be enhanced.

4. Summary of Major Points: The Pro Assessment Center Argument

Ginsburg and Silverman [28] put the assessment center in perspective with respect to an organization's personnel selection and development needs. In doing so, they summarize some of the major points this author makes and establish a pro-argument. Their comments apply to the development of an assessment program designed to identify potential administrators within the ranks of a large metropolitan hospital staff; however, they apply to assessment centers in general. Enumerating the requirements of their selection program, which the authors contend were satisfied by an assessment center, they list the following:

1. It must validly measure management potential. Decisions made on the potential and development of the individual must be related to the actual job performance factors.

2. It must have high face validity or acceptability to both the organization and the persons being assessed.

3. It must be administered as an integral part of the organization's manpower development program. The assessment program will serve as a partial individual needs analysis, since the output reports will include information about the individual's skills which may be improved through education, developmental or training programs. Further, the program will serve as a developmental experience for the assessors (line managers), who will have an opportunity to enhance their skills in evaluating performance.

4. It must be flexible enough to permit assessment of management potential at various levels and functional areas of specialization, and provide for future alterations as the need arises.

5. It must be comprehensive enough to tap a wide variety of managerial potential characteristics. The complexity and breadth of managerial functions require an elaborate battery of measuring devices for adequate coverage.

6. It must have a high payoff value in relation to investment and cost of administration.

7. It must be feasible in terms of the realities of the company's particular organizational structure and climate, and be practical as well as theoretically sound.

Additionally, Howard [40] reviews the following benefits:

Help with the Criterion Problem--Installation of assessment procedures may force better job analyses and identification of the important criteria for success on a job. Such a rigorous process has been aptly described in connection with an analysis of the job of foreman Another way assessment centers may help with the criterion problem is by training assessors to evaluate more accurately the performance, behavior, and potential of others. Assessors have been shown to have greater agreement in ratings of different assessee traits . . . , but it has not yet been demonstrated that assessors will experience a transfer of training in rating subordinates under the unstandardized conditions of the normal work experience.

Training Assessors--Benefits of assessor training have been claimed not only in the form of a partial solution of the criterion problem but through (a) improvement in interviewing skills, (b) broadening of observation skills, (c) increased appreciation of group dynamics and leadership styles, (d) new insights into behavior, (e) strengthening of management skills through working with simulations, and (f) broadening one's repertoire of responses to problems. No well-designed training studies have validated these promises, however; as has been pointed out previously, firms do considerably more management research on selection than on training and development

The flexibility of the procedures and the use of generated data for further improvement-oriented research tend to keep the assessment center dynamic and constantly adapting to changes in society. The research with respect to actual criteria for success should reflect changes in society and job requirements.

The contrasting of the assessment center with two other forms of personnel selection procedures,--interviewing and testing--provides a more complete summary of pro-assessment

center arguments. The points are related to corresponding aspects of other methods in Table 3.

5. Negative Considerations: The Con Assessment Center Argument

A thorough review of assessment literature reveals the following recurring negative factors which are succinctly and comprehensively summarized by Howard [40] as follows:

The Crown Prince or Princess. Those who do outstandingly well in assessment centers may find that they have become a crown prince or princess. Management may treat them so well that their future success becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy, the morale of those without royal status may decline, and the validity coefficients for the assessment center process may become inflated. No research has substantiated these potential coronation effects, however.

The "Kiss of Death." A candidate who does poorly at an assessment center may feel that he has been given the kiss of death as far as his future with the company is concerned. This could result in some undesirable attrition, since the candidate may be quite competent in the job he is now performing. Research on turnover of assessees so far has been inconclusive.

Stress. If a candidate gets the impression that his entire career is on the line based on a few days "on stage," the stress effects could be quite strong. It would seem important that the data from the procedure not be made of the pass-fail variety or kept too long in an employee's file. On the other hand, defenders of the procedures reply that since stress is a typical part of a manager's job, a candidate should be stressed to see how he copes with it. It would still seem important to keep stress in the exercises with limits.

The Nonnominee. The feeling that an individual may be part of the "out group" if he or she has not been selected to participate in the assessment process (which may become a status symbol) is another dimension of employee attitudes that needs to be empirically tested.

The "Organization Man." Some have raised the issue of whether or not assessment centers may not proliferate the model of the conforming organization man and serve to eliminate the unusual or imaginative managers that are believed to be needed in the future. A study at Sohio showed that assessments correlated negatively with conformity for one small sample, however An IBM study

TABLE 3

Comparison of Assessment Center Method with Typical Use of Panel Interviews and Testing

<u>Assessment Center</u>	<u>Panel Interviews</u>	<u>Paper & Pencil Tests</u>
Built around dimensions carefully defined through job analysis, and all dimensions are systematically covered.	While dimensions from research may be used, more often no list is used or an inadequate list is used. No real attempt to cover all of the dimensions is made in the interview due to the unusual lack of structure.	Tests may be selected by job analysis but tests only attempt to predict certain of the dimensions. For example, tests are poor at determining interpersonal dimensions.
Dimensions are agreed upon by management before use. This creates an acceptance and understanding of them.	Usually not the case.	Usually not the case.
The involvement of higher-level managers in the selection of assessment center dimensions and as assessors allows them to make effective use of assessment center reports and to believe in the results because they understand the system.	Membership of higher-level managers on interview panels often increases their distrust of the Panel Interview process as they feel it is unreliable. Thus they discount the results.	Unless a specific cut-off score is used as in Civil Service Examinations, the users of the test results seldom know how to integrate the test results with other performance data.

TABLE 3 (cont.)

<u>Assessment Center</u>	<u>Panel Interviews</u>	<u>Paper & Pencil Tests</u>
Multiple exercises are used. The participant can be observed in different situations: group and non-group; small and large group exercises that require preparation and those that do not; exercises where the participant is a subordinate, peer, supervisor; exercises requiring oral, written, and other skills.	Single exercise.	Tests may be slightly different depending on tests used but all generally emphasize written and cognitive skills.
Uses multiple judgments (3 to 6 assessors) which increase accuracy and decrease bias.	Uses multiple judgments.	Quantitative score. Use of score may be judgmental.
Trained observers are used.	Participants in panel interviews are seldom trained and seldom have adequate time to plan the interview.	
Assessors usually do not know participants.	Interviewers usually do not know participants.	
Assessors are several levels above participants and thoroughly know the target-level job.	Interviewers are several levels above participants and thoroughly know the target-level job.	

TABLE 3 (cont.)

<u>Assessment Center</u>	<u>Panel Interviews</u>	<u>Paper & Pencil Tests</u>
Real behavior observed.	What a participant says he would do or has done is determined. Follow-up of important areas possible.	Participants often say what they think will get a high score in nonability tests.
Formal method of recording observations used.	Usually no formal method of recording observations of behavior or insights.	Formal method of collecting data used.
Large amount of data on participant obtained.	Small amount.	Small amount.
Procedure delays final decision until all information is obtained.	Research indicates that interviewers quickly jump to a decision and their subsequent questions are often an attempt to reinforce the first decision.	Highly quantitative.
Highly structured program producing quantitative results.	Low in structure. Low in quantitative results.	Highly quantitative.
High reliability.	Low reliability.	High reliability.
Validities usually around 4 to 5.	Little known about validity.	Seldom above 3.
Technique flexible to various jobs.	Technique flexible to various jobs.	Less flexible because content validation for supervisory and managerial jobs is more difficult to achieve.

TABLE 3 (cont.)

<u>Assessment Center</u>	<u>Panel Interviews</u>	<u>Paper & Pencil Tests</u>
Relatively easy to establish content validity (job-relatedness).	Difficult to establish content validity (job-relatedness).	Difficult to establish content validity (job-relatedness).
Criterion-related validity research should be conducted.	Criterion-related validity research should be conducted.	Criterion-related validity research should be conducted.
Produces insights into development needs that can be beneficial whether or not the participant is promoted.	Not usually the case.	Not usually the case.
Process is understandable to participants, they see it as a fair means of evaluating all areas of management potential.	Participant evaluation of fairness depends on interviewers. Most interviewees feel interview covers only a portion of important management skills.	Often misunderstood, biases carried over from negative school experiences.

Source: Byham and Wettengel [10]

indicated that supervisors may nominate those higher on conformity and lower on independence, but that the assessment procedure itself does not select this type of individual The organization man may be the other side of the nonnominee problem; the most able and not the least able may be denied access to the assessment center. The implication is that it is the nomination procedure and not the assessment procedure that creates the organization man syndrome. The supervisory nominations should perhaps be supplemented by self-nominations, peer nominations, personnel records, or assessment of everyone at a job level if numbers are not too large.

Costs. Estimates of costs have ranged from the price of a few meals to \$5,000 per candidate, exclusive of staff salary Installation costs are the highest, but to these must be added assessors', assessees', and psychologists' time, travel, accommodations, and meals, plus materials, from rating sheets to videotapes. Various cost saving devices might include completing all possible procedures before arrival at the center, conducting exercises on company property over weekends, and combining small companies with similar jobs in a multiple company center, perhaps in a synthetic validity paradigm. In the end, these costs must be weighed in the context of current selection ratios against the possible gains in selection and training in some kind of a utility model.

In summary, the possible negative outcomes of assessment centers, have much the same status as the (benefits), they appear reasonable, but for the most part they lack supporting data.

Howard's comments apply in almost all respects to the private sector, but in government these syndromes may be altered to an unknown extent. The Civil Service and military promotion systems based on longevity as well as merit may alter the "Crown Prince," "Kiss of Death" and "Organization Man" syndromes. Or, one can argue that these syndromes already exist in other forms such as the "Hot Runner" or "The Admiral's Boy". Their relationships and existence are secondary to what should be the primary consideration in adopting any system, e.g., cost effectiveness. Assessment centers are expensive to establish and operate relative to other types of

selection systems, such as interviews only, or interviews and paper and pencil testing combined. This writer agrees with Howard when she states, "In the end these costs must be weighed in the context of current selection ratios and against the possible gains in selection and training in some kind of utility model." That utility model should be a cost effectiveness study, weighing all the costs of the current system (operating, economic costs, etc.) against the costs of the proposed assessment center, (operating costs as well as savings from improved selection procedures). This type of an analysis is especially important to any proposed government or military assessment center where both costs and benefits can be diverse, elusive and large.

B. THE OVERSEAS ADJUSTMENT PROBLEM (CULTURE SHOCK) AND SELECTION CRITERIA

In the following section, the nature of culture shock is reviewed through an examination of literature pertaining to its description and causes. After this analysis of behavioral traits associated with culture shock, the writer examines recent specific area analyses (task analyses) done by the U. S. Navy in its attempt to better screen personnel for assignment to Greece and Vietnam. The third portion of this section contains specific exercises designed to train and select overseas adjusters to the overall concept of selecting potential overseas adjusters based on desirable behavioral characteristics. Finally--to round out the assessment center approach to selection - interviewing for cultural adjustment is discussed.

1. Culture Shock

The inability of an individual to function in a foreign environment as well as he does in his own is termed "culture shock". Whenever an individual leaves his own cultural base for another, he experiences some form of culture shock. The range of adjustment difficulty can be anywhere from very mild discomfort and ineffective behavior such as that which might be experienced by a Yankee traveling in the Deep South, to the grossly ineffective behavior that causes businessmen, Peace Corps Volunteers and military advisors to miserably fail in their assignments. The degree of culture shock experienced is related not only to the individual personality but also to the nature of the cultural change one is required to make.

Stewart [70] describes the reasons for culture shock in simple psychological terms:

It is a commonplace that every man is a product of his culture. Nearly everyone is likely to recognize the influence of culture on differences in customs, beliefs, and attitudes. Nearly everyone will also recognize that there are differences in the uses of expressions and gestures. These obvious cultural differences, so often emphasized for their exotic appeal, obscure the fact that culture plays an important role in some very basic psychological processes, such as in determining how individuals interpret events, how they form judgments, and by what process they arrive at decisions. Cultural intrusion at this basic level is often unrecognized and unacknowledged. When such intrusion leads to interpersonal conflict, the conflict may tend to be attributed to factors have little to do with its true origin.

However, Richard Hayes [36] explains the phenomenon in much more vivid detail for the readers of Business Horizons:

Each individual is a product of his own culture and background--probably much more so than he would suspect or admit. Each adult has learned, through a long series of

experiences in his specific cultural environment, to behave in specified ways and to expect particular kinds of behavior from those around him. The child-rearing process is largely an attempt to inculcate within the child the "proper" set of behaviors and expectations, so that child may become a well-integrated member of the society in which he lives. Most of the rules relating to behavior standards are culture-bound, in the sense that they are uniquely generated and taught to help the individual get along in that particular culture.

This system of appropriate behavior and expectations is extensive and ranges from such simple acts as the accepted way to deal with merchants or to obtain directions for travel to such a complex problem as the way to obtain employment or effect a political change. Each individual learns how to carry out these actions in his own cultured environment extremely well and has generated, over the years, a firm set of expectations as to how those around him will respond to his own behavior.

A confrontation, however, results when he faces individuals from another culture who operate under different behavioral assumptions and expectations. When he tries to carry out the simplest actions (which always worked in his home environment), the response from the new culture environment may be totally unexpected and unintelligible to him. As pressures continue to mount because of this divergence from the sets of assumptions and behaviors that he has grown to know and understand, it becomes clear that the assumptions which he has used to guide his behavior in the past are no longer applicable. The people which surround him in this new setting think and act according to rules which he does not understand, and the inappropriateness of his own set of assumptions and internal rules is all too evident.

Unfortunately, however, the individual usually has not had sufficient training in the new culture to learn the subtleties of expected behavior which govern the actions of the local residents. Since his own frame of reference has been shown to be inadequate and since he has not had time to develop a new set of behavioral reference points, he is left with a void in the set of assumptions upon which he can base his behavior and expectations. Quite predictably, this void may cause a high level of anxiety disorientation, more familiarly termed "culture shock."

The severity of culture shock will differ among individuals, but some generalized statements about typical responses can be made. First, it should be noted that culture shock is a universal phenomenon which is precipitated when individuals are confronted with environments that are substantially different from those in which they were reared.

Culture shock can affect the casual American tourist to England, the experienced multinational businessman in Thailand, or the foreign diplomat in Argentina. It often can be noted even when a family moves from one section of the United States to another.

One could expect the more severe cases to develop when the new environment was substantially different from the previous one, or in cases in which the individual concerned had not had much previous exposure to new and varied cultures. Therefore, we could expect that moving from Philadelphia to Phoenix would induce less shock than moving from St. Louis to Saigon. Similarly, it would be less severe for an individual who had spent his life traveling and exposing himself to different cultures and varying assumptions governing behavior than for an individual who had been exposed to only one environment.

Beginning with the Peace Corps experiment in the late Fifties and the expansion of multinational corporations in the Sixties, the problems of culture shock became increasingly more evident. The military began to experience its own problems during the Vietnam War and in other advisory assistance programs throughout the world. Researchers, recognizing that the severity of cross-cultural problems would only increase as interaction among cultures increased worldwide, undertook the task of identifying the specific causes of cross-cultural conflict. Studies were made not only of conflict but also of successful relationships in cross-cultural situations. The aim of many of the studies was to determine the complexities of cross-cultural interpersonal relationships and to improve them.

A proponent of cross-cultural operations improvement for business, Steven Rhinesmith [67] explains his belief that persons can overcome culture shock and function effectively in a new environment. It is his contention that:

. . . persons can function successfully abroad when they are (1) aware of themselves as culturally conditioned individuals; (2) alert to the differences in perception which exist between themselves and others; (3) aware of their own social and emotional needs and are attentive to those same needs in others and (4) are willing to work actively toward meaningful relationships with others through communication and the development of interpersonal skills.

An almost identical statement of the same belief is made by Hoehn [38] prefacing his research sponsored by the U. S. Army. Hoehn calls for an increased emphasis in training for cross-cultural operations in the U. S. Army on:

1. Understanding the interpersonal interaction process of the culture as contrasted with a superficial knowledge of the host culture.
2. An empathetic understanding of the values, assumptions and attitudes of the host country people.
3. Insight into the cultural basis of ones own values, assumptions and attitudes.
4. Understanding and acceptance of the roles called for in the assignment.
5. Development of skills and techniques which promote success.

This, and other cross-cultural research done in the Sixties, should enable organizations to identify potentially good adjusters to the cross-cultural environment by providing the basis for an adequate selection system.

a. Cultural Self-Awareness

Rhinesmith's first descriptor--people who are aware of themselves as culturally conditioned individuals--corresponds to Hoehn's third above. This condition has been described by Kraemer [48] as "cultural self-awareness."

Kraemer's early research was the groundwork for the development of his simulation exercises to increase cultural self-awareness.

His explanation of cultural self-awareness and its relationship to the adjustment problem is presented here, in its entirety, as an illustration of some of the basic research that is the foundation of his and other simulation exercises to be discussed in section III B 3 b.

Working Hypotheses

When persons communicate with each other, or when they attempt to do so, each makes certain assumptions about the cognitions of the other. They may make these assumptions knowingly, or, more frequently, without awareness. Ease of communication between people is partially determined by the extent to which these assumptions are correct. When false assumptions about each other interfere with communication between individuals, they may perceive it immediately, or they may discover it later. Often they never become aware of it.

Probably the most common assumptions that persons in an encounter make about each other's cognitions are assumptions involving projected cognitive similarity--when they assume that the other person's cognitions are similar to what their own would be if they were in the other's place. Since cognitions are based largely on experience, the validity of assumptions of this type--and consequently ease of communication--should depend largely on the degree to which the persons' experiences are similar. Witness the ease with which identical twins communicate with each other, and the difficulties in communication experienced by persons who differ considerably in some important aspects of their experience, such as age, income, level of education, or the type of geographical environment to which they have become accustomed.

These kinds of differences, however, are often minimal in encounters between Americans and persons of other nationalities. It would be a rare occurrence to have an old Thai peasant and a young Wall Street banker trying to communicate with each other. More typical are encounters involving persons who are similar in age, education, and occupation, and who differ primarily in their cultural background. In such cases, cultural differences can be expected to assume a much greater importance than the other factors in contributing to false assumptions involving projected cognitive similarity.

. . . the effects of cultural conditioning are sometimes so pervasive that people whose experience has been limited to the norms of their own culture simply cannot understand

a communciation based on a different set of norms. To this should be added that they also cannot understand why a "self-evident" communication from them cannot be comprehended by others.

An Illustration

The following example will illustrate the ideas presented so far. It is an excerpt from the diary kept by a young American computer engineer while he was the captain of the United States ping-pong team during its visit to China in 1971. He wrote:

"I seemed to have some kind of a communications gap with many of the Chinese I met. I had a number of talks, for example, with our interpreter, but we sometimes had difficulty getting through to each other. He spoke excellent English, and I used very simple words, but he often apologized and said I should get a better interpreter because 'I just don't understand what you are saying.' I used words like 'individual' and 'unique.' They are words he knows, but he couldn't relate them to the idea of doing what you want to do. 'Do what I want to do?' one puzzled Chinese asked me. He looked terribly confused, as if to say: 'How do you do that?' I guess in China you have to do what the chairman tells you to do and then everything is cool and happy."

Several things should be noted at once. The two persons in the encounter are of the same sex and are similar in age and level of education. The Chinese was a 26-year old university graduate and, being an interpreter, probably spoke English as well as almost any Chinese. It is not known what exact question asked by the American prompted the question "Do what I want to do?" However, the American recalls that the exchange occurred during a discussion of vocational choice and of whether or not one should always follow a leader's orders.

Let us suppose that the American's question was something like, "But what do you want to do?" asked by him after hearing the Chinese describe his vocational interests in terms of how he might best serve the state. Note that the American had a ready-made explanation for the puzzlement of the Chinese: "I guess in China you have to do what the chairman tells you to do and then everything is cool and happy." This explanation seems to downgrade the intellectual level of the interpreter, as well as that of the Chinese people in general. He is, in the eyes of the American, a lesser person for not asserting his own individuality. The American's reaction does not suggest any doubt that his question had the same meaning for the interpreter as it did for him. For how could anyone speaking English that well not understand such a simple question? However, the

apparently simple question, "But what do you want to do?" implies certain assumptions by the American about the cognitions of the Chinese interpreter, namely, that the latter understood and valued the idea of individual choice--assumptions likely to be unwarranted because individualism, as known in American society, is neither well understood nor valued among the Chinese.

What should the American have done, once he had asked the question and observed the puzzlement of the Chinese? At the very least, suspend judgment. And had he recognized upon reflection, the implicit assumption he had made, a suspension of judgment on his part would have been more likely. Probably no harm resulted from the failure in communication illustrated in this example since the American returned home after a few days. But had this been the beginning of a tour of duty, during which he would have met regularly with this Chinese, the early disparagement of the latter could have adversely affected future encounters between the two.

The Need for Cultural Self-Awareness

The existence of these kinds of difficulties in intercultural communication is generally recognized by designers of so-called "area training" programs. These programs are intended to prepare Americans for overseas assignments requiring interaction with host nationals. But the usual approach to such training is ethnocentric and too abstract; ethnocentric, because the culture is usually described at the anthropological or sociological level, rather than at the level of the individual.

The students may learn what the values of a society are, but not be able to recognize the influence of these values when they encounter the specific cognitions and behaviors of a host national. The same may be said about approaches based upon the idea that knowledge of one's own culture should make it easier to interact with members of another culture. Here again, one may know one's own culture in terms of abstractions and generalities, but not recognize their manifestations in one's cognitions and behavior. . . .

Out of the foregoing considerations evolved the conviction that people's effectiveness in intercultural communication could be improved by developing their cultural self-awareness--that is, their ability to recognize cultural influences in their own cognitions. The development of this ability should have several beneficial results. It should enhance people's skill at diagnosing difficulties in intercultural communication. If they come away from an intercultural encounter with a feeling that communication was poor, they would be able to examine the conversation from the point of view of discovering what cultural elements in their own cognitions led them to make false assumptions about the cognitions of the other person.

Ordinarily one's reaction to not being able to communicate what seems to be a self-evident idea is to speculate on what shortcomings of the other person might explain the unexpected difficulty. This may be useful in one's own culture where false assumptions about another person's cognitions are more likely to have a psychological basis. In an intercultural situation, however, the search for psychological explanations can have unfortunate results--unless one is an expert on the host culture. The nonexpert is likely to come up with explanations that are not only not valid, but that falsely attribute deficiencies in character or intellect to the other person.

At the very least, the ability should help make it easier to suspend judgement when one is confronted by behavior that appears odd. For the cultural elements in one's own cognitions will now be suspected of having caused one's perception of oddness in the behavior of the other person.

Some intercultural encounters are isolated occurrences, such as a meeting between a "good-will" hostess and a foreign visitor arriving at an airport. But the important ones are usually part of more or less continuous relationships which often last as long as the overseas tour of duty by the American, or the U. S. tour of a foreign national. Under such circumstances suspension of judgment and subsequent diagnosis are very useful, because the next meeting offers an opportunity to try to correct previous misunderstandings.

Another beneficial result should be greater awareness of one's ignorance of the other culture, and a corresponding increase in motivation to learn more about it. For example, as long as one assumes that a particular thought pattern is universal (under given circumstances), one has no reason to look for a cultural variation. Recognition of its cultural aspects should result in awareness that it may not be shared to the same extent in the other culture, and should arouse curiosity as to the nature of its variation there.

However, learning to recognize subtle manifestations of this variation among host nationals is something difficult to accomplish in stateside training--particularly if there are no nationals from the eventual host country in the program. The ideal place for learning about the host culture is in the host country. However, predeparture training of the kind to be described can be an effective preparation for in-country learning.

A case in point is the way Americans tend to think of themselves and others in connection with their occupations. That tendency could manifest itself in a question such as "What kind of work do you do?" that one American might ask another just after they have been introduced at a social

gathering. That kind of question is a manifestation of the idea that people are primarily known by their work and their achievements--an idea not equally common in other cultures.

Having discovered in training how their way of thinking and talking about themselves is culturally influenced, Americans abroad would be more likely to pay close attention to the way host nationals think and talk about themselves. They might listen carefully to an exchange between host nationals who have just met for the first time. What might otherwise have been thought of as an insignificant event is now recognized as an opportunity to learn. Thus, apart from its contribution to effectiveness in communication, the ability to recognize cultural aspects of one's own cognitions can serve as a stimulus and as a conceptual tool for learning the host culture.

Other less detailed and authoritative descriptions of cultural self-awareness exist in the literature to support Kraemer's work. Torre [78] shows a similar view by stating:

National societies differ greatly in the main characteristics of their structure. Each individual serves a kind of social apprenticeship in handling the particular patterns of relationship characteristic of his own society. In considering applicants for cross-cultural posts, attention needs to be given to the extent to which the individual applicant's social apprenticeship may have helped or hindered in preparing him to adapt to a new situation.

The message of both cultural self-awareness excerpts is the same: some people understand the underlying values and assumptions of their own culture better than others of their culture do. These people, whether the understanding is innate or has been learned through special training, are more likely to succeed in a cross-cultural situation than are those who have a poor comprehension of the values and assumptions of their own culture. Cultural self-awareness then could be a potential selection criteria or assessment variable to be used in assessing individuals for suitability for overseas positions.

b. Cultural Sensitivity

Returning to Rhinesmith's comments on successful overseas adjusters (p. 79), his second descriptor--people who are alert to the differences in perception which exist between themselves and others--has been named by various authors as cultural-sensitivity (Textor [76]) and Awareness-Sensitivity (Foster [25]). Textor simply refers to cultural-sensitivity as one's ability to keep his ethnocentric tendencies under control. Torre [78] places his description of cultural-empathy into a more meaningful perspective by explaining this requirement for a successful interchange as in the following.

Empathy. It is generally recognized, in theory, that an employee of an international agency must be able to open windows onto the culture of the country to which he is assigned; to sense the way the nationals among whom he will be working see things; and to sense the relationship between his way of doing something and local methods. He must develop a basic positive regard for the local nationals as individuals. This deep understanding of others has been called empathy or *simpatico*, the quality of spontaneously doing and feeling the appropriate thing. It involves being able to put oneself in other people's shoes, being sensitive to another's frame of mind. This seems to be a general ability some people have which is applicable to many different cultures.

It is important, however, always to distinguish empathy from sentimental exploitation of other people's troubles, that is, over-identification. In international work the employee should maintain a degree of aloofness or critical distance. Too strong a commitment to an individual, a group or a project generally leads to bias and loss of effectiveness. When this happens, the job is being used to serve the employee, whereas the employee should be serving the job. Some people interested in "good works" in a selfish, condescending way find it satisfying to do things to or for people but unsatisfying to work with them.

It is difficult to say what makes a person empathic. Empathy seems to stem from a basic attitude toward others which develops early in life. Often such persons have had an early identification with people from economic groups other than their own. They generally come from families where the atmosphere was warm and accepting. Often they

have taken an interest in history, political science or foreign relations. They see their problems in the context of the local culture rather than personalizing them. Their wives and children also take an active interest in the nationals of the country where they are working and are generally enthusiastic about living abroad. Sometimes the spouse is of a different ethnic background. An empathic individual may have any of these characteristics, yet none of them guarantees empathy. Empathy is an essential for successful international service.

Finally, Foster's [25] description of Awareness-Sensitivity rounds out the overall perspective by adding psychological background to the explanation:

Awareness-Sensitivity

This kind of learning is more elusive, although words describing it are present in our everyday vocabulary. Ordinarily we do not think of it as an aspect of formal training or education, since traditionally this learning takes place during the process of everyday psychological development rather than being a conscious and deliberate part of classroom instruction. Emotional involvement is probably the key characteristic that distinguishes it from intellectual understanding. While cognitive content is necessarily present in the notion of sensitivity-awareness, it is likely to be out of immediate consciousness or not systematically organized. Such knowledge may be referred to as "intuition" or, from another frame of reference, "attitude" or similar concepts that incorporate both the cognitive and affective aspects of experience.

Saliency is also a key notion, since the trainee frequently already "knows" that which forms the content of the training. He may readily agree, for example, to the principle that trying to understand the other person's attitude is helpful in working effectively with him, but this does not mean his behavior will actually display this understanding. This can be attributed to the fact he may lack the capability to accomplish this end, or he simply may not be motivated to work more effectively with the person. . . . However, another explanation is that conceptually and emotionally this concept is not a salient part of his personal way of relating to the world; in other words, he lacks "sensitivity" or he is "unaware."

Advertising often addresses itself to learning of this kind; bad-breath commercials attempt to change sensitivity-awareness to the effects of bad breath rather than provide information that bad breath is offensive (that is known) or alter one's evaluative attitude (it was already unfavorable toward having bad breath). Typically, learning of this

type does not require a great intellectual power (as intellectual understanding might); it involves emotional factors to a greater degree, since an important characteristic of this form of learning is meaningfulness at the personal, rather than merely abstract, level.

Numerous instances illustrating the need for increased awareness-sensitivity are found in the attempts made by Americans to implement new ideas overseas. For example: Although an American soldier speaks frequently about the importance to Asians of "saving face," he nevertheless attempts projects by methods that require a competitive attitude and will cause someone to lose face; a technician, while well aware of the rigid social hierarchy that typifies the country, bypasses it in implementing a change; an educator who has commented on the poor qualifications of host-country teachers builds an institute with an Americanized program for which indigenous teachers are not available. In these examples the relevant facts are "known" and the problem is not one of high intellectual complexity. What is usually lacking is salience of the specific knowledge and an "attitude" toward the work situation that would enable one to become aware of the relevant, but unconsidered factors.

Often a person behaves as though he is sensitive or aware (of a class of events, characteristics, or phenomena), but is unable to verbalize his awareness; he is usually said to be "intuitively effective." Although conscious awareness is not essential to effective performance it is undoubtedly helpful, and training should usually attempt to bring existing sensitivity to a more conscious level. Cognitive or intellectual understanding is helpful, and perhaps essential, in bringing about change in the degree of awareness-sensitivity, but it probably is never sufficient alone.

It is also important to remember that increased awareness in itself does not necessarily mean behavior will be altered, although behavioral change usually does occur. Other factors, such as ability and motivation, must also be present.

Again, no matter what label is put on the above phenomenon, the message is the same: some people understand the values and assumptions underlying other cultures better than other people do. This understanding may be facilitated by their own cultural background or through unconscious learning through normal experiences such as world travel.

Foster contends that the awareness-sensitivity level of an individual can be increased through training. No matter how this cultural-sensitivity level has been increased in the individual, it too may be measured by means of exercises and is therefore useable as an assessment variable.

c. Ethnocentrism

The third of Rhinesmith's descriptions (p. 79)-- persons who are aware of their own social and emotional needs and are attentive to those same needs in others--i the opposite of what some cross-cultural research calls ethnocentrism. There is only a fine line of difference between Rhinesmith's second and third descriptors, but that difference is central to the meaning of ethnocentrism: that is the emphasis on the self, regarding one's own cultural group as superior. Unlike the culturally-sensitive person, the ethnocentric person continually thinks and acts using himself as his sole behavioral reference point. The difference, then is that the ethnocentric person is not only not "alert to the differences in perception which exist between himself and others"; but, he insists on thinking in terms of himself only, not yet having the capacity to become alert to those differences.

Hayes [36] explains this hindrance to effective cross-cultural relationships through the following examples.

. . . one problem that seriously inhibits the effectiveness of many individuals in a foreign culture is a strong tendency to rely almost totally on themselves as reference points in making behavioral assumptions and judgments. This tendency is very natural. In situations where behavioral decisions must be made, the easiest assumption to make is that "others will behave as I would behave in this situation." If one is talking about individuals of one's

own culture, this assumption can be quite valid and can produce effective behavior, but, in the international sphere, it can result in highly unsatisfactory situations.

. . . (listing three examples). The first concerns lateness for appointments. American standards for promptness and the obligations incurred by making an appointment sometimes differ dramatically from those used by foreigners. If an American executive has no real understanding of the nature of foreign thinking regarding lateness for appointments, he may find his actions severely at odds with those of members of the local culture.

A second example of use of the self-reference model relates to postponement in getting down to business. In the United States, only preliminary social amenities are exchanged prior to dealing with the business at hand. However, in a foreign culture one often experiences long delays (as judged by American standards) as seemingly endless social amenities and unnecessary niceties are exchanged. This system can be frustrating to an American using his own experience as a reference point without a real understanding of the reasoning behind this postponement.

The third example concerns the immensely varying commitments which are incurred in various cultures by virtue of a promise. In the Orient, an individual's promise that a certain act will be completed by a certain date does not necessarily mean that the act will be carried out as agreed. Judging by American standards, this is a breach of promise and onerous action, but an understanding of the Orient rationale for this type of behavior can reduce the probability of an erroneous judgment regarding a colleague's promise.

Many other examples could be cited. But in each case, the foreigner's behavior, as seen by the foreigner himself, is eminently reasonable and logical. However, this same behavior, as seen through eyes using American bases for judgment, seems foolish or inefficient. These two differing interpretations arise because of the differing reference points of the observer. In cross-cultural situations, the use of one's self as a reference point in making decisions about the behavior of others may cause dysfunctional results. Self-reference tendencies can become a problem either because no better reference system is available or because the person involved forgets how strong this tendency is and how often it is used.

Torre [78] combines ethnocentrism and authoritarianism into a single personality type description in the following.

Ethnocentrism and authoritarianism. One of the common types of failure in serve abroad is the ethnocentric and authoritarian personality. In a sense this person typifies the opposite of the empathic person.

The authoritarian is a supreme conformist; he sees the world as menacing and unfriendly; he is a loyal camp follower so long as the leader remains strong. He is rigid and shows limited imagination. He is hard-minded, exalting his own group and disliking many outgroups; he is a "phony conservative," waving the flag but showing many antidemocratic tendencies. He is a moral purist; he is deeply concerned with questions of status. These individuals on the surface are often poised, self-confident and well-adjusted, but fundamentally they are anxious and insecure; they appear to worship their parents but have strong, repressed hostility against them; they blame others for their own faults and misfortunes.

This rather dogmatic description is one consisting of identifiable characteristics, not behaviors. It is included as a contrast between Hayes' behavioristic description of ethnocentrism and a characteristic-based description consisting mostly of labels. The direct nature of Torre's definition may describe the extreme ethnocentric personality, but this writer believes that ethnocentrism in most persons is much more subtle and can only be measured by observation of his behavior in the foreign environment or in a simulated foreign environment. When ethnocentric behavior is observed in the simulated environment and compared with the behavior of other candidates under the same or similar conditions, it too may be used as an assessment variable.

d. Motivation and the Development of Interpersonal Skills

Rhinesmith's final description (p. 79)--persons who are willing to work actively toward meaningful relationships with others through communication and the development of interpersonal skills--describes persons who are motivated

toward developing sound relationships with others. Motivation works to develop and improve cultural-self awareness and cultural-sensitivity. Motivation is necessary to recognize and overcome ethnocentrism. In short, motivation is necessary to overcome any potential barrier to effective interpersonal relationships, whether those relationships are cross-cultural or within the same culture. But due to the high potential for misinterpretation in a cross-cultural relationship, a high level of motivation is required to overcome misunderstandings and promote effective and meaningful communication.

Foster [25] describes the relationships of motivation to cross-cultural training as follows:

The notion of awareness and sensitivity suggests an inherent motivational element (e.g., we perceive what we want to perceive), but motivation can be conceptualized as a separate objective of training. An analogy can be found in speaking a foreign language: Knowledge of the language does not necessarily ensure its use; the desire to communicate and willingness to risk making errors are also important factors. Given adequate knowledge, skill, and awareness, failure to behave in the most effective way can be attributed either to the absence of appropriate motivation or, more likely to the presence of competing motives such as fear of experimenting with new behavior, or anticipation that one's own organization will punish the "correct" behavior.

This motivational aspect often is not an intended part of the learning process, but may occur as a consequence of it, typically in the form of meta-learning. (Such things as pep talks by football coaches or by instructors at sales seminars are similar in purpose and are acknowledged by both trainer and trainee as intended to alter the "will" rather than the "what"). In any case, the critical determinants of behavior in the overseas situation probably rest largely with the prevailing reward-punishment system that exists overseas.

Training alone probably can have only limited effect. This will be largely through (a) restructuring both intellectual understanding and sensitivity--especially awareness of the forces in the overseas situation that determine behavior--so that when obstacles occur they are perceived

as less frustrating, and (b) removing some of the conflicting motivations, especially feelings of inadequacy arising from poorly developed skills.

It is the contention of this writer that an individual must possess a minimum, prerequisite level of motivation in order to this training/motivation improvement cycle to take effect.

Human relations training exercises have been used in recent years to thaw frozen attitudes and to help individuals see their dysfunctional behavior in a more objective light. In such group exercises, such as sensitivity training, some persons will drop inhibitions and react to the training sooner and more effectively than others. Whether their early and more complete response is a result of greater motivation to establish meaningful relationships, or whether they are influenced by fewer and weaker competing motives, matters little. The fact that an individual reacts to an exercise before another does indicate that he is more responsive to others' needs as well as to his own. Such behavior--the response to human relations training exercises--can be observed and from it a level of motivation, or competing motivation, can be inferred. Through such observed and evaluated exercises then, as assessment variable perhaps called "motivation to communicate with foreigners" could be measured. Communication here is meant in the sense of meaningful communication, not the superficial dialogue that is characteristic of the culturally-insensitive and ethnocentric person.

Foster and Danielien [24] discuss human relations training as an integral part of an overseas indoctrination program. They state:

The major objective in human relations training has been to develop the ability to communicate and become effective in one's behavior with others rather than to teach about human relations. The same objective is shared by people engaged in area training. They stress the ability to work in different cultures rather than merely knowledge about different cultures.

It seems reasonable to assume that, to be effective overseas, the American needs skills to diagnose the problems of communication and interpersonal strains that may be accentuated by cultural differences. He needs to develop self-awareness, both as an individual and as an American, to enable him to recognize how and why he thinks and feels differently from those with whom he is working. He must become increasingly sensitive to the reactions of non-Americans and the impact he has on them. Above all, he needs to develop an attitude or perspective that will enable him to evaluate accurately, without an ethnocentric or egocentric bias, the ambiguous events which will inevitably confront him.

In general, human relations training attempts to induce the individual to change in the way he views himself, understands and respects others, and interacts in a work situation. Achieving this objective in area training means decreasing the resistance with which the individual faces change and also reducing the anxiety and frustration with which he faces the uncertainties and pitfalls of the overseas situation.

Rhinesmith [67] discusses human relations training in the context of training businessmen for cross-cultural operations. He feels that:

It cannot be expected that any management training program or human relations experience of a duration of two weeks or even two months can accomplish radical attitudinal and behavioral changes in an individual. A significant contribution can be made, however, to greater self- and other-awareness by introducing persons to the means whereby new and unanticipated situations can be encountered and successfully handled as opportunities for meaningful personal growth. The goal thus becomes the development of an attitudinal flexibility which will enable an individual to gain the utmost from his exposure to different points of view and unfamiliar modes of behavior. One of the most potentially successful means of accomplishing such a goal can be found in recent programs involving human relations training methods.

A basic assumption of human relations training is that learning becomes most effective when it flows from doing. Through simulation of a new and unfamiliar environment the individual can, to a certain degree, experience the feelings associated with culture shock. With the help of others, he can become acquainted with the learning process of "unfreezing-moving-refreezing" and gain skills for more effectively meeting and overcoming the difficulties involved in adjusting to a new environment. These learning and communications skills will hopefully provide the means by which the individual will be able to function more successfully abroad.

Human relations training is designed to enable participants and staff to work together on problems of common interest. A great deal of learning flows from the relationships between participants in the program as they interact with one another. Since, as in an intercultural experience, each person brings with him different values, behaviors and beliefs, the interaction of the members may be used to increase awareness of the learning process and personal learning goals, thereby creating a foundation for behavioral experimentation when the individual goes abroad. In this way, participants are able to learn from experiences which they have had, rather than merely studying cases of problems which others have experienced. At the same time, they can be helped and taught to deal with such experiences through the development of skills in communication and responsive sensitivity.

The point this writer wishes to make is that some persons do react much more readily and favorably to human relations training than do others. Carefully chosen human relations type exercises, when evaluated by competent assessors, could be used to identify persons having the prerequisite interpersonal skill and motivational levels. Thus, interpersonal skill and motivation are also possible selection criteria.

e. Miscellaneous Possibilities

The findings above dealing with cultural self-awareness, cultural sensitivity, ethnocentrism and motivation are necessarily non-quantitative in description; they are

based on descriptions of human behavior which is seldom quantitative. The original researchers based their findings on data gleaned from empirical studies done in the Sixties. However, these four factors do not stand alone among the data that serve as possible predictors. Studies indicate relationships between overseas adjustment and such things as biographical and interest data, spouse relationships and attitudes, health record data, and many others. (See Appendix A). However, the progress in identifying general behavioral tendencies that relate to good and poor overseas adjustment has enable researchers to devise situational exercises to aid in both the selection and training of the superior overseas adjuster.

2. In-Country Research, Vietnam and Greece (Task Analysis)

The previous section--which defined culture shock and examined behaviors associated with it was general in nature, applying to all overseas duty. Many of the findings were a direct result of extensive study of Peace Corps Volunteers, businessmen and military personnel serving abroad. The bulk of the definitive research was sponsored by the U. S. Army and aimed at improving training of personnel going abroad. However, recent research done by the U. S. Navy has not only assumed that training can improve an individual's experiences abroad, but that the pre-assignment selection process will improve the quality of the Navy's overall image abroad. Unlike the Army's assumption that the individual ordered abroad is a given and that training will improve him, the Navy

assumption is that selection improvement will introduce individuals into the training system who are more likely to succeed abroad. Selection improvement will upgrade the end product of the training program as well as save dollars otherwise wasted on training poor adjusters who will probably be relieved early, regardless of training. The following two segments describe efforts to determine characteristics of personnel who would adjust more easily to the role of a Vietnam advisor or to being homeported in Athens, Greece.

a. The Navy Advisor Profile Report (NAPR)

Yellen and McGanka [89] of the Naval Personnel Research and Development Center (NPRDC), San Diego have compiled a detailed report, based on empirically gathered data, to be used as a selection tool for detailing advisors to Southeast Asia. The method, and much of the detail, of the report are germane to this paper because their work is an example of the type of rigid study required to perform an adequate task analysis for the choice of assessment variables. However, only small segments of that work will be presented here to illustrate certain points and establish the connection between assessment center task analysis and some recent studies to improve the overseas assignment selection process.

The authors state their major objective as:

. . . to produce an evaluation instrument which could be used by detailers in the Bureau of Naval Personnel (BUPERS) to assess an individual's potential and suitability for advisory assignment. The project was undertaken to improve the present selection technique which focuses mainly on information found in recommendations and fitness reports. The rationale behind the project was that an evaluation instrument specific for the Vietnam advisor would increase the objectivity and accuracy of personnel selection.

The description of the approach taken by Yellen and McGanka is closely aligned with the steps in performing a task analysis to determine assessment variables. Portions of the approach description follow:

Approach

Development of an evaluation instrument was undertaken in four phases. Phase I consisted of several procedures for investigating and identifying desirable behavioral factors for advisory assignments. Phase II involved conducting a survey of current and former RVN advisors in order to verify and supplement the types of behavior found in Phase I and also to obtain operational definitions of the behavioral factors. Phase III of the research was concerned with developing an experimental evaluation form based on the information collected in Phases I and II, field testing the form, and analyzing the results. Phase IV involved the development of the operational evaluation instrument, the Navy Advisor Profile Report.

PHASE I . . . INVESTIGATION AND IDENTIFICATION OF DESIRABLE BEHAVIORAL FACTORS FOR ADVISORY ASSIGNMENTS

In order to understand and analyze effective advisory performance, it was necessary to identify actual behavioral factors that relate to the culture and advisory role in Vietnam. A variety of means was used to obtain descriptions of advisor functions and performance which aided in identifying the required behavioral factors.

The means listed in Phase I were:

1. Personal interviews and consultations.
2. Literature search.
3. Review of The Advisor Appraisal Form, an appraisal form developed at BUPERS completely independent of Yellen and McGanka's work.

Phase II produced these results:

In frank discussions with former Vietnam advisors, it was found that the meaning of behavioral factors in the normal military setting was quite different from the meaning attached to it in the RVN environment. As a result, the identified behavioral factors per se were not adequate

descriptors of behavior and, therefore, did not provide adequate information for personnel assessment purposes. Accordingly, it was necessary to obtain real-life descriptions of conditions and work experiences and their relationship to the behavioral factors. Thereby the factor, "adaptability," would relate directly to what "adaptability" means to advisors in the RVN setting.

The ambiguities found in Phase II were corrected through further empirical study, and the findings of Phase III enabled the authors to develop "a highly structured, one page report used in conjunction with a detailed set of instructions and behavioral definitions contained in an instructor's manual." The evaluation form was field tested and found acceptable. The final variables assessed by the NAPR are (1) Patience and Persistence, (2) Tact, Diplomacy, Social Skill, (3) Adaptability, (4) Self-Reliance, Resourcefulness, Ingenuity, (5) Friendliness, Sense of Humor, Socialability, (6) Empathy, (7) Morality, (8) Emotional Stability, (9) Instructional Ability, (10) Job Dedication and Motivation, (11) Leadership, Organizational Ability, and (12) Overall Effectiveness as an Advisor. But, out of context, this is just another list. To illustrate the nature of behavioral description that Yellen and McGanka have used to clarify the terms, observe the description of a term previously used in this paper, empathy.

Empathy

The successful advisor establishes sound and constructive interpersonal relationships with the Vietnamese and senses the way the Vietnamese see things. He realizes that what the Vietnamese does, and the way he does it, cannot be judged against a background of American customs, beliefs, and standards. On the contrary, he informs himself about the Vietnamese values and beliefs, about their standards and customs, so that he may gain greater understanding of their actions. With this approach and understanding of the Vietnamese, the advisor can "put himself in his counterpart's shoes" when the need arises, and can see his

counterpart's problem in the context in which it must be solved.

The advisor who lacks these qualities will fail to see problems in a Vietnamese context and will try to impose "American" solutions.

The effective advisor does not act, or consider, himself "superior" to his counterpart because he is American. The constructive advisor sincerely wants to help the Vietnamese. He is never condescending, nor does he convey the impression that the Vietnamese cannot take care of themselves.

Just as relevant to the assessment center method of selection as is rigid and detailed task analysis are the authors' implications for future research. They state:

Theoretical research into the classification of interpersonal behavior can be expanded to develop techniques and procedures for identifying and selecting different types of personalities required for highly sensitive positions such as diplomatic advisory roles and military attache duty . . .

Another area of future research is the use of the NAPR as a training evaluation device. Under simulated Vietnam conditions at the advisor training centers, personnel selected for advisory assignment can be evaluated with the NAPR. The potential advisors can be closely observed as they undergo a series of situational tests (role playing, self-awareness). A course curriculum can be designed to incorporate the behavioral factors found paramount to effective advisory performance. Comparison of NAPR results and other psychological tests administered at the training centers would aid in the final selection. In this manner, the NAPR provides a way to evaluate the selection, training, and management procedures which would enhance advisory performance.

b. In-Country Experience: Navy Personnel Stationed in Greece

A second report done by NPRDC San Diego is the first step in the development of a selection procedure to be used in assigning personnel to U. S. Navy, ships homeported overseas. Yellen and Hoover [88] compiled the report based on the results of questionnaires and in-depth face-to-face

interviews with Navy personnel stationed in Greece. The authors describe their objective as:

. . . to develop an assessment procedure to evaluate Navy personnel for their potential for making a satisfactory adjustment to a homeporting assignment to Greece. The purpose of this report is to present the finding of one part of the project: namely, the identification of the personal attributes which contribute to successful and unsuccessful adjustment to living and working in Greece.

Following more than over a year of extensive research and analysis, Yellen and Hoover published these important conclusions.

CONCLUSIONS

Personal attributes and personal/family conditions associated with notably successful and critically poor adjustment to living and working in Greece were isolated. The more prominent positive qualities of American Navy people who functioned well in Greece were: an interest in language and cultural matters, friendliness, adaptability, family stability, maturity, even-tempered personality and flexibility. The qualities associated with especially poor adjustment in Greece were more singular in nature in that even one of these could constitute an almost insurmountable handicap in attempting to make a satisfactory adjustment to living in Greece. Some examples are: impatience, intolerance--including the "everything American is the best" attitude, marital instability, and heavy drinking accompanied by aggressive behavior.

Many of the problems recounted by the Navymen could be minimized if they had a better understanding of the Greek social customs and daily living pattern, and had at least a few words and phrases of Greek with which to communicate with host-country nationals.

Providing more information about Greek culture, living conditions, etc., is relatively simple through brochures, pamphlets and lectures. However, information alone has proven less than adequate in preparing people for actually living under on-site overseas conditions. Mere description must be supplemented by some means of giving the person an opportunity to experience prototypical overseas conditions beforehand, so he gains some feel not only for the facts of the situation but also a feel for his own participation in and reactions to it. For example, bargaining over price in Greece is their way of life and Navy personnel stationed there are well aware of this. However, bargaining is an

unfamiliar practice to most Americans; consequently, they have little feel for when and how to bargain and often do it ineptly when they try. In addition they may pay more for merchandise than they need to, or may incur the Greek's disfavor by attempting to bargain for things that the Greeks themselves do not bargain for.

Rather than provide the traditional method of simply furnishing information, a different approach to cultural indoctrination and training is needed. It appears desirable to provide Navymen and their families with some situational experience prior to their actually being confronted with the real overseas situation. Such experience should be offered in indoctrination and training session which would simulate various representative and frequently encountered conditions in the trainees' prospective overseas location. In addition, the participant would also be exposed to, and would use, enough of the basic day-to-day host-country spoken language to enable him to communicate with minimum adequacy in his interactions with host-country nationals.

The simulation experience, aside from its educational aspect, simultaneously brings each participant some knowledge of his own probable reactions and of the likelihood that he can successfully cope with a given overseas situation. Where the person's self-generated feedback indicate difficulty in dealing with significant, or many, of the more common host-country situations, he may elect to self-select himself out of the program. This is particularly true and important for the Navyman's dependents who will be living, day in and day out, in close and constant contact with the host-country environment.

The conclusions from Yellen and Hoover's report support the opinions of this writer that (1) traditional indoctrination methods for overseas assignees is not sufficient to ensure they will adjust to the foreign environment; (2) certain personal attributes and behavior patterns indicate a potential for good adjustment and; (3) simulated experiences designed to elicit behaviors that personnel are prone to emit in the genuine foreign environment can be used as a selection aid. However, rather than permit the individual to make the selection decision himself, a board of trained and experienced assessors should observe exercise performance

and evaluate the results, along with the results of interviews, personal history investigations and instrumentation, then make the selection decision for the individual and the Navy.

3. Existing Instrumentation and Exercises

a. Instrumentation

Instrumentation--independently validated paper and pencil tests which measure attitudes, mental ability and academic achievement--exists in many forms primarily for use in human relations training. Assessment centers are using instrumentation that measures personality characteristics and traits considered necessary for success in positions under consideration. The inclusion of validated instrumentation results along with the results of various assessment exercises and interviews, is central to the concept of increased predictive validity through multiple techniques.

Pfeiffer and Heslin [62] have compiled a reference book consisting of guidance on the choice and uses of instrumentation and review of commercially available instrumentation. The review is divided into three sections: section A lists instruments with a personal focus, B lists those with interpersonal focus and C lists those with organizational focus. This reference could be a valuable asset to a beginning assessment center as the review of each instrument comments on its length, administration time, measurement scales, positive as well as negative features, ordering data (including cost) and administering, scoring, and interpreting data. Careful use of this reference would be an excellent aid to choosing proper instrumentation.

One of the instruments reviewed by Pfeiffer and Heslin is the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) which measures fifteen primary need scales. Of the EPPS the authors list as positive features:

The EPPS is a widely-used instrument, and, even though it is moderately long, it does yield a large amount of information for the time spent. Also, the majority of the needs measured are inter-personal and thus quite relevant to human concerns. The needs are fairly low in social desirability overtones: there are no obviously good or "healthy" responses. Finally, there is very little overlap among the scales.

The authors review seventy-four additional instruments, but this example was chosen because Affourtit [2] recommends the use of the EPPS as a screening device in cross cultural selection for the following reasons:

- a. The EPPS was designed to provide a quick and convenient measure of relatively independent normal personality variables.
- b. EPPS profile scores are based on the assumption that normal populations vary in terms of personality characteristics and profile results can be compared to standard populations in many functional areas.
- c. Other widely used personality assessment techniques, such as the MMPI, Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, compare response against populations which represent pathological categories and interpretation is presented in terms of the degree to which individual scores fall into these categories.
- d. Since the EPPS is amenable to standardization on any population, it is possible to develop standards for military groups in any area of cross-cultural participation based on actual performance.
- e. The EPPS is self-administered and can be given to large groups of personnel by individuals with no background in social science. Results can be either machine or hand scored. Administration of the inventory takes about 45 minutes.

f. The statements in the EPPS are implicit and direct, thereby facilitating responses by adult populations in virtually any educational or cultural category.

g. The EPPS yields a measure of test consistency and profile stability. Consistency and stability scores provide for the detection of response distortion and can determine if an individual has made his choices on the basis of chance alone, thereby indicating the validity of response.

h. The statements in the EPPS have been scaled for social desirability using the method of successive intervals. Therefore, the problem of defensive bias, common with most objective inventories, is virtually ruled out.

i. The EPPS is a flexible instrument in that it can be adopted for comparative studies based on a variety of established normative groups. Thus, norms based on empirical or predictive validity can be developed in the actual or situational contexts.

j. The EPPS measures a wide range of personality variables reflected by various scales and provides a profile of a respondent or group in a condensed form.

Although Affourtit has completed only preliminary research on establishing screening criteria, he presented a detailed summary of possible uses for the EPPS in screening overseas candidates as well as an analysis of strengths and weaknesses of its use. Validation for the selection of overseas adjusters has not been accomplished for the EPPS and could be accomplished as part of an assessment center validation study.

Another predictive instrument currently under study (awaiting funds for a validation study) is the Cross Cultural Interaction Inventory (CCII). Developed by Yellen and Mumford [86] of NPRDC San Diego, it is designed to "supplement procedures for screening and selecting personnel for overseas assignment." By means of the following summary

the authors briefly describe the developmental background of the CCII.

SUMMARY

Introduction

The development of measures which identify successful and unsuccessful overseas adjustment is basic to better selection and more satisfactory training of Navy personnel assigned overseas.

Previous research indicated that personal attributes and personal and/or family conditions contribute most to successful overseas adjustment. Information from service records has been shown to be of little practical value in predicting overseas adjustment.

Approach

Predictive instruments. A Biographical, Interest, Attitude Inventory (BIAI) was designed to tap important determinants of overseas adjustment. Broadly defined, these were sociability, empathy, intellectual curiosity, patience, adaptability, acceptance, and morality.

The BIAI and the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB) were administered to 249 Navy persons stationed in Yokosuka, Japan.

Criterion instruments. Information on how well individuals were adjusting (criterion measures) was obtained with peer and command nomination forms and two self-report instruments.

Scoring. Of the 249 individuals in Japan who completed the battery of instruments, 26 received nominations as successful adjusters and 16 as unsuccessful adjusters. These individuals served as benchmark groups for determining scoring weights for the criterion instruments.

Based on the criterion scores derived from the benchmark groups, 201 people from the total sample were identified as successful adjusters and 48 as unsuccessful adjusters.

Responses of successful and unsuccessful adjusters were contrasted and a scale was constructed from items differentiating most effectively between the groups.

Results

A high relationship existed between the weighted BIAI items and overseas adjustment criteria. This was evidenced

by the low coefficient of overlap (27%) and the significant validities, .63 on the key-construction group and .66 on the cross-validation group ($p < .01$).

Group means showed that the attitude items differentiated better between successful adjusters (10.77) and unsuccessful adjusters (-.25) than the biographical/interest items (successful adjusters = 2.15 and unsuccessful adjusters = -.96).

Utilizing items identified through an item selection procedure, cut-off scores were developed. Applying these scores to the identified successful and unsuccessful adjusters would have resulted in disqualifying the majority of unsuccessful adjusters for overseas duty.

The thirty-eight BIAI items which differentiated with high accuracy between successful and unsuccessful adjusters in Japan were incorporated into an instrument entitled Cross-Cultural Interaction Inventory (CCII).

The SVIB was judged not to be as useful as the CCII for predicting overseas adjustment due to its length, the absence of any response pattern for successful adjusters, and the negative pattern that emerged for unsuccessful adjusters.

Conclusions

1. The types of items that appeared most useful in differentiating between successful and unsuccessful adjusters were attitude items.

2. The scoring key that was developed significantly discriminated between successful and unsuccessful adjusters. A selection strategy was applied to the identified successful and unsuccessful adjusters which would have resulted in disqualifying the majority of unsuccessful adjusters for overseas duty.

3. The scoring key has somewhat limited use in the further development of a selection device since it was validated on personnel already overseas. However, it has value since it shows the possibilities for success with this inventory and could serve as a basis for developing an adequate key for use with inexperienced personnel.

4. Items in the SVIB, as a whole, were not especially predictive of successful or unsuccessful adjustment. However, a negative response pattern that emerged for unsuccessful adjusters should be useful in writing some additional items to be tested for inclusion in the CCII.

Recommendations

1. Before the CCII can be recommended for implementation, longitudinal research should be undertaken to test its predictive validity.

2. The Navy Overseas Adjustment Scale (NOAS) should be further refined for use in validating selection decisions. It could also be used as a Human Resources Management Center and/or personal feedback device. (NOAS is a personnel questionnaire designed for cross-cultural adjustment research).

As preliminary validation studies show the CCII to be a promising predictive instrument, it is the opinion of this writer that further studies could be made via an assessment center validity study if they are not completed sooner.

A third instrument has been recently developed by Kraemer [51] who desired instrumentation to measure the effectiveness of cultural self-awareness training. The test was designed to be sensitive to differences among individuals who are considerably above average in their level of cultural self-awareness. A construct validity test was made on the basis of administering the instrument to persons with known levels of cultural self-awareness based on a logical estimate of that self-awareness. Defending this method of validation Kraemer states:

It can be assumed that cultural self-awareness (CSA) develops as a result of direct or indirect exposure to cultural variation. Therefore, to the extent that groups of people who have a high degree of such exposure (e.g., highly experienced Foreign Service Officers, returned Peace Corps Volunteers, or cultural anthropologists) obtain higher CSA test scores than comparable groups with low exposure, to that extent the test has validity. . . .

It should be noted that the measure of exposure to cultural variation is a crude one, since it does not take into account the "quality" of exposure It should also be noted that the CSA test attempts to measure an

ability that hasnot been measured before, and one which until now has never been defined in terms that would make measurement even possible. As with all new tests, further validation studies should be conducted

Many more instruments designed to measure attitudes and interpersonal skills are commercially available and may be adaptable to assessment center use. The above three examples and the listing in the Pfeiffer and Heslin reference book, Instrumentation In Human Relations Training, are intended to point out that suitable instrumentation for an assessment center for the selection of overseas personnel does exist. Thus, it would be possible to reduce research and development costs and time lag in choosing instrumentation for an operational or a prototype center.

b. Situational Exercises (Role Playing and Simulation)

Situational exercises are frequently used in assessment centers to evaluate behaviors that are not easily observable in the candidate's present daily performance. Of managerial situational exercises, Greenwood and McNamara [33] state that:

. . . they place the individual in a situation whereby some basic managerial characteristics will have to be displayed in order to carry out the situational task.

In their study, the authors found that a particularly significant fact for assessment center application was that adequate reliability can be obtained from the use of non-professional evaluators (manager assessors vice trained psychologists) in business-oriented situational tests. This "adequate" reliability factor and the capability of situational exercises to elicit observable behaviors not common to the candidate's

present experience makes situational exercises adaptable for cross-cultural training and evaluation.

The Peace Corps has been using situational exercises for Peace Corps Volunteer (PCV) training for more than a decade. Wight and Casco [83] describe the characteristic behaviors required of PCV's and the relationship of situational training to their overall training program.

The Volunteer's success depends almost entirely on his ability to assess the situation he is in and respond to it in an appropriate manner. It would probably be impossible to provide the trainee with the necessary concepts, sensitivities, and skills to do so through lectures and reading materials alone. The necessary understanding, sensitivity, and abilities must be developed by the trainee himself, with the help of the other trainees and some guidance by the staff. The conditions for such discovery and development are created in the laboratory by placing the trainee in situations where he is required to behave or react and then to examine the behavior and its consequences. Conditions are created for experimentation with alternative patterns of behavior and the examination of feedback regarding their relative effectiveness. This will allow the individual to modify habitual patterns of behavior, if he wishes to do so, and to develop the skills, perceptiveness, and flexibility he needs for effective and constructive interaction with others.

Much of this learning takes place in exercises simulating conditions or situations in the host country, or in assigned tasks dealing with analysis of conditions and problems which the Volunteer will face, the role of the Volunteer, and what the trainees must learn or what skills they must acquire to be effective Volunteers. Maximum use is made of experience-based learning techniques rather than the lecture, demonstrations, reading assignments, etc., of the conventional classroom or training situation.

The Peace Corps also relies upon such exercises as an assessment tool:

The purpose of some of the exercises is to face the trainee with the stark reality of Peace Corps service at the outset of the program and to see how he deals with this reality. Some trainees may refuse to believe that conditions could really be as described (possibly those Volunteers who would suffer most from culture shock).

Wight and Casco present a detailed description of Peace Corps training and assessment through situational exercises including leaderless group discussions, role playing situations, unassigned role simulations and critical incident evaluation exercises. Their work has been a precedent for much subsequent work done by the military.

Describing the importance of simulation exercises to an Air Force cross-cultural training program, Haines [35] notes the importance of generating behavioral subtleties.

Learning to eat unusual foods is only an example of a rapport-establishing skill. Many other cross-cultural skills will be necessary and require training techniques tailored to produce them. This is particularly true for those nonverbal behaviors making up the wide range of social communication vital for effective exchange of ideas and information. Most of these behaviors have a large motoric or gestural component which the advisor is mostly unaware of, since he cannot see himself as others do--especially during the very act of communication. An example is the critical role of facial and postural expressiveness in an ordinary conversation. Since our only source of feedback in conversation is the reaction of our audience (which may be rigidly controlled or greatly delayed), we have difficulty in learning how and when to modify our behavior for more effective presentation and interaction. This is aggravated when we deal with people from an unfamiliar culture who present us with unfamiliar patterns of facial and postural response. What is needed is a kind of "ego-mirror." Simulation of critical moments in cross-cultural situations plus the phenomenon of self-confrontation are being exploited for such a purpose.

This "ego-mirror" is a feedback system that helps the trainee evaluate his own behavior, but carefully chosen observers might also evaluate and rate his behavior.

With respect to the advantages and disadvantages of situational exercises, Stewart [71] in his work for the U. S. Army said this of advantages:

First, the exercises are realistic and plausible.

Second, they can be considered at different levels of training. At the very least they are practical exercises, but to students with appropriate preparation for the simulation the exercises bring cross-cultural differences to life. The exercises may be analyzed into systematic themes that provide the student with concepts for understanding the events of the simulation.

Third, the exercises are presented at a level and in a manner that is most likely to be conducive to action by the student. A live, simulated technique is more likely to affect the cultural predispositions of the student than is a lecture or discussion presentation. When appropriate feedback is provided, the trainee is afforded the opportunity of gaining insight into both his own culture and that of his counterpart. At the same time, he is offered a flexible frame of reference for categorizing future cultural styles or traditions to which he may be exposed. Thus, the training impact of the simulation may be conceived as a continuing process, enhancing the ability of the student to understand and to cope with novel cultural experiences.

Fourth, the simulation provides a means of conducting research into techniques of advising and of training advisors.

There are, however, some disadvantages associated with simulation exercises:

(1) Not all students can successfully assume the part of the American. Hence, in using students from a class to play the American advisor, one runs the risk of a performance that is not effective for a class of observers or for the participant.

(2) The intent of simulating cross-cultural values and assumptions is apparently difficult for some people to grasp. They react with the feeling that the exercises have little training value, or that they stress the obvious. In our experience negative reactions to the exercises are more characteristic of persons, military and civilian, who see the task of giving advice or assistance as purely one of imparting technical information. Personal, social, or cultural factors are ignored.

(3) Simulation is expensive. To overcome this disadvantage, we are considering making video tapes and films to preserve some of the benefits of live simulation while reducing the expense.

Stewart's listed disadvantages of situational exercises may well be disadvantages when considering the trainee

as a given. However, if the exercises are to be used for selection purposes--to select personnel for assignment and additional training--the first two disadvantages can be considered as advantages. Those persons who cannot successfully assume the part and those who cannot grasp cross-cultural values and assumptions would be evaluated as having little or no potential to adjust abroad and thus be selected out of the program. The third disadvantage, cost, is lessened when the exercises are of short duration for evaluation of behavior rather than lengthy training sessions. Then those exercises are not more expensive to administer than a video taped simulation.

One such simulation currently used for training in U. S. Navy cross-cultural operations is BaFa-BaFa, a game developed by Simile II, a private research organization. Campus magazine [1] said this of the game's current prospects.

As originally conceived by the project's sponsor, Commander Richard McGonigal of the Human Resources Development Project Office and the research psychologists on the project at NPRDC, this exercise would be used to help screen persons being considered for high impact billets, such as MAAG or the Personnel Exchange Program.

However, as clarified by Commander Warren Winchester, also of BUPERS:

"There is no intention, at this stage, to use this device for screening and selection. It is only being looked at as a possibility downstream . . . it's an outstanding training device, no question about it."

While its screening potential is under investigation the exercise is being used with great enthusiasm.

BAFA BAFA is an experience! In just a few hours, participants learn (among other things) how easy it is to misperceive events, how hard it is to communicate when you don't know the language, how important it is to be a good observer when entering another culture, and what

culture shock really feels like. This is just a partial list of what people get from participating in this exercise because the experience impacts differently on different individuals; but everyone seems to come away with insight into the meaning of culture and the kinds of overt and subtle cultural rules and customs they will be encountering and contending with while living overseas. For instance, after going through the simulation one student commented: "what you first glimpse on the surface, isn't necessarily what's going on . . . you need to know what underlies what's going on or you can blow it."

How does all this happen? To begin, participants are divided into two groups: the Alpha culture and the Beta culture. Alpha is a relaxed, outgoing culture that values friendly relationships within a strict, patriarchal structure. Beta culture is aggressive, competitive, measuring a person's values by bargaining ability.

After "practicing" their own culture, the players are given the opportunity, through controlled visits, to observe and interact in the other culture, with the objective of figuring out what the other culture is all about. After everyone has been a visitor, a "debriefing" session is held and the players are asked to describe the other culture, to explain how the visitors appeared to them, how they felt as visitors to the other culture. Students are encouraged to generalize from their observations of the experience to real world applications.

Somewhat unexpectedly, BAFA BAFA has turned out to be highly flexible, easily incorporating various spontaneous innovations devised by the players.

Considering the success, acceptance and flexibility of the game, this writer certainly hopes that BUPERS will soon reach that downstream point and include BaFa-BaFa as an assessment center simulation exercise.

Using the results of his Japanese cross-cultural research Dr. Yellen of NPRDC San Diego has also been able to develop a simulation-based assessment procedure. In his introductory paper for the Japanese Contact and Communication Course, Dr. Yellen [87] provides this background:

As part of a research program designed to develop a selection procedure for overseas assignment, the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center in conjunction with Similo II of La Jolla, California, developed the Japanese Contact and Communication Course. As originally conceived, the course was to serve as a criterion measure of overseas adjustment. However, as the simulation was being developed and tested with Navy personnel stationed in San Diego, it became apparent that it could also serve as an overseas training device.

As a criterion measure, the simulation gives Navy personnel stationed in Japan an experience in communicating with Japanese people in controlled situations as a means of observing their performance and obtaining their attitudes, reactions, and opinions toward their tour of duty. The procedure involves a number of situations which portray various aspects of the Japanese culture. These situations represent activities which Navy personnel should have some knowledge of and experience with in their interaction with Japanese people and in their every day living in Japan. The participants are given a limited amount of Japanese money to complete six simulated situations. For example, one of the situations involves a train station ticket counter in which the Navy person has the task of buying a ticket from a Japanese ticket agent to a specific city. The task not only requires the purchase of the ticket but being able to translate to another person the exact route and related train changes. The Japanese people at each of the six stations explain everything in detail, however, they speak only Japanese. Other situations are centered around the interaction of a Navy person with a Japanese waiter, hotel clerk, theater ticket seller, and shopkeeper. Also the Navy person is required to purchase a subway ticket in Tokyo. Upon completion of each task the individual reports to a "feedback table" where he is told if he successfully completed the task. The feedback table is manned by a Japanese person who can read Japanese and an assistant director who can speak the Japanese language and has a good understanding of their culture and customs. They are responsible for evaluating the performance of the individuals participating in the simulation exercise.

The assessment procedure for evaluating overseas performance involved the development of two separate measurement techniques. The first method consists of evaluating the individual's performance on each of the six tasks using a three point rating scale. For example, upon completion of the train ticket exercise the Japanese ticket agent writes in Japanese the price, route, and destination on a receipt and gives it to the participant. He then goes to the feedback table, gives the ticket to the individuals at the table and explains to them the price, route, and destination he thinks he has taken. If there is no

discrepancy between what he thinks he has done and what is actually on the receipt, then the evaluators punch a "2" on his ticket. If he accomplished the task, but did not understand fully what he was doing, then he receives a "1" on his ticket. If he has no idea of what he was doing and did not accomplish the task, he receives a zero. The evaluators keep a record of his score and also provide him with immediate feedback as to his ability to negotiate the transaction.

The second measurement technique is a self-evaluation instrument entitled the "Navy Overseas Adjustment Scale" (NOAS). This scale is designed to provide information on a participant's level of effective functioning in the Japanese culture. More specifically, the measurement procedure obtains evaluative-type information concerning the participant's attitude toward Japanese people, the amount of personal interaction with Japanese people, their feelings concerning the Japanese culture, and, in general, their feelings about living in Japan. The development of the adjustment scale followed basically the mixed standard scale procedure. . . ., this method is designed to minimize the errors in rating and provides an index of the accuracy of rating. Briefly stated, there are three descriptions representing degrees of overseas adaptation on ten important traits. The individual responds by indicating the extent to which each description fits him, over-estimates his adaptation or under-estimates his adaptation.

It has been our experience, although not verified experimentally, that participants are more willing to report their experiences more honestly and in greater detail after participating in the simulation than when asked to report their feelings about Japan without having participated in the simulation experience.

The validity of the assessment procedure will be determined by correlating the performance evaluations and NOAS scores with command and peer nominations. The command nomination procedure involves an overseas command in Japan providing a list of individuals who have come to the command's attention for detrimental reasons. Also, the command will provide the names of individuals who are doing an outstanding job in Japanese-American community relations affairs. The peer nomination procedure involves having personnel nominating individuals who they feel have adapted extremely well to living in Japan and also listing those that they feel are having an extremely difficult time adjusting. Individuals nominated as outstanding and those having adjustment problems, as well as individuals in between, will be requested to participate in the Japanese Contact and Communication Course exercise. These individuals will serve as the high and low criterion groups for the validation effort.

As previously mentioned, the simulation was designed as a criterion measure of overseas adjustment. However, in the developmental phases of the simulation, the course has shown successful application as a training vehicle to introduce the Japanese culture to personnel who are preparing to go to Japan. When the course is used in this manner, then, upon completion of the tasks a debriefing is conducted. The discussion is aimed at helping the participants understand their attitudes, manners, and demeanor which facilitate communication with the Japanese and those which create problems. These discussions are tailored to the needs of the participants.

Again, due to an unfortunate funding climate, final validity studies for the Japanese Contact and Communication Course have been held in abeyance.

This writer has observed a video taped session of the exercise, and the varying abilities of participants were readily discernable. This particular exercise is highly adaptable to almost any culture and would be an excellent assessment exercise due to its inherent simplicity and brevity; yet the exercise does elicit behavior that evidences motivation to communicate with host nationals.

The simulations just described are two exercises currently within the Navy inventory. BaFa-BaFa is culturally generalized and the Japanese Contact and Communication Course, although culturally specific, is adaptable to any culture. Both can be used to evaluate behavior potential to cross-cultural encounters. As with the case of instrumentation, a great many situational exercises are available through commercial catalogues and could possibly be adapted and tested in an assessment center. One such handbook series by Pfeiffer and Jones [63,64] details 136 exercises and includes evaluation forms and administration guidance.

Thus, this writer believes that the expertise in simulation is well enough advanced within our organization that simulation can be added to an assessment center without further delay or excessive development cost.

c. Interviewing

As interviewing is also a component of the multiple assessment approach to personnel selection it will not be overlooked here, although less attention shall be devoted to it than was to instrumentation and situational exercises. The Firestone Tire and Rubber Company uses interviewing combined with projective psychological testing to assess candidates for overseas positions. Karras et. al. [46] provide a useful description of that company's interviewing philosophy and program.

The subsequent depth of interviews concentrates on factors other than job skills, centering on areas that facilitate or impede, as the case may be, the employee's or wife's adjustment to tenure in, and job success in the location involved. Members of top International management, who serve as interview panel members, take part in selected intake situations and who play a vital role in all intake and transfer situations, conduct a tandem interview with the employee with heavy emphasis on the job skills demanded of the position in question. The entire approach is one of determining the employee's fit to the specific job, location, and culture involved in the position.

Although depth interviewing must be experienced and cannot be described in a few short statements, the orientation used is clinical and complete. The basic rule for including an element in the actual interview centers around its relevancy in the placement match. Early Identification Program generated findings are used. Marital relations, latent needs, and job satisfaction are of particular relevancy in this personnel decision and interview. Leisure activities, authoritarianism, knowledge of expected managerial behavior, personal motivations, and acceptance of duty conditions are among the areas explored in these interviews. Husband and wife are not interviewed

simultaneously but rather independently and privately. Two interviews are used with each interviewer seeing both the husband and the wife in two separate interviews.

A summary rating sheet is used with ratings provided on each employee in ten areas deemed important to the decision at hand. In addition to this standardized evaluation format developed for and used with all employees in an international placement situation, narrative reports concerning the specific interview and Early Identification Program results are made available to management. Discussions are held with management members to expand upon the findings and recommendations of the interviewers.

The rating sheet used evaluates the candidate on the following areas:

1. Leisure activities (nature of, importance of, expression of in foreign service location).
2. Interpersonal sensitivity (perception of feelings, attitudes toward individual differences, customs acceptance, empathy, husband-wife compatibility).
3. Culture (cross culture experience, culture knowledge drive).
4. Consideration (for subordinate, need for).
5. Authoritarianism (extreme pride in our own culture, prejudice, hostility toward out group, short-range solutions to social problems, behavior and intellectual rigidity, intolerance, extreme conservatism, anxiety, submissive to authority figure, non-intropection, exaggerated sex identification, extreme moral positions, power and toughness, openness to change).
6. Cultural Management (knowledge of expected managerial behavior views held by indigenous personnel).
7. Travel and distance acceptability (health problems, distance from home, travel history).
8. Job satisfaction (money, people, job itself, needs).
9. Motivation (career plan, life goals, interest in people, supervision style, participation tendencies, production concern, overseas motivations, acceptance of duty conditions).
10. Management match (personal impact, self-objectivity, need approval, inner directedness, importance of work,

International Company value orientation, realism of expectations, tolerance of uncertainty, resistance to stress, environmental resistance to stress, decision making tendencies, education and skills).

The reader's attention is invited to the similarity between the above categories and the characteristics that contribute to overseas success noted elsewhere in this paper, especially interpersonal sensitivity, culture, authoritarianism and motivation. Although this writer believes that interviewing is not a sufficient selection tool alone, carefully developed interviewing enhances the overall assessment program. Karras et. al. certainly place faith in a well constructed interviewing program as noted in the following:

A company that invests the time and effort to define success and determine the correlates of success via the early identification approach will benefit from the further development of interviewing techniques and formats in which success-related information can be utilized. This is especially true where international placement situations are involved and cultural and managerial fit are a concern.

Torre [78] adds the comment that the primary purpose of the interview is to obtain information not made clear by other means and that the candidate has the opportunity to round out information about his background and behaviors.

As noted by Karras, wives should not be excluded from interviewing as much evidence shows that spouse relationships and attitudes have bearing on the overseas adjustment problem (See Appendix A). One advantage of interviewing is that it generates data on family relationships that may not otherwise be available. If operating costs would prohibit family participation in assessment exercises, a great deal of data might be gleaned through interviewing.

Tucker [80] notes that prospective overseas assignees are presently interviewed by their current commanding officers prior to assignment overseas and that an interview sheet is used. However, the interview looks only for failure criteria in order to screen out personnel. Success criteria are not yet considered by the interviews, as a success oriented personality profile is still lacking. It is the opinion of this writer that the interview should be expanded to include success criteria, such as those used by Firestone and that the interview task also be turned over to the assessment center.

4. Comment

The preceding sections indicate that preliminary criteria for evaluating potential overseas adjusters are currently available, as are instrumentation, assessment exercises and interviewing techniques. Given competent management, funding and a coordinated plan for establishing and validating an assessment center for the selection of overseas personnel, this writer submits that the U. S. Navy might improve the overall caliber of personnel it is sending overseas. This could be done through the establishment of the Navy's first personnel assessment center.

IV. A PROPOSED ASSESSMENT CENTER FOR THE SELECTION OF PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS DUTY

A. COMPLETED STEPS TOWARD ASSESSMENT CENTER ESTABLISHMENT

Section III A described the general process of establishing an assessment center and section III B described some of the research directed at improving the selection process for overseas assignees. The following section will parallel the significant products of cross-cultural research with a general outline for establishment of an assessment center.

1. Elements of Success

Assessment center design and operation require good management and planning, which are keys to success. Management and planning imply the existence of objectives at which a productive effort is aimed. The Navy's objective in funding cross-cultural research is the improvement of the procedures for selecting personnel to be stationed abroad. The funding of NPRDC San Diego's research and of the CRE report on selection and assignment attest to the existence of that objective. Thus, the objective of the proposed assessment center for selection of overseas assignees should be improvement of predictive validity over current selection procedures. A second objective should be the establishment of a facility to provide research aimed at continued improvement of that predictive validity through feedback and refinement of the criteria used in the selection mechanism.

2. Task Analysis

The step following the establishment of the objectives is the task analysis. Section III B described much of the research that has been done toward that end. The concepts of ethnocentrism, cultural self-awareness, cultural-sensitivity and motivation to develop interpersonal skills have been researched and described by Hayes [36], Torre [78], Foster [24-26], Kraemer [48-51], and others. The researchers have also experimented with these concepts in order to develop new approaches to training and self-assessment.

Dr. Yellen at NPRDC San Diego has completed task analysis for the requirements of the role of the Naval advisor in Vietnam as well as those for successful adjustment of U. S. Navy personnel in Greece. Through those general as well as specific task analyses, preliminary criteria for the selection of overseas candidates have been established. To restate what Tucker [80] has said, probable criteria should be used until replaced by proven ones as they become available. The general behavior patterns of the ethnocentric, culturally insensitive person have been described and tend to identify poor adjusters, just as the behavior patterns of culturally sensitive and motivated persons tend to identify good adjusters. The research at NPRDC San Diego described additional characteristics associated with positive and negative adjustment abroad. The results of these task analyses could be used to establish the assessment variables for the proposed assessment center.

3. Exercise Selection/Development

Having selected the assessment variables based on the task analysis results, the next phase is the selection or development of exercises that will elicit sample behaviors to be evaluated. Both instrumentation and situational exercises that might be employed in the proposed center have been developed at NPRDC San Diego. Additionally, Affourtit [3] has suggested using the EPPS and Kraemer [51] has developed a cultural self-awareness test which has both face and construct validity. Both of these are candidates for instrumentation. The strong point of the above-mentioned exercises is that each has been independently validated and could serve to measure the initial variables without incurring additional developmental costs.

Interviewing--currently a part of the screening process--might be expanded to add measures of success as Tucker recommends. The Firestone Tire and Rubber Company's interview program might serve as a good model from which to start. The measures of that program include interpersonal sensitivity, culture, travel and motivation, to mention a few that have appeared several other places in the research.

4. Assessor Selection and Training

From among the great number of personnel that the Navy has stationed abroad it should be possible to select an initial pool of ten to twelve assessors for the proposed center. These persons could be selected from the Human Resources Management personnel serving abroad by soliciting

command nominations and further evaluating candidates for suitability through peer nominations, the Navy Overseas Adjustment Scale and examination of their performance records. A second possible source of potential assessors is the large population of advisors that served in Vietnam. Identification of these persons for suitability as assessors, however, would be much more difficult as evaluations must be made based upon their performance records, which may not reflect their true abilities to adjust cross-culturally. The command and peer nominations mentioned above would be of little value unless the advisor were currently serving abroad.

An assessor training program should be devised that would include group participation in the proposed exercises; reading and discussion sessions dealing with cross-cultural adjustment; development of interviewing skills; and practice evaluations of video taped exercises for which the adjustment success or failure of the participants is known. The selection and training of assessors should be done by the proposed center's management staff to be made up of persons with known expertise in the field of cross-cultural research.

B. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION (A PROPOSED PROGRAM)

The time required to assess a group of candidates for overseas adjustment would depend upon the exercises chosen. As an example, with the proposed existing materials a two day assessment center might be administered in accordance with the following schedule:

Day 1

0730 Arrival and Orientation
0800 Administer Cross Cultural Interaction Inventory
0900 Administer Japanese Contact and Communication Simulation
1100 Lunch
1200 Administer Cultural Self-Awareness Test
1300 Explain rules of play for BaFa-BaFa
1330 Administer BaFa-BaFa Simulation
1500 Interview candidates (12 candidates; 6 assessors, 1.5 hour allotted to interview each candidate)
1800 Secure

Day 2

0800 Interview wives and family members
1200 Lunch
1300 Assessors evaluate candidates and make recommendations

The above schedule is based upon the actual administration time of the proposed exercises and arranged to maintain candidate interest. The administration of the CCII serves as an introduction and stimulates candidates to think in terms of their relationships with others. The Japanese Contact and Communication Course is a relatively simple and quickly administered simulation and serves to set the atmosphere for the more complex simulation of BaFa-BaFa. After lunch the cultural self-awareness test would settle the candidates down again and prepare them for the BaFa-BaFa simulation. Following BaFa-BaFa six assessors could finish up the day by allotting at least one and one half hours to interview each of twelve candidates. The following day the schedule allots time to

interview wives and other family members who will have a bearing on the candidate's adjustment abroad, and finally assessors could evaluate the candidates during the remainder of the second day.

The proposed schedule has used existing materials to demonstrate how the choice of instrumentation and exercises would influence the administration of such an assessment center. Additional or longer exercises of course would lengthen the schedule, but it appears to be possible to establish a two day assessment center using the available materials.

The time allotted for candidate feedback in the assessment center's initial program would be minimal as its primary purpose would be selection only and candidates could simply be informed if they have been selected to go abroad. However, eventually the assessment center could be used as a developmental tool to train specialty personnel who would be assigned overseas repeatedly. Careful feedback to candidates qualifying for overseas duty could provide a significant training effect. Such feedback utilizes the full potential of the experiential exercises as suggested by Rhinesmith [67], Stewart [70,71], and Yellen [88].

C. VALIDATION

It is not within the scope of this paper to propose a specific design for a validation study, but the observation is made that validation efforts should begin immediately and adhere to empirical methods that will allow scientific

refinement of the success criteria. The management team of the proposed assessment center should include persons qualified to analyze the statistical data generated in the validation study and relate the results of the analysis to corrections that would refine the assessment program. This project should consist of a continuous validation effort rather than a one-shot study.

D. SUMMARY OF POINTS

To demonstrate potential benefits of an assessment center for the selection of personnel for overseas assignment, Tucker's [80] recommendations for a total systems procedure (see p. 25) have been listed in Table 4. How each recommendation might be met through the assessment center method is also shown in Table 4.

E. PROPOSED LOCATION

Most of the cross-cultural research and selection effort in the Navy is currently being carried out at the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, California. The research program is firmly established at NPRDC, and San Diego appears to be a good location for the proposed assessment center for the following additional reasons:

1. San Diego, the major concentration of Navy personnel on the West Coast, homeports most of the Pacific Fleet and houses many additional shore facilities within the Naval establishment. This is a rich source of personnel who would be leaving San Diego for overseas duty. An assessment center in San Diego would effectively temporarily eliminate expenditures for candidate travel pay if personnel from the San Diego area were assessed initially. If this prototype center is found to be effective in selecting good adjusters to the overseas

TABLE 4

Recommended Improvements in Navy Selection Procedures

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Assessment Center Realization</u>
Total systems procedure for an integrated selection, preparation and training system for overseas assignments.	Assessment center to select candidates nominated on basis of command or record screening, train through feedback via experiential exercises and instrumentation.
Key principle throughout implementation of system is rigorous documentation according to specified criteria, and constant feedback throughout the system.	Initial task analysis to determine preliminary success criteria and constant refinement of the assessment program through continuous empirical validation study.
Proposed integrated system should begin to operate anyway making use of probable criteria--replace probable criteria with proven ones as they become available.	Use existing knowledge and task analysis results to commence center--refine through validation study feedback loop.
Good selection rests with the selector--selection personnel (assessors) benefit from skill training in selection for overseas assignments.	Assessor selection based on known experience overseas and assessor training program.
Present screening and selection procedures should begin to also focus on the families of Navy personnel assigned overseas.	Interview wives and adolescent members of family on day two of assessment center program--possible inclusion of family members in exercises.
Take into account rank, job and personal situation of each Navy member involved--especially for high impact billets.	Ideally, or as the situation permits, assess candidates with a homogenous background who are all being considered for similar positions--evaluate each candidate on relative merits.

TABLE 4 (cont.)

Special attention given to personnel being considered for high impact billets--spearhead above recommendations one through six.

Commence assessment center operations evaluating personnel going to high impact billets--as expertise is gained in multiple assessment consider personnel for lesser impact billets.

assignment a second center could be established in a similar fleet concentration on the East Coast, such as Norfolk, Virginia.

2. Staff expertise gained thus far through cross-cultural research at NPRDC San Diego would be available to the management and assessor training staff of the proposed assessment center.
3. The consulting and simulation development firm Simile II of La Jolla, California, has worked closely with the Navy in developing BaFa-BaFa, and their expertise in simulation is available only a few miles distant from San Diego.
4. Both the computer facilities in the San Diego area and those at the Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, are available to assist in validation studies.
5. Because of reasons 1 - 4, the overall cost of establishing an assessment center at NPRDC San Diego should be less than doing so at any other location. The existing facilities and management personnel are now sunk costs and the incremental out-of-pocket costs would be minimized.

F. CONCLUSION

1. Speeding Up Progress

Cohen and Jaffee [14] have forecast that as assessment centers become more prevalent at all Government levels, interest in assessment centers throughout the Government will markedly increase. Citing the results of validity studies, the success of assessment centers in industrial profit-oriented organizations and the British and German military programs, Allen [3] states:

If one accepts the concept as valid, then the remaining question becomes: How best to utilize it within the Navy--vice whether it should be.

Allen also submits that the advent of the Operational, Technical, Managerial System (OTMS) and the All-Volunteer force have made personnel decisions even more important than they

were in the past and increase the potential value of the assessment center to the U S. Navy.

This writer agrees with both the Cohen and Jaffee forecast of increased government use of assessment centers and Allen's view of their value to U. S. Navy personnel management. To elaborate on Allen's question of how best to utilize an assessment center, this writer wishes to ask where a prototype center would make the most noticeable impact. A cost effective center that improves upon current selection procedure to a significant extent will hasten acceptance of the concept within the service.

2. Cost Effectiveness

The Navy's efforts to improve the selection system for choosing personnel to be stationed abroad appear to be pointed in the direction of multiple assessment. This writer has submitted a proposal for establishing an assessment center to select personnel for overseas duty. The proposal is based on existing assessment materials and three cost saving factors, namely: (1) a readily accessible test population, (2) existing support facilities, and (3) expertise availability of currently employed personnel. Thus this writer's proposal involves minimum initial investment costs.

However, as with any new system--ordnance, maintenance, or personnel management--the ultimate decision to adopt the proposed personnel selection system should be based on its long run cost effectiveness. Cost effectiveness is as important to management systems as it is to hardware systems.

The estimates of the costs and benefits of the proposed center are beyond the scope of this project. However, the Center for Research and Education [13] will provide cost figures for overseas failures by May, 1975. With these cost figures, a cost effectiveness study of the proposed assessment center can be initiated. Using the current costs for overseas failures (as provided by CRE) and subtracting estimated investment costs, operating costs and the lowered failure costs attributable to the proposed assessment center, the net cost savings might be determined.

It is the opinion of this writer that the proposed assessment center would be cost effective. The use of existing facilities, personnel and technology would minimize investment costs. The center should lower the failure rate among overseas selectees, thereby reducing costs associated with premature termination of overseas assignments. The savings due to the lowered premature termination costs should exceed the annual operating costs of the proposed center, therefore the Navy could expect to realize a net economic gain indicating cost effectiveness.

It is the recommendation of this writer that BUPERS carefully consider the current CRE report [80] and the impending CRE cost estimates and then determine whether the personnel assessment center as proposed in this paper will be a cost effective program for the U. S. Navy.

APPENDIX A

Source: Tucker [80]

Cleveland, Mangone and Adams, 1960.	
Population:	Missionaries.
Measure/Procedure:	Attrition in overseas assignments.
Outcomes:	One-fourth of missionaries failed to complete their assignments or did not return to the host country after their first vacation.
Gullahorn and Gullahorn, 1963.	
Population:	American cultural exchange grantees assigned to other countries.
Measure/Procedure:	Expressed dissatisfaction.
Outcomes:	One-third of those assigned to Europe, Australia, and New Zealand expressed dissatisfaction as did two-thirds of those assigned to the Near and Middle East.
Thompson and English, 1964.	
Population:	Peace Corps volunteers.
Measure/Procedure:	Failure to adapt to host country due to adjustment problems.
Outcomes:	Failure to adapt to the host country due to adjustment problems accounted for approximately 60% of the premature terminations among Peace Corps volunteers during the first 17 months of the Peace Corps' existence.
Henry, 1965.	
Population:	American businessmen and their families.
Measure/Procedure:	Informal data.
Outcomes:	Approximately 30% of the personnel sent abroad by American companies are mistakes and have been, or should be, sent home.

Allard, 1966.

Population: Peace Corps volunteers (3,400).
Measure/Procedure: Post-service questionnaire.
Outcomes: Approximately one-third reported they had not done well; only 2% reported doing very well. Thirty-two percent said they were not satisfied with the Peace Corps; only 10% reported great satisfaction.

Loubert, 1967.

Population: Americans selected for overseas operations.
Measure/Procedure: Estimation from various sources.
Outcomes: About one-fourth of Americans selected for overseas operations are obvious failures. A similar percentage will be hidden failures (marginal performers who retain their positions but whose work does not fully meet the requirements).

Reddig, 1969.

Population: American business executives and their families.
Measure/Procedure: Corporate report.
Outcomes: Fifty percent of the executives of one large firm returned to the U.S. during the past three years because either the wife or husband could not cope with the alien ways.

Musick and Jones, 1971.

Population: Peace Corps volunteers (1,000).
Measure/Procedure: Mid-service questionnaire.
Outcomes: Sixteen percent responded they were moderately or very likely to terminate early.

David, 1972.

Population: Peace Corps volunteers.
Measure/Procedure: Attrition data given in Peace Corps by annual statistical summary for 1970

Measure/Procedure:

Incorporating data for the years 1961-68.

Outcomes:

Attrition among Peace Corps volunteers overseas increased from a low 10% in 1961 to 37% in 1968.

Population: Allard, 1966.
Peace Corps volunteers (3,400).
Criteria: Completion-of-service questionnaires.
Predictors: None.
Outcomes: Sixty-two percent rated language of very great importance; 11% of very little importance; and, 3% of no importance. Volunteers in Latin America gave the highest ratings for importance and proficiency of language. Volunteers in Africa gave the lowest ratings.

Population: Allard, 1966.
Peace Corps volunteers (3,400).
Criteria: Completion-of-service questionnaires.
Predictors: None.
Outcomes: The relationship between self-reports of overseas performance and language fluency, and between satisfaction with overseas service and language proficiency was significant.

Population: Allard, 1966.
Peace Corps volunteers (3,400).
Criteria: Completion-of-service questionnaire.
Predictors: None.
Outcomes: Reported communication problems in the local dialect were related to other problems encountered during volunteer service.

Population: Antler, 1970.
Foreign medical students studying in the United States.

Criteria:

Observation.

Predictors:

None.

Outcomes:

The amount of interaction foreign students had with each other was of greater importance for their adjustment than the degree of interaction with Americans.

Population:

Bennett, Passin and McKnight, 1958.

Criteria:

Japanese students in the United States.

Predictors:

Interviews and a battery of tests.

Outcomes:

None.

The adjustment patterns of students were described in relation to three personality types: the adjuster, the constrictor, and the idealist. The adjuster adapts to Japanese and American cultures and is able to assimilate attitudes from both. The constrictor is conservative in regard to attitudes, and demonstrates behavior congruent with orthodox Japanese culture. The idealist has liberal attitudes and is open to cultural change.

Population:

Bracher, 1970.

Criteria:

Peace Corps volunteers.

Predictors:

Personal knowledge gleaned from observation and interview.

Outcomes:

None.

Fear of ailments may be an important aspect of overseas adjustment. The typical Peace Corps trainee has virtually no idea about such basic public health knowledge as: how to make and preserve potable water; how to handle food; how to dispose of organic waste; how to take a bath properly; how to care for the feet; or how to maintain a proper diet.

Brein and David, 1971.

Population:

Sojourners (many types including: students, trainees, technical assistants, tourists, businessmen, military personnel, missionaries, foreign service officers, professors, and others).

Criteria:

Review of literature and personal observations.

Predictors:

None.

Outcomes:

The authors believe the adjustment of the sojourner is dependent upon the development of understanding between himself and his host. The degree they are able to attain an effective exchange of information will determine the degree which mutual understanding develops. Thus, the sojourner's adjustment is directly related to the effective intercultural communication which occurs between the sojourner and the host. The authors stated that an awareness of differences between cultures is crucial for effective intercultural communication, and cited numerous examples of intercultural misunderstandings. They suggested that the sojourner's adjustment is related to those areas where differences between cultures occur and that further investigations of cross-cultural differences should be able to establish the areas where intercultural communication can be improved. Specifically, to understand the adjustment difficulties of an individual sojourner, it is necessary to relate specific background factors, personality traits, and situational factors to the communication process. Relating these factors to intercultural communication may provide an integrating framework by which any number of independent approaches can be understood in relation to the sojourner's adjustment. Although effective intercultural communication is the necessary basis for adjustment, it does not insure that the sojourner will show good adjustment. A sojourner may know how to communicate effectively in a host culture, but he may not be able to accept the differences between cultures. The authors concluded that the next step in understanding the sojourner's adjustment may be related to his acceptance of the host culture once he has developed effective patterns of communication.

Byrnes, 1966.

Population:	American professionals working for AID.
Criteria:	Review of literature.
Predictors:	None.
Outcomes:	Major adjustment problems were associated with job performance. "Role shock" was differentiated from "cultural shock." "Role shock" was reported as more severe, to increase over time, to frequently reach its peak at the midpoint of the expected overseas tour, and to rarely result in complete recovery. For technical assistants, "role shock" was believed to result from ambiguity in their professional roles, unsuccessful relationships with host-country counterparts, and problems with communication and participation in the host-country hierarchy. The investigator also reported that evidence did not support an "overseas" type. Successful overseas technicians did not demonstrate any consistent personality patterns which would distinguish them from unsuccessful technicians.

Cole and Bruner, 1971.

Population:	People in general, and children from disadvantaged subcultural groups in particular.
Criteria:	Personal observation through study of the problem and review of the literature.
Predictors:	None.
Outcomes:	Situational factors are of paramount importance in understanding differences in performance between persons of different cultures.

David, 1972.

Population	Peace Corps volunteers.
Criteria:	Review of literature.
Predictors:	None.
Outcomes:	Poor intercultural adjustment results from two types of punishment the sojourner

Outcomes:

experiences in the host culture. They are: (1) removal of reinforcers, and (2) presentation of aversive, painful stimuli. Removal of reinforcers results in depressive-type reactions, whereas presentation of aversive stimuli produces anxiety-type reactions. The principle of reinforcement may be applied to reduce and prevent adjustment problems in three ways: (1) learning stimulus cues necessary for attaining reinforcers and eluding punishers; (2) transferring and modifying present reinforcing systems and developing new reinforcers; and, changing, neutralizing, and avoiding punishers.

Population:

Dickens, 1969.

Criteria:

Peace Corps volunteers.

Ratings of overall effectiveness as a volunteer, taking site difficulty into account. The ratings were made by the Peace Corps staff members on a 7-point scale, ranging from poor to superior.

Predictors:

Pretraining assessment.
General Ability Test.
Modern Language Aptitude Test.
Crutchfield Figures.
MMPI evaluation.
MMPI Es.
Interview.
Group discussion rating.
Community development grade.
Language rating.
Physical education grade.
Domestic skills grade.
Peer assignment preference.
Peer leadership nomination.
Peer overall nomination.
Peer negative nomination.
FAO rating "board status."
FAO rating "development."
FAO rating "overall potential."
Final selection board rating.

Outcomes:

Reliability estimates for the composite criterion ratings were .62.

Five of the twenty predictors had correlations of a sufficient statistical magnitude with the criterion. They were:

Pretraining assessment .41
Community development grade .43
Peer leadership nomination .50
Peer overall nomination .40
Final selection board rating .37

The first 16 predictors listed were used in a multiple correlation with the criterion, resulting in $R = .82$. This multiple R was not cross-validated.

Females were somewhat more predictable than males.

From a pragmatic viewpoint, the most significant finding was that pretraining assessment was as valid as anything else, and that a combination of it with a single, easily obtained, in-training assessment (peer leadership) tests the validity of the selection board. (Multiple R , two predictors = .54).

Dossett and Mitchell, 1971; and Fiedler, Mitchell, and Triandis, 1971.

Population:

American Reserve Officer Training Corps cadets, male members of the University of Illinois Arab Student Association, American ROTC cadets of a special forces company, foreign students from the Far East, American teenagers in the Los Amigos de las Americas program, officers of the United States military advisory assistance group, civilians from the United States in Thailand, American military and civilian advisors in Greece.

Criteria:

Various ratings of overseas performance and adjustment.

Predictors:

Culture assimilators for the Arab countries, Iran, Thailand, Central America, and Greece.

Outcomes:

The data from available validation studies does not show a consistent trend. Investigators summarize the studies as follows: the culture assimilator has been shown to improve the effectiveness and satisfaction of those trained with this method when they are compared with those trained by other methods. These studies show that the culture assimilator is an effective method of decreasing some of the stress experienced when one works with people of another culture. In general, personal adjustment and impersonal relations in heterocultural groups are enhanced by this form of culture training.

Population:

Eldin and Sadig, 1971.

Foreign management consultants working in developing countries.

Criteria:

The authors suggested a set of criteria that a private foreign management consulting firm soliciting work in a developing country should have. They were: (1) the staff representing the firm should be professionally competent and well respected; (2) it should put forth practicable solutions to problems and assist in the implementation phase of its recommendation; (3) its staff should exhibit a general attitude of empathy -- not apathy, they should have a missionary zeal, a high sense of professional integrity and objectivity and an extraordinary appreciation of the working environment which may be quite alien to them; and, (4) the firm should offer extensive facilities for the education and training of the local management counterpart officials; in a sense, a mutual spirit of teaching and learning should prevail, so that the association between the consultant and the client ripens into an ever-enriching experience.

Predictors:

None.

Outcomes:

This was not an empirical study, simply a set of suggested criteria for selecting foreign management consultants in developing countries.

Epstein and Harris, 1967.

Population:

Peace Corps volunteers in Ghana (58).

Criteria:

Ratings made by the Peace Corps representative to Ghana, his deputy representative, and two field interviewers. The criterion scales were: (1) job competence; (2) relationships with other Peace Corps volunteers; (3) relationships with counterparts; (4) relationships with other nationals, including students; (5) emotional maturity; and (6) overall evaluation.

Predictors:

Ratings were made by seven psychiatrists during training on the following scales: (1) effectiveness in stressful overseas teaching assignments; (2) success of coping techniques in past life situations; (3) relationships with others; (4) estimate of likelihood of developing psychopathology; and (5) scaled order of effectiveness.

Outcomes:

The reliabilities among the five predictor scales had a median correlation of .31. The six criterion rating scales had a median inter-correlation reliability of .65. The findings revealed no relation between the ratings of the psychiatric interviewers and the field supervisors' ratings. Cluster analysis of the data confirmed the lack of relation between the dimensions measured by the criterion raters versus those of the psychiatrist interviewers. The reasons for these results were: (1) ignorance among the psychiatrists of the criterion situation; (2) behavior may be emergent; (3) some psychiatrists are inclined to focus on pathology; and (4) psychiatrists may be described as being less than enthusiastic about the application of rating scales to their assessment procedures.

Exner and Sutton-Smith, 1970

Population:

Peace Corps volunteers teaching English in Micronesia and Thailand; and math-science in Malaysia, Micronesia, the Philippines, and Western Samoa.

Criteria:

Success-failure categories derived through nominations of Peace Corps country directors. The success-failure categories were: (1) successful, (2) marginal, (3) early returnees (those volunteers having to quit their assignments for non-medical reasons), (4) training attrition, and (5) adequate volunteers.

Predictors:

Birth order (whether or not a volunteer was born first, second, or third in his family).

Outcomes:

This study tested the theory that first or only born persons succeed better in hierarchically structured and closed role relationships, whereas later born persons are more successful when innovation is required. It was assumed that volunteers teaching in math-science programs must conform to a closed system of hierarchical relationships and carry out math-science work in a competent manner along established lines, observing respect for supervisors and authority over students. Conversely, teachers of English as a second language are much less structured and much more innovative in role relationships. The hypothesis that first or only born persons were more successful in teaching math-science, while second or third born were more successful in teaching English was confirmed.

Feldman, 1968.

Population:

People chosen at random in Athens, Paris, and Boston.

Criteria:

Experimenters asked subjects for directions and a favor.

Outcomes:

The social status of hosts was related to the amount of assistance they gave to a sojourner. This suggested that sojourners tend to associate with host nationals of higher social status.

Gardner, 1962.

Population:

Americans overseas.

Criteria:

Observations.

Predictors:

None.

Outcomes:

This investigator suggested that the "universal communicator" will have least difficulty adjusting to another country. The "universal communicator" was described as having a well-intergrated personality, a central organization of an extroverted type, a value system that includes the values of a socialization of cultural universals, and a high degree of sensitivity towards others.

Goldberg, 1966.

Population:

Peace Corps trainees (46).

Criteria:

None.

Predictors:

Final board ratings.

Outcomes:

Inter-judge agreement among none final selection board judges was quite high. The average correlation reported was .83.

Gordon, 1957.

Population:

People being assessed for selection programs.

Criteria:

Review of literature.

Predictors:

None.

Outcomes:

The writer stated that although the weight of available evidence does not support use of clinical assessment for selection programs, such programs continue to be developed, despite very high costs. Undoubtedly, the base validity of the problems used and the confidence shown by assessors contribute materially to the support of such programs.

Gordon, 1967.

Population:

Peace Corps trainees being trained for programs in Peru, El Salvador, and Thailand (172).

Criteria:

Selection for overseas service at conclusion of training.

Predictors:

Clinical assessment based upon data from situational performance tasks, information

Predictors:

obtained from the Peace Corps application form, and the mental ability and language aptitude test scores used in initial selection, and sixth day peer ratings and work sample language scores obtained during the assessment program. Clinical assessment included:

- (1) adaptability
- (2) motivation
- (3) interpersonal relations
- (4) intellectual level
- (5) Language capacity

Work sample measurement and psychometric measurement, consist of scores on four brief factored personality tests, two measuring personality traits and two measuring values. Finally, brief assessment included: predictions made by the project coordinator utilizing only the language work sample scores, and the scores derived from the one-hour paper-and-pencil test battery.

Outcomes:

This was a pre-assessment study attempting to predict whether or not trainees would succeed in being selected for overseas service. The results were: correlations of .39 between clinical assessment predictions and the criterion of selection for overseas service; .41 for work sample measurement; .37 for psychometric measurement; and .39 for brief assessment. All of these correlations were significant beyond the .01 level of chance. The percentage of correct identification of those who would not be selected for overseas service by the four methods of prediction were: 58% for clinical assessment; 59% for work sample assessment; 56% for psychometric; and, 58% for the brief assessment. The conclusions were as follows: first, there does not appear to be any significant differences in the validity of predictions favoring theory-oriented clinical assessment over work sample measurement, psychometric measurement, or an abbreviated assessment approach. Second, each of these approaches provides prediction significantly greater than would be expected by chance. Third, the level of prediction is of practical utility and could result in a 5% reduction of

Outcomes:

the attrition rate during training. Fourth, where relative cost is considered, clinical assessment is the poorest choice and cannot be given serious consideration as an operational alternative; and, finally, valid prediction may be affected for the lower part of the criterion range by very simple instrumentation. A follow-up study was conducted to predict criteria of overseas performance.

Grande, 1966.

Population:

Peace Corps Volunteers (62).

Criteria:

Overseas ratings of overall effectiveness.

Predictors:

Two scales of Bill's Index of Adjustment and Values.

Outcomes:

The predictor scales were not significantly related to the overseas ratings.

Gullahorn and Gullahorn, 1966.

Population:

American students in France, and Fulbright and Smith-Munt American grantees.

Criteria:

None.

Predictors:

None.

Outcomes:

For grantees who were research and teaching professors, there was a positive relationship between professional outcome (job role) and adjustment (self-satisfaction). However, for the students, interaction with the host culture tended to be related to adjustment.

Guthrie and Zektick, 1967.

Population:

Peace Corps volunteers in the Philippines (278).

Criteria:

(1) Ratings on overall performance made at the conclusion of volunteer service by American Peace Corps staff, and
(2) Ratings on overall performance by local Filipinos.

Predictors:

Likelihood of successful performance rated by: (1) selection board at the conclusion of training, (2) discussion group leaders, (3) Filipino trainers, (4) peer choices, and (5) vocabulary score in the local dialect. Also, the Johnson-O'Connor English Vocabulary Test, the Strong Vocabulary Interest Blank, the Allport-Vernon-Lindsey Scale of Values, and the MMPI tests were used. Finally, biographical data was used as predictors.

Outcomes:

The reliability of the final service ratings by American Peace Corps staff ranged from .54 to .84. For the total group, the highest predictive correlation was .36 between the final selection board and the final performance rating by the Peace Corps staff. Sub-group breakdowns resulted in somewhat higher predictions. The highest was .55, with the selection board predicting the final performance rating. There was a correlation of .38 between Americans' ratings and the Filipinos' ratings of volunteer performance. The personality and intelligence tests and biographical data showed chance relationships with the criteria. None of the predictors collected during training coordinated significantly with Filipinos' field evaluations.

Harris, 1970.

Population:

Micronesia Peace Corps volunteers (64).

Criteria:

End-of-overseas-service ratings.

Predictors:

Final board ratings completed at the end of training.

Outcomes:

The reliability coefficients for end-of-service ratings for pairs of three raters ranged from .64 to .73. The correlation between end-of-service ratings predicted by final board ratings was .37.

Harris, 1973.

Population:

Peace Corps volunteers.

Criteria:

Worldwide rates of attrition of Peace Corps volunteers from 1961 to 1971.

Predictors:

None.

Outcomes:

Total attrition during training and volunteer service has risen annually in linear fashion from 26% in 1961 to 56% in 1969. It was clear that total attrition increased steadily through the years regardless of the adequacy or inadequacy of the initial screening, selection, placement, and retention processes.

Population:

Harris, 1973.

Criteria:

Peace Corps volunteers in Tonga (53).

Predictors:

A 32-item rating scale of successful performance overseas.

Outcomes:

None.

This study described the development of a procedure for obtaining criterion ratings on overseas performance among Peace Corps volunteers. The criterion instrument was successfully developed and the ratings showed sufficient reliability and statistical structure as well as successful discrimination between a group of non-successful and successful volunteers. A factor analysis of the scale indicated four factors: (1) strength of character; (2) general competence as a teacher; (3) cultural interaction; and (4) facility in interpersonal relations. The investigator stated "with the findings of the present research (the rating scale), it should be possible to augment considerably the predictive efficiency of an observer/rater at the time of training or even at the time of staging by focusing attention on variables that are known to be of critical importance in the field."

Population:

Hofman and Zak, 1969.

Criteria:

Ninety U.S. and Canadian Jewish boys and girls visiting a summer camp in Israel, also attended by Israeli peers.

A contact rating scale measuring amount of daily contact between non-Israelis and Israelis.

Predictors:

An attitude questionnaire assessing feelings towards Jewishness and Israel.

Outcomes:

It was hypothesized that interpersonal contact in a cross-cultural situation is associated with attitude change. Before and at the end of camp, attitudes towards Jewishness were assessed. Subjects were divided into high and low contact groups. As predicted, attitudes of high contact campers became more favorable while attitudes of low contact did not change or became less favorable.

Kennedy and Drager, 1974.

Population:

Protestant Missionaries.

Criteria:

The missionary-in-action check-list (MINA) which measures behavioral attitudes of missionary overseas performance; and the FIRO-B (fundamental interpersonal relations orientation behavior), a standardized measure of interpersonal relationships.

Predictors:

None.

Outcomes:

A factor analysis of the MINA checklist resulted in 11 factors which were judged as more relevant to the missionary enterprise than the factors measured by the more general FIRO-B.

Krug, 1962.

Population:

Forty-three Tanganyika Peace Corps volunteers and 30 West Pakistan volunteers.

Criteria:

Ratings of overseas effectiveness .

Predictors:

Final selection board ratings made at the conclusion of training.

Outcomes:

Predictive correlations were found of .37 for the Tanganyika volunteers and .25 for the West Pakistan Volunteers.

Leon, 1963.

Population:

American housewives in Columbia.

Criteria:

A psychiatric study.

Predictors:

None.

Outcomes:

The investigator reported that a lack of social interaction may result in adjustment problems for housewives in Columbia. The women patients manifested the neurotic symptoms of anxiety, insomnia, and heavy drinking. Perhaps it is true that a woman overseas may have more difficulty adjusting to a foreign country than a man, because a woman has less opportunity to interact with others. The professional man can derive satisfaction from his work and engage in social interaction related to his job, whereas the housewife may have few avenues of social contact open to her.

Population:

Lundstedt, 1963.

Criteria:

Americans overseas.

Predictors:

Observations.

Outcomes:

None.

This investigator stressed the importance of personality factors in research on Americans overseas. He maintained that a closed mind and ethnocentrism may limit achievement of effective overseas adjustment; the more effective coping mechanisms consist of rational attitudes, universalistic tendencies, open mindedness, and flexibility.

Population:

Madden and Cohn, 1966.

Criteria:

Americans abroad.

Predictors:

Legal status of Americans abroad.

Outcomes:

None.

The complex legal status of the American abroad was shown to be a potential source of serious adjustment problems.

Population:

Meehl, 1965.

A variety of people involved in 50 empirical studies.

Criteria:

Human behavior as represented in the studies reviewed.

Predictors:

(1) Statistical/actuarial approaches, and
(2) human judges.

Outcomes:

Human judges were less successful in predicting human behavior than a simple statistical approach. In the studies reviewed, approximately two-thirds showed significantly superior predictive efficiency for the statistical method; the other one-third showed essentially the same. Only one study showed human judges to be superior.

Population:

Meggison, 1967.

Managers operating in foreign cultures.

Criteria:

Depth interviews regarding the managerial experience with a highly select group of manager in New York in 1964. Selected managers from the United States who had operated in other cultures and who were responsible for their companies' worldwide operations. These were selected managers operating in Europe in 1966.

Predictors:

The study was undertaken to test two hypotheses: (1) there is a direct relationship between a manager's knowledge of a host country and his ability to adapt to it and perform effectively as a manager; and, (2) the greater the difference between the culture in which he operates and his own cultural heritage, the greater will be the impact of the newer culture upon the manager's effectiveness.

Outcomes:

The hypothesis were proven valid. First, research demonstrated that greater knowledge of and ability to adapt to a second culture rendered the manager more effective. Second, the greater the diversity in his own culture and/or in the host society, the greater was their influence upon the manager's effectiveness; the more similar the cultures, the less effective. Five criteria were correlated to success in international operations. First, a manager should possess professional competency

Outcomes:

in his field of expertise. Second, he should have an optimistic outlook, a mind that deals in cultural cognates rather than differences, and a personal philosophy which accepts value differences in others. He should conceive of people, places, and cultures as similiar rather than different. Emphasizing similarities leads to cooperation whereas an emphasis of differences leads to competition and potential conflict. Third, a history of success in various endeavors other than professional ones; a person who has been successful in other areas has a greater chance for success than one who has not. Fourth, a manager with greater self-reliance has a greater opportunity for success than ones without it. The overseas manager must be more independent than the one who is domestically employed. Fifth, trust is a basic obstacle in intercultural movement, thus the manager must be able to inspire trust in himself. A corollary is that a perception of and sensitivity toward values in another culture is essential to success as an international manager.

Menninger and English, 1965.

Population:

Peace Corps volunteers.

Criteria:

Discussion paper regarding the role of a consulting psychiatrist at training sites.

Predictors:

None.

Outcomes:

Identifying volunteers during training who will be unable to adapt effectively overseas is a considerable challenge, and a ridiculous impossibility, for the psychiatrist. The psychiatrist is expected to estimate the probable responses of volunteers to overseas assignments when he is unknowledgeable about it.

Mischel, 1965.

Population:

Foreign students in the United States.

- Criteria:** Combined rating score for overseas of effectiveness.
- Predictors:** The California f scale, Barron's ego strength scale, Taylor's manifest anxiety scale, a 30 minute interview made by a counselor during training in the United States, and final selection board ratings.
- Outcomes:** The three predictor tests were significantly related to the criterion score. Ratings were based upon the interview. Final selection board ratings were not significantly correlated with the criterion ratings.
- Population:** Foreign students in the United States.
- Criteria:** Unknown.
- Predictors:** Unknown.
- Outcomes:** The investigator found that the volume, range, and depth of foreign students' interactions in the U.S. were significantly related to satisfaction with their own experiences.
- Population:** Two hundred and sixty-five Americans participating in the Los Amigos de las Americas program, serving in Honduras and Guatemala.
- Criteria:** Ratings of team performance -- two persons per team on measures of: (1) productivity, and (2) adjustment. Productivity was measured for clinic operations, community development work, and overall performance. Adjustment ratings had to do with: (1) how well the members got to know their villagers and to what extent they made friends with them; (2) their general adjustment to Honduran or Guatemalan life; and (3) how well the team members got along with each other.
- Predictors:** Whether or not the team members participated in the culture assimilator training via the Honduran culture assimilator. Of 265 people, 119 people received culture assimilator training prior to departure.

Outcomes:

The overall effect of training upon clinic performance was insignificant, but trained groups did perform more effectively in community development work. This effect was accentuated for experienced groups, and groups working in low difficulty villages. Members in trained groups were less depressed; they perceived themselves as coping more adequately with the task. Rated adjustment to villages was not significantly affected by training.

Perlmutter, 1954.

Population:

Americans abroad.

Criteria:

A scale consisting of sentences that compared foreign and domestic objects. The scale was constructed to measure Xenophilia, which is the preference for things and persons foreign.

Predictors:

None.

Outcomes:

Xenophiles were defined as sojourners who chose the foreign in preference to the domestic object. In spite of the Xenophile's preference for things foreign, he tends to isolate himself in American enclaves while living in the host country. The investigators suggested that the Xenophile tends to fantasize about a "better world abroad" regardless of where he lives. It appears likely that the Xenophile is a dissatisfied person who is trying to maintain his self-esteem by holding his environment responsible for his feelings.

Personnel Measurement Research Division,
Naval Personnel Research & Development
Laboratory, 1970.

Population:

Navy officers serving in advisory capacity to Navy officer personnel in the Republic of Vietnam.

Criteria:

Identification of a group of effective advisors and ineffective advisors by senior advisors in the field. (The criterion groups consisted of 18 advisors judged effective and 14 judged ineffective.)

Predictors:

All the information contained in personnel jackets. This information was classified into three major areas: education, military information, and biographical information.

Outcomes:

Effective advisors compared to ineffective advisors had: a higher level of education; majored primarily in the social sciences or arts; were younger at the time of commissioning and had less prior military experience than a higher enlisted grade. (The more mature and experienced individuals belonged to the ineffective group). Scores developed on 24 factors of the officer fitness report indicated that the effective advisors typically scored better than the ineffective group on fitness reports rendered prior to RVN. In spite of the observed differences between effective and ineffective advisors, they could be chance occurrences and might not reflect any real differences due to the limited number of people involved.

Sewell and Davidson, 1956.

Population:

Unknown.

Criteria:

Observations.

Predictors:

None.

Outcomes:

Four kinds of overseas Americans were described and the characteristic adjustment patterns they adopted. They were: (1) the detached observers, (2) promoters, (3) the enthusiastic participants, and (4) the settlers. The investigators stated that these patterns were related to the sojourner's role perceptions and expectation about returning home.

Sewell and Davidson, 1961.

Population:

Scandinavian students in the U.S.

Criteria:

Unknown.

Outcomes:

A significant relationship was reported between social interaction of Scandinavian students with Americans and their satisfaction with their U.S. experiences.

Shelton, 1964.

Population: Investigators conducting field research in Africa.

Criteria: Personal observations.

Predictors: None.

Outcomes: The investigator observed a characteristic pattern of social interaction among field researchers in Africa which he termed the "Miss Ophelia Syndrome." It consisted of avoiding physical contact with Africans and refusing to accept Kola (nuts), food, or wine from them. The usual reason was that investigators were acting in a detached scientific manner appropriate for conducting their research. However, Africans and other host nationals are likely to have interpreted this aloofness in a manner which may have jeopardized the researchers' success. They may have believed, for example, that the "Miss Ophelias" considered themselves superior to the Africans.

Shetty, 1971.

Population: International managers (managers of international enterprises).

Criteria: A role profile of the international manager. This requires that international managers acquire a clear understanding of their roles and seek solutions to management problems by: (1) identifying the environmental dynamics and reading them accurately (these are inherent in the functions of an international manager and add new dimensions to managerial decisions); (2) recognizing these environmental differences, necessitate adaptation and/or approaches which demand an innovative spirit; (3) consider a broader outlook and "a national" perspective, emphasizing accommodative integration of conflicting goals of a multinational corporation and host environment; (4) emphasizing the need for effective cross-cultural communication to develop and sustain a viable relationship between the multinational corporation and the people from the local environment.

Predictors:

None.

Outcomes:

This was not an empirical study, but a recommended role profile for the international manager. A concluding statement was: an international outlook is essential to the practical implementation of corporate objectives in consonance with the local environments. International managers need a sense of identification with the multinational corporation, whose scope and purpose transcend the limited sphere of each manager's responsibilities and national boundaries.

Population:

Smith, 1965.

Criteria:

Peace Corps volunteers in Ghana (58).

(1) First and second year evaluations by Peace Corps staff, (2) peer nominations in which volunteers were asked to name several volunteers (who were performing particularly well), and (3) a factor loading score derived from cue sorts of field interviews, measuring interpersonal openness, tolerance, and sensitivity.

Predictors:

Two pre-departure measures of authoritarianism: Levinson's f scale and the derived f scale.

Outcomes:

There were no significant relationships between authoritarianism scores and overseas criteria.

Population:

Smith, 1966.

Criteria:

Peace Corps volunteers in Ghana (58).

(1) First and second year evaluations by Peace Corps staff, (2) peer nominations in which volunteers are asked to name several volunteers (who were performing particularly well); and (3) a factor loaded score derived from cue sorts of field interviews measuring interpersonal openness, tolerance, and sensitivity.

Predictors:

Pre-departure ratings of predicted psychological effectiveness by seven psychiatrists during 50-minute interviews.

Outcomes:

No significant relationships were found with overseas ratings.

Stein, 1963

Population: Peace Corps volunteers in Columbia (47).
Criteria: Ratings of overseas effectiveness.
Predictors: Final selection board ratings.
Outcomes: A predictive correlation of .62 was reported.

Stern, 1966.

Population: Church missionaries.
Criteria: A good match between the missionary and his overseas job.
Predictors: Reference checks, interviews, physical examinations, psychiatric and psychological examinations.
Outcomes: No particular outcomes were listed in this article. This was a general statement of procedures that might be followed in the recruiting and selecting of personnel for overseas service.

Suedfeld, 1967.

Population: Peace Corps volunteers.
Criteria: Volunteers who terminated from service early compared to volunteers who remained for their tour overseas.
Predictors: Volunteers whose fathers had been absent during the last five years from the volunteer's home, and volunteers whose fathers had been present in the home for the last five years.
Outcomes: Paternal absence differentiated extremely well between stayers and terminators: 9% of the former and 44% of the latter came from absent father backgrounds. This clear cut finding was so unexpected that 2 more samples were drawn in the same way. This time, 14% of the stayers and again 44% of the returners had had absent fathers.

Taylor, 1968.

Population: New Zealand volunteers serving abroad (613).

Criteria: Satisfactory completion of service as measured by: (1) completion of abroad of full tour service, (2) satisfactory performance assessed by an independent person from a study of various formal and informal field reports from professional and diplomatic representatives.

Predictors: A four-stage selection program focusing on (1) personality, (2) cultural adjustment, and (3) vocational suitability. The four stages were: (1) personal history questionnaire, (2) preliminary screening interview, (3) panel interviews and discussions in groups, and (4) anxiety-provoking time-lag between acceptance and departure overseas, allowing for personal re-examination.

Outcomes: During the first five years of this program, 93% of the volunteers completed their full tour quite satisfactorily.

Taylor, Yagi, DeMik, Tucker, and Wight, 1967.

Population: Peace Corps volunteers.

Criteria: Final selection board ratings completed at the conclusion of training.

Predictors: Situational tests, both written instruments and measures derived from live simulations.

Outcomes: Nonsignificant relationships were found between situational test measures and ratings made by the final selection board at the conclusion of training. Investigators reported that this finding indicated the skills and abilities measured in the situational tests were tapping different areas than were the final selection board ratings. No follow-up was conducted to correlate the situational test scores with criteria of overseas performance.

Tucker, Raik, Rossiter, and Uhes, 1973.

Population:

Peace Corps volunteers in Brazil.

Criteria:

Identification of adapted and non-adapted volunteers in Brazil as judged by the Peace Corps State Director, the Assistant Director, peers, Brazilian colleagues, and volunteers themselves.

Predictors:

A gestures test, a factual information test, a verbal semantic differential, a photographic semantic differential, an activities list, a volunteer interview, cultural dimensions test, and a questionnaire on nationality clues. (None of these eight measures were utilized prior to overseas assignment. They were all used to discover significant differences in these eight areas between nominated volunteers in the adapted and non-adapted groups.)

Outcome:

Significant mean score differences were found between the two criterion groups on the gesture test, the factual information test, the verbal semantic differential, the activities list and the volunteer interview. Investigators concluded that significant differences were due largely to affective and behavioral aspects of overseas life and work, and that non-significant differences concerned largely cognitive understanding of cultural differences. They recommend much more emphasis in the future on affective and behavioral areas of intercultural adaptation.

Turrer, 1974.

Population:

Americans living in Europe.

Criteria:

Observations as Director of Health for English language people in Belgium.

Predictors:

None.

Outcomes:

American expatriates in Europe experience culture shock in ways that strain family relationships. The strains are more pronounced for the wife and children than for the male. One of the most critical problems among men was the success syndrome which often required them to choose between job and family. Job pressures became so great that they either devoted all of their time to the job, or gave up career goals and spent more time with their families.

Uhas and Shybut, 1971.

Population: Peace Corps trainees bound for Micronesia (92).

Criteria: The final selection board rating at the conclusion of training.

Predictors: Personal Orientation Inventory (POI).

Outcomes: Six of the twelve scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) were significantly correlated to the final selection board ratings. The inner-directedness scale showed the highest correlation, .41.

Useem, 1966.

Population: American wives living in India.

Criteria: Observation.

Predictors: None.

Outcomes: The wife's illness can be devastating for family adjustment because of the inter-relationship between family and work roles. Approximately one-fourth of the families reported they were either continuously ill or had serious health problems during their India sojourn. Many wives were unskilled in the basic methods that should be used to avoid illness. Wives were classified according to four behavior patterns: (1) copers, (2) cautious, (3) supporters, and (4) fumblers. However, it was emphasized that these patterns would not provide an effective basis for the selection of personnel for overseas assignment. With the exception of a few fumblers, for whom fumbling was a life pattern, these behaviors were not consistent over periods of time.

Wrigley, Cobb, and Kline, 1966.

Population: Peace Corps volunteers.

Criteria: Ratings of overseas performance made by Peace Corps staff members. The ratings were made at intervals of 2, 12, and 24 months, after volunteers had been overseas. The content of the rating items dealt with job competence, leadership skills, maturity, and an overall evaluation.

- Predictors:** Pre-departure scores from 32 personality scales: Baroon's ego strength scale, Levinson's $\bar{f}$ scale, 16 scales from the Edward's personal preference schedule, 14 scales from the MMPI.
- Outcomes:** One hundred and twenty-eight comparisons were made. All the coefficients were either nonsignificant or negligible in magnitude.
- Population:** Wrigley, Cobb, and Kline, 1966.
- Criteria:** Peace Corps volunteers.
- Predictors:** Peace Corps staff ratings of overseas performance. The content of the staff rating items were overall effectiveness, job competence, maturity, and language fluency.
- Outcomes:** Pre-departure language grades.
- Predictors:** Very low relationships were reported between pre-departure language grades and ratings of overall effectiveness, job competence, and maturity. A significant relationship was found between language classroom grades during training and overseas ratings of language fluency.
- Population:** Yellen and Hoover, 1973.
- Criteria:** Naval officers and enlisted personnel stationed at the Naval Communications Station Neamakri, Greece.
- Predictors:** Identification of personal attributes that maximize positive interaction between Naval personnel and Greeks through questionnaires and in-depth, face-to-face interviews.
- Outcomes:** None.
- Predictors:** A positive relationship was revealed between the facility to speak some Greek and both the amount of actual social interaction with Greeks and the degree of satisfaction with living in Greece. Almost all Navy men stated they used the

Outcomes:

military exchange as the primary source for shopping. However, most indicated that they were dissatisfied with the quality, quantity, and availability of food, clothing, and general merchandise. Most of the respondents were critical of the American community school. Problems encountered in adjusting to life in Greece were: undisciplined Greek driving habits; lack of communication because of language barriers; and housing conditions, including finding housing, dealing with landlords and the unpredictable service from public utilities. Also mentioned was Greek rudeness in public and the different style of daily living which includes an afternoon siesta. When questioned about what things the Navy men thought Americans do that Greeks have the greatest difficulty adjusting to, the list included: lack of respect for Greek socialist customs, acting superior, spending a lot of money, drinking too much in public, and making disparaging remarks about the Greeks. The positive qualities mentioned by the Navy men as the most critical personal characteristics to successful homeporting in Greece were: friendliness, interest in cultural matters and language, adaptability, family stability, maturity, even-tempered personality, and flexibility. Traits or conditions mentioned most frequently as contributing to poor adjustment to homeporting in Greece were impatience, intolerance, marital instability, and heavy drinking accompanied by physically aggressive behavior.

Yellen, and McGanka, 1971.

Population:

Naval officers serving in advisory capacity to the Navy of the Republic of Vietnam.

Criteria:

None.

Predictors:

The Navy Advisor Profile Report. This is an empirically developed assessment instrument to be used by Navy detailers for selecting officers for advisory duty in Vietnam. It consists of the following twelve factors which are rated on a 7-point scale (the factors are described in some detail by officers who had personally

Predictors:

completed advisory service in Vietnam). (1) patience/persistence, (2) tact/diplomacy/social skill, (3) adaptability, (4) self reliance/resourcefulness/ingenuity, (5) friendliness/sense of humor/sociability, (6) empathy, (7) morality, (8) emotional stability, (9) instructional ability, (10) job dedication/motivation, (11) leadership/organizational ability, and (12) overall effectiveness as an advisor. Additionally, twelve general qualities are listed: (1) technically proficient in his speciality/rating; (2) willing to listen and learn; (3) good at handling people; (4) racially nonprejudiced; (5) "jack of all trades"; (6) mature in judgement and actions; (7) able to take care of himself; (8) uses common sense; (9) well-rounded Navy knowledge; (10) has pride in appearance, action, and organization (professionalism); (11) performs well without supervision; and (12) absence of superior attitude.

Outcomes:

No validation studies have been reported for this instrument in successfully screening, selecting, and detailing Naval advisors who succeeded, or who did not succeed in advisory duty in Vietnam.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. "Alfas and Betas Communicate," Campus, p. 26-28, February 1974.
2. Affourtit, Thomas D., A Standard Screening/Training Plan for Cross Cultural Operations, paper presented as U. S. Marine Corps Research Project, VTU-4-3 Civil Affairs, Washington, D. C., April 1974.
3. Allen, Galen Bruce, The Personnel Assessment Center: A Review and Suggested Applications, M. S. Thesis, U. S. Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, June 1974.
4. Baker, James C. and Ivancevich, John M., "The Assignment of American Executives Abroad: Systematic, Haphazard or Chaotic?," California Management Review, V. 13, p. 39-44, Spring 1971.
5. Bassford, Gerald L., "Job Testing--Alternative to Employment Quotas," Business Horizons, V. 17, p. 37-47, February 1974.
6. Bender, Joseph M., "What Is Typical of Assessment Centers?," Personnel, V. 50, p. 50-57, July-August 1973.
7. Bennett, George K., "Factors Affecting the Value of Validation Studies," Personnel Psychology, V. 22, p. 265-268, Autumn 1969.
8. Byham, William C., "The Assessment Center as an Aid In Management Development," Training and Development Journal, p. 10-22, December 1971.
9. Byham, William C., "Assessment Centers for Spotting Future Managers," Harvard Business Review, V. 48, p. 150-160, 1970.
10. Byham, William C. and Wettengel, Carl, "Assessment Centers for Supervisors and Managers . . . An Introduction and Overview," Public Personnel Management, V. 3, p. 362-365, September-October 1974.
11. Campbell, Richard J. and Bray, Douglas W., "Assessment Centers: An Aid in Management Selection," Personnel Administration, V. 30, p. 7-13, March-April 1967.

12. Carleton, Fredrick O., "Relationships Between Follow-Up Evaluations and Information Developed in a Management Assessment Center," Proceedings 78th Annual Convention APA, 1970.
13. Center For Research and Education, Personal correspondence between Dr. Michael Tucker, Associate Director, and the writer, November 27, 1974.
14. Cohen, Barry M. and Jaffee, Cabot L., "Assessment Centers Aid Government Agencies," Government Executive, V. 5, p. 42-44, November 1973.
15. Danielian, Jack and Stewart, Edward C., New Perspectives In Training and Assessment of Overseas Personnel, Professional Paper No. 6-67, Human Resources Research Organization, 1967.
16. David, Kenneth H., Intercultural Adjustment and Applications of Reinforcement Theory To the Problems of Culture Shock, Hilo: University of Hawaii, 1972.
17. DeNelsky, Garland Y. and McKee, Michael G., "Prediction of Job Performance From Assessment Reports," Journal of Applied Psychology, V. 53, p. 439-44.
18. Development Dimensions, Inc., Catalog of Assessment and Development Exercises, Pittsburgh, 1973.
19. "The Federal Executive Development Program," Journal of Navy Civilian Manpower Management, V. 8, p. 9-13, Summer 1974.
20. Fiedler, Fred E., "The Effect of Leadership and Cultural Heterogeneity on Group Performance: A Test of the Contingency Model," Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, V. 2, p. 237-263, April 1966.
21. Fiedler, Fred E., A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness, New York: McGraw Hill, 1967.
22. Fiedler, Fred E., Mitchell, Terrence and Triandis, Harry C., "The Culture Assimilator: An Approach to Cross-Cultural Training," Journal of Applied Psychology, V. 55, p. 95-102, April 1974.
23. Finley, R. M., Jr., "Evaluation of Behavior Predictors From Projective Tests Given in a Management Assessment Center," Proceedings 78th Annual Convention APA, 1970.
24. Foster, Robert J. and Danielien Jack, An Analysis of Human Relations Training and Its Implications For Overseas Performance, Technical Report No. 66-15, Human Resources Research Organization, 1966.

25. Foster, Robert J., Dimensions of Training for Overseas Assignment, Technical Report No. 69-11, Human Resources Research Organization, 1969.
26. Foster, Robert J., and O'Nan, David T., Some Resources For Area Training, Technical Report No. 67-11, Human Resources Research Organization, 1967.
27. Foundation for Research on Human Behavior, Assessing Managerial Potential, Report of Seminar February-March 1951.
28. Ginsburg, Lee R. and Silverman, Arnold, "The Leaders of Tomorrow and Their Development," Personnel Journal, V. 51, p. 662-666, September 1962.
29. Goldberg, Lewis R., "Some Recent Trends in Personality Assessment," Journal of Personality Assessment, V. 36, p. 547-558, December 1970.
30. Golde, Roger A., "There's More to Videocassetts Than Meets The Eye," Training and Development Journal, V. 27, p. 20-24, October 1973.
31. Gordon, L. V., "Clinical, Psychometric and Work Sample Approaches In the Prediction of Success in Peace Corps Training," Journal of Applied Psychology, V. 51, p. 111-119, April 1967.
32. Grahm, Warren R., Preparation and Utilization of Military Assistance Officers, Center for Research in Social Systems: Washington, D. C., 1969.
33. Greenwood, John M. and McNamara, Walter J., "Interrater Reliability in Situational Tests," Journal of Applied Psychology, V. 51, p. 101-106, April 1967.
34. Grant, Donald L., Katovsky, Walter and Bray, Douglas, "Contributions of Projective Techniques to Assessment of Managerial Potential," Journal of Applied Psychology, V. 51, p. 226-232, June 1967.
35. Haines, Donald B., Training for Culture-Contact and Interaction Skills, (AD 611 022) Aerospace Medical Research Laboratories Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, 1964.
36. Hays, Richard D., "The Executive Abroad: Minimizing Behavioral Problems," Business Horizons, V. 4, p. 87-93, June 1970.
37. Hinrichs, J. R., "Comparison of Real Life Assessments of Management Potential with Situational Exercises, Paper-and-Pencil Ability Tests, and Personality Inventories," Journal of Applied Psychology, V. 53, p. 425-432, October 1969.

38. Hoehn, Arthur J., The Design of Cross-Cultural Training for Military Advisors, Professional Paper No. 12-66, Human Resources Research Organization, 1966..
39. Hoehn, Arthur J., The Need for Innovative Approaches In Training In Inter-Cultural Interaction, Professional Paper No. 9-66, Human Resources Research Organization, 1968.
40. Howard, Ann, "An Assessment of Assessment Centers," Academy of Management Journal, V. 17, p. 115-134, March 1974.
41. Howard, Cecil G., "Is Your Manager Suitable for Overseas Assignment?," The Personnel Administrator, V. 18, p. 25-28, January-February 1973.
42. Howard, Cecil G., "Why Executives Fail Abroad," Human Resources Management, V. 2, p. 32-36, Spring 1972.
43. Huck, James R., "Assessment Centers: A Review of The External and Internal Validities," Personnel Psychology, V. 26, p. 191-212, Summer 1973.
44. Hunt, Chester L., and Walter, Lewis, Ethnic Dynamics, Homewood: The Dorsey Press, 1974.
45. Ivancevich, John M., "Selection of Managers For Overseas Assignment," Personnel Journal, V. 48, p. 189-193, 200, March 1969.
46. Karras, E. J., McMillan, Roy F. and Williamson, Thomas R., "Interviewing For a Cultural Match," Personnel Journal, V. 50, p. 276-279, April 1971.
47. Kelley, E. L., Assessment of Human Characteristics, Belmont: Brooks Cole Pub. Co., 1967.
48. Kraemer, Alfred J., A Cultural Self-Awareness Approach To Improving Intercultural Communications, Professional Paper No. 5-73, Human Resources Research Organization, 1973.
49. Kraemer, Alfred J., Development of A Cultural Self-Awareness Approach to Instruction In Intercultural Communication, Technical Report No. 17-73, Human Resources Research Organization, 1973.
50. Kraemer, Alfred J., The Development of Cultural Self-Awareness: Design of A Program of Instruction, Professional Paper No. 27-69, Human Resources Research Organization, 1969.

51. Kraemer, Alfred J., Workshop In Intercultural Communication: Handbook for Instructors, Technical Report No. 13-74, Human Resources Research Organization, 1974.
52. Kraut, Allen I., "A Hard Look at Management Assessment Centers And Their Future," Personnel Journal, V. 51, p. 317-326, May 1972.
53. Little, Alan, "Assessment Center or Development Center?," Personnel Management, V. 26, p. 28-31, March 1974.
54. Lloyd, Gary E., "An International Career: Probing and Pondering Overseas Success," Journal of College Placement, V. 32, p. 53-57, February-March 1972.
55. Lupton, Daniel E., "Assessing The Assessment Center-- A Theory Y Approach," Personnel, V. 50, p. 15-22, November-December 1973.
56. MacCrae, Donald S., "Assessment Centers For Supervisors and Managers . . . An Academic Laboratory Report," Public Personnel Management, V. 3, p. 367-378, September-October 1974.
57. McConnell, John H., "The Assessment Center: A Flexible Program For Supervisors," Personnel, V. 48, p. 35-41, September-October 1971.
58. McConnell, John H., "Sizing Up Assessment Centers," Personnel Management, V. 5, p. 36-38, October 1973.
59. McCowan, William Blake, An Evaluation of the Usefulness of The Assessment Center In Personnel Selection and Promotion, M. S. Thesis, University of Minnesota, May 1972.
60. Miller, Edwin L., "The International Selection Decision: A Study of Some Dimensions of Managerial Behavior In The Selection Decision Process," Academy of Management Journal, V. 16, p. 239-252, 1973.
61. OSS Assessment Staff, Assessment of Men, New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1948.
62. Pfeiffer, William J. and Heslin, Richard, Instrumentation In Human Relations Training, Iowa City: University Associates, 1973.
63. Pfeiffer, William J. and Jones, John E., Annual Handbook For Group Facilitators, La Jolla: University Associates, 3 Vols., 1972-1974.

64. Pfeiffer, William J. and Jones, John E., A Handbook of Structured Experiences For Human Relations Training, La Jolla: University Associates, 4 Vols., 1968-1971.
65. Pomerleau, Raymond, "Identification Systems: The Key To Effective Manpower Planning," Personnel Journal, V. 52, p. 434-444 & 474, June 1973.
66. Rawls, James R. and Rawls, Donna J., "Recent Trends In Management Selection," Personnel Journal, V. 53, p. 104-109, February 1974.
67. Rhinesmith, Stephen H., "Training For Cross Cultural Relations," Training and Development Journal, V. 24, p. 20-23, March 1970.
68. Slevin, Dennis P., "The Assessment Center: Breakthrough In Management Appraisal and Development," Personnel Journal, V. 51, p. 255-261, April 1972.
69. Sparks, Charles P., "Validity of Psychological Tests," Personnel Psychology, V. 23, p. 39-46, Spring 1970.
70. Stewart, Edward C., The Simulation of Cultural Differences, Professional Paper No. 19-67, Human Resources Research Organization, 1969.
71. Stewart, Edward C., Simulation Exercises In Area Training, Professional Paper No. 39-67, Human Resources Research Organization, 1967.
72. Stewart, Edward C., Danielien, Jack and Foster, Robert J., Simulating Intercultural Communications Through Role Playing, Technical Report No. 69-7, Human Resources Research Organization, 1969.
73. Stone, J. L., "Assessment Centers For Supervisors and Managers . . . A Personnel Officer's Testimonial," Public Personnel Management, V. 3, p. 365-366, September-October 1974.
74. Stoner, James A. F., Aram, John D. and Rubin, Irwin M., "Factors Associated With Effective Performance In Overseas Work," Personnel Psychology, V. 25, p. 303-318, Summer 1972.
75. Taft, Ronald, "Multiple Methods of Personality Assessment," Psychological Bulletin, V. 56, p. 333-351, September 1959.
76. Textor, Robert B., Cultural Frontiers of the Peace Corps, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1966.
77. Torre, Mottram, The Selection of Personnel For International Service, Geneva, Switzerland: World Federation For Mental Health, 1963.

79. Trankell, Arne, "The Psychologist As An Instrument of Prediction," Journal of Applied Psychology, V. 43, p. 170-1975, 1959.
80. Tucker, Michael, Screening and Selection For Overseas Assignment: Assessment And Recommendations To The U. S. Navy, Final Task Report, Task Order 73/28, Center For Research and Education, 1974.
81. Wallace, S. Rains, "Criteria For What?," American Psychologist, V. 20, p. 411-417, 1965.
82. Wernimont, Paul F. and Campbell, John P., "Signs, Samples, and Criteria," Journal of Applied Psychology, V. 52, p. 372-376, October 1968.
83. Wight, Albert R. and Casco, Glendon, Training And Assessment Manual For A Peace Corps Instrumented Experiential Laboratory, Estes Park: Center For Research And Education, 1969.
84. Wilson, John E. and Tatge, Walter H., "Assessment Centers-- Further Assessment Needed," Personnel Journal, V. 52, p. 172-179, March 1973.
85. Wolowick, Herbert B. and McNamara, W. J., "The Relationship Of The Components Of An Assessment Center To Management Success," Journal of Applied Psychology, V. 53, p. 348-352, October 1969.
86. Yellin, Ted M. I. and Mumford, Sandra J., The Cross-Cultural Interaction Inventory: Development of Overseas Criterion Measures and Items That Differentiate Between Good And Poor Adjusters, Unpublished Draft Report, Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, July 1974.
87. Yellin, Ted M. I., An Experimental Assessment Procedure For Evaluating Overseas Performance, Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, 1974.
88. Yellen, Ted M. I. and Hoover, Margaret, in Country Experiences: Navy Personnel Stationed In Greece, Special Report, Navy Personnel Research and Development Laboratory, Washington, D. C., 1973.
89. Yellen, Ted M. I., and McGanka, John F., The Navy Advisor Profile Report, WPR 72-5, The Navy Personnel Research and Development Laboratory, Washington, D. C., 1971.
90. Zubin, Joseph, "Discussion: Symposium On New Approaches to Personality Assessment," Journal of Personality Assessment, V. 36, p. 427-433, October 1972.