

INDUSTRIAL PSYCHOLOGISTS
AND THEIR PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION

Report of a Survey of Members
of the Division of Industrial Psychology

Special Interest Activities Committee
Division of Industrial Psychology
American Psychological Association

April 1963

Foreword

A persistent problem facing the elected leadership of any professional organization is the identification of purposes and goals, policies and programs, that meet the wide variety of needs and interests of the membership. This problem is made especially difficult by the lack of adequate channels for communication. It was with these considerations in mind that the Division established in 1960 the Special Interest Activities Committee.

Applying the skills and techniques of our profession, the Committee undertook as a first crucial step an attempt to establish communication. The survey reported in these pages ranged broadly over the wide spectrum of member interests and identification, and Division policies, organization, and programs. The officers and Executive Committee of the Division will find these data helpful, I believe, for many years to come.

A survey of this order requires the investment of substantial time and effort. An acknowledgment first must go to those two out of three members of the Division who took the time carefully and completely to fill out one of the longest questionnaires extant. The Division owes a debt of gratitude to the members of the Special Interest Activities Committee of 1961-62, all of whom played an active role in the formation and execution of the project: Wayne Kirchner, Dave Merrill, Jack Parrish, Stan Seashore, and Phil Ash (Chairman). In addition, a special note should be taken of the cooperation ex-officio of Orlo Crissey, then-President of the Division, in the origination and execution of the project. Finally, it is appropriate to acknowledge the arrangements made by Stan Seashore for running the tabulations and the contribution of Orlo Crissey in printing and mailing the questionnaire.

William McGehee
President
Division of Industrial Psychology

April 15, 1963

INDUSTRIAL PSYCHOLOGISTS AND THEIR PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION*

Report of a Survey of Members of the Division of Industrial Psychology
(Division 14) of the American Psychological Association

Philip Ash, Wayne Kirchner, David W. Merrell,
Jack Parrish, and Stanley E. Seashore

Leadership in a voluntary organization is a little like marching under the head of a Chinese dragon, with the head cut loose from the body. The leader can stay in front only by looking back to see where the rest of the dragon is going. As the dragon grows longer, or the group grows larger, concurrent leadership becomes more difficult. Division 14 has been growing enormously, from a membership of 281 in 1949 to 775 in 1962: a rate of 8.1 percent per year compounded. Over the past several years, those who served on the Executive Committee have been concerned with what their constituency, the Division members, expected of them and of the Division. Elections are conducted without issues, and concluded without mandates. Lacking this kind of communication the Executive Committee has asked itself what can be done more adequately to serve the needs of their colleagues. Several events of the past years have been felt by some to be possible symptoms of a failure to meet the needs of members-- for example, the formation of the Divisions of Engineering Psychology and Consumer Psychology. What other interests and needs exist that might be satisfied through the activities of the Division have not been known.

With the revision of the By-laws in 1960, a new standing committee was established. It was called the Special Interest Activities Committee. The By-laws charge that this committee "shall identify special interests among members, develop and promote activities to meet these interests, and facilitate communication among members of each special interest group."

The committee undertook in 1962 a broad-gauge survey in an attempt to "identify special interests," to develop a profile of ourselves as professional psychologists, association members, and division participants, and to provide a basis for longer-range planning for policies, organization, and future activities.

About 800 questionnaires were mailed, and 522 usable replies were received, a remarkable 67 percent. The survey results were sorted out into three main areas:

*Summary of a symposium presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, St. Louis, Missouri, September 4, 1962.

1. What we are like. Personal information, education, professional affiliations, employment, and knowledge and participation in Divisional activities.
2. How we view the Division. Attitudes toward the purposes served by membership in the Division, and interests in various Divisional activities and professional functions.
3. What we would like to do. Attitudes toward the Convention, workshops, topics of professional and scientific interest, and member activities in support of the Division's purposes.

WHAT WE ARE LIKE

The typical member of Division 14, although a hypothetical creature at best, is 44 years of age, has a Ph. D. degree, has been a member of the Division for more than a decade, belongs to other Divisions and professional organizations as well, holds a certificate or license if his state provides it, has about 15 years of professional experience, and is employed by an academic or business institution.

Age.

The median respondent was born in 1918, but if he had a Ph. D. he was probably born somewhat earlier (1916) and if he did not have a doctorate, he was born later (1919). Forty percent of the Ph. D. 's were born in 1914 or earlier, while only 24 percent of the non-Ph. D. 's are in that age group (Table 1). Fellows are older than Members: 70 percent of the Fellows were born in 1914 or earlier, while only 21 percent of the Members were born before World War I.

1. Percent Distribution of the Sample by Year of Birth Against Educational Attainment, Membership Class, and Major Employment Category

	Y E A R O F B I R T H				Percent of Total Sample
	1901 or earlier	1905-1914	1915-1924	1925-1934	
<u>Education</u>					
Ph. D.	11%	29%	37%	23%	84%
Other	1	20	56	20	16
<u>Membership*</u>					
Fellow	23%	47%	28%	1%	30%
Member	1	18	46	12	68
<u>Employment</u>					
Academic	13%	33%	36%	17%	27%
Other, Not Self	5	22	44	29	47
Self (including consulting)	11	31	38	17	26
Total	9%	28%	40%	23%	100%

*2 percent either Associate or status unreported

Younger members of the profession, more than their seniors, go into industry or government rather than into education. Those in the former group ("other employment") are on the average almost four and a half years younger than their academic colleagues. Self-employed industrial psychologists, including those associated with consulting firms (26 percent of the total), are about the same age as the academicians.

Education.

Almost all Fellows have their doctorates, while a quarter of the Members do not (Table 2). Similarly, almost all respondents employed in educational institutions have the doctorate, while just under three-fourths of the "other employed" respondents have the degree. However, about one out of four of those who do not now have a Ph. D. are still pursuing graduate work.

2. Percent Distribution by Educational Attainment Against Membership Class and Major Occupational Category

	HIGHEST DEGREE ATTAINED			
	Bachelor's	Master's	Graduate Work Beyond Master's But Not Ph. D.	Doctorate
Membership				
Fellow	0%	1%	1%	98%
Member	+	7	16	77
Employment				
Academic	0%	0%	4%	96%
Other, Not Self	+	9	16	74
Self (including consulting)	0	0	4	96
Still Pursuing Graduate Work				
Yes	23%			1%
No	77%			99%
Total	+	5%	11%	84%

+Less than 0.5%.

Professional Affiliation.

Thirty percent of the respondents are Fellows, 68 percent are Members, and one percent are Associates. There are few in the Division, however, regardless of status, who are beginners in APA. The median Fellow has been in APA over 23 years; the median Member only half as long, but still 11.6 years (Table 3).

The differences between educational or occupational categories are smaller, but in the expected direction. Psychologists in academic institutions have the greatest membership seniority--16.4 years--while those in "other employment" the least--12.8 years. Overall, only six percent have been in APA less than six years, while 68 percent have been in the Association 10 years or more.

3. Percent Distribution by Years of Membership in APA

Years as Member	Total	Education		Employment			Membership	
		Ph. D.	Other	Academic	Other Not Self	Self**	Fellow	Member
Less than 1 yr.	*	0	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	*
1-5 yrs.	2%	7%	6	10	7	4	0	10%
6-10 yrs.	25	24	33	18	12	21	2	36
11-15 yrs.	29	27	37	20	31	35	19	33
16-20 yrs.	13	14	9	12	12	17	19	11
21-25 yrs.	12	13	7	20	9	7	24	7
26 yrs. and over	13	11	7	18	7	15	35	4
Not reported	1	1	0	2	0	0	1	*
Median (years)	14.1	14.5	12.5	16.4	12.8	14.6	23.1	11.6

*Less than 0.5%

**Including consulting firm

Other APA Divisions. Over two-thirds (69 percent) of Ph. D. members belong to one or more other divisions of APA; 39 percent of non-Ph. D. members belong to other divisions. Multiple-division membership is most common among academic psychologists (73 percent), and least common among "other employed" psychologists (57 percent). The self-employed (including consulting) group is exactly between. The most frequently listed memberships in other divisions were: Division 5 (17 percent); Division 17 (12 percent); Division 19 (9 percent); Division 12 (8 percent); Division 23 (7 percent); and Division 21 (6 percent).

Other Organizations. Industrial psychologists are joiners. Over 94 percent of Ph. D. respondents belong to other scientific and professional organizations; among non-Ph. D. respondents, 83 percent belong to other organizations.

For the group as a whole, almost two out of three (63 percent) belong to regional psychological associations, and half are estimated to belong to state associations. Among other associations the most frequently mentioned were: AAAS (13 percent); Sigma Xi (7 percent), Psychometric Society (5 percent), APGA (5 percent), the Human Factors Society (4 percent), and the International Association of Applied Psychology (4 percent).

Certification and Diplomate Status. About three out of four industrial psychologists live in states that have certification or licensing procedures. In these states, over three-fourths of the Ph. D. psychologists, and over half of the non-Ph. D. psychologists, have certificates (Table 4). The rate of certification is highest among the self-employed, and lowest among the "other employed."

4. Percent of Respondents Who Have State Certificates and ABEPP Diplomas

	Total	Education		Employment			Membership	
		Ph. D.	Other	Academic	Other Not Self**	Self**	Fellow	Member
Certification								
% Living in Certification States	71%	70%	74%	65%	69%	79%	74%	69%
Of these:								
Have certificate	74%	78%	55%	75%	66%	85%	78%	73%
Don't have, ineligible	1	1	9	9	3	1	1	3
Don't have, will apply	8	7	11	9	10	6	5	10
Don't have, probably eligible, will not apply	15	14	26	15	21	6	17	14
ABEPP Diploma								
Have diploma:								
Clinical	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	3%	1%
Consulting	2	3	1	4	4	4	4	2
Industrial	21	24	4	27	15	24	49	8
Taking exams	4	3	0	2	2	3	1	3
Qualified, will apply	7	9	1	6	8	8	5	9
Plan to apply, not yet qualified	8	7	9	7	7	9	0	11
Do not plan to apply	59	52	86	53	65	49	37	65

*Less than 0.5%

**Including consulting firms

Less than a quarter of the respondents have the ABEPP diploma, and a majority do not intend to seek it. Half of the Fellows, but only 4 percent of the non-Ph. D.'s, or 11 percent of Members, have the diploma. Over half (59 percent) of the total group, and 86 percent of the non-Ph. D.'s, say they do not plan to apply for diplomate status. Among Fellows, however, only 37 percent say they do not plan to apply and 5 percent definitely say they will apply.

Employment.

About one-third of the respondents are employed in industry, slightly over a quarter in educational institutions, another quarter in private practice, and consulting, and the balance in government, contract research, or other settings. The private practice group itself comprises only 8 percent of the total; all others work for someone else (Table 5). These data are closely comparable to those of previous recent surveys of Division 14 membership.

Only 28 percent of the Ph. D.'s as compared with 52 percent of the non-Ph. D.'s work for private industry, but the proportion of Ph. D.'s in consulting is slightly higher than the proportion of non-Ph. D.'s in consulting. Similarly, only 19 percent of the Fellows, but 39 percent of the Members, are employed in private industry, but 18 percent of each group are in consulting firms, and relatively more Fellows than Members (10 percent to 7 percent) are self-employed.

Number of Positions Held. Multiple job-holding is not uncommon (Table 6). For the whole sample, unemployment (no position currently held) was 1 percent, while 35 percent hold two or more positions concurrently.

Among respondents in academic institutions, multiple job-holding is twice as common as it is among any other group: none are unemployed, and nearly two out of three hold two or more positions. Multiple job-holding is more common among those with the Ph. D. than among non-Ph. D.'s, and less common among the self-employed and consulting group than among the "other employed."

5. Employment Distribution of Industrial Psychologists

	Total	Education		Other Studies		
		Ph. D.	Other	Dunnette ¹⁾	Sawyer ²⁾	MacKinney ³⁾
Manufacturing	10%	16%	17%	-	-	-
Retailing	1	0	0	-	-	-
Communications	3	4	0	-	-	-
Other private industry	9	7	15	-	-	-
Total Industry	32	28	52	32%	15%	32%
Academic	27%	11%	6%	29%	26%	26%
Self-employed	8%	8%	8%	-	-	-
Consulting firm	18	19	11	-	-	-
Total Consulting	26	27	21	24%	28%	25%
Govt. contract research	5%	6%	1%	-	-	-
All Other	7	8	15	-	-	-
Government and Other	14	14	18	15%	11%	17%

1) Dunnette, M. D. "The Incomes of Industrial Psychologists," *American Psychologist*, 1961, Vol. 16, pp. 533-36.

2) Sawyer, J. "The Industrial Psychologist: Education and Employment," *American Psychologist*, 1960, Vol. 15, pp. 670-73.

3) MacKinney, A. G. and Dunnette, M. D. "The Industrial Psychologist's Job: A Further Analysis of the Division 14 Salary Survey," Paper read at the American Psychological Assn. Convention, St. Louis, September 1967.

6. Percent of Distribution of Number of Positions Held

Number of Positions Held	Total	Education		Employment		
		Ph. D.	Other	Academic	Self	Other (Including Consulting)
None	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	2%
1	63	61	75	34	70	80
2	28	29	22	17	21	11
3	5	0	2	10	1	5
4	2	2	0	5	1	0
5 or more	1	1	1	3	0	1

Length of Work Experience. The median member has been in "work mainly psychological in nature" for 14.3 years, and has been with his present major employer 7.5 years (Table 7). Fellows, as might be expected, have the most experience and service with the same employer. Two out of three Fellows have been in the field 19 years or more in comparison with only 18 percent of Members who have had as much experience; the median length of service with their current major employer is 11.3 years, in contrast with 6.4 years for Members.

Among the three major occupational groups, psychologists in educational institutions have the longest experience and service with present employer; those in private practice or in consulting firms have less; and those in "other employment" have least. The data suggest, however, that psychologists with the Ph. D. may be slightly more mobile than those without it. While the former have been in the field longer (15 years to 12 years), on the average they have been with their present employers for less time (7 years to 9 years).

7. Percent Distribution by Length of Work Experience

Mainly Psychological Work	Total	Education		Employment			Membership	
		Ph. D.	Other	Academic	Other Not Self	Self, Including Consulting	Fellow	Member
Less than 1 year	1%	1%	3%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%
1-9 years	21	20	25	17	26	12	2	28
10-18 years	45	45	47	39	46	49	30	53
19 yrs. and over	33	34	25	43	26	38	67	18
Median (years)	14.3	15.0	12.1	16.9	12.6	15.7	19.1*	12.2
Present Major Employer								
Less than 1 year	9%	9%	5%	7%	7%	12%	7%	8%
1-9 years	52	54	48	44	61	48	32	61
10-18 years	30	27	38	31	25	35	41	25
19 yrs. and over	9	10	9	18	7	5	20	5
Median (years)	7.5	7.1	7.2	9.4	6.9	7.6	11.3	6.4

*Could not be calculated.

Activities Engaged In. Respondents were asked to report the proportion of time, in 10 percent intervals, they spent in each of five activities: teaching; research; application of psychology, or practice; supervision and administration of teaching, research, and/or application; and activities unrelated to the preceding (Table 8).

8. Percent Reporting Various Occupational Activities, and, For Those Engaged in Such Activity, Median Percent Time Devoted To It

Activities	Total	Education		Employment			Membership	
		Ph. D.	Other	Academic	Other Not Self	Self, Including Consulting	Fellow	Member
Teaching								
% Reporting Activity	42%	45%	29%	82%	31%	21%	43%	42%
Median % Time Devoted to it	27.1%	31.0%	11.2%	52.3%	14.6%	20.7%	41.7%	22.9%
Research								
% Reporting Activity	63%	64%	55%	74%	66%	46%	64%	62%
Median % Time Devoted to it	26.8%	25.6%	15.8%	29.0%	25.3%	17.7%	23.1%	27.9%
Application								
% Reporting Activity	80%	79%	81%	73%	77%	93%	72%	84%
Median % Time Devoted to it	41.4%	19.3%	54.4%	21.1%	36.9%	83.8%	32.0%	45.7%
Supervision and Administration								
% Reporting Activity	61%	61%	63%	47%	74%	55%	57%	64%
Median % Time Devoted to it	29.0%	10.1%	25.8%	26.8%	43.1%	25.6%	31.0%	28.7%
Other								
% Reporting Activity	33%	29%	49%	20%	45%	24%	28%	34%
Median % Time Devoted to it	26.4%	21.2%	40.8%	16.6%	28.6%	18.8%	24.0%	15.0%

Teaching was reported by 42 percent of all respondents, ranging from 82 percent of those in academic institutions to 21 percent of those in private practice and consulting. However, even among academicians reporting the activity, the median proportion of time spent on it is only 52.3 percent. Only 12 percent of those academicians doing any teaching devote as much as 80 percent of their time to it. It is definitely a part-time activity for the one in five private practice and consulting psychologists who engage in it, and for "other employed" industrial psychologists.

A slightly higher proportion of academicians than "other employed" respondents engage in research (74 percent to 66 percent), and significantly fewer consultants do it. However, whatever their occupational affiliation, on the average research occupies only about a quarter of the respondents' time. Only 3 percent of the total sample is engaged in substantially full-time research.

Consultants, both in private practice and in firms, see themselves as engaged primarily in the application of psychological theory and techniques: over nine out of ten reported engaging in application, and of these, the median proportion of their time spent on the activity is 83.8 percent. However, about three out of four of the academicians and "other employed" respondents also reported engaging in application as a substantial part of their work time.

"Other employed" respondents are more likely to have responsibility for supervision and administration of psychological activities than their consulting or academic colleagues, and on the average they spend more time at it. For three out of four "other employed" it represents a substantial--almost half-time--activity.

About a quarter of the academic and consulting psychologists, and 45 percent of the "other employed" group reported spending some time at least on non-psychological activities. The industrial psychologist in business, industry and government is quite likely to devote a significant part of his time to miscellaneous activities not particularly related to his training. For the one in four of his academic and consulting colleagues who engage in them, however, such tasks on the average occupy only a minor part of their time.

Knowledge About Division 14.

It is a reasonable hypothesis that membership interest and involvement in an organization might be reflected in the extent to which the members know the names of the officers and are aware of significant actions of the organization. In the absence of any standards for judging what constitutes a well-informed membership, it is difficult to draw from the following data any very dependable inference concerning interest. However, it seems clear that a large proportion of the membership does not keep up with the activities of the Division.

77 percent knew (or guessed!) that Orlo Crissey was President of the Division for the 1961-62 term, but, as several respondents pointed out, this result is contaminated by the fact that Dr. Crissey's name and title were on the survey materials.

41 percent knew that William McGehee was President-Elect.

39 percent knew that the membership voted at the 1961 APA Convention to lay a special assessment on itself. Almost a quarter of the respondents thought that they voted to change the Division's name.

61 percent knew that the business meeting was held during the convention, before the social hour. It is possible to speculate that this relatively high level of knowledge was the result of learning impressed by an enforced delay.

Few differences appeared in terms of educational level (the proportion of Ph. D.'s who gave the correct response tended, if anything, to be lower than the proportion of non-Ph. D.'s answering correctly), membership status, or employment category (although consultants were less well-informed than their academic or "other employed" colleagues).

Participation in Division Affairs.

In any organization, the activists constitute only a minority of the membership. Division 14 is no exception.

Elective and Appointive Offices. About two out of three members vote for candidates regularly, just over a third submit nominations for office, and just under a fourth have served on Division committees (Table 9). Only one in ten has ever been nominated for elective office in the Division.

9. Percent of Membership Participating in Elected and Appointed Positions in the Division

Activity	Total	Education		Employment			Membership	
		Ph. D.	Other	Academic	Other Self	Including Consulting	Fellow	Member
<u>Vote for Candidates</u>								
Regularly	62%	62%	65%	60%	65%	57%	69%	59%
Occasionally	29	29	24	28	27	32	22	32
Rarely	9	9	11	11	7	11	9	9
<u>Submit Nominations</u>								
Regularly	34%	36%	27%	30%	36%	36%	38%	33%
Occasionally	40	41	37	45	40	38	42	41
Rarely	25	23	36	25	24	26	20	26
<u>Asked To Serve On Committee</u>								
Yes	22%	25%	6%	27%	22%	17%	48%	11%
No	78	75	94	73	78	83	52	89
<u>Served on Committee</u>								
Yes	22%	24%	6%	26%	21%	17%	46%	10%
No	78	76	94	74	79	83	54	90
<u>Nominated for Division Office</u>								
Yes	9%	10%	2%	13%	7%	8%	25%	2%
No	91	90	98	87	93	92	75	98

Active service in the Division, either appointive or elective, is primarily left to Fellows and the holders of the Ph. D. In committee appointments, the rate of participation of Ph. D.'s and Fellows is four times the rate of Members or non-Ph. D. respondents. In nomination for Division office, the difference is even greater. Whereas one out of four Fellows has been nominated for elective office, for example, only one out of 50 Members has been nominated for office.

Business Meeting Attendance. Another index of participation might be attendance at Division 14 annual meetings (during the APA Convention). The extent of such participation may be expressed approximately as follows: if a Division member attends the convention, there is one chance in two that he will come to the business meeting. Only 14 percent of the respondents attended no APA Convention in the past five years, but 35 percent attended no business meeting. On the other hand, 54 percent attended three or more Conventions, but only 27 percent attended three or more business meetings. Fellows, and Ph. D.'s, were more likely to attend the business meeting than Members or non-Ph. D.'s but the differences were small.

"The Psychologist in Industry." Finally, a member could evidence his affiliation in the Division by reading the Division-sponsored brochure, "The Psychologist in Industry." About 94 percent of the membership have read it, and about 85 percent of those who expressed an opinion felt that it was an accurate presentation of what industrial psychologists do.

HOW WE VIEW THE DIVISION

Members were asked to give their views concerning the Division, with special reference to purposes in joining the Division, the emphasis given to various special interests and problems, and the Division's responsibility for various activities and member services.

The survey information is fairly complex. This summary is limited to a statement of some of the highlights, with particular attention to (1) points of discrepancy between our expectations and interests on the one hand, and the Division's performance on the other, and (2) some points that appear to involve a difference of opinion as to what the Division should be like. These discrepancies and differences are singled out because they guide us to areas of possible change and improvement in the Division. However, the dominant tone of the results is one of consensus; the highlighting of disagreements should not be allowed to conceal very substantial areas of agreement.

Purposes Served by Division Membership.

The questionnaire allowed for the evaluation of six possible reasons for joining the Division (Table 10). Each of the six reasons is of great importance to some significant segment of the membership, and of at least moderate importance to a majority. There is a clear order of priority,

with "To exchange scientific and professional ideas with colleagues," and "To create and project a sound public image of my field" rating high, and "To promote personal contact with colleagues" following closely. These three main reasons for joining the Division are also the three reasons least often judged to be served adequately, although a solid majority feel they are served at least partially. As might be expected, those who rate a particular purpose as of great importance tend also to rate this purpose as being served less than adequately. All of the purposes merit attention in the Division's activities.

10. Purposes Served by Division Membership*

Purpose	Importance to Member Personally			How Well Purpose is Served		
	Great	Moderate	Slight	Adequately	Partially	Not at All
Information Exchange	49%	41%	9%	34%	52%	12%
Representation to Public	46	38	13	24	57	16
Contact with Colleagues	34	47	17	29	41	28
Professional Obligation	32	45	22	55	34	8
Representation within APA	23	50	25	59	23	11
Personal Identification	13	40	45	46	31	21

*In this and following tables, percentages do not add up to 100 because of omission of non-responses. Non-response rates are less than 5%, except where noted.

There is ample room for improvement in how well each is served. Each of the purposes is served "adequately" for some substantial segment of the membership.

Issues of Future Choice in Policy and Program Emphasis.

The old question of balance of emphasis among scientific, professional and technological interests is not resolved by this survey (Table 11). Each of the three is rated as of great importance by about half of the membership and of moderate importance by another third or more. Half or more of the respondents say that the present emphasis on each is about right. A substantial minority would like each to receive more emphasis, especially in the area of "scientific problems; theory; research," which 47 percent say is now emphasized too little. Apparently

11. Issues of Future Choice in Policy and Program Emphasis

	Emphasis Should Have			Emphasis Has Now		
	Great	Moderate	Slight	Too Much	About Right	Too Little
Application problems; skills, techniques	60%	34%	4%	7%	53%	36%
Scientific problems; theory; research	55	36	7	5	46	44
Professional problems; status and role	42	47	9	9	60	25

members feel generally that all three problem areas merit emphasis, and about equally.

Membership in the Division.

Members were asked about the emphasis that should be given to three issues of membership: (1) unethical practices, (2) membership standards, and (3) attracting new members (Table 12). All three are judged to merit great or moderate emphasis, with ethics and membership standards having priority. A great majority feel that the emphasis now given to each is about right, although a significant minority say that unethical practices (30 percent) and attraction of members (22 percent) are now emphasized too little.

12. Membership in the Division*

	Emphasis Should Have			Emphasis Has Now		
	Great	Moderate	Slight	Too Much	About Right	Too Little
Unethical practices	49%	42%	9%	2%	68%	30%
Standards for admission	41	52	7	6	84	10
Attraction of new members	25	57	18	4	74	22

*In Tables 12 and 13, non-respondents are omitted in computing percentages. An inadvertent defect in questionnaire reproduction resulted in a high but, presumably, non-biasing non-response rate.

The point about ethics will come up again; the membership is concerned about the role of the Division in the establishment and surveillance of ethical practices.

Representation of Special Problems and Interests.

How should the Division allocate its attention among the special interests of labor, management of public and private organizations, private consulting, the military, and academia? This question is one of the main sources of divisiveness among members, as each has some special interest to be served and attention must be restricted in some fashion (Table 13).

13. Representation of Special Problems and Interests*

	Emphasis Should Have			Emphasis Has Now		
	Great	Moderate	Slight	Too Much	About Right	Too Little
Management of Private Enterprises	44%	43%	13%	4%	60%	36%
Private Consulting	39	50	11	12	61	27
Academic	26	57	17	22	61	17
Labor; Labor Unions	22	61	17	4	43	53
Management of Public Agencies	19	58	23	7	66	27
Military	10	56	34	27	63	10

*See footnote, Table 12 above.

On the whole, members feel that all six of these special interests have a place in the Divisional program--all six categories are judged by a large majority to merit moderate or great emphasis. However, there is a marked hierarchy of desired emphasis, with the representation of

private enterprises and private consulting heading the list and the representation of the military and of public agencies trailing. The differences are large; for example, 44 percent say that the management of private enterprises should have "great" emphasis, while only 10 percent say this for military interests. The intermediate ranking of emphasis on academic and labor union interests will surprise many.

A majority--60 percent or more--say that the emphasis on each of these special interests is now "about right," with the notable exception of the interests of labor and labor unions, which a majority say are now underemphasized in the Division's policies and programs. Military and academic interests are singled out by a quarter as being now emphasized too much.

Clearly there are divisions of interest as to the sectors of the membership and the clientele that should be favored by Division program emphasis, yet no area of special interest dominates and none is singled out for exclusion.

Interest in Convention Activities.

A very substantial majority of the membership claim to have at least a moderate interest in convention activities such as symposia, discussion groups, workshops, and paper-reading sessions (Table 14). Symposia and special interest discussion groups stand out in preference, while paper-reading sessions and social hours rate much lower in esteem.

	Member's Interest			Responsibility of Division		
	Great	Moderate	Slight	No	Undecided	Yes
Symposia	55%	36%	5%	1%	4%	91%
Special Interest Discussion Groups	49	39	8	1	14	80
Workshops	34	39	23	3	9	83
Paper-Reading Sessions	21	58	17	3	9	84
Social Hours	21	52	23	10	24	62

All of these convention activities are clearly judged to be a responsibility of the Division, with the possible exception of social hours, for which 35 percent question the Division's responsibility.

Divisional Services on Professional Problems.

Members were asked about their interest in Divisional aid on professional problems of these kinds: enforcement of ethical standards, certification, job placement, legal aid, and income improvement (Table 15).

The matter of enforcement of ethical standards stands out. Sixty-eight percent say this is of great interest to them personally, and another 28 percent say it is of moderate interest. Eighty percent, furthermore, say this is definitely a responsibility of the Division.

15. Divisional Services on Professional Problems

	Member's Interest			Responsibility of Division		
	Great	Moderate	Slight	No	Undecided	Yes
Enforcement of Ethical Standards	66%	26%	4%	8%	11%	77%
Obtaining Certification	31	41	24	22	25	48
Job Placement	26	45	25	16	24	55
Aid with Legal Problems	19	43	34	16	31	47
Income Improvement	27	36	32	40	32	24

The other four areas of Divisional service on professional problems show a diversity of opinion, in sharp contrast to the unanimity regarding enforcement of ethical practices. Aid with income improvement is apparently a matter of relatively small interest, and three-quarters doubt that this is a responsibility of the Division. On the issues of aid in certification, job placement, and professional-legal problems, there is at least a moderate interest among most members, and they split about evenly on whether they should definitely be a responsibility of the Division.

Divisional Training Activities.

About three-quarters report great or moderate interest in such training activities as: Setting standards for doctoral programs, promoting internship plans, sponsoring post-doctoral training institutes, and

16. Divisional Training Activities

	Member's Interest			Responsibility of Division		
	Great	Moderate	Slight	No	Undecided	Yes
Setting Standards for Ph. D. Programs	39%	40%	17%	11%	25%	60%
Promoting Internship Plans	27	45	24	9	21	63
Sponsoring Post-Doctoral Programs	30	40	26	13	23	59
Promoting Graduate Scholarship	28	44	24	17	27	52

promoting graduate study fellowships (Table 16). Better than half of the membership say these clearly should be a responsibility of the Division, and about a quarter are doubtful. A small minority--10 to 15 percent--feel that these training activities should not be a Divisional responsibility.

Special Services.

Members were asked about their interest in, and the Division's responsibility for, certain special services, including public relations, publications (journal and/or newsletter), and sponsorship of new state, local, or special interest groups (Table 17).

17. Special Services of The Division

	Member's Interest			Responsibility of Division		
	Great	Moderate	Slight	No	Undecided	Yes
Public Relations	38%	44%	14%	5%	16%	75%
Publication of Journal(s)	38	40	18	21	25	50
Publication of Newsletter	32	46	18	10	21	65
Formation of Special Groups	16	37	43	32	33	31
Formation of State and Local Chapters	17	30	48	33	28	35

The first of these stands out. Thirty-nine percent say they have a great interest in public relations, and another 46 percent have a moderate interest. A solid majority of 78 percent feel that improvement of public relations for industrial psychology definitely should be a responsibility of the Division.

Publication of a journal or of a newsletter rate equally high (with public relations) in the interests of the membership, but the Division's responsibility is not so clear. Only half consider that publication of a journal should be a responsibility of the Division, and 22 percent say it definitely should not be. Publication of a Divisional newsletter is thought by a majority to be a responsibility of the Division.

As to the sponsorship of additional local and special interest membership groups, half are rather cool to the idea, and less than 20 percent express great interest; the members split evenly as to whether this activity should definitely be or not be a responsibility of the Division.

A Note on Sub-Group Differences.

Analysis was made to assess differences between Ph. D. and non-Ph.D. members, and between those in different employment categories. While there are many differences that are statistically significant, few seem to be of much help in illuminating the members' view of the Division. In general, there is a remarkable uniformity of viewpoint among the several sub-groups. Some instances of difference are noted below.

Non-Ph. D. members constitute about 15 percent of the membership. They differ from Ph. D. 's in these ways:

- more interest and concern about methods in application of psychology, and about problems of labor, private enterprises, certification and job placement. More feeling that these are now underemphasized.
- less interest in the post-Ph. D. training activities of the Division, and a notable positive interest in the convention workshops.

- more interest in Division-sponsored communication through Divisional journal(s) or newsletter and through the encouragement of new regional or special interest membership groups.

Members employed in educational institutions are about 27 percent of the membership. They differ from those otherwise employed in these ways:

- more concern about scientific problems and special academic interests, coupled with a belief that these are now relatively underemphasized.
- more interest in advanced professional and scientific training-- e.g., scholarships, internships, post-Ph. D. training, Ph. D. program standards.

Members self-employed (including those with consulting firms) make up about 26 percent of the membership. They are a rather strongly deviant sub-group in their view of the Division, as follows:

- they have greater concern about public relations, professional (as contrasted with scientific or technical) problems, ethical conduct, certification, and the special problems of private consulting and private enterprises.
- they feel that these concerns are, on the whole, underemphasized, and that there is some overemphasis on military and academic matters.
- they are less interested than others in Divisional communications as in convention activities, or a Divisional journal or newsletter.
- in comparison with others, they are less favorable in their view of how well all of the Division's purposes are now served.

WHAT WE WOULD LIKE TO DO

The members of Division 14 were queried extensively regarding the APA Convention, the Division 14 Workshops, other Division activities, and the structure of their own professional and scientific interests.

The APA Convention.

The interest of the membership in the Convention is indicated by their attendance at conventions. The results here are impressive: 85 percent of the respondents have attended one or more APA conventions in the last five years, and almost a quarter had attended all five conventions (Table 18).

16. Number of Conventions Attended in the Last Five Years

Number of Conventions	Percent Attending
None	14%
One	13
Two	18
Three	19
Four	14
Five	21
Unreported	1

However, Ph. D. 's attend more often than non-Ph. D. 's and those who are self-employed attend less often than those who are institutionally employed. Fifty percent of the respondents said that they intended to attend the 1962 meeting, and again less for non-Ph. D. 's than for the self-employed.

There are three primary reasons for not attending the APA Convention: the expense (13 percent), the inconvenience of the date (13 percent), and the inability to spare the time from work (16 percent). Only two percent say that they do not like the programs and only five percent say that they just don't like conventions. Of minor interest here is that the only difference in percentages among the employment categories is that the educationally employed often mention expense and inconvenience of date, but they appear to have no difficulty taking the time from their work, whereas the self-employed are relatively unmindful of the expense but say that they have difficulty taking time from their work.

With respect to the Division 14 program, members overwhelmingly (77 percent) accept the status quo with respect to the amount of time allotted to it.

As between paper-reading sessions and symposia, there is a general strong endorsement of more symposia, with the self-employed being somewhat more positive in this assertion than the educationally employed. There is general endorsement of the idea of more small group discussion both of research interests and of problems of practice. On the issue of whether to invite more speakers to participate in the program, there is an endorsement of the status quo, but with about 25 percent of the respondents wanting more invited speakers.

Should the programs emphasize theoretical or applied interests? The response reflects a clear schism in the Division. Approximately one-third of the respondents (26 percent) want more emphasis on theoretical interests; approximately a third (35 percent) want the same balance as now exists, and the remainder (29 percent) want more emphasis on applied interests. The educationally employed vote for more emphasis on theoretical interests, and the self-employed vote for more applied interests. The Ph. D. 's follow the general split of the total group, but the non-Ph. D. 's vote over-

whelmingly for more applied interests. There would appear to be a rather clear conflict of need between the academicians and the applied psychologists that will not yield to a simple majority decision.

Division Workshops.

There have been eleven Division 14 Workshops since 1953, and 62 percent of the respondents have never attended one. Eighteen percent have attended one and 15 percent two or more. The breakdown is approximately the same for the several education and employment categories. Four percent said they planned to attend this year's workshop, and 72 percent said they did not; 20 percent were undecided.

Again, expense and not being able to spare the time are the major reasons for not attending. However, far more of the respondents are critical of the Workshop format than were critical of the Division 14 program in general. More self-employed than educationally employed do not like the program of the workshop, and about 20 percent of the respondents took the time to list specific reasons for not attending. A number of people feel that they are too elementary in content, and others do not believe this was a very appropriate activity for people with doctorates-- " . . . can't imagine substituting workshops for relevant scholarship. Ph. D.'s with workshops, yet!"

19. Percent of Members Checking Interest in Participation in Division Activities

Activity	Total	Education	
		Ph. D.	Other
Meet regularly with an informal group of industrial psychologists in your nearest metropolitan area?	54%	50%	75%
Participate in a symposium for APA convention?	51	53	38
Serve as a member of a Division 14 committee?	50	51	46
Be guest speaker at a meeting of businessmen?	48	49	48
Be a guest lecturer at a graduate student seminar in psychology?	46	49	33
Attend a Division 14 Workshop?	37	35	48
Organize a symposium for APA convention?	25	28	9
Be an officer of Division 14?	25	27	15
Serve on a committee investigating a violation of ethical standards?	22	24	13
Serve as chairman of a Division 14 committee?	21	22	12
Chair or lecture a Division 14 Workshop?	19	21	9
Serve on an ABEPF reading committee?	14	17	0
Help edit and publish a Division 14 newsletter?	12	11	17

Other Division 14 Activities.

The members were asked to check the activities, from a list of thirteen, in which they would like to participate (Table 19). Popular activities (checked by 40 percent or more) are: meeting regularly with informal local groups of industrial psychologists, participation in an APA convention symposium, being a guest speaker at a meeting of businessmen (checked by 66 percent of the self-employed), being a guest lecturer at a graduate student seminar (this was also exceptionally popular with the self-employed), and, finally, serving on a Division 14 committee. The academically employed prefer to participate in symposia and to serve as members of Division 14 committees.

Relatively unpopular activities include: chairing or lecturing at a Division 14 workshop, editing and publishing a Division 14 newsletter, and serving on an ABEPP reading committee.

Scientific and Professional Interests.

The members were asked about their own interest in a variety of topical areas and how well they felt each area is represented in the Division programs and activities. The members were also asked to indicate whether they think each area is or is not a responsibility of the Division (Table 20).

As the table suggests, there are a number of distinct interest clusters. Individual assessment, individual performance, opinion attitude measurement and morale, and organization theory are primary interests of 40 percent or more of the members (and secondary interests of almost everyone else), they are felt to be very well or fairly well represented by all but a few of those who have each as a primary interest, and a negligible percent feel that they should be left to other divisions.

On the other hand, mental health at work is a primary interest to only 12 percent of the members, but five out of six of these say it is not well represented, while a third of the membership (presumably other members) say it is not an area of concern to Division 14.

Another cluster involves human factors: job and equipment design and environmental factors. Of the minority who claim each as a primary interest, a significant fraction feel it is not represented, but almost a fifth of the membership feel it is no concern of the Division.

Finally, market analysis, public opinion, product design and acceptance, and advertising and promotion form a third cluster of interest

to a small minority--15 percent or less--of the members, who are dissatisfied with the extent of recognition each of these areas receives in the Division. A quarter of the membership is not willing to accord these areas any place among Division concerns.

20. Percent of Respondents Expressing Interest in Various Content Areas, and Respondents' Perception of How Well These Interests Are Represented in Division 14

Content Area	Primary Interest to	Primary Interest, Not Represented	Very or Fairly Well Represented	Leave To Other Divisions
Individual Assessment	53%	3%	85%	6%
Vocational Training	30	3	79	3
Individual Performance	47	4	80	2
Mental Ill Health at Work	12	10	41	32
Job Description and Evaluation	16	3	72	1
Job Design, Equipment	12	4	66	18
Environmental Factors	9	3	59	18
Performance Assessment	20	4	67	6
Opinion-Morale-Attitude	40	6	74	3
Organization Planning	38	13	53	3
Personnel Policy Development	23	9	55	2
Interpersonal Relations	34	4	73	9
Organization Theory	43	9	68	4
Market Analysis	11	7	50	26
Public Opinion	14	5	58	26
Product Design and Acceptance	9	6	41	25
Advertising, Promotion	9	5	46	25

The first clustering seems to represent those members who would extend Division 14 to embrace some of the concerns of Division 12; the second, those who do not subscribe to the fractioning off of Division 19; and the third, those who did not follow into Division 23. For the majority of the membership, the specialization implicit in the emergence of the latter two divisions seems to be well accepted.

PARTICIPANTS VERSUS NON-PARTICIPANTS

Although the survey sample seems to be representative of the membership of Division 14, it is possible to be led astray if the data interpretation is confined to the total sample, or to sub-group categories of educational and professional affiliation. Accordingly, an analysis was undertaken to compare "participants" and "non-participants."

One item was selected to split the sample . . . "How many Division 14 annual business meetings have you attended in the last five

years?" Arbitrarily, participants were defined as those who have attended two or more business meetings in the past five years. With this split, 54 percent of the respondents were tagged as "non-participants," and the remaining 46 percent as "participants." Further, of the "non-participants" (282 cases), 65 percent had not attended a single Division 14 meeting in the past five years!

A preliminary analysis was made to see if there were any obvious sources of bias to account for response differences. The participants do not differ significantly from the total sample in terms of year of birth or educational level, although they do contain an underrepresentation of the West Coast contingent. The differences and tests of significance were analyzed on the basis of the proportion of participants responding in a given way versus the proportion in the total sample.

Participants are more likely than non-participants to be Fellows and Diplomates in Industrial Psychology. A higher proportion of the participants answered correctly the information questions about Division 14. If we may consider wrong answers to the question, "Who will be President for the 1962-63 term?", the participants favored Katzell, whereas the total group favored Stagner. This was not a significant difference. The correct answer is McGehee: the correct answer received the highest count.

As to the purposes served by Division 14, participants differed from the total group in that a higher proportion of the former thought that "promotion of personal contact with colleagues" was of great importance to them, and more of them said that "Division 14 does not serve this purpose at all for me." Also, a higher proportion of participants indicated that the promotion of exchange of scientific and professional information was of great importance to them. Fewer of them said that the Division did not at all serve this purpose.

For issues that the Division 14 program should emphasize in the future, more participants thought that "scientific problems, research and theory" should receive great emphasis. More of them also thought this area receives too little emphasis at present.

A greater proportion of the participant group said that the area of labor and labor unions receives too little emphasis at present. The same opinion was shared by the total sample as well, but the participant--non-participant differences were significant.

In the area of interests in activities and professional functions, it was found that "participants participate." More of them are very interested in symposia, workshops, special interest discussion groups, social hours, enforcing ethical standards, and establishing Ph. D. program standards. More of the participants submit nominations, vote in elections, have been nominated for Division offices and have served on committees. Of the

participant group, 99 percent have attended two or more conventions in the past five years. The figure for the total sample is 72 percent. More of them said they would attend at St. Louis. More of them believe the time allotted to the program is "about right," and that there should be more emphasis on theoretical interests and more opportunities for small groups to discuss research interests. More of the participants belong to informal professional groups (41 percent versus 25 percent for the total sample), and more of them have attended workshops.

In the group of items concerning activities in which members would like to take part (organizing and participating in symposia, being a guest lecturer, chairing or serving on a Division committee, being a Division officer, etc.), the participants responded positively in greater proportion. One exception was: "Help edit and publish a Division 14 newsletter."

Finally, in the area "Content Interests," more of the participants indicated primary interest in the cluster of topics including: individual performance assessment, merit rating, measurement of skill and knowledge, and performance criteria. As for content areas that should be left to other divisions, the participants did not differ from the total sample.

Any course of action developed on the basis of a survey such as this should probably be weighted in favor of people who are active participants in the Division activities. However, while all the differences mentioned are significant, it should be noted that they would alter the interpretation of the data obtained from the total sample in only a few instances.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The typical industrial psychologist who belongs to Division 14 was born during or shortly after World War I and reached his professional maturity during or shortly after World War II. He has earned his doctorate and, if the state in which he resides or works has a certification procedure, he probably holds a certificate or license. Only a minority, however, now possess the ABEP diploma, and, if intentions are a guide, that situation does not seem likely to change in the near future.

He works for someone else, in industry, college or university, government, or a consulting firm. In the field since the end of World War II, he has been with his present employer for almost the last half of that period--a rather stable employment experience.

He joined Division 14 out of diverse individual purposes, and he sees the Division as a multiple-purpose organization. He wishes for an equal balance of concern with scientific, technological, and professional problems and more emphasis on all three.

He acknowledges the presence of diverse special interests, largely arising from different individual employment relationships and responsibilities, but he does not wish to exclude any of these special interests nor to concentrate on any one or two. He feels particularly an imbalance with respect to interests concerning labor and labor unions and wishes more emphasis to be given to them.

He is concerned about ethical practices and their enforcement, and would like to see more emphasis of this Divisional responsibility.

There are a number of activities in advanced training, convention meetings, professional aid to members, and communications which he sees as meriting interest; all of these, with one or two possible exceptions, are viewed as responsibilities of the Division.

By and large, however, he has permitted the affairs of the Division to be run by its "senior citizens"--Fellows with the Ph.D. Even among these only a minority have taken an active role. This may well be due to the fact that the number of jobs open is always small in relation to the size of the total membership. However, there is little indication that he would like to become much more active himself. He would be willing to participate in a symposium, make a speech, meet with fellow psychologists, or serve on a committee, but he would not be interested in taking on assignments that are likely to involve much work, such as, for example, editing a newsletter (which he thinks should be published).

Finally, he views the Division as having opportunities and responsibilities beyond those now realized. He wants it to do more, to enlarge its sphere of activity, and to take on some responsibilities that are now slighted. He has offered guidelines for the Division's officers, committees, and self-motivated activists. What follows seems to be up to them.