

preface

From start to finish, this is a new book rather than a revision of our *Psychology in Industrial Organizations*, 3d ed., 1974.

Since the publication of the first edition in 1962, much has happened in the field, and to the one of us who did the original writing. As we thought about the task facing us, we came to a selfish realization: It would be easier for us if we began over.

We call this book *Personnel and Organizational Psychology* both to distinguish it from the earlier one and to reflect (equally) the antecedents and present concerns of industrial/organizational psychology.

Our discussion moves freely between theory and application as we attempt to emphasize how each reinforces the other. One of our messages is that professional applications are derived from, and contribute to, furthering the science of human behavior.

We have sought to keep our readers' backgrounds in perspective while delivering this message. The book is written for an undergraduate course. From our own experience, we know that although a few such students are psychology majors, most are not. Many have taken only one or two earlier psychology courses. For a fair number, including adult students returning to studies after some hiatus, this is either a first exposure to a psychology offering, or the first in many years. (And we recognize, finally, that even the institutional context for the course which might use this book varies. It is offered by departments in schools of business administration as well as in psychology departments.)

We have tried to be sensitive to the diverse backgrounds and interests brought to this book by its readers. Many choices about content coverage had to be made. Some topics (such as consumer behavior and job evaluation) are left untreated in our attempt to present a comprehensive, but not encyclopedic, overview of I/O psychology. Within those topics selected for discussion, we chose to sacrifice some breadth in favor of increased depth of coverage.

Certain judgments about what constitutes a balanced treatment are matters of personal preference in which considerable variation can be tolerated. Others are more important in their effect upon a book's teachability, fairness, and accuracy in representing its subject matter, and—for the student—readability. We endeavored to make judgments about the latter

sufficiently well so that instructors and students alike would accept—even though they might not agree with—the former.

Not surprisingly, the book's primary organizing concept is *performance*. Its structure flows in two directions. First, the discussion moves from issues in defining and measuring performance, to performance prediction, to facilitation. Second, it moves from considering task performance by individuals to considering the behavior of individuals in an organizational context. Hence, the book's two major divisions: Personnel Psychology, and Organizational Psychology.

In spite of our best efforts, certain chapters in both sections are more difficult to read than others. None, however, require students to approach them with specialized backgrounds. We prefer to think that those particular chapters treat topics which, by their nature, require the reader to be intellectually active. These are the chapters which either consider issues typically unfamiliar to undergraduate students or consider familiar issues but in new (to the reader) ways. Chapters 7, Validity and Prediction, and 15, Leadership, are cases in point.

We see our field as vigorous, stimulating in its approach to questions and issues, and socially valuable. Those perceptions were reaffirmed in the process of preparing the manuscript. We hope we succeeded in communicating them.

There are some persons whose contributions to the manuscript must be acknowledged. The task of a critical field reader is sufficiently thankless that one wonders how our colleagues are ever talked into it. We had three readers who had substantial impact in shaping the book from its preliminary manuscript: D. L. Dossett, H. Takooshian, and M. S. Taylor. Their careful, objective readings led each of them to make invaluable suggestions. We agreed with, and therefore implemented, many of them. We may yet regret that we did not implement all of them.

Finally, several typists again did the impossible by helping us make deadlines. We particularly and gratefully acknowledge Linda Corona, A. Elaine Moore, and Dawn Scallan. And we here publicly promise that they will not again be asked to handle a manuscript while also readying an academic department to move across campus.

Laurence Siegel
Irving M. Lane