

UNIV
SHELF

Call. Univ. Inst of Ind. Rel. (L.A.) c.2

Reprinted from

VOLUME 3, NUMBER 2 - SUMMER, 1950

Personnel Psychology

The Personal Factor in Labor Mediation

Irving R. Weschler

A JOURNAL OF
APPLIED RESEARCH

INSTITUTE OF INDUSTRIAL
RELATIONS LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY

INSTITUTE OF
INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

RECEIVED

DEC 11 1950

Personnel Psychology

A JOURNAL OF APPLIED RESEARCH

Edited by:

G. FREDERIC KUDER, CHARLES I. MOSIER, AND ERWIN K. TAYLOR

EDITORIAL ADVISERS:

GEORGE K. BENNETT, Psychological Corporation

WALTER VAN DYKE BINGHAM, 1661 Crescent Place N. W.,
Washington 9, D. C.

M. W. RICHARDSON, Richardson, Bellows, Henry and Co.

EDITORIAL BOARD: John D. Coakley, *Dunlap Associates*; Neal Drought, *Radio Corporation of America*; Jack Dunlap, *Dunlap Associates*; Paul M. Fitts, *Ohio State University*; John Flanagan, *American Institute for Research*; E. N. Hay, *Edward N. Hay and Associates*; Carl Hovland, *Yale University*; Daniel Katz, *Survey Research Center*; William McGehee, *Fieldcrest Mills*; Walter J. McNamara, *International Business Machines Corporation*; Jay L. Otis, *Western Reserve University*; Robert C. Rogers, *Socony-Vacuum Co., Inc.*; C. L. Shartle, *Ohio State University*; and Robert Wherry, *Ohio State University*.

MANUSCRIPTS and editorial communications should be sent to G. Frederic Kuder, Department of Psychology, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina. For details concerning the type of article appropriate, please see the inside back cover.

Personnel Psychology is issued quarterly (Spring, Summer, Autumn and Winter), one volume per calendar year, at Washington, D. C. Entered as second-class matter September 4, 1948 at the Post Office at Washington, D. C. under the Act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry at Baltimore, Maryland.

SUBSCRIPTION RATE, \$6.00 per volume; foreign, \$7.00 per volume. Single copies, \$2.00. Subscriptions and business communications should be sent to PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY, INC., 1727 Harvard Street, N. W., Washington 9, D.C.

COPYRIGHT, 1950, BY PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY, INC.

Personnel Psychology

A JOURNAL OF APPLIED RESEARCH

VOL. 3, NO. 2

SUMMER, 1950

Contents

The Personal Factor in Labor Mediation. <i>Irving R. Weschler</i>	113
The Dollar Criterion—Applying the Cost Accounting Concept to Criterion Construction. <i>H. E. Brogden and E. K. Taylor</i>	133
Identifying the Faker. <i>G. Frederic Kuder</i>	155
A Method for the Study of Bargaining Conferences. <i>Wesley H. Osterberg</i>	169
Validation of Group Oral Performance Test. <i>Milton Mandell</i>	179
Normative and Validity Data for the Purdue Mechanical Adaptability Test. <i>Harold F. Rothe</i>	187
The L.O.M.A. Merit Rating Scales. <i>Leonard W. Ferguson</i>	193
Validity of Tests for Insurance Office Personnel. II. <i>Frank J. Holmes</i>	217
A Warm-Up Test. <i>Edward N. Hay</i>	221
Book Reviews	225
<i>Super's Appraising Vocational Fitness</i> , reviewed by <i>J. B. Boyd</i>	
<i>Bennett and Cruikshank's A Summary of Clerical Tests</i> , reviewed by <i>W. J. E. Crissy</i>	
<i>Stuit, Dickson, Jordan and Schloerb's Predicting Success in Professional Schools</i> , reviewed by <i>Marjorie McGillicuddy</i>	
<i>Bellows' Psychology of Personnel in Business and Industry</i> , reviewed by <i>William E. Erickson</i>	
<i>Piéron's La Psychologie Différentielle</i> , reviewed by <i>W. J. E. Crissy</i>	
<i>Vernon and Parry's Personnel Selection in the British Forces</i> , reviewed by <i>E. K. Taylor</i>	
<i>Dooher and Marquis' The Supervisor's Management Guide</i> , reviewed by <i>Stanley G. Dulsky</i>	
<i>Given's Bottom-Up Management</i> , reviewed by <i>Ruth Freeman</i>	
Personnel Psychology Abroad. <i>John B. Carroll</i>	239
Today and Yesterday, No. 10. On Some Uses for Tests. <i>Walter V. Bingham</i>	253

Publish in PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY

Your article in PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY will reach an audience (both industrial and academic) whose primary interest is in progressive personnel management. Profit from the interchange of research ideas and findings that accrue to those who share their experience. See the inside back cover for details of our publication policy.

Subscribe to PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY

PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY brings you the latest findings and most advanced thinking in the application of scientific psychological research to the problems of personnel management. Students, technicians, administrators, and executives can all profit from this readable source of important progress. Keep abreast of developments in this important area. Order your subscription now.

PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY

**1727 HARVARD STREET, N. W.,
WASHINGTON 9, D. C.**

Please send PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY to

Name.....

Address.....

City & State.....

Attn.....

(Please type or print)

Remittance for Six dollars (\$6.00) is enclosed.....

Please send bill.....

The Personal Factor in Labor Mediation

By IRVING R. WESCHLER, *Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, Los Angeles*

THE PROBLEM

IN THE development of labor-management relations, the role of the industrial mediator has become increasingly important. Public scrutiny has been directed toward the mediator as one of the principal agents for settling conflicts between employers and employees. The press and the public generally have come to rely increasingly on these mediators for assurance that the use of economic force will not seriously interfere with necessary productive and distributive processes.

During recent years many important investigations have dealt with the dynamic relationships between organized labor and management groups, but comparatively little has been studied about the modes of operation and qualifications of the third parties who participate in industrial peace negotiations either in the role of conciliators, mediators or arbitrators. A few articles have been published about the nature of the mediation process (2, 7), but not much is known about the activities of the individual mediator, the manner in which he is selected (4), or the methods by which his performance is measured. Even fewer data are available about the job or performance standards which the mediator is supposed to maintain during the execution of his various missions.

The investigation here reported represents an effort to study the collective personality of active labor mediators and to isolate those significant differences among the personality vari-

Irving R. Weschler is a Research Assistant in the Institute of Industrial Relations of the University of California, Los Angeles, and a lecturer in psychology at that institution. He received his Ph.D. from U.C.L.A. in 1949, and has published several articles in the field of industrial psychology.

ables which distinguish a group of "good" mediators from a group of "poor" mediators. Such a study does not necessarily rest upon the assumption that "good" mediators are different from other types of human beings. On the other hand, it is quite possible, and even likely, that a group of "good" mediators might have shared certain experiences or be endowed with certain traits which facilitate the successful performance of their work. With this distinction in mind, the aim of this study is to throw light upon the status of the mediator in the settlement of labor-management disputes and to evaluate his background and personality as they affect the successful performance of his work.

Specifically, we shall attempt to answer the following questions:

1. Who are the mediators who are now active in the field, and how did they enter the occupation?
2. Can mediators be characterized by a personality pattern of similar backgrounds, interests, experience and abilities?
3. Are there any criteria of performance or evaluation by which a group of "good" mediators can be distinguished from a group of "poor" mediators?

THE METHOD

The first step was to collect the names of persons now active in mediation work, and to obtain their agreement to participate. Personal letters, signed by Edgar L. Warren, Director of the Institute of Industrial Relations at the University of California, Los Angeles, and formerly Director of the U. S. Conciliation Service, were sent to all members of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, to persons in the New York and California state mediation services and to a few people who are not full-time mediators but who are known to accept assignments in times of emergency. 232 letters were sent out, and 146 persons indicated their willingness to take part in the study. *Biographical material*, which it was hoped

would reveal pertinent life history variables that might account for differences in performance between "good" and "poor" mediators, was requested on a specially constructed "Biographical Record Blank." In addition to the usual questions on age, sex, marital status (but not name), this covered education, membership in professional, fraternal or work organizations, political and religious beliefs, method of entry into the mediation profession and others pertaining to the work status of the individual.

The most difficult step consisted of the establishment of a validating procedure, designed to provide an adequate division of the sample population into "good" and "poor" mediators. A number of techniques were suggested, such as examining the rating of supervisors or interviewing the parties who were involved in the subject's last three active mediation cases, but none of these alternatives was practically feasible. The course finally adopted consisted of the following procedure: all those mediators who had indicated their willingness to participate in the study were listed on a so-called "Labor Mediator Evaluation Blank." The order of the listing was alphabetical, except that the staff members of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the people from the New York State Board of Mediation and the representatives of the California Conciliation Service were treated as unit groups.

This rating blank was sent to all participants with the following instructions:

Below you will find the names of all active mediators who are participating with us in our study on the importance of the personal factor in labor mediation. You are asked to examine this list carefully and to evaluate the recent work of these people to the best of your ability.

In column # 1, please check all mediators with whom you are personally acquainted.

In column # 2, please indicate under (+) three mediators among your personal acquaintances whom you would pick for an assignment of importance, and under (-) three mediators whom you would pass up in your selection.

In column #3, please check all mediators whose work you know of only by reputation.

In column #4, please repeat the rating procedure with those mediators whose work you know of only by reputation.

The scoring originally consisted of an arbitrarily selected award of 10 points for each "plus" in the "acquaintance column" and 5 points for each "plus" in the "reputation column." The subject's individual rating was computed by dividing the sum of his award points by the number of people who knew him personally and by reputation. An analysis of the completed rating sheets disclosed an unreasonably large variance of scores, due largely to the disproportionate influence of the reputation factor. A rescoring of the ratings, eliminating the reputation factor and considering only the acquaintance points, provided a more normal and probably more representative distribution of scores. The rating of those individuals who were known only by four or less acquaintances was ignored because it was felt that one favorable or unfavorable response might have too great an effect on the subject's final score. The average ratings now ranged from +6.00 to -4.50, with the mean rating being slightly in the "plus" direction. This is due to the fact that some of the mediators were willing to award positive ratings to their fellow subjects but did not give the negative ratings which were also called for.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to go into a detailed statistical analysis of distribution of ratings which were obtained by each individual mediator. However, it is of interest that there was fairly close agreement among the raters as to the performance capabilities of any given individual within the sample group. Thus, 46 members in the sample received *only* positive ratings, 42 only negative ratings, 28 mixed ratings, with one of the two variables usually dominating, and 30 individuals received no ratings at all.

The breakdown of the population sample into "good" and "poor" mediator groups was undertaken with the following considerations in mind. All those mediators who received a

rating of plus 1 or over, a total of 46, were included in the "good" group, while all those mediators who received a minus rating of any size, a total of 51, were lumped into the "poor" classification. Those mediators whose ratings were based on the opinion of four or less acquaintances were included in the "no rating" category, and were not represented in the quality

TABLE 1
Distribution of Performance Ratings of Mediators

	MEDIATOR'S RATED SCORE	NO. OF MEDIATORS
"Good"	5.01 and above	3
	4.01 to 5.00	5
	3.01 to 4.00	7
	2.01 to 3.00	7
	1.01 to 2.00	24
	Total "good" mediators	46
"Other"	0.01 to 1.00	19
	No rating	30
	Total "other" mediators	49
"Poor"	-0.01 to -1.00	13
	-1.01 to -2.00	15
	-2.01 to -3.00	9
	-3.01 to -4.00	8
	-4.01 and below	6
	Total "poor" mediators	51
Total participating mediators.....		146

breakdown of the sample population. (See Table 1.) Although the ratings were based upon the names of the subjects, any further manipulations made use of the assigned code numbers and preserved the anonymity of the participants.

The validating procedure which has been described may be criticized on the ground that these ratings do not represent performance evaluations, but rather serve as popularity indicators of the various participants. It may also be claimed that the mediation process makes it impossible for co-workers

to arrive at a performance rating, because the activities inherent in the mediator's job are carried out in privacy and do not lend themselves to any form of supervision.

Although these criticisms have some merit, they do not, in this investigator's opinion, impair the usefulness of this validating procedure. Mediation work is carried out by a small group of individuals, many of whom are acquainted with each other and in actual contact during and between mediation assignments. It seems likely, therefore, that a mediator's co-workers are in as good a position as anyone to observe his behavior and personality characteristics and to form judgments concerning the effectiveness of his performance. Mediators are frequently interchanged on their assignments, and their usefulness can be measured by their successors on the basis of the reputation which they have left behind. Furthermore, a few of the participants hold supervisory jobs, and thus their ratings of the people under their jurisdiction may have additional merit.

Recently, an empirical study has been reported by Wherry and Fryer (11), which shows that "buddy ratings"—similar in nature to the type of ratings which were employed in this study—can be successfully used to predict the general performance of candidates in an officer school. Although this method of validation remains relatively unexplored, the available evidence seems to indicate that it is not subject to as many defects as other suggested validation procedures.

Upon completion of the personal rating phase a survey was conducted among the participants to determine their subjective evaluation of factors which might have a bearing in the selection of new personnel for mediation activities. The subjects were asked to check a series of pertinent job variables and to rate the relative importance of their choices. The job dimensions which were included on this "Labor Mediator Rating Blank" were suggested by an examination of the requirements listed by the Civil Service Commission for the job of Mediator on the National Mediation Board (6), by a review of Father Breen's subjective analysis of needed qualifications (1) and

by a careful job analysis by some members of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. Additional space was provided for specific opinions on any item and for the addition of other job dimensions deemed important.

The results of this survey (10) were utilized in the planning of a psychological testing program which it was hoped would permit an objective differentiation between "good" and "poor" mediators, as rated by other mediators, on some of the more or less accessible personal qualifications and aptitudes.

The specific variables to be examined were determined by conferences between staff members of the Institute of Industrial Relations and the Department of Psychology. Since the time which the subjects could give was limited by their professional duties, a battery of tests was chosen which it was believed would provide the most meaningful results under the circumstances. The dimensions finally selected included, in addition to the biographical data, an intelligence test, a personality test, and an information and attitude inventory.

Intelligence was estimated by means of the Wonderlic Personnel Test (12), which was designed for testing adults in business and industrial situations and has been utilized as a selection instrument in the hiring and placing of applicants. The test was mailed for self-administration, and the subjects were asked to cooperate by limiting themselves to the required time of 12 minutes. Although unlimited time norms for the test were available, it was felt that the introduction of the speed factor would provide for more equalized testing conditions; this assumption was borne out by the fact that none of the participants completed the test, the majority attempting between 35 and 45 items.

"*Personality*" *per se* represents a totality of traits which cannot be measured by any given single test nor even by a battery of paper and pencil tests. In the present case it was felt that an instrument might be useful which would permit measurement of certain traits believed to be crucial in the mediation process. The Guilford-Martin Personnel Inventory

(5), which was chosen, consists of 150 items, is self-administrative, requires approximately 15 to 20 minutes to take, and was designed to yield scores on the dimensions of "objectivity," "agreeableness" and "cooperativeness."

Impartiality is one of the main characteristics which job analyses have shown to be important for successful mediation work. Although a mediator cannot perform his activities without "bias"—we do not live in a social vacuum and the person without "bias" does not exist—it was assumed that the mediator whose views on the issues of labor-management relations are less rigid or extreme might be the person more likely to be successful on the job. To test this hypothesis, the author's own "Labor Relations Information Inventory" (8) was utilized. Constructed to measure the subject's information as well as his attitudes toward labor or management, this inventory is based on the "error-choice" principle and contains thirty-four multiple-choice information questions and eleven attitude items. The former cover a wide range of topics and are thought to represent a cross section of the kind of information which a mediator is supposed to possess. The scoring key provides for an award of 1 point for each correct answer, with a possible maximum information score of 34.

The attitude items, technically of the same multiple-choice type as the information items, are "non-factual," that is, they either fail to contain the correct answer among their possible choices, or they are controversial in character or of such nature that the true answer is not easily accessible. Thus, on any given "non-factual" item, the selection of either one of the alternatives is assumed to indicate "bias" in either a pro-labor or a pro-management direction. The eleven items, whose validity had previously been determined, were distributed among the other items of the Labor Relations Information Inventory, with their total collective weights established at 25. Since the items were scored in the "pro-labor" direction, a high score was considered evidence of a favorable attitude toward labor while conversely a low attitude score could be interpreted as a favor-

able attitude toward management. (See Appendix for a sample of the "error-choice" items of the Labor Relations Information Inventory.)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of the results obtained from the biographical data and psychological test materials proceeded along two main lines of inquiry.

The biographical materials permitted an examination of the mediators' personal backgrounds and an investigation of those long-term variables which might help to account for subsequent success or failure on the job. This method of analysis makes possible a comparative treatment of some of those vital experiences which have a direct effect upon the shaping of the total personality and which cannot be adequately identified through the standard interview or testing procedures.

The psychological test materials utilized were chosen because they were thought to tap certain more or less permanent aptitudes or personality characteristics which, although unaffected by the subject's past mediation experience, offer a clue to his potential success on the job. These tools are intended to measure abilities rather than achievement, and are considered useful if they are able to differentiate statistically between two critical groups, such as the "good" and "poor" mediators. Their validity for individual prediction still remains to be investigated, and will depend upon the results of their application in actual hiring situations.

The results which will be presented differ, among other things, in the number of participants who took part in any given phase of the project. Thus, the greatest number of subjects completed the Biographical Record Blank, while the Guilford-Martin Personnel Inventory received the smallest degree of participation. It is interesting that the group of mediators which was rated "good" produced a higher percentage of replies on all test instruments than the group which was rated "poor"; this fact might be interpreted as favorable evidence

for the validity of the rating procedure, if it is assumed that the "good" mediators differentiate themselves from the "poor" in their degree of enthusiasm, good will and cooperation.

The data which were thought to reveal differences between the "good" and the "poor" group of mediators were treated statistically by means of the chi-square technique.¹ Thus, an examination of the *biographical* records revealed a number of variables which differentiated between the "good" and the "poor" mediators. Age turned out to be a statistically valuable indicator, with the majority of "good" mediators falling into

TABLE 2
Age of Mediators

	"YOUNG"			"MIDDLE-AGED"			"OLD"				TOTAL
	Below 30	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	Above 70	
"Good" Mediators.....	0	1	1	4	8	3	0	3	2	0	22
"Other" Mediators.....	1	4	6	10	4	4	3	3	0	1	36
"Poor" Mediators.....	1	2	8	2	2	3	2	4	0	1	25
	2	7	15	16	14	10	5	10	2	2	83

$$\chi^2 = 13.61, \text{ d.f.} = 4, p = .02\% - .05\%.$$

the middle-age range, while those who were classified as "poor" were "either too young or too old." (See Table 2).

Analysis of the educational qualifications of our subjects revealed a high degree of variability; in the present sample there were 15 individuals who had a high-school education or less, while 37 persons had completed work for either the M.A., LL.B. or Ph.D. degrees. From a statistical point of view, there was no clear-cut difference between the "good" and the "poor" mediators, but an inspection of the data points to the fact that a relatively large number of "good" mediators received an "average college education," while a comparatively high percentage of individuals among the "poor" and "other" mediators held an advanced postgraduate degree. (See Table 3.)

¹ GARRETT, H. E. *Statistics in Psychology and Education*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1947, 241-253.

One of the main aspects of this investigation concerned the manner in which the participants received their start in the mediation field. This phase of the analysis limited itself to a job breakdown of the positions held immediately prior to mediation work. The data revealed that the majority of mediators in our sample came from various labor groups, government service or management work, while teaching, law or newspaper experience provided the other channels of entry into the occupation. Again, there were no statistically significant differences among the "good or "poor" mediators, and no one professional preparation seemed to have offered specific advantages over the others.

TABLE 3
Educational Qualifications of Mediators

	GRAMMAR SCHOOL OR BELOW	HIGH SCHOOL	COLLEGE	POST- GRADUATE WORK	TOTAL
"Good" Mediators.....	1	4	10	6	21
"Other" Mediators.....	1	5	9	20	35
"Poor" Mediators.....	0	4	10	11	25
	2	13	29	37	81

χ^2 not significant.

The economic status of the subjects, as determined by a study of their annual income over a period of years and their house ownership, provided some significant differences between the "good" and the "poor" mediators. It seems that the average income of the "good" mediators was quite low during the early thirties, mainly because as a group they were too young to enter the active phase of making a living. On the other hand, the "poor" mediators were doing reasonably well on the average during the depression years, either because the majority of them were old enough to have made an economic start or because they were still so young that they did not affect the above calculations. At the present time, however, the "good" mediators are financially quite well off, and making more money than either the "poor" or the "other" mediators.

(See Table 4.) In terms of house ownership, the preferred income status of the "good" mediators again showed itself by the fact that they owned proportionately more houses than either the "poor" or the "other" mediators, the majority of whom lived in rented apartments.

A series of results which throw some doubt upon the validity of the rating procedure became apparent upon the investigation of the subjects' political and religious preferences. The preliminary job analyses indicated that neither of these variables would have a bearing upon the performance rating of the mediator, but the present findings did not bear out these hypotheses. Regardless of the reasons which account for the appearance of significant differences between the "good" and

TABLE 4
Annual Average Income of Mediators During a Number of Selected Years
(in hundreds of dollars)

	1932	1934	1937	1939	1941	1943	1945	1947
"Good" Mediators.....	27.0	29.5	37.0	36.0	44.5	55.0	63.0	87.0
"Other" Mediators.....	25.5	25.0	26.0	32.0	40.0	56.5	69.5	82.4
"Poor" Mediators.....	40.5	35.0	35.0	39.5	48.0	52.0	57.5	69.0

"poor" mediators on the political and religious dimensions, the data cannot be ignored. In the area of politics, the majority of the mediators identified themselves as Democrats, while others were listed either as Republicans or as "Independents." The breakdown of the data revealed a comparatively high number of Democrats among the "good" mediators, with a statistically significant large number of Republicans and Independents among the "poor" group. (See Table 5.)

In regard to religious preference, the majority identified themselves with various Protestant denominations, while the rest were classified either as Catholics or as Jews. When the subjects' religious preferences were related to their performance ratings as established by their colleagues, a disproportionately high number of Catholics and Jews appeared among the

“poor” mediators, while the Protestants distributed themselves according to expectation. (See Table 6.)

Various hypotheses can be advanced to account for the appearance of these differences among the political and religious variables. It is a well known fact that people tend to rate those individuals high who form a part of their psychological “in-group” and who share a set of common values, goals and mythologies, while they are prone to “veto” those individuals who

TABLE 5
Political Preferences of Mediators

	DEMOCRATS	REPUBLICANS	INDEPENDENTS	TOTAL
“Good” Mediators.....	12	1	3	16
“Other” Mediators.....	21	4	5	30
“Poor” Mediators.....	8	6	6	20
	41	11	14	66

$\chi^2 = 6.71, d.f. = 4, p = .10\% - .15\%.$

TABLE 6
Religious Preferences of Mediators

	PROTESTANTS	CATHOLICS	JEWS	TOTAL
“Good” Mediators.....	12	5	6	23
“Other” Mediators.....	22	5	2	29
“Poor” Mediators.....	9	9	7	25
	43	19	15	77

$\chi^2 = 9.73, d.f. = 4, p = .02\% - .05\%.$

may differ from them with respect to certain other crucial personality characteristics. In the present situation the majority of all the participants belonged to the Democratic Party and also indicated preference for Protestantism; it is therefore plausible that the members of these two groups, representing the majority, would rate each other highly.

Another view might hold that Democrats or Protestants, for some reason or other, do tend to make better mediators than members of political or religious “minority” groups. It may be

possible that the practice of collective bargaining can best be encouraged by those people who believe in the government's policies in this area and who feel that they are contributing to their successful administration. The "real" Republican or the "real" Independent may bring certain concepts and orientations to the job which are measurably different from those held by the so-called "real" Democrats. The mediation and conciliation process is likely to involve a close and continuing contact with divergent social and economic attitudes, and it is possible that the individual's political philosophy may have a bearing upon his performance in the mediation situation.²

The Biographical Record Blank contained a variety of other questions, but the analysis of responses revealed no additional signs which could be interpreted to yield a useful differentiation between the "good" and the "poor" mediators. Most of the mediators who participated are male, married, have two dependents, carry a moderate amount of life insurance, belonged at one time or another to either a management or a union organization, own a car, have limited interests in fraternal or community organizations, enjoy the usual range of hobbies, and have no other source of income than their salary.

The results obtained from the psychological tests were less controversial and generally supported the hypotheses which were originally postulated. The Wonderlic Personnel Test, for instance, which was aimed at getting a measurable difference between "good" and "poor" mediators on a dimension vaguely

² In a recent study of the characteristics of the "industrial rate buster," Dalton (3) was able to show that the political preference of the subject may have a direct bearing upon the person's performance on the job. (An industrial "rate buster" is a worker who, under the operation of an incentive system, consistently exceeds the production limits informally agreed upon by his work group.) In this particular case, Dalton concluded that the "rate buster" will usually be a Republican, who "dislikes labor unions and regards their function as essentially immoral, and who is insensible to the struggle for power between management and labor and of his role in it." The author did not claim that all management has to do to increase production in the manufacturing-operating situation is to employ "Republicans, good family men, non-joiners, non-church-goers, and so on," but the materials which he collected did make possible the positing of certain hypotheses concerning the type of worker who responds most strongly to wage incentives.

called "intelligence," succeeded in obtaining a statistically significant distribution of scores, with the "good" mediators in general obtaining the higher scores. (See Table 7.)

The Guilford-Martin Personnel Inventory was used because it was thought to yield objective scores on such traits as "objectivity," "agreeableness" and "cooperativeness." According to the authors' norms, the mediators in our sample tended to score positively, that is, in the upper fifty per cent of the distribution on all three of the measurable dimensions; the test itself, however, did not differentiate between the "good" and the "poor" groups on any of the above scoring keys.

TABLE 7
Intelligence of Mediators
(Estimated through scores on Wonderlic Personnel Test)

	SCORES ON WONDERLIC PERSONNEL TEST							TOTAL	
	Below 26	27-29	30-32	33-35	36-38	39-41	42-44		45 and above
"Good" Mediators.....	2	3	3	4	6	8	2	2	30
"Other" Mediators.....	2	3	0	4	6	4	4	1	24
"Poor" Mediators.....	2	3	6	1	3	1	1	0	17
	6	9	9	9	15	13	7	3	71
	"Low"		"Medium"		"High"				

$\chi^2 = 10.46, d.f. = 4, p = .02\% - .05\%.$

The *information* items of the Labor Relations Information Inventory tested the mediators' knowledge on a variety of topical problems in industrial relations. The 34 questions emphasized those areas of knowledge which were considered important by the subjects themselves in their evaluation of the traits needed by the "ideal mediator" (10). The analysis of the scores revealed a high degree of knowledge on the part of all mediators. Although a comparatively larger proportion of "good" mediators obtained the higher scores, the results were not statistically significant.

One hypothesis that might account for the failure of the in-

formation items to differentiate statistically between "good" and "poor" mediators is that the possession of specific information is not essential for successful mediation. This view holds that knowledge *per se* is not a factor in the mediation process because the mediator serves as a catalyst rather than as an active participant in the bargaining procedure; accordingly the mediator should be able to utilize his skills under a variety of factual conditions, irrespective of the specific situation at hand. Proponents of this position would eliminate any informational testing provisions which might be contemplated in the future for the selection of new mediators, and would instead emphasize the more or less observational techniques (4) whereby the prospective applicant can be studied under simulated job conditions.

This position ignores the theory held by others that the mediator, unlike the conciliator, is much more than a catalyst; that he must frequently suggest a solution himself which requires a broad understanding of the specific situation as well as of the factors operative in the total situation. The failure of the information items of the Labor Relations Information Inventory to differentiate significantly between mediators may be due to the inadequate nature of the test instrument itself rather than to a lack of importance on the part of the information dimension. This part of the Inventory consists of a relatively small number of items, and it may be that the concepts which are covered therein are part of the daily routine of *any* person active in this field. Furthermore, since no time limit was specified and since each person was free to consult all kinds of source materials (although he was asked not to), it seems reasonable that the easy nature of the test materials plus the other artificial components of the testing situation more than counterbalanced the potential usefulness of the information key.

Probably the most rewarding results of the study appeared in the analysis of the *impartiality* key of the Labor Relations Information Inventory. As will be recalled, this test contained,

in addition to the factual information items, eleven weighted non-factual "error-choice" items which were scored in such a manner that a person's general attitude toward labor or management could be estimated from his performance on this key. A maximum score of 25 points was attainable, representing the highest degree of "pro-labor" sympathy; a score between 16 and 25 was identified as "pro-labor," while a score below 12 was interpreted as falling within the "pro-management" zone. In terms of *impartiality*, a score of 13 to 15 was considered "neutral," and the subject characterized as "open-minded" or "flexible" with respect to the issues under examination.

TABLE 8
Impartiality of Mediators

	SCORES ON THE LABOR RELATIONS INFORMATION INVENTORY			TOTAL
	"Pro-Management" Zone Scores 2-12	"Neutral" Zone Scores 13-15	"Pro-Labor" Zone Scores 16-25	
"Good" Mediators.....	1	7	13	21
"Other" Mediators.....	4	1	19	24
"Poor" Mediators.....	5	0	14	19
	10	8	46	64

$\chi^2 = 14.45, d.f. = 4, p = .01\% - .02\%.$

In the present study, the mediators generally tended to score in the "pro-labor" direction; however, when the distribution of scores between "good" and "poor" mediators was compared, it was found that a high percentage of "good" mediators scored within the so-called "neutral" zone, while all of the "poor" mediators fell either in the "pro-management" or "pro-labor" zones. The results of this analysis are statistically significant, and serve as additional evidence of the usefulness of the "error-choice" method of attitude measurement. (See Table 8.)

These data on impartiality do not imply that most mediators are actively "pro-labor" or prejudiced in any other way. The

test was used to indicate tendencies on the part of mediators to favor unwittingly one side or the other on a number of specific labor relations questions. Obviously, there is a range of attitudes, which makes it possible for only a very small number of persons to fall into the middle or "neutral" range of the distribution. Furthermore, the fact that the majority of mediators in this sample scored in the "pro-labor" direction does not mean that only those mediators who have no leanings of any kind are "good" mediators, a fact which the data themselves will deny. The data simply show that there are a number of "good" mediators, as rated by their colleagues, who made "neutral" as well as "pro-labor" scores, that most labor mediators in the sample made "pro-labor" scores, and finally, that all of the "poor" mediators, as rated by their colleagues, scored either in the "pro-labor" or in the "pro-management" zones.

The data which have been collected for this study could well have been analyzed further to reveal the influence of common variables, which may have affected the consistency and significance of the results. It might have been possible to control all other variables except the one factor under investigation, but in view of the small number of subjects in the study and the usefulness of the raw data analysis, further treatment of the data did not seem justified at this time. This study was intended to be exploratory in nature and has served to indicate that additional work in the area might perhaps result in a number of useful concepts, whose practical application can contribute to the improvement of the nation's labor-management relations.

APPENDIX

Sample factual questions from the Labor Relations Information Inventory.

- (3) In the United States, organized labor comprises a) about 25 per cent of the labor force, b) about 35 per cent of the labor force.

- (11) The monthly publication of the Bureau of Labor Statistics is the a) Labor Letter, b) Monthly Labor Review.

Sample "non-factual" questions from the Labor Relations Information Inventory.

- (4) In 1947, the average weekly earnings in the bituminous coal industry amounted to a) \$76., b) \$56. Correct answer: \$66.
- (5) At present, the following percentage of people in the United States are entirely dependent upon jobs and have very few savings: a) about 55%, b) about 85%. Correct answer: about 70%.
- (15) The recent increases of the price of steel are a) proportional to the wage gains made by the unions, b) proportionally greater than the wage gains made by the unions. Meaningful answer: not easily accessible.
- (24) In 1929, 49% of the corporate wealth in this nation (excluding insurance companies) was controlled by approximately a) 100 corporations, b) 300 corporations. Correct answer: 200 corporations.
- (35) After one year of operation, the Taft-Hartley Act has resulted in a trend a) toward successful management defenses of its rights and prerogatives, b) toward weakening the security of even the largest unions. Correct answer: controversial.

REFERENCES

1. BREEN, V. E. *The United States Conciliation Service*. Washington: Catholic University Press, 1943, 139-150.
2. BULLEN, F. H. The mediation process. In *Proceedings of New York University First Annual Conference on Labor*, 1948, 105-143.
3. DALTON, M. The industrial rate buster: a characterization. *Applied Anthropology*, 1948, 7, 5-17.
4. GELLHORN, W. AND BRODY, W. Supervisory mediators through trial by combat. *Public Administration Review*, 1948, 259-266.
5. Guilford-Martin Personnel Inventory, 1943, published by the Sheridan Supply Company, Box 837, Beverly Hills, California.
6. Mediator Examination Announcement No. 141, U. S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C., issued December 8, 1948.

7. WARREN, E. L. AND BERNSTEIN, I. The mediation process. *Southern Economic Journal*, 1949, 15, 4, 441-458.
8. WESCHLER, I. R. An investigation of attitudes toward labor and management by means of the error-choice method. To be published in the *Journal of Social Psychology*.
9. ———. A follow-up study on the measurement of attitudes toward labor and management. To be published in the *Journal of Social Psychology*.
10. ———. Who should be a labor mediator? *Personnel*, Nov. 1949, 222-228.
11. WHERRY, R. J. AND FRYER, D. H. Buddy ratings: popularity contest or leadership criteria? *Personnel Psychology*, 1949, 2, 147-160.
12. Wonderlic Personnel Test, 1945, published by E. F. Wonderlic, Glencoe, Illinois.

Publish in
**PERSONNEL
PSYCHOLOGY**

PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY solicits manuscripts reporting research methods, research results, or the application of research results to the solution of personnel problems in business, industry, and government. Equally welcome are critical surveys of the literature giving current status of knowledge and research on various phases of personnel psychology such as aspects of training, job and worker analysis, employee relations, morale, etc.

PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY serves a dual audience: the operating personnel official and the personnel technician. To serve both, manuscripts are judged on the basis of three criteria:

- (1) *technical soundness*—Papers are expected to report on adequately designed, well controlled research.
- (2) *readability*—Studies must be well presented. The implications of the research results must be understandable to the personnel executive whose training may have been in fields other than psychology and statistics.
- (3) *practicality*—While articles dealing with basic research problems will be given consideration, priority will be afforded to papers whose implications are for immediate and general problems.

Each article should begin with a non-technical summary presenting the problem and the solution found. If involved technical materials are to be presented, they should be separated from the body of the article and placed in a technical appendix.

Send manuscripts, if possible in triplicate, to:

G. FREDERIC KUDER
Box 6907
College Station
Durham, N. C.

PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY pays all printing costs including reproduction of tables, charts and graphs. Authors are charged for any revisions made in proof and for the cost of redrawing charts, graphs, or illustrations when necessary.

One hundred reprints of articles are supplied gratis. Additional copies may be purchased at the time galley proof is returned.

Personnel Psychology