

KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

INTERVIEW WITH TED H. SHORE

CONDUCTED BY THOMAS A. SCOTT

EDITED AND INDEXED BY JAN HEIDRICH-RICE

for the

KSU ORAL HISTORY SERIES, NO. 33

WEDNESDAY, 4 JANUARY 2006

Kennesaw State University Oral History Project
KSU Oral History Series, No. 33
Interview with Ted H. Shore
Conducted by Thomas A. Scott
Edited and Indexed by Jan Heidrich-Rice
Wednesday, 4 January 2006
Location: Telephone Interview from Pilcher Hall, Kennesaw State University

Tom: Let me just begin, Ted, by asking you when and where you were born and if you'd just talk a little bit about your background.

Ted: I was born in Brooklyn, New York, in 1951. At an early age my parents moved to the town of Franklin Square. Subsequently, they moved to Great Neck, a very affluent Long Island community when my father's business began to thrive.

Tom: So you grew up on Long Island.

Ted: That's correct.

Tom: And then I know that you got your bachelor's degree—you went all the way up to Buffalo, I guess, for that. How did that come about?

Ted: Initially, I attended the University of Hartford in Connecticut and then transferred to State University of New York [SUNY] at Buffalo. When you grew up in New York, it was very common for students to try to get into one of the SUNY colleges and universities. It was very cost-efficient for one's family as an in-state resident, much like it is in Georgia to go to a state school. So that was the rationale. It was a good university and relatively inexpensive.

Tom: You went probably to about one of the coldest places in the world, I guess, going to Buffalo, didn't you?

Ted: Well, there were many times later that I thought I missed the boat by not going to UC [University of California at] Santa Barbara or Santa Cruz instead. Nevertheless, that was what I did at the time.

Tom: What did you get your bachelor's degree in?

Ted: Psychology.

Tom: It was a B.A. degree in psychology?

Ted: That's correct.

Tom: And then, after you got through there, there's kind of a gap before you got a master's from City College of New York. Why don't you talk about that a little bit? What did you do straight out of college?

Ted: Well, that's a little embarrassing in a sense. When I was a senior in college, I decided that I wanted to be a clinical psychologist. I went to my advisor and informed him of that a few months before graduating, and he kind of laughed and said, "Do you know what your odds are?"

Tom: What were the odds?

Ted: Well, the odds were like 1 or 2 percent of those people who applied to clinical psychology Ph.D. programs got accepted nationwide.

Tom: Really?

Ted: For example, at SUNY Buffalo that year they had 500 applicants for 10 openings. I was a pretty average student, and he said basically there was no chance that I was going to get in. When I graduated, I still had that goal. Consequently, I worked for a couple of years for my uncle in the family business in New York. Then I got a master's degree at City College for the purpose of enhancing my qualifications for getting into a Ph.D. program

Tom: I see. So you're still in psychology for the master's program?

Ted: Yes.

Tom: What was there about psychology that attracted you?

Ted: Well, I guess at a fairly early age I decided business was not for me; that to go off and get a bachelor's degree in management or something and then go and work for some company . . . I just didn't feel like that was a good fit. Psychology was just interesting. Unfortunately, it was interesting to a lot of people. In fact, I remember listening to the radio one day when a well-known talk show host said that if the universities produced any more psychology majors, the earth was going to tilt! I guess it was the most popular major in the country for awhile; maybe it still is. Which makes it very difficult when one wants to get into graduate school. Since there is not a lot one can do with a BA in psychology, many students apply to Ph.D. programs. It's far more competitive than getting into medical or law school in terms of numerical odds.

Tom: So you would have been doing your undergraduate degree in the late '60s, early '70s, I guess, during the age of protest on campus, and I guess people were trying to find themselves?

Ted: I guess that's true. It coincided with that whole self-help movement and so forth. Anyway, psychology was inherently interesting to me so I pursued that.

Tom: What kind of business did your uncle have that you worked for?

Ted: He owned an art publishing company in which he published reproductions of famous paintings and art books. I used to go around to the various colleges and run art print sales.

Tom: I bet that was fun.

Ted: It was a lot of work, but it was actually kind of my own little business. I just bought the product from him and rented space at universities and sold the art prints to students, so it was kind of an introduction to doing something entrepreneurial.

Tom: So you're in business whether you wanted to be or not, I guess then.

Ted: That's right. That's how it turned out.

Tom: What did your parents do for a living?

Ted: Well, my father was actually a partner in a printing company that he and his two brothers founded back in 1948 called Shorewood Press—just a small printing company initially. He died, unfortunately, when I was young.

Tom: What was his name?

Ted: His name was Fred. The two remaining brothers then split the company into two separate businesses. One continued with the art publishing business under the name of Shorewood Fine Art Reproductions, which is now owned by New York Graphic Society. One of his most interesting projects was to commission Salvador Dali to complete two suites of 25 images in his New York studio. One was of the opera *Carmen* and the other was the *Aliyah* to celebrate the 20th anniversary of Israel in 1968. My other uncle continued on with the more standard commercial printing side of the business which eventually became the largest packaging company in North America. It was purchased a few years ago by International Paper Corporation for \$900 million. It trades on the stock exchange.

Tom: Wow. What was your uncle's name?

Ted: Paul Shore. The company is Shorewood Packaging Corporation. The thing that got him started was that he patented a new form of record jacket printing called a Shorepack. He printed the cover for the Beatles' *Abbey Road* album. That was his first big printing job. At the time that records were in vogue his company was printing about 50 percent of the records jackets in the U.S. in partnership with Columbia Records. After records phased out he expanded to a variety of other packaging applications and acquired various major corporations as clients including Kodak, Sony, Wilson Sporting Goods, Estee Lauder, American Tobacco, etc.

Tom: All right. Well, if you'd stayed in that business, you might be rich nowadays.

Ted: Quite possibly.

Tom: Okay. So you're interested in psychology. In the master's program later on you got into human resource management. Were you gearing that way by the time you were in your master's program, or was there any particular slant that you took?

Ted: No, it was just a general psychology program to get myself into a Ph.D. program. That was the goal.

Tom: So you finished there in '78. Did you go straight to Colorado State [University] from there?

Ted: Yes.

Tom; Then you finished there in '85?

Ted: Correct.

Tom: What was your dissertation on?

Ted: My dissertation was on employee work attitudes.

Tom: So that became your career path then, I guess, didn't it?

Ted: Right. What happened was I applied for Ph.D. programs in both clinical and industrial organizational psychology. I was accepted to some of both types of programs, but decided that industrial psychology was more interesting than my original plan to be a clinical psychologist. So I pursued that degree.

Tom: I would assume that a lot of people in industrial psychology actually go out in the business world when they get through, don't they, or work for a corporation?

Ted: Yes, it's common for I/O psychologists to work for consulting firms and large companies. When I finished my Ph.D. program, my first job was with the Standard Oil Company of Ohio [SOHIO] working as an industrial psychologist in human resources, a typical job for an I/O psychologist.

Tom: All right. Well, that's John D. Rockefeller's company.

Ted: That's his company; right.

Tom: Okay, but you didn't do that very long because you came to Kennesaw in '86, I believe, didn't you?

Ted: For two years—long enough to know that the corporate world was not my preferred future.

- Tom: Right. So in industrial psychology, what kind of things were you doing for Standard Oil?
- Ted: I was working on a program called the FACT Program which stood for Formal Assessment of Corporate Talent. This was an assessment center program of the type used by many companies to evaluate individuals for possible promotion to management positions. SOHIO had the second oldest assessment center in the US which was started in 1963; AT&T had the first assessment center which they started in 1956. It was a five-day assessment program where the candidate's skills were evaluated by a group of company assessors, including three psychologists. We then wrote reports to outline their competencies and potential for management. I also worked in the area of employee attitude surveys and was responsible for developing and validating personnel selection programs for the company. That was essentially the scope of it.
- Tom: Right. So those things are very valuable for the corporation, but I gather they were not the kind of thing you wanted to do for the rest of your life.
- Ted: That's correct. After two years I decided to pursue an academic job. Along the way, I got married to someone I had gone to graduate school with. She was working for a company that was transferred to Texas and she ended up as a visiting professor at Cleveland State University in the business school. I took a look at her lifestyle and mine. She had a lot more freedom and flexibility in how she spent her time. Consequently, we decided to look for two academic jobs. We searched the whole country and ended up in Atlanta with her having a job at Georgia State University Business School and my getting hired at Kennesaw.
- Tom: All right. That was fortuitous, I guess, that you could both get a job in the same location.
- Ted: It was not easy, particularly because I had no research record at the time. When I went through graduate school, the emphasis was more on consulting than publishing. Consequently, I had a hard time getting an academic job.
- Tom: I guess so. I want to get into your coming to Kennesaw, but before we get too far away from it, one of the things that we've been asking everybody in these interviews is about mentors. Was there anybody that had a major influence on you in the academic world, that directed the way that you went or what-have-you? Some people have mentors, and others don't. I just wondered in your case whether you had any mentors that stand out along the way.
- Ted: I would acknowledge my advisor at Colorado State, George [C.] Thornton [III], a well-known industrial and organizational psychologist. I recall that when I was close to completing the Ph.D. program, he and I had lunch one day. He asked me what my plans were when I finished the program. I said, "Well, I think I would like to have a job like yours. But I don't think I could do that." He disagreed. I told him that I just didn't have the confidence that I could succeed in that kind of

job. So initially I went to work for a large company and pretty quickly discovered that it really wasn't a good match for me. But in part because of his words of encouragement, I made the decision to leave industry and pursue an academic job.

Tom: Did you get to do any teaching while you were at Colorado State?

Ted: I did, and this is another interesting thing. When I applied to that program, they sent this brochure out describing the requirements for the Ph.D. program. One of the things it said was that teaching a class while you were a graduate student was "strongly recommended." I noted that it did not say "required", and said to myself, "That's the one thing I won't do." I was scared. As it turned out I had a research assistantship for the first two years of my Ph.D. program. I could have continued with that for the full time I was there, but actually opted to take a teaching assistantship after the second year. In that capacity, when my advisor was on sabbatical, I taught a class in the psychology department for him one semester. So, I had some teaching experience, but not a great deal.

Tom: Right. Did you like to teach? What was your impression in the classroom? [For] some people we've talked to, it's just kind of like a light comes on in their head when they walk in the classroom for the first time; they know they're at home. Others have different reactions. I wonder how you felt.

Ted: That wasn't the case for me; I was petrified. I spent the entire Christmas break preparing for this class, writing out all the lecture notes, word for word what was I going to say. My greatest fear was that I was going to get into this class, which had seventy students—a class in testing and measurement—and within the first two weeks, the class and I would all mutually discover that I was completely incompetent. Fortunately, that didn't happen. I guess I did reasonably well—I wouldn't say great. But that was my fear. So, no, it was certainly not the case at that time I knew teaching was a calling or anything like that.

Tom: Well, it's been almost forty years now, but I remember how petrified I was in that first year of teaching, too. I don't know whether you remember [James] J.B. Tate when he was on our faculty here, but he used to say back in those days that that first year of teaching, we should have had to pay them instead of them paying us.

Ted: Yes.

Tom: So I know those feelings exactly. What about consulting? You said they didn't put much emphasis on the scholarship. Did they get you out consulting with anybody while you were in graduate school?

Ted: The faculty did a fair amount of that. My advisor had a fairly steady stream of consulting work with companies like Eastman Kodak, and he used to take me along on various projects. Another faculty member was doing a lot of employee attitude survey work in the mining industry, which involved a number of the graduate students, including myself. So I did a fair number of consulting projects.

Tom: Did you enjoy doing them?

Ted: I did. I definitely did. It was worthwhile.

Tom: So that at least gave you an option of what you could be doing. You talked about getting married, and your wife also had a doctorate. Is her doctorate also in psychology?

Ted: Yes, we finished the same program up at Colorado State.

Tom: What is her name?

Ted: Lynn Shore.

Tom: I gather that she was scholarship-oriented from the beginning.

Ted: She was, more so than I was. It came more naturally to her. She grew up in an academic family in Berkeley California, and I did not. Her mom had a Ph.D. in psychology and she taught at a community college, whereas neither of my parents went to college. She has excelled in the area of scholarship. She happens to currently be an associate editor for *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, the leading journal in the human resource management field. She's a Fellow of the American Psychological Association and of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology and has a long list of publications in top journals.

Tom: She got a job in the Business College at Georgia State, but she was doing the same kind of stuff that you do, the human resource management? Would that be her field?

Ted: Human resource management, organization behavior and general management, the same areas in which I have taught.

Tom: Was Mike Mescon the head of the Business College at that time?

Ted: Yes, I think he was.

Tom: So I guess he played a role in hiring her there?

Ted: Yes, I think he was dean when she was hired.

Tom: Right. So she got her job. Why don't you talk a little bit about how you got to Kennesaw State in '86.

Ted: Lynn received an offer from Georgia State. The chair of the department at that time, Tom Clark, sent my resume around town to the various colleges. I received a phone call from Kennesaw State indicating a possible interest in me. I came for the interview and was offered a job.

Tom: I believe Harry [J.] Lasher was the dean at that time?

Ted: Harry Lasher was the dean at that time.

Tom: Of course, that's really before you had the Burruss Business Building.

Ted: That's right. Our offices were kind of spread around campus. My first office was one of those cubicles in the library up on the third floor. After that it improved dramatically when we had a trailer office for awhile. I'm being facetious; that wasn't much better!

Tom: I know; I know. I remember that trailer.

Ted: But eventually the new business building opened.

Tom: Right. I think that was '91 when that building opened.

Ted: That sounds about right.

Tom: So for five years you were just bouncing around. Actually, the Business College was still pretty small when you came, wasn't it?

Ted: It was just sort of getting under way, I guess.

Tom: I know Betty [L.] Siegel put a lot of resources into it in the '80s and the '90s, but I remember very well when there were just a handful of faculty members in the Business College. So when you came, was there a search committee that interviewed you, or was it just Harry Lasher? How did that work out?

Ted: Well, he interviewed me over the phone. I probably shouldn't say this, but since you asked I will answer since it bears directly on the intellectual climate at KSU which you expressed interest in. It was sort of funny. In essence he made clear that Kennesaw was not looking for faculty whose focus was doing scholarly research. I said—and this was probably a dumb thing to say, but what came to mind was to say that, "If you look at my resume, you'll see that there are no publications on there." To which he responded, "Great, when can you come for an interview?" Anyway, that gives you some insight into the kind of intellectual climate that existed at that time on campus.

Tom: Really, you didn't have that much teaching experience at that point.

Ted: Not much, although I had taught as an adjunct at Cleveland State University business school while working at SOHIO. I had industry experience, and I think he liked that.

Tom: Yes, well, I think his background was that he came out of industry back into the academic world at Kennesaw, didn't he?

Ted: I believe that's right. In my phone interview he asked me a question or two that I couldn't answer about the company that I was working for—something about

their annual revenues—things that you might get from an annual report. I said I didn't know the answer, and when he met me at the airport, the first thing he asked me was, "By the way, did you check on those annual revenue figures?" And actually, I had done so. He later told me that had I not known the answer at that point, he wouldn't have hired me.

Tom: Okay. So he picked you up at the airport. Who all interviewed you when you got to campus?

Ted: Well, I just met with the various members of the department.

Tom: Who was the chair at that time?

Ted: Jack [John F.] Grashof. It was actually the management and marketing department at the time.

Tom: Right.

Ted: So I just met with all the various individuals in the department. The one thing that I guess was noteworthy was there was no formal research presentation that was required, which is atypical of most universities.

Tom: Yes, and it's certainly typical here now.

Ted: [In most places] you were required to make a presentation, usually a research presentation. But they didn't require that. A couple of years after I was hired I suggested that we add a research presentation to the selection process for faculty, however the chair and dean rejected this idea. Again, I think it helps further explain the kind of climate that existed at that time.

Tom: Well, we were less than a decade out of junior college days at that point.

Ted: Right. So that was the essence of the interview, which was, more or less, I guess, if they thought I was a likable sort of guy.

Tom: Right. Well, who all was in the department at that time? Was Craig [E.] Aronoff in the department?

Ted: Yes. There was also [Christina C.] Tina Brush, who later left. Janet Adams, and some temporary faculty who were finishing up degrees at Georgia State. I guess I met some of the other department chairs: Ralph [W.] Frey, a fellow named Terry [E.] Powell from Marketing, who passed away—

Tom: Oh, yes, I remember Terry. He was a nice guy.

Ted: Gary Roberts was also there.

Tom: Yes, he came in '85, so he would have been there.

Ted: Right. So that was basically the group.

Tom: Teresa Joyce hadn't come yet at that point?

Ted: No, she came the following year I believe.

Tom: So really, just a handful of people.

Ted: There was a very nice woman. She retired soon after that.

Tom: Mildred Landrum—wasn't she in that department?

Ted: Yes. That's who I'm thinking of.

Tom: I saw her a couple of years ago. They live up in North Carolina now. Her husband was the athletic director, [James D.] "Spec" Landrum. Six or seven or eight people or so, I guess, but a tiny department for sure. I guess I should ask, too, were you applying for jobs in psychology as well as business?

Ted: I actually did. I looked in both areas, and it just so happened that this was the job that came up.

Tom: So is this the standard route into human resource management, to go through a psychology graduate program?

Ted: Not the standard route, but it is one route. Probably not the standard route for most people. I think the norm is probably to get a Ph.D. in management with a specialty in human resources, which is offered by a lot of schools. But there are a lot of industrial psychologists that do work in business schools. In fact, a recent survey done by the Society for Industrial Organizational Psychology reported that 50 percent of all the Ph.D.s in industrial and organizational psychology with academic jobs are employed in business schools. So it is not at all uncommon.

Tom: But I gather that those two years of experience at Standard Oil were probably the key to getting the job along with your psychology degree, wouldn't you think?

Ted: Yes, although the psychology degree in itself was actually a liability at Kennesaw. The dean made some comments to me about it being a very different kind of degree. And I remember at the time that he hired me, he wanted me to do this developmental program that involved certain kinds of readings—it was never clear as to exactly what he expected.

Tom: Like a non-credit program?

Ted: Right, just an informal activity because he didn't think that my degree was necessarily adequate for teaching in the business school. I think that was a very narrow view, particularly when you consider the fact that 50 percent of all the Ph.D.s with my degree are in business schools, and many of them at very good

business schools—Michigan State, UGA and so forth. In fact, at Cal. State Long Beach where I currently teach, there are 5 psychologists in the management department which has about 12 members. Also, when you examine a typical text in the field of management/organizational behavior you find that the majority of the important theories in the field come directly from the field of psychology. Furthermore, studies have shown that psychologists in B-schools [business schools] tend to publish as much or more than those with Ph.D.s in management. And, of course, by being actively engaged in the research process I necessarily did considerable reading of the academic literature in the field, although I don't think this is what Harry quite had in mind for a "developmental program." At one point he commented that I had not fulfilled my development program which was confusing to me since I was among the most productive scholars in the department which certainly required reading extensively in the field. I guess he did not consider reading the academic literature in our field professionally developmental.

Tom: And this is Harry Lasher who said that he didn't think your degree was adequate? Yet he's the one that really hired you, wasn't he?

Ted: Well, they needed warm bodies at the time. They had an opening, and I guess personally he liked me; I guess he liked my industry experience. But definitely my degree was not a plus in his view.

Tom: Well, you've given a pretty vivid description, I think, of what the campus was like at that time as you saw it in the Business College. Why don't you talk a little bit about your experiences when you got here? What kind of teaching load did you have, for instance?

Ted: Well, I remember we were on the quarter system, and the teaching load was, if I recall, that you typically taught three five-hour classes.

Tom: So you're teaching fifteen hours.

Ted: Right, you were teaching three, three, and two across the 3 quarters. It was a very heavy teaching load with a lot of different class preparations. I ended up teaching things I never imagined, like business statistics and a lot of different courses. Consequently, for the first two years I did nothing but prepare for classes. I did serve on a few committees.

Tom: Yes, everybody did that.

Ted: Finally my wife impressed upon me the need to start publishing if I was going to have a viable academic career. So if I wanted to have prospects of moving to a different kind of university, I really needed to start publishing. So after my second year I started to think seriously about that.

Tom: And I guess she was publishing quite a bit at Georgia State, wasn't she?

Ted: She was trying, because unlike Kennesaw, that was more of a research university model. They had a very clear guideline for tenure/promotion which included publishing in the top journals. So she was struggling with it but on a much lighter teaching load.

Tom: What was her teaching load?

Ted: I think it was two, two and one per quarter or even less.

Tom: So you were teaching one more class a quarter than she was.

Ted: Yes, at least that much. So I began to think about the research issue. I had some data from the Standard Oil Company on their corporate assessment program. I guess this was foresight, but I had made special arrangements before I left the company to collect this data and obtain permission to use it for research purposes. It turned out to be a very excellent source of data and very hard to get. So I published a couple of studies, one in 1990 and one in 1992, in two of the top journals in our field—*Personnel Psychology* and *Journal of Applied Psychology*, which was, at that time, very unusual at Kennesaw. Very few people were publishing much at all of a scholarly nature and certainly not in the top journals. Some people were publishing practitioner articles in non-peer reviewed outlets. A few years later they hired some people like Bob [Robert F.] Scherer, Jim [James D.] Brodzinski, and Teresa Joyce who started working at the research pretty actively. Bob and Jim moved on after a few years. In fact, Bob Scherer is now the dean of the College of Business at Cleveland State University. Armen Tashchian from the Marketing Department who had been at Florida State University prior to Kennesaw is a very productive and talented scholar. He and I have co-authored several articles together and continue to collaborate to this day.

Tom: The other one, Jim, I don't remember him.

Ted: Jim Brodzinski. He was [at Kennesaw] for three or four years and then went off to a school in Ohio somewhere. I haven't kept track of him. So I began to work at the research really with the goal that someday I could be at a higher caliber school. I mean, that was frankly my motivation. I also had a philosophical belief which was that if you have a Ph.D., one of the things that you should do is make some intellectual contributions to your field. That's partly why you get a Ph.D. That's my personal view. Otherwise, you could just hire a lecturer with a master's degree, and they'll do, in many cases, just as good a job in the classroom. I make a distinction between a "teacher" and a "professor." This may sound a little elitist to some people, but I believe that a professor is one that does more than just teach. You also participate in the ongoing development of your field, and you do that mainly by publishing original research.

Tom: That you have something to profess—that's your own.

Ted: It's a matter of contributing to the knowledge base of your field.

Tom: Well, that certainly is the ideal and the model that we all go through, isn't it, in a Ph.D. program? That's what it's all about.

Ted: I think so. So to some extent, early on it was really a mismatch for me at Kennesaw because, frankly, a lot of people didn't share that view.

Tom: Yes, we were very much teaching- and service-oriented, I guess, at that time.

Ted: And you had administrators that were very strongly oriented that way. They felt that research on that campus had little value because it wasn't a so-called "research university". I used to argue, and I guess I was a little opinionated about this, that it's not a black or white issue. It's not like you're either a "research university" or you're not. You're a university. So while you certainly wouldn't expect the level of research at Kennesaw that you would at a Georgia Tech, nevertheless, faculty who have a Ph.D. should, in my view, be making some intellectual contributions to their field. I remember at some point there were these campus-wide discussions about this whole issue some years later. I don't know if you recall them; I think all departments in the university participated in these large town hall type of meetings.

Tom: Yes, I vaguely remember them.

Ted: We went to one of these, and our department was combined with several others from around campus. I was really rather shocked, to be honest. People were arguing that if you do a local radio interview, for example, that should count as research. I said, no, I didn't think so. An intellectual contribution is an activity that moves your field forward in some way because you make some kind of contribution to the development of the knowledge base in the field. Doing a local radio interview simply doesn't do that. Certainly no major research university would ever consider a radio interview or newspaper article as an intellectual contribution that would count toward tenure or promotion as some argued it should at KSU.

Tom: Sounds like service to me.

Ted: I agree. Now, they were saying that you wouldn't be asked to do the radio interview if you weren't known as an expert in your field. Perhaps that's true, but even so the radio interview in itself is not an intellectual contribution to one's academic field.

Tom: Right. Well, were people talking about the Boyer [scholarship] model at that time?

Ted: I'm not familiar with that term, but it was an era [where] if you got your name in a local newspaper, or you did an interview on radio, you counted that as research. I strongly disagreed with that. I still do.

Tom: Yes. Well, I always put that in the service category myself.

Ted: That brings to memory another example. Two colleagues had published an article in what was then called *Personnel Administrator* (now called *HR Magazine*), a practitioner magazine in the HR field, not a scholarly journal by any stretch. The department chair made quite a big deal about their article. At the same time I had published an article in *Personnel Psychology* which went largely unnoticed. Ironically, a few years later I was interviewed for a job elsewhere and the department chair at the other university having looked at my vita commented favorably on my having published in *Personnel Psychology* and stated that they knew the difference between *Personnel Psychology* and *Personnel Administrator*. So anyway, those were some things that I remember about the intellectual orientation of the university at that time.

Tom: What did you think about the students at that point?

Ted: The students were not terribly impressive at that point. A lot of them seemed like local kids who came down from the mountains with their caps on backwards. A lot of them weren't terribly bright. Some of them were; it was a real mix. But I did see a steady improvement in the quality of the students over time.

Tom: Right. In history, we oftentimes had the older students, the nontraditional in our classrooms; but I gather in the business majors you probably had a higher concentration of the traditional-aged students, didn't you?

Ted: I don't know statistically how it compared with the rest of campus, but I certainly recall having lots of nontraditional-aged students, particularly in the evening classes.

Tom: Did you see a difference between the traditional and the nontraditional students?

Ted: Yes, the older, nontraditional students were more motivated because a lot of them had missed out for some reason on the opportunity of going to college early on. They were returning and now they had family obligations and jobs, and so they were making a much bigger sacrifice than many of the traditional students.

Tom: Were they able to bring life experiences into the classroom? Were any of them in the business world?

Ted: Many of them had responsible jobs in the business world, and so that certainly made the class more of an interesting experience.

Tom: Right. Yesterday when we were talking you mentioned the change that Tim [Timothy S.] Mescon brought about when he came in as dean, and I believe that was 1990, wasn't it?

Ted: Right. That was very significant actually. At the time that Tim came, we were not accredited with the AACSB, the accrediting agency.

Tom: What does that stand for?

- Ted: The American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business.
- Tom: So I guess they hadn't even sought that kind of accreditation, had they?
- Ted: No. There was discussion about it, and, in fact, I recall participating on a task force to evaluate the possibility of pursuing AACSB accreditation. At one particular meeting I recall that certain department chairs were quite opposed to the idea of accreditation; one even said he would resign if we became accredited. I recall when Harry Lasher addressed the MBA students and made the statement that he would not be pursuing accreditation.
- Tom: So it wasn't important to him.
- Ted: He seemed to be very opposed to it.
- Tom: Because it didn't fit our mission, is that what he was thinking?
- Ted: Well, I recall him saying things like the standards are too rigid, and it didn't allow them to be flexible in changing the curriculum in certain ways that perhaps he felt was important. That is, to be responsive to needs of the local business community. I think, quite frankly, there was more to it than that. I think it also meant that faculty members were going to have to spend significant portions of their time doing research. If you are accredited with the AACSB, you have standards for research, and we weren't meeting those standards at that time—not even close. Right now the term they use is “academically qualified”—to be an accredited business school a certain percentage of the faculty must be “academically qualified”. To be “academically qualified”, the faculty member must publish a certain number of articles in peer-reviewed journals—I believe currently this is 2 articles every 5 years.
- Tom: So as far as Harry was concerned, that just wasn't what we were capable of doing at that time?
- Ted: Well, I can't speak for whether he believed we were capable of meeting that standard, but it was my definite impression that spending time on scholarly research was not consistent with his values. I think he felt like it detracted from the quality of our teaching. Interestingly, a few years ago three faculty members from the CBA actually analyzed teaching evaluations for faculty on the three tracks – teaching/service, balanced and teaching/research. They found that evaluations of faculty on the teaching/research track were slightly higher than on the other tracks. This did not surprise me since it has been my observation that competent researchers are often also competent teachers.
- Tom: So when Tim comes in, how does it change things?
- Ted: Well, dramatically. I believe that Tim was hired principally to get the Business College accredited. To do that, he had to move a group of people who were

largely unproductive researchers to being productive researchers—at least a portion of them.

Tom: Right. Or else bring in a new faculty?

Ted: Right. Or else fire everybody and start over. We couldn't do that, obviously, so he implemented this track model, in which you selected from one of three different tracks and the course load and the research expectations varied according to which track you were on. His goal was to provide an incentive for people to publish so the B-school would get accredited. And it also helped to attract faculty members who otherwise wouldn't go to a place like Kennesaw, because now you can go there and have a reasonable course load in exchange for reasonable productivity.

Tom: So the incentive was some release time to do the research.

Ted: Right, exactly. So we set it up initially so that you had a two-year commitment on a certain track. If you met the standard in the following timeframe you got to stay on the track. In some cases, people had to switch tracks.

Tom: And the standard was so many publications in peer-reviewed journals?

Ted: Right, it went through several iterations, especially when the system changed to semesters. It was so many courses per year that you taught, and you were expected to produce, in the case of the research track, I think it was one article per year in a refereed journal. There were three different models that you could select from.

Tom: Right. So in order for the people in the research track to teach less, the people in the other track were teaching more, is that the way it worked?

Ted: Well, not exactly. It was not the case that people on the research track caused the loads of others to increase beyond what it would have otherwise been. It was just a matter of selecting a model that fit your interests and your competencies. It was a matter of instead of having a “one-size-fits-all” approach—you know, “we're all just going to be basically heavy duty teachers”—now, you had to pick what was best for you. It is true that not everyone could select the research track – about one-third did so with most others selecting the balanced track.

Tom: Right. So I gather that Tim needed a lot of support from higher up in the administration to justify the reduced teaching loads for the scholars.

Ted: I'm not really sure how it worked on his end, but I know it was done very quickly when he arrived. It didn't require a great deal of debate and discussion. It just changed, and I was quite frankly delighted. In fact, I would go as far as to say that it was not until that workload model was introduced that I felt like a university professor. For the first time I felt like there was reasonable balance in my work life instead of feeling like a teaching machine.

Tom: I guess so. So you obviously took the scholarship track.

Ted: I did. I was already working in that mode anyhow, so it was just a natural fit for me. I said, "Gee, finally there's some recognition for all the hard work we do." Prior to that, those of us who were research-oriented were actually penalized in the annual performance review. If you were the kind of person that spent your non-teaching days doing consulting work, you got rewarded in the system for doing that since it counted as "community service" plus you got paid by your client—so in essence you got a double benefit. By contrast, someone who was not doing consulting but instead was doing research seemed to get little recognition at KSU and, of course, did not receive any pay for their research activity from an outside source.

Tom: Well, you've given a pretty stark picture of where the intellectual life was back in the '80s when you came. Did you see it evolve at all? You were here through 2002; did you see it evolve at all during those years after the scholarship model came into place?

Ted: Most significantly. If you look at the caliber of the faculty that we had at that point in time versus when I first arrived you see a dramatic difference. When I first arrived, you had a lot of faculty members who got degrees from Georgia State University. I'm not putting Georgia State down, but at the time that these individuals got their degrees, Georgia State had few faculty with strong research records. By the time I left Kennesaw we had hired people from all over the country from good universities. For example, colleagues such as Ken Robinson, Satya Chakravorty, and Raj Veliyath were very productive scholars in my department. Dana Hermanson, Armen Tashchian, and Lucy Ackert, all from other CBA departments, in my view are among the most talented scholars at KSU. I think that absent the revised workload model, KSU could not attract and retain those types of faculty. I would add, however, that in other ways progress was slow. A few years ago I served on a committee to re-evaluate the performance standards in the management department. At that time all journal publications counted the same regardless of journal quality. So a publication that may have taken several years to get accepted in a top-tier journal received the same credit as one in a lower-tier. I proposed that publications in top-tier journals be given double-credit since they represent a significantly greater level of achievement, effort, impact on the field and prestige to the university than those in lower-tier journals. My proposal was acceptable to many of my colleagues but flatly rejected by certain others. In fact, one individual described it as "elitist." I found that both personally insulting as well as hypocritical since every theory of human motivation advocates rewarding individuals commensurate with their level of accomplishment. Just as not every student deserves an "A," not all publications deserve an "A"; when someone does "A" level work they should be recognized for that. Interestingly, when a new department chair was hired, my proposal was instantly accepted and from then on any publication in a journal with a 20 percent or lower acceptance rate was given double-credit. The issue of research quality surfaced once again when I served on the Faculty Development

and Awards Committee when I tried to advocate that three criteria be applied to the decision about the Distinguished Scholarship Award; these were *quantity* of publications, *quality* of journal and *impact* on the field. At KSU my ideas about journal quality and the relevance of citations were not readily accepted and were even seen as radical by some people. Incidentally, at Cal. State Long Beach which is also a teaching university, we have an elaborate journal classification system modeled after the one in use at U.T. San Antonio and San Diego State University.

Tom: Well, what about students? Did you see any change in students over the years?

Ted: The students seemed to get progressively better. Although I do not attribute that directly to the workload model that we had in the business school, I think it may have contributed indirectly. That is, by having a work model that helped to attract better faculty, this enhanced the overall reputation of the university. I think that students who were disinclined, for example, to go to Georgia State because of the downtown environment, became more likely over time to come to Kennesaw because of its improving reputation and campus environment. Also, I recall that at some point they increased the admissions standards at UGA, so we got some of the good students who might have otherwise gotten into UGA. I think there were a number of factors that contributed to the improvement in the quality of students.

Tom: Why don't we talk a little bit about how you have developed in your scholarly career and what you were writing about? You had mentioned earlier that you had brought the data with you from Standard Oil to really give you what you needed to write those first two papers for *Personnel Psychology* and *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Talk a little bit about how your career evolved as a scholar.

Ted: Okay. I guess initially my first stream of research was in the area of assessment centers, which many large companies use as a tool for internal promotion. The focus of some of this research was on construct validity of dimensions measured in the assessment center. Then I also started working in the area of organizational commitment and other kinds of employee work attitudes. In 1995, I published a paper in the *Academy of Management Journal*, the premier journal in the field of management. We developed a model of managerial perceptions of employee commitment. Typically, prior to that time most commitment studies employed employee self-reports. We developed a model that incorporated a manager's perceptions of the employee's commitment and looked at the antecedents and outcomes of those perceptions. We found that managers actually treated employees differently based on the kind of commitment they perceived the employee to have. There were basically two forms of commitment that we evaluated: One is called *affective commitment*, which means that the individual stays in the organization because they want to be there. The alternative is called *continuance commitment*, where the person stays because they have no choice; they're stuck. That 1995 paper helped to stimulate research on manager-perceived commitment by a number of well-known other scholars in the field. In

fact, I currently have a follow-up paper under review with *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.

Tom: What's the term where you reach the level of your incompetence?

Ted: The Peter Principle.

Tom: But you are suggesting that they might be very competent, but they don't have any place they can go.

Ted: Or, because they've been there for a long time, they have built up pension and other benefits which make leaving difficult. So they stay not because they necessarily want to be there but because they have to be there. We found that managers who perceive employees to be affectively committed treat them very differently than the employees that they perceive to be committed because they have no alternative.

Tom: Treat them differently in terms of promotions and pay increases and such as that?

Ted: In a variety of ways they treat people better when they perceive that they are affectively committed, including promotion opportunity and other types of rewards and punishments.

Tom: So I guess really the question is how accurately [do] employers perceive the commitment of their employees?

Ted: Right, and perhaps more importantly, what form of commitment do they perceive the employee to have. It's really a matter of manager perceptions, not so much what is actually true, that determines how the employee is treated by the manager. I've also done a number of other studies on employee attitudes, but that was probably the most noteworthy. Beyond that I've done a number of studies in performance appraisal. In particular, I've published three studies on accountability theory, which is a sub-area in the performance appraisal literature that deals with rater motivation. Early in the performance appraisal literature the focus was on improving the accuracy of ratings by improving rating formats and instruments. More recently attention has shifted to understanding the social context of appraisal. Interestingly, this line of research got started by an observation I made at Kennesaw. As you know, every year you have this performance review with your department chair. You have to evaluate yourself, and submit that to the chair.

Tom: Right. We're still doing that.

Ted: Well, one year several colleagues and I were talking after we had gotten our reviews. All of us had received an "above-expectation" rating except for one person. It turned out that the one person who got the average rating had rated him/herself as *average*. Everyone else had rated themselves *above* average. I got to thinking about that. Here you rate yourself very well, and you get a very high

rating; and someone else rates him/herself average, and gets an average rating. I wondered if there was a connection between the self-rating and performance rating so I explored the literature. Sure enough, I found one study that had looked at that very question using a theory called accountability. I embarked upon several experiments using student subjects to test that theory out and expand it and so forth. Among other things we found that self-evaluations have a strong effect upon supervisory ratings when the supervisor has knowledge of the self-rating and expects to give face-to-face feedback to the ratee. So that's been an interesting line of research.

Tom: Yes. Well, unfortunately, I don't believe anybody has listened to you on it around here because we still seem to have the Muhammad Ali philosophy of "I'm the greatest" when you're doing these self-evaluations.

Ted: Right. Well, of course, one of the implications is that you don't show the self-rating to the manager before he/she does their evaluation. It does have a strong biasing effect.

Tom: I would think so.

Ted: So it's been an interesting area of research because it's helped to further understand why, in some cases, poor performers in organizations actually receive good ratings. One of the reasons is because they rate themselves high. Since the supervisor usually knows that and also has to have a face-to-face meeting with the employee, he/she inflates the employees rating to avoid conflict. According to this notion of accountability, people don't want to have negative interactions with other people, and the supervisor actually feels accountable to the subordinate. They don't want to be disliked by their subordinate and are motivated to have a positive relationship. So there's a real pressure to inflate performance ratings when you know you're going to have a personal feedback meeting, particularly when you know a person has rated him/herself well. That's been the kind of research I've done on performance appraisal.

Tom: But if the employee rates himself low, then the boss is able to feel good about giving him a low evaluation also, I guess.

Ted: That's right. It's like the employee gives him/her permission to give a low rating. That's exactly what we found in one study.

Tom: That's interesting. One of the things that's been coming through in these interviews that I've been doing with people who have won the Distinguished Teaching and Scholarship and Service Awards—particularly those that have stayed here a long time—is that there seems to be a very strong what you call affective commitment to the institution. I'm not sure what I want to ask in the way of a question, but did you ever do any research on Kennesaw's faculty with regard to commitment?

Ted: No, I never did research on the faculty; I just used the students as participants. So any opinions I would have about that would just be purely subjective, if you're asking me about the type of the kind of commitment the faculty have.

Tom: Yes, well, it might be interesting to just have your subjective opinion of what you thought it was like.

Ted: Well, I would say it's a mix, but I don't think that's unique to Kennesaw. For example, I believe that certain faculty members stay because they don't really have many alternatives—largely because they haven't been productive. Let's face it, in the academic world, publication plays a key role in getting one job interviews and offers. That's what largely governs marketability for faculty positions.

Tom: So they need to start doing some research if they want to get out.

Ted: Well, it's probably too late for some of these people. If an individual has been disengaged from the research process for an extended period of time, I think it is unrealistic to suddenly jump back in.

Tom: I understand.

Ted: But then there are people there who seem to be very committed because it's a good match for them. In the case of my own experience, it became a better and better match with the implementation of the workload model that we have discussed. Frankly, I had reservations about leaving because of that one element. I had some nice colleagues, as well, that I miss. But as we talked about, my personal circumstances were such that we have a dual-career issue to manage.

Tom: Right. So your wife Lynn got a job out in California. Where did she go?

Ted: Well, initially, what happened was I received an offer from Cal State [California State University] Long Beach at the same time that she had received an offer to be a visiting professor at UC [University of California] Irvine. So we came to California four years ago kind of as an experiment. We took leaves of absence initially for one year from Georgia in the hope that she would be able to obtain a permanent position either at UC Irvine or another university in Southern California. As it turned out UC Irvine did not have an opening for a senior faculty member. However, they extended her visiting position for one additional year, which gave her a two-year span of time in which to find a position. She did so at San Diego State, where she is now a full professor.

Tom: Very good.

Ted: That's why we moved to Carlsbad. If you know anything about California, it's a coastal community in North County San Diego about 20 minutes north of La Jolla, near Del Mar, Cardiff-by-the-Sea, Solana Beach and Rancho Santa Fe. It's

a very attractive place to live with near-perfect climate and beautiful scenery. Of course, housing prices are sky high—2-3 times what they are in Atlanta.

Tom: So you both have a fairly long commute then, I guess.

Ted: I have the longer of the commutes.

Tom: So did she just want to get back to California?

Ted: She grew up in Berkeley and had always dreamed of coming back to California, but we never could find two academic positions at the same point in time out here. Finally, we reached a point in our careers and ages where we felt we had to take a little bit of a risk—making a move without finding positions simultaneously, but doing it sequentially. The two-year visiting position at UC Irvine enabled that to happen.

Tom: Right. Well, San Diego State sounds like a great place to be.

Ted: Lynn is very happy there.

Tom: I just had one or two last questions, but let me just ask you about winning the Distinguished Scholar Award in the year 2000. Was it primarily the research you were doing at that time on accountability theory that won you the award? Just talk a little bit about getting the award.

Ted: First of all, I have no idea what was in the minds of the people who made that decision. I was rather surprised to be honest! But I don't think it was any particular study or research area that I was working on at that time. If I had to guess, it had to do more with the fact that I had a fairly steady stream of publications. Of course, many others had that, but in my case, I had published in some of the most competitive journals in the field. I think that's what made my record perhaps stand out. I can think of certain individuals who had far longer vitas. However, when one actually examines the record in some of these cases they are largely devoid of publications in some of the well-regarded scholarly journals. So I happen to think that the issue of quality is highly important. As we discussed, the issue of quality versus quantity was an ongoing issue when I was on the faculty at KSU.

Tom: Well, what are you doing research on now?

Ted: Right now I'm working in several areas. One of those is workplace equity. I recently had a paper accepted in the *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* that deals with workplace compensation. Specifically, we compared effects of internal equity—how people's compensation compares with co-workers—with the effects of external equity, or how your compensation compares in your industry or field. It's kind of an interesting finding that the internal pay comparison affected pay satisfaction, perceptions of pay fairness, work motivation, and perceptions of the

- organizational support they received. On the other hand, the external pay comparison had a greater effect on turnover intentions.
- Tom: Oh, because they go elsewhere, if they can make more money at another place?
- Ted: Right. That was one of our main findings.
- Tom: But what really bugs them is if the guy in the office next door is making more money and is not as productive?
- Ted: Or being equally productive. In this study we had equal productivity but different outcomes. That really bothered people much more than the external comparison. I'm also doing some work on ethics and performance appraisal and following up on some work on employee work attitudes and performance appraisal. Some colleagues from Cal. State Long Beach and I are doing a study of Asian American stereotypes in the performance appraisal process and also another pay equity study. I have also been studying equity sensitivity, a personality variable that is concerned with differences in reactions to inequity. I recently published one study in *Journal of Managerial Psychology* and a second study is "in press" with *Journal of Business and Psychology*. In the latter study we found that equity sensitivity related to various employee attitudes and behaviors.
- Tom: Right. Well, I think I'm just about at the end of my list of questions. I certainly have enjoyed talking to you today, Ted. I'm certainly sorry you're not at Kennesaw any more.
- Ted: Thanks—I appreciate you saying that and the opportunity to get to know you.
- Tom: A number of people here have told me to convey their regards to you. Anything we've left out that you'd like to add to the interview?
- Ted: Yes, just one final comment. In doing this interview it was not my intent to embarrass any particular individuals. Rather, my purpose was to provide my honest assessment of how the intellectual climate at KSU evolved over time since you stated that as your primary objective. I hope this interview helps to achieve that goal.
- Tom: It's been interesting, and I certainly appreciate your time.

INDEX

- Academy of Management Journal*, 18
Ackert, Lucy, 17
Adams, Janet, 9
Affective commitment, 18-20
American Association of Collegiate
Schools of Business (AACSB), 14, 15
Aronoff, Craig E., 9
- Brodzinski, James D., 12
Brush, Christina C., 9
- California State University, Long Beach, 11, 18, 21, 23
Carlsbad, California, 21-22
Chakravorty, Satya, 17
City College of New York, 1
Clark, Tom, 7
Cleveland State University, 8, 12
Colorado State University, 4, 5, 7
Continuance commitment, 18, 19
- Dali, Salvador, 3
- Frey, Ralph W., 9
- Georgia State University, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12
Grashof, John F., 9
- Hermanson, Dana R., 17
- International Paper Corporation, 3
- Journal of Applied Psychology*, 12, 18
Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22
Journal of Business and Psychology, 23
Journal of Managerial Psychology, 23
Joyce, Teresa M., 10, 12
- Kennesaw State University
Early years, 7-9
Burruss Building, 8
Coles College of Business, 8, 11, 14, 15
Intellectual climate, 8, 9, 12-17, 23
Early business faculty, 9, 10
Teaching load, 11, 12

Orientation toward teaching and service
 versus research and scholarship, 12-15
 Students, 14, 18
 Business School accreditation, 14, 15
 Business School faculty tracks, 16, 21
 Commitment of faculty, 20, 21

Landrum, James D. "Spec," 10
 Landrum, Mildred, 10
 Lasher, Harry J., 7-9, 11, 15

Mescon, Michael H., 7
 Mescon, Timothy S., 14-16

New York Graphic Society, 3

Personal Psychology, 12, 14, 18
 Peter Principle, 19
 Powell, Terry E., 9

Roberts, Gary B., 9
 Robinson, Kenneth C., 17

San Diego State University, 21, 22
 Scherer, Robert F., 12
 Shore, Fred (see Shore, Ted H., father)
 Shore, Lynn (see Shore, Ted H., wife)
 Shore, Paul (see Shore, Ted H., uncles)
 Shore, Ted H.
 Birth and childhood, 1
 Father, 1, 3
 Mother, 1
 Undergraduate studies, 1, 2
 B.A., Psychology, 1
 Master's education, 1, 2, 4
 Draw toward clinical psychology, 2, 4
 Industry experience, 2-5, 8, 10
 Uncles, 2, 3
 Graduate work, 4-7
 Dissertation, 4
 Draw toward academe, 4-6
 Coming to Kennesaw, 4, 5, 7-9, 11
 Wife, 5, 7, 11, 21, 22
 Mentors, 5, 6
 Early teaching, 6
 Committee work, 11, 17

Research and publication, 11, 12, 14, 18-20, 22, 23
Leaving Kennesaw, 17, 21
Awards, 20, 22
Shorepack, 3
Shorewood Fine Art Reproductions, 3
Shorewood Packaging Corporation, 3
Shorewood Press, 3
Siegel, Betty L., 8
Standard Oil Company of Ohio (SOHIO), 4, 5, 8, 10, 12
State University of New York (SUNY), 1, 2

Tashchian, Armen, 12, 17
Tate, James B. (J. B.), 6
Thornton, George C., III, 5, 6

University of California, 1, 21
University of Hartford, 1

Veliyath, Raj, 17