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I-O psychology is involved in a continuing identity quest. In my year of service to you as SIOP president, the greatest challenges have related to our identity as a field. These challenges occur because we haven’t clarified what our identity is, we haven’t been able to convey our identity well, and because we don’t have a clear sense of what direction we would like our identity to evolve in.

I will begin by briefly noting these challenges we are facing, using quotes from last year’s survey of the SIOP membership to illustrate the issues. I will define organizational and occupational identity and describe how lessons from other professions can be applied to developing our identity as a field. I’ll then discuss a direction for our identity quest, referring to theory and empirical research to support what we need to do. Mostly, I’m going to offer my opinions on what I see as the critical challenges facing I-O and how I think we can and should tackle them. While my ideas have been influenced by conversations with so many of you—and I thank you for your insights—I’ll take full responsibility for what is presented here.

First, what is happening that leads me to state that I-O psychology is on an identity quest? The challenges we are facing that relate to our identity include concerns about the visibility of the field, concerns about how well we are differentiated from other like disciplines, concerns that we are not perceived as positively as competitors in the marketplace, concerns about how we fit within the broader field of psychology, concerns about how well our name conveys who we are, and concerns about future generations of I-O psychologists. Let me discuss each of these in turn.

The first symptom of an identity problem is our feelings about the visibility of our field. Here are quotes from member responses to the SIOP survey that illustrate the visibility challenge: “SIOP is not recognized as widely as it could/should be...it has yet to make sufficient inroads in conveying who we are and how we can make a difference.” “When CNN reports on issues they should go to SIOP to ask for an expert to provide fact-based commentary on the subject.” “I still find that the overwhelming majority of people I meet do not know what I-O psychology is....” The concern is that we are not doing a good job of conveying our identity.

Other data supports these views—Gasser and colleagues have conducted several studies illustrating how poorly understood I-O psychology is (Gasser, Butler, Anderson, Whitsett, & Tan, 2000; Gasser, Butler, Anderson, Whitsett,
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& Tan, 2001; Gasser, Whitsett, Mosley, Sullivan, Rogers, & Tan, 1998). More recently Baker, Grubb, and Downs (2002) found that individuals unfamiliar with our field can guess at what we do, but often have misperceptions about our activities.

A related challenge is differentiation. Some member quotes to illustrate: “SIOP members are trying to carve out a unique niche for themselves. The problem is that there is too much overlap with other areas with regard to actual applications.” “We need to define and advertise what really distinguishes our society and service from the throng of MBAs.” Are we seen as distinct from other fields? Are we able to convey the distinctions we believe are there? Organizational decision makers view consultants as more interchangeable in terms of services than we believe they should (Church & Waclawski, 1998). Recent trends toward I-O focused units being swallowed up by big management consulting firms can add to the lack of differentiation in the eyes of others.

Some additional member quotes: “I-O psychology is rapidly losing its identity and becoming too closely associated with human resources. There is, or should be, a big difference between psychology and HR.” “There is too much of a disconnect between I-O and HR.” These two quotes illustrate that our members view the differentiation problem in opposite ways—we are too associated with HR or we are too disassociated from HR. As I’ll discuss shortly, I come down strongly on the side of the first quote—the research on the development of professions clearly shows that if you cannot articulate distinctions, you will be marginalized as a profession (Forsyth & Danisiewicz, 1985).

Another challenge is the image of the competition. Some member quotes: “I see other professionals (e.g., MBAs, clinical-counseling psychologists, adult education professionals) making inroads into service areas that I believe I-O psychologists are better trained to deliver.” “We are increasingly squeezed out of prestige and work by members of other companies and associations (ASTD, SHRM, AOM, and major consulting firms).” We are concerned that in practice settings, others are being viewed more positively and are chosen over I-O psychologists, despite our ability to deliver a higher quality service or product.

Another challenge that I hear a lot about is the identity of I-O relative to other areas of psychology. Some member quotes: “I am...concerned about the potential marginalization of I-O...with the field of psychology.” “SIOP’s apparent push to continue distancing itself from APA...is counterproductive and if continued will eventually prove damaging to both the substance of I-O psychology and its impact on society.” While part of the issue is that others in psychology ignore our existence, we also have chosen consciously to distance ourselves from the broader field of psychology.

Maintaining a distinct identity for I-O psychology depends upon there being I-O psychologists. A member quote illustrates: “Not enough attention to the ‘pipeline problem’ relative to preparing and motivating top notch scientists/practitioners to go into PhD-granting psychology departments.” The open session with graduate program directors at last year’s conference indi-
icated strong concerns about our ability to replicate ourselves effectively. As a considerable salary gap exists between positions in I-O psychology departments and those in business schools, more of our new PhDs may seek an academic career path that does not include teaching I-O psychologists. While the extreme scenario may be a long way off, some have expressed concern that if no one is teaching I-O psychology, we will not sustain ourselves as a field.

Finally, as you are all aware, debate over the name of our field is in part a debate over our identity. An example quote: “We might need to start with a name change—industrial-organizational psychology is almost unintelligible to anyone outside our discipline...and even many within our broader field (psychology)!”

To me, these challenges—visibility, status in psychology, image of the competition, differentiation, replication, discussion over our name—are all related to some frustration regarding conveying our identity and maintaining our identity.

It is important to recognize that our identity quest is not something peculiar to our field. **Identity quests occur in all professions and scientific disciplines.** For example, the field of osteopathic medicine struggled with how to indicate competence on par with MDs yet make clear distinctions between the two professions (Miller, 1998). Those in social work have long commented on the search for a distinctive identity (Dumain, 1954; Wasserman, 1982). Within psychology itself there has been much written about identity struggles for the field as a whole (Boring et al., 1942; Fox, Barclay, & Rodgers, 1982) as well as within the clinical (Albee, 1970; Ekstein & Mayman, 1957; Lancaster & Smith, 2002), counseling (Hanna & Bemak, 1997; Shertzer & Issacson, 1977) and school (Bardon, 1982; Goldwater, 1982) specialties. Indeed, Hughes (1988) noted that every profession shows a desire over time for more recognition, a higher place, and a cleaner distinction between those in and out of the field. Challenges related to our identity have been issues for I-O psychology for quite some time.

Here are some quotes from the past that show that our quest is not a recent development. Viteles (1941) stated: “The psychologist has made relatively little progress in convincing industry that his services are needed.” Watson (1954) stated: “The position of the industrial psychologist has never been sharply and clearly differentiated from that of workers with other backgrounds.” Ammons (1955) suggested “persons from other fields are taking over.” The issues of visibility, differentiation, status, et cetera, are old, not new concerns for us.

Further, these challenges are applicable to our field on an international level. The same issues beset those in the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Germany, Australia, and other places—not always to the same degree or manifested in the same manner—but it is important to note that other I-O organizations around the globe are also concerned with these issues.

So, the obvious question: Where do we go from here in this quest for identity? I’d like to propose several actions we can take.

**First, we need to create solidarity around a set of distinctive, core attributes.** We need to clearly state what our identity is. Albert and Whetten (1985)
defined organizational identity as a set of characteristics that are distinctive, central, and enduring, and this definition has been applied to occupations as well. This is not the same as asking for a textbook definition of the field—we have a sense of our content—we need a sense of the attributes that make us unique, that we believe are fundamental to who we are.

This is not something for me to stand up here and provide for us, but for us collectively to agree upon. However, because I am standing up here, I’d like to propose a few distinctive, central, and enduring aspects—a start to answering the question of what is our occupational identity.

One attribute is that our field is about the application of psychological principles to workplace phenomena. While not everyone in SIOP is a psychologist by training, the core of what defines the organization and the field of I-O is an interest in applying psychological principles and research to organizational settings. In writing about school psychologists, Bardon (1983) criticized those who do not identify with a broader psychology but want to have a clear professional identity. These individuals see no need to adhere to standards of training that link them to other psychologists, and are happy with an organization that “represents them and them alone.” He also noted that there are the purists at the other extreme, who feel that the work of many in the organization is not related enough to psychological science and knowledge. We most definitely have both of these camps within SIOP—perhaps we’ve always had them and always will. I myself have wavered over the course of my career in my beliefs about how tied to psychology we must be.

In Elsbach’s (1999) terms, I-O psychologists might be said to be schizo-identified with psychology, in that we see ourselves like other psychologists on some dimensions but really want to disidentify with other psychologists—and with APA—on other dimensions. This is a reasonable position because there are directions that other subspecialties have taken that we do not wish to follow; however, we need to recognize that connections with psychology are what makes us distinctive from others practicing or doing research in the HR area.

In discussing consumer psychology, Nuckols (1976) noted that many of the most creative and productive people in the field were not products of psychology departments. The same is true of our field. However, he noted, that to severe a connection with the parent discipline of psychology would be a loss of what differentiates the field from others—a loss of a certain language, set of values, and view of the human condition acquired by exposure to psychology. I think the same is true of us—if we move away from psychology as a core, we lose.

A second attribute that I think is core to our identity is our scientific approach. Some members complain about how there is an overemphasis in I-O on measurement and statistics, that our standards for methodological rigor in applied settings are unrealistic. However, this is part of our distinctive competence, what makes an I-O psychologist different from others. In general, we should not be hiding our scientific approach behind a “more businesslike” identity—to do so makes us less distinctive.
A third attribute of our identity is a concern for both the effectiveness of the organization AND the well-being of individuals. While some of us focus more on certain outcomes than others, our goals relate to both. Our mission statement reads “The Society’s mission is to enhance human well-being and performance in organizational and work settings....”

A fourth attribute is that we operate with an implicit multilevel model; that is, we recognize that in addition to individual influences on individual behavior and attitudes, higher-order units such as teams and the organizational context have influence, and we also recognize that the individual has influences on higher level outcomes. In 1977 Thayer noted that he wished to “remind those who emphasize organizational variables at the expense of individual ones and those who emphasize individual variables at the expense of organizational ones that neither will make much progress.” A multilevel perspective may not be a very conscious or often stated part of our identity, but I think it gives us distinctiveness in that we are not solely micro or macro in how we approach problems.

You probably have other ideas about what is core to our identity and what distinguishes us from related disciplines, and I hope that you take time to share them with others so that we can gain clarity regarding our identity.

In defining ourselves, there are some lessons from the sociological literature on the development of professions that we should keep in mind. A key learning from this literature is: Identity comes from knowledge, not practice.

Professional identity is about retaining control and ownership over a shifting and incomplete body of knowledge (McLaughlin & Webster, 1998). Identity has to be malleable because a fixed body of knowledge is an expertise easily appropriated. For example, if there were no new knowledge being generated about how to develop selection systems, the knowledge base could be gained by many and would not constitute an area of professional expertise and identity for our field.

Further, a theme that runs throughout the literature on identity and professions is that one must be distinct in one’s knowledge base in order to be distinctive in practice (Bartram, 1996; Peterson, 1991; Rodgers, 1986). We won’t be distinguished from others in what we do per se, but rather in our approach to what we do.

Thus, we cannot be defining ourselves through just a reference to the types of practice we engage in, but we must be referring back to our knowledge base and our disciplinary core. It isn’t being a test developer, or a change agent, or a trainer, or a survey designer that defines our identity—other people do these things. Our identity derives from how we do it, how we approach it, what we base it on. Our identity isn’t from our practice; our practice flows from our identity.

There is a fundamental here that has to be made very salient to those entering our profession—the knowledge base, the research, is the core of training. Graduate students in our field often lament that faculty, because of the publish or perish syndrome, overemphasize research productivity in the
training and evaluation of students and underemphasize the acquisition of applied experience. I am someone who has always advocated applied experience for students. BUT…. Lots of people can be trained to execute the steps of a job analysis or put together a 360 feedback instrument; however, not everyone will do so based on a fundamental knowledge of theories of individual differences and their relations to work outcomes. Not everyone will do so based on a knowledge of research on rating behavior, and not everyone will evaluate their efforts. Research is the base on which it all rests, and therefore knowledge generation must be the more pervasive element of our training programs if we wish our field to have a strong identity that can be sustained over time and not appropriated by others.

One last point on knowledge and identity from the sociological literature on professions is that we must continue to develop our own unique knowledge base. For example, counseling psychologists have noted that despite having their own journals and association, the field has lacked a proprietary knowledge base, and this has negatively affected the professional identity of counselors. In I-O, we have long drawn from other fields but we do have our own knowledge base, and we must continue to support the growth of that base if we wish to have a strong identity. Further, we need to counter a drift in our knowledge base that Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson (2001) have pointed out. They noted that academic reward systems can lead researchers to drift toward Pedantic Science, where methodological rigor is high but practical relevance is low. Organizational clients push practitioners toward Popularist Science, with high practical relevance but low methodological rigor. What we really need is Pragmatic Science where both relevance and rigor are high. Further, a real problem for our field is Puerile science, which lacks both rigor and relevance—many of you feel that too much is being generated. The key issue for identity is which of these is becoming increasingly associated with I-O—I hope SIOP can do more to keep the focus on pragmatic science as our associated knowledge base.

An important direction in our quest is that we must work so that our external image matches our identity, not to craft an external image that fits what “they” are looking for.

Image and identity are not synonymous—the former is a representation of the organization that exists for an external public and the latter is a self-perception. O’Brien (1983) noted that if you base the content of a field on what is socially important—or in our case, what is relevant to business—you run the risk of having “habitual trendiness” (p. 36). He goes on to say that instead of asking what those outside the profession—what the business world—considers important, we should ask whether what we have chosen to focus on is important. This is not a dismissal of the concerns of those outside our profession, but it is a conscious decision for us to use our own criteria to decide what is relevant for our profession to focus on (O’Brien, 1983). Gioia, Shultz, and Corley (2000) have a model that describes how organizations are continually adapting so that their identity and external image
might be in sync. I have grossly oversimplified it in Figure 1, but in essence, it’s the process of saying who are we and who do they think we are, and if there are discrepancies, should we act. At this point, our Visibility Committee will tell you that the answer to “who do they think we are” is “they aren’t aware we exist.” So there’s definitely a discrepancy, and we should definitely act, but one thing to decide is the direction of that action. Gioia et al. (2000) emphasize that one shouldn’t just ask “who are we” but also “who do we want to be.” These questions must get answered first, before we try changing our image in the eyes of the public, executives, or academic colleagues.

Figure 1. Adaptation of Gioia, Shultz, and Corley (2000) model.

Hatch and Schultz (2002) have an Organizational Identity Model in which they discuss dysfunctions in relating identity and image. In our steps ahead to create an image that matches our identity we should avoid these. I know some members are very dismissive of the issues I raised earlier as challenges—seeing them as not worth devoting resources toward. This self-absorption of being unwilling or unable to respond to external images may be a very real problem for our field. There are others in the organization that appear to me to be going toward hyper-adaptation—letting the outside images have such influence that we abandon parts of our tradition without good cause. In writing about the history of psychology’s professional identity, Capshew (1999) noted that in the 1930s there was discussion that the definition of psychology would be written by those who are not psychologists. We don’t need or want to be defined by others, and should avoid hyper-adaptation.

We must also consider who we want to be known to. I’ve had interesting conversations with a number of you regarding who we need to make ourselves visible to. Some of you have argued that educating the general public as to what is an I-O psychologist is not a task we should take on—that it is not very feasible, given that there are only a few thousand of us here in the United States and it is not necessary, as it is only important to educate those who are decision-makers in organizations so that they are aware of what we have to offer. I disagree—our goal may not be to make our name a household word, but I think our visibility efforts need to embrace a much wider group
than just business decision makers—and indeed our efforts already do. We want to educate young people as to what our field is so that they see it as a viable career opportunity. We want to educate others in psychology so that those who feel that “a corporate psychologist” or “business psychologist” is a brand new profession are aware of our field and our knowledge base. We need to make some inroads toward educating the general public about who we are because anyone who works can and will be affected by what we do.

**A fourth concern in our quest is that we must choose our comparators and dimensions of comparison thoughtfully** (Elsbach & Bhattacharya, 2001; Elsbach & Kramer, 1996).

Members of SIOP often tell me that we need to be more like SHRM. While there are certain things that SHRM does in educating HR practitioners that I wish we did half as well, we are not and should not be SHRM. Our size is so much smaller than SHRM’s that we cannot tackle things at their scale because of resource constraints—SHRM has over 170,000 members who pay $160 in dues a year; we have 3,500 professional members who pay $55 a year to SIOP and 2,500 student members paying a mere $25 in dues—we are not going to have the same kind of reach. More importantly, we are not a society composed solely of HR practitioners and we do not host a conference that is merely descriptive of the latest practices. SIOP is a society of individuals whose practice is rooted in research, and we put on a conference where advances in practice are discussed in terms of their relation to the research base and research needs.

Other members think we should be more like the Academy of Management. There are many things that the Academy does well that we should emulate, such as their inclusive climate and international reach, but we are not and should not be the Academy. We are a science-oriented society, but we are not hosts to a conference solely of academics. Indeed, we present a conference that provides information on the latest scientific advances so that practice can be informed and improved by science, and where the latest challenges in practice can be presented in ways that stimulate research.

In writing about psychology as a whole Chao (2002) noted, “It is one thing to interact with other fields. It is quite another to substitute psychology’s identity with that of another field or specialty that it draws to and to which it is drawn.” (p. 452). Such must be our concern—we certainly need healthy interaction with other organizations and SIOP is working to forge those links, but we should not be substituting their identity for our own.

Literature on organizational identities highlights two ways in which identities are managed through comparisons (Elsbach & Kramer, 1996). First, we should make salient those categorizations that highlight positive attributes of our identity that others might not know about. For example, our scientific approach should be used when comparing our field to those without training in a scientific discipline. Second, choose who to be compared to—make salient comparisons on which we can see our identity emerge.
Rather than defending or explaining ourselves in terms of the categories others choose, we should be actively working to focus attention on legitimate, alternative dimensions that we think we ought to be compared on. We need to make salient the ways we are different from or better than others by setting the bases for comparison ourselves.

**Change the name to something that better conveys who we are and what we do but recognize that a name is not a panacea.** While it is my personal opinion that a name change will be helpful to our identity quest, I didn’t come to that conclusion lightly or quickly, and I ask that we respect one another’s views as we as an organization debate whether we want to do something along these lines. It is vitally important that we recognize that while a name can be very helpful in conveying identity, it will not serve as a panacea for all that faces us regarding our identity. We will need to do much more to address our challenges.

**In our quest, we must manage the multiple identities within our organization.** Within organizations, there are often subgroups that share specific identities, and this is also true of our occupation (e.g., scientist, practitioner, management professor, HR generalist, counseling psychologist, management consultant, dean). Research on how organizations manage the fact that multiple identities exist may be of value to us (Pratt & Foreman, 2000). One way of managing multiple identities is by making conscious decisions about identity plurality—what does the umbrella of the organization encompass? Are there groups we should be embracing? Are there identities that the field wishes to shed, or to downplay? If you look at the historical entwining of I-O psychology with human factors psychology or consumer psychology, you can see periods of distancing. We have often had discussions on the Executive Committee regarding what are our criteria for membership. Thus, we have thought about and need to continue to think about what our umbrella is.

Research on managing multiple identities also mentions exploiting identity synergy (Pratt & Foreman, 2000). To me, our conference is great because we have people here who in addition to their broader identity as an I-O psychologist might have an identity as an entrepreneur or as an HR generalist or as a work–family researcher or as an administrator for an Executive MBA program, and bringing these other identities to bear on the issues facing the field enhances us all. We should work to exploit these synergies rather than to view our multiple identities as problematic and choosing to compartmentalize within our organization. One issue in our quest that I see as particularly hard to manage is that of determining which ways of ensuring quality are best for our field.

In the literature on the development of professions there is a clear indication that too much variability in training and too little attention to ensuring quality in research and practice leads to difficulties in maintaining a strong identity. Within I-O, we do have guidelines for education and training; we also have some guidelines regarding quality in practice areas, most notably the Principles, and we have gatekeepers of research quality who serve on the edi-
torial boards of journals and on thesis and dissertation committees. We have chosen to avoid other strategies that are often invoked as ways to ensure quality—namely, accreditation of training programs and internships, and strong advocacy of credentialing or licensing. Both of these strategies have negatives associated with their adoption. As Ilgen (1990) has noted “credentialing in any field is a defensive strategy.” Rogers (1973) noted that certification tends to freeze professions and discourage innovation. SIOP wrestles regularly with the tradeoffs inherent in these choices—we want to avoid cookie cutter programs, rigid boundaries to our field, bureaucracy in general, but we also do not want to be boxed out of practice areas because we don’t accredit programs and most of us aren’t licensed and we want to maintain high standards for training and research. This is an aspect of identity management for which I don’t have an easy answer because I am not very much in favor of the more bureaucratic solutions; however, the assurance of quality in our training, research, and practice is key to maintaining a strong identity.

What is SIOP doing to meet these challenges? A LOT! Here is a list of just a few of the activities that we have been engaged in to convey our identity to others and meet the challenges I’ve mentioned: name change discussion, press releases, PR person, media referral, brochures, brand analysis, solutions series, workplace toolkit, Web site enhancement, outreach to HBCs, involvement in APA and APS, I-O teaching modules, ensure I-O coverage in APA materials, respond whenever other psychologists ignore our existence, and licensure toolkit. For example, we have many ongoing efforts to convey our identity to HR audiences, through the media, to students and in particular to underrepresented student groups, and to other areas of psychology. Our biggest effort each year—the conference—is something that reaffirms our identity and creates anew our identity.

What else should SIOP be doing? I think we all need to engage in a conversation about what are our core attributes, what makes us distinctive, and what we should be conveying to others about our identity. Carry out these conversations informally with others. Carry on the conversation via SIOP’s bulletin boards or by e-mailing your thoughts to committee chairs (their addresses are in every issue of *TIP*). I’d also encourage you to engage in the conversation at a global level—let’s work on a unified professional identity for I-O psychologists at an international level.

One final and most important point with regard to our quest is that our collective identity is your individual responsibility. You can do things to make the field more visible. You can start by being willing to identify yourself as an I-O psychologist rather than hoping that people will somehow learn about our profession without you having to mention the name. I am guilty of introducing myself as someone who works at MSU or as a professor, not as an I-O psychologist. The literature on social identity contains reference to concepts such as identity centrality, and to identity management strategies such as recategorization. This body of research indicates that individuals do
attempt to manage how others define them, as well as how much they see cer-
tain categories as defining themselves. You are making conscious choices
about how much you embrace the identity of an I-O psychologist and how
you manage that identity. We have to do a better job of identifying ourselves
if we wish to be identifiable.

You can talk to others about our profession (e.g., talk to the media, to local
HR, business, and civic associations, to students during career days; write a
column for a trade publication, civic organization newsletter, or local paper).
Why should we be called on as experts if we do not willingly offer our expert-
ise? We need to speak out as individuals on how our field can contribute to
important issues of the day.

We need to be willing to connect with our psychology roots as individu-
als, not just via a small set of representatives that sit on various APA and APS
boards and committees. You can ensure that our status within the broader field
of psychology is enhanced by being active (e.g., publish in journals with audi-
ences in other areas of psychology; write columns in state association newslet-
ters, newsletters for other APA divisions, the Monitor, the Observer, etc.).
Perloff (1968) discussed how subdisciplines deserve a place in psychology
only so long as they “continue to give to, and not just receive from” main-
stream psychology. What are you giving back to mainstream psychology?

You can work to ensure new entrants to our field are socialized to the val-
ues with which we wish to identify. I have been fortunate enough to be men-
tored by Paul Sackett who is a role model for scientist-practitioners, as is his
mentor, Milt Hakel, and as is his mentor, Marv Dunnette. These individu-
als transmitted an identity that I continue to try and convey to my students,
and that I am so proud to see so many of my former advisees conveying to
others. Each of you has opportunities to shape our future identity as you inter-
act with students and new members by the choices you make about what you
convey as the central, distinctive, and enduring aspects of I-O.

In the literature on professions, it is clear that professional position is won
by demonstrated competence (Shoben, 1955). In the marketing literature on
branding it is noted that to build a brand you need to provide superior customer
value (Randall, 2000). We cannot expect people to be familiar with us unless
they can see that what we do has relevance for their lives. You can demonstrate
the relevance of I-O by doing the research that shows the value added by our
perspective. You can show that our field deserves notice by doing your job well.

I end with a quote that addresses how important the individual is in deter-
mining the collective identity. This is Carl Rogers speaking about clinical
psych in 1951, but I have substituted I-O. “It is not what I say about the cur-
riculum of I-O psychology but what I do in my classes that is important. It is
not what is written about the relationship of psychologist to client which will
decide that issue, but the actual relationships which…psychologists create
when they meet new clients… Each one of us is operationally deciding each
of these issues for himself as he carries on his work.”
You are determining what an I-O psychologist is, and conveying what is an I-O psychologist each day as you go about your work; you are operationalizing our identity. It is not what I’ve said here today that will make a difference in our identity quest, but what you choose to do in your work lives as you convey who we are to others. Be conscious of your choices.
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