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Take a minute to look at an article published in *Journal of Applied Psychology* or *Personnel Psychology* 50 years ago. Compare it to what is published in those journals today. You will notice an exponential increase in the length of articles. Certainly, the analyses conducted in today’s articles are generally more sophisticated, and the cumulative knowledge-base in I-O is greater. But does that justify the increase in length? Are longer articles a sign of scientific maturity? Are they appropriate in the age of new media?

Short reports of empirical research are an indication that a science has matured (Park, 2009; Taylor, 2009), and shorter articles garner scientific influence more efficiently than standard articles (Haslam, 2010). Although articles throughout the sciences have moved to shorter and more accessible formats, management journals have gone in the other direction. The editors of *Academy of Management Journal* recently commented:

> Submissions may have inadequate scope because authors are under the mistaken impression that *AMJ* still publishes “research notes.” It does not, and in fact rarely publishes any article that is significantly shorter than the 40 pages ....” (Colquitt & George, 2011, p. 434).

Research in I-O has been ongoing for over 100 years.
The *Journal of Applied Psychology* will be 100 years old in 2017. *Personnel Psychology* is 65 years old. I believe the field has enough shared assumptions that encyclopaedic introductions, methods, and discussion sections have become an anachronism in the world of online access.

The success of the Association for Psychological Science (APS) journal *Psychological Science* has shown that publishing empirical research in psychology can become quicker and leaner by publishing shorter and more accessible articles. The new journal, *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, is a collaboration of scholarly associations and bills itself as a unique short reports journal in social and personality psychology. As the former Publications officer for SIOP, I have seen a demand for a similar journal in I-O psychology.

There seems to be an illusion of a crowded field of I-O journals. Some of the journals that were formerly homes for the work of I-O psychologists, however, have become increasingly dominated by research focused on strategy and policy issues, to the neglect of behavioral and psychological issues (see Ryan & Ford, 2010). I-O psychology needs a journal that focuses on basic empirical research on people at work.

I-O psychological research provides the science behind the behavior and well-being of people at work. In addition, it provides the scientific foundation for human resource practice (Cohen, 2008). As such, it must get the best science out to the relevant community quickly.

**References**


Searching for Capitalism
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A recent spate of curiosity compelled me to search the archives of Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice using one keyword: “capitalism.” Delivering no results, I then tried “capitalist.” Nothing. Searching the archives of The Industrial Organizational Psychologist proved more challenging, but not in the least more fruitful. The one aggregate search engine I gained access to—EBSCO—delivered no results.1

Driving this curiosity was a suspicion by-now familiar to an older generation of organizational psychologists: namely, that we organizational psychologists take for granted—or at least do not fundamentally question—the broader socioeconomic milieu in which we work. Loren Baritz (1960) said it best over 50 years ago: “From the pioneers in industrial psychology to the sophisticated human-relations experts of the 1950s, almost all industrial social scientists have either backed away from the political and ethical implications of their work or have faced these considerations from the point of view of management” (p. 34).

Curiously, Baritz’s words have long-since been buried or forgotten among my generation of organizational psychologists. Born after the infamous “crisis years” of the 1970s in the social sciences and largely self-assured by our increasingly sophisticated science, we display little of the political savvy—not to mention revolutionary fervor—of our predecessors. And it is not just our contemporary socioeconomic milieu that we tend to ignore in our theorizing and research but also our own history. Anecdotally, my graduate training consisted of virtually no serious consideration of the historical and philosophical foundations
of organizational psychology. Compare this to our counterparts in clinical and counseling psychology for whom a course in “History and Systems of Psychology” remains a requirement (APA, 2013).

Such educational myopia baffles me. Even if capitalism were man’s most wondrous achievement or a self-evident fact of human nature, we still could not rule out its influence on our lives as organizational psychologists and, more importantly, the lives of those we purport to understand and help. And yet, for some reason or another, mentioning capitalism has remained taboo, and puzzlingly so, because it is hard to deny that society remains ordered (or otherwise) by an impersonal market economy, competition between individuals and companies, and the accumulation of material resources. It is also hard to deny the cycles of production and consumption that lie at the center of our lives or the reality of wage-labor forced upon the large majority of us, first as a form of survival and later as a measure of our status and self-worth.

It is my hope that tomorrow’s organizational psychologists, insofar as they remain dedicated to understanding and alleviating the contemporary problems of organizing, also dedicate themselves to incorporating the features of capitalism intertwined with and contributing to these problems. Granted this may require a new type of knowledge and a new set of skills—perhaps, even, a new and more politically engaged type of organizational psychologist—but we should neither be discouraged nor intimidated. Putting capitalism in question, pace Joseph McCarthy, is no longer “un-American”; in fact, it’s arguably now mainstream. For those of you who missed it, “Capitalism in Question” was this past summer’s Academy of Management Conference theme.²

Meanwhile, let us hope that searching for capitalism in SIOP’s flagship publications eventually returns more than just this commentary.

Notes
1 Interestingly, not long after these searches were conducted, TIP published a paper (Lefkowitz, 2013) that mentioned capitalism—but one paper might well be viewed as “the exception that proves the rule.”
2 The benefits—and challenges—of putting capitalism in question for I-O psychology will be expanded upon in a future piece.
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The History Holiday Special: An I-O Psychologist in the Miracle on 34th Street?
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Invited article for History Corner section of the January 2014 issue of The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist.

Note. The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of U.S. Customs and Border Protection or the U.S. Federal Government. The author would like to thank Kevin Byle, Chihwei Su, Megan Leasher, and Susan Reilly for their valuable comments and suggestions on this paper.

The holiday season is currently winding down, and no doubt many SIOP members have enjoyed department and office parties with colleagues, spending time with family, exchanging gifts, and watching classic holiday movies and television shows. One holiday movie, Miracle on 34th Street (Davies, Seaton, & Perlberg, 1947) appears to have the only fictional portrayal of an I-O psychologist in a movie.¹ In this movie, Kris Kringle (played by Edmund Gwenn) is hired by Doris Walker (played by Maureen O’Hara) to replace an intoxicated Santa Claus in the Macy’s Thanksgiving Day Parade. After receiving rave reviews from customers and R. H. Macy (the store’s owner, played by Harry Antrim), Kringle is hired to work as Santa Claus in the famous Macy’s on 34th Street in New York City (Figure 1). Walker becomes suspicious of Kringle’s mental health after he insists that he truly is Santa Claus and lists eight reindeer as next of kin in his personnel forms. Worried that Kringle might “have a sudden fit,” Walker and her coworker, Julian Shellhammer (played by Philip Tonge) decide to “have Mr. Sawyer talk to him” because “he’s a psychologist” and was hired “to examine employees.”
Granville Sawyer (played by Porter Hall) verbally administers an examination consisting of general knowledge questions (e.g., the number of days in a week), arithmetic, and muscle coordination. Throughout the examination, Sawyer appears nervous and Kringle asks Sawyer about Sawyer’s own “nervous habits” and if he is “happy at home.” After the examination, Sawyer recommends that Macy’s fire Kringle and have him “placed in a mental institution.”

Later in the movie, it is revealed that Sawyer has started conducting free therapy sessions for a 17-year old Macy’s employee Alfred (played by Alvin Greenman) who enjoys dressing up as Santa Claus to entertain children at the local YMCA. Kringle confronts Sawyer about his qualifications for conducting therapy. During the confrontation, Kringle states “Your job here, I understand, is to give intelligence tests.” Eventually, Kringle is placed into the psychiatric ward of Bellevue Hospital and his case (for psychiatric commitment) is brought before a court. Kringle winds up winning the commitment hearing and Sawyer is fired by R. H. Macy, who says “Psychologist!? Where did you graduate from, a correspondence school?...You’re fired.”

The 1947 version of the film highlights some issues for psychologists that are still relevant today. For example, the psychologist was practicing outside of his area of expertise, which would be a violation of the current APA (2003a, Standard 2.01[a]) Ethical Principles, al-
though the movie predated the first ethics code, which was published in 1953 (APA, 2003b; APA, 1953). In addition, the psychologist was portrayed in a negative light throughout the film, which is consistent with other films up to this day (see Cannon, 2008; Niemiec & Wedding, 2006; Orchowski, Spickard, & McNamara, 2006 for examples). In fact, Division 46 of APA has created a “Media Watch Committee,” which aims to advise movie and television industry on how to depict psychologists as “competent and ethical without sacrificing dramatic impact” (Heitner & Schultz, 2004; Sleek, 1998).

Another issue is the relative lack of knowledge among members of the media and the general public on the roles and training for clinical versus I-O psychologists. More modern articles in *TIP* (Gasser et al., 1998; Gasser, Bulter, Waddilove, & Tan, 2004) and Ryan’s (2003) SIOP presidential address are evidence that this is an issue we still grapple with today. However, Jamieson (2011) notes that recent depictions of clinical psychologists on TV are not entirely accurate either. Thus, it appears that the grass may not be greener on the other (i.e., clinical) side of the fence in terms of nonpsychologists’ ideas about the work that psychologists do.

**Other Adaptations**

There are a number of adaptations of the 1947 movie. The first was a book by Davies (1947) that describes Sawyer as “Macy’s expert on vocational guidance and psychology” (p. 32). In 1947 and 1948, the movie was adapted into two live radio programs (Davies, Seaton, & Cummings, 1947; Davies, Seaton, & Keighley, 1948), with much of the same script as the movie. The radio programs were part of the *Lux Radio Theatre* series and featured some of the same stars that were in the movie. Interestingly, Sawyer was not depicted as a psychologist in these adaptations; instead Shellhammer introduces him as someone who works “in personnel” and is “paid to examine employees.” None of the other characters refer to him as a psychologist.

Another remake was done on live television in 1955 (Davies, Seaton, Monks, & Stevenson, 1955) and was simulcast on radio as part of the *Lux Radio Theatre* series (Gargiulo, 2002). Sawyer is depicted as a “psychologist” and the credits list his character as “Dr. Sawyer” although the name “Mr. Sawyer” was spoken throughout the movie. During the movie, Sawyer gives a rather professorial talk, entitled “Exploding the Myth of Santa Claus,” to an audience.

Another live television adaptation was made in 1959 (Davies, et al.) and osten-
sibly went missing for many years (IMDB, n.d.). In those days, NBC’s east coast stations would televise live broadcasts of shows, well before primetime on the west coast. To resolve this time-zone issue, NBC recorded the live broadcasts using an archaic contraption called a kinescope and later played the recording to the west coast (Abramson, 2003). In 1986, NBC donated its kinescope recordings to the Library of Congress (2010), and I was able to view a digital copy of the adaptation there. In this version, Sawyer (played by Orson Bean) takes on both an “I” (e.g., testing) and “O” role (e.g., job satisfaction) at Macy’s as he states that he “was hired to find out what bothers our people, what makes them unhappy, makes them un-Macy-like.”

I was unable to track down copies of the 1973 remake of the movie (Davies, Seaton, & Cook, 1973) and the 1963 Broadway musical, (Davies, Willson, & Seaton, 1963) so I must rely on secondary citations for Sawyer’s portrayal in these two adaptations: Erickson (n.d., see also Thompson, 1973) reports that the 1973 film depicted Sawyer as a psychiatrist (Erickson states that this is a “somewhat anachronistic...plot device”), and the Broadway musical reportedly portrayed “Dr. Sawyer” as a psychologist (The Guide to Musical Theatre, n.d.). Macy’s declined to allow its name to be used in the most recent adaptation of the movie (Davies, Seaton, Hughes, & Mayfield, 1994; also see the related book by Singer, 1994); Sawyer’s role in the story was also removed as the producer/director indicated that “We felt it would be better if we made it an external threat to the store” (p. D21, Elliott, 1994). The external threat comes from a competitor to the department store that conspires with the (now fired) intoxicated Santa Claus.

Macy’s also presents puppet-show adaptations of the movie in its department store on 34th Street (Davies, Schermerhorn, Whatley, & Coppola, 2008; Examiner, 2010; Macy’s, 2011). In an amateur recording of the puppet show, Sawyer is depicted as a “personnel” employee and “retail executive” not as a psychologist. Finally, a number of amateur groups perform Miracle on 34th Street as either a musical or play; Sawyer’s role varies in these performances.

**Did an I-O Psychologist Actually Work at Macy’s?**

The 1947 version of the movie was released when I-O psychology was still in its infancy; SIOP was only two years old at the time. Prior to 1945, the major professional organization for the field was Section D (Industrial and Business) of the American Association of Applied Psychology (AAAP), which eventually merged into APA as Division 14 in 1945 (Koppes, n.d.). At the 1947 APA meeting, only 130 psychologists were identified as members of SIOP (compared to 7,136 members² today).
It turns out that Macy’s (then known as R. H. Macy & Co., Inc.) does indeed have a long I-O psychology history. Some of the early history does include a clinical aspect, including the employment of a psychiatrist, Victor V. Anderson, M.D., as the director of Medical Research for Macy’s from 1924 to c. 1931 (Angus, 1960). Anderson’s (1929) efforts are detailed in his book, *Psychiatry in Industry*, in which he recommends that personnel offices employ a psychiatrist, a psychologist, and a social worker. He discusses topics such as employment testing, job analysis, and validation. In one section he describes the “Testing Service” of Macy’s Employment Office, which consists of “a psychologist in charge,” three clerical employees, and a testing room that accommodates 35 applicants (p. 298). There are numerous references to intelligence testing and examining for mental illnesses throughout his book. In its review, the *Journal of Applied Psychology* (1929) notes that Anderson clearly stresses the “clinical and psychiatric approach” and that he oscillates between “belittle[ing] tests” and “welcome [ing] them.” (pp. 418, 419). Nevertheless, Anderson’s work at Macy’s was influential. In his autobiography, SIOP Past President Carroll Shartle (n.d.) mentions visiting Anderson’s program at Macy’s.

In addition to employing a psychiatrist, Macy’s also employed psychologists (as noted by Koppes, 2003 and Koppes & Pickrin, 2007). Early feminist and psychologist Lorine Pruette worked at Macy’s in the 1920s (Ogilive & Harvey, 2000; Rutherford, n.d.), although there is scant information available on her career at the store. Another Macy’s psychologist, Elsie Bregman, was credited with creating the first testing program for sales staff in department stores during her tenure at Macy’s from 1919 to 1921 (*New York Times*, 1969). After working for Macy’s, Bregman (1921) published a report on her applied research at Macy’s in the *Journal of Applied Psychology* and a more detailed monograph a year later (Bregman, 1922). Both publications mention the use of tests for “intelligence” at Macy’s, and she was a coauthor of a book entitled *The Measurement of Intelligence* (Thorndike, Bregman, Cobb, & Woodyard, 1926). Bregman (1921) also mentions that she was hired into her position to “experiment with vocational tests” (1921, p. 127). Thus, the notion that Macy’s hired a psychologist to work on intelligence testing (which was Sawyer’s role in *Miracle on 34th Street*) appears to be quite accurate. In contrast to the movie, Bregman (1921) states that operational testing of job applicants was done by a clerical employee under her direction, not by a psychologist.³

In her publication, Bregman (1921) details results from criterion-related validation studies and discusses her work conducting job analyses using the job-tryout method. One of the most striking aspects of her papers is that she refers
to issues that I-O psychologists still grapple with today, including “dispel[ling] prevalent bugaboos about the nature of mental tests” (1921, p. 129; see O’Boyle & McDaniel, 2008, for a modern discussion of this topic), leniency errors in supervisory ratings (1921, p. 133; see Pulakos & O’Leary, 2011 for a modern discussion), applicant reactions/face validity (1921, p. 143, see McCarthy et al., 2013, for a modern discussion), and the validity of general versus specific abilities (1922, see Brown, Le, & Schmidt, 2006, for a modern discussion). Some aspects of her paper are nearly identical to current practices (e.g., the use of correlation and regression) and others (e.g., the use of hand-drawn graphs as shown in Figure 2) are now antiquated.

It might seem surprising that a department store would employ a psychologist and a psychiatrist. Although I-O psychology was very small at the time, Macy’s appears large enough to support an I-O psychology presence. In the 1920s, the Macy’s on 34th Street was the world’s largest store and the company employed 7,500 permanent employees, often hiring an additional 2,500 for the holiday season (Grippo, 2009). Macy’s was clearly not a small mom-and-pop corner store at the time. Grippo notes that Macy’s “enjoyed a solid stream of job applicants” (p. 101), so it seems reasonable that the company would be interested in using the products and services of an I-O psychologist (e.g., selection system design).

It is likely that Macy’s still used employment tests around the time that Miracle on 34th Street was released. Loes (1949) mentioned that Macy’s administered aptitude tests to applicants for cashier-wrapper positions. The tests measured speed and accuracy, manual dexterity, and color vision (e.g., tests for color blindness). A manual search of APA’s (Wolfe, 1948)

![Figure 2. In this hand-drawn graph from Bregman’s (1921) article, the use of a cognitive ability test for placement of applicants into clerical and sales positions is detailed. Note that the histogram and the writing are hand-drawn on graph paper. (Reprinted with permission from the publisher, APA.)](image-url)
membership directory revealed that an APA Associate Member Patricia Jackson, was working at Macy’s when the movie was released. According to her biography in the directory, she began serving as the director of Psychological Testing at Macy’s in New York starting in 1941. She listed her areas of expertise as test construction and validation and selection and placement for retail employees and executives. As an aside, Macy’s competitor in the movie (the now defunct Gimbel Brothers department store) also employed an APA associate member in Philadelphia, Isabelle Fife, who listed test development and validation in her biography (Wolfe, 1948).

Macy’s also employed Lillian Gilbreth (see Figure 3) who is credited with writing the first I-O psychology dissertation (Gilbreth, 1914) and received her PhD in 1915 from Brown University (Koppes, 1997; Koppes, Landy, & Perkins, 1993; Landy, 1994; Perloff & Naman, 1996). In the true-life movie, Belles on Their Toes, Gilbreth is shown teaching a training class that included two attendees from "the biggest department store in New York," which ostensibly is Macy’s (Levin, Ephron, Ephron, Gilbreth, & Gilbreth Carey, 1952). In addition, psychologist John B. Watson spent two summer months in 1921 working at Macy’s after resigning his professorship at the Johns Hopkins University in 1920 (Larson, 1979). Watson later gave a presentation in 1922 to a class of graduates from a Macy’s executive training program (DiClemente & Hantula, 2000). According to an article in TIP (1981), SIOP member Mildred “Kitty” Katzell served as a “supervisor of employment testing at Macy’s in NY” at some point in time prior to 1976 (p. 2). In addition, an obituary for I-O psychologist Walter V. Clarke indicated that he was in charge of Macy’s employee test division during the 1930s (Walter V. Clarke Associates, 1978). Clarke published a number of articles in the Journal of Applied Psychology in the 1950s and 1960s and developed an early I-O personality test, the Activity Vector Analysis (Clarke, 1948). Today, Macy’s still employs an I-O psychologist; SIOP member Megan Leasher “oversees talent assessment and measurement programs” (Leasher, personal communication October 28, 2013) and contributes to I-O research (Leasher, 2011, 2012, 2013). As for Santa Claus, Stetz (2012) recently reported that he still has not yet “employed or consulted with an I-O psychologist” (p. 37).

Figure 3. In addition to writing the first I-O psychology dissertation, it also appears that Lillian Gilbreth is also the only psychologist to be featured on a postage stamp (Koppes, 1999). This stamp, issued on February 24, 1984 by the U.S. Postal Service (2003), includes her portrait.
Notes

1In a review, Cannon (2008) notes that the most common psychology specialties shown in films are clinical and forensic, followed by occasional portrayals of child and school psychologists. Cannon made no mention of any portrayals of I-O psychologists. Searches of the Internet Movie Database (IMDB), Netflix, and Google failed to identify any other fictional English-language movies that depicted an I-O psychologist. Occasionally, some of my colleagues have opined that the two Bobs in the movie Office Space are fellow I-O psychologists; however, neither of them was referred to as a psychologist in the movie. In addition, Exam (Hazeldine & Unwin, 2009), a British movie, involves a group of job applicants taking a rather warped employment examination. One of the characters, “Dark” (played by Adar Beck), is an internal applicant from Human Resources who states that she is a psychologist. However, in one scene she displays an encyclopedic knowledge of the DSM criteria for narcissism, which suggests that she is clinical psychologist not an I-O psychologist. In the 1950s, there were two nonfictional movies based on the true life of Lillian Gilbreth who, as mentioned later in this article, was an I-O psychologist. Told from the perspective of her children, the movies mainly focus on her family life as the mother of 12 children. However, they depict her pioneering time-motion studies.

2Current membership numbers courtesy of the SIOP Administrative Office (as of December 10, 2013).

3The biography for the psychologist (Patricia Jackson, who is mentioned later in this article) employed at Macy’s at the time of the release of the film makes a similar statement, indicating that Jackson was responsible for the “general direction and supervision” of the testing.
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The Leading Edge Consortium: Realigning for Future Success

The Leading Edge Conference (LEC) was initiated by SIOP in 2005 and has been held every year for the last 9 years. In the early years the LEC was considered a major success by SIOP members, but in recent years there has been declining attendance and revenue losses. In 2012, a special LEC Advisory Group made recommendations on how to get the LEC back on a successful track, and those recommendations were implemented in 2013 with significant results. We provide a review of the LEC over the years, the ups and downs of the conference, the Advisory Group recommendations, and the future outlook for the LEC.

2005 Leading Edge Consortium: Getting Launched

On a warm Spring night in 2005, on the inviting St. Paul patio of the home of Marv Dunnette and Leaetta Hough, and overlooked by a six-foot Dancing Snoopy sculpture, Leaetta and Rob Silzer discussed professional issues in SIOP. Leaetta had just been elected SIOP president-elect and wanted to pursue ways that SIOP could provide more support to I-O practitioners. Among the many ideas discussed, Rob suggested that SIOP sponsor a short conference focused on a single I-O practice topic that would attract and engage senior, seasoned I-O practitioners and help move the field forward. As a result the Leading Edge Consortium was born, and Leaetta soon gained the support of the SIOP Executive Board to sponsor the first LEC in St. Louis during October, 2005.

In late Spring, 2005, with only 4 months left to plan and organize the October LEC, three LEC chairpersons were appointed: Rob Silzer, Leaetta Hough, and David Campbell, along with Dave Nershi, the new SIOP executive
director. The topic of “Executive Talent” was selected (with input from others), and the St. Louis location and hotel were identified. There was an intense scramble by the chairs and Dave Nershi that summer to operationalize the LEC concept, construct the program, solicit influential speakers, communicate and market the conference, influence SIOP members to attend, register participants, and manage the hotel and conference logistics. Everything was done from scratch and the four key players were very actively engaged in making hundreds of decisions. Dave Nershi and the SIOP Administrative Staff provided immense help in getting the LEC launched.

The original LEC objectives were:

- To address a leading issue in our field that focuses on psychological variables
- To bridge and integrate the practice and the science of the issue
- To move the field forward in both practice and science
- To engage seasoned I-O psychologists
- To provide visibility and discrimination for the profession of I-O psychology and build a stronger reputation in the business and academic worlds
- To connect with organizational and human resources professionals
- To build a practice/research consortium for future research/benchmarking efforts

The 2005 LEC was held at the Westin Hotel in St. Louis, and was titled “Leadership at the Top: The Selection, Globalization and Ethics of Executive Talent.” The goal was to explore the practice and science associated with organizational executive leaders during sessions on executive selection, effectiveness, development, globalization, ethics, and talent management integration. An explicit effort was made to design a different type of conference that was more focused and more intimate than the annual SIOP conference. Unique features were added like focused talks and panels, a packed fast-paced 1½ day agenda, invited high profile speakers, networking breaks and dinners, smaller boutique hotel sites, full speaker slide decks provided to registrants, and a follow up DVD made available of the conference. The intention was to provide a more personal experience for attendees and to focus on a single critical I-O topic.

A total of 184 people registered for the 2005 conference on Executive Talent with 163 full fee registrants (and 21 complimentary registrations for chairs and speakers). The conference also brought in $13,000 in net revenues for SIOP and received rave reviews from both participants and speakers. The program topic, the program content and the program speakers were all highly rated (with average ratings of 4.8, 4.4, and 4.7 respec-
tively on a five-point scale). A typical participant comment was “the right topic, by the right people, in the right venue, in the right city, and coordinated in exactly the right way—thank you co-chairs!” By all outcome measures (attendance, revenue, evaluation ratings and comments), the first LEC was a major success and the Leading Edge Consortium was off to a terrific start.

**2006–2013: Ups and Downs for the LEC**

The Leading Edge Consortium has now been held for 9 continuous years in various cities in the South (5), Midwest (3), and West (1), usually in October of each year. The various LEC topics, locations and chairpersons can be found in Table 1. Typically it has been held in medium-sized cities such as Louisville, Kansas City, Tampa, and Richmond, and until 2012 the most recent SIOP past-president automatically became the LEC general chair (both of these policies have now been changed). The additional chairs for each LEC were usually selected because of their expertise and knowledge in the topic area and usually designated as the practice chair or the science chair. Dave Nershi was a critical member of each LEC team. The LEC topic was often identified based on the input of a small select group of active SIOP members but sometimes left to the discretion of a SIOP president.

**2006 LEC**

For the 2006 LEC on Talent Management a total of 230 people were registered with 199 full fee registrants (and 31 complimentary registrations for chairs and speakers). The conference also brought in $46,000 in net revenues for SIOP (still an LEC record) and received very strong reviews from partici-
pants. The program topic, the program content, and the program speakers were all highly rated (average ratings of 4.8, 4.2, and 4.7 respectively on a five-point scale), which matched the high ratings from 2005. A typical comment was “met my expectations—which were set high after last year’s consortium!” The 2006 LEC was able to maintain the high program quality and evaluation ratings from 2005, but increased attendance by 22% and significantly increased revenues by 253% from 2005. Another major LEC success!

**Attendance and Revenue**

There were great expectations that the LEC would continue to be successful (measured by attendance, revenues, and evaluation ratings). Some participants particularly liked the smaller, personal size of the LEC and did not want it to turn into another big annual SIOP conference. However, over the next 6 years (2007–2012) the LEC experienced very mixed success, with regularly declining attendance and significant revenue losses (see Figures 1 & 2).

In 5 of the next 6 years (2007–2012) the LEC attendance declined every year and there was a revenue loss every year. The clear exception was in 2008 (executive coaching), when the LEC noticeably increased registration from the year before and also had positive net revenue. The registration declines and revenue losses were particularly significant in 2011 (virtual workforce) and 2012 (environmental sustainability) when full fee registrations dropped to 56 and 34 registrants respectively, and when there were revenue losses of -$18,000 and -$15,000. It should be noted that in 2012 live video connections were organized for 11 remote sites. This attracted another 103 remote

---

**Figure 1. Full Fee and Complimentary Registrations by Year**

* In 2012 there were an additional 103 registrants who attended the LEC remotely at drastically reduced fees.

** The complimentary unpaid registrants for 2013 included chairs, speakers, as well as HR Impact Award winners.

---

**Figure 2. LEC Net Revenues by Year**

*Preliminary estimate
location people (many were graduate students) but at drastically reduced fees, and it was not continued in 2013.

Also starting in 2005, a video DVD was produced to record each LEC and to generate additional revenues by selling them to the SIOP membership. This effort produced marginal revenues and was discontinued in 2010. Similarly there was an intermittent effort to publish an edited book based each LEC as part of the SIOP Professional Practice Series. Books were only produced in some years, and they had mixed success.

LEC attendance (full fee registrants) peaked in 2005 (executive talent), 2006 (talent management), and then again in 2013 (building leaders). The lowest registrations (full fee registrants) were in 2012 (environmental sustainability) and 2011 (virtual workforce). The revenues were highest in 2006 (talent management), 2013 (building leaders), and 2005 (executive talent). The steepest revenue losses were in 2007 (innovation), 2010 (high performance teams), and 2012 (environmental sustainability).

There were a total of 1,349 registrants for the nine LECs (which includes all complimentary registrants such as speakers and chairs, etc.). Participants were primarily associated with SIOP:

- Members (current and retired): 675 participants (50%)
- Fellows (current and retired): 125 participants (9%)
- Associates: 124 participants (9%)
- International affiliates: 28 participants (2%)
- Students: 77 participants (6%)
- Nonmembers: 314 participants (23%)
- Other: 6 participants (0.4%)

Of the 952 participants (71% of total registrants) who were associated with SIOP membership (Members, Fellows, Associates and International affiliates, but not including students), 654 of these registrants (69%) self-identified as working in the private sector (in consulting and in organizations), 161 (17%) were working in the academic sector, and 27 (3%) were in the government sector. In addition, 314 of total registrants (23%) were nonmembers. Based on the observations of the first author and others who have attended multiple LECs, most of these participants are likely to be colleagues and HR professionals associated with I-O practitioners from consulting firms and business organizations.

It appears that the dominant groups of participants across all the LECs were I-O practitioners and their work colleagues from consulting firms and business organizations. It seems clear that I-O practitioners are the core registrant group and should be the primary target market for future LECs.
**Evaluation Ratings.**

In general evaluation ratings are high in most areas across the LECs, typically averaging 4.0+ on a five-point scale. There is some moderate variance in the evaluation ratings across the LECs (see Fig. 3–8).

It should be noted that each of the LEC teams worked exceptionally hard to pull together and deliver a high quality conference. Each LEC takes a sustained 10-month effort to plan and organize, and

---

**LEC Program Topic Importance**
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*Figure 3. Ratings of the Importance of the Topic Chosen for the LEC (2005-2013)*

**Applicability of Topic to Workplace**
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*Figure 6. Evaluation Ratings on Applicability of Topic to Workplace (2005-2013)*

**Topic effectively represented by LEC**

![Graph of Topic effectively represented by LEC](image)

*Figure 4. Evaluation Ratings on Topic Effectively Represented by LEC (2005-2013)*

**Opportunity for Networking**
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*Figure 7. Evaluation Ratings on Opportunity for Networking (2005-2013)*

**Speaker Knowledge and Expertise**
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*Figure 5. Ratings of Knowledge Level and Expertise of Speakers at LEC (2005-2013)*

**One of the Best Conferences Overall**
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*Figure 8. Attendees' Ratings of LEC as the Best Conference They Have Attended*
requires a multitude of decisions related to program development, speaker recruiting, marketing and promotion, and conference logistics.

Although these data are presented as cross-LEC comparisons, it should be noted that registrants at any particular LEC may tend to provide fairly positive ratings because they have already been attracted to and committed to the topic, paid for airfares and hotel rooms, and sat through several days of presentations.

**LEC program topic importance.** Average ratings varied from 4.45 to 4.88. The evaluation results (Figure 3) show only minor rating variance across LECs. The highest rated topics, all rated similarly, were executive talent (2005), talent management (2006), high performance teams (2010), virtual workforce (2011), and building leaders (2013). The lowest rated topics were environmental sustainability (2012) and innovation (2007).

**Topic effectively represented by LEC.** Average ratings varied from 3.98 to 4.65 (see Figure 4). The highest rated LECs for “topic was effectively represented” were on high performance teams (2010), building leaders (2013), executive talent (2005), and virtual workforce (2011). The LECs with lowest ratings for “effective representation of the topic” were on innovation (2007) and executive coaching (2008).

**Speaker knowledge and expertise.** Average ratings varied from 4.30 to 4.84 (see Figure 5). The highest rated LECs for “speaker knowledge and expertise” were in 2010 (high performance teams), 2013 (building leaders), 2005 (executive talent), and 2011 (virtual workforce). The LECs with the lowest ratings for “speaker knowledge and expertise” were in 2007 (innovation) and 2012 (environmental sustainability).

**Applicability of topic to workplace.** Average ratings across LECs varied from 3.91 to 4.61 (see Figure 6). The highest rated LECs for “applicability of topic to workplace” were in 2010 (high performance teams), 2005 (executive talent), and 2006 (talent management). The LECs with the lowest ratings for “applicability of topic to workplace” were in 2007 (innovation) and 2012 (environmental sustainability).

**Opportunity for networking.** Average ratings across LECs varied from 4.28 to 4.73 (see Figure 7). The highest rated LECs for “opportunity for networking” in 2010 (high performance teams) and 2011 (virtual workforce). The LECs with the lowest ratings for networking opportunity were in 2005 (executive talent) and 2012 (environmental sustainability).

**One of the best conferences overall.** This evaluation question represents a summary overall evaluation of the LEC. Av-
verage ratings across LECs varied from 3.54 to 4.73, a much wider variance than for other evaluation areas (see Figure 8). The highest rated LECs for being “one of the best conferences overall” were in 2010 (high performance teams), 2005 (executive talent), 2013 (building leaders), and 2006 (talent management). The LECs with the lowest relative ratings for being “one of the best conferences overall” were in 2008 (executive coaching), 2009 (global selection and assessment), and 2007 (innovation).

**Outcome metrics.** There are a four key metrics that can be used for evaluating the success of the LEC:

- Number of full registration fee participants
- Net revenue income or loss for SIOP
- Evaluation ratings on specific evaluation questions
- Overall rating on “one of best conferences overall” question

In an effort to look at the LEC effectiveness more broadly across all years, the nine LECs were ranked ordered based on each of these four variables (using data presented above [see Table 2 for summary]).

The data in Table 2 is only a general estimate of how these nine LECs might compare. The rank orders do not give full justice to actual variation on each variable. As expected there is a noticeable relationship between number of full fee registrants and net revenue—the more registrants the higher the revenue. Similarly there is a relationship between

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Attendance-full fee registrants</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Average evaluation rating**</th>
<th>“One of best conferences” rating</th>
<th>Average rank***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Executive Talent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Talent Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Executive Coaching</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Global Selection &amp; Assessment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>High-Performance Teams</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Virtual Workforce</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Environmental Sustainability</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Building Leaders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Revenue Loss
** Ranking based on the average rating across first five evaluation question ratings (see text)
*** Average of four rank orders in table across the nine LECs (for full fee attendance, revenue, average of five evaluation ratings, and “one of best conferences” rating)
the average evaluation rating (averaged across the five core evaluation questions) and the “one of the best conferences overall” rating.

Based on the average ranking across these four outcome measures (see Table 2), there are three LECs that have the highest averaged rank orders. Based on this analysis of outcomes the most successful LECs were:

- 2013: Building Leaders
- 2005: Executive Talent
- 2006: Talent Management

The 2013 LEC chairs should be applauded for delivering a highly successful LEC based on the Advisory Group recommendations. They brought the LEC back to life and demonstrated that an LEC could again successfully deliver on all four outcome measures. The other notable LEC was in 2012 (High Performing Teams), which gained the highest evaluation ratings across all the LECs but had lower attendance and a significant revenue loss.

LEC Location Ratings
The advantages and disadvantages of holding the LEC in various cities have been discussed in SIOP. Recently SIOP agreed to start holding the LEC in larger cities (starting in 2014), based on the reasoning that larger metropolitan areas would draw a greater number of local SIOP members and would allow more direct air travel to reach. For example the 2014 LEC will be held in Chicago. Each LEC location was rated by the attendees at that LEC. The location ratings in order of ratings were:

- Tampa: 4.59
- Denver: 4.43
- Charlotte: 4.25
- Louisville: 4.15
- St Louis: 4.10
- Kansas City: 4.06
- Richmond: 3.89
- Cincinnati: 3.71
- New Orleans: 3.7

These ratings are probably influenced by several factors, such as the central location for reaching by airplane, the hotel facilities, the ease of attending networking dinners in the city, and the hotel and airfare costs, etc.

Reasons for LEC Decline
Some of the LECs were disappointing in terms of attendance and revenue. Various reasons have been discussed for the LEC decline in recent years (except for 2013). One possibility is that the long economic recession has curbed attendance at conferences and seminars in most organizations because of tight budgets and travel restrictions. Similarly I-O practitioners whose consulting businesses had plateaued during the recession may have been hesitant to spend limited resources to attend an LEC on topic that seemed tangential to their work.
Some have suggested that the LECs topics in recent years were too obscure and academic, and less central to I-O practice and practitioner interests. For example the 2012 topic of “Environmental Sustainability” was not seen by many members as central or even relevant to their work, whereas the 2013 topic of “Building Leaders” was considered as more central to I-O practice and drew significantly more attendees and greater net revenue than the previous 6 years. The topics may have varied depending on who was chairing the LEC. In some years the LEC chairs were primarily I-O practitioners (nonresearch consultants and professionals in organizations): 2005, 2006, 2008, and 2013. In other years the LEC chairs were primarily academics and researchers: 2007, 2009, 2011 and 2012. (The 2010 LEC was not included in this analysis because the primary employment setting of one of the chairs at the time of the LEC was unclear). These two groups of LECs were compared on the key LEC outcome metrics (see Table 3).

These data suggest that the Group 1 LECs (where 67% or more of the chairs were I-O psychologists in nonresearch consulting and in organizations) had more than doubled the paid attendance of the Group 2 LECs (where 67% or more of the chairs were academics and researchers). Group 1 LECs also brought in significant net revenues; every one of these LECs delivered positive net reve-

Table 3
Comparison of Two Groups of LECs Based on Composition of LEC Chairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Metric</th>
<th>Group 1 LECs 2005, 2006, 2008, 2013 (Chairs were mostly consultants &amp; professionals in organizations)</th>
<th>Group 2 LECs 2007, 2009, 2011, 2012 (Chairs were mostly academics &amp; researchers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance (full fee)</td>
<td>X = 169 registrants &gt;&gt; Total = +$86K gain &gt;&gt;&gt; Every LEC had a revenue gain</td>
<td>X = 82 registrants &gt;&gt;&gt; Total = -$63K loss Every LEC had a revenue loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program topic</td>
<td>X = 4.8 &gt;</td>
<td>X = 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic representation</td>
<td>X = 4.3 &gt;</td>
<td>X = 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker knowledge &amp; expertise</td>
<td>X = 4.6 &gt;</td>
<td>X = 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicability to workplace</td>
<td>X = 4.4 &gt;</td>
<td>X = 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking opportunity</td>
<td>X = 4.4 &lt;</td>
<td>X = 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of best conferences overall</td>
<td>X = 3.9 &gt;&gt;</td>
<td>X = 3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
nues. Group 2 LECs resulted in significant revenue losses; every one of these LECs had a revenue loss. The evaluation ratings for these two groups of LECs were relatively similar but almost always were higher for Group 1 LECs. The rating difference on “one of the best conferences overall” is more significant and favored Group 1 LECs.

The differences between these two groups of LECs may not only have been the chairs but also the relevance of the topic to I-O practice, the selection of speakers (more academic versus applied), and the target market. The differences in Table 3 may also suggest differences in the topic interests between the two worlds of I-O psychology: the academic/research world versus the consulting and organizational world. These differences have also been identified in the IOP journal (Silzer & Parson, 2012).

For the LEC in years 2009 through 2012 there was a noticeable trend in declining attendance (123 > 99 > 56 > 34) and declining revenues (all had net losses). The situation looked dire in the summer of 2012 with the very weak advance registration for the 2012 LEC on environmental sustainability.

In Spring 2012, the SIOP Executive Board became concerned with the viability of the LEC and Doug Reynolds, the new SIOP president, took the initiative to address the issue.

2012 LEC Advisory Group

By 2012 there was an emerging interest by SIOP in conducting a thorough review of the LEC and to consider the viability of future LECs. At the request of SIOP President Doug Reynolds an LEC Advisory Group was formed, and included: Rob Silzer (Chair), Wendy Becker, Allan Church, Alison Mallard, and Steve Rogelberg.

The primary objective of the Advisory Group was to “re-envision the Leading Edge Consortium and outline recommendations for future LECs” (Silzer, Becker, Church, Mallard, & Rogelberg, 2012). The Advisory Group spent 4 months reviewing past LEC programs; speaking with past chairs, past attendees, and the SIOP executive director; and reviewing LEC options. Final recommendations for the LEC were provided to the SIOP Executive Board in September, 2012, and covered LEC objectives, LEC dates, target market/audience, topic selection, LEC chairs, agenda/program structure, speakers, marketing, promotion, LEC location, hotel/logistics, finances/income, expected outcomes/metrics, and future formal LEC reviews. The overarching recommendation was that “in order for the LEC to be a successful conference it needs to stay fo-
cused on its target audience: seasoned I-O practitioners. The LEC was envisioned as a practitioner conference, but it has strayed from its original mission.” Five primary LEC objectives were recommended:

- Advance I-O practice: communicate leading I-O practices
- Educate I-O practitioners: provide knowledge to practitioners
- Develop I-O practitioner skills: develop practice skills and abilities
- Focus on leading edge areas of core I-O topics: explore developments in Core I-O topics
- Engage seasoned I-O practitioners: involve seasoned practitioners in SIOP and the field

In addition the Advisory Group stated:

The topic must be a core I-O psychology practice topic or competency, that is, directly relevant to the current content domain of I-O practitioners. The term “leading edge” should be repurposed to mean that the LEC program provides new developments and practices in a core I-O practice area. (Silzer et al., 2012)

The Advisory Group suggested that, if these objectives were met, “the LEC should be able to deliver expected attendance, revenue, and reputation outcomes.” There was “optimism that the LEC can be much more successful in the future” but also an expectation that major changes would be required. It was recommended that “timely action should be taken by SIOP to correct the identified deficiencies in order to insure LEC meets and exceeds expectations.”

The realignment recommendations were accepted and fully endorsed by the SIOP Executive Board and implemented for the 2013 LEC recently held in Richmond focused on “Building Future Leaders: Innovations and Trends in Talent Management”.

**2013 LEC Realignment**

In 2013 a major effort was made by the LEC chairs, led by Jeff McHenry, to realign the LEC with the recommendations of the LEC Advisory Group. All of the recommendations were accepted and implemented (except moving the LEC in 2013 to a more major city, which would happen in 2014). The 2013 LEC chair, McHenry wrote that “the blueprint created for future LECs is helping us get LEC back on track,” and “we have certainly relied heavily on the recommendations that the LEC planning committee established” (McHenry, personal communication, November, 2013). The 2013 chairs were all seasoned I-O practitioners who were well experienced in the 2013 topic of building leaders.

A total of **219** people registered for the
2013 conference, with 170 full fee registrants. The conference also brought in +$22,000 in net revenues for SIOP (preliminary estimate) and received positive reviews from participants. The program topic, the program content, and the program speakers were all highly rated with average ratings of 4.81, 4.47 and 4.62 respectively (on a five-point scale). By all accounts the 2013 LEC took major steps to implement the recommended changes by the Advisory Group, to realign the conference, and to put the LEC back on a successful track. It was a very successful LEC!

Future Directions for LEC

Based on the Advisory Group recommendations and the impressive success of the 2013 LEC, there is renewed optimism in SIOP that the Leading Edge Consortium can meet the realigned objectives and achieve significant success in the future. Refocusing it on I-O practice topics and working to meet the needs of I-O practitioners seems to be the critical foundation for future success. But it is also important to have clear LEC guidelines and a regular review process to avoid getting off track again in the future.

The 2014 LEC will be held October 17–18 at the Intercontinental Hotel (Chicago O’Hare) in Chicago. The topic will be related to high potential talent and succession planning (the specific topic will be announced soon). The 2014 LEC seems on track to continue, and even extend, the recent success of the 2013 LEC. See you next October in Chicago.
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“It’s natural to trust what you know. When you walk into a store you tend to gravitate towards the brands you are familiar with. You know what they provide and you trust what you will get. In the modern global digital world standing out is a tall order, particularly if you are a small practice or solo practitioner,” says Dr. Woody, author of The You Plan, an expert on the topic of branding we interviewed. The fact is marketing and branding are just as important for the field of industrial-organizational psychology (I-O psychology) and individual SIOP members as it is for any product or organization.

It’s likely that each one of us has been in a recent situation where we had to define I-O psychology or explain what we do as an I-O psychologist. This alone continues to signify the greater need to create more awareness about our field. As our 2012 president Dr. Doug Rey-
nolds explains, building awareness for SIOP can and will lead to more meaningful communication about our work (Reynolds, 2013). Tammy Allen, SIOP’s current president, outlined her priorities and objectives during the conference’s closing plenary last year (SIOP, 2013), which focused on increasing the visibility and understanding of SIOP to the outside community. Overall, it is clear that the SIOP community as a whole needs to inform and advance these objectives but in order to get there we need others to understand what we as I-O psychologists can do for individuals and organizations.

One way we can help enhance our visibility as a field is by developing our own personal brand as individual I-O psychologists. Although SIOP leaders and volunteers can surely work to increase the visibility of our field from the top down, they cannot do it alone. Our field is complex and each and every one of us practices or conducts research in different areas that are extremely diverse. I-O psychologists need to work together to represent the rigor and diversity of our field by representing the SIOP brand.

Marketing oneself is not only critical for the larger SIOP community, but it is also critical for growing your presence throughout your career as well as positioning yourself for future opportunities, thus selling the value of I-O psychology to organizations. Impression management and personal branding are recognized as valuable business skills that are taught in many university business courses (Sacks & Graves, 2012). Personal branding can benefit each one of us by advancing our own personal growth, career movement, and self-awareness as well as benefiting the broader field. However, talking about yourself or explaining what you do can be difficult.

In this TIP issue, we will present best practices for developing a brand, provide branding tips from experts, and highlight social media websites that you can leverage to communicate your brand. The goal of this article is to help you begin to build your own personal brand and highlight how doing so will ultimately help brand our field along the way.

What Is a Personal Brand?

“Everyone has a chance to learn, improve, and build up their skills, and we all have a chance to be a brand worthy of remark.” (Peters, 1997)

Mark Oehlert, Customer Success Director at Socialtext/Peoplefluent, another expert who was interviewed, defines personal branding as “your overall professional reputation independent from any company or organizational affiliation. In today’s workforce, what is more important is the work you do, not who you do it for.” Dr. Woody further ex-
plains that “a brand is a promise and should come from within you. Your brand should be rooted in your values, personality, personal beliefs, and interests. Creating a strong personal brand starts with self-discovery. You have to know yourself before you can effectively project yourself to the world. The purpose of a strong personal brand is to project who you are in an honest, deliberate, and constructive way that communicates your value to those you are seeking to do business with.”

Do you have a strong personal brand online? Here are a few questions to ask yourself:

- Do you spend time communicating your interests inside and outside of your organization?
- Are you aware of what appears when people Google your name?
- Are you good at summarizing your strengths and expertise?
- Do you know what differentiates you from others?

If the answer to any of these questions is no, you likely have some work to do building your personal brand.

In addition, it doesn’t matter whether you are an undergraduate or graduate student preparing to enter the workforce or early or late into your career, everyone should define and evolve their brand as often as necessary. The fact of the matter is, you are either standing out or blending in (Cooley, 2013). It’s important to start articulating your brand as an I-O psychologist so you can market yourself internally within the field as well as outside of it, and others become aware of and understand the value of I-O psychology.

**How to Begin Building a Personal Brand Online**

One’s personal brand as an I-O psychologist should be authentic and credible. It should uphold your values and principles, including those of a psychological professional. Reynolds (2013) also explains that a well-articulated brand cannot only create visibility but it can also guide future actions to align with an overall mission and strategy for the future. Below are some key steps to building a strong personal brand.

**Begin With Introspection.**

It’s important to understand that the first step in developing and maintaining a brand is self-reflection and evaluation. Only you know what you can do or enjoy doing. Although you may not consider your job as part of your brand, there are likely pieces and parts that provide good examples of your brand. What is it others should think of when they think of you? How can you provide value to others? Once you know those answers, you can begin to evaluate and develop your brand.
**Conduct a Brand Audit.**
The next step to building a strong brand is to conduct an audit of your current brand. Online traffic on social networking sites has significantly increased over the past few years, which leaves much to be found about individuals and organizations on the Internet. For instance, there are around 175 million tweets a day and over 465 million accounts on Twitter, and every second LinkedIn has two new members join their site. Given these rates, we need to maintain control of our online brand especially because each site provides much to be found about our work, interests, and personal lives (Bullas, 2012).

In order to get started, we recommend you look at your web presence to see what kind of message you are projecting to the world and how consistent your message really is. Take a look at your personal accounts and profiles on sites such as LinkedIn, Twitter, Facebook, my.SIOP.org, your personal website, professional association bios, business websites, and so on. As Dr. Woody states, “inconsistency causes confusion, which leads people to start questioning the authenticity of your brand promise. You have to present a singular brand if you want to establish trust. Your brand must be one that is consistent, easily recognizable, and makes sense to your target audience.”

**Develop and Communicate Your Identity as an I-O Psychologist.**
This next step requires you to think about how you want others to perceive your identity. Particularly, this is what makes you unique such as where your expertise lies within the field of I-O psychology. For some, this may include outlining personal research interests or emphasizing a skill set that might be found in a special area of practice.

Rampersad (2008) even suggests that conducting a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) analysis to evaluate yourself may be helpful. Although as Dr. Woody puts it, “simplicity is key. You have to make a quick and lasting impact.”

Crafting a biography can also be an important part of developing your identity. A biography can help tell a story about yourself in the way you want it to be told. A recent article by SteamFeed highlights the importance of a biography as well as provides useful tips for developing one, including using your own genuine voice and finding ways to entertain others.

**Determine Your Audience.**
While developing your brand, think about whom it is you are speaking to at that moment. For instance, is your audience your students, clients, colleagues, family members, or other I-O psychologists? Each audience has its’
own goals, which should be addressed in your brand message. For instance, if you’re speaking to other researchers it may be preferable to use research jargon. However, if you’re speaking to executives you may need to adjust your language and the information to ensure it is relevant to their interests and work.

**Ensure Your Brand as an I-O Psychologist Is Aligned With SIOP’s Brand.**

If one is going to represent him or herself as an I-O psychologist, it is important to keep in mind the mission and strategy of the field at large. Some attributes that describe SIOP include smart, rational, ethical, professional, analytical and objective, and a strong work ethic (Rotolo, 2009).

Be sure to find ways to remind people that what you do is related to your field training. When someone thinks of you, find ways to associate your background as the backbone to what you do. For instance, when you see workplace articles, be sure to share them in the community on media such as LinkedIn and Twitter. On Twitter, be sure to use the hashtag #iopsychology every chance you can in association with other hashtags to ensure the message is shared with the I-O community and other fields. (We’ll explain more about hashtags in the next section.)

**Participate, Participate, Participate.**

Mark Oehlert states that, “so much of your brand will be determined by the volume, quality and variety of your participation and that’s on a daily basis not only occasionally. There are literally millions of brands and people competing for attention; consistency of voice and contributions are key ways in getting your brand noticed.” Glen Llopis, chairman of the Glenn Llopis Group, LLC and contributor to Forbes.com, emphasizes that personal branding is about making a full-time commitment to defining yourself (Llopis, 2013).

**Online Methods to Establish a Brand**

Social networking websites are being leveraged daily to connect to others in our lives and within the workforce. These same sites should also be leveraged by each of us to communicate our brand. Although there are several avenues to highlight your brand and various social networking sites that exist, we will briefly describe two known sites that are most commonly used for this purpose. We will also emphasize the features and how you can use them to brand yourself and our field.

**LinkedIn: Building Your Professional Network**

LinkedIn has over 225 million members across the world, making it the largest online professional network and an essential personal branding tool (Arruda, 2013; Van Dijck, 2013). This site is not only designed to be an online resumé and networking site, but it was designed
to connect professionals and provide an avenue for organizations to recruit and advertise. In addition, individual profiles are designed to help highlight one’s professional skills and experience, and serve as a “comprehensive branding resource” (Arruda, 2013).

Social networking theory explains that people are more likely to do favors for those with whom they have close connections as opposed to complete strangers. Although you may not have realized it, one of the benefits of LinkedIn is its ability to provide information with regards to “social distance” (Sacks & Graves, 2013). LinkedIn allows an individual to see who they are connected to directly along with second- and third-order connections. In addition, the site allows individuals to gather additional data such as whether they know individuals working in specific companies or regions as well as education related information.

In order to communicate your personal brand via LinkedIn, we recommend you leverage some of the key features. For instance, posting status updates, liking other people’s updates, and updating your profile on a regular basis triggers the home page on LinkedIn to tell your connections what you are doing, what you like, and who you are following. By participating actively, you are likely to get noticed more often and communicate your brand regularly.

One way to stay “ultraconnected” is to follow thought leaders and companies that are in your area of interest, industry, or with similar job functions. This brand association with other key thought leaders will influence who LinkedIn recommends you connect with or others who will view your profile (Arruda, 2013).

Finally, another key personal profile feature includes uploading or sharing various documentation, presentations, and publications highlighting research and practice in I-O. By sharing examples of your current projects or efforts, you can help inform your connections and others on what you do as an I-O psychologist and build your reputation as an expert.

Twitter: Widely Disseminating SIOP’s Message
Another very commonly used social media site is Twitter. This site differs from other social networking sites in that its main purpose is to allow members to share and read brief messages (i.e., no more than 140 characters) on topics and areas of interest. This site provides an avenue for individuals to quickly get their message across to many users by leveraging methods of hashtags and re-quoting or retweeting others (Sacks & Graves, 2013). I-O psychologists should take advantage of how quickly messages are disseminated on this site by tweeting about important research publica-
tions and findings, information related to organizational work or customer updates, educational opportunities, as well as other information. This alone could begin to increase the awareness of the positive implications of our work.

One of the beneficial features of Twitter is that it allows users to follow trends and search for certain topics based on how users categorize or tag their messages with hashtags. For example, if you added “#iopsychology” or “# SIOP” to the end of your message, one could click on that hashtag and find other posts that also used that hashtag. While writing this article we did a quick search for #iopsychology and learned that this hashtag still remains low in terms of daily tags. However, other hashtags like #biology gets a significant amount of tags by the minute, which demonstrates that this branch of science is continuously discussed via social media.

Another benefit of Twitter is it pays attention to the types of users you follow and suggests that you follow others similar to you. In addition, popular trends get posted on your homepage regularly, which allows you to see what common categories of messages are being posted. For example, if you followed several I-O organizations and other I-O psychologists, the site would consistently recommend you follow and view other I-O psychologists and organizations. By following each other and those who should be aware of our field, we can begin to build a stronger community of I-O psychologists on Twitter.

Want to get started following other I-O Psychologists on twitter? Check out Talegent’s list of “Top 50 Leading I-O Psychologists who tweet GREAT content.”

Conclusion

We cannot overemphasize the importance of personal branding and taking the time to develop it. We recognize it is a commitment and requires personal reflection and work, but by doing it you can continue to promote yourself and help broaden the awareness of I-O psychology in the community.

Hopefully, the tips provided in this article will help you get started or encourage you to read more on the best ways to build and grow your own personal brand. If you are wondering whether you have an established brand or would like some suggested actions to improve your brand, we recommend taking the branding quiz provided by Reach Personal Branding.

Follow us on Twitter @TheModernApp and tell us how you are developing your personal brand as an I-O psychologist and don’t forget to share your work with us by using the #iopsychology hashtag!
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I have observed, throughout life, that a man may do an immense deal of good, if he does not care who gets the credit for it.

Father Strickland, an English Jesuit, 1863

What's in a name? that which we call a rose
By any other name would smell as sweet.

William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*

Imitation is the sincerest form of flattery.

Charles Caleb Colton

I’ve got a 16-year-old son. He’s a good kid, but like a lot of teenagers everywhere, he wants to figure it out for himself. Or, at least, he wants to believe that he figured it out for himself. There are times that he’s stuck on his homework and asks for help. So I’ll sit with him and try to work something through with him, and we don’t get very far. So he’ll say, “Maybe I’ll just keep trying on my own.” And then 20 minutes later, he’ll announce that he figured it out. When I ask where the error was, he’ll explain it, and as often as not, it will be exactly where I had suggested the error was.

Now, I have multiple identities in my life. Two of them are that I am a professor and that I am a dad. If my “dad” identity is activated at that moment, I’m probably going to be happy that he figured it out, and I don’t really get hung up on whether I was involved in the process that got him there. In that identity, I (mostly) understand that it needs to be his victory. But if my professor identity is activated, I may say (or at least think), “So our conversation helped you to identify the error,” or, “So when you approach this problem in the future, what will you remember to do?” I focus on the learning (and maybe sometimes the credit for the discovery) rather than on the victory. My dual identities can sometimes be in conflict with each other.
We have dual identities at work, as well. We are I-O psychologists, and we are faculty members. Depending on which identity we are most identifying with at a given moment, we may respond differently to stimuli in the environment. Part of the faculty member identity for many of us (which I have embraced many times over the years) is a tendency to look with skepticism or even derision at decisions that come from “above” that are related to what we do in the classroom. This is true, I think, whether “above” means the department, the college, the university, the government, the accreditors, or anywhere else other than colleagues who are with us in the trenches. There’s likely good reason for this. Oftentimes these decisions merit our skepticism or derision, and we could all tell stories of boneheaded administrative decisions.

But lately, I’ve been thinking that our well-practiced responses might be preventing us from recognizing when we as I-O folks are actually winning, and our faculty identity is preventing us from activating our I-O identity. I’m specifically thinking about the requirements coming into place nationwide to identify course- and curricular-level learning objectives, and ways to link assessment of student learning to those learning objectives. I’ve talked with I-O colleagues in a number of settings, and the response is generally pretty common. There’s some eyerolling, and sometimes there’s some generalized annoyance that anyone would have the temerity to suggest that they know better than we do how we should teach, and then there’s some effort to satisfy the “requirement” with as little effort as possible.

But think about a training needs analysis in an organization. We identify what people at specific levels and in specific jobs within the organization need to know and need to be able to do. We identify the desired level of ability or knowledge for those things. We determine what the best training modality would be to ensure that people in the target groups develop those abilities or knowledge levels. We identify how we will know, after delivering that range of training, whether the employees in question did in fact develop the required abilities and knowledge levels. We then execute that posttraining assessment, and if we find deficiencies, we modify something somewhere in the system—maybe the training process, maybe the target learning levels (if they are found to be too rigorous or lenient, or to no longer be relevant, for example), or maybe the selection system. This is pretty much classic I-O psychology of the kind many of us learned about in grad school by reading Irv Goldstein’s classic training book.

So along come accrediting agencies, and they require us to do I-O psychology. They make us identify what a student majoring in our discipline should, at the completion of the major, know and be able to do, and then what a student taking our course should, at the end of the
course, know and be able to do. They make us tell the students at the start of a course what they are expected to know and to be able to do at the end of the course. They make us demonstrate that the way we assess student performance actually links to the things we said at the start of the course that students should know and be able to do. In short, they’re making us —and all of our colleagues—do what I-O has talked about for years, and we’re not even noticing it.

Perhaps the issue is that we as I-O folks aren’t getting credit for this: Nothing that I have read about assessment of student learning outcomes refers to Irv Goldstein’s book, for example. But there’s a saying that I’ve seen variously attributed to Harry S. Truman and Ronald Reagan that, on further research, seems to originate in the mid-1860s with an English Jesuit named Father Strickland. He wrote in his diary, “I have observed, throughout life, that a man may do an immense deal of good, if he does not care who gets the credit for it.” If we’re actually seeing basic principles of I-O psychology being applied to the educational process, perhaps we should just get behind that, even if our discipline isn’t getting a lot of credit for the process.

Perhaps the issue is that we don’t recognize it because “assessment of student learning outcomes” doesn’t sound like “training needs analysis”, but in Romeo and Juliet Shakespeare wrote, “What’s in a name? that which we call a rose By any other name would smell as sweet.” Does it matter what we’re calling this thing, if it is actually adhering to the principles and practices that we as I-O scholars and practitioners have advocated for years?

Maybe we’re just a little resentful that other folks are taking what we see as “our stuff” and running with it. But instead, perhaps we should be flattered: Charles Colton says that “Imitation is the sincerest form of flattery.” When the accrediting agencies begin to imitate us, perhaps we should be pleased that the approach we’ve advocated for years is being adopted.

For me, this is a time to (a) adopt our I-O identity over our faculty member identity; (b) not worry about who’s getting the credit as long as good work is getting done; and (c) implement —and help our colleagues implement—what we can think of as a training analysis and evaluation, regardless of what it’s called. I know that others may see things differently, and there may be at times an overly heavy hand from “above” in the assessment of student learning process. But we argue so often that I-O practices ought to be more widely adopted in organizations, and then when it happens, it seems to me like we haven’t noticed that we’re winning on this one. We should be flattered that we’re being imitated.
Tenure. Just the mere mention of it can send an otherwise rational person to the brink of insanity. Intelligent, confident, capable individuals transform into insecure, blubbering messes, questioning whether they belong at their institution—or in their chosen career. Whereas some see tenure as the ultimate form of job security, a prize earned after a grueling 6-year (or more) race, others view it as an honor, allowing them to finally be seen as a worthwhile member of the academic community. Indeed, tenure has such importance that many people I’ve spoken with report having had nightmares about being denied tenure. Just as Hannibal Lecter’s classic slurpy sound when he spoke of eating a census taker’s liver “with some fava beans and a nice Chianti” makes people shudder, it seems the mere thought of being denied tenure has a similar effect for those working towards it.

With such importance bestowed on the magical phenomenon of tenure, it is no wonder that those graced with the gift of tenure often offer their guidance, whether solicited or not, to those seeking it. One need only go to the Chronicle of Higher Education’s website and type in “tenure advice” to be bombarded with 1,540 results (1,270 articles and 270 blog posts). Explore further into the fora and you’ll see even more pearls of wisdom. Some of the advice is warranted. Do quality research and get it published. Don’t shirk your teaching obligations. Don’t be a jerk (despite advice I received once to “just publish like crazy because then you can be a [bleep]”, I would still advocate for being nice, regardless of the number of publications you get).

Other advice, however, is more debatable. Now, I’m not talking about the obvious bad advice, such as one profes-
sor’s advice for women to delay their bids for tenure until they are 50 because “the functions of a young woman’s body, including menstruation and pregnancy, take up lots of energy and interfere with her ability to work.” (Note that this was in an actual 1994 article as advice for women, but was later noted as being a sarcastic statement by the professor. However, had the reader not known of the subsequent redaction, it would come across as real advice.) Rather, I’m thinking about advice given, either explicitly or implicitly, to individuals seeking tenure that is potentially flawed and should be given some caveats. So, I decided to present four pretenure tips that I think are potentially flawed. I say “potentially” because each of them does have some merit. In fact, I’ll discuss their merits. But I also think the advice is not appropriate in all cases and is therefore in need of some qualifications.

1. **Don’t Go Applied First.**

   This is really a tip given to graduate students when they are trying to decide between going academic or going applied. Assuming a student is able to go into academia (i.e., they have presentations, publications, etc.) and have a desire to ultimately wind up in academia, they are often encouraged to simply go there and not make a detour into the world of practice first. The rationale often provided to those students is that it is difficult to transition back into academia after you’ve gone applied. Such statements as, “You’ll be so busy that your research productivity will decline, or cease to exist, and then who will want to hire you?” or “Faculty will wonder about your motivations if you transition from industry to academia, and you won’t likely be seen in the same light,” are the types of things used to scare and deter students from this path. And I can understand the merit. It can be difficult to maintain research productivity, which is certainly important for a tenure-track faculty member. It can be difficult to convince faculty that you really are okay with taking a salary cut to be back in academia (without them thinking you just want a lot of time off).

   I did this (albeit only for a year, so keep that in mind). After finishing up my studies at Texas A&M University, I worked for a year in Chicago as a consultant. It wasn’t my ultimate goal, as I knew I wanted to be in academia, but it was, in my opinion, a necessary stepping stone. My jobs up to that point had consisted of fast food, retail, and similar jobs to get me through college. I had some management experience and practica experience through coursework and assistantships, but had it in my mind that I didn’t want to go straight to the ol’ ivory tower without ever experiencing “the real world.” How could I teach students to do something I had only read about? So I ignored the advice that people gave me and accepted a job in the Windy City. To be fair, I had originally sought
out an internship, but one wasn’t available and I was encouraged to apply for the consultant position instead. Given the pay difference, it wasn’t that hard to twist my arm. But I digress.

Most flawed advice likely has some kernel of truth in it. I would say there is some merit in the suggestion to not go applied first. It certainly can make things difficult. In order to ensure I was still academically “fit” for the types of jobs I was hoping to obtain after my applied stint, I spent evenings and weekends working on research and reviewing articles. Thus, I had little to no life at this time (though that’s a nice excuse for what might have been the case anyway). When I submitted my materials for tenure-track jobs, I encountered individuals who doubted my abilities as a researcher and educator, and seemed to question my intentions to give up applied life for the life of the academic pauper (for lack of a better way to say it), despite having only been in the applied world for a very short time.

This all said, I did find my way back to academia. I took a 1-year teaching gig, and with the 5-5 load that came with it, I had little to no life then either. Despite the hassles, I have to say that I thought it was all ultimately worth it. The “real world” experience cemented some concepts for me, I realized the difference between what is ideal and what is realistic given deadlines and available funds and personnel, I met some amazing people, I got a feel for research questions to help guide some of my research that could actually impact practitioners, and for a brief while I got to know what it was like to have an office in the Mercantile Exchange with a window that had a view of the Opera House. Moreover, my students benefit from me having stories, examples, and a practical perspective that I can bring to the classroom. And, on the selfish side, I continue to benefit from the contacts I made there, both professionally and personally, as some of my closest friendships developed during this short time period.

My advice, then, instead of simply saying, “Don’t go applied first,” would be, “Know that it will be hard if you choose to go applied first.” Just be informed and be ready to work hard. And isn’t that the case for any path you choose to take?

2. Don’t Rock the Boat.

I understand the point here, and definitely know many people in the tenure process who are fearful of making waves. In fact, a common statement on any given post in The Chronicle of Higher Education’s fora is to STFU (shut the xxxx up) until you’re tenured. That said, I think this point is inherently flawed. First, by saying “don’t rock the boat” people are essentially telling you not to assert your influence. Yet by asserting your influence you can help shape the
department in ways that are beneficial for all involved, including you.

Second, and related to the first, presumably you are striving for tenure in part because you are hoping to stay in your role within the department for a long time. If you don’t speak up when something is troublesome, policies may be in place and much more difficult to change by the time you do earn tenure. You want to have a say in terms of crafting the role you’re in and the department of which you are a part.

Third, you really shouldn’t pretend to be someone you aren’t. If you’re not going to speak up and then all at once start being a naysayer after earning tenure then you could be met with more resistance than you’d receive had you been yourself the whole time. Plus, keep in mind that unless you’re being a complete jerk about raising your concerns, people won’t hate you for speaking your mind. In many cases, voicing concerns that may be contrary to others in the department doesn’t mean you’ll automatically be met with resistance. Rather, you may simply be raising a concern they had never considered given it is outside of their worldview. We’re not in high school anymore, and although you may have some colleagues who don’t seem to know this, hopefully most of your colleagues are sane and won’t hold your beliefs against you (again, as long as you’re civil). The advice here, I think, should be more along the lines of “be polite as you rock the boat” or “assert your influence with respect.” If you wind up respectfully voicing concerns and are penalized for doing so by being denied tenure, more than likely this isn’t a place you’d want to stay for your career.

3. Steer Clear of Service Commitments.

When seeking tenure, most people will tell you to steer clear of service commitments. Avoid serving on committees or volunteering for extra duties if you can prevent it. In fact, avoid volunteering for anything that does not directly relate to your research or teaching (especially your research) because it will only divert you from what is actually important to tenure and promotion committees. In fact, one of the most common things to hear when you first start a tenure-track job is “we like to protect our junior faculty from service commitments,” and it’s always the word “protect” that is used. I like to imagine faculty members standing with their battle armor on, wielding their weapons of choice, risking their lives to keep committee chairs at bay.

Although there is some merit to this advice (in that too much service really can prevent you from getting data collected, articles written, or classes prepped), I think that service commitments can actually be a good thing. As with many things (e.g., alcohol, pie, relatives), it’s all about moderation. As I’ve noted in a past column,
service is not all bad. In fact, I’ve found some of my most rewarding experiences as an academic have been in the service domain (and I’m not even trying for the Distinguished Service Award...). For example, as I noted previously, I’ve really enjoyed my service commitments to SIOP, particularly as the student volunteer coordinator (a role taken over by Adam Hiliard, who is looking for students to help in Hawaii...hint hint).

In addition to the personal gratification I get from service commitments, there are other reasons that I think make the “avoid service commitments” advice flawed. For example, had I followed this advice then I wouldn’t have had input into my department’s promotion, merit, and tenure document revision. Clearly, as an individual who was seeking tenure, this was an important committee to be on, and had I opted to use my “no service commitments” card, I would have missed the opportunity to have a say in a document that would be key in my own tenure and promotion decisions. Along these lines, being on selection committees for new hires (including our department head), while certainly time consuming, allowed me to not only play a key role in shaping the future of my department but to also see how the selection process was from the “other” side, which I am convinced only helped me become a better applicant when I decided to go on the market again. In addition, you should never forget that sometimes being on a committee simply makes sense. For example, although I’m being “protected” from service commitments right now, I was asked if I would be on a committee for the honor’s program for the college. As one of the few people who has taught multiple honor’s classes for the university, it simply made sense to have me on the committee.

In short, when it comes to service commitments, I am a firm believer that it can be a good thing, as long as it’s done in moderation. I do agree that you should pick and choose, when possible, but don’t choose to simply turn it all down, as you may be missing out on some really great opportunities to craft your own life in your institution.

4. Wait to Have Children.

First off, I was never actually given this advice but I was aware of this “unwritten rule” (at least for women) and definitely got comments from people when I became pregnant with my first son. As a quick background, I have two sons. By the time you’re reading this, one (Matt) will be 4.5 and the other (Ryan) will be 3.5 years old. Both were born before I was tenured.

I will admit that this particular “flawed advice” was one that I contemplated leaving off of my list because I’m sure some people will say it’s not real. That is, some people don’t realize how much
of a fear there is for some women to even think about starting a family pre-tenure. But it’s real, and as such I think it’s worth discussing.

The idea behind this “advice” is that, much like engaging in too much service, having children will divert too much attention away from what is “important” (at least in terms of getting tenure).

The archaic thinking implies that it isn’t possible to juggle multiple roles effectively, and that bearing offspring will result in an inability to engage in professional activities to the extent that a negative tenure decision would likely result. And it seems that the implication is that actually bearing the children is the problem, as the fear is greater for women than it is for men. And perhaps for good reason given the unfortunate belief systems that seem to still be in place for many. For example, I’m aware of one individual who was present during a faculty meeting in which a discussion ensued about some female graduate students who should be expected to take longer to graduate and get publications due to impending weddings and/or children, but a discussion of male graduate students in similar situations in the same department was not raised. The individual, pregnant at the time of the discussion, sat silently, wondering whether the faculty members were “expecting” her to be less productive as well. Fear was present, and this is unfortunate.

Whereas I was willing to give the other three pieces of advice some merit, I’m not as willing to do so in this particular case. As somebody who conducts research on work–family conflict, as well as an individual who is currently “single parenting” while my husband is deployed, I fully understand the competing obligations and difficulty that accompanies balancing multiple roles. But to say that one should delay the decision to start a family in order to ensure a favorable bid for tenure is rubbish. In the words of Forrest Gump, “and that’s all I have to say about that.”

Concluding Thoughts

As I noted at the start of this, I wanted to present some advice that I think is potentially flawed (or very much flawed, in my opinion, in the case of the last one). It is important, of course, to note that I am not an expert on this. I earned tenure in one department and am still earning tenure in my current department. Nevertheless, I do think these are valid points, and it’s my column. I’m happy to hear others’ thoughts on this, and apparently there is space on my.SIOP to voice such thoughts. So mosey on over and leave your thoughts, good or bad, and let me know what you think.
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Greetings TIP readers! Welcome to another issue of the **Spotlight on Humanitarian Work Psychology** (HWP) column! In this issue, we are privileged to have an insightful look at I-O psychology in the Federal Republic of Nigeria. Nigeria is the 7th most populous country in the world, and as a country that has been classified as of “low human development” by the United Nations Development Programme (2013), it wrestles with a number of serious social and economic challenges. For example, Nigeria has the second highest number of people infected with HIV/AIDS in the world, a population where only half of women over the age of 15 are able to read and write, and 70% of its people live below the poverty line; despite these challenges, Nigeria is increasingly a leading economic influence in the world with an economic growth rate of 6.3% in 2012 (Central Intelligence Agency, 2013).

Our view of I-O psychology in Nigeria is generously provided by **Dr. Ike E. Onyishi** who is a senior lecturer in the Department of Psychology at the University of Nigeria, Nsukka. Dr. Onyishi has over 20 years of experience in research and teaching, and has consulted for organizations from the United Nations Development Programme to the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). As part of our column’s focus on issues of international development and humanitarian aid, we asked Dr. Onyishi to provide his thoughts on how I-O psychology might benefit the human development of Nigeria. What Dr. Onyishi provides is a comprehensive call to arms for all of I-O psychology to
more fully engage with salient social and economic issues in Nigeria, and beyond.

An Interview With Dr. Ike Onyishi

The problem of sustainable development in Africa, including Nigeria, has continued to attract the interest of economic analysts, political commentators, scientists, and other social critics. Accelerated and sustainable economic development seems to have become illusive in Nigeria, and although successive governments in Nigeria have adopted several measures and strategies to engender growth and development of the Nigerian economy, it seems that most of these efforts have not achieved the desired results. It is difficult to comprehend how a country so blessed like Nigeria with abundant natural and human resources is still struggling to become economically self-reliant after over 5 decades of political independence. With a population of over 160 million, Nigeria stands as the most populated country in Africa. Nigeria is the 8th largest oil-producer and has the 6th largest deposit of gas in the world (Soludo, 2006). Despite all of these resources, many social and economic issues remain. As a way to address these issues, professionals in areas such as economics, political science, engineering, medicine, and other physical sciences have been invited from time to time to serve in government institutions with the hope of utilizing their expertise to solve national problems. However, it seems that the discipline of psychology, including I-O psychology, has not been tapped in a similar way even when most of the problems facing the country can be traced to psychological factors. In this article, I provide a historical perspective of I-O psychology in Nigeria and then discuss ways in which I-O psychology could be used to assist the accelerated and sustainable development of the Nigerian state.

Industrial-Organizational Psychology in Nigeria

The beginning of psychology in Nigeria could be traced to the country’s attainment of political independence on October 1, 1960. In the same year, the University of Nigeria was established as the first indigenous university. Four years later, a department of psychology was established in the university with 21 pioneer students and two lecturers, J. O. Anowi and Carl Frost, the latter a psychologist from Michigan State University in the United States (Gire, 2004; Nweze, 2007). The first set of students graduated in 1967 (University of Nigeria, Nsukka, 2013). Since then, many more universities in Nigeria have established departments of psychology, and by 2011, there were 23 departments of psychology across the country (Obot, 2011). However, as there were over 100 universities in the country in 2011, the
The number of psychology departments might be considered quite low.

In terms of I-O psychology’s presence within the country, all of the psychology departments in Nigeria have I-O courses taught at least at the first degree level. Most of the departments also offer postgraduate training in I-O up to the doctoral level. Currently there are hundreds of people who have obtained master’s degrees and a few with PhDs in I-O from these universities. Many others Nigerians have obtained their master’s degrees and PhDs from Western universities. Most of those who have PhDs seem to be teaching in various psychology departments. Few of those with doctoral degrees appear to be working outside of academia. Those with master’s degrees often tend to work in management consulting firms, and there are a few firms where I-O psychologists make up a majority of the staff.

Although there are many more psychologists in Nigeria than there used to be, that does not mean that the discipline is popular or widely known. Indeed, there is difficulty in accurately knowing the number of psychologists and their areas of specialization and practice in the country because there is no accurate data on this, and there is no regulatory body for the practice of psychology in the country (Gire, 2004). For now, the Nigerian Psychological Association (NPA) is the umbrella association for all psychologists in the country. The NPA was founded in 1984 with the merger of two existing associations: the Nigerian Association of Psychologists and the Nigerian Psychological Society (Obot & Gire, 1995). Since then, the association has continued to be the central body for all psychologists in the country but has had a challenging history. Although one of the major activities of the association is to organize an annual conference where psychologists in the country assemble to present papers and hold annual meetings, there have been periods, including as long as 3 consecutive years, where no conference has been held. The association also publishes the Nigerian Journal of Psychology, but the publication of the journal has also been very inconsistent. Adding to the problem, regulations regarding the practice of psychology in the country are not clear. Although the constitution of the NPA stipulates that a person is qualified to become a full member of the association if he or she has obtained “at least a master’s degree or equivalent in psychology from a recognized university” (Nigeria Psychological Association, 1984, p. 4), there is no clear statement on the conditions one needs to satisfy before being allowed to engage in professional practice (Obot, 2011). Many I-O psychologists are therefore practicing without registering with the NPA or obtaining any certification.
The above difficulties do not mean there are no prospects for the growth of the discipline of psychology in Nigeria. The current leadership of the NPA, including Dr. Andrew Zamani, has started making concrete efforts to reposition the association to promote professional values and practices. For the past 3 years the association has consistently organized annual conferences and a few regional conferences have also taken place. The association is currently reviewing the constitution in order to, among other things, clearly spell out who should practice psychology and how such practice should be done. There are also efforts to introduce a bill to the National Assembly for the professionalization of psychological practice. This bill would include stipulating methods of certification for psychologists.

In essence, the practice of I-O has been affected by the same factors that have negatively affected psychology in general in the country. In short, there is no formal association uniting I-O psychologists in the country, and this to a large extent has made it difficult to know the number of I-O psychologists and where they work.

**How I-O Can Help Accelerate Sustainable Development in Nigeria**

Nigeria is a country that many believe has the potential to become a strong economic and political power in the world. Yet the situation on the ground is daunting. There are high levels of unemployment, disease, and hunger, and limited numbers of people have access to a high quality education. I believe I-O psychologists have a duty to help solve some of these problems that beset the majority of Nigerians. I agree with the opinion of Governor Scott McCallum in a previous article in this column who asserted that, “any work done to help those that are jobless, below the poverty line, stuck at a certain rung of the economic ladder, or unable to find a job they are better suited for is an important humanitarian endeavor” (Thompson, McWha, & Gloss, 2013, p. 76).

One area where I-O psychology may be relevant is the issue of ethical practice in business organizations. Nigeria has been ranked as one of the most corrupt countries in the world (Transparency International, 2011). Recent reports of the corrupt practices of managers and directors of some banks in the country, fraudulent activities of some directors of public organizations, and other reports of fraud in both public and private organizations in Nigeria have brought the issue of corruption to the attention of broader society. I-O psychology’s perspective can help highlight factors that contribute to unethical organizational behaviors and help devise ways of helping organizations reverse this ugly trend.

In addition to the issue of corruption in Nigeria, attitudes toward work often seem to be very poor. The sort of problem has been described by Munene
(1995) as a “not on seat” phenomenon, where employees report to work on time only to leave the work environment soon after to attend to personal matters. This behavior seems to be common in many different types of organizations in Nigeria. For reasons explained below, this behavior might have been expected following Nigeria’s emergence from colonialism and the growth of formal organizations and paid employment (Onyishi, 2009); however, the persistence of such behaviors after the end of colonialism is difficult to explain. As part of the economic agenda of the colonialists, and in the few formal organizations that were established, native labor was frequently exploited and natives were often not included in organizations in meaningful ways. Thus, natives often referred derogatively to these jobs as “white man’s” jobs. In such situations, native workers understandably felt no incentive to identify with the organization nor any incentive to pay great attention to their work output. Formal colonialism has ended, and most firms in Nigeria are owned by Nigerians, but still these behaviors persist. I-O psychologists can help to explore how Nigerian employees can be motivated to engage in behaviors that benefit their organizations, including going the extra mile or taking charge at work (Onyishi & Ogbodo, 2012). In many ways, greater participation is necessary in order to make Nigerian organizations viable and to contribute to reduction of the poverty in the country.

The spirit of entrepreneurship also seems to be declining in Nigeria. Most Nigerians have continued to depend on the government, and many believe that it is the sole responsibility of the government to solve all their problems. With a population of over 160 million people, it is obvious that Nigeria has a large potential market for goods and services, yet many Nigerians shy away from establishing small businesses and engaging in craftwork. A closer look at the population of craftsmen and women tends to show that a growing number of people in this sector are non-Nigerians, mainly from neighboring West African countries. In a recent workshop organized by the Economic Commission of West African States (ECOWAS) and the Nigerian Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs, I presented a paper on the relevance of an ECOWAS protocol on the free movement of persons, goods, and services to national development. Specifically, I focused on how Nigerian youth can be empowered to benefit from the protocol. An interesting discovery during this workshop was that some of the participants were not even interested in how they would benefit from the protocol. Rather, they suggested that the government should provide money for them to establish their own businesses. I believe that many Nigerians are engaging in what could be viewed as learned helplessness. If this is true, Nigerians require psychological empowerment to be able to leverage the abundant resources
within the country to create positive social and economic change. This is a critical area for the application of I-O psychology in the country.

Just as the poverty level in Nigeria is high, so too are problems with healthcare delivery, literacy, and employment. The Nigerian federal government and a number of international organizations, including the United States Agency for International Development and the United Kingdom’s Department for International Development, have been involved in providing support to improve these issues. A lot of resources have been deployed, yet not much has been achieved. People are still suffering from several tropical diseases, and there are high rates of infant mortality. It is possible that the way these development initiatives are designed or executed may have contributed to poor service delivery. This possibility calls for reexamination of these existing intervention projects in the country; I-O psychologists have an important role to play in that reexamination.

The several problems that are currently confronting Nigeria, by and large, require political will on the side of the country’s leadership to harness the resources available to improve the economy for the greater good of the citizens. Yet, quality leadership is lacking. This lack of leadership may be as a result of a lack of skills or an inability of those in leadership positions to appreciate the responsibility thrust on them, issues that I-O psychology can help address. I-O psychology can help support the leaders and managers of the Nigerian economy. In the same vein, it is possible that government institutions could be reengineered and strengthened to provide the enabling environment for sustainable development of the country through I-O psychology interventions.

There are great prospects for I-O psychology in Nigeria to bring about great economic and social change. Luckily, the number of I-O psychologists in Nigeria seems to be growing. Yet the overall prominence of I-O psychology in government and private industry is very low. I-O psychologists should rise to the occasion, market their skills, and then deploy them to solve the problems militating against growth and development in Nigeria. At the national level, the Nigerian Psychological Association should establish a foundation with the purpose of helping organizations to understand and apply the principles of I-O to social and economic problems. This is the time. As Nigeria strives to provide the leadership expected of it in the economic and social development of the African continent, I-O psychologists can become the catalysts for the much awaited growth of the region.

Conclusion

We are extremely grateful for Dr. Onyishī’s detailed and insightful perspective on I-O psychology in Nigeria and the po-
potential for the discipline to address important social and economic issues. The ways in which Dr. Onyishi believes I-O psychology can better engage with Nigeria’s sustained human development are great examples of the sort of “humanitarian” work psychology in which Nigerians can engage; these ideas are also examples of how I-O psychologists from outside of Nigeria can become engaged in supporting the human development of the country. We believe that many of these examples generalize to countries besides Nigeria, and we are thankful for the reminder of how central I-O is to helping to tackle some of the world’s greatest challenges.
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“A Nurse, A Computer Scientist, and an I-O Walk into a Bar”

Welcome to Yes You Can: I-Os and Funded Research, where we connect you with the success stories of I-Os who are bringing home the bacon for their research interests! This quarter we focus on how I-Os are teaming up with interdisciplinary partners and winning research funding! You may be thinking, “Interdisciplinary partners? That could be almost anyone in any field....” Correct! I-Os can partner with any discipline to lead or collaborate on funded research! Whether deradicalizing terrorists, studying violence against nurses, or evaluating the success of kindergarten teachers, your I-O expertise brings to the table theory, methodology, and a vast knowledge base—a significant value to researchers from other disciplines and the agencies that offer research funding.

Interested? Your peers were! And now three of them join us to share a taste of just how diverse the funding opportunities can be when collaborating with other disciplines! Paul Spector (I-O psychology) from the University of South Florida (USF) discusses his success stories in leveraging an interdisciplinary focus with occupational health psychology to obtain training grants. Michele Gelfand (cross-cultural and organizational psychology) from University of Maryland (UMD) shares how her passion for cross-cultural interdisciplinary research has led to several exciting funding opportunities. Last but not least, insider Wai-Ying Chow, program officer from the Institute for Education Sciences (IES; U.S. Department of Education) joins us to introduce the desire for I-Os to collaborate with education researchers on funded studies. What ideas will come to you as you hear their stories? Let’s dive in!
*Paul and Michele, we will start with you. Could you describe some examples of funded research projects in which you collaborated across disciplines with other research partners?*

**Michele (UMD):** Absolutely! My first experience with large-scale interdisciplinary research was supported by MURI (Multi-University Research Initiative; click here for an example News Release about MURI awards) from the Department of Defense (DoD). Funded at six-million dollars, our project centers on cultural factors that affect negotiations and collaborations. As the PI of this interdisciplinary study, I wanted to facilitate a synergistic effort to understand these processes, so I assembled a project team of psychologists, computer scientists, political scientists, and economists. The research has a special emphasis on the Middle East, meaning I also work with contributors cross-nationally in Jordan, Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan, and other countries. The funding for this project is now in its final year, and it has been a really interesting experience for my research.

Another example of interdisciplinary funded research is our Minverva grant (also funded by DoD, click here for more information on the Minerva Initiative), in which we are trying to understand the process by which people become radicalized and deradicalized in different terrorist organizations around the world. Minverva grants involve both basic research and policy implications. I support this research as a co-PI, and the I-O psychology angle here involves linking our theories of recruitment, selection, training, and embeddedness to understand terrorist organizations and develop strategies for deradicalizing people. The project team, led by Aria Kruglanski (social psychologist) includes anthropologists, computational social psychologists, and complexity researchers.

**Paul (USF):** I’ll start with some background on my funding situation. Tammy Allen and I have a training grant to provide interdisciplinary occupational health psychology (OHP) training to I-O doctoral students as a specialization within our I-O doctoral program. This grant is part of the USF Sunshine Education and Research Center (ERC) funded by the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH). Our center cuts across four colleges: Arts and Sciences (Psychology), Medicine, Nursing, and Public Health. The center provides two forms of support that have benefitted my (and Tammy’s) research—our OHP component provides stipends to doctoral students, which are like fellowships, freeing them to work full-time on research. The center also offers Pilot Project Research Grants of up to $15,000 for doctoral students and junior faculty.
Two projects that come to mind were supported by NIOSH Pilot Grants. For the first example, I was part of a four-person interdisciplinary team (the others had backgrounds in public health and epidemiology) that conducted a study of nurses’ exposure to violence in a Veterans Health Administration hospital. My main contribution to the study was including nurses’ perceptions of violence prevention climate as a potential correlate of both physical and nonphysical violence (it did correlate). This study began an ongoing program of research on the connection between climate and violence. As a second example, Liu-Qin Yang, now at Portland State University, continued the violence prevention climate research for her dissertation. She conducted a longitudinal study of nurses’ violence exposure in two hospitals. Her study showed that violence prevention climate predicted future violence and that violence did not affect perceptions of climate. One wave of the study was funded by a Lee Hakel Fellowship from SIOP and the other by a NIOSH Pilot Grant. The team included two Occupational Health Nursing master’s students and I-O psychologist Daisy Chang, now at Michigan State University, who was a faculty member in Public Health at the time.

Those are great examples of diverse collaborations! And Wai, you have a complementary perspective both as a program officer and as a representative of a field outside of I-O. Can you describe some of the interdisciplinary research IES is funding right now?

Wai (IES): Certainly, and to set the stage, I oversee the “Effective Teachers and Effective Teaching” research topic, which spans preservice training for teachers, certification, recruitment/hiring, in-service training, performance evaluation, and decision making about teacher retention/promotion/dismissal. Thus, the types of projects we support are quite diverse. For example, a recently awarded project will identify teaching strategies that match specific student learning needs and subsequently lead to better student reading outcomes. Another example of current research we are supporting involves the development and psychometric testing of measures of teaching and teacher constructs (e.g., attitudes and knowledge). The project team is revising a diagnostic assessment of knowledge required for math teaching; the assessment is intended to identify areas for training and gauge progress after training.

Even from that brief introduction, you can see that there are numerous I-O topics relevant to “Effective Teachers” research, yet currently only two projects that I oversee include some I-O psychology expertise. One study sought consultation with I-O experts for measuring teacher skill based on responses to writ-
ten scenarios. The other project uses administrative data to explore aspects of the teacher hiring process and relations to student outcomes, and their I-O collaborator will help integrate I-O literature and methodology.

It is great to hear that IES is interested in increasing I-O involvement in their funded research. Many of your PIs currently come from education fields—sounds like a nice interdisciplinary opportunity for our readers who may be trying to brainstorm how to get involved as a PI, co-PI, or consultant on funding proposals.

On the topic of interdisciplinary partners, Paul and Michele, what are some of the backgrounds of your grant collaborators?

Paul (USF): In the past few years my students and I have worked with colleagues with PhDs in engineering, nursing, and public health, as well as physicians and occupational health nursing master’s students. These connections occurred mainly through the Sunshine ERC. For example, nursing students are required to have a research experience. At one of our ERC meetings I mentioned to the nursing program director that we would like to work with nursing students on a violence project, and she referred two of them to me. If a grant proposal is involved, it is not hard to locate team members who would be eager to be part of the project. My students and I have worked also with our ERC director, Tom Bernard, whose background is in ergonomics.

Michele (UMD): Several of my collaborators are computer scientists. The computer science background offers a very different perspective from our approaches in psychology, and experts from this field help me address research questions in more diverse ways. For example, I work with a computer scientist who is very interested in using agents (computer programs that perform various actions continuously/autonomously) to negotiate with people. She and I have been working on building culturally competent agents, which actually outperform her former agents who didn’t have culture embedded in the programs. It’s very synergistic because although I’m not going to start studying agents, I can leverage her agents to help collect data in different countries through a standardized platform. It’s a big win–win in terms of our collaboration, and she gets to use the cultural information collected to build a better agent. Other great examples are the political scientists we work with, whether their expertise is in intercultural mediation or international conflict. In general, I think when you are looking for collaborators the first point of consideration is whether they have an inter-
interest in interdisciplinary research: Are they willing to explore research questions through angles that they aren’t as familiar with? It’s also important to frequently meet (whether online or in person) to make sure that everyone is speaking a common language.

To sum up the big picture, in each of your areas how would you characterize the opportunity for I-O experts to collaborate on research proposals with other disciplines? What is the potential risk for research when I-O expertise is missing?

Michele (UMD): Increasingly, I-O psychologists are very interested in culture and have started to get more training on how to conduct cross-cultural research. The more global our field becomes, the more central I-O becomes to many of these research proposals, particularly as they relate to negotiation, collaboration, training, leadership, many core areas in our field. Sometimes the I-O angle is very clear. For example, there is a lot of funding at DoD on cross-cultural issues because they want to understand and navigate cultural differences in many areas of the world.

In other cases the contribution of I-O may be a little less obvious, for example with important global concerns, like terrorism. However even in these areas, the theories from our field about recruitment, selection, or other HR functions can still benefit the research and strategy (i.e., many issues relevant to Fortune 500 organizations will be relevant to terrorism organizations). Without I-O, some of these grants may not account for dynamics of organizations. That’s where we really need to show up and show off our expertise!

Paul (USF): In my experience, people in health-related disciplines frequently work in interdisciplinary research teams, so they are quite accepting of I-O psychologists. They recognize that we have expertise in assessment and research design, as well as psychology. Occupational safety colleagues who study accidents and injuries have often told me that they know how to design the physical work environment to make it safe, but they need our expertise to figure out how to get people to act responsibly and not violate safety protocols. What I sometimes see missing from projects that do not involve psychologists is sound assessment and a lack of solid grounding in relevant psychological factors.

Wai (IES): I think that more representation of I-O psychology expertise in teaching and teacher research would help fill critical gaps in our knowledge base. For example, I-O would be a natural fit in the efforts to empirically uncover not only the characteristics of teacher candidates and in-service teachers who most likely to produce target outcomes, but also the
contextual or organizational factors to promote teacher wellness and performance and ultimately student or teacher outcomes. I-O has historically been underrepresented in IES research grant applications and could advance education research, particularly around selection; job evaluation (for retention, promotion, and dismissal); and training of personnel.

A Look Ahead to the Next “Yes You Can: I-Os and Funded Research”

Thank you Paul, Michele, and Wai for demonstrating a few of the ways in which an I-O can partner with other fields to pursue research funding! Remember, you can read the continued conversation from these interviews at www.siop.org/grants.aspx, in which all three experts share their top two tips for getting started with interdisciplinary funding, and Wai provides easy steps to plugging yourself in as an I-O contributor in IES funding opportunities!

Stay tuned for upcoming issues in which we bring you stories of early career (postgraduate) grant start ups and the “world records” of I-O grant experiences! So, what potential grant partners were you reminded of as you heard from Paul, Michele, and Wai? Your story could be next, so keep those gears turning—and until next time remember: Yes You Can!
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Welcome to the second installment of Portland State University’s TIP-TOPics column! Our inaugural column introduced The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist readers to our program, faculty, and students. We now ask ourselves, “What do we write about next?” Given that we know that a portion of our readers are new graduate students, we reflected on our first years as graduate students and remembered a question we all pondered: “I got into graduate school—so now what do I do?” Therefore, it made perfect sense to use this column to share tips, tricks, and practical advice on how to make the most out of your own graduate career from graduate students who thrived in (or at least survived!) their first year in graduate school.

**Transitioning From Undergraduate to Graduate**

One of our columnists received the following advice from a 5th year PhD student about how to spend their summer prior to their first year of graduate school: Go lie in the grass under the sun, and buy a coffee pot. Once you get to graduate school, you find yourself busier than any other time in your life—you’ll likely need that coffee pot to keep you going, and you’ll wonder what happened to all that free time you had as an undergrad that you spent, well, lying in the sun.

Making the transition into embracing your new role as a graduate student is largely about changing your expectations of what your experience will look like. You (usually) no longer wear sweat pants or sports jerseys to class, and you don’t sit in a 600-seat lecture hall quietly as the instructor lectures. You are more likely to come to class wearing business casual attire, since you have a meeting with a community partner or client in
the afternoon. In class, you probably spend more of your time discussing readings in small groups, giving a presentation on a research proposal, or even teaching a topic yourself!

Thankfully, the faculty, staff, and senior students of the PSU I-O program acknowledge that these changes mean that students make a lot of adjustments to their new roles. Accordingly, they have helped to assuage some of the ambiguity that comes with grad school through our Student Socialization Committee.

Getting Involved: Our I-O Department’s Student Socialization Committee

Beginning graduate school is analogous to entering a cocktail party in which everyone is engaged in conversation. You’ve been invited to this party but you drift through the room unable to join any of the conversations. In the beginning it may feel as if you have nothing to say, but over time you learn all the acronyms, names of principal investigators, and random citations that pepper the conversations. Our team at PSU understands (and remembers!) what it is like to stand in the room with nothing to say so we have created a number of resources for new graduate students in our program.

Before a student arrives at PSU, the I-O Student Socialization Committee will reach out and connect them with the other incoming students. This allows the new cohort to share knowledge and information. Further, the socialization committee supports the student-driven mentorship program in PSU’s psychology department in which each incoming student is paired with another more senior student from their lab. Once the term begins, the new students meet with the I-O Student Socialization Committee where they receive a packet that outlines all the essential memberships related to the field, such as SIOP, AoM, and SOHP. The packet also contains a list of important discussion lists and annual events sponsored by PSU or Portland Industrial & Organizational Psychology Association (PIOPA). There are also materials such as our graduate student handbook and resources prepared by the university’s Office of Graduate Studies. Soon all new students slowly begin to join the party and participate in the conversations that make up our school, our science, and our field.

Capitalizing on Your Resources

As a graduate student, there are numerous resources available to you. Some are blaringly obvious, but others are like buried treasure—you have to do a little digging to uncover them. First, SIOP (www.siop.org) is a wonderful resource for students looking to get more involved. Within the organization, you will find student-run committees, scholarships, grants, professional events, and a vast wealth of information about our field in
general. Getting involved in these will expose you to networking opportunities galore. Second, if your community has an I-O psychology-based organization like the Portland I-O Psychology Association (PIOPA), get involved. Organizations like PIOPA offer students connections with community partners, local practitioners, and applied experiences that are invaluable. Third, take advantage of university resources like librarians, writing centers, or mental health/counseling centers. Also, other departments may offer classes and colloquia that are relevant to your interests and goals. Finally, your department likely offers several important resources such as research colloquia, faculty emails about internships/jobs, and research projects outside the department. Student organizations like what we have at PSU—the Psychology Graduate Student Association (PGSA)—offer opportunities for students to volunteer for various committees, mingle with peers and faculty, and learn about opportunities inside and outside the department/university.

**Becoming Involved in Research**

In your graduate program you will hear faculty and graduate students passionately talking about their own research projects—and you’ll likely have a desire to get involved. However, you might not know exactly how to get your foot in the door. Welcome to one of the most commonly faced challenges of being a first year graduate student! Here are some tips that we think can help you make a good start.

- **Establishing a good relationship with your own advisor.** During your graduate years, your advisor will be the key person who can help you advance in your program. Therefore, make sure to build a strong relationship with him/her. Know your advisor’s research interests and follow his/her latest publications closely. Your advisor may have ongoing projects at hand; thus, simply starting by expressing your interest in research would be a good first step. Remember that your advisor will likely appreciate when you are proactive. Ask what kind of research projects he/she is conducting and if he/she needs any help, and speak up if there is a particular project you want to work on.

- **Building relationships with faculty other than your advisor.** This is another excellent way to get involved in research. In our department, each faculty has his/her own lab where specific research teams work on different research topics, which creates plenty of research opportunities. Working with other faculty will broaden your perspective. Many of our students at PSU collaborate with faculty members other than their own advisors. You can work with your own advisor on selection while you also are involved in another research lab working on work and family issues, for instance.

Sometimes, working with faculty in other departments can bring good research
opportunities as well. For example, some of our students at PSU collaborate with the faculty in PSU’s School of Business Administration (SBA) on topics such as overqualification and leader–member exchange. This collaboration with faculty in the SBA allows us to learn from their unique perspectives and expertise.

Knowing how to take advantage of small research opportunities. Sometimes good research opportunities may appear in disguised forms, such as a proposal you write for a class. What seems like a small project may turn out to be an important one in time. Plus, it can give you a chance to show your skills to faculty inside and outside the I-O department, thus opening doors for future collaborations. Remember that small steps can help you make big moves. So, be open-minded, try to balance your coursework, and stay available to research opportunities when they arise.

Finding Study Strategies That Work Best for You

Sherlock Holmes would not find the mystery about time in graduate school “elementary;” instead he too would wonder aghast, “Where does the time go? How did it take two hours to read just this one article?” Time is slippery, and thus it feels as if each minute must have value. This is ever so true when it comes to studying. Often class work is pushed into the recesses between your advisor’s research, teaching assistant or graduate research assistant responsibilities, and your own projects (e.g., thesis). In order to maximize the time you have for coursework it is important to find a study strategy that will work best for you. Although there is value in studying in groups, it may also be important to study alone. We have found that group study time can help to solidify knowledge and answer questions, but there are also times when studying in groups can add confusion. For example, one of our cohorts decided to study together for their first quantitative methods exam. The session quickly turned into a chaotic lamentations of, “I am not going to PASS this test” and other such panic-driven statements. It is important to remember that only you know what you need to study and how much time it will take you. Time management, being able to juggle multiple roles, and prioritizing them according to dynamic demands can be something that needs to be developed. Some of us have found success by logging our time as if we were on “the clock.” This way you can track the amount of time it takes to complete assignments and then plan your time accordingly. Further, by tracking your time you may solve the mystery of where all the time goes.

Networking and Socializing With Other Graduate Students

Graduate school is a time where all you do is work, right? Not exactly. Research on non-work recovery experiences and
occupational burnout, for instance, indicates that people need a break every once in a while. Although it’s tempting (and we do it often) to work through lunch, work until the early morning, and work on weekends, we’ve found it helps to take a break and socialize with your fellow grad students. At PSU we have a grad student happy hour organized every Friday, and we have other regularly occurring events to attend, such as Portland Trailblazer games, cohort coffee breaks, and lunch dates with our friends from other labs that we may not see on a regular basis. These type of events are ideal because they serve as breaks from your normal routine but also give you a chance to seek advice, ask what other students’ research is about, or connect in other ways with your colleagues, perhaps just by having some fun.

**Coping With the Unexpected Challenges or Setbacks of Graduate School**

Graduate school can be the first time in your life where you may not be the “best” at something, where you don’t score 100% on your midterm, or where you feel like you may not succeed. You are now in a program full of students who were at the top of their class. Many students during their first year may feel the onset of the “impostor syndrome,” where you look around at the other graduate students and think that you aren’t as accomplished as they are and it was obviously a mistake that you were accepted into your program. Fear not—if you were accepted, you are deserving. Most everyone feels the struggle of graduate school; that’s what makes it such a great accomplishment for those who finish their degrees! Whether you get a B on your first quant midterm or you nearly faint in your first class presentation, talk to other graduate students about your experiences. Normalizing the struggles of graduate school with your peers or lab mates can help you realize you’re not alone in experiencing setbacks.

**Reducing/Managing Your Stress**

As the title of this column suggests, we’ve aimed to highlight how to make the most of your graduate school experience. As you may discover, “making the most” of graduate school can carry with it a fine print that reads, “WARNING: Graduate school participation has been known to cause severe stress, insanity, grey hair, and/or balding.” To remedy this problem, we offer some anecdotal advice: (a) acknowledge the past, (b) focus on the present, and (c) look toward the future. **Acknowledge the past;** when the day is filled with reminders of missed deadlines, incoming exams, stacks of undergraduate papers to grade, and an advisor who keeps asking, “Where is that thesis draft you promised me?” it is easy to forget all of the triumphs you have made along the way. By taking time to remember past triumphs, you are reminded that, eventually, there are rewards for your efforts. **Focus on**
the present; there is an entire field of science dedicated to mindfulness research. Taking a few moments every day to be aware of your thoughts, feelings, and environment can greatly reduce stress. Also, it is important to find an appropriate work–life balance. Take time to have fun, be with friends, and engage in activities that define you (i.e., other than research/school). Both friends inside and outside your program, as well as family and significant others, are important resources to help remind you that there is a life beyond the graduate lab. Look toward the future; finally, remind yourself of your end goal (i.e., why it is that you spend 15 hours/day logged into your “name@university.edu” email). By taking time to think forward, you give meaning to all the work you do.

Our Upcoming Column

In our next column, “Building Your Program’s Internal Strengths and Infrastructure: Service to the Department,” we highlight initiatives our graduate students participate in that involve service to our psychology department. We discuss these activities in the hopes that they may inspire graduate students at other institutions to develop their own initiatives that can serve as a source of support and camaraderie. For example, our Psychology Graduate Student Association (PGSA) has hosted a number of workshops and panels, covering topics such as “How to Prepare for Comprehensive Exams” and “How to Find a Great Internship.” Our students have also developed a mentoring program that pairs incoming first-year graduate students with second- and third-year graduate students, and have organized community service projects, such as collecting toys for the annual Toys for Tots drive and fundraising for a 5K walk/run hosted by the National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI).

To correspond with the authors about this topic or to provide feedback on this column, please e-mail portlandstatetip-topics@pdx.edu. In addition, to learn more about the graduate students at PSU as well as the writers of our column, you may view our graduate student website at http://www.pdx.edu/psy/graduate-students. We look forward to hearing from you, and we invite you to read our next TIP-TOPics column!

Frankie Guros is currently a doctoral student at PSU pursuing his PhD in Industrial-Organizational psychology with a concentration in Occupational Health Psychology. Frankie received his undergraduate degree from Pacific University in Forest Grove, OR. His research interests include (but are not limited to) recovery from work, emotion regulation in the workplace, proactive work behaviors, and dangerous occupations. Frankie also enjoys running, biking, hiking, and generally enjoying the outdoors in his free time.
Lale M. Yaldız is a second-year doctoral student in I-O Psychology with a minor in OHP at PSU. She is originally from Istanbul, Turkey, and received her MA degree in I-O Psychology from Koc University, Istanbul, in 2008. Before starting her PhD, Lale spent 4 years in the industry gaining professional experience in selection, recruitment, and training areas. Her research interests include aging workforce, personality, selection, and training. In her spare time, she enjoys exploring Oregon with her husband, salsa dancing, and painting.

Layla Mansfield is working towards a PhD in I-O psychology with a minor in OHP at PSU. Her current research interests include selection/recruitment, employee onboarding, safety, and well-being. Originally from Lake Tahoe, California, Layla settled in Portland after trying out a number of different locales: Ohio, New York, Spain. Layla received her BS in Economics and Psychology from Portland State University in 2008. Along with traveling, Layla enjoys cooking (eating!) and trips to the zoo with her husband and 4-year-old daughter.

Joseph Sherwood is currently entering his second year at PSU, working toward a PhD in I-O Psychology with a minor in Occupational Health Psychology. Joseph received his undergraduate degree at Utah State University in Psychology and Spanish. His research interests include work–family balance, individual differences, health behaviors, and supervisor and employee development. Joseph’s career goals include a balance between research and practice. He is a new, annoyingly proud, dog owner. He enjoys playing the guitar and getting lost in the great outdoors with his wife. He also loves to write!
An Interview With a Pioneer of Multidisciplinary Research in Organizations, Professor Nick Lee

Our exploration of organizational neuroscience (ON) continues, taking us to England where Professor Nick Lee was part of the first team of academics to develop the multidisciplinary research field of organizational cognitive neuroscience (OCN), the predecessor and close relative to ON. In this issue, we take a strategic perspective in the metaphorical construction site that is ON and consider the blueprints of OCN, past, present, and future.

At Aston Business School, Dr. Nick Lee (BCA, BCA [Hons.], FAMS) is the director of the Research Degrees Program and professor of Marketing and Organizational Research. His professional interests include sales management, ethics, social psychology, cognitive neuroscience, and research methodology. His research has won multiple awards, including the 2010 Joseph Lister Award for Social Science from the British Science Association, and his articles have been ranked highest in downloads and citations within their fields. Dr. Lee is the editor in chief of the European Journal of Marketing. His book Doing Business Research was published by Sage in 2008. Popular outlets such as The Times, the Financial Times, and BBC Breakfast have featured Dr. Lee’s work. In 2009, he was featured in The Times as “one of the 15 scientists whose work will shape the future.” In this issue, we discuss Nick Lee’s work regarding OCN by talking about what it is now, how it came to be, and what it could become in the future.
How did your involvement with OCN begin?
It’s actually a story of coincidence, which you’ll hear from most people doing interdisciplinary work. I had first gotten to Aston, and I became quite friendly with a number of people from the neuroscience research group around 1999/2000. I first met Carl Senior, my collaborator and the neuroscientist of the gang, at a meeting that was actually between two other people. Carl and I met up afterwards, and he was very interested in applying his work, that is, taking an organizational psychology perspective. We started talking about combining these two research fields and presenting a framework. We got very lucky in publishing quite early, and a number of things came together at the right time, which gave OCN some momentum, and that’s where we are now.

Can you define the field of OCN? How does OCN compare and contrast with ON?
When we came up with this terminology we saw a lot of people putting participants in a scanner to see which parts of the brain light up and then reporting that they’d found something, such as a “buy button” in the brain. We felt that people needed to be more careful about the claims that they made, and the evidence on which they based those claims. We were—and still are—really worried about this continuing notion that the tools define the project. We use the term OCN is because it’s relatively well established in a cognitive neuroscientific framework that the modality or the methodology is not the defining characteristic. We wanted to try to express that you didn’t need a million-dollar brain scanner, that you can do good organizational cognitive neuroscience using even behavioral studies. There are many different research methods available. We really wanted to get people to think about things in a broader sense rather than continue attaching the neuro- prefix to areas like marketing. OCN was our way of trying to create this framework for research.
We saw then that the Becker, Cropanzano, and Sanfey (2011) paper about ON had many similarities, and we then tried to answer how these two terminologies can be maintained as both meaningful rather than saying you should use one or the other. We were trying to position OCN as a framework for areas that were fragmented at the time. There were a lot of clever people who had become interested in neuroscience in their own field and rushed out to do bits and pieces that lacked theoretical bases. [For a discussion of the relationship between OCN and ON, see Lee, Senior, & Butler, 2012b].

What publications do you see as influential or high quality work in OCN?
Gad Saad is doing some fantastic work on consumer psychology from an evolutionary perspective. Richard Arvey is
doing some great stuff in the area of large populations, twin studies, and so forth. What I really like is the new stuff in these large population studies about the heritability of leadership. Carl and I coedited a special edition of Leadership Quarterly on that topic (Lee, Senior, & Butler, 2012a), which contained some cool papers. Richard Bagozzi and Willem Verbeke (along with other colleagues; Dietvorst et al., 2009) are doing some great work, and they published a really excellent paper called “A Salesforce-Specific Theory of Mind Scale” that took a really nice set of studies from pencil-and-paper surveys to fMRI. In fact, the idea of survey research versus neuroscience research is a very interesting one because the public seems quite scared about what brain scans can tell companies. But people have been answering questionnaires for years on the same topics. Either people are deliberately hiding something so they don’t care about questionnaires, or they don’t realize that we can’t really find something out about a person without that person’s consent. People can’t just point a “brain scan” gun at someone while they aren’t looking! Neuromarketing firms selling services to big companies might say they can reveal consumer opinions, but that’s a bit of a stretch. We can be pretty confident about how certain brain activity links with certain other brain activity, and in turn simple behaviors and the like, but we’re not quite sure how that leads to ultimate choice behavior and other complex human behaviors. Those are social psychology questions as much as they are basic brain activity questions. That’s where we come right back to where we started: We need behavioral and social research just as much as we need brain scanning research to develop a more complete model of organizational or consumer behavior.

What current projects are you working on that relate to OCN?
We have a research topic called Society, Organizations, and the Brain: Building Toward a Unified Cognitive Neuroscience Perspective in Frontiers in Human Neuroscience. We’re collecting the cutting-edge work of leading people from around the world. I mention this because TIP readers will be able to access this without a subscription—it’s open access. The issue will come out sometime next year, and we’ve got some great work to report.

In terms of my research, I’m looking at decision making and risk from an evolutionary framework. Family businesses are a huge part of England’s economy, and we’re investigating whether people make different decisions when dealing with family members versus nonfamily members. We’re trying to unpack a number of things. First, why do people tend to make certain decisions when they’re dealing with family members? Is simple familiarity with family members influencing deci-
sions, or is there some genetic component to the decision making process? Second, what’s the role of risk in those decisions? Existing theory supports prediction of both more and less risky decision making in this context, so it remains to be seen whether we can unpack this. In a broader sense, we’re wrestling with whether industrial psychology and applied research areas can offer any insight into therapeutic or clinical issues. For example, how can marketing offer insight into addictive consumption? Could applied research offer some insight into closing what is called the “therapeutic gap” by informing treatments? Given the fact that we’re using a very important context and part of people’s lives, what can organizational neuroscience give back to more basic neuroscience and psychology?

What challenges have you encountered when conducting OCN research? How have you overcome those challenges?
I think a lot of people are surprised at the difficulty of getting empirical data—it’s an ongoing challenge. Scanner time is expensive so you’ve got to find projects that would be interesting to both neuroscientists and organizational psychologists before you can collaborate. Another big challenge has been trying to create empirical collaborations. My tradition is such that I collect and analyze my data myself. I quickly found that this is not the model from the neuroscience perspective. The typical professor there would have people to collect the data, then experts who run the scanners, then other people who analyze the data. So it’s a completely different model. It’s expensive work and it’s hard to get buy in from the people who hold keys to equipment. So, in some ways that’s a problem I’m not quite sure how to solve. One of the ways we’re thinking about solving the problem is thinking about different types of data that are useful. Good behavioral studies, as long as you design the theoretical side of them well, can be just as groundbreaking as scanner data. The problem is designing the projects in light of understanding what empirical data you’ll be able to collect. Another challenge is getting credit for multidisciplinary research. At many (although not all) tenure-track business schools, my paper in for example the International Journal of Psychophysiology would be ignored even though it’s been really well-cited and influential. I often wonder if such institutions would ignore a Science or Nature paper too!

What implications do you see your work having for I-O psychologists, both for their work in research and their practice in consulting with organizations?
I think designing better workplaces is a huge issue that ON can inform. As just one example, there’s lots of research on how large groups of animals operate
that deals with where leaders should be positioned in order to have the biggest impact on the group. I think an understanding of the brain is really going to give us the quickest benefit in job design and organizational design.

**Where do you see OCN in 10 years?**
From a technological perspective, I would like the research methods of OCN to be seen as just a tool that people use when it’s the right tool for the job. In terms of theory, I hope to see people making theories about how people behave in organizations and the like in a way that’s consistent with what we already know about human behavior in general. There’s a lot in basic psychology and neuroscience about how humans behave that our theories in organizational psychology and marketing, to some extent, seem to essentially blindly ignore, making completely different predictions. I hope that gap will be gone in 10 years’ time.

**What conclusions or final remarks do you have for TIP readers?**
There’s a lot out there that can inform practice but isn’t widely read, and the way to get access to that is to try to get to the source—the scientific literature rather than newspapers and magazines, or the trendy books at the airport bookstore. There’s a lot of really fascinating stuff that we can learn as practitioners from the more basic neurosciences. You don’t have to understand the technical aspects. My advice is to read and dig down into open access publications where a lot of high quality research is coming out. Open access is really a great boon for practitioners; it’s all out there for you to look at. OCN isn’t the kind of work you can do by yourself. You’ve really got to get a good team who’s interested in pushing this kind of thing forward and is interested in working across disciplines. I think the best kind of team is where organizational psychologists are interested in publishing stuff in neuroscience and neuroscientists are interested in publishing stuff in organizational psychology. Then everybody’s working together and everyone’s winning.

**Conclusions**

Many thanks to Nick Lee for sharing his perspective as one of the original founders of OCN. Again we hear about the importance of theoretical grounding and allowing research questions to guide measurement. Following these blueprints will lead to a solid foundation on which we can build ON.
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Looking for your next job?

Check out **JobNet**, a service designed to match leading employers with highly qualified candidates in the field of industrial-organizational psychology.

**The SIOP Conference Placement Center** website, on site computer room, interview area, and help desk work together to provide you all the resources you need to get the job!

**Sign up for one or both today!**
Mentoring has demonstrated tremendous benefits for employee development and growth within organizations. With the many potential advantages to mentoring for both protégés and mentors, SIOP launched a multifaceted mentoring program in 2010. In this article, we will briefly examine the value of mentoring, review the history of the SIOP Practitioner Mentoring Program, and describe the three types of mentoring programs that SIOP offers to its members. At the end of this article, we will review where the SIOP Practitioner Mentoring Program is headed next and when participants can sign up for the next round of mentoring.

The Value of Mentoring

From its origins in Greek mythology, the term *mentor* connotes a wise counselor or teacher. Early studies of mentoring in the workplace defined a mentor as a guide, counselor, and sponsor (Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee, 1978), who facilitates the realization of a protégé’s goals. Kram (1985) conceived of mentoring as a two-dimensional construct comprising...
career-enhancing functions (e.g., sponsorship, coaching, exposure and visibility, protection, challenging work assignments), and psychosocial functions (e.g., acceptance and confirmation, counseling, role modeling, and friendship).

The positive outcomes of mentoring extend to both protégés and mentors. Being a protégé has been linked to successful objective career outcomes, such as compensation and promotion (Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992; Scandura, 1992), as well as to positive subjective results, such as higher organizational socialization, affective and continuance commitment, career satisfaction, job satisfaction, and anticipation of advancement (Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz, & Lima, 2004; Chao et al., 1992; Payne & Huffman, 2005; Schrodt, Cawyer, & Sanders, 2003).

In enhancing the visibility of protégés by providing them with exposure to others in the organization, mentors themselves have found that it helps to strengthen contacts within their own network and reconnect with the organization (Pullins & Fine, 2003). In addition to getting recognition for the role they fulfill (Philip & Hendry, 2000), mentors derive internal career satisfaction from using their skills and experience to further the development of their protégés (Levinson et al., 1978) and grow a more competent workforce (Allen, Poteet, and Burroughs, 1997). With their protégés serving as supporters, mentors may also realize other nontangible work-related positive outcomes, such as personal growth and development and close working relationships or friendships (Allen et al., 1997).

History of SIOP Practitioner Mentoring Program

The impetus for the SIOP Practitioner Mentoring Program came from a 2008 SIOP Practitioner Needs Survey, which identified the need for more practitioner-focused career development opportunities. In response, then-President Gary Latham in his April 2009 TIP column presented the idea of creating a mentoring program for practitioners. He approached the Professional Practice Committee (PPC) and proposed the concept of speed mentoring.

Joan Brannick, then-chair of the PPC, approached Mark Poteet about leading a subcommittee to create a proposal and potentially leading the program. Joining him were Van Latham and Heather Prather. Together, they conducted a needs assessment over the next several months. The results, combined with input from Joan Brannick and then-President Kurt Kraiger helped form the proposal for a SIOP Practitioner Mentoring Program. In January 2010, the proposal was submitted to and approved by the SIOP Executive Board (Poteet, Latham, & Prather, 2010).

The proposal included a three-pronged approach to mentoring: (a) Speed Men-
toring, (b) Group Mentoring, and (c) Virtual Mentoring. Each of these three mentoring approaches will be discussed next, including some of the best practices and lessons learned to date.

**Speed Mentoring Program**

The SIOP Practitioner Mentoring Subcommittee began its foray into mentoring by creating a Speed Mentoring Program. It was designed to benefit SIOP’s practitioners through short-term mentorships received from seasoned I-O psychologists. Mentors are typically Fellows or Members of SIOP, and they are selected based on their knowledge and experience in a specific topic area.

Protégés must be members of SIOP and practicing in the field of I-O psychology. They can be internal or external consultants, academicians, or researchers. They can work in a variety of industries, including private and public sectors, academia, and research organizations.

The Speed Mentoring Program works very much like speed dating, facilitating conversations that are focused on topics related to the practice of I-O psychology. Protégés participate in two back-to-back sessions lasting 20–25 minutes each. In each session, up to eight protégés along with one to two mentors (who stay at their table for both sessions) discuss a specific I-O practice-related topic. Ten topic areas of particular interest to practitioners are presented at the annual conference. Prior to each conference, the subcommittee solicits interest from potential protégés and subsequently matches them to the two topics of their choice on a first-come, first-served basis. If there are openings left, the subcommittee will accept participants on a walk-in basis.

The first Speed Mentoring Program, implemented in April 2010 at SIOP’s Annual Conference in Atlanta, was a huge hit. The Speed Mentoring Program was subsequently implemented at the Leading Edge Conference (LEC) in Tampa in October 2010. Due to popular demand from both mentors and protégés, SIOP has continued its tradition of offering speed mentoring to its practitioners at the annual conference.

After each Speed Mentoring event, the subcommittee gathers evaluation surveys from participants with the goal of improving the program for the subsequent year. Since the inception of this program, survey results have shown that protégés who participated in the Speed Mentoring Program were very satisfied with the overall program. They found the Speed Mentoring sessions to be very useful in regard to providing the following:

- Helpful advice and resources in handling work-related issues or challenges
- Direct networking opportunities
- Sound career advice and guidance
- Professional development opportunities
- An increased knowledge and perspective on specific topic areas
Feedback received from mentors was similarly positive. Mentors were extremely satisfied with the overall program. They cited the following about the Speed Mentoring Program:

- It provided them with an opportunity to give back to the profession.
- It allowed them to share their knowledge and experience.
- It allowed them to utilize their coaching and mentoring skills.
- It provided them with networking opportunities.

After each Speed Mentoring event, members of the subcommittee consistently received feedback from participants that they would like to engage in ongoing mentoring activities after the annual conference. To respond to this request, the subcommittee launched the first pilot of the Group Mentoring Program that was originally proposed and approved in 2010.

**Group Mentoring Program**

The Group Mentoring Program consists of several groups of mentors and protégés involved in a mentoring relationship for an 8-month period. Mentors are assigned 5 to 10 protégés each. They meet monthly as a group via a 1–2 hour conference call on a day and time agreed upon by each group. Although protégés may be initially matched to a topic of their choice, each group eventually is free to discuss any topic of interest to them.

To date, protégés had come from all parts of the world, including the United States, Canada, Mexico, United Kingdom, Australia, and Singapore. On the other hand, all mentors who had volunteered for this program were from the United States.

The first Group Mentoring Program was implemented in 2011. It was a small program with less than 50 protégés and served as a pilot. The second and latest round was a more formal and structured Group Mentoring Program with about 70 participants. It started in February 2013 and ended in September 2013.

Every group mentoring session operated a little differently, with the agenda or discussion topics shaped by members of each group. This group-driven approach allows for the mentoring experience to be tailored to the needs of the group participants. Based on protégés’ requests and suggestions in the most recent round of the Group Mentoring Program, innovative approaches to mentoring were combined with the more traditional discussion format. For example, some mentors invited guest speakers to address topics of interest to their groups. In other instances, mentors had protégés present on topics of their own interest, followed by group discussions and input from the mentors. Mentors and protégés also connected each other with other members of the I-O community to further expand their network or help address more specific needs.
Throughout the course of the Group Mentoring Program, mentors had shared best practices and lessons learned with each other to improve the mentoring experience for all groups. Although evaluation surveys were still being compiled and analyzed as of the submission deadline of this article, informal feedback received from this year’s program suggested that it had been a highly valuable experience for both mentors and protégés. The upcoming survey results, in combination with the best practices and lessons learned, will be used to further enhance the Group Mentoring Program, which is slated to start again in 2014.

**Virtual Mentoring**

In April 2012, the SIOP Practitioner Mentoring Subcommittee implemented its first Virtual Mentoring Program as an extension to the Speed Mentoring Program held at the 2012 annual conference. The purpose was to provide a forum for mentors and protégés from the Speed Mentoring Program to continue their discussions online.

Although technology is transforming the way we interact with each other on a social and professional level, in the case of Virtual Mentoring, protégés did not make use of this online resource. Feedback received suggested that protégés did not feel comfortable sharing questions, issues, or concerns online that could be viewed by others. In addition, my.SIOP, the online community networking tool of SIOP, was relatively new at that time, which may have contributed to the lack of use of the Virtual Mentoring space. As a result, the Virtual Mentoring Program was not offered in 2013.

Thus, of the three SIOP mentoring programs, speed and group mentoring are by far the more popular programs compared to the Virtual Mentoring Program. In the future, virtual mentoring may be offered again. In the meantime, the subcommittee encourages all SIOP practitioners to join the SIOP LinkedIn group, which offers many opportunities to engage in virtual mentoring-like interactions with a wide range of I-O professionals.

**What Is Next?**

The SIOP Practitioner Mentoring Subcommittee will continue to offer speed and group mentoring to the I-O community. A new approach to the mentoring offerings is being explored, to include an integrated offering for participants to join either the Speed Mentoring Program or Group Mentoring Program or both. The benefit of the latter is that it would provide continuity in interactions for mentors and protégés.

With the new or combined offering, protégés will have a seamless transition from speed mentoring to group mentoring, with the added benefit of having
met their mentor(s) and possibly other protégés in person. The concept of a face-to-face meeting to enhance the group mentoring experience started at the 2013 annual conference with a Meet-and-Greet session. It allowed the in-progress group mentoring protégés to meet their mentor(s) and other protégés with whom they had been communicating for several months.

Other program enhancements are also in the works. Some of them include lengthening the speed mentoring sessions and possibly moving these sessions to an earlier timeslot. Other creative ways are also being explored in Group Mentoring to include developing a “menu” of possible topics for discussion, coming up with creative scheduling recommendations to accommodate protégés from around the world, and offering free conference calls for international and domestic participants.

**Interested in Mentoring? Signing Up Is Easy**

In January 2014, the SIOP Practitioner Mentoring Subcommittee will be announcing the next round of mentoring programs. Be on the lookout for more information on these programs in SIOP’s *NewsBriefs*, SIOP’s website, and emails from SIOP’s Administrative Office. Both the Speed Mentoring Program and the Group Mentoring Program are on a first-come, first-served basis and fill up quickly! If you are interested in serving as a mentor for either the Speed Mentoring Program or the Group Mentoring Program, please email us directly at Mentoring@siop.org. We would be happy to put you in touch with mentors from previous years to learn more about these programs, if desired.

Current members of the SIOP Practitioner Mentoring Subcommittee include Karina Hui-Walowitz (Co-Chair), Maya Yankelevich (Co-Chair), Charu Khanna, and Megan Leasher. Special thanks go to Mark Poteet for his contribution to and review of this article.
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**Professional Practice Committee Updates**

The Professional Practice Committee is seeking participation from members on two important initiatives. Please see details below!

The careers study of I-O psychologists continues to be a focus area of the Professional Practice Committee. Interviews with more than 55 SIOP members working in various sectors of employment (academic, government, internal consulting, and industry) were completed and provided rich input into the jobs, competencies, and experiences of individuals with advanced degrees in I-O. Next, SIOP members will receive an invitation to participate in a membership-wide survey. Please contribute to this important project by completing the survey and sharing your career experiences. This last phase of data collection will inform the career paths to be shared at a conference session in May.

Recognizing the growing importance of business skills to those in practice, the committee has begun work to develop a model of business acumen to describe the nontechnical competencies related to business acumen (e.g., sales, marketing, financial concepts) required for success by practitioners. The committee is currently seeking practitioners spanning the midcareer to executive levels across various sectors of employment (internal consulting, industry, government) to participate in workshops to provide input and refine the competency model. Practitioners interested in contributing to this project via participation in a virtual workshop can contact Amy DuVernet (amyduv@gmail.com).

For more information on these and other projects, please feel free to contact me at tracy.kantrowitz@shl.com.
In late 2011, Mo and I set out to explore practice and research issues common across all I-O psychologists regardless of national origin. We started with such topics as stress audits and leadership development only to move onto the prevalence of selection instruments in foreign settings. Each of these topics gave us a clear indication of the differences explored in common I-O practices. But before long, we settled on what I (Alex) believed to be one of the most universal practices in our field—the assessment of employee engagement. Jay Dorio of Kenexa Worldwide (now IBM Kenexa) shared distinctions between U.S. and global engagement trends. In that iteration of our column, Jay noted engagement levels across cultures may not vary widely, but strategies for engaging employees vary exponentially.

Jay’s contribution to our column spurred a question in my mind—does employee engagement vary on national levels? Does employee engagement matter in other nations the way it does in the U.S.? Are there groups that track national levels of employee engagement the way we do in the U.S.? Are the outcomes of disengagement the same ones we witness in the U.S.? Okay, so maybe it spurred more than one question (Yikes!). But Jay’s thought-provoking piece led us to seek out other examples of international research and practice involving employee engagement. This led us to Shawn Bakker.

Shawn Bakker is a registered psychologist, and holds a master’s degree in Counselling Psychology from the University of Alberta. During his 14-year career, he has helped organizations with staff selection, succession planning, team building, and training. His clients include...
Chevron, NAV CANADA, the British Columbia Public Service Agency, the Canadian Air Transport Security Authority, Nortel Networks, and Winn-Dixie. In addition to his consulting work, Shawn has written numerous articles on the use of psychometric assessments in the workplace and has spoken at many HR industry events. He is committed to helping organizations develop effective and innovative assessments of the talents people bring into the workforce. Shawn is coauthor of the Work Personality Index, Career Values Scale, and Career Interest Profiler.

In his contribution, Shawn will address some of the lingering questions we have about employee engagement and its impact on various outcomes from his practice experiences in Canada. In future columns, we will ask other contributors to explore this same topic from other national perspectives.

**Studying Canadian Employee Engagement Trends at a National Level**

Employee engagement can best be described by its results. Engaged employees study employee engagement in Canada. We sought answers to questions such as:

- Is engagement a problem in Canadian organizations?
- What are the results of engagement?
- What happens when people are disengaged?
- Who is responsible for employee engagement?
- What can organizations do to improve engagement?
- What do organizations do that builds disengagement?

The results of the engagement study surprised us at times and at other times supported common findings. For industrial-organizational psychologists and human resources (HR) professionals, we feel that the results of this study support the argument for engagement focused training that targets specific individuals with specific content.

**The Research**

In December 2010, we surveyed 368 Canadian human resource professionals working in business, government, consulting, education, and not-for-profit organizations. We surmised that these professionals had a great deal of familiarity with employees’ experiences at work and would provide a valuable perspective on employee engagement.

Employee engagement can best be described by its results. Engaged employees...
demonstrate higher levels of performance, commitment, and loyalty, whereas disengaged employees do not. Given most organizations’ strong focus on performance, employee engagement has become a popular topic. Our survey of Canadian HR professionals indicates that, along with its popularity, engagement is both problematic and very important.

The majority of Canadian HR professionals (69%) indicated that employee engagement is a problem within their organizations. A large percentage (82%) said that it is very important that their organizations address employee engagement. In fact, less than half of 1% felt that engagement was not an important issue for their organization.

The benefits of engaged employees are found in a number of organizational measures. HR professionals responded that some of the most common results are a willingness to do more than expected (39%), higher productivity (27%), better working relationships (13%), and more satisfied customers (10%). The advantage of engagement goes beyond better communication; it directly affects the production and efficiency of an organization.

Disengaged employees also affect the output of their organizations. Survey respondents indicated that the most common results of disengagement were dysfunctional work relationships (29%), lower productivity (25%), and an unwillingness to go beyond the job description (17%). A startling finding was that disengaged employees do not quit in droves or fail to show up for work. Turnover (8%) and absences (7%) were among the lower rated results of disengagement. It appears that the disengaged do not leave their organizations; instead they stay and damage both productivity and relationships.

To increase employee engagement, Canadian HR professionals rated the following as most effective: control over how a person does their work, opportunities to use their skills, and good relationships with management and leadership. Because engagement is driven by the work environment and processes, it can only be affected by those with influence over them. These people are an organization’s leaders. The vast majority of survey respondents (84%) indicated that senior leaders and managers are primarily responsible for employee engagement. Fair or not, it appears that it is not up to employees to engage themselves but up to organizations to engage their employees.

When asked what leaders could do more of to improve engagement, respondents endorsed the communication of clear expectations (71%), listening to employees’ opinions (62%), and providing recognition (52%). From initially matching a person’s skills to the job requirements to communicating clear expectations and recognizing a job well done, leadership begins and sustains employee engagement. Interest-
ingly, there are also significant benefits to be gained from training that focuses on engagement. In organizations that provide engagement training, the percentage of engaged employees rises by more than 10%, and the proportion that see engagement as a problem drops by 20%.

Increasing engagement is a multifaceted challenge. Driving engagement requires adjusting our work environments and processes and training our leaders. With increased communication, less micromanaging, and greater responsibilities for employees, employee engagement can leap forward.

**Top Tips for Driving Engagement**

1. Build positive work relationships
2. Ensure a good fit between people’s skills and their job requirements
3. Provide regular feedback on performance
4. Give opportunities to learn new skills
5. Give employees greater control over their work: stop micromanaging
6. Celebrate progress and recognize employees’ accomplishments
7. Share information: communicate the direction and strategy of the organization
8. Give employees the opportunity to share their ideas

To view the complete study, please visit [www.psychometrics.com](http://www.psychometrics.com).

**See You Next Time!**

We leave you with this parting thought: “Happiness is not something readymade. It comes from your own actions.” These words from Dalai Lama although simple hold true for nations and organizations striving for highly engaged workforces generating interesting and meaningful work. As Shawn noted in his contribution, employees and employers have equal roles in ensuring engagement. Until next time, goodbye, zaijian, and adios!

**WE NEED YOU AND YOUR INPUT!** We are calling upon you, the global I-O community, to reach out and submit topic ideas for future columns. Give us your insights from lessons learned in your practice. We are always looking from contributors and we will be on the lookout. To provide any feedback or insights, please reach us by email at mo.wang@warrington.ufl.edu, alexander.alonso@shrm.org.

Lynda Zugec of The Workforce Consultants and Dan Costigan of Psychometrics Canada coedited this contribution.
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The Other Two Siblings

It was almost 50 years ago that I began my long journey into psychology. One precursor to my vocational choice is that I flunked out of chemistry. Thus, it is with great delight that I get to use something I learned in chemistry many years ago. It is the benzene ring. The benzene ring is six-sided, and each of the positions in the ring has a name. It looks like this.

You probably don’t recognize two of the names, ortho and para. But we all know the third one, meta, the linguistic basis of meta-analysis. There is no need for me to wax about meta-analysis, other than to say meta-analyses are typically complex and wordy. I don’t know if chemistry stole meta from us or we stole it from them. I think I know, but I won’t rat out my profession. I say it is time that we create two other types of analyses that, in their own way, will be just as useful to us as meta-analysis. Yes, I am talking about ortho-analysis and para-analysis. As a service to SIOP, The High Society offers two constructive ideas.
Ortho-Analysis

After we write a manuscript that is thousands of words in length, our journals require us to condense everything about our paper into 120 words, the abstract. However, we are now in the Information Age, awash in words of all kinds. It takes precious time to process all this information. Quite frankly, 120 words take too much time to read. We need something pithier. I propose that preceding the abstract, the author(s) must state in 10 WORDS OR LESS what the article is all about. This would be an ortho-analysis. Forget about a string of “key words.” The ortho-analysis must stick in your head. Accurately condensing the meaning expressed in thousands of words to 10 words or less would be a supreme test of mental discipline. Think of a terse ortho-analysis as a counterweight to a verbose meta-analysis.

I got the idea of an ortho-analysis long ago from a colleague in sociology. During a lull in a meeting, my colleague said he knew someone who reduced all the findings from 100 years of sociological research into only five words! Needless to say, I took the bait and asked what they were. He replied, “Some do and some don’t.” I was struck with the simplistic eloquence of the statement, not to mention its high accuracy. I never forgot that story, and now I am sharing it with you. Because I am gracious, I demand an ortho-analysis be 10, not five, words or less. Could you cogently reduce your latest paper to 10 words or less? That is why we need it. The ortho-analysis would appear as the first segment of an article, right before the abstract.

Para-Analysis

If you look at the benzene ring, you will see the para-position is at the opposite end. Opposite, as in “least related to.” What we typically do in I-O research is to look for convergence or relatedness between measured constructs. We get excited when we discover that something relates to something else. The technical term for this is convergent validation. But what about the other type of validation, divergent? It seems lately divergent validation is only discussed in a class on test construction. I say it is time to bring back divergent validity. A para-analysis would explain what the findings from a research study are not related to. Such an analysis would serve to keep us focused by clearly stating the limits of what we are talking about.

Just as ortho-analysis began with an event in my past, so too with para-analysis. This one goes back even further in time. I was a graduate student at Purdue. Through some means I have since forgotten, I got hooked up with the head of research for the Purdue University Library. I learned that people conducted research on how libraries operate. The field is called library science. I remember
being rather amazed that the area of study existed. As a means to acquaint me with the field, the head of research loaned me a recently written master’s thesis that greatly impressed him. The thesis was entitled, “What a Library Isn’t.” The thesis explained that a library isn’t just a repository of books, it isn’t just a quiet place to read, so on and so forth. But I could not get beyond the intriguing and almost invitational title. To help ease the stress of graduate studies, in my spare time I found myself penning clever responses to the thesis title. I didn’t think the library guy would have appreciated my work. I came up with such side-splitting entries as, “a library isn’t a pumpkin, a library isn’t a hemorrhoid,” and hundreds more of this genre. If I had shared these witticisms with the library guy, I’m sure he would have lectured me about there being no room for humor in science. As they say in developmental psychology, “As the twig is bent, so grows the tree.”

If the ortho-analysis is the opening segment of an article, the para-analysis would be the closing segment, right before references. It would serve to prevent readers from wandering needlessly into the blind alleys of science. It would be a professionally acceptable way of saying, “Don’t go there.” If you want to impose the 10-words-or-less rule in the para-analysis to achieve symmetry with the ortho-analysis, that would be fine by me. But as I said, I didn’t limit myself to identifying only 10 things that a library isn’t.

Ortho-analysis and para-analysis, the other two siblings of meta-analysis. Remember, you first read about them in The High Society. If only my old chemistry professors could see what I have done with their benzene ring.
New EEO/AA Regulations for Individuals With Disabilities and Protected Veterans

Most readers of this column are familiar with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA, 1990) and the ADA Amendments Act (ADAAA, 2008). Numerous articles in this column have covered important ADA rulings and the protection expansions stemming from the Amendments Act. A related statute that doesn't get as much attention is the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which, among other functions, is the precursor to the ADA and provides protections for federal employees and applicants with disabilities. Section 503 of this act establishes equal employment opportunity and affirmative action requirements for federal contractors doing business with the government and is enforced by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP).

In August of 2013, Section 503 was updated via a final rule developed by OFCCP and approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). That rule was published in the Federal Register on September 24 and becomes effective 180 days later in March of 2014. On the same date a final rule also updated the Vietnam Era Veterans’ Readjustment Assistance Act of 1974 in parallel ways.

Based on what we have seen, these regulatory changes have not received substantial attention in the SIOP community yet. We think that they will have important implications for IOPs working in federal contractor organizations and for consulting firms working for federal contractors. The goal of this article is to provide a basic overview of these new regulations and identify those changes that are particularly controversial and/or will likely require federal contractors and
those representing federal contractors to spend significant time and effort on in order to be in compliance.

**Background**

Patricia Shiu, who is director of OFCCP under the Obama administration, made it clear early in her appointment to OFCCP that one of her major goals was to strengthen EEO and AA requirements related to both individuals with disabilities and protected veterans. Her focus seemed to be on the high unemployment rates for these protected groups, and a lack of measurement in the current regulations. As such, it became clear that potential revisions would involve new quantitative metrics.

The rulemaking process regarding Section 503 started in 2010, with the announcement of proposed rulemaking. This was followed up by a more formal notice of proposed rulemaking in December of 2011, when OFCCP had more specific proposed changes for evaluation. This NPRM led to a substantial amount of public comment, some of it controversial. The controversy stemmed from a variety of proposed requirements, including those related to:

- conducting various quantitative comparisons for the number of individuals with disabilities who apply for jobs and the number of individuals with disabilities who are hired;
- establishing a 7% hiring goal for individuals with disabilities separately for each job group;
- asking job applicants to self-identify as disabled pre-offer and solicit disability status from current employees;
- assessing the potential burdens associated with paperwork and recordkeeping requirements; and
- considering disabled applicants for all possible job openings regardless of to what jobs the applicant applied.

We were particularly interested in the pre-offer disability status solicitation issue. There is clear ADA statutory language prohibiting employers from asking disability-related questions before an offer of employment has been made. The rationale is to ensure that discrimination doesn’t happen. Could this possible Section 503 requirement actually be a violation of the ADA?

EEOC regulations discuss the notion that certain affirmative action-based exceptions may be made to this prohibition, but whether federal contractor status is exceptionworthy is unclear. In 1996, the EEOC provided an opinion letter stating that pre-offer solicitation would be a violation under general AA provisions. However, this year the EEOC provided an opinion letter stating that when federal contractors are required to solicit this information to comply with a federal regulation, it will not be violating
the ADA/ADAAA. It remains to be seen whether this will provide a legal safe haven for contractors if they are challenged, but one would assume so based on the most recent letter.

Public Comment to Regulatory Change

In January of 2012, Congressman John Kline, chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and Congressman Phil Roe, chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions responded to these controversies with a letter requesting a 90-day extension of the public comment period. The public comment period was extended 14 days, and little was heard between January 2012 and August of 2013, when Vice President Biden and The U.S. Department of Labor announced the two final rules.

Importantly, there were major changes made to proposed Section 503 revisions based on public feedback, and many of those changes were removal of requirements that the public viewed as overly burdensome. For example, the regulations no longer required record maintenance of 5 years, employer justification for all cases where individuals with disabilities are rejected, and employer consideration of rejected individuals with disabilities for all other job openings regardless of whether applicants applied to those positions. We find it reassuring to know that the public comment process worked in a sense.

Soliciting Disability Status

The updated regulations will still require that federal contractors and subcontractors who meet the 50 employees/$50,000 threshold solicit disability status from applicants pre-offer, postoffer, and from employees periodically. Obviously federal contractors and their vendors need to begin the process of system changes that allow for data collection, confidentiality, and new quantitative analyses required under the new regulations.

The OFCCP developed a draft form that contractors would be required to use, verbatim, to request this sensitive information. Obviously this information must be kept separate and confidential. Employee disability status will be solicited every 5 years thereafter, with a reminder in between. The form is currently under review at the Office of Management and Budget’s Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA). See next page for the complete form.

Obviously the proposed self-ID form raises a number of issues. The first involves the response options for self-identification. The instructions ask applicants and employees to “please indicate below whether you have a disability,” and give the option of selecting either
Voluntary Self Identification of Disability

Why Am I Receiving This Form?

This employer is a Federal contractor or subcontractor. We are required by Federal law* to reach out to, recruit, and provide equal opportunity to qualified people who have disabilities. The Federal Government requires contractors and subcontractors to invite job applicants, new hires, and employees to tell us whether they have, or have previously had, a disability. We will use this information to measure the effectiveness of our outreach, recruitment, and other employment practices. Because a person who does not now have a disability may become disabled at a later time, we are required to invite our employees to self-identify each year.

Your submission of information is voluntary. Information you provide will be kept confidential in accordance with Federal law, and will not affect our consideration of your job application or subject you to negative treatment of any kind. Employees may self-identify as having a disability on this form without fear of any penalty for not having self-identified as having a disability on a previous form.

Self-Identification of Disability

What is a Disability?

A person has a disability if he or she has a physical or mental impairment or medical condition that substantially limits a major life activity, or has a history or record of such an impairment or medical condition.

Major life activities include, but are not limited to: seeing, hearing, eating, walking, standing, sitting, lifting, bending, speaking, breathing, learning, reading, concentrating, thinking, communicating, and performing manual tasks. Major life activities also include the operation of major bodily functions such as: the immune system, skin, normal cell growth, bowel, bladder, neurological, circulatory, cardiovascular, endocrine, hemic (blood), lymphatic, and reproductive functions.

Please indicate below whether you have a disability:

☐ YES, I HAVE A DISABILITY (or have previously had a disability)
☐ NO, I DON’T WISH TO IDENTIFY AS HAVING A DISABILITY

Reasonable Accommodation

Federal law requires us to provide reasonable accommodation to qualified individuals with disabilities to ensure equal employment opportunity for all. If, because of your disability, you require a reasonable accommodation such as a change to application or work procedures, documents in an alternate format, sign language interpreter, or specialized equipment, please let us know.

* Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended. For more information about this form or the equal employment obligations of Federal contractors, visit the U.S. Department of Labor’s Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) website at www.dol.gov/ofccp.

PUBLIC BURDEN STATEMENT: According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. This survey should take about 5 minutes to complete.
“Yes, I have a disability (or have previously had a disability)” or “No, I don’t wish to identify as having a disability.” These options don’t cover the full range of possibilities. It isn’t possible to identify as not having a disability. Not having a disability and not wishing to identify as having a disability are surely not one and the same. Based on the form, it may also be possible that applicants truly don’t know if they are disabled under the law. Also note that the first response option combines applicants and employees who identify as having a disability with those who identify as having previously had a disability.

A related issue concerns the readability of the proposed form. According to Microsoft Word’s readability statistics, the self-ID form is difficult to read. According to the Flesch Reading Ease Formula, the proposed form receives a score of about 21, which places it in the “very confusing” category. Scores between 0 and 30 (with a maximum score of 100) indicate that the text is best understood by individuals who are university graduates. In addition, the form receives a score of about 16 from the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability Formula, suggesting that it is at the college graduate level. Many applicants and employees in federal contractor organizations may have a difficult time reading and understanding the form.

One other issue is worth noting. There is no place for identifying information on the form. The regulations clearly specify that a 7% utilization goal for individuals with disabilities will be set for each job group. Without identifying information, organizations will be unable to assess whether or not they have met the utilization goal for each job group.

It is also important to note that a 7% disability goal by job group is not a quota. Contractors must assess whether they have a gap between the 7% goal and actual employment within each job group. If there is a gap, they must strive to eliminate the gap with focused outreach and recruitment efforts. Not meeting the goal does not automatically mean violating the regulations.

A Note on Protected Veteran EEO/AA

As mentioned earlier, OFCCP proposed updated EEO/AA regulations for protected veterans as well, and in many ways these updated regulations parallel the 503 updates. One similarity is the requirement of establishing a quantitative metric, called a benchmark. In theory, contractors would compare their protected veteran percentage at the establishment level (not at the job group level) to the benchmark, which would either be a standard OFCCP-derived percentage, or a contractor-specific percentage based on five different factors.
The difference between a disability “goal” and a veteran “benchmark” is unclear, although the regulations did devote space to differentiating the two. Our best guess is that the difference between a goal and a benchmark is based on the fact that the underlying census data for individuals with disabilities is more accurate than the underlying census data for protected veterans because the veteran data actually includes all veterans not just those protected under the regulations. This may also explain why goals are analyzed at the job group level while benchmarks are analyzed at the broader workforce level.

One other point is worth noting. The updated regulations do not require any sort of formal veteran preference. However, in theory, whether or not a benchmark is met is a function of the percentage of veterans in the workforce and, as such, the percentage of veterans that are hired. Could a strong veteran program have adverse impact on women? We note that in theory recruitment and selection are two very different things, but in some cases federal contractors may be faced with conflicting goals. As an example, according to the Department of Veterans Affairs, in 2011 women made up about 8% of veterans in the United States and Puerto Rico. The EEOC has issued policy guidance stating that veteran hiring preferences grant disproportionate advantage to men based on the greater percentage of men serving in the armed forces, which is an intuitive notion. Whether or not veteran preference is justification for adverse impact against women is another question, and we suggest that context matters. It will be interesting to see if effective veteran programs lead to more men being hired than women and whether veteran status could be a potential defense for this adverse impact in the context of Section 503 compliance.

The Controversy Continues

Even though these regulations have been approved by OMB and become effective in March, the controversy continues. Shortly before this article was due, the Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc. (ABC), a construction trade association, filed an injunction against the new regulations. ABC claimed that the new 503 regulations "imposed unprecedented, wasteful and burdensome data collection and utilization analysis requirements on government construction contractors, without statutory authority and in an arbitrary and capricious manner." The suit focuses on legislative history, previous exemptions for construction contractors, and the burdens that the new regulations will put on small businesses. Stay tuned.

Closing Thought: A Supreme Court Case to Keep an Eye On

In 2013 we covered the Supreme Court ruling in Fisher v Texas. Our take was
that the majority essentially punted on a substantive ruling by sending the case back to the district court to rule on whether the University of Texas program was narrowly tailored. We were hoping that the Supreme Court would answer that question, and they still may if the case is appealed again and ends up back on the Supreme Court docket.

In the fall of 2013 the Supreme Court heard oral arguments in Schuette v Coalition, another affirmative action related matter. In a nutshell, the case is about a Michigan law (Proposal 2) than bans preferential treatment based on race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in public education, employment, or contracting. Proposal 2 was favored by voters 58% to 42%. The district court granted summary judgment deeming Proposal 2 constitutional, but a divided en banc panel of 15 6th Circuit judges overturned and deemed Proposal 2 unconstitutional.

The central issue in this case relates to what is known as the “Hunter/Seattle Doctrine”, based on prior Supreme Court rulings in Hunter v. Erickson (1969) [393 U.S. 385] and Washington et al., v. Seattle School District No. 1 (1983) [356 U.S. 457]. Hunter featured a challenge to a city charter amendment that was challenged on grounds that it nullified the city’s fair housing act and Seattle featured a challenge to Initiative 350 that, effectively, would have ended busing for integration. The Supreme Court over-turned both initiatives on grounds that the reallocation of decision-making authority imposed substantial and unique burdens on racial minorities. Although Proposal 2 cites education, employment, and contracting, the crux of the Schuette case relates to education and, more specifically, to the ruling favoring diversity decided by a 5–4 majority of the Supreme Court in Grutter v. Bollinger (2003) [124 S. Ct. 35].

The challenger to Proposal 2, Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action, argued that the “political process doctrine” established in Hunter and Seattle imposes hurdles to laws that place substantial and unique burdens on racial minorities. The defendants argued that the Hunter and Seattle initiatives were passed because of racial animus, whereas Proposal 2 involved no racial animus and simply requires equal treatment.

Not surprisingly, Justices Roberts, Scalia, and Alito were hostile to the Coalition. Justice Thomas was his usual silent self but undoubtedly is also in this camp. Also not surprisingly, Justices Sotomayor and Ginsburg were hostile to Proposal 2 and, although Justice Breyer seemed neutral based on his questions, one would assume that he would be with Sotomayor and Ginsburg based on his vote favoring diversity in the Grutter. Justice Kagan will take no part in this case, so Justice Kennedy would have to join the opponents of Proposal 2 to cre-
ate a 4-4 split that would allow the 6th Circuit ruling to stand, and thereby over-
throw Proposal 2.

There are three things we find interesting here. First, basing a ruling on what
many feel is an obscure (Hunter/Erickson) doctrine would allow the Su-
preme Court to leave Grutter untouched regardless of what the ultimate outcome
is because diversity separated the notion of racial preference from diversity as a
means of providing a better education. The opponents in Grutter did not have
racial animus, but rather, a belief that diversity can be better served with race-
neutral methods.

Second, race neutrality was one of the arguments used by the proponents of
Proposal 2 and, among the arguments used was elimination of alumni prefer-
ences, which is presumed to favor non-
minorities. Of course the argument in Grutter was that race-neutral methods
were tried by the University of Michigan and failed. More interestingly, though,
Justice Sotomayor gave a stinging re-
sponse to the alumni preference argu-
ment, stating:

"It’s always wonderful for minorities that they finally get in, they finally have chil-
dren and now you’re going to do away for that preference for them. It seems
that the game posts keeps changing every few years for minorities."

Third, in searching through the various legal blogs, Art found it particularly inter-
esting that so many of the scribes believe the opponents are facing an uphill battle
in this case. One of the scribes based this notion on Justice Breyer’s seeming neu-
trality, as well as his vote in Gratz v.
Bollinger (2003) [123 S. Ct. 2411] in
which he sided with the majority in over-
turning the University of Michigan’s un-
dergraduate admissions plan. However,
his agreement with the majority in Grut-
ter and dissent to Justice Roberts ruling
in Parents Involved in Community Schools
Ct. 2738] involving plans that would fa-
vor minorities in both Seattle and Louis-
ville, Kentucky speak otherwise.

We favor the 4-4 split because it was Just-
tice Kennedy who provided the most
difficult questions for defendants, and it
was Justice Kennedy who defended di-
versity as a compelling government in-
terest (in the 14th Amendment strict
scrutiny test). Furthermore, although he
disagreed that the target plans in those
cases were narrowly tailored to the com-
pelling government interest, he outlined
methods that could be used that would
be narrowly tailored. We’ll see.

Notes
DCI staff members have been following these regulatory changes very carefully over the
last two years. Many of these have been
summarized in real time for the federal con-
tractor community at ofccpblogspot.com, which is run by DCI. Special thanks to Dave Cohen, Fred Satterwhite, Kristen Pryor, Rachel Gabbard, Dave Sharrer and various other DCI staff members for their thoughts and blogs on the topics that helped inform this article.

2 http://www.dol.gov/opa/media/press/ofccp/OFCCP20131578.htm
3 http://www.regulations.gov/#!documentDetail;D=OFCCP-2010-0001-0001
4 http://www.dol.gov/ofccp/regs/compliance/faqs/Section503_NPRM_faq.htm
5 http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAICList?ref_nbr=201307-1250-001
6 http://www.dol.gov/ofccp/regs/compliance/vevraa.htm
7 We covered this ruling in detail over a couple of articles. For example refer to: http://www.siop.org/tip/july12/18gutman.aspx
8 http://www.supremecourt.gov/oral_arguments/argument_transcripts/12-682_l537.pdf
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Both scientists and practitioners have an interest in the impact our human resource-oriented practices have on individuals and organizations. After all, as an applied field, if it turns out that our theoretical and applied works have no impact whatsoever—or worse, have a negative impact on people and organizations—we would have some serious soul searching to do.

There is a growing body of research focused on understanding the impact of organizational human resource systems upon individual and organizational performance. Historically, there have been a variety of investigations of the impact of specific practices (i.e., hiring systems, compensation) on performance but less focus on human resource management (HRM) practices within organizations broadly on performance. There also exists some work on system-level practices; however, they tend to define HRM systems in different ways. In this edition of Good Science–Good Practice, we’ll review some of the extant research to see what we can learn to inform practice.

The first study we reviewed by Sun, Aryee, and Law (2007) set out to examine the impact of “high performance” human resource practices on employee citizenship behaviors (CBs) and their subsequent impact on turnover and productivity. Using a number of hotels in China, the authors included the unemployment rate and business strategy as potential moderators of the CB–turnover and productivity relationships. The first construct, “high performance human resource systems” requires some definition, given that this construct has been defined in several different ways in existing studies. The authors adapted Bamberger and Meshoulam’s (2000) model, which breaks HRM practices into three categories: people flow, appraisal and rewards, and employment retention. The model is prescriptive in the sense that it identifies spe-
specific practices as “high performance.” For example, within “people flow,” selective hiring practices, extensive general skills training, promotion from within, and some sense of job security are considered “high performance.”

High performance appraisal and rewards practices include results-based appraisals and extensive open-ended rewards. Finally, broad job descriptions, flexible job assignments, and participative management are considered high performance practices.

Sun et al.’s (2007) findings supported most of their predictions. First, CBs partially mediated the relationship between high performance HRM practices and turnover and productivity. Second, unemployment rate moderated the relationship between CBs and turnover, such that CBs and turnover are more strongly related when unemployment is low versus when unemployment is high. Finally, business strategy moderated the relationship between CBs and productivity, such that CBs and productivity were significantly more related in hotels that utilized a customer-service oriented business strategy versus a value-based strategy. This study supports practitioners with some very useful information. First, HRM practices make a difference in employee and organizational performance. Second, the nature of HRM practices makes a difference; although additional studies need to further examine these relationships, it appears that HRM practices that encourage employee participation, focus on employee growth and development, and ensure selectivity in staffing can impact both turnover and productivity.

Fu (2013) recently examined the moderating role of high performance HR practices upon flight attendants’ organizational commitment and CBs. The author used the measure of high performance HR systems developed by Sun et al. (2007), along with measures of CBs and affective commitment to the organization. The author focused on six airlines in Taiwan, surveying 47 supervisors and 346 flight attendants. The author found that the stronger the attendant’s affective commitment to the organization, the more likely the attendant would demonstrate CBs. Second, the author found that attendants were more likely to contribute CBs when airlines actively adopted high performance HR practices. Finally, the author found that the relationship between CBs and organizational commitment was moderated by the airlines’ adoption of high performance HR practices, such that these practices strengthened...
the relationship between commitment and CBs. Consistent with Sun, Aryee, and Law’s findings, adopting high performance HR practices appear to positively impact employees and employee behavior.

Finally, Piening, Baluch, and Salge (2013) examined the relationship between employee perceptions of HR systems and organizational performance. In contrast to the study reviewed above, in which the authors classified HR systems as high performing or not, Piening et al. developed a series of hypotheses regarding employee perceptions of HR systems over time. Specifically, the authors posit that changes in employees’ perceptions of the organization’s (in this case, 169 hospitals in England) HR systems would be related to changes in job satisfaction, customer satisfaction, and organization financial performance. The authors tracked employee job satisfaction, customer satisfaction, and financial performance over a 5-year period using surveys and archival data to develop a variety of models to test their hypotheses.

Piening et al. (2013) found that changes in HR system perception were positively related to changes in customer satisfaction via changes in job satisfaction; however, these effects on employee attitudes and firm performance tend to diminish fairly quickly. The authors suggest several potential implications for practice. First, finding that perceptions of an organization’s HR system impact job attitudes as well as performance provides some fodder for HR practitioners as they argue for their share of an organization’s resources. Second, the roughly 2-year duration of the positive impact of HR practices on employees, customers, and performance suggests that organizations should be continually reviewing practices for improvements and opportunities for meaningful “new” practices. The authors suggest that it might be the fact of change or new initiatives or programs rather than the exact nature of the program that brings about the desired result.
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Sustaining and Advancing I-O

The SIOP Foundation Trustees invite you to sustain and advance I-O psychology by contributing your ideas, time, and financial resources to initiate projects such as these:

**Internships**

The program would be designed to provide financial support for deserving students currently enrolled in their 2nd year of an I-O graduate/doctoral program. The program would assist I-O departments in matching deserving students with credible work organizations that have a record of mentoring future I-O scientist-practitioners. The program must include qualified supervision, meaningful work, systematic mentoring, and feedback. The student should be involved in the production or presentation of a professional work product. The main goal would be to provide needed resources for I-O programs and talent for organizations.

**Grants for Building I-O Programs**

This would provide an annual or periodic grant to a university’s I-O doctoral program to support its actions to make its program stronger, more competitive, and more sustainable. The criteria for this award will focus on the recent, demonstrated accomplishments of the program. The size of the program will not be a factor in selecting the grant recipient. The main goal would be to contribute to the long-term sustainability of the field of I-O psychology.

**Clinical Faculty/Visiting Professorships**

The purpose of this project is to place I-O practitioners in I-O educational programs so that students are exposed to a practice perspective as well as an academic
perspective. This could be accomplished by funding a group that would identify I-O practitioners who are capable and willing to serve as a visiting professor then matching them with educational institutions. Another approach would be to consider funding the visiting professor positions to ensure that diverse perspectives are provided to I-O students. The Foundation Board could work together with SIOP’s E&T Committee to support the development of standards for this kind of faculty role.

**Midcareer Refreshment**

The purpose of this program would be to offer professional development to midcareer practitioners and academics. The program would utilize an assessment center model that would offer follow-up development programs. The program could be run by SIOP volunteers serving as assessors and presenters. Another option might be to offer a training/certification program that might be co-branded with an organization with SIOP volunteers serving as presenters. The SIOP Foundation might provide some funding to allow for sabbaticals for practitioners or academicians to take part in the program. The assessment center might be held in connection with the SIOP conference with development to follow over the course of the year. The goal of the program is to strengthen the profession.

**Field Research Consortia**

The consortia would bring in experts and others in related fields, such as economics or law, to work with SIOP volunteers on a multidisciplinary topic. Once the topic/initiative is identified then a steering committee could reach out to companies that might be interested in funding the research on common problems. Another approach might be to contact companies and/or consultants to see what data would be available for analysis by members/students. The Foundation would lay the ground rules, seek a research site, and identify possible researcher(s).

**The PhD Project**

The purpose of this program would be to increase the racial and ethnic diversity among I-O psychologists by attracting I-O students from underrepresented groups, supporting their training, and aiding in the transition to careers. This would be accomplished by reaching out to graduate schools, offering financial and mentoring support to students during their study activities, and providing job search and coaching support as they transition to careers in I-O.

**Future Summits**

The idea behind this project would be to hold multiple 1–2 day summits fo-
cused on a particular competency that includes academic, practice, government, and/or international participants. The goal would be to address an issue of long-term and strategic importance that is affecting the profession. The goal of the summits would be to enhance strategies that I-O psychologists need to perform effectively in the future.

Your Ideas?

The Foundation trustees believe our field can be sustained and advanced through development of the projects outlined here. The Jeanneret Working Conference is an example of a field research consortium initiative that is already getting underway. Of course the projects described above are not the only potential ones, so we invite your ideas and creative imaginings—your financial contributions, too. Every trustee would be eager to talk with you.

Foundation Board of Trustees
The SIOP Foundation would like to be among your beneficiaries. We are here because others before us laid the foundations for our work. Let us continue to build for the future.

Help to encourage excellence and innovation in I-O psychology. Contribute at http://www.siop.org/foundation/donate.aspx. Your calls and questions to the SIOP Foundation are always welcome.
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