Grüß Gott! Greetings from Innsbruck, Austria where even in the summer months one can go skiing in snow-covered mountains in the Alps. I am pleased to bring you the July issue of *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist (TIP)*, which highlights our very successful 2009 meeting in New Orleans. Let’s relive our memories of the conference even while we look ahead and plan for next year.

**Features**

New SIOP President **Kurt Kraiger** provides an inspirational challenge for SIOP members and identifies three goals for the year of his presidency: to make SIOP louder, more global, and more accessible. Building on our strategic initiatives, Kraiger champions efforts to increase our visibility and influence through science-based practice. For example, in New Orleans, SIOP, EAWOP, and IAAP-Division 1 formed a historic alliance for psychology. Kraiger updates us on these and other initiatives, as well as a potential name change. Don’t forget to follow Kurt in his presidential year on Twitter.

Direct from the conference, **Gary Latham** recaps his presidential year with his address, “The Joys of Serving SIOP as President.” Thanks, Gary!

Also featured, Thomas Stetz and **Gary Burns** ask the burning question, “What Would I Be if I Wasn’t an I-O Psychologist?” Stetz and Burns walk us through their strategy for job mapping and uncover some interesting possibilities.

If you missed the motivational “From Surviving to Thriving: Seven Leaders Share Their Stories” at the SIOP conference you will find a summary of the panel discussion prepared by **Erica Hartman** and **Jennifer Thompson** in *TIP*’s July issue. Finally, **Al Kraut** and **Lauren Mondo** ponder whether SIOP is truly global.

**From the Editorial Board**

**Eric Dunleavy** and **Art Gutman** review the recent Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act and Paycheck Fairness Act in their editorial column *On the Legal Front.*

**Scott Highhouse** continues his exploration of great books relevant to psychology in organizations in the column *The History Corner.*

In *The Academics’ Forum, Sylvia Roch* takes a closer look at the percentage of published articles supported by research grants and the types of grants that are represented in published articles.
TIPTIP has a new Practitioners’ Forum spearheaded by Judith Blanton. The goal for this column will be to provide greater visibility to the work of I-O practitioners. Blanton notes that practitioner work is ephemeral in the sense that it is pervasive yet often not documented. In this issue, Blanton highlights four impressive practitioner-oriented programs that you may have missed at SIOP 2009.

As always, James Madigan and Marcus Dickson keep us updated with a review of Good Science–Good Practice.

We have a new editorial team of students for the TIP-TOPics column. TIP welcomes Pennsylvania State University I-O graduate students Scott Cassidy, Patricia Grabarek, Shin-I Shih, Lily Cushenbery, Christian Thoroughgood, Amie Skattebo, Katina Sawyer, Rachel Hoult, and Joshua Fairchild. A special thanks to Professors Rick Jacobs and Jim Farr for helping with the column transition to the Penn State team.

Lori Thompson features Per T. E. Tillman from Sweden in the column Spotlight on Global I-O. Stu Carr addresses I-O joining a worldwide initiative in a global special issue of his Pro-Social I-O.

Finally, Rich Cober, Rob Silzer, and Anna Erickson continue their analysis of science–practice gaps in I-O in the column Practice Perspectives.

News and Reports

Recapping SIOP 2009, you will find descriptions and pictures of conference highlights. New Orleans and the French Quarter offered an exciting venue for us. Indeed, the good times rolled, and various program chairs and committees review and update us on their offerings. Be sure to read about the SIOP, EAWOP, and IAAP-Division 1 alliance for psychology and SIOP’s makeover of an elementary school library in New Orleans.


Please note also various deadlines and procedures in the Calls and Announcements concerning conferences, papers, and awards. Note also that SIOP members continue to be well represented in the news, as well as win awards, be recognized, and transition to new positions.

Guten Tag!
To the Editor:

It is my belief that there are very few successful statutory efforts that take us backward in time, and I can not believe that the state/provincial legislative bodies that establish the licensing statutes for psychologists would have any desire or incentive to do so in the case of the licensing of I-O psychologists. Prior to 1969, I-O psychologists in Texas, where I practice, were not licensed and did not fall within the purview of any licensing laws. After 1969, I-O psychologists in Texas who called themselves a “psychologist” (and at some later point who “practiced” psychology) were required to be licensed. Academics, researchers, and in-house I-Os were exempt. In 2009, (and for the foreseeable future) to practice psychology in Texas as an I-O (e.g., conduct assessments with psychological instruments) and call yourself a “psychologist” you must be licensed. I say “must”; clearly there is not exacting enforcement, but non-compliance means purposely breaking the law, which if for no other reason I find to be a violation of professional and business ethics and my personal values. Regardless of what APA’s Model Licensing Act (MLA) says, I cannot imagine the Texas Legislature or very many other legislative bodies turning the clock back 40 years and declaring practicing I-Os to now be exempt.

In my judgment a better message to be sent by the more senior members of SIOP and faculty members who prepare the younger members of our profession is that if you are going to practice I-O psychology (I guess 50% of SIOP members may fall in this category) and call yourself a “psychologist” then you should prepare to become licensed. If that includes internships and supervision, then we need to find ways to make it happen. If it means being exposed to certain courses, then identify opportunities for students to take them. (I note that the MLA exempts I-O from having an APA-accredited curricula. There are, however, a variety of courses in the MLA that define required coursework [ethics, research design and methods, statistics, psychometric theory, biological bases of behavior, cognitive-affective bases of behavior, social bases of behavior, and individual differences]. If we are not now teaching most of this content in I-O psychology programs, then what are we teaching?)

In summary, it is my belief that any attempts to exempt “practicing” I-O psychologists from the state and provincial licensing acts are likely to be fruitless, and in any case do a disservice to our profession. In fact, it is my sense that there are very few, if any, professions that have practitioners who directly influence the well-being of individuals who are not licensed. There is no basis for I-O psychologists who practice like I do to be the exception.

There is no reason for SIOP to take an official stance that licensing is somehow inappropriate or not applicable to what we do when we offer psy-
chological services to organizations and to individuals. Nor is there any rea-
son to assert that licensure should or should not be “mandatory.” The only
bodies that can speak (and have spoken) to whether or not I-O psychologists
must be licensed are the state boards and legislatures. Certainly there are those
who may take the traditional stance of SIOP that the work of some I-Os does
not impact individuals and ought not to require licensure but that licensure
should not be denied to those who do perform such work.

The matter of accreditation has been offered as a major reason to oppose
licensure. But I cannot find the relationship between the fear of accreditation
and the need for “unequivocal resistance to mandatory licensing” as expressed
by a group of esteemed faculty members in their letter to the SIOP Executive
Committee (TIP, 46(4), April, 2009). As far as I can tell there does not seem
to be any desire or intention on the part of APA to impose accreditation on
I-O psychology programs. Moreover, if APA did wish to require I-O programs
to be accredited, I do not believe licensure would be the principle argument for
doing so, since our academic colleagues are exempt from licensing.

Let’s not go back 40 years. Vicki Vandeveer and Judy Blanton served
us well in developing a better place for I-Os in the MLA. Let’s not destroy it.
If the accreditation battle ever needs to be fought, I would be happy to give
my full support to my academic colleagues. In the mean time, I trust that the
academics and others who do not need to be licensed will support those of us
who must be licensed.

Dick Jeanneret
March 5, 2009

Gary Latham, Ph.D.
President
Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology
440 East Poc Road
Suite 101
Bowling Green, Ohio 43402

Dear Dr. Latham,

Thank you for writing about the valuable work done by the California Board of Psychology. You have a wealth of information and insight to share, and I was glad to hear from you.

Any plan to address the challenges caused by our difficult economy and California’s fiscal crisis must include what I refer to as a “four-legged stool” of spending reductions, revenue increases, economic stimulus and measures to make government more efficient. The state is joining California’s families and businesses in tightening our belt by consolidating some programs to increase efficiency while also maintaining exceptional service. Although the final budget I signed did not include reorganizing the Board of Psychology, I will be working with my partners in the Legislature to continue evaluating all areas of government for ways to increase efficiency and realize savings.

I recognize the wide scope of the practice of psychology, and it will be important to keep the lines of communication open as we move forward. You and your colleagues do some remarkable work every day, and your in-the-trenches perspective is an important one for us to have here in Sacramento. Please keep in touch on this or any other issues you would like brought to my attention.

Sincerely,

Arnold Schwarzenegger

/la
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The Supreme Court decision in *Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company, Inc.* was reviewed in the January 2008 edition of this column. The title of that article accurately captured short- and long-term reactions to the *Ledbetter* ruling: “A Divided Supreme Court Causes Quite a Stir.” In that article we concluded that *Ledbetter* was the latest in a string of rulings that divided the Supreme Court and produced majority and dissenting opinions that couldn’t be more diametrical. As expected, control of the longer term implications of the ruling ended up the responsibility of Congress in the form of the Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. It was up to the House and Senate to decide (a) whether the Supreme Court ruling was consistent with intended Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) statutory protections, and if not, (b) what EEO law should and should not protect with regard to compensation discrimination. Since we wrote that article in 2008, the Ledbetter Act made its way to Congress more than once, detoured through a presidential election, and was eventually passed and signed into law by President Obama in January of 2009. In fact, the Ledbetter Act was the first bill President Obama signed into law. Interestingly enough, it may not be the last bill related to compensation discrimination that President Obama signs into law in 2009; Congress may have voted on another compensation discrimination bill, the Paycheck Fairness Act, by the time you read this article.

Given a renewed enforcement focus on compensation discrimination, we think it is important for the I-O community to understand the implications of the Ledbetter Act and the potential implications of the Paycheck Fairness Act. Toward that end, we briefly summarize the *Ledbetter* Supreme Court ruling, review the political context around the Ledbetter Act on its journey to becoming law, and consider the implications of that law. We also review the Paycheck Fairness Act, which, as written at the time of this article, would meaningfully amend the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), the Equal Pay Act (EPA), and enforcement policies for both the Equal Employment Opportunity Commis-
sion (EEOC) and Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP). We conclude with some potential implications for I-O psychologists, particularly for those involved in developing and monitoring compensation systems.

The Supreme Court Ruling in *Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.*

As described in the January 2008 column, *Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber* was a disparate treatment case where pay discrimination was alleged based on sex. Lilly Ledbetter worked at the Goodyear Tire & Rubber company for close to 20 years and, after retiring, discovered evidence that she may have been discriminated against early in her career at Goodyear. She filed a claim of intentional discrimination in her pay under multiple statutes, including Title VII and the Equal Pay Act (EPA).

Ledbetter’s claim centered on pay decisions made early in her career, which, as expected, had long term “rippling effects” on her pay relative to men in similar jobs. Interestingly, because of the temporal lag before Ledbetter discovered potential evidence of discrimination, none of the Goodyear employees that made pay decisions early in Ledbetter’s career were at Goodyear at the time she filed her claim. In fact, the manager who made raise decisions early in Lilly Ledbetter’s career had passed away at the time of litigation.

In an initial district court ruling, a jury decided that Ledbetter was paid less than her male coworkers based on her sex. However, the jury agreed that Goodyear had not discriminated against Ledbetter in the 2 years before the filing of her complaint. In fact, over Goodyear’s objection, the judge allowed the jury to consider pay review decisions made at different times by different managers over the course of Ledbetter’s long career. The jury initially awarded her over $3 million in back pay and for emotional distress and punitive damages before the amount was reduced to meet Title VII’s damages maximum.

Goodyear appealed the ruling, and upon appeal, the Eleventh Circuit decided not to consider the pay decisions prior to the period 2 years before Ms. Ledbetter’s charge and excluded them from evidence. Instead, the Circuit held that Title VII’s protection extended to the last discriminatory act affecting pay before the start of the 2-year back pay limitations period and not to the duration of Ledbetter’s tenure. That is to say, Ledbetter’s claim had a time limit relative to when the discriminatory act occurred. If that time limit passed without a claim, then a claim cannot be made after the fact, regardless of whether a claimant was aware of the act or not. The Circuit Court of Appeals then reversed the initial verdict and dismissed the lawsuit.

Ledbetter appealed the reversal and the Supreme Court agreed to hear the case in 2006, eventually ruling in the spring of 2007. A majority of the Court sided with the Eleventh Circuit and dismissed the lawsuit in a close 5–4 ruling. Justice Alito delivered the opinion of the majority and was joined by Justices Roberts, Scalia, Kennedy, and Thomas. Justice Ginsberg filed a dissenting opinion joined by Justices Stevens, Souter, and Breyer.
The majority relied upon a set of decisions spanning 4 decades, including *Bazemore v. Friday* (1986) and *United Air Lines, Inc. v. Evans* (1977). The majority held that the initial act of pay discrimination is a “discreet act” and happens only, for example, on the day of that specific check, raise, or promotion and not during the days after that initial action when the alleged victim is paid. In other words, pay is similar enough to employment decisions like hiring and promotion that it should be treated similarly. In situations where the victim does not timely file a charge challenging the discriminatory policy or practice, the employer act is necessarily legal and is “an unfortunate event in history with no current legal consequence.”

The dissenting justices focused on the fact that employees are often unaware of pay information related to their coworkers, and given the absence of this information, it is very difficult to determine whether discrimination is occurring. The dissenting justices also supported the notion that pay discrimination is particularly damaging because of the long-term ripple effect that it can have on compensation after the initial discriminatory act. In addition, the dissent questioned the ruling relative to the purpose of Title VII and suggested that it was not consistent with the intention of EEO protection. The dissent foreshadowed where these issues would conclude in the final paragraph of their opinion: “Once again, the ball is in Congress’ court. As in 1991, the Legislature may act to correct this Court’s parsimonious reading of Title VII.”

**Reactions to the Ruling**

Given the potential implications of the ruling for various stakeholders, it was not surprising to see immediate reaction from the public. Many civil rights groups (e.g., National Partnership for Women and Families, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, National Organizational for Women, etc.) and politicians agreed with the dissenting justices and considered the ruling a setback to equal employment opportunity for women. However, many employer associations (e.g., Society for Human Resource Management, Chamber of Commerce, HR Policy, National Association of Manufacturers, Equal Employment Advisory Council, etc.) agreed with the decision and argued that the Court’s ruling correctly interpreted Title VII.

Politicians including Hillary Rodham Clinton, Nancy Pelosi, George Miller, and Ted Kennedy openly condemned the ruling, and this political reaction eventually led to drafting the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, which would reverse the ruling. However, the timing of the bill was an important issue, primarily because there was a presidential election on the horizon. Further complicating the matter was the fact that, given the makeup of Congress, the bill was expected to pass both the House and Senate. However, the Bush administration supported the Supreme Court ruling, openly criticized the act, and threatened to veto the bill if it made it to the president’s desk.

If you followed the presidential election, you know that the Supreme Court ruling was not the last time you heard Lilly Ledbetter’s name. In fact, pay dis-
cramination became a priority in the presidential campaigns of Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton. The eventual president talked about Lilly Ledbetter and the issue of pay discrimination on the campaign trail, framing it as both an economic and civil rights issue. Lilly Ledbetter told her story to America at the Democratic National Convention. At this point, it was clear that the act had political momentum behind it, particularly if eventual President Obama was elected to the White House. Congress first voted on the act before the election in 2008, and it was passed by the House of Representatives. The act stalled in the Senate later in 2008, probably in part because of the impending election.

After the election in November, the Act once again became a legislative priority. In January of 2009, the House approved both the Ledbetter Fair Pay Act (247 to 171) and a companion bill called the Paycheck Fairness Act (256 to 163). The bills were combined in a session of Congress and sent to the Senate, and eventually separated into two bills again and voted on. On January 22, 2009 the Senate approved the stand-alone Ledbetter Act (61 to 36), and on January 27 the House again passed the act (250 to 177). On January 29, 2009, President Obama signed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act into law, and stated: “Making our economy work means making sure it works for everyone…..That there are no second class citizens in our workplaces, and that it’s not just unfair and illegal—but bad for business—to pay someone less because of their gender, age, race, ethnicity, religion, or disability.”

What the Ledbetter Act Does

The Ledbetter Act amends Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and modifies the operations of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Specifically, the act differentiates pay discrimination from other more overt acts of discrimination and endorses, in effect, a “continuing violation” theory of discrimination that expands the timely filing period. From a legal perspective, compensation discrimination may happen at three different times depending on specific context, and those times are the date:

1. “A discriminatory compensation decision or other practice is adopted”;
2. “An individual becomes subject to a discriminatory compensation decision or other practice”;
3. “An individual is affected by application of a discriminatory compensation decision or other practice, including each time wages, benefits, or other compensation is paid, resulting in whole or in part from such a decision or other practice.”

Thus, the Ledbetter Act refines Title VII and other statutes such that pay discrimination is treated differently from other more overt acts of discrimination (e.g., in employment decisions like hiring and promotion). In addition (as described by the Ledbetter Act):

1 This period is typically either 180 or 300 days from the discriminatory act.
• The purpose of the act is “to clarify that a discriminatory compensation decision or other practice that is unlawful under such Acts occurs each time compensation is paid pursuant to the discriminatory compensation decision or other practice, and for other purposes.”

• The Supreme Court ruling in Ledbetter was flawed in that “The limitation imposed by the Court on the filing of discriminatory compensation claims ignores the reality of wage discrimination and is at odds with the robust application of the civil rights laws that Congress intended.”

• The act, and the amendments made to this act, “take effect as if enacted on May 28, 2007 and apply to all claims...that are pending on or after that date.”

After the act was signed into law, the EEOC quickly issued a press release and a notice of guidance for potential claimants. Acting Chairman Stuart Ishimaru congratulated Congress and President Obama, saying “The Commission celebrates this important piece of civil rights legislation...The Act is a victory for working women and all workers across the country who are shortchanged by receiving unequal pay for performing equal work. The EEOC intends to enhance enforcement in this area, in addition to increasing public outreach and education.”

Although the act is short, it has some important implications for claims of compensation discrimination and, necessarily, EEOC enforcement. It isn’t unreasonable to expect the number of pay discrimination claims to increase substantially in the next few years, primarily under Title VII. This is not a trivial implication, particularly given EEOC charge statistics in FY 2008, which showed a 15% increase in discrimination claims overall and similar spikes across most statutes. Intuitively, more victims of long standing pay discrimination will now be able to make claims that they could not make in light of the Supreme Court ruling. In addition, the Supreme Court ruling, legislation, and compensation discrimination as a national, political, and economic issue have received quite a bit of TV, radio, and newspaper coverage in the last few years. For this reason, it is reasonable to assume that many employees may now be more aware of their statutory protection and more

2 Note that the phrase “or other practice” may be an issue of legal contention. Some in the EEO arena are worried that employment decisions other than compensation (e.g., promotions, demotions, etc.) could erroneously be covered by this phrase.

3 http://www.eeoc.gov/press/1-29-09.html

4 http://eeoc.gov/epa/ledbetter.html

5 Note that there have been some radical recommendations made in response to the Ledbetter Act. For example, some in the EEO community have suggested that the safest way to avoid allegations of long-standing compensation discrimination would be to stop giving base pay raises. Instead, organizations could pay everyone in similar jobs the same base pay and provide differential lump sum bonuses based on performance once a year. Such a system may in theory limit liability from a temporal perspective because there is only one annual pay decision/application that could be discriminatory, and the timely charging period would expire before the next decision/application. This recommendation has obvious practical limitations, including the possibility that employees and applicants could have strong negative reactions to this type of system.
interested in gathering information about their pay relative to others. In fact, EEOC placed a notice on its Web site suggesting that if claimants are aware of unexplained differences between their own compensation and coworkers’ compensation and believe that the difference is because of group membership they should call the EEOC for more information.

Note that the Ledbetter Act should not meaningfully affect OFCCP enforcement as it relates to compensation, primarily because the Ledbetter Act does not amend Executive Order 11246, which includes a review of compensation data in audits of federal contractors. The Solicitor of Labor’s office (SOL) has taken the position that EO 11246 does not have a timely filing period for audits and that the executive order has no statute of limitations limiting the collection of back pay. Interestingly, some federal contractors initially interpreted the Ledbetter ruling as limiting OFCCP’s compensation enforcement under the rationale that Title VII and the executive order were similar. Some federal contractors even went as far as to deny OFCCP requests for compensation data under the executive order. OFCCP threatened to take these federal contractors directly to litigation. In fact, in one recent case an administrative law judge considered this issue and ruled in OFCCP’s favor.6

The Paycheck Fairness Act

As mentioned above, the Ledbetter Act isn’t the only legislation that may affect pay discrimination enforcement in the coming years. In 2008, the House passed a version of the Paycheck Fairness Act when it was attached as a companion to the Ledbetter Act. Eventually the two bills were separated, and the Paycheck Fairness Act has been referred to various subcommittees since then but has not been voted on again. The Paycheck Fairness Act could have even broader implications for compensation discrimination enforcement than the Ledbetter Act. For example, as it was written at the time of this article, the Paycheck Fairness Act would refine EEOC enforcement of the EPA and OFCCP enforcement under EO 11246.7

In recent years the EPA has become an infrequently used statute. For example, from fiscal years 1997 to 2007, only between 1% and 2% of all discrimination claims made to EEOC were under the EPA. This isn’t surprising given that the statute only protects one class (gender), applies to one type of employment decision (pay), requires narrow comparisons (employees performing equal work, often interpreted as identical jobs), and has limited damages (back pay and liquidated damages). For these reasons Title VII is generally considered a more powerful and consequential statute for allegations of pay discrimination. The Paycheck Fairness Act could change that. For example, the Act would amend the EPA by:

---

7 The act would also appropriate an additional $15,000,000 to the EEOC and OFCCP to carry out enforcement.
• Allowing for both punitive and compensatory damages (matching Title VII);
• Allowing for a comparison of similarly situated (and not essentially identical) jobs;
• Endorsing a UGESP standard of affirmative defense, such that a “bona fide factor other than sex” burden would take the place of an “any other factor other than sex” burden. The “bona fide factor other than sex” burden would likely require a demonstration of job relatedness and consistency with business necessity and may also offer the plaintiff or enforcement agency the opportunity to demonstrate a “reasonable alternative;”
• Allowing pay data to be compared across physical establishments in similar geographic locations;
• Requiring EEOC to issue regulations on a compensation survey for employers;

With regard to OFCCP enforcement of EO 11246, the Paycheck Fairness Act would change how OFCCP investigates compensation discrimination by:

• Reinstating the Equal Opportunity (EO) survey as a data collection method;
• Supporting the “pay grade methodology” as adequate prima facie evidence of discrimination. In other words, multiple regression analysis controlling for legitimate factors like experience, education, and geographic location may not be necessary, and anecdotal information would not be required to support initial evidence of systemic discrimination;
• Allowing OFCCP to decide what variables can be used in more complex analyses (e.g., multiple regression);
• Requiring that the agency “make print readily available…accurate information on compensation discrimination, including statistics, explanations of employee rights, historical analyses of such discrimination, instructions for employers on compliance, and any other information that assist the public in understanding and will address such discrimination.”

8 Note that the Paycheck Fairness Act, as currently written, does not forbid the use of multiple regression analysis to support or refute allegations of pay discrimination. In other words, employers could still use regression models to explain a disparity in later phases of enforcement. Interestingly, the Paycheck Fairness Act also provides some inconsistent guidance on how analyses should be conducted. For example, the Act endorses the “pay grade” theory of analysis, which generally refers to broad analyses where data are grouped by grade. However, the Act also reiterates that “similarly situated employees’ will be defined consistent with the EEOC manual, which are jobs that generally involve ‘similar tasks, require similar skill, effort, and responsibility, working conditions, and are similarly complex or difficult.’ Note that the EEOC compliance manual does not endorse a “pay grade” theory. If an agency uses a “pay grade” strategy for initial analyses, and employers use more complex employee groupings that (1) mirror the reality of pay decisions and (2) are consistent with the EEOC manual, and develop regression models that account for bona fide factors related to pay, substantially more claims could end in litigation. In this situation the courts would then determine which methodology is more appropriate to assess allegations of compensation discrimination.
Concluding Thoughts and Implications for I-O Psychologists

It is reasonable to expect that compensation discrimination will be a major focus of enforcement agencies in the next few years. The current economic challenges may only increase scrutiny directed toward compensation systems and decisions; recall that the Obama administration has framed compensation discrimination as both an economic and a civil rights issue. Employees may be more cognizant of compensation decisions in the current economy and may be more willing to share information about pay with coworkers when raises are small or nonexistent.

In the short term, the Ledbetter Act may immediately increase the number of pay discrimination claims, perhaps as early as fiscal year 2009. In the longer term, it will be important to monitor the fate of the Paycheck Fairness Act given its potential implications. When considering the priorities of the new administration, it is also reasonable to expect OFCCP to prioritize compensation discrimination as well, regardless of whether the Paycheck Fairness Act passes. OFCCP may even revise their Compensation Analysis Standards and Voluntary Guidelines (2006), which describes the methodology OFCCP uses to investigate systemic compensation discrimination. In the next few years federal contractors could see very different OFCCP enforcement strategies, both in terms of resource allocation and the statistical methods used during investigation. Anecdotally, it appears that some OFCCP regions have increased their focus on pay equity enforcement in 2009, perhaps anticipating the priorities of the new administration. If the Paycheck Fairness Act passes, the EPA may become substantially more relevant, statistical analyses of compensation data in the EEO context may change, and organizations may have a more difficult time justifying the defensibility of pay decisions in litigation.

I-O psychologists may be in a position to leverage their skills to help organizations understand the adequacy of their pay-decision systems. For example, job analysis data can be used in the development of compensation systems. Ensuring that compensation systems are standardized, reasonable, and tied to the work requirements of the job may decrease the likelihood of claims of discrimination and increase the likelihood that such a decision system would be legally defensible if disparities exist.

In addition, an understanding of jobs and statistical methods may place the I-O psychologist in a strategic position to conduct proactive pay equity analyses. These analyses are intended to determine whether there are significant disparities in compensation between two groups before the situation escalates to EEO enforcement. Organizations can make a good faith effort to evaluate their current compensation systems for evidence of disparity and may remedy any situations that require it via legitimate and data-driven pay adjustments. These analyses are usually conducted under the attorney–client privilege.

9 In a review of OFCCP settlements from FY 2007, the Center for Corporate Equality reported that less than 10% of OFCCP settlements focused on compensation discrimination. This percentage may rise under the Obama administration. The report is available at http://cceq.org.
As an initial step in this process, employers should have a clear understanding of the work requirements for each job in their organization. This information can be the foundation for creating meaningful groupings of similarly situated employees for analyses. Such groupings ensure that any disparities that are identified are not simply due to differences in job, job level, and so on. Additional and legitimate factors that affect pay can then be modeled in multiple regression analyses, potentially explaining any initial disparities against protected groups (assessed by a regression coefficient) via education, experience, performance, and so forth. I-O psychologists may be leveraged to develop these statistical models, conduct analyses, and interpret results.

Anecdotally, one recent OFCCP settlement exemplifies the usefulness of a proactive pay equity analysis. In this case a significant pay disparity was identified by the agency. However, the contractor had already made adjustments to salaries based on a proactive pay equity analysis, and the disparity no longer existed. The OFCCP accepted this explanation because an initial disparity was identified proactively and corrected. In some situations like this, proactive analyses may actually cut off liability that is now actionable under the Ledbetter Act by correcting for significant differences in compensation.

As a final point, it is obvious that partisan politics greatly impacted the evolution of the Ledbetter Act and has and will continue to impact the evolution of the Paycheck Act. Generally, it is our policy to avoid political issues, except when absolutely necessary. However, when necessary, our goal is to present such issues objectively. It is not our goal to decide whether these are “good” or “bad” laws but rather to focus on the reality of what the implications of these law are. In our opinion, the reality is that employers will face increasingly heavier burdens to document and support pay scales, particularly if the Paycheck Fairness Act becomes law.
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More Great Books Relevant to Psychology in Organizations

Scott Highhouse
Bowling Green State University

In the January 2009 issue of TIP, the History Corner column had suggestions for books related to I-O history. Various people nominated books that inspired them and wrote a couple of sentences about why they think others would be inspired as well (http://www.siop.org/tip/jan09/09highhouse.aspx).

I commented at the time that I would include recommendations in a future issue if enough people were interested in contributing ideas. There were enough contributions to motivate me to include them, along with some invited contributions, in this month’s History Corner column. These are coming just in time for your summer reading list!


Recommender: Neal Ashkanasy, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.

I came upon this book by happenstance when I was just beginning my interest in emotions research. In it, António Damásio, a Portuguese-born neurobiologist, makes the startling claim that Descartes was wrong after all. Cogito ergo sum. Separation of mind and body. All wrong. Damásio makes a compelling case that in fact humans cannot reason without access to their bodily states, which Damásio calls “somatic states.” In the most memorable chapter, Damásio relates the case of Elliot, who had an exceptionally high IQ but, because of a brain lesion, was incapable of experiencing emotion. As a result, and despite his intelligence, Elliot was incapable of making even simple decisions. Even the most entrenched emo-skeptic might find this book compelling.


Recommender: Nathan Kuncel, Department of Psychology, University of Minnesota.

This book, written by three of the clearest thinkers and writers in our field, is an actual investigation of key research questions. They distill out both
what questions need to be answered and how to go about answering them effectively. The fact that it is now a bit over a quarter century old only makes the content more interesting...and telling. Their extensive advice on how to develop good research ideas is good reading for any scientist–practitioner. My personal favorite,

If you find yourself attempting to “test” a “model” of organizational behavior consisting of several boxes connected by arrows, by writing self-report questionnaire items to “measure” each major variable in the model, stop. This particular paradigm has not proven very useful....Almost everyone we interviewed or surveyed warned of this danger. Some were quite vocal about it. (p. 135)


Recommender: **Bill Balzer**, Department of Psychology, Bowling Green State University.

This book remains one of the most comprehensive and practical frameworks for understanding, predicting, and changing behavior in complex organizations. This “bible of organizations” brought concepts from social psychology to the forefront in the developing fields of organizational psychology and organizational behavior. The open systems approach, psychosocial structures, and the organization as a system of roles are key concepts that continue to shape research and practice. This book was the centerpiece of Ray Katzell’s graduate-level organizational psychology course at NYU, and I continue to use it in my graduate courses today. If there’s a better book out there, please let me know!


Recommender: **Tim Judge**, Department of Management, University of Florida.

I don’t think I have read a more beautiful illustration of the benefits of marrying qualitative and quantitative analysis to gain a full understanding of a topic. The vignettes in the book are fascinating and poignant.

Recommender: **Nathan Bowling**, Department of Psychology, Wright State University.

Despite its age, this book remains a relevant source for job satisfaction researchers. As a basis for the book, Hoppock examined the job attitudes of employed residents of New Hope, Pennsylvania. An important finding of this research, which has been replicated in dozens of subsequent studies, was that the vast majority of people report being satisfied with their jobs.

¹ This book was also recommended by **Terry Beehr**, Department of Psychology, Central Michigan University.

Whyte’s treatise on the push for conformity in organizations and the role of organizational scientists and testing is certainly worth reading even after more than 50 years.

Like **Gary Latham** in the previous column, **Milt Hakel** chose to send a favorite article, along with some of his favorite quotations. Because Milt is retiring this year, I let him get away with whatever he wanted to do:

*On the Folly of Rewarding A While Hoping for B*—Steve Kerr, in *AMR*, 1975, and updated in *AME*, 1995

“When God closes the books on Judgment Day, one of the great questions to be answered will be whether zeal and idealism were responsible for more human suffering than were sloth and greed.”—Walter Russell Mead

“When we try to pick out anything by itself, we find it hitched to everything else in the Universe.”—John Muir

“Go where there’s trouble.”—Murray D. Lincoln, founder of Nationwide Insurance

“Always prefer intelligent fast failure to slow stupid failure.”—Jack Matson

“Insight is the sudden cessation of stupidity.”—Edwin Land

“Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has.”—Margaret Mead
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Given the increasing importance many universities place on grants, it may be useful to know what percentage of published articles is supported by research grants and what types of grants are represented in published articles. Given the applied nature of industrial and organizational psychology, many of the traditional governmental funding agencies that heavily fund other areas of psychology do not often fund research in industrial and organizational psychology. One way of gaining a glimpse of the state of funding in I-O psychology is to examine published articles to see how many of them acknowledge funding and what kind. Granted, this is much less than a scientific approach. For example, the U.S. military is an important source of funding for I-O psychology projects, but it is possible that many of these projects are only reported in technical reports, *The Military Psychologist*, or in outlets other than mainstream I-O psychology journals. Nonetheless, taking a look at the type of organizational affiliation of individuals reporting funding and the type of funding they report may provide a useful snapshot of the state of funding for I-O psychologists.

Thus, with the help of my research assistants, I decided to conduct an admittedly rough investigation of the type of funding reported in articles published between 2003 and 2008 in five journals. Authors were placed in one of six categories according to their reported affiliation: psychology department, business or management department or school, private organization, government organization (not military), military, or other. Funding source was categorized according to one of 12 categories, as reflected in Table 1. Initially I chose to examine the *Journal of Applied Psychology, Personnel Psychology, Academy of Management Journal*, and *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* because these journals were ranked as the top four by I-O psychologists in Zickar and Highhouse’s (2001) review of the top journals. However, until recently, *OBHDP* did not report specific author affiliation; in other words, until recently only the university was reported and not the department or school. Thus, I removed *OBHDP* from the list and replaced it with the *Journal of Management* and *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, ranked 8th and 13th respectively according to Zickar and Highhouse. Thus, we examined 5 years of articles published in five journals for a total of approximately 1,650 articles. Overall, about 30% of the research reported in these journals is funded according to
the acknowledgement section of the articles. The *Academy of Management Journal* reported the highest percentage of funded research (39%), followed by the *Journal of Applied Psychology* (35%), and the *Journal of Management* reported the lowest percentage of funded research (18%). Please see Figure 1 for the breakdown by journal. Table 1 presents the breakdown of funding source by journal, along with overall percentages by funding type. It should be noted that we coded up to four funding sources per article. A number of articles reported more than one funding source, 122 articles (7.4%) reported two funding sources, 39 articles (2.4%) reported 3, and 3 articles (.2%) reported 4 funding sources. However, given that relatively few studies reported three or more funding sources, only the first two funding sources are reported in Table 1.

Table 1

*Type of Funding Source Reported by Journal*

(based on up to two funding sources per article)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>JAP</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>AMJ</th>
<th>JOB</th>
<th>JOM</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology dept.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/management dept./school</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other university funding</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIOP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Human Resource Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other U.S. govt. agency funding</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other govt. funding</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private organization</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Here and subsequently, JAP refers to the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, PP refers to *Personnel Psychology*, AMJ refers to the *Academy of Management Journal*, JOB refers to the *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, and JOM refers to the *Journal of Management*.

*Figure 1:* Percentage of funded research by journal.
It appears that the most common source of funding was a management/business school, followed by other university funding and other governmental funding. This “other governmental funding” category was designed to represent government funding that did not mention a specific U.S. government agency. The most common type of funding represented in this category was funding provided by a non-U.S. government, such as the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Research Grants Council of Hong Kong, and the RGC (UK) Research Grants Council. Funding from the National Science Foundation, a traditional funding source for many areas of psychology, only accounted for 13% of the funding reported in the journal articles examined but did place 5th in terms of representing the most common type of funding. Overall, it appears that researchers look to a wide variety of funding sources to support their research.

However, not only I-O psychologists publish in these journals. As seen in Table 2, the majority of the affiliations associated with the first author are from a business/management department or school. Granted, many I-O psychologists are affiliated with business and management departments and schools; however, to receive a more in-depth view of authors who are predominately I-O psychologists, I focused on the grants received by authors in psychology departments. It should be noted that some of the authors may be in areas of psychology other than I-O psychology but most likely the majority are I-O psychologists, which is likely not the case for business schools and departments. Unfortunately, there was no definitive way of determining which authors identify themselves as I-O psychologists, other than directly contacting the authors of the 1,650 articles, which was not possible.

Table 2
Percentage of Articles by First Author Affiliation Within Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author affiliation</th>
<th>JAP</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>AMJ</th>
<th>JOB</th>
<th>JOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology dept.</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/management dept./school</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private organization</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt. organization</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 0% does not imply that there were no authors representing a category but that they constituted less than 1% of the authors published in the journal.

Thus, I examined the data with only authors in psychology departments selected. I examined the data in two ways; (a) specifying that the first author must be from a psychology department (resulting in 108 articles reporting funding) and (b) specifying that at least one of the authors must be from a psychology department (resulting in 144 articles reporting funding). We coded for the first five authors for each article. When the first author was
from a psychology department, the article was slightly more likely to report grant funding than the overall sample (33% vs. 30%). This difference is at best minimal; it appears that about a third of the articles in these journals report funding regardless of whether the authors are psychologists.

Table 3 reports the number and percentage of funded articles according to funding source and according to whether the first author reported an affiliation with a psychology department or any author reported a psychology department affiliation. It should be noted that the numbers do not add up to the number of articles reporting funding because if articles reported more than one funding source, the first two funding sources were included in the table. The percentages are very similar to those reported in the larger sample, with the exception that the percentage of funding from a business or management department or school is much smaller, which is to be expected given the criteria that either the first author or at least one author must represent a psychology department. Military funding represents a larger percentage of the funding in this sample (approximately 10% versus 5% in the overall sample), as does government funding not mentioning a specific agency (approximately 20% for this sample versus 5% of the overall sample). The rest of the funding sources appear to be within 3 percentage points of the overall sample. Thus, it also appears that researchers affiliated with psychology departments rely on a wide variety of funding sources to support their research.

Table 3
Type of Funding Source Reported in Articles Written by Members of Psychology Departments (based on up to two funding sources per article)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding source</th>
<th>First author only</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Any author</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology dept.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/management dept./school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other university funding</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIOP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Human Resource Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other US govt. agency funding</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other govt. funding</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private organization</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: First author refers to articles in which the first author was a member of a psychology department. Any author refers to articles in which at least one of the authors was a member of a psychology department.
In conclusion, it appears that as best as can be determined by examining the published literature, the majority of the articles published by I-O psychologists represent unfunded research, suggesting that I-O psychologists can conduct high-quality research without outside funding. Of course, this does not imply that I-O psychologists publish without outside assistance. Often private organizations will support data collection efforts without providing an official grant. Nonetheless, it appears that the majority of our research is not funded, and when it is funded, we rely on a wide range of funding sources.

In hindsight, I should have included some of my favorite journals, such as Human Performance and the International Journal of Selection and Assessment. I would not be surprised if these journals report larger percentages of authors affiliated with psychology departments, but other researchers will need to determine whether this is indeed the case. Nonetheless, I hope that a snapshot of the most frequent funding sources as represented by published journal articles will give researchers ideas for where to look for research funding. Lastly, I would like to thank Gene Trombini for overseeing the collection of this information and for his editorial assistance. I would like to thank Ryan Armstrong, Jerry Gioeni, Kamilah McShine, Jeanne Messerschmitt, and Noelle Whitney for their help in data collection.
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The goal for this column is to provide greater visibility to the work of I-O practitioners. Much practitioner work is ephemeral, not in the sense that it has no impact (it does!) but in the sense that it is not documented. Practitioners (and researchers) seldom know much about the work that other practitioners do. Sharing of knowledge and best practices is minimal. Sometimes this is because the work is the intellectual property of the practitioner (or client organization), but more often, it is because there is neither the motivation nor a mechanism to share knowledge or lessons learned. Client organizations are focused on the impact and the results of the project and seldom see much value in documentation of the process. Practitioners have little financial incentive to take time away from their client work to describe their efforts. At the same time, most practitioners I know express the desire to share their experiences and to learn more about what their colleagues are doing. In a small way, I hope that this column will enhance the dialogue among practitioners about methods and interventions that they have found useful. Elsewhere in this issue, Rob Silzer talks about the gap between practitioners and researchers. Perhaps this column can also encourage researchers to explore the practitioner work described here with greater depth and rigor.

For this first column, I focus on four of the excellent programs at the New Orleans SIOP conference that described the work of I-O practitioners. Below are descriptions of recent work that represents this varied practice. The selection of these programs was, frankly, unsystematic. I depended on nominations from senior SIOP practitioners and my own sense of topics that might be innovative or spark discussion. There were literally dozens of programs that deserve space and further discussion. For future columns, I look forward to input from practitioners about innovative or impactful interventions and tools that they (or their colleagues) have used to implement the projects. I would be particularly interested in projects where the practitioner was able to gather systematic data to document impact.

I would also like to highlight the scope of I-O practice. We know that our members are engaged in a wide variety of activities with a broad range of clients. I would be interested in hearing from members who are working with nontraditional clients and/or using I-O tools and knowledge in innovative ways with clients. I welcome your suggestions in how to make this column useful as well as ideas for projects to feature. Please send your comments and ideas to Judy Blanton (jblanton@rhrinternational.com).
This presentation dealt with the impact of a major employment discrimination lawsuit against Coca-Cola Company. As part of the settlement, rather than react defensively, under court scrutiny Coca-Cola Company agreed to create an external task force to review and revise virtually all HR processes within the company. The goal was to create a “gold standard for diversity” by developing processes that were best in class, by committing to diversity as part of business strategy, and that used data as an accountability index. An additional goal of the project was to have employees perceive the processes as fair and equitable. The task force met on a bimonthly basis and was assisted by Irv Goldstein and Kathleen Lundquist (the “joint experts”). The joint experts also consulted with the HR process owners on development and implementation of new processes. Integral to the process was the annual data collection on each process. These data were provided by the company to the joint experts. In addition, there was an annual report to the court covering results and recommendations for each process. The annual court reports can be found at http://www.thecoca-colacompany.com/ourcompany/taskforce_report.html.

The evaluations included annual analysis of workforce demographics, perceptions regarding diversity fairness, and effectiveness of HR processes. In addition there were annual audits of such HR data as training completion, performance appraisals, staffing, and slating data. This was not a short-term project but took place over 5 years. The effort provided a rare opportunity to simultaneously design and implement HR processes for all jobs system wide and to track the success of these initiatives. The project is an excellent example of turning a negative (such as a lawsuit) into a positive and transformative process.


Deals that require integrating organizations (PE buyouts, mergers, or acquisitions) are fraught with risk. Aside from legal and financial issues, the capabilities of the senior team members are key determinates of success or failure. A relatively new area of practice for I-O psychologists is “management due diligence.” The process is designed to ensure that the right people are in position to swiftly create profitability. It can take place as part of due
diligence and/or during the ownership period. This presentation described a case study in which a major private equity firm asked if the new management team could create the necessary organizational transformation and lead in the new environment. After assessing how the investment thesis translated into needed management behaviors, the consultants created a talent map that compared managers on the appropriate dimensions. The assessments included standardized testing, in-depth interviews, and reference checks. Short individual report snapshots on each manager were developed. Based on the assessments, a number of management changes were made. All managers received individual feedback, and a series of team meetings were held over the course of the first year to align expectation and accelerate team performance. The PE firm found the process highly valuable because of the clear understanding of the relationship of the investment thesis to the assessments and the follow-through during the ownership period. For more information, contact David Astorino (dastorino@rhrinternational.com or visit: http://www.rhrinternational.com/Senior-Management-Services/Management-Due-Diligence/).

Insights on Teams at Work: Lessons From Collaborative Work on Team Development and Effectiveness. Linda Rhoades Shanock, University on North Carolina at Charlotte; John Mathieu, University of Connecticut; and Scott Tannenbaum, The Group for Organizational Effectiveness (gOE).

The goal of each year’s Master Collaboration session at the SIOP conference is to have a leading researcher and a leading practitioner discuss the overlap, interaction, and current state of science and practice on a particular topic. Scott Tannenbaum and John Mathieu drew from their experience with a wide variety of work teams (from surgical to sales to senior leadership teams) to discuss team effectiveness and ways to conduct science–practice collaboration using an example collaborative project they did together.

According to Scott, the top needs from the practice side are the creation of usable diagnostics, especially rapid diagnostics as well as rapid interventions, better team training, ways to make sure roles are clear, help for teams with changing membership and distributed teams, and support for team leaders. John Mathieu stated that the top needs from the research side include the need to define multiple applicable types of criteria for effectiveness, to seriously model temporal issues, to differentiate highly related constructs, to create a sophisticated team composition model, to identify contextual drivers and influences on members, to decipher multiteam membership dynamics, and to incorporate team interventions into theoretical models.

An important take-away message from the session was that when working with organizations the stated problem is not necessarily the underlying issue that needs to be addressed. Thus, it is important for those engaged in practice to do good questioning/diagnostic work to get to the heart of the matter. For example, organizations often ask for team building when what they
really need is team training (i.e., to develop team KSAs) or perhaps leader coaching and/or process and structural changes. Or when they say two teams are fighting with each other, the underlying issue is often that the teams have competing priorities. In such cases, an intervention should raise awareness of the implications of each team’s actions for each other, teach collaborative behaviors, and ensure clear leadership from above.

The two also provided tips for effective science–practice collaboration. These include finding the right partners, clarifying the desired outcomes for each party early (including intellectual property issues), establishing respective roles (remember, role clarity leads to team effectiveness), being aware of timing issues that could affect completion of deliverables and the size of effort required by all, refraining from exaggerating scientist–practitioner differences (build trust with each other and make each other look good), and challenging each other constructively (e.g., does the work pass the academic sniff test, is it credible)? Does the work pass the practitioner sniff test (e.g., will anyone care)? For more information, contact John Mathieu at John.Mathieu@business.uconn.edu or Scott Tannenbaum at scott.tannenbaum@groupoe.com.

Audits of Human Resources Programs (Panel Discussion). Irene Sasaki, Dow Chemical Company; S. Morton McPhail, Valtera Corporation; and Michael T. Tusa, Jr., Sutton & Alker, LLC.

With an increasing focus on accountability in organizations, I-O practitioners may be called on to assist in ensuring that HR programs conform to professional standards and legal guidelines. This session reviewed some of the best practices for auditing HR programs in a variety of areas. It is possible to identify three purposes for conducting audits: (a) evaluating the business proposition (e.g., utility, effectiveness, best practices, and prevention or detection of business risks), (b) limiting legal liability or exposure, and (c) defending legal or regulatory challenges. The panelists discussed several specific issues including the role of controls (such as policies and procedures, segregation of duties, delegation of authority, monitoring, and access control) in preventing or identifying problems. Important considerations for audit processes were offered for several examples. Key issues in auditing testing programs included the quality of the validation research and the extent of exposure of the testing program. It was suggested that audits of performance management systems should include evaluation of statistical information, system validity, administration and procedural structures, and implementation issues. Auditing downsizing processes included both issues in the design of the process and appropriate statistical modeling to evaluate the outcomes. Finally, risks such as legal privilege and failure to act on results of audits were addressed. For more information, contact Mort McPhail of Valtera (mmcphail@valtera.com).
Sustainability.

Just Ask Our Clients.

Aon Consulting is shaping the workplace of the future through benefits, talent management, and reward strategies and solutions.

We are in turbulent times, but we know the economy will rebound. Strong leaders can have a big impact on how your organization will look with recovery on the horizon. Will your organization have the leaders needed to ensure success?

Visit www.aon.com/siop2009 to download a copy of Aon Consulting’s Leadership Sustainability Survey Results conducted during the 2009 SIOP Conference.
Get the highest level of success and performance metrics with Selex Success

- Obtain accurate and construct valid measures for critical success factors
- Use metrics for developing, validating, and evaluating all recruitment, hiring, training, and personnel management programs
- Collect data quickly and at substantially lower costs than traditional methods
- Access the service from anywhere around the world with 99.9% reliability

Call or visit our website today to find out more about Selex Success.

www.e-Selex.com
(800) 690-6130
TIP-TOPICS

An Introduction

Amie Skattebo
The Pennsylvania State University

TIP-TOPICS, a column for students by students, has been a staple of *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist* for over a decade. A group of eager Penn State University (PSU) grad students will be editing this column for the next 2 years. In an effort to contribute to this grand tradition, we considered very carefully not only what we may have to offer but also how our culture and norms are likely to shape our contributions. For that reason, we devote this column to giving you a sense of who we are and what you may expect from us over the next seven issues of *TIP*.

Penn State’s tradition of I-O leadership includes four past presidents of APA Division 14\(^1\) as well as the first person to receive a PhD in the field, Bruce Moore (Jacobs & Farr, 1993). Two areas that are hallmarks of our program include (a) the scientist–practitioner model and (b) an appreciation for multidisciplinary perspectives. Although there has been ongoing debate about whether and how we might best enact these principles in the field at large (e.g., Banks & Murphy, 1990), we make efforts to “walk the talk” during our graduate school training at Penn State in both these respects. We have also been making efforts to better communicate the value of our knowledge and skills to people outside our field. As a result, you can expect that our column will address these themes and be flavored with these perspectives. Below, we elaborate on these principles and discuss some topics you may see discussed in upcoming issues.

The Grad Student as Scientist–Practitioner

The scientist–practitioner model reflects an appreciation for the interaction between theory building/testing and real-world problem solving. Although we accept that these endeavors mutually enhance and rely on one another, I-O psychologists tend to work in either applied or academic settings. The different sets of pressures in these environments are not always

\(^1\) Bruce Moore, Frank Landy, Jim Farr, Kevin Murphy
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conducive to maintaining a balance between the roles or communication between members of the field that identify themselves more with one role or the other (Murphy & Saal, 1990). Therefore, it is important that the value of persisting through these challenges as well as the skills needed to do so be instilled early in graduate school.

One way we gain a deep appreciation for the scientist–practitioner model and skills for balancing these roles is through our experience participating in and leading projects in practicum. A 3-year commitment for all Penn State I-O grads, practicum provides exposure to the world of practice through participation in solving applied problems for private and public organizations. With the guidance of faculty, students learn how to apply theory and research under the constraints of demanding project timelines and unique client needs. In addition, practicum allows students an opportunity to gather research evidence from the field and gain additional skills such as communicating with a nonacademic audience. A recent review of this program requirement suggests this process speaks quite comprehensively to a number of SIOP’s guidelines for training at the doctoral level (Lindsay, Tate, & Jacobs, 2008). A recent, unpublished survey of Penn State I-O alumni supports the ongoing value of the practicum experience beyond graduation (Grandey, 2008).

In addition to practicum, Penn State I-O has recently chartered an assessment center through the Schreyer’s Honor’s College. This project focuses on the assessment of undergraduates who are seeking the opportunity to learn more about their strengths and weaknesses before entering the job market. For graduate students at Penn State, it provides a valuable opportunity to apply research and theory while gaining applied skills in the organization and administration of assessments. In addition, this project provides a way for the program to communicate our value to the university. Efforts to make our contributions more visible support not only our program but also the field as a whole (Ryan, 2003).

Finally, gaining applied experience through internships is fast becoming a norm at Penn State, even for students considering academic careers. Previously, students have shared their experience through colloquium presentations with other students in the program. Through this column, we hope to pass on some of the lessons learned from participating in practicum, the assessment center, and applied internships to a broader audience.

**Sharing Knowledge and Skills Within and Across Disciplines**

All students at Penn State are expected to participate in a variety of research projects during their tenure in graduate school. In addition, there is a strong norm for students to complete a minor outside of I-O. As a result, many cross-discipline relationships between I-O and researchers in other university departments have been formed over the years. Some on-going projects include collaborations between students and faculty in Business, Infor-
Utilizing science from disciplines outside the I-O community is a tradition of the field. The archival description presented on the APA Web site defines I-O psychology as rooted in cognitive and social psychology but also influenced by business, labor and industrial relations, physiology, as well as law (American Psychological Association, 2009). However, multidisciplinary research and collaboration is not easy (Younglove-Webb et al., 1999). We hope to bring you some of the lessons we have learned along the way to aid your potential multidisciplinary interests as well as encourage your collaboration efforts by extolling the benefits we have observed through our experiences.

Understanding and Communicating the Value of I-O

Our experiences working with clients through practicum and departments outside of the I-O community highlight the need to learn how to communicate the nature and value of I-O with a nonacademic audience. A norm that has quickly developed among our students and faculty is to ask someone for the “elevator speech.” That is, we are expected to learn and practice the skill of explaining our research in a short period of time (i.e., the few minutes you may share with someone in an elevator) using language that is easily comprehensible to people outside our field.

Related to the above is the need to understand the value of I-O research and organizational interventions in terms that are meaningful to business leaders. Utility theory provides a way to discuss the value of organizational interventions in dollar terms (Cabrera & Raju, 2001). Although we commonly accept that business leaders want to understand how our research will affect their bottom line, research suggests many in our field do not (Macan & Highhouse, 1994). Furthermore, research on the influence of reporting utility to business leaders presents equivocal results (Carson, Becker & Henderson, 1998; Whyte & Latham, 1997). We hope to discuss how we might explore utility theory and practice communicating with business leaders and others outside our field in upcoming issues.

About Our Team

Over the next 2 years you will be hearing from students spanning a range of program tenure as well as research interests. Here is a quick preview of our TIP-TOPics team:

Scott Cassidy brings both a unique applied and international perspective to our group, having both lived abroad and worked in the field following
completion of his master’s degree from the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, VA. His research interests include leadership, selection, and creativity and innovation.

**Joshua Fairchild**, alum of the University of Connecticut, is just off the heels of his first year of graduate school and brings a fresh perspective to our column. His research interests include leadership and creativity. Josh is also a seasoned comedian, participating in improvisational comedy for 10 years.

**Patricia Grabarek**, a UCLA alum, is looking forward to her third year at Penn State, with interests in emotional labor, training, feedback, selection, and assessment centers. Patricia speaks Polish and will be living and breathing the scientist–practitioner model in her role as assessment center coordinator this upcoming year.

**Rachel Hoult** is a graduate of the University of Maryland and has many research interests, including leadership and teams. She can speak four languages and brings a fresh perspective to our column having just completed her first year of graduate school.

**Lily Cushenbery** hails from sunny California, a graduate of California State University at Fresno. Her interests are broad, but include leadership, innovation, and training. A recent newlywed and fluent speaker of Russian, Lily is excited to start her third year in grad school this fall.

**Katina Sawyer** brings an exciting cross-disciplinary perspective to our group. A graduate of Villanova University, Katina is working toward dual degrees in I-O and women’s studies. She studies gender and diversity issues at work and home.

**Shin-I Shih** brings an international perspective to our team having completed her undergraduate degree at the National Chengchi University in Taipei, Taiwan. Her research interests, as she begins her third year in graduate school, include decision making, selection, teams, and cross-cultural issues in the workplace.

**Amie Skattebo** is finishing up her doctorate this summer. Her research focuses on technological and organizational change. Having completed a minor in information science and technology, Amie adds to our team’s multidisciplinary perspective.

**Christian Thoroughgood** hails from the University of Maryland and has research interests in leadership, particularly deviant leadership. He’s beginning his fourth year at Penn State this fall.

**Conclusions**

We hope to provide greater insight to the larger graduate student community about the three topics discussed: the scientist–practitioner model, cross-disciplinary experience, and communicating effectively with people outside our field. We look forward to serving and thank the excellent contributors to TIP-TOPics in the past. Suggestions for future topics that readers would
like us to cover or questions/comments can be directed to Amie Skattebo (als383@psu.edu). To learn more about our program, please visit our Web site (http://psych.la.psu.edu/graduate/programAreas/ioArea/index.html).
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New SIOP titles coming in 2009

Organizational Frontiers Series
Learning, Training, and Development in Organizations
Adverse Impact: Implications for Organizational Staffing and High Stakes Selection

Professional Practice Series
Performance Management: Putting Research into Practice
Strategy Driven Talent Management: A Leadership Imperative
Kenexa isn’t just about improving workforces and organizations, it’s about improving the world. We planted 650 trees in the Plumas National Forest—one tree for every person who attended our SIOP reception. Thanks to everyone who contributed to making the world a better place.

Learn more about Kenexa at kenexa.com
To start, we wanted to mention one study in a recent issue of *Journal of Applied Psychology* that hit upon a couple of things relevant to the mission of this column. In “Tapping the Grapevine: A Closer Look at Word-of-Mouth as a Recruitment Source,” authors Greet Van Hoye and Filip Lievens (2009) do essentially what the title suggests: They examine how “word of mouth” works to encourage (or discourage) people to apply with different employers. Word of mouth is one of those ubiquitous recruiting strategies that professionals always talk about and that may be becoming more and more important as the “mouths” become virtual and the words are spread across e-mail and online social networking sites like Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter, and others. Although research has certainly been done on word-of-mouth sources like employee referrals and networking during job searches, we always welcome additional research, especially when it steps back to present coherent models that look at larger concepts and identifies and clarifies the constructs at work.

But although the melding of science and practical issues is one reason the Van Hoye and Lievens piece stood out, there is perhaps a more interesting and potentially more important reason that harkens back to something we’ve written about in this column, which other thinkers have been advocating in other outlets. Instead of recreating the wheel to look at word of mouth in the context of recruiting research to be published in a journal for industrial-organization-al psychologists, the authors realized that other researchers outside of that space have already taken cracks at this nut since the 1960s. Specifically, they look at research done in the product-marketing literature to see how word of mouth affects consumers’ attitudes and behaviors towards brands and products. This is the kind of cross-discipline and cross-boundary research we love seeing, even if it is hard to get started and sometimes takes a lot of extra effort.

Both word of mouth advertising and word of mouth recruiting involve many of the same phenomenon and characteristics—both involve interpersonal communication outside of the company’s control about them and their products. Van Hoye and Lievens acknowledge that word of mouth is a transfer of information in a social context; that the source of information is of a particular, consistent type; and that the information is never under direct control of the company despite any efforts at advertising or guerilla marketing. Furthermore, they note that word of mouth is characterized by face-to-face com-
munication or similar communication through technology (though here I think they sell short the Internet in general and social networking sites in particular), that anyone can do it, that it can be affected by both the motivations of the giver and the receiver (think job seeking vs. bad mouthing here), and that unlike traditional recruiting word of mouth can be either positive or negative.

Following what they call the “recipient–source framework” to predict the determinants of word of mouth and the “accessibility–diagnosity” model to understand how easy the information is to retrieve and use mentally, the authors made several hypotheses about how it would affect subjects’ interest in joining the Belgian Defense Force. Although not all their hypotheses were supported, several were and the authors were able to draw several conclusions. First, those high in Extraversion and Conscientiousness spent more time receiving positive word of mouth. They also found that the more expertise the word of mouth’s source seemed to have, the more people paid attention, and that people were more likely to receive word of mouth information from sources with which they already had strong social ties. And it all seems to matter—positive word-of-mouth information early in the recruitment process relates positively to perceived organizational attractiveness and intentions to apply. We look forward to more research in this vein and seeing what else the marketing literature can teach us.

The next work we wanted to examine extends the concept of taking lessons from other disciplines, but instead of marketing it examines how I-O psychologists—both practitioners and academics—should learn to think in terms of business people in general. In their book, Investing in People: Financial Impact of Human Resource Initiatives (2008), authors Wayne Cascio and John Boudreau hit squarely on another theme that we like to harp on in this column: making research understandable and meaningful to a wider audience in the context of business.

After some introductions and defining of terms, the authors propose what they call a “LAMP” framework for approaching the measurement of human resources initiatives. LAMP is an acronym for a paradigm relating to planning and couching these initiatives (and the research projects that go with them) in terms that break past the shortcomings of traditional approaches and make them meaningful to decision makers and stakeholders elsewhere in the organization. You must have a coherent logic for the initiative and how it connects to the larger business, the right analytics to make sense of the data, the right measures to gather the data in the first place, and the right processes to make use of what you discover.

This framework established, the next chunk of the book dealt with very specific questions that I-O psychologists working in the area of human resources are likely to be called upon to answer. How much does employee absenteeism really hurt the company? How worried should we be about our turnover? Is it going to benefit the company to put in a new fitness center for
employee use or to pay for a smoking cessation program? Is it worth it to offer onsite daycare for employees to use in emergencies? How concerned should I be about these employee satisfaction survey results?

The authors obviously don’t give you specific answers to these questions as they relate to your company’s situations, but instead they provide logic, analytics, measures, and processes for each issue to educate the reader on how to approach each question as both a scientist and a business person. Good research methods, theory building, and scientific interpretation of results are stressed but so is communicating the outcomes in terms of dollars (or whatever your local currency may be). If you need a formula for calculating the hourly cost of turnover or absenteeism, for example, you’ll find it here.

The next major part of the book dives head first into the complicated (and often controversial) concept of staffing utility. The authors provide information on measuring and using staffing utility, then its use in decision-making processes for things like enhanced selection systems and HR development programs. This section of the book is not for the faint of heart as it contains some pretty complicated (but powerful) algebra and calls to do some pretty challenging measurement, but utility (pun intended) of this kind of effort can’t be understated when you are trying to sell a program to key decision makers or to communicate the impact of a new program.

So in general I liked Investing in People, even if it bogs down from time to time and once or twice the reader is presented with instructions that basically amount to “just make a best guess and plug the number into your model.” But the message of how to communicate and debate with stakeholders in their own language and on their home turf is an invaluable one if human resources in general and I-O psychology in specific are going to move forward and become a real driving force in business.

With the economy in the state it’s in right now, organizations are often facing decisions that can lead to survival or organizational demise. One of those decisions can be the extent to which the organizations focus on innovation. Latham and Braun’s recent article (2009) in Journal of Management looks almost prescient in its appropriateness because they looked at unprofitable publicly traded software organizations during the technology downturn of 2000–2001. They also considered whether (a) the extent to which management and ownership overlapped, and (b) the availability of undesignated financial resources affected decisions to invest resources in innovation. Gathering publicly available data about financial performance and investment in research and development (R&D), Latham and Braun found clear evidence that:

[M]anagers with more equity participation (i.e., more “skin in the game”) and more slack resources reduced R&D spending at a greater rate than those with less. This suggests that managers faced with potential loss of their firm-linked personal wealth and/or job security were more inclined to curtail risky investments. (p. 275)
These findings supported theoretical models related to personal agency in decision making, as well as the extent to which threat leads to rigidity. However, the findings don’t suggest that these are inherently bad decisions; in fact, those failing organizations that continued investing resources in uncertain innovations (and presumably, in innovations with uncertain payoff timeframes) were more likely to totally fail than were those organizations that diverted resources away from longer-term innovation-oriented projects and towards shorter-term, more secure resource investments. In short, when your personal wealth is tied to firm performance, and there are slack resources with which to work, you’re less likely to “bet the farm” on R&D investments. Perhaps you don’t do it when it’s your personal wealth presumably because of agency-oriented decisions (i.e., I personally will be affected by this), and you don’t do it when there are slack resources because you don’t have to take the longshot bet as your only hope of surviving. I liked this article because it helps us understand the decisions that current financially challenged organizations have made and are making, and it relies on hard data that were always available. It just took some clever researchers to track down the data and put them to good use.

We usually close the column that follows the SIOP conference with a review of sessions from the conference, but this time around, we’re just going to hit one presentation—the closing keynote address by Steve Kerr. Dr. Kerr is well known in our field, having been on the faculty at Ohio State, USC, and Michigan, then serving as chief learning officer at GE under Jack Welch, and working now at Goldman Sachs. (See Greiner, 2002, for an interesting conversation with Dr. Kerr about these experiences.)

Steve’s basic premise in his talk (or at least, our main take-away point) was that there’s a lot of research that goes on in organizations, and we can and should be helping to make that research better. Much of that research will never meet the standards for publication (insufficient sample sizes, lack of control groups, threats to validity, etc.), but that doesn’t mean that the research isn’t useful. Academics who focus primarily on publication need to remember that “publishable” is not a synonym for useful, nor is “not publishable” indicative of “not useful”. (The correlation might even be negative.)

Dr. Kerr asked the audience to consider a favorite restaurant that suddenly started serving bad food in an unpleasant atmosphere. “How many times would it have to be bad before you would stop going?” Most people answered with three or fewer times. Steve then pointed out that three cases in one condition will never be enough to achieve statistical significance, and yet most people (and certainly most managers) make their decisions in situations analogous to this one—they don’t have much data, but the data appear to be convincing to them. If we as organizational researchers and practitioners can help organizations to get better data, or more data, or to think more carefully about the data to which they attend, we will be doing a tremendous service to those organizations, even though none of that will likely ever be publishable. In
short, Dr. Kerr’s message was that science that is useful and used in practice is closer to being good science than is science that is never done because the researcher claimed not to have the resources necessary to do the research perfectly. That doesn’t mean we shouldn’t have respect for published research—we simply shouldn’t dismiss research that we simply shouldn’t dismiss research that is useful for decision making solely because it does not meet standards of generalizability or sample size required for publication.

In closing this issue’s column, we wanted to take a moment to let you know of some changes coming up. I (Marcus) have been asked to take on a new column for TIP that will be focusing on I-O education and classroom issues, and so I’ll be moving out of the role of co-editor of this column. I’ve enjoyed the chance to help spread the word about research that is what we all profess to be most interested in: work that advances our theoretical understandings of people at work, while at the same time providing specific, practical information to organizational practitioners about how to address the problems they wrestle with each day. Although I had known Jamie prior to this column, it’s been a privilege to get to know him better as we’ve worked on this column together for the past 3 years. (Thanks to Laura Koppes for inviting us to do this column and to Wendy Becker for her support in continuing it.)

Good Science–Good Practice will continue (of course, good science and good practice will continue, but so will the column!), with Tomas Giberson taking over as co-editor. Tom has a great background as a former full-time (and still frequent) organizational consultant and now assistant professor at Oakland University (and, I have to mention, graduate of Wayne State’s I-O PhD program). Tom and Jamie will be back next issue in this column (reach Jamie at jmadigan@ameren.com and Tom at Giberson@oakland.edu), and look for a new TIP column on education and classroom issues from me as well (I’m at marcus.dickson@wayne.edu, if you have topic suggestions or questions you’d like me to address).
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Is Your Company Positioned for the Economic Recovery When It Arrives?

- Are your business leaders and line managers still aligned around short and long-term business goals?
- Are your managers and employees still energized and engaged?
- Will your HIPO’s stay once the hiring environment changes?
- Our assessment tools, normative benchmarks and data from previous recessions and recoveries can help you prepare. These include:
  - Illuminate!
  - Leader Assessment
  - Restructuring Impact and Change Management

Visit the newly relaunched www.sirotacom to learn more
Greetings TIP readers, and welcome to the July edition of the Spotlight column! Whether you’re a practitioner working in an applied setting or an academician concentrating on research and education, chances are you’ve got plenty to keep you busy this summer. As budgets tighten and professional responsibilities expand, many people find themselves longing for more hours in the day. Are you searching for an environment where you can leave work prior to sundown for once? If so, this column is for you! This issue provides an introduction to I-O psychology in Sweden, where inside sources say you’re unlikely to find many of our colleagues burning the midnight oil this time of year. To get a better handle on the state of Swedish I-O, I interviewed Per Tillman, who works for Personnel Decisions International in Stockholm. Read on for details.

I-O Psychology in Sweden

Per T. E. Tillman
Personnel Decisions International

Q: Can you give us some background information about the geographic and economic context in which Swedish I-O psychology operates?

A: Certainly. The following excerpts from Wikipedia (2009) provide an accurate portrayal of the broader environment in which I-O psychology functions here.

Sweden, officially the Kingdom of Sweden, is a Nordic country on the Scandinavian Peninsula in Northern Europe. Sweden has land borders with Norway to the west and Finland to the northeast, and it is connected to Denmark by the Öresund Bridge in the south. At 173,746 square miles, Sweden is the third largest country in the European Union in terms of area, and it has a total population of over 9.2 million. Sweden has a low population density of 52 people per square mile but with a considerably higher density in the southern half of the country. About 85% of the population lives in urban areas, and it is expected that these numbers will gradually rise as a part of the ongoing urbanization. Sweden’s capital is Stockholm, which is also the largest city in the country (population of 1.3 million in the urban area and with 2 million in the metropolitan area). The second and third largest cities are Gothenburg and Malmö. Sweden is a constitutional monarchy with a parliamentary system of...
government and a highly developed economy. It ranks first in the world in The Economist’s Democracy Index and seventh in the United Nation’s Human Development Index. Sweden has been a member of the European Union since January 1, 1995 and is a member of the OECD (“Sweden,” 2009).

Sweden is an export-oriented market economy featuring a modern distribution system, excellent internal and external communications, and a skilled labor force. Timber, hydropower, and iron ore constitute the resource base of an economy heavily oriented toward foreign trade. Sweden’s engineering sector accounts for 50% of output and exports. Telecommunications, the automotive industry, and the pharmaceutical industries are also of great importance. Agriculture accounts for 2% of GDP and employment (“Sweden,” 2009).

Some of the most well-known Swedish organizations are Volvo, Ericsson, Vattenfall, Skanska, IKEA, Electrolux, TeliaSonera, Sandvik, Scania, and Hennes & Mauritz. Sweden’s industry is overwhelmingly in private control. Unlike some other industrialized Western countries, such as Austria and Italy, publicly owned enterprises were always of minor importance. The World Economic Forum 2008 competitiveness index ranks Sweden fourth most competitive, behind Denmark. The Index of Economic Freedom 2008 ranks Sweden the 27th most free out of 162 countries, or 14th out of 41 European countries. Sweden ranked 9th in the IMD Competitiveness Yearbook 2008, scoring high in private-sector efficiency. According to the book The Flight of the Creative Class, by the U.S. economist Professor Richard Florida of the University of Toronto, Sweden is ranked as having the best creativity in Europe for business and is predicted to become a talent magnet for the world’s most purposeful workers. The book compiled an index to measure the kind of creativity it claims is most useful to business—talent, technology, and tolerance (“Sweden,” 2009).

Q: How would you describe the presence of I-O psychology in Sweden?

A: Overall, the practice of I-O psychology has had mixed penetration in Sweden. Some organizations, typically the large global ones, have well established processes for the management of their talents that are state-of-the-art and well on par with their U.S. or European counterparts. However, there is a large contingent of companies within the Swedish economy where the awareness and implementation of I-O psychology principles are limited. Thus, it is difficult to say that any one generalization fits the country, as the picture is rather fragmented. On the whole, it appears to be the large global companies who are leading the charge in the application of I-O psychology. Further, during the last 15 years there has been an upswing and increased interest in the professional and scientific work application of psychology, which has contributed to a positive trend in recent years across the board. For instance, in a study published recently, 68% of Swedish organizations reported implementing structured performance appraisals in the last 5 years, and the acceptance of such systems appears to be increasing (“Svenska Dagbladet,” 2008). In many large organizations, sophisticated I-O psychology work has been in place for more than 30 years.
Q: What are some cultural and historical factors that affect the application of I-O psychology in Sweden?

A: One of the explanations that has been put forth, which seems to be corroborated with anecdotal evidence, is that from the 1970s through the early to mid 1990s there was a very strong humanistic movement in Sweden—within the social sciences in particular. As a result, many of the “hard” topics that relate to individual differences psychology and measurement were deemphasized in the academic curricula. Thus, some things that are taken for granted within U.S.- or UK-I-O psychology communities, such as the importance of cognitive ability and personality differences in job performance, were less central in Sweden and for a long time treated with a high degree of skepticism.

Another cultural aspect that relates to the application of individual differences psychology is Sweden’s standing on Hofsted’s taxonomy of power distance. Sweden is one of the countries that scores the lowest on this dimension in the world (“Clearly Cultural,” 2009), indicating a very low tolerance for unequal distribution of power by those who do not have power. This fundamental outlook contributes to a society where status differences among people are reduced and where boasting or bragging is considered highly inappropriate. There is even a word for the value of humbleness called “jante,” or basically “not sticking out (positively).” From an I-O perspective there are some interesting consequences of this that have seemed to impact how some organizations work with HR issues. The “jante-principle,” and the strong humanistic movement from the 1970s to 1990s, led to a reluctance to differentiate among people, and steps to do so are considered somewhat controversial (“Svenska Dagbladet,” 2008). Although people can agree in theory that some employees perform better in their jobs than others, there has until recently been great reluctance to articulate or specify which people are and are not performing well. Lacking strong performance systems and data, and being skeptical of individual measurement methods, promotion and reward decisions were often made based on tenure and social network. This led to a paradoxical outcome: In a well-intentioned effort to be fair, the result is arguably unfair.

However, as described previously, the last 15 years have trended toward greater acceptance of individual differences measurement and the application of what one might call scientific work psychology principles, like structured performance appraisals and the use of reliable and valid selection/development tools such as cognitive and personality tests and assessment centers. These practices are now beginning to emerge as standard procedures in a large contingent of organizations and are viewed by many organizations as an integral link between organizational strategy and the organization’s human capital (“Svenska Dagbladet,” 2008).

Q: How are I-O psychologists trained in Sweden?

A: The educational track for I-O psychologists in Sweden is not as well established as it is in the U.S. or the UK. Most people who work in I-O are either clinical psychologists with an interest in the work application of psy-
chology, people who have a BA or MS degree in personnel administration, or people with a business background who have converted to HR. The “I” side of I-O psychology is rarely mentioned. I-O courses—often offered as electives in clinical psychology programs—are usually referred to as “organizational psychology” or “work psychology.” The University of Gothenburg offers a MS in organizational psychology, but most other major universities do not have separate degrees for I-O or “organizational” psychology.

The Swedish research tradition within I-O psychology has historically concentrated on job stress, burnout, work–family conflict, and gender/equality issues where some contributions have been made. These topics are also central to public discussions, which likely helps generate interest for the research in these areas.

Q: How do I-O psychologists in Sweden network?
A: In general, I-O psychology as a discipline is probably less formally organized than it is in some other countries. There are fragmented segments of people interested in the area, and many people doing very good work, both inside organizations and in consultancies. However, these individuals don’t usually come from a common ancestral I-O psychology tree, as is the case in the U.S., and they do not typically hold formal meetings to network on a regular basis in the same way as is common in the U.S.

That said, there are some domestic and international networks that people are a part of. Some are members of SIOP or domestic organizations such as HRK (Sveriges Bransch Förening för Human Resource Konsulter; http://www.hrk.org/). Many people are also members of one of the pan-European networks, such as ENOP (European Network of Organizational Psychologists; http://www.enop.eu/index.php). Others use new electronic networking tools like LinkedIn to connect with colleagues holding similar interests.

Concluding Editorial

So there you have it, an enlightening primer on I-O psychology in the Kingdom of Sweden where there really are “more hours in the day,” at least during the summer months, which are marked by perpetual daylight in certain parts of the country. Clearly, our Scandinavian colleagues are putting those hours to good use, enabling the discipline of I-O psychology to endure and flourish in a unique environment shaped by its distinct cultural and historical context.
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How does your assessment provider measure up?

IPAT recently commissioned an independent research company to survey both existing IPAT customers and non-customers, primarily to get feedback on our flagship personality assessment, the 16PF® Questionnaire, but also to understand how IPAT is viewed as an assessment provider. Here’s a snapshot of what these two groups had to say:

- **Test Validity, Reputation, and Quality of Customer Service** top the list of reasons customers keep coming back.

- **Ease of Administration and Quality and Variety of Reports** are close seconds.

Interestingly, as customers were telling the survey interviewers about their top report needs, IPAT was putting the final touches on two new 16PF reports that directly addressed their requirements!

- The **16PF Competency Report** provides personality insights into person-job-fit, in the language of business. The report can be customized, using any combination of off-the-shelf competencies and those you identify as critical for success in your organization.

- Our new **16PF Practitioner Report** delivers actionable information, including potential strengths and limitations, feedback prompts, and a shareable summary for both the employee and manager.

If your assessment provider doesn’t measure up, give us a call. We’ve been around for over 60 years – let us show you why.
I-O Joins Worldwide Initiative: A “Global Special Issue”

Stuart Carr
Massey University

In mid 2010, a dozen international journals will release a set of publications focused on a single global topic. I-O is closely involved. Today we hear about the project from some participating editors. Their calls for papers are found at http://poverty.massey.ac.nz/#global_issue.

Ajit K. Dalal, PhD, Editor: Psychology and Developing Societies (Sage). Professor of psychology at University of Allahabad, India, Dr. Dalal is an ex-Fulbright Senior Fellow who has worked at UCLA and University of Michigan and was a recipient of the UGC Career Award, Rockefeller Foundation Award, and an ICSSR Senior Fellowship. Books include New Directions in Indian Psychology and Handbook of Indian Psychology.

Professor Dianna L. Stone, PhD, Editor: The Journal of Managerial Psychology. Professor Stone is with the Department of Management, University of Texas at San Antonio. Dr. Stone is a Fellow of APA, APS, and SIOP.

Dr. Winnifred Louis, Special Issue Co-Editor: Australian Psychologist. With a PhD from McGill and based in psychology at the University of Queensland, Australia, Dr. Louis is a member of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI) and an affiliate of the Australian Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies.

Professor Chris Burt, PhD, Special Issue Co-Editor: Journal of Managerial Psychology. Chris coordinates the industrial and organizational psychology program at the University of Canterbury in Aotearoa/New Zealand. His interests include publishing on the organizational psychology of fundraising and social marketing.

Please tell us a little about your understanding of the project.

Dianna Stone: My understanding is that a number of journals are collaborating to promote research on how psychology can be used to reduce poverty around the world. This strategy will help encourage research on poverty reduction and enable us to gain insights about the issue from a wide variety of perspectives.

Ajit Dalal: Reduction of poverty is a major challenge for all countries of the world, especially for developing countries. Poverty is multidimensional and multisector, and countries are joining hands to meet UN Millennium
Goals of poverty reduction by 2015. These essentially entail improving access to health and education, enhancing quality of life, freedom, and human rights. As in many other social sciences, psychology has much to contribute toward poverty alleviation. This realization has brought psychology journals from across the globe together to focus on psychological issues, implications, interventions, and inputs in formulating effective strategies to deal with worldwide poverty. Many special issues at one point in time should help in consolidating the contribution of psychology, both actual and potential, and should provide new insights and understanding about human factors in poverty.

**Winnifred Louis:** By launching special issues addressing poverty and poverty reduction across every area of psychology, the project will create a huge boost of research attention and scholarly interest. It will motivate people to dust off and write up their data in the area, and it will bring new readers to the topic and perhaps lead people to do more research of their own.

**Chris Burt:** Psychology has a long history of investigating issues associated with poverty. However this work is scattered across journals and decades. The Global Special Issue (GSI) will bring this work together through referencing, as well as setting the research agenda for the next decade. While the GSI may attract the attention of researchers and students, our real audience has to be the policy makers and others who are in a position to make change. By creating a critical mass of work on this central topic, such individuals may take notice.

**Does the psychology of work and organization play a role in the project?**

**WL** and **AD:** Of course!

**AD:** There are government and nongovernment organizations that are actively engaged in interventions to reduce poverty. Much depends on the effective functioning of these organizations.

**DS:** I believe that industrial and organizational psychology will play a key role in this project because we have a great deal of knowledge that can be used to help reduce poverty. For example, we have a lot of expertise in the areas of training, motivation, and strategies for building individuals’ self-efficacy and skill levels. We also have insights about leadership, cooperation in organizations, teamwork, and other issues that may be helpful. Many years ago, researchers in our field conducted research on training for the hardcore unemployed. The results of this research may be a useful starting point for research on poverty reduction. Similarly, our research on strategies for enhancing individuals’ self-efficacy may be quite helpful.

**CB:** The key word in the question is role. As we all know, an objective is often achieved by everyone completing their role. The objective of poverty reduction is a massively complex endeavor, and the systems surrounding it are complex. Individual organizations involved in poverty-related work undoubtedly face some of the same issues as for-profit organizations, and any improvement in their ability to function through the application of I-O psychology knowledge should translate into an improvement in their key outcomes.
What kinds of impact would you like to see from this project?

AD: This collective endeavor should help in forging better international and interdisciplinary collaborations in improving quality of life of the poor. It should lead to a more intense dialogue within the psychology discipline to create new knowledge base to deal with poverty. I see many exciting possibilities of integrating cultural, social, and personal perspectives into global strategies to bring people out of the poverty trap. Poverty is an economic challenge as much as it is a psychosocial one. Psychological theories, research, and practices have much to contribute in preparing viable action plans both at macro- and microlevels. Such action plans should benefit from the rich field experience of the developing world, as well as from scientific and technological advancements of the west.

DS: I believe that this project will have important implications for reducing poverty around the world and will also benefit our field. It may help promote research in I-O psychology on other important social issues, for instance reduction of serious illnesses like HIV/AIDS.

CB: Generally research takes time to produce a real change. Thus, I think patience is the key word when thinking about the GSI impact. If it gets the attention of key policy makers, things may start to happen, which ultimately will have a true impact on poverty. Hopefully, key organizations engaged in poverty reduction work will pick up on some of the ideas that come out of the GSI and attempt to implement them. The GSI should be considered as Stage 1 of a multistage process—our research will only have an impact if adopted and implemented. The GSI will undoubtedly prompt further research efforts, which we all know will be years away from publication—again patience is the key. Poverty is not going away, so thinking that our endeavors will take time to have a true impact should not be discouraging.

WL: It would be great if the mass research attention and new findings created momentum for a new research-active community aimed at understanding poverty and helping individuals and groups escape it.

How can I-O psychologists get behind it?

WL: Some of the issues that are in the I-O domain concern the working poor: Researchers could study organizations and workers affected by casualization, contract work, and underemployment. It’s my perception that marginalized workers attract very little attention in I-O.1 When does work lift people and families out of poverty, and when does it lock them in? What institutional and organizational factors reinforce or weaken class inequalities? Many have commented that compared to fields like sociology and history, psychology has neglected the role of class and socioeconomic status (SES). And then there are evaluation research projects. Which projects aimed at

---

recruiting people from disadvantaged groups into the workforce actually work and to what extent?

**DS:** I believe that I-O psychologists have a great deal of knowledge that can be used to enhance the lives of people throughout the world. We have focused primarily on private-sector organizations, but many of the same principles can be used to increase the well-being of individuals. I think many I-O psychologists are just waiting for the opportunity to conduct and publish research on these key issues.

**CB:** If we divided I-O psychologists into two groups, academics and practitioners, we may get a better answer to this question. Academics need to produce research that is applicable to not-for-profit organizations. They need to truly understand the unique features of the poverty-reduction industry. Only then will practitioners be able to translate research output into useful interventions.

**What else can, could, or should the profession do in the future?**

**AD:** Academic psychologists need to focus more on the widening gap between rich and poor, and on why the poor are getting poorer. There is a wide range of social-psychological ramifications of this changing scenario. We need to take cognizance of innovative, practical strategies that work and where the profession of psychology can make a difference. As journal editors we can contribute by way of encouraging and publishing poverty studies and by crystallizing issues for an ongoing debate. What we could do as editors and professionals is to organize various forums, workshops, and discussion groups. We have to collectively think about the ways of promoting research on poverty and its proper dissemination.

**WL:** It’s a wider question for psychologists: Part of the bigger picture surely involves lobbying governments and universities to make sure there are incentives to do difficult applied research. This project is also a great initiative; I can imagine if it were repeated every few years it would help to keep the ball rolling.

**DS:** As noted above, I believe our profession should focus on the application of I-O psychology to other important social issues. For instance, the SIOP conference might include key sessions on social issues, and our journals might expand their coverage of these topics. Last year, Lois Tetrick, the president of SIOP, set the stage for this strategy by focusing the conference on issues of employee well-being. Therefore, I would encourage our leaders to expand the domain of I-O psychology to include its application to important social issues.

**CB:** Listen to those in need and those trying to help them and respond to their issues. They may be different (or in addition) to the concepts that we think are important.

Thank you for your valuable time and collective insights on a timely initiative.
At Hogan, we pioneered the use of personality testing to predict job performance more than three decades ago. In the years since, our research has set the global standard, ensuring that our products and services are second to none. There simply is no more reliable and useful source than Hogan for excellence in employee selection, development and leadership practices.
Science–Practice Gaps in
Industrial-Organizational Psychology:
Part I: Member Data and Perspectives

Rich Cober, Rob Silzer, Anna Erickson

Executive Summary

The recent SIOP Practitioner Needs Survey explored the possible “gaps” that might exist between the science and practice of industrial-organizational psychology. Survey responses suggest that gaps do exist in a number of areas. Possible reasons for these gaps include:

- practice may underutilize available science
- science may undervalue innovations in practice
- science may not produce research findings that are relevant to practice
- practice might not provide sufficient opportunities to research relevant issues

This article (Part I of a two-part article) presents member survey results related to science–practice gaps and explores the details around those perceived gaps. In addition, a group of experienced SIOP members provide their perspectives on the survey results. Part II (in the next TIP) will summarize member recommendations on the steps that can be taken to address these gaps and to increase science–practice collaboration.

Introduction

The gap between I-O science and practice has long been discussed as a significant issue in our field, and SIOP tried to bridge the gaps by regularly encouraging conference forums that bring researchers and practitioners together. Successful advances in other disciplines often depend on an initial incubation and testing of ideas in either a research environment or in practice efforts before they become widely studied and applied. To explore this topic, the Practitioner Needs Survey included a question that asked where such “gaps” actually exist.

In 2008 the SIOP Professional Practice Committee conducted a membership survey to better understand practitioner views and needs on a variety of professional issues (Silzer, Cober, Erickson, & Robinson; 2008). The survey was sent to all members, with an overall response rate of 36%. Respondents were divided into four practitioner groups based on self-reported percent of work time devoted to being a practitioner (as opposed to time being an educator or scientist/researcher):
• Full-time practitioners \((n = 612,\) indicating 70\% or more time as a practitioner)
• Part-time practitioners \((n = 101,\) indicating 21\%–69\% of time as a practitioner)
• Occasional practitioners \((n = 193,\) indicating 1\%–20\% of time as a practitioner)
• Nonpractitioners \((n = 99,\) indicating 0\% of time as a practitioner)

**Survey Results: Perceptions of the Science–Practice Gap**

Survey respondents were asked to indicate: *In which areas do you find the biggest gap between the available science/research on a topic and actual organizational practice in your work?* Respondents evaluated the gap between science and practice in 26 content areas identified during the survey development process to reflect both research and applied interest areas in our field. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they felt that a gap existed in the area by identifying whether (a) *practice was ahead of science/research*, (b) *science/research was ahead of practice*, or (c) *little or no gap exists*. Respondents were also allowed to indicate *do not know* if they did not have the knowledge or experience for answering in a particular area.

Table 1 summarizes the responses to this question. The percent of total survey respondents that selected the *do not know*, found in the fourth data column of Table 1, provides some insight into which content areas are more or less relevant to SIOP member activities.

**Table 1**  
**Science/Practice Gap**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Practice ahead*</th>
<th>Little or no gap*</th>
<th>Science/research ahead*</th>
<th>Do not know**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting and advising</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment branding</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR technology</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive/management coaching</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession/workforce planning</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent management</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor relations</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR general practices</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee relations</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee recruitment</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational development</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As seen in Table 1:

- In 14 of the 26 areas, practice is seen as ahead of science/research by more than 50% of respondents (who chose one of the first three alternatives).
- In another five areas, practice is seen as ahead of science/research by smaller percent of respondents (36%–49%).
- In five areas, science is seen as ahead of practice (by slight to substantial margins).
- In just two areas the largest proportion of respondents indicate that little or no gap exists.
- In seven areas (from organizational culture through assessment), responses suggest potential convergence of science and practice given the balance of responses (and with most responders having opinions, suggesting high familiarity in these areas).
- In five areas more than 40% of our respondents indicated did not know with regard to a gap. It is likely that these areas, such as employment branding, labor relations, and litigation support, are not widely part of either research or practice activities.

An evaluation of the content areas receiving the highest percentage of practice ahead responses (toward the top of the list) suggests that these areas tend to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Practice ahead*</th>
<th>Little or no gap*</th>
<th>Science/research ahead*</th>
<th>Do not know**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Litigation support</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and management development</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/executive selection</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational culture</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance management</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency modeling</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and development</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross cultural issues</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee engagement and attitudes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual assessment/assessment centers</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection/staffing</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job and work analysis</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement and statistics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Response percentages in first three columns are based on the total number of respondents answering one of the first three response choices and do not include the do not know respondents.

** Bold font indicates highest percentage for a specific content area.

** Based on total survey respondents
- Hands on practice areas such as consulting, coaching
- On the organization side of I-O psychology such as strategic planning, organizational development
- Core areas of human resource practice such as succession/workforce planning, talent management, employment branding, HR technology, labor and employee relations, and employee recruitment

An evaluation of the content areas receiving the highest percentage of *science/research ahead* responses (toward the bottom of the list) suggests that these areas tend to be:

- Measurement oriented such as measurement and statistics
- On the industrial side of I-O psychology such as job and work analysis and selection/staffing

Finally, there was the group of seven content areas that receive more balanced responses. These areas include organizational culture, performance management, cross-cultural issues, competency modeling, training and development, employee engagement and attitudes, and individual assessment/assessment centers. In these areas a mutually beneficial connection or convergence might exist between science and practice.

In many of the areas found in Table 1, there is some response agreement across the four practitioner groups on which sector is “ahead” in an area. In these areas:

- In *practice ahead* areas, practice knowledge, experience, and innovation) might have the most influence on handling an issue in organizations (though this does not necessarily mean that practice innovations are adequately researched).
- In *science ahead* areas, science (laboratory studies, empirical field research, meta-analyses) might have the greatest influence (though this does not necessarily mean that scientific findings are put into practice).
- If many respondents choose *little or no gap*, it might mean that science is being utilized in practice and that practice innovations are being researched.

Table 2 reports response distributions from only those areas where differential response patterns exist across practitioner groups. Such patterns were found in 9 of the 26 areas. Data illustrating the differences are highlighted in bold font. The biggest response pattern differences are found in performance management, organizational culture, and competency modeling.

**Perspectives of SIOP Members**

To further understand the implications of these results, we invited 12 SIOP members, whose professional experience bridges science and practice, to respond to several questions related to the survey data. Here is a summary of their responses to the first question (Part II of this article will provide a summary of responses to other questions):
Table 2
Science–Practice Gap Responses Across Practitioner Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Response option</th>
<th>Full time</th>
<th>Part time</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Nonpractice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Succession/workforce planning</td>
<td>Practice ahead</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science/research ahead</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little or no gap</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee relations</td>
<td>Practice ahead</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science/research ahead</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little or no gap</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee recruitment</td>
<td>Practice ahead</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science/research ahead</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little or no gap</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance management</td>
<td>Practice ahead</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science/research ahead</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little or no gap</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational culture</td>
<td>Practice ahead</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science/research ahead</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little or no gap</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency modeling</td>
<td>Practice ahead</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science/research ahead</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little or no gap</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and development</td>
<td>Practice ahead</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science/research ahead</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little or no gap</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee engagement, attitudes and motivation</td>
<td>Practice ahead</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science/research ahead</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little or no gap</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection/staffing</td>
<td>Practice ahead</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science/research ahead</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little or no gap</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on your experience, do the results in this area of the Practitioner Needs Survey surprise you? Why or why not?

Generally, the findings were not surprising to our SIOP members. Below are their reasons:

- Topics with measurement foundation (i.e., methods per se, selection, attitude measurement) are topics where academics historically have made and continue to make central contributions. Note that those are areas where academics have a good chance of doing work that accomplishes the dual goals of (a) contributing to scientific psychology and (b) contributing to practice. Both goals loom large for academics.
- A significant issue in our field is that one can become an I-O psychologist and not practice. Those that have only learned about topics, and never really done a job analysis, developed a test, or dealt with a hostile client, will have divergent perspectives from those practicing in organizations. This data provides another data point for the need of some clear sort of certification, which includes a knowledge and practice component, for both practitioners and academics in our field.
- Reward systems affect this issue significantly. Scientists can afford to study what they are interested in as long as it is publishable. Publishable, quick turn-around work may not be the kind of work that will truly benefit practice. However, there is little incentive for scientists to tackle some of the more nebulous applied topics (areas at the top of Table 1) unless they have an intrinsic interest. Practitioners survive based on management’s willingness to pay. Unfortunately, this drives work that may not have optimal scientific rigor.
- Although grounded firmly in our field’s scientific principles and body of research evidence, much of professional practice requires a degree of art to sufficiently address business problems. The practice areas that received the highest percentages for “practice ahead” are those that are the least “studyable” with I-O methodologies (e.g., large sample statistics with highly coveted small p-values); and the culture of SIOP related to professional practice is reflected in another section of the survey that found SIOP leadership does not fully understand the issues and context within which our practitioners operate. The gap ultimately exists because full-time practitioners and nonpractitioners have very different understandings of what professional practice is/entails.
- If there was any surprise, it was the relatively high level of agreement among the different response categories. One may have thought there would have been some more entrenched positions on this topic, but these results are a testament to the applied nature of our field. As more I-O psychologists join organizations, there is a growing realization and respect for the advances that are made in applied settings that may drive or in many cases outpace research.
- We give ourselves credit for more collaboration between science and
practice than typically gets noted. There are a number of studies that are born from applied data sets or whose implications directly affect the way a practitioner may choose to design an intervention/project. As Anthony Rucci stated in his 2008 SIOP Keynote “It is only where science and practice converge that I-O psychology really makes its full contributions.” We have many examples of that: Our struggle as a field may be in effectively sharing and disseminating those examples.

Thoughts on What These Results Tell Us

Why Is There a Science–Practice Gap?

To fully understand any science–practice gap, we need to ask why the gap exists. There are several possibilities.

1. Different reward systems. One hypothesis is that limited connection between the practice and science may be due to the differential reward systems for scientists and practitioners. Those that pursue the science must focus on building research programs that can yield a large number of studies publishable in top-tier journals. Those who practice must focus on building useful and feasible solutions for organizations that are valued (and paid for) by the organization.

2. Normal evolution of the field. The gap might just reflect the current state of our field and suggest an opportunity for the further evolution of I-O psychology. Areas such as job analysis and selection are foundational for much of the work done in organizations. As I-O psychology (and human resource management for that matter) evolves and innovates in practice, new areas will emerge for our science to investigate.

3. Limited organizational resources. Perhaps organizations are unwilling to pay for interventions and solutions that require adherence to research principles and findings. These approaches may be perceived as too expensive or unnecessary to address a problem. Organizational constraints and resources often dictate what a solution will look like, even when the I-O practitioner makes cogent arguments about the ROI and effectiveness of more rigorous approaches. Key decision makers in organizations often do not value the benefits of scientifically sound interventions.

4. Lack of relevance. Practitioners may not be leveraging our science because of the nongeneralizability of research findings, a lack of relevance to real-world problems, and a lack of access to literature summaries by topic. Practitioners often face complex contextual issues, strategic objectives, and executive demands that require uniquely tailored solutions that are not addressed in the literature. On the other hand, researchers may not sufficiently value the innovative ideas and leading-edge efforts by practitioners. They may not see relevance of practice activities to their research interests or efforts.

5. Science is hard to apply. In some areas the science may have evolved in an area beyond what practice is able to absorb or apply. Management may think that research approaches require unnecessary steps and delays.
6. Insufficient time or motivation by researchers. Researchers may not have the time to focus on key issues faced by practitioners in organizations, and those issues may not be of personal interest to the researchers.

7. Insufficient time or motivation by practitioners. Practitioners may not take sufficient time to discover the relevant research on an organizational issue or may not be interested in trying to see the relevance of key research findings, particularly when they are under significant demands to add value and quickly produce work products and services.

8. No need to close the gap. There are some areas, such as measurement, where there is, and may always be, a profound gap between the methods used by science and the methods employed by practitioners. In a sense, the gap provides a healthy opportunity for science to advance the profession by experimenting with new methodologies or creating nonintuitive insights. Similarly, practice may continue to serve as an innovation lab for generating new approaches to emerging issues.

**Moving Forward**

The time for moving the field to greater collaboration is now. Economic downturns provide opportunities for innovation and entrepreneurship. We are living and working in a time where partnerships between practitioners and researchers can be mutually beneficial for both product/service quality and economic reasons. We should seize this opportunity. In Part II of this article SIOP members provide recommendations on steps that can be taken to address these gaps.

At our 2008 SIOP conference, Tony Rucci said the core purpose of I-O psychology today is “to support the dignity and performance of human beings, and the organizations they work in, by advancing the science and knowledge of human behavior.” It is incumbent on our entire professional community to capitalize on these ideas and work toward shared goals in order to provide lasting value and support the continuous evolution of our profession and its noble purpose.

Part I lays the groundwork of where gaps are perceived to exist today. Part II will present recommendations on how scientists and practitioners can increase their collaboration to facilitate science–practice convergence.
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