Over the last 8 years, this Practice Perspectives column has reported on a range of professional and practice issues in industrial-organizational psychology. We have used available data or collected new data when needed to identify, document, and communicate the views and professional needs of I-O practice and I-O practitioners on critical professional issues. The issues we have reported on have included:

**SIOP membership**
- SIOP membership trends (see references 16, 23, 25, 26)

**Professional activities, job titles and careers**
- I-O practice activities, job titles, and career stages (1, 9, 10, 28)

**Education and development**
- Graduate education (19, 20, 21, 23)
- Practitioners professional development and professional needs (1, 2, 4, 9, 30, 31)

**Practitioner satisfaction, licensing and representation**
- Practitioner satisfaction in SIOP (1, 3, 9, 23)
- Professional licensing (1, 5, 9)
- SIOP membership representation in SIOP officers, Fellows, chairs, appointments and awards (16, 17, 20, 24, 26, 29)

**Communications and publications**
- I-O journals, SIOP books, and the Leading Edge Consortium (9, 18, 27, 29)

**Science–practice gaps**
- Science–practice gaps in I-O psychology (1, 7, 8, 11)

**Future directions**
- Promotion of I-O psychology (1, 6, 9)
- Future of I-O psychology (12, 13, 14, 15, 22)
In 2007, Rob Silzer, Rich Cober, Anna Erickson, and Greg Robinson were all serving on the SIOP Professional Practice Committee (Rob as committee chair). All four of us are I-O practitioners who were committed to advancing I-O practice. The field of I-O psychology was growing, particularly for Practitioners, but SIOP seemed to be stuck in the past. At the time SIOP members were considered either an academic or a nonacademic. The professional title of I-O psychology practitioner was not used and in some academic/researcher circles was considered personally offensive.

We decided to find out what I-O practitioners identified as their professional needs and how well SIOP was serving their professional interests. To meet that goal the Practitioner Needs Survey (1) was developed and distributed to all SIOP members and over 1000 members responded. We have worked hard to be databased in our findings and conclusions. The core authors—Rob Silzer, Rich Cober, Chad Parson, and Anna Erickson (with some help from Greg Robinson)—have produced 29 TIP articles so far (see reference list), two SIOP conference presentations (2, 22), a major SIOP membership survey and final report (1), and a letter to the TIP editor (24). We think these articles have made an important contribution to I-O psychology and SIOP, and have had some impact on the direction of the profession. As the three primary authors, Rob Silzer, Rich Cober, and Chad Parson, we have made a huge commitment to insuring that the work represented in these articles is well grounded and relevant to I-O psychology and I-O practice. We hope that is evident to readers.

In this article we provide an overview of the results and conclusions from past articles and presentations and outline some future directions for: SIOP membership; professional activities, job titles, and careers; education and development; and practitioner satisfaction, licensing, and representation.

**SIOP Membership**

It has been evident that the membership of SIOP has been changing and is likely to further evolve. We did a thorough analysis of the 2011 SIOP membership. Our key findings on SIOP membership (16, 23, 25, 26) included:

**General Membership**

- There has been a steady increase in the number of full members over the last 40 years, but there are recent declines.
- The number of Fellows in SIOP has remained almost unchanged for the last 40 years despite a 538% increase in full membership. The percentage of Fellows in the full membership has dropped from 29% to 9%.
- The number of Student Affiliates in SIOP has more than doubled in the last 10 years and now is larger than the number of full members.
- The number of members working in each of the primary work settings has significantly increased over the years, particularly in consulting firms. Of the recent graduates (graduating 2000–2009) who are SIOP members, 55% hold positions in consulting firms or in organizations.
• Full members with I-O and OP (Organizational Psychology) degrees represent 68% of the membership, up from 50% in 1985.
• 17% of the members are self-employed or are in independent practice.
• More academic members work in business schools \(n = 660\) than in psychology departments \(n = 590\).
• Membership is evenly split between members who have a primary research work focus (academics and researchers; 48.6%) versus members who have a primary I-O practice work focus (49.3%).

**Member Location**

• Most SIOP members are located in the Eastern half of the U.S., with particular concentrations along the Northeast Corridor.
• There are substantial numbers of members in cities of Minneapolis, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and Seattle as well as larger states along with Florida and Georgia.
• I-O consultants are concentrated in the New York, Washington DC, Atlanta, Minneapolis, and Chicago areas.
• Members in organizations are concentrated in the New York area and larger states.
• Academic members are primarily located in nonmetropolitan areas.
• Researchers are heavily concentrated in the Washington DC area.
• There are 242 international members (2011), 60% hold non-U.S. graduate degrees and 40% hold U.S. degrees; 60% hold I-O degrees.
• The largest group of international members is in Canada, whereas Europe and Asia have equal numbers of members.
• The overwhelming majority of international members are academics.

**Likely Future Membership Trends**

• The number of full members is likely to not increase much unless SIOP is more successful in recruiting new graduates and international members and in capitalizing on the large number of student affiliates.
• It is unclear how much the recent decision to allow individuals with a MS/MA degree to join SIOP as full members after 5 years as an associate member will affect SIOP. It will depend on how many of these individuals stay through the 5 years and then convert to a full member. Those that join are most likely to be practitioners (rather than academics or researchers) because that is where they are most likely to find employment, and therefore they will likely increase the portion of full members who are practitioners. But their inclusion in large numbers may impact the identity of SIOP as a professional association of I-O psychologists, because master’s level members are not allowed to be called “psychologists” by professional guidelines and state regulations.
• Member growth will be the strongest among members working consulting (many self-employed) and in organizations; particularly among those with I-O or OP (Organizational Psychology) degrees.
• Academic members increasingly work in business schools and the trend will continue and likely become more pronounced in the future.
• The U.S. geographic distribution of members is not likely to change much, with I-O practitioners in larger cities and states and academics primarily in nonmetropolitan areas.
• There may be some increase in international members as more U.S.-based members take international positions and more internationally trained professionals join SIOP.

Professional Activities, Job Titles, and Careers

Most seasoned I-O practitioners have noticed a change over their careers in the job titles and professional work activities for I-O practice. We have identified the most common titles and professional activities for I-O psychologists in different I-O careers and differences in work activities across the career stages of I-O practice (1, 9, 10, 28).

Job Titles

• There are 1,110 unique job titles among the 3,057 job titles listed by SIOP members.
• The most common job titles in organizations (nonconsulting) are director and consultant; personnel research and management development titles have largely disappeared but talent management is the top content area listed in job titles.
• Job titles in consulting firms (nonresearch) were primarily director, VP, manager, partner, principal, associate, consultant.
• Job titles for independent and self-employed I-O practitioners were president, principal, consultant, psychologist, executive coach.
• Job titles in research consulting firms usually include “research” or “scientist.”
• Job titles in government organizations are typically psychologist, social scientist, director, manager, analyst.
• Academic job titles are overwhelmingly assistant professor, associate professor, or full professor with a heavy concentration of full and assistant professors in business schools.

Work Activities

• The work activities rated as most important in consulting work are consulting and advising clients; building relationships; implementing and delivering programs; making presentations; developing and designing systems, methods, programs; managing work projects and administrative tasks.
• The work activities rated as most important in organizations are consulting and advising clients; building relationships; managing work projects and administrative tasks; making presentations; implementing and delivering programs.
• The work activities rated as most important in academic settings are making presentations; conducting primary research and data analysis; building relationships; teaching courses or training programs.
• There are many significant differences in the importance of various work activities between practitioners and academics/researchers.
• The activities rated least important by practitioners are writing for a scientific journal; teaching courses; writing reports, articles, chapters; conducting primary research and data analysis.

**Important Activities by Practitioner Career Stage**

• The importance of various work activities varied by the career stage of the Practitioner.
  - Advanced career practitioners give higher importance to: managing a business; coaching others and providing feedback; writing reports, articles, chapters (nonresearch)
  - Early career practitioners give higher importance to conducting primary research and data analysis; managing work projects and administrative activities

**Likely Future Career and Activity Trends**

• Job titles are not likely to change much in the near future, however the trend in organizations for including “talent management” in the title will increase.
• The use of organizational psychologist as a job title will also likely increase because it is increasingly being used by I-O practitioners to identify themselves to others. New titles may emerge for full members with MA/MS degrees because they are not allowed to be called “psychologists.”
• Work activities in consulting firms (nonresearch) and in organizations will continue to overlap as the roles are considered internal and external consultants; I-O practitioners will increasingly move back and forth across these work settings.
• Job titles and work activities are unlikely to change much for I-O consultants in research and academic roles.
• Career stages in I-O practice will become more distinct and better understood as the career paths become more standardized.

**Education and Development**

In recent years there has been a lot of discussion in the profession about the education and professional development of I-O psychologists, including the graduate school curriculums, professional workshops and conferences, and SIOP sponsored professional development activities. It is a particularly important area for I-O psychologists who want to be well trained and developed as I-O practitioners. We have surveyed SIOP members and explored the trends and member perspectives on graduate education (19, 20, 21, 23) and professional development (1, 2, 4, 9, 30, 31) in I-O psychology.

**Graduate Programs**

• The graduate programs that produce the most graduates (who join SIOP) have been fairly stable over the last 40 years. A few programs have folded while others have emerged.
The top five graduate degree institutions for SIOP members and Fellows are U of Akron, U of Minnesota, U of South Florida, Michigan State, and Bowling Green State U. The University of Minnesota has been in the 10 graduate producing programs (based on SIOP membership) across all 5 recent decades. Other programs have been in that group in 4 of the last 5 decades are U of Houston, U of Akron, U of South Florida, U of Tennessee-Knoxville, and Ohio State University.

The number of graduates (who are SIOP members) produced by the top graduate I-O programs has greatly increased each decade from 28 (in pre-1970) to 294 (in 2000–2009). There has been a steady increase across the decades in the number of graduates joining SIOP.

The number of different graduate programs contributing graduates to our field and membership is expanding. From 1986 to 2011 the number of I-O PhD/PsyD graduate programs went from 40 to 125 programs (member self-report) while the number of business school graduate programs (OB/HR/OD) went from 0 to 103 (member self-report) during the same time period.

The universities with the most SIOP members and Fellows in each employment category are:
- Consultants: U of Akron, U of Minnesota, U of Georgia, Bowling Green State U, U of Tennessee-Knoxville
- In organizations: U of South Florida, U of Houston, Alliant/CSPP, U of Akron, Wayne State U
- Academics: Michigan State U, U of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign), U of Akron, U of Maryland, Purdue U
- Researchers: U of Minnesota, U of South Florida, U of Georgia, U of Oklahoma, U of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign)

Graduate programs that have produced the most SIOP Fellows are U of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign), U of Minnesota, Purdue U, Michigan State U, and Ohio State U. The U of Minnesota is distinguished in this group for being the only graduate program that has produced Fellows in all four I-O career tracks. The overwhelming majority of SIOP Fellows are in academic/research positions (83%).

Graduate Degrees

- I-O psychology was the field of graduate study for 67% of the SIOP membership; other fields include organizational behavior, social psychology, and organizational psychology. Of the members holding I-O graduate degrees, 38% are academics, 33% are in consulting (nonresearch), 23% are in organizations, and 6% are researchers.
- Of the 1,357 members who are academics, only 60% hold I-O or OP degrees and 40% hold other degrees. New I-O or OP graduates who take academic positions are more likely to be employed in psychology departments (60%) than in business schools (40%).
- The number of members who hold degrees in OB and OP has been doubling every decade, but they still represent modest groups in the SIOP membership.
- SIOP members with graduate degrees in I-O and OP tend to pursue a
broad range of career tracks, whereas members with graduate degrees in OB, social psychology, and human resources strongly tend to be academics.

**Professional Development**

- Full-time practitioners value additional education and training activities more and are more likely to find practice-specific information more valuable (e.g., a practice-related publications, online resources, and educational opportunities) than other SIOP member groups.
- Advanced and midcareer practitioners have expressed interest in getting additional training in consulting skills, organizational assessment/program evaluation, leadership skills, strategic skills, and communication skills, and rate as more important those topics that are most closely associated with their work.
- Seasoned practitioners primarily gain professional proficiency (knowledge and skills) through on-the-job learning and structured learning. Only a few proficiency areas are seen as primarily gained during graduate school: conducting primary research and data analysis; writing in scientific journals.
- Practitioners use a range of professional resources for their development, particularly online resources, conferences, articles, books, and networks.
- Full-time practitioners indicate they would find the following SIOP professional development activities the most valuable to them:
  - Summarize the state of practice and science on specific practice topics
  - Make I-O research and reference materials more readily available
  - Provide more online resources (annotated literature, Q&A on practice areas)
  - Provide a practitioner journal or newsletter
  - Provide article and book summaries (research and professional press)
  - Provide advanced practice workshops
  - Provide practice benchmark surveys and opportunities to share best practices
  - Organize more workshops, seminars, retreats (not conference-based) on specific topics

**SIOP Workshops**

**Attendance**

- Over the recent 15 year period there has been a decline in overall workshop attendance (1016 to 404) and in the average attendance per workshop (64 to 40 for two sessions). This is partially due to the 2008 SIOP conference program expansion to 3 days (workshops moved to Wednesday) and the 2008 economic collapse.
- In the same period there has been a decline in the number of workshops offered each year (16 to 10) and the percent of workshops that were sold out each year (from a high of 69% to 10%).

**Frequency**

- Across the last 30 years the most frequently offered topics were employment law/litigation/EEOC, talent management/high potential, con-
sulting, selection/staffing, leadership development, and employee surveys.
• In most recent decade (2006–2015), the most frequently offered topics were talent management/high potential and employment law/litigation/EEOC.
• The top five most frequent workshop presenters across last 30 years (9–13 workshops each, with a total of 52 workshops) were Wayne Cascio, Rob Silzer, Ben Schneider, David Peterson, and Nancy Tippins.
• Across the 34 most frequent workshop presenters (4–13 workshops each), 59% are practitioners, 32% are academics/researchers, 9% are nonmembers.

Sold Out Workshops
• Best attended workshop topics were talent management and high potential talent (17 sold out workshops) and selection & staffing (11 sold out workshops).
• Presenters whose workshops were most frequently sold out included Keith Pyburn, Wayne Cascio, William Ruch, Ben Dowell, Kathleen Lundquist, Lawrence Ashe, Rob Silzer, and Frank Landy.
• Workshops that were frequently offered but poorly attended include testing, development & use; research methods; and performance appraisal & management. There also seems to be a softening of interest in selection, teams, testing, and job analysis topics.

Reader Recommendations

In addition to the above findings, practitioners had many suggestions on ways that SIOP could help with their professional development. Their suggestions are fully outlined in several *TIP* articles (1, 2, 4, 9). Here is a high level summary.

• Provide research summaries, practice benchmarks
• Improve communications to practitioners such as a practitioner journal or newsletter
• Provide training and development in some specific development topics
• Improve graduate training and early career development of I-O practitioners
• Provide more workshops, seminars, forums
• Strengthen the practice orientation in SIOP
• Better facilitate networking and mentoring opportunities
• Improve the SIOP conference to focus more on practice related issues
• Provide more online education and development programs

General Suggestions by the Membership

• Development and training: provide more Practice related professional development and training opportunities
• Focus on practice: give more attention in SIOP to practice-related issues
• Career education: consider establishing graduate training and development guidelines
• Further research: better understand practice jobs and careers
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Likely Future Education and Development Trends

- SIOP will likely continue to give more attention to I-O practitioner professional development needs. There have already been successful initiatives in mentoring programs, access to research literature, increased SIOP conference focus on practice issues, and the Practitioner Career Study. A business acumen competency model is also currently being developed. The Practitioner Needs Survey has recently been readministered, and we are waiting on hearing the survey results.
- There still is work to do such as re-energizing and rebuilding the SIOP workshops, initiating a practitioner journal, increasing the focus on the development of practitioner skills and knowledge through expanded graduate program curriculums, early career development, and advanced workshops and providing more online resources.
- Future success in the professional development of SIOP members will likely depend on two key factors: (a) an individual or team that will champion and actively pursue the initiative and (b) the support of the SIOP Executive Board, which still is dominated by academics and researchers. As practitioners become more prevalent and influential in SIOP there is some hope that both of these conditions will be met.

Practitioner Satisfaction, Licensing, and Representation

The primary reason for initiating the Practitioner Needs Survey and the Practice Perspectives TIP column was the perception of widespread practitioner discontent with SIOP’s lack of support and attention to I-O Practice. Given that such discontent was leading to at least some discussions of finding another professional organization that would better support practitioner needs and interests, the original authors (Silzer, Cober, Erickson, and Robinson) set out to determine the actual level of discontent by developing and distributing the Practitioner Needs Survey (1). Here we report the general findings from that survey and other studies related to Practitioner satisfaction (1, 3, 23) professional licensing (1, 5) and representation in SIOP (16, 17, 20, 24, 26, 29).

Practitioner Satisfaction in SIOP

- The level of member satisfaction with SIOP varies considerably based on work career track. Students and members in academic/researcher positions report high levels of satisfaction, while full-time practitioners who work in applied settings report high levels of dissatisfaction with SIOP.
- I-O practitioners have expressed dissatisfaction with
  - Opportunity for practitioners to influence SIOP decisions and future directions
  - SIOP’s efforts to provide a clear vision of the future of I-O psychology and practice
  - SIOP’s support for advancing I-O practice careers
  - SIOP’s understanding of practice issues
  - Practitioner Fellow status in SIOP
 Recognizing practitioner contributions
○ SIOP’s support of advancing I-O practice
○ The lack of election of practitioners to SIOP positions
○ SIOP’s support for practitioners who want to get licensed

Professional Licensing

○ A strong majority of full-time practitioners (87%) consider themselves to be psychologists.
○ A minority of full-time practitioners (24%) are licensed psychologists and only 8% of nonpractitioners are licensed.
○ 30% of full-time practitioners think their graduate program prepared them to a moderate extent or to a great extent to meet licensure requirements, whereas 32% indicated to no extent or to a little extent.
○ 71% of full-time practitioners indicate that individuals or their employer organizations could potentially be harmed if someone without advanced training in behavioral science tried to do your work.
○ 64% of full-time practitioners indicate that they would apply to be licensed if licensing requirements were more appropriate for I-O psychologists.

Membership Representation and Recognition

We have provided data documenting an apparent bias in favor of academics/researchers in Fellow designations, SIOP awards, key appointments, committee chairs, and Executive Board membership (16, 17, 20, 24, 26, 29). The initial analysis was based on 2011 SIOP membership data. Here we provide some highlights of those findings.

○ SIOP Membership can be sorted into employment categories:
  ○ 49.3% were consultants/professionals in organizations
  ○ Consultants (nonresearch) - 30.3%
  ○ Organizational-based professionals - 19.0%
  ○ 48.6% were academics/researchers
  ○ Academics - 43.5%
  ○ Researchers - 5.1%
○ Of those members who hold PhDs in I-O psychology –
  ○ 56% are consultants (non-research) and professionals in organizations
  ○ 44% are academics/researchers

Awards and Fellow Designations

○ The overwhelming number of SIOP members awarded SIOP Fellow status have been Academics.
  ○ From 1957–2009, 83% of all Fellows were academics/researchers
  ○ In the most recent five years, 84% of the new Fellows (on average) have been academics/researchers (see Table 1).
  ○ Limited progress has been made in equitably recognizing practitioners for Fellow status even though they are now 50% of the membership.
○ The number of Fellows in SIOP has remained almost unchanged for the last 40 years despite a 538% increase
Table 1  
**SIOP Progress Dashboard of Member Representation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Academics/researchers (1)</th>
<th>Consultants/professionals in organizations (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership (2011)</td>
<td>48.60%</td>
<td>49.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members with I-O PhDs (2011)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fellows (3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past (1957–2009)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013–2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014–2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusions**

Some progress

**Awards (4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013–2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014–2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusions**

Negative progress

**Key appointments (5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010–2011</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013–2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014–2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusions**

Little progress

---

1 = Academics in universities and colleges, and researchers in research consulting firms & government research positions

2 = Consultants in consulting firms and nonresearch consulting positions and organizational-based professionals in organizations & in government positions with a practice focus

3 = SIOP Fellow designation

4 = SIOP awards, 2014–2015 awards include 8 Distinguished and traditional awards (78% of awards were given to academics/researchers and 22% were given to practitioners) and 7 newer awards, such as the Dunnette, Hogan, and Jeanneret (86% of these awards were given to went to academics/researchers and 22% were given to practitioners).

5 = 2014–2015 key appointments included 33 Committee Chairs (70% are academics/researchers and 30% are practitioners) and 49 other key appointments (69% are academics/researchers and 31% are practitioners) and include SIOP Foundation Bd., AOP representatives, LEC chairs, Publication Bd, editors, Professional Practice Editorial Bd, Organizational Frontiers Editorial Board, Fellowship Committee, and Strategic Planning Committee (n = 5)
in full membership. The percentage of Fellows in the full membership has dropped from 29% to 9%.

• SIOP has overwhelmingly given the SIOP awards to academics/researchers
  o Academics/researchers have been awarded 84% of all past SIOP awards.
  o In the most recent four years academics/researchers were given 76% of all SIOP awards (on average) (see Table 1).
  o In 2014–2015 practitioners were only awarded 22% of the nine Distinguished Awards and only 14% of the six more recently added awards (Dunnette, Katzell, Jeanneret, Hogan, Wiley, etc.).
  o It seems very clear that SIOP continues to hugely favor rewarding research and journal publications and gives little attention or recognition to the professional contributions of I-O practitioners.

• Many of the SIOP awards have built in criteria that emphasizes full-time teaching or research (Myers, Owens, Distinguished Teaching, Distinguished Scientific Contribution) and therefore are off limits to practitioners who are not publishing research or teaching full-time (five of the top eight awards). Even the Distinguished Service Award, given to members who have held SIOP positions or key appointments, has been given to academics/researchers 73% of the time in the past (100% in 2015).

• That leaves only two Distinguished Awards that Practitioners might be considered for (Distinguished Professional Contributions and Distinguished Early Career in Practice). To rectify this SIOP needs to develop and award several new distinguished Awards that are focused on I-O practice and I-O practitioners.

**Key Appointments**

• Each year SIOP makes numerous appointments of members to serve as Committee Chairs, special SIOP representatives, special taskforce members, and so on. These appointments are an important opportunity to get a wide range of members involved in SIOP affairs and to provide some recognition to members. These appointments are completely at the discretion of the Executive Committee.

• Practitioners continue to be significantly underrepresented in key appointments made by the Executive Board.
  o In the most recent 5 years academics/researchers were given 75% of all SIOP key appointments (on average; see Table 1), even though practitioners volunteer for SIOP committees about as much as academics/researchers (44% vs. 56% of committee volunteers).
  o In 2014–2015, practitioners were only awarded 30% of all key appointments including only 30% of committee chairs and 31% of other key appointments (Foundation Board, editorial boards, AOP reps, Fellowship Committee, etc.).
  o Practitioners were most significantly underrepresented on the Organizational Frontiers Editorial Board (0% practitioners), the SIOP Founda-
tion Board (17% practitioners), the Fellowship Committee (33% practitioners), Strategic Planning Committee (25% practitioners). It is worth noting that in each of these cases the primary person influencing the decisions is an academic.

- It is hard to understand why the SIOP Executive Board continues to show this apparent bias against practitioners. In our opinion it demonstrates a lack of commitment by the Executive Board to being fair and equitable in fully recognizing the talent and the contributions of I-O practitioners. The SIOP decision makers seem to not accept that their broad leadership responsibility is to all SIOP members across all member groups.

Table 2

*Member Representation Among SIOP Officers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Academics/researchers (1)</th>
<th>Consultants/professionals in organizations (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership (2011)</td>
<td>48.60%</td>
<td>49.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members with I-O PhDs (2011)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past 30 years (1982–2012)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past 10 years (2002–2012)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013–2014</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014–2015</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions: **No progress**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIOP Officers (Executive Board)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2013</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013–2014</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014–2015</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions: **No progress**

1 = Academics in universities and colleges, and researchers in research consulting firms & government research positions

2 = Consultants in consulting firms and nonresearch consulting positions and organizational-based professionals in organizations & in government positions with a practice focus
For the past 30 years (1982–2012) the presidents of SIOP have been overwhelmingly academics/researchers (83%) and only 17% have been practitioners (see Table 2). Even in recent years (2011–2015) 75% of the last four presidents have been academics/researchers. Unfortunately many of these past presidents show their strong bias for other academics/researchers (see key appointments, Fellows and awards). A president who supports “equitable recognition” of practitioners in SIOP could significantly alter this in their term as president.

Similarly the Executive Board has been and continues to be dominated by academics/researchers. Over the last 4 years (2011–2015) academics/researchers have held 72% (on average) of the Executive Board positions. They continue to be significantly overrepresented while practitioners are significantly underrepresented.

**Likely Future Representation Trends**

- The SIOP membership will likely grow only modestly, provided that SIOP can attract a sizeable number of new PhD graduates to be members. It will depend on whether SIOP can provide clear value to these graduates.
- The membership will continue to shift, and greater percentages of the membership will be I-O practitioners. Among I-O PhDs the shift will be even more evident as larger percentages of I-O PhD graduates go into I-O practice careers.
- This may also include more MA/MS level full members. Among academic members, the shift will continue toward being employed by business schools and the percentage of academic members who hold I-O PhDs may continue to decline with the rise of business school graduate degrees (OB, OD, HR, etc.). This may also shift their primarily professional allegiance to Academy of Management and away from SIOP.
- SIOP awards, Fellow designations, and key appointments will continue to strongly favor academics and researchers, until two things happen: (a) SIOP elects presidents and Executive Boards who support “equitable treatment” and work to insure that it happens and (b) the membership, and particularly the growing practitioner membership, insist that SIOP more strongly support the professional needs and interests of I-O practitioners. Key appointments would the easiest to change by just requiring that all appointments going forward are made with the goal of achieving parity.
- The Executive Board and the officers will likely continue to be dominated by academics/researchers until practitioners leverage their growing membership in SIOP and insist that 50% of the Executive Board and SIOP presidents represent their needs and interests. Unfortunately that has not happened, and recent presidents seem to continue to focus primarily on the needs of academics and researchers.
- There are some immediate things that the SIOP Executive Board could do in this area: (a) equitably appreciate and recognize the contributions
of I-O practice and I-O practitioners, (b) engage and involve practitioners in all committees, boards and appointments, and (c) ensure that I-O practitioners are involved in all SIOP decisions and in setting the future direction of the profession.

Conclusions

In the areas covered in this article the trends in SIOP are often clear. We have provided data and support for why SIOP needs to do more to support the professional needs and interests of members who are in I-O Practice. Although some progress has been made (access to research literature, mentoring programs, LEC, etc.) more needs to be done to ensure that I-O practitioners are treated equitably in SIOP recognitions, SIOP awards, SIOP Fellow designations, SIOP key appointments, and Executive Board membership. Practitioners are gaining in SIOP membership, and that needs to be converted into equitable treatment.
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