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With TIP transitioning to an online-only format, there couldn’t be a better time to introduce a new column on technology and social media! As I-O psychologists, there’s a need for us to understand how modern technology and social media influence practice and research, as they are increasingly prevalent in the workplace. Think about the last time you worked without some form of technology or social media. Virtually impossible, right? (Ok, pun intended.)

We can’t ignore the fact that modern applications of technology are changing the way we do work daily. For example, in order to write this column, we leveraged technology by collaborating through online tools, which allowed us to share our computer screens, track our tasks, hold video meetings, send emails, and save our documents in a shared space using Dropbox. These are just a few of the ways that technology is changing the way work gets done.

Social media, which can be formally defined as “Internet communications platforms where more than one user can publish/post information within a community of users” (Carroll, Romano-Bergstrom, & Fischer, 2013) such as Twitter, LinkedIn, and Facebook, are also impacting the workplace. In fact, research shows that users spend 20% of their time on social media sites with 17% of that time spent on Facebook alone (Nielsen, 2012)! As most of us know, some of this time spent on social media sites is during work hours. It’s not unheard-of for workers to be fired for posting messages about their workplace issues or frustrations (Clearinghouse, 2013). Don’t worry, it isn’t all bad news. Recent studies are beginning to test and understand the positive effects social media can have on the workplace, such as increasing trust among workers and increasing informal learning (e.g., Cao, Vogel, Guo, Liu, & Gu, 2012; Ravenscroft, Schmidt, Cook, & Bradley, 2013).

The way we as I-O psychologists interact with each other is also shifting due to new technologies and social media tools. One example of this is the new technological platform called my.SIOP, which facilitates collaborations and social connections between SIOP members. Because of this new online tool, members have connected at conferences and begun research collaborations after meeting virtually! Also, this year at SIOP, Dr. Theodore Hayes revolutionized the way that we as SIOP members can present at the conference using advanced technology by having his personal avatar introduce his session. In case you missed it, be sure to check out the introduction to his Technology Enhanced Assessments Symposium (Hayes, 2013).

These evolving tools also provide additional avenues to communicate with the general public and enhance the familiarity of our field. Our 2013 SIOP president, Tammy Allen, stated that this year’s goal is to continue to increase the visibility of the I-O field as well as advance the overall impact the field is having on the workforce. What better way to meet these goals than to leverage social media to share knowledge and create awareness about our field of study! For example, I-O psychologists can post updates about their latest publications or share details about I-O related events. In fact, it’s already happening. Check out the buzz from the Houston conference.

The ways that technology and social media are changing the workforce are innumerable and we are confident that we could have a never-ending list of topics to write about in this article. However, we were curious to learn what I-O Psychologists are most interested in to help us tailor our column. So we figured, what better way to find out then...
to review all of the cutting-edge research presented at SIOP over the last couple of years! After scouring past conference sessions, we identified some key thematic topics. While this isn't by any means intended to be a comprehensive summary of all presentations in this realm, we wanted to provide you with a list of trends and hot topics in our field. Below you will find those key areas.

*Increase in Virtual Workplaces*

One of the largest areas of interest in 2012 and 2013 was virtual workplaces. This isn't a complete surprise as approximately 20% of workers worldwide reported telecommuting in 2012 and this trend is one that has been and will continue to grow over the years (Reaney, 2012). We can also speculate that this 20% underestimates how many true virtual employees are in the workplace as the statistic is limited to only those who are geographically dispersed. Researchers in this area suggest that when defining the term “virtual,” we must account for recent changes in technology and define the construct in terms of the use and characteristics of the virtual tools being used in organizations (Grossenbacher, Brown, Quinn, & Prewett, 2013; Prasad, DeRosa, & Beyerlein, 2012). Specifically, it should be defined in terms of three dimensions (a) sychronicity (i.e., the naturalness of the communication exchange and degree of delay between responses via technologies), (b) technology reliance (i.e., whether technology is needed to get the work done), and (c) information value (i.e., whether information being communicated over technology is critical to the work being done) (Grossenbacher et al., 2013). Within this area, SIOP members are working towards understanding how virtual work impacts individual performance, teamwork, and leadership (e.g., Burke & Grossman, 2013; Vega, Anderson, & Kaplan, 2012). For example, research is being conducted to understand which individual- and team-level factors predict performance in a virtual environment (e.g., Geller, 2013; Pitts, Wright, & Harkabus, 2012).

*Changes in Assessment & Selection Technology*

Technology is rapidly changing the way I-O psychologists are designing and implementing assessments in the workplace. Paper-and-pencil tests are moving out and video-based situational judgment tests, simulations, and web-based assessments (even provided through mobile devices) are moving in (e.g., Golubovich & Ryan, 2013). Fetzer (2013) argues that simulations are becoming the norm rather than the exception. To demonstrate this, there was an IGNITE session in Houston with nine different organizations showcasing their state-of-the-art simulation technologies. In case you missed it, be sure to check out the highlights from a few of those presentations! [Holland Video](#)  [Sydell Video](#)

Yang, Sireci, and Hayes (2013) caution that practitioners and researchers should be thinking about which situations are best for these new technologies because they're not all appropriate for every situation. In addition, they encourage practitioners and researchers to think about how the measurement of psychological constructs may differ, compared to traditional measures. Video technology is further transforming the way organizations recruit and select employees. For example, resumés are now being submitted in a video format (Hemstra, Oostrom, Derous, Serlie, & Born, 2013) and organizations are starting to conduct more interviews through video technologies as they realize their cost-saving (both time and money) potential (Miller & Alder, 2012).

*Emergence of Social Media in the Workplace*

Social media sites are no longer just a place to keep in touch with friends and family. They’ve entered the workspace and are influencing the way recruitment and hiring is implemented. Recruiters and headhunters can now find ideal candidates in minutes by searching key terms and leveraging sites such as LinkedIn, which hosts a repository of potential candidate pools (Zide, Elman, & Shahini-Denning, 2013). However, there are concerns with this type of public applicant data. For instance, we are now finding that recruiters are making selection decisions based on information they gather from public profiles such as photographs, or the lack thereof (Salter & Poeppelman, 2013). Not only are social media sites changing our practice in the field, they are also impacting how researchers gather valuable workplace data (Robinson, Sinar, & Winter, 2013). For instance, if researchers want to collect turnover data, but do not have access to personnel files, they can pull specific information from LinkedIn profiles. By leveraging the name of the employee and organization of interest, researchers can view individual profiles and determine if an employee has left or stayed at that organization. Of course, using LinkedIn as a data source comes with a host of concerns and limitations (e.g., individuals not keeping their profiles up to date). We are confident that next year’s conference will continue to highlight more research findings in this area.
Leveraging Mobile Devices

Research shows that between 2011 and 2012, the amount of time spent accessing the Internet from mobile devices increased by 22% and the usage of mobile applications increased by over 120% (Nielsen, 2012). Currently, I-O psychologists are trying to understand how we can leverage mobile devices for assessment and data collection (e.g., Hedricks, 2013) in addition to how these methods are changing the way we measure constructs (Morelli et al., 2013). Luckily, preliminary research is demonstrating measurement equivalence with noncognitive assessments, supporting the usage of these devices in practice and research (Morelli et al., 2013). However, Morelli (2013) cautions that there is no shortage of challenges and considerations that I-O psychologists should be aware of when using mobile assessments. For example, there may be demographic differences in those who use or do not use mobile devices, and technological issues may impede the proper delivery of assessments.

Sharing Technological Lessons Learned

It is clear that expertise surrounding technology and social media continues to grow in our field. Therefore, it should be of no surprise that we are also learning practical and logistical lessons along the way (e.g., Stehura, Klein, Otsberg, Killian, & Zimmer, 2013). There have been several SIOP presentations discussing the importance of information technology (IT) (Such et al., 2012) and why we need to continue to build our understanding of their “language” because we are often their customers (Locklear, 2012; Stehura, Dawson, Glass, Licht, & Ostberg, 2012). Stehura et al. (2013) described several challenges I-O psychologists encounter when delivering technology-laden products and how we can navigate them in the future. For example, I-O psychologists need to help organizations understand (a) how to handle user reactions to new technologies because employees may lack the capabilities to appropriately leverage them; (b) that new technologies may not get used after being implemented, therefore proper education needs to be delivered; and (c) that technologies may become quickly outdated, making adaptable technologies important (Illingworth, 2013; Stehura et al., 2013).

So, as you can see, the importance of technological advances and social media are indisputable; they are evolving our own SIOP experience as well as vastly and continuously changing our workplace. These facts alone make it even more important to generate awareness around common day-to-day practices so we can understand how they impact our personal interactions, employer expectations, hiring practices, training experiences, marketing techniques, and much more. It is for this reason we have embarked on a long and exciting journey as TIP columnists for The Modern App.

The Modern App: Future Columns

So what should you expect? Within The Modern App column, we will not only highlight current technologies and social media research, but we also intend to cover current practices within industry. We recognize that you as researchers, professionals, and students do not have time to read all of the current literature. We get it. So our goal will be to summarize the research and current practices and bring it to you. Our goal of highlighting research is to help educate and bring awareness to those technologies or social media best practices. However, we know that research in itself is not enough. The question we want to help you answer is: What kind of research should I-O psychologists be conducting that can help practitioners use technology more efficiently, and how can those practices inform research? In essence, we hope to provide a bridge between practice and research. What a thought!

In this column, we will also introduce experts from the field that can highlight how we as I-O psychologists are having an impact and leverage multidisciplinary means to advance our area of practice. Some of the areas of interest we might target include communication and marketing of social media benefits, adaptive training technologies, big data research and technologies, and others. We want to keep you up to date and make this a key resource for you every quarter so you continue to leverage it for your workplace and research needs. Who wouldn’t want their readers coming back every issue?

The Modern App, at its core, is a way for us to communicate the best and the worst of technologies and social media that are currently changing the way people think about and conduct business.

In the coming issues, you can expect to see this column focus on hot topics and trends highlighted above along with some key issues mentioned by our SIOP leaders. But keep in mind that we are open to hearing your ideas! If you or others you know are doing work in this area and have research or current practices you want to share with us, feel free to email us directly (modernapp.tip@gmail.com). We’d love to hear from you! Who knows, we might ever feature your current work in our next issue!

Also, be sure to follow us on Twitter @themodernapp! We’d love to hear what you think and topics you’d like future columns to focus on!
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**Confirmed speakers include:**

*Mike Benson, Director, Johnson & Johnson*
*Allan Church, PepsiCo*

*Vicki L. Flaherty, Cloud Computing Enterprise Learning Leader, IBM Talent*
*Mark Kizilos, Experience-Based Development Associates*

*Elizabeth Kolmstetter, US Agency for International Development*
*Moheet Nagrath, former Proctor & Gamble*
*David Peterson, Google*

*Anna Marie Valerio, Executive Leadership Strategies*
*Brian Welle, Google*

*Jack Wiley, the Kenexa High Performance Institute*

Get all the information on this important event at [http://www.siop.org/lec/2013/default.aspx](http://www.siop.org/lec/2013/default.aspx)
Greetings TIP readers, and welcome to our first issue of the Spotlight on HWP column! In this column, we plan to focus on people and issues pertaining to a very specific type of work, namely deliberate and organized efforts to enhance human welfare. This is the form of work around which the emerging subdiscipline of humanitarian work psychology is centered. As you might imagine, organized work intentionally designed to improve a person or people’s standard of living includes many types of activities, everything from disaster relief to corporate social responsibility programs to the training of entrepreneurs in lower-income settings. Either directly or indirectly, countless jobs are in some way related to enhancing human welfare. We seek to highlight this fact and to better understand the unique dynamics of work that is specifically designed to help others.

This is the first issue of this new column, but it is also a synthesis of two retiring columns: the Spotlight on Global I-O Psychology column that was edited by Lori Foster Thompson, Alexander Gloss, and M. K. Ward, and the Pro-Social I-O: Quo Vadis column that was edited by our colleague Professor Stuart Carr. For many years, while advancing his work as a researcher and scientist, Professor Carr has been advocating and working for three things: the greater awareness of prosocial issues in I-O psychology, a heightened internationalization of the discipline, and an enhanced focus on humanitarian work. Indeed, Professor Carr can in many ways be considered the father of the subdiscipline of humanitarian work psychology from which this column gets its name.

In his Quo Vadis column, Professor Carr brought on guest authors who were able to speak to prosocial, humanitarian, and international issues in I-O psychology. We carry on his tradition by devoting each issue to an interview with individuals involved in at least two of these three areas. Before moving forward with this first issue’s interview of our esteemed guest author, it is important to acknowledge that we, and indeed I-O psychology, owe a deep debt of gratitude to Professor Carr for his tireless advancement of our discipline and for his passion in helping to bring that discipline to bear on some of the world’s most pressing issues.

An Interview With Governor Scott McCallum

In this first column, we are joined, auspiciously, by Governor Scott McCallum, former governor of Wisconsin and now president and CEO of the Aidmatrix Foundation, the world’s leading nonprofit dealing with information technology and the use of that technology to assist humanitarian efforts. Some of you heard or met Governor McCallum at SIOP 2013 in Houston. The governor was invited to speak at the Friday Seminar entitled “Humanitarian Work Psychology: Supply Meets Demand” alongside Telma Viale, special representative to the United Nations and director of the New York International Labour Organization office. The governor has received high accolades for his innovative approaches to helping over 52,000 organizations on six continents, organizations that are themselves tackling some of the world’s most pressing problems. He received a 21st Century Achievement Award for his “visionary use of information technology to promote positive social economic and educational change” and was designated a “true hero of the information age” by...
Earlier this year, Government Technology Magazine named him one of the “Top 25 Doers, Dreamers, and Drivers” in US Technology.

In this issue, we explore what Gov. McCallum and Aidmatrix do, why it is that he was invited to SIOP this year, and how he thinks I-O psychology can interface with humanitarian organizations.

**Can you tell us more about what you and the Aidmatrix Foundation do?**

Aidmatrix and I believe that by leveraging information technology, we can triumph over the world’s most challenging humanitarian crises. Our world-class supply chain management technologies make it easy and efficient for everyone from donors to nonprofits to governments to get the right aid to people when and where they need it most.

Our team of passionate people is dedicated to, and successful in, creating and delivering tools and processes that bring people together to help others. $1.5 billion in value of products moves through Aidmatrix technology each year. This includes almost all U.S. charitable food, most UK charitable food, and donated food in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Aidmatrix solutions are used for other products as well, including medicines and clothing. Our users include organizations like Catholic Relief Services, Save the Children, CARE, and Children International. These organizations, and many others, build their entire supply chain on Aidmatrix solutions: from procurement and transportation, to warehousing and distribution. These solutions change the manner in which work is done in the humanitarian sector. In most cases, the changes required are more than just technology inputs, they shape the very work setting within the organization. This includes, and requires, adjustments to training, education, and in many cases a shift in culture within the organization.

**What brought you to SIOP this year?**

I came to SIOP to learn more about I-O psychology and to make the case that there is a need for a greater understanding of how to assist and develop human capital within the humanitarian sector. If we are to shift the paradigm of traditional giving and training programs away from charity and toward impacting the core of a person’s ability to move out of poverty, and even beyond that to reach their greatest potential, we need to utilize I-O psychology’s abilities to measure people and match them to skills, training, education, and occupations. Looking at it in another way, the Aidmatrix supply chain has been so beneficial because of its ability to match needs and demands with supply; while this matching is presently used for product and services, with the help of I-O psychology, we believe it can be applied directly to the “supply chain” of human capital in disaster situations, humanitarian crises, and even more universally in a variety of settings, including lower-income settings.

For example, we have been approached by several companies—including from regions where poverty and unemployment are especially high—that need us to help them match potential employees with job vacancies. From a single company’s perspective, this means greater productivity, but from the standpoint of the region in which those companies are located, this means greater economic and workforce development. We can break free from the constraints of traditional training or job-matching work by utilizing insights from I-O psychology. This should be able to dramatically increase the likelihood of success in helping individuals to find jobs, in boosting organizational productivity, and I believe ultimately in driving economic, workforce, and human development around the world.

**What role do you see for I-O psychology in the support of humanitarian organizations?**

Any work done to help those that are jobless, below the poverty line, stuck at a certain rung of the economic ladder, or unable to find a job they are better suited for is an important humanitarian endeavor. I-O psychology is important in that it can help provide solid measurements of individuals and occupations. In the nonprofit sector, this includes not only paid employees but the countless volunteers utilized by many organizations throughout the world. I-O psychology can also help to allow nonprofit and humanitarian organizations to change their ways and to become more effective as inefficiency disruptors like information technology and new management techniques are introduced into the field.

**Do you have any advice for I-O psychologists looking to work with humanitarian organizations?**

The humanitarian sector, and specifically the nonprofit sector, is being forced to use better skills and metrics in their operations. This means that successful tools and management techniques used in the private sector will in-
creasingly be applied to the nonprofit sector. As with most other occupations, prospective I-O psychologists should be prepared to demonstrate how they would bring value to an organization. This can for example be through cost cutting by developing better recruitment tools or by measuring the impact of work in the field. The myriad number of examples of how I-O psychologists have helped organizations in the private sector can serve as a useful demonstration for how I-O can assist humanitarian and nonprofit organizations to be more efficient in accomplishing their mission of helping others.

Conclusion

Thank you to Governor McCallum for this interesting and compelling perspective on I-O psychology’s relationship with the nonprofit and humanitarian world. Governor McCallum’s comments underscore the relevance of our discipline to assisting humanitarian aims and broader economic development efforts. We are very grateful to the governor for the time he took to respond to our questions, and we sincerely hope to see him at future SIOP conferences!

Final Notice!

If you have not paid 2013-2014 SIOP dues, the deadline is June 30.

Don’t miss out on the benefits and discounts that SIOP membership provides! Renew TODAY!

Pay Dues Now
Relatively recently there has been a growing trend involving the addition of a “neuro” prefix to academic disciplines. Some examples of the neuro-movement include neuroeconomics, neuroleadership, and social neuroscience. In many high impact journals such as *Psychological Science*, the percentage of articles that involve neuroscience is higher than ever, and the rate of publication is increasing. Searching PubMed and EBSCOhost databases for the keywords “social neuroscience” returned seven articles published in 2002 compared with 276 articles in 2012. Today, neuroscience’s influence extends to popular media as seen in topics like *brain training in the New York Times*. In short, the reach of neuroscience is expanding rapidly in academic and public consciousness.

We believe that I-O is one of the few areas of psychology that has yet to embrace and explore the potential benefits of incorporating neuroscience into our research. We were, therefore, very pleased when *TIP*’s new editor, Morrie Mullins, was so receptive to a new column about organizational neuroscience (ON) and interdisciplinary research. We think this is an important emerging area of scientific inquiry that has the potential to push I-O research in exciting new directions.

Like many things in psychology, ON has been defined a variety of ways. Beugre (2010) described ON as neuro-organizational behavior or “the study of the impact of brain structures on human behavior in organizations” (p. 289). Senior and Butler (2007) termed organizational cognitive neuroscience as “the study of the processes within the brain that underlie or influence human decisions, behaviors, and interactions either (a) within organizations or (b) in response to organizational manifestations or institutions” (p. 22). For the purposes of this column, we define ON as “a deliberate and judicious approach to spanning the divide between neuroscience and organizational science” (Becker & Cropanzano, 2010, p. 1055). Here we advocate a “big tent” approach to ON that embraces a variety of methods that seek to go inside our attitudes and behaviors. As such, we include areas such as genetics, biophysiology, and experimental philosophy to name just a few. Initial research in ON has included studies of leadership, job satisfaction, and implicit affect in organizations (Barsade, Ramarajah, & Westen, 2009; Lee, Senior, & Butler, 2012; Li, Song, & Arvey, 2012). Neuroscience is not about what parts of the brain “light up” when we get our performance review; rather, it is about understanding how a complex mix of conscious and nonconscious brain processes determine our attitudes and behaviors.

The collective “we” of I-O psychologists should familiarize ourselves with research in ON. We see three major benefits from this type of research. First, tools for data collection in ON provide an additional level of measurement. More specifically, neuroimaging techniques and physiological measures can assess processes within individual employees that they are unable to consciously report. In this way, ON offers a new within-person level of measurement. This relates to a second benefit, specifically that much of the I-O research literature relies on self-report data from surveys that are commonly influenced by self-serving biases and the vagaries of our memory system (Schwarz, 1999). Measurement tools from ON offer alternatives to self-report data. In combination, these additional methods of collecting data can complement traditional methods and create a powerful defense against mono-method bias with which we are all too familiar. It’s plausible that neuro measures can be helpful in the last steps of a multihurdle selection system, when precision is key and where restriction of range is inherent to the situation. Third, research in ON has the potential to refine theory and refocus I-O on important questions. For example, leadership theories in I-O classify different types of leaders; techniques of ON can measure fine distinctions to support or refute differences between transformational and nontransformational leaders (Balthazard, Waldman, Thatcher, & Hannah, 2012).
Aside from potential gains from ON, there are also potential losses that I-O will incur if we fail to pursue this line of research. Some people have urged that we should avoid ON because of ethical or methodological concerns. We do not dismiss these concerns but instead argue that the best way to be involved in these debates is to be involved in the research. If we don’t pursue ON, then we risk stagnation and becoming marginalized by other areas of psychology, such as social neuroscience, that are gaining influence. As psychologists we are committed to doing good, as evident in our principle of beneficence. In our opinion, that includes a responsibility to explore all opportunities to improve our field as a whole. In order to do good science, it is our belief that we must conduct the best research we can, and that means incorporating neuroscience to the extent that it improve our studies.

Assuming we’ve completely convinced you of the benefits of ON and its potential benefits for I-O research and practice, what’s next? There are three simple steps: First we learn about issues, then we conduct research, and finally we put what we learn into practice and start over again. Step 1: we need to learn about ON. This column will feature researchers conducting studies in related areas of neuroscience as well as ON. We’ll see that conducting studies in ON means doing interdisciplinary research. “Interdisciplinary research (IDR) is a mode of research by teams of individuals that integrates information, data, techniques, tools, perspectives, concepts, and/or theories across two or more disciplines or bodies of specialized knowledge to advance fundamental understanding or to solve problems whose solutions are beyond the scope of a single discipline or area of research practice” (National Academies, 2005, p. 188). As mentioned previously, there are areas in psychology that have successfully merged into interdisciplinary domains, for example social neuroscience and evolutionary psychology.

Like other areas of psychology, I-O has rightfully touted the benefits of interdisciplinary research. Now, with this column, we will strive to spark ideas and encourage interdisciplinary studies. In short, we push to move from talking the talk to walking the walk. To this end, our desire is to help each other rise to the challenges and opportunities inherent in interdisciplinary studies.

Communication, measurement, and synthesis are three major challenges of interdisciplinary research. First, members of the research team need to clarify the expression of their thoughts to a more basic level because other team members often come from different training backgrounds. Measurement becomes challenging when members of an interdisciplinary research team inevitably have varying preferred methods of measurement. The third major challenge of interdisciplinary research lies in synthesizing theory and findings from more than one body of literature. I-O can contribute to overcoming these challenges. As a field, I-O has theories, empirical data, and practical research questions that are ripe for interdisciplinary inquiry.

Step 2 for I-O psychologists will be to build the subdiscipline of ON by conducting studies. Research about organizational teams and diverse perspectives has been a hot topic in I-O. Doing research in ON is an opportunity for us to practice what we preach by working in interdisciplinary teams that can provide that same diversity of thinking. By incorporating a biological perspective, Klein and D’Esposito (2007) found incongruence between strategic analysis protocols that many organizations use (e.g., SWOT analysis) and the cognitive functioning those protocols require. In the process of reconciling this discrepancy, further ON research can develop a unifying theory for strategic thinking in organizations. From the perspective of neuroscience, Yeats and Yeats (2007) found that activating specific neural networks in the brain during an organizational intervention mediated affective states and social behaviors. Understanding how organizational interventions change neural activity can lead to more efficient intervention designs (Yeats & Yeats, 2007).

In Step 3, many may be surprised to learn that despite its complexity and mind boggling future, ON has many applications that could be put into practice right now. What’s more, these applications do not involve mind reading or reprogramming people’s brains. For example, in a forthcoming paper we explore the evidence on intelligence that suggests that simple memory and reasoning tests are likely to be equivalent to, and potentially less biased predictors of, job performance than traditional IQ tests. In a similar vein, we will introduce readers to the practice of neurofeedback where practitioners are using qEEG to help individuals recognize counterproductive work behaviors and change their response mechanisms. The bottom line is that, although ON may appear more like something out of science fiction, in reality many of the practical implications involve relatively traditional, low tech changes. In sum, we can conduct valuable interdisciplinary research through ON that advance both the science and practice of I-O psychology.

Our goal is for this column is to challenge and support TIP readers in learning about and conducting research in
The primary purpose of this column is to provide multiple views of the overall state and potential future of ON. Going forward we will feature individuals who are doing research related to ON. These features will aim to uncover lessons and overcome the challenges, real and imagined, facing interdisciplinarity and ON. Our hope is that this column will provide a forum to share information and inspire studies so we can put the organization in organizational neuroscience.
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Developing Career Paths for I-O Psychologists

Michael Trusty
Rolls Royce

In this installment of the Practitioners’ Forum, we highlight a major initiative underway in SIOP: the study of careers for individuals with advanced degrees in industrial-organizational psychology.

How do the careers of I-O psychologists develop? While previous authors have looked at what I-O psychologists do (Blakeney, et al., 2002; Borman & Cox, 1996), less work has been done to help understand how I-O psychologists’ careers develop over time. Documenting an I-O psychologist’s career path (or career paths) could be useful on a number of fronts.

The Professional Practice Committee (PPC) is leading a project to develop a career path or set of career paths for I-O psychologists. A project team including members of the PPC and University of Akron’s Center for Organizational Research are currently working on this with support from several other SIOP committees, including Scientific Affairs and Education and Training. Data are being collected regarding work activities of people with advanced degrees in I-O psychology, with the goal of documenting the career paths and experiences that contribute to success in both applied and academic settings. This initiative is currently underway, and in this article we describe the project and report on some preliminary findings.

This careers study has a number of ties to the current SIOP goals. Understanding the various roles and activities that people with an I-O education engage in will help ensure SIOP is seen as the authority on work-related psychology. It will also provide important information to champion the value of applied psychology in work settings. It could also provide a baseline for career support tools for students and members. Other professional organizations provide similar information. For example, the HR Careers website for the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development in the United Kingdom (http://www.cipd.co.uk/hr-careers) provides an excellent example of the type of resources and support that could come from an effort such as this. In the U.S., the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) recently conducted a large-scale competency project by collecting data on members’ perceptions of importance of, and experience in, various competencies. They were also asked to identify competencies that were needed at various levels of experience (early, advanced, and/or senior level) in the profession. SHRM will use this information for several purposes, including providing better development, education, and training to its members.

How Will SIOP Members Benefit?

We anticipate that the careers study will benefit all SIOP members, Student Affiliates, and potential members. The creation of I-O career paths could support the following:

1. Provide a standard template/protocol/base of information for SIOP mentors when working with mentees.
2. Provide a standard and informed framework from which people with advanced degrees in I-O psychology can consider how to manage their individual careers.
3. Advise efforts for lobbying for licensure and/or certification criteria.
4. Link with the I-O Salary Survey process to provide additional benchmarks and inform the way future salary surveys are structured.
5. Provide valuable input to academic program leaders responsible for undergraduate and graduate curriculum choices to maximize development of future recipients of advanced degrees in I-O psychology.
6. Create a body of knowledge with direct implications for the Guidelines for Education and Training at the Doctoral/Master’s Level in Industrial-Organizational Psychology.
What Do We Hope to Accomplish?

This study has three main objectives.

1. Document the breadth of work currently engaged in by people with advanced degrees in I-O psychology
   This goal builds on the findings of earlier studies of what I-O psychologists do (Blakeney et al., 2002, and Borman & Cox, 1996). This study includes practitioners working in organizations, practitioners working in consulting firms, and teachers and researchers working in academic settings, giving us further insight into what I-O psychologists do in a variety of work settings.

2. Identify the experiences and competencies related to success in the field of I-O Psychology
   The intent of the second objective is to understand the underlying experiences and competencies that enable people with advanced degrees in I-O psychology to be successful. This objective will also allow some classification of experiences and competencies. Specifically, as the outcomes and activities of those working in applied and academic settings are likely to diverge, it is expected that some of the experiences and competencies required to work in these settings will differ.

3. Outline a career progression and development model for people with advanced degrees in I-O psychology
   The final objective is more prescriptive in nature. We hope to develop prototype career paths from the data that can have multiple uses (e.g., inform graduate training, mentor–mentee interactions, career modelling by current members, and SIOP member development efforts). A very simple model is shown in Figure 1.

![Possible Career Paths for Person With Advanced Degree in I-O Psychology](image)

*Figure 1: Possible Career Paths for Person With Advanced Degree in I-O Psychology*

Based on data collected to date we anticipate multiple career paths. At minimum we expect different career paths for I-O Psychologists working in Academia, Consulting, working in government organizations, and finally those who are working in HR functions inside companies.
How Is the Professional Practice Committee Approaching This?

Step 1: Review of Current Models and Materials

The first step in this study involved collecting and reviewing current career models and source materials to ensure the approach is representative of contemporary thinking and research. Using SIOP membership data, we identified organizations that employed more than 3 I-O psychologists and contacted those organizations, asking them if they would be able to share any information such as job descriptions, competency models, or existing career paths specifically for people with advanced degrees in I-O psychology. We received information from 8 consulting firms and 5 government organizations. Although we did receive responses from I-O psychologists working in HR functions inside companies, there was little documented information available.

This information was used to develop preliminary career paths as well as structured interview guides for use in the second phase of the study. Table 1 summarizes the levels and possible job titles associated with each career level.

Table 1
Levels and Possible Job Titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General level</th>
<th>Private sector - Industry - HR</th>
<th>Consulting organizations</th>
<th>Public sector - Government</th>
<th>Academic university</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possible sample titles or roles</td>
<td>Possible sample titles or roles</td>
<td>Possible sample titles or roles</td>
<td>Possible sample titles or roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry level individual contributor</td>
<td>Assistant HR manager</td>
<td>Project assistant</td>
<td>Analyst</td>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual contributor</td>
<td>HR manager (Nonsupervisory or supervisor of clerical only)</td>
<td>Consulting associate</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR Research Specialist</td>
<td>Lead professional (Consultant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert individual contributor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior consultant</td>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>Full professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager (or Supervisor) of individual contributors</td>
<td>Director of HR Center for Expertise</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Case team leader</td>
<td>Department chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sr. director of HR Center for</td>
<td>Team leader</td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>Program manager</td>
<td>Senior associate consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager of managers</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Project leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area director of HR</td>
<td>Senior team leader</td>
<td>Senior manager</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal consultant</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>VP of HR - Center of Excellence</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>V.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VP of HR - Operations</td>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>Senior executive</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional vice president of HR Operations</td>
<td>Executive consultant</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior vice president HR</td>
<td>V.P.</td>
<td>V.P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief HR officer</td>
<td>Senior V.P.</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global HR officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 2: Subject Matter Expert Interviews

The University of Akron’s Center for Organizational Research is completing 1-1 interviews with 50 SIOP members selected to represent academic, consulting, government, and corporate HR careers. This step begins the process of capturing appropriate and relevant career experiences. The results of these interviews are being used to design a careers survey for the full SIOP membership. Over 30 interviews have been completed as of mid-May, enabling the team to develop some preliminary career paths for academic, consulting, and government careers. However, we still need to complete interviews with people in corporate HR roles. If you are contacted by the team from the Center for Organizational Research, please take the time to participate in an interview.

Step 3: Design and Administer a Careers Survey

A careers survey will be administered to the SIOP membership during the summer of 2013. Participation in this survey is critical to the study, so please complete the survey when you receive it! Data from all three steps will be combined to create the final career paths, including key competencies and experiences that I-O psychologists working in different settings need in order to be successful.

Findings from the careers study will be disseminated in a variety of formats including technical reports, a future TIP column, mentoring and careers sessions at the conference, and through my.SIOP and the SIOP website.
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Professional Practice Committee Updates

Tracy Kantrowitz
SHL

The careers study is a major focus for the Professional Practice Committee, along with several other important and impactful projects designed to facilitate member development and advocate for the practice of I-O psychology with outside organizations. The annual conference was the stage for a variety of committee-related activities, including mentoring programs, conference sessions presented as part of the executive block program that focus on the “business” of SIOP, task force meetings, and interviews conducted as part of the careers study. I’ll highlight a couple of conference-related activities here.

Mentoring activities for professional members have expanded in exciting new directions. For the 4th consecutive year, the Professional Practice Committee sponsored a speed mentoring session during the conference. More than 50 practitioners participated in two 25-minute roundtable topic-driven discussions guided by 19 seasoned mentors on topics including: making career transitions, I-O psychology around the world, employee selection and assessment, I-O research-practice partnership, how to influence
stakeholders as an I-O practitioner, in-house consulting vs. external consulting, using data to drive organizational strategy, when best practice and practicality conflict, bringing I-O to the mainstream, and how things "really" work within organizations. This event was a great opportunity for practitioners to seek guidance from experienced mentors who have “been there and done that.” Participants commented that they liked the relaxed nature and small groups, the caliber of the mentors, the ability to participate in an open and honest dialogue, meeting people with different perspectives and experiences on professional issues, and networking and meeting others in the field.

In addition to the speed mentoring program, the latest iteration of virtual group mentoring was launched in January with more than 80 protégés and 14 mentors from countries all over the world, including Namibia, Australia, Canada, India, and every time zone in the US. Such diversity in location has presented scheduling challenges, but the level of enthusiasm and flexibility on the part of participants is extremely high! This round of group mentoring builds upon previous group mentoring programs and includes more structure and tools (e.g., a blog for mentors to share tips and lessons learned calls facilitated by the Practice Committee).

Mentors and protégés from the speed and group mentoring programs enjoyed a meet and greet at the conference to meet in person and connect faces with names. Special thanks to Samantha Ritchie, Maya Yankelevich, Karina Hui-Walowitz, and Mark Poteet for leading and expanding the mentoring programs focused on practitioner development.

As reported by Eric Dunleavy and Rich Tonowski in the April 2013 TIP (see http://www.siop.org/tip/ Apr13/22_Kantrowicz.aspx), the Professional Practice Committee is spearheading an initiative to facilitate dialogue on findings and practices from our field that are of mutual interest to SIOP and EEOC. This dialogue has been operationalized as the Task Force on Contemporary Selection Practice Recommendations to EEOC. The Professional Practice Committee took advantage of the conference to progress the task force. An in-person meeting was held with task force members, SIOP executives and committee chairs, and members of the EEOC who attended either in-person or by phone. The main objective was to review findings and recommendations made by the task force related to the measurement of adverse impact and present this information to the EEOC for their comment. Once agreement is reached regarding direction for a series of papers on this topic, the next topic to be broached is validity transportability.

Special thanks to outgoing members of the Professional Practice Committee who have contributed in important ways during their three year terms: Alexander Alonso, Dennis Doverspike, Anu Ramesh, Samantha Ritchie, Michael Trusty, and John Weiner. For more information on these and other projects, please feel free to contact me at tracy.kantrowitz@shl.com.
Announcing the SIOP Wikipedia Initiative

Satoris S. Culbertson  
Kansas State University

I have a love–hate relationship with Wikipedia. On the one hand, I love being able to instantly find information on the most obscure things with the touch of a button. Indeed, it is through Wikipedia that I am able to quickly ascertain Mark Harmon’s age while watching NCIS, figure out amid a conversation with a friend which season of Dexter featured the “Trinity Killer” (Season 4), and lovingly diagnose my grandmother as clearly exhibiting signs of witzelsucht while she’s regaling stories from across the room. Oh, Grandma...

On the other hand, as an academic, Wikipedia can be a thorn in my side. Students consistently turn to information on Wikipedia for information for their class papers, treating the information therein as verified fact. The only real truth regarding Wikipedia, however, is that any given entry can contain mistakes or even intentional misinformation. In fact, Wikipedia’s policy on this issue states: “While the overall trend is toward improvement, it is important to use Wikipedia carefully if it is intended to be used as a research source, since individual articles will, by their nature, vary in quality and maturity.” This is evidenced by the realization that prior revisions of Wikipedia pages on Plato and Janis Joplin indicated that the former “is widely believed to have been a student of Barney the Purple Dinosaur and to have been deeply influenced by his dog, Cutie” whereas the latter “speedwalked everywhere and was afraid of toilets.” (See http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/04/06/the-funniest-actsofwiki_n_522077.html#s224977 for more humorous examples of Wikipedia misinformation.)

It is with this love–hate relationship in mind that I wanted to shine a spotlight on a worthy initiative that Dr. Therese Macan, professor and director of the Doctoral Program in Industrial and Organizational Psychology at the University of Missouri-St. Louis, is putting forth: The SIOP Wikipedia Initiative. Dr. Macan hosted a roundtable discussion at this past conference in Houston to highlight ways to enhance student learning and service through Wikipedia. Rather than view Wikipedia as the enemy of academics, she acknowledges and appreciates the impact that Wikipedia can and does have in terms of knowledge dissemination. She notes, “When conducting a Google search on a topic, a Wikipedia entry typically appears as one of the first three web results, increasing the likelihood that individuals access information from this site. In this way, Wikipedia may often be the first research tool used by the public as an initial source of information.” With this said, it's not surprising that estimates as of February 2012 indicate that the site attracts approximately 476 million unique visitors each month (ComScore, 2012).

Along with this appreciation for its impact, however, Dr. Macan also acknowledges the potential for misinformation given its open, editable platform. Rather than banish Wikipedia and its content from use by her students, however, Dr. Macan did quite the opposite. She incorporated Wikipedia and the revision of content into one of her graduate courses as a way to actively engage students in making Wikipedia a more credible source for technical and professional information about I-O psychology while concurrently expanding the visibility of I-O psychology as a whole.

In terms of credibility, what better way for us as I-O psychologists to ensure that content related to I-O psychology is accurately portrayed than to engage in the editing of content ourselves? Who better than those within the field to provide definitions of constructs, overviews of topics, and summaries of the extant literature? Of course, it isn't just about improving the accuracy of information that is reflected on Wikipedia. Dr. Macan also argues that engaging in the editing of Wikipedia content can help increase the visibility of I-O psychology. Referencing SIOP's Strategic Plan put forth by the Executive Committee to be the visible and trusted authority on work-related psychology, Dr. Macan notes that actively participating in the writing and updating of Wikipedia content can serve as a viable yet untapped resource to help SIOP move towards our goal of greater visibility.

What I find really great about all of this is that Dr. Macan not only talks about the benefits of participating in the modification of Wikipedia content, but she has also already taken steps to actively engage students in the process. As part of a special topics course on employment interviews that she taught during Spring 2011, she included an
assignment specifically geared toward having students update the Wikipedia entry on job interviews. While prepping her course and trying to find a unique learning experience for her students, she was reminded of an initiative put forth by the Association for Psychological Science (APS) that called upon APS members and their students to write, edit, and update Wikipedia entries. She subsequently looked at the existing Wikipedia entry for job interviews and found the coverage to be relatively sparse. "It included some information about legal issues and stress interviews but cited no empirical evidence from the more than 100 years of employment interview research conducted by I-O psychologists. This is unfortunate given that we know much more about interviews that could be beneficial to the larger public. For example, we know that adding structure to the interview can increase prediction. We also know that asking each applicant the same job relevant questions is one means of incorporating structure into the interview. None of this information had been shared."

With that, Dr. Macan and her students decided to take action during the course of the semester and try to make a difference. During that semester, her graduate students enhanced the information on employment interviews on Wikipedia by adding more complete and accurate information with over 100 research study references. In addition, a notable side benefit emerged. The graduate students learned how to translate research findings from journal articles on employment interviews into a layperson’s terms, skills that will undoubtedly benefit them in their future professional careers. A quick glance at the current Wikipedia entry for job interviews shows the impressive outcome of their efforts.

In terms of going forward, Dr. Macan urges other members of SIOP to actively participate in the updating of content on Wikipedia. She also suggests that members share best practices with one another to continue moving this initiative forward in the future, (e.g., through the SIOP Exchange). As part of the exchange of ideas, she notes that it would be useful to keep track of which topics were updated and which topics still need to be tackled as a means to coordinate future efforts. "As a result of our unified efforts, user-friendly summaries of main research findings in I-O topic areas would be more accessible to a larger degree than is presently available on Wikipedia. Furthermore, this information could be made available in real time as studies are published in the I-O literature."

With all this said, I encourage you all to take a peek at what the Wikipedia entries look like for some of your particular research areas. Are there areas that need improvement? Are there topics that could use refinement? If so, take a stab at it, or build in a Wikipedia assignment into your own course. Dr. Macan has graciously agreed to serve as a resource to anyone who wants to try this in their classes, stating that she is more than happy to share what she did and lessons learned. She can be reached at Theres.Macan@umsl.edu. Shoot her an email—you never know what topic somebody might want to look up during an episode of Undercover Boss!

Discuss this article in the TIP section of my.SIOP forums!
The effect of globalization has left an indelible mark on the practice of I-O psychology. Consider, for example, the rise of multinational corporations over the last 30 years as described by Milt Hakel and CJ de Wolff in our last column (Alonso & Wang, 2013). I-O psychology as a field has experienced an increasingly substantial need to apply our professional principles and practices to numerous populations and markets emerging across the globe. Building selection systems, designing executive education programs, and developing adaptive competency models across emerging markets have become the norms for I-O psychology practitioners worldwide. In particular, after establishing our profession in Europe and the U.S., I-O psychologists have extended our service in emerging markets starting with the “BRIC” countries (i.e., Brazil, Russia, India, and China), whose GDP yearly growth exceeded 10%, nominal GDP exceeded $600 billion and populations exceeded 100 million. Today, as the “MIST” countries (i.e., Mexico, Indonesia, Spain, and Turkey) approach these same criteria for economic superpowers, our profession has once again begun the adaptive process to meet the needs of these emerging markets. But with all this growth and volatility, there is a clear need for tips of the trade helping I-O psychology practitioners work in emerging markets.

For I-O psychologists working in the North America and Europe, emerging markets are a scarcity or a distant topic. However, in other parts of the world, dealing with the growing pains of emerging markets is customary. As such, we thought it would be worthwhile to explore how practitioners overcome these growing pains. Specifically, we are interested in tackling three critical questions:

1. How do emerging markets differ from the mature market in terms of workforce strategies?
2. What practices are universal across emerging and mature markets?
3. What are some workforce strategies I-O practitioners should use in emerging markets?

To address these questions, we are very fortunate to have a terrific team of contributors from the nation of Singapore, Drs. James and Alison Eyring. James Eyring holds a PhD and MA in industrial-organizational psychology. He is the chief operating officer of Organisation Solutions and leads the global consulting practice. He has over 20 years of experience in executive development and human resources, specializing in executive coaching and leadership development. James has worked for PepsiCo, Dell, and Motorola and now works with clients such as Cisco, BHP Billiton, InterContinental Hotels Group, Nokia Siemens Networks, and GSK. Most recently, he has taught at the Helsinki School of Economics and the Singapore Management University and is actively conducting research in the area of leadership and distributed organizations.

Alison Eyring holds a PhD and MA in industrial-organizational psychology as well. She is the founder and chief executive officer of Organisation Solutions. She has 25 years of experience in large-scale organization design and change and executive development. Alison works closely with global leaders and their organizations, including Royal/Dutch Shell, BHP Billiton, Chubb Group of Companies, NEC, and Thomson Reuters. She also serves as an adjunct associate professor at the National University of Singapore. Educated in the U.S. and Spain, Alison has lived on four continents and has resided in Singapore since 1999. Alison serves as chair of the Board for the Asian Collaborative Organisation Research Network (ACORN).

**Workforce Strategies in High-Growth Markets: Perspectives From Asia**

Many Western multinational companies (MNCs) have turned to emerging markets in Asia over the past decade to fuel their growth. China, India, and Indonesia have attracted much of this investment capital. As a result, many MNCs have large and complex businesses in these markets. HP, for example, has more than 18,000 employees in...
China. A growing number of Western MNCs now operate in as many cities in China as they do in the U.S. Because of their size and complexity, countries like China and India are more frequently reporting directly to the CEO, alongside their North American and European counterparts.

These markets have their own unique talent management challenges, including:

- High rates of revenue growth. Companies established in markets for over 20 years may still experience growth rates > 20%. Newer entrants experience growth > 60%
- Limited talent pools and therefore greater competition for talent
- High employee expectations for rapid promotion and rising compensation
- Job complexity caused by complex supply chains, government relations, and other factors

Companies have had to adapt their HR practices to meet these challenges. The most successful companies have adapted their workforce strategies to suit high-growth market demands. Companies that have failed to adapt have struggled to achieve their growth goals. High rates of revenue growth often mean that an employee who can successfully fulfill the responsibilities of his job today may find the job has outgrown him within a very short time. Practices to overcome this include “over hiring” for open positions (i.e., hiring someone at a grade level higher than needed based on future revenue expectations). A less common, but successful, strategy is proactive mapping of talent in the external market. Leading companies track talent for years in the hopes of hiring the person with the right, critical skills. One technology firm told us that it tracked a research scientist in India for 10 years and was able to hire the person when he was finally ready to consider moving companies.

These markets are also challenged by a limited talent pool (e.g., limits in language capability). As these markets grow, the competition for talent has become fierce. For years, Western MNCs were an employer of choice compared to their local MNC counterparts. Over the past 5 years, they have lost this advantage. Asian MNCs often attract mid- and senior-level leaders with the opportunity to lead a business in their home country. Increasingly, they offer more interesting work, more autonomy (fewer hierarchical structures), and greater opportunity for advancement within one country. Western MNCs who take care to define a locally relevant employee value proposition (i.e., a proposition that is valuable and competitive in the context of a local labor market), communicate this, and act on it are better able to retain the talent.

These limited talent pools also have resulted in increasing expectations for promotions. Employees in India and China have the highest levels of job hopping in the world, and most of this is driven by the need to show success. We know many HR leaders who have received calls by concerned parents over the advancement of their child in the company. MNCs that are successful in managing this often adapt their compensation systems to show advancement in pay and in title. The most successful companies also take risks on their employees, promoting managers to much more senior positions than their counterparts in slower growth markets.

This rapid promotion creates its own challenges. Many employees are promoted faster than they are ready, or their jobs outpace their own development. Companies address this issue in part by investing more in employee development. This includes creating core management training programs suited to the needs of the emerging market. In addition to core management training and high potential development, some companies have adapted their organizational structure to address this challenge. Although most Western MNCs have gone through decades of delayering and increasing spans of control, a smaller number of companies offer smaller spans of control as a way to help new supervisors learn how to lead before they manage a team of 10 or 14. They also are more likely to add a level of hierarchy to help develop leaders. Western MNCs who think of organizational hierarchy purely as a cost and inhibitor of performance disadvantage themselves in these markets.

Not all practices need to be modified for emerging markets. Good people management skills are important everywhere. Strong interview and selection practices are important. Although some modifications may be required, many talent management practices will work in emerging markets.

Some of the best practices we have seen for designing relevant talent management processes include:

- Creating a local strategy for use in emerging markets to ensure that regional or global strategies are adapted to local needs
- Segmenting markets globally and applying different HR practices in high-growth markets versus those that are growing more slowly
- Allowing greater flexibility in emerging markets to ensure that HR practices can compete with local company practices
• Allowing greater flexibility in organizational structure (spans and layers) for companies that are growing rapidly

For I-O psychologists working in multinational corporations who want to attract, develop, and retain talent successfully in these markets, we offer the following advice in Table 1. Please feel free to use this as a cheat sheet for your own work.

See You Next Time!

We leave you with this parting thought: “I don’t think anyone now really understands the planetisation of mankind, really understands the new world order emerging through all this period of strain and pain and contradiction, so more than ever, we need to have an internal sense of navigation.” These words from William Irwin Thornton underscore the need for effective business practice in emerging markets. Sharing lessons learned from all cultures and taking best practices to new frontiers, we can strive for more integrated workforce strategies for improving the employee experience. Until next time, goodbye, zaijian and adios!

We NEED YOU AND YOUR INPUT! We are calling upon you, the global I-O community, to reach out and give us your thoughts on the next topic: local I-O communities of practice and their influence on professional development. Give us your insights from lessons learned in your practice. We are always looking for contributors, and we will be on the lookout. To provide any feedback or insights, please reach us by email at the following addresses: mo.wang@warrington.ufl.edu and alexander.alonso@shrm.org.
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Marcus W. Dickson  
Wayne State University

When I first started at Wayne State, back those many years ago, Psychology was housed in the College of Science (we have since merged our Colleges of Science and Liberal Arts). Back then, it was pretty clear that to the other departments, psychology was considered to be on the fringe of “science.” It was also pretty clear that to my departmental colleagues, I-O was considered to be on the fringe of psychology. So we I-O types were on the fringe of the fringe.

Today, though, psychology and I-O in particular are finding our way to the forefront of many conversations about the future of higher education. There’s a lot of discussion going on of late in state legislatures and governors’ mansions about undergraduate education at state colleges and universities, with a disconcertingly common theme of trying to influence the undergraduate curriculum to produce graduates who are more “job ready.” The New York Times, in discussing the goals of the Florida state legislature and governor, said “The message from Tallahassee could not be blunter: Give us engineers, scientists, health care specialists and technology experts. Do not worry so much about historians, philosophers, anthropologists and English majors” (Alvarez, 2012). The same article goes on:

To nudge students toward job-friendly degrees, the governor’s task force on higher education suggested recently that university tuition rates be frozen for three years for majors in “strategic areas,” which would vary depending on supply and demand. An undergraduate student would pay less for a degree in engineering or biotechnology — whose classes are among the most expensive for universities — than for a degree in history or psychology. State financing, which has dropped drastically in the past five years, would be expected to make up the tuition gap. (Alvarez, 2012, emphasis added)

These discussions are often couched in the context of what an undergraduate student should be expected to know—or be expected to be able to do—in order to be a contributing member of society. Another way of saying “be a contributing member of society” is “employed and paying taxes,” it seems. Indeed, in North Carolina, Gov. Pat McCrory has repeatedly argued that state funding levels for state community colleges and universities should be based on how well those schools succeed at placing their students in the job market.

“Right now, we pay based upon how many students you have, not on the results of how many jobs you’re getting people into,” McCrory said. “I’m looking at legislation right now—in fact, I just instructed my staff yesterday to go ahead and develop legislation—which would change the basic formula in how education money is given out to our universities and our community colleges. It’s not based on butts in seats but on how many of those butts can get jobs.” (Binker & Sims, 2013)

At my school as at many schools, Psychology is one of the most popular majors on campus. We have about 19,000 undergraduates, and about 1,100 of them are Psychology majors. We provide a substantial amount of tuition revenue to the university as our students take classes on the way to degree. The problem, of course, is that in many of the reported conversations with legislators and governors, psychology as a major is grouped in with other liberal arts majors that are presumed not to lead to students being easily employable. To some extent, that’s true—if the focus is on employment in the field that shares the name of the major. So while a recent graduate with an accounting major may be able to get an entry level job doing accounting, a recent graduate with a psychology major is typically not able to get an entry-level job doing psychology. So there is much ado about colleges and universities preparing students for the business world, along with questions about whether psychology does that (though the large numbers of students seeking psychology degrees suggests there may be other valuable reasons for considering it as a major).

So we know that there are lots of problems with these revised funding arguments (should we focus on graduates getting jobs within six months of graduation or on their career success five or more years post-graduation; liberal arts majors are touted as promoting critical thinking skills which is what most surveys of employers suggest employers want; etc.). But is it true that psychology is one of those degrees that states shouldn’t want to promote, and might even
want to charge more for? What does the APA have to say about it? Surely they are defending the psychology major.

On APA’s website, under the heading “Career choices with a Psychology Bachelor’s degree”, there is a 2009 article that starts this way:

Congratulations on your psychology degree! Now, what are you doing with it?

First, the bad news: If you’re hoping to get a psychology-related job, the odds aren’t in your favor. A 2003 survey by the National Science Foundation found that of the 122,800 people who graduated with BS degrees in psychology, less than 5 percent got jobs in the field.

Now, the good news: Employers of all stripes want and need your communication and interpersonal skills; your ability to collect, organize, analyze and interpret data; and, perhaps most important, your strong understanding of human behavior. As a result, many psychology majors find jobs managing human resource departments or working as recruiters, according the PayScale Salary Survey. (Martin, 2009)

When I read that, I was shocked. When APA talks about what you can do with a bachelor’s degree in psychology, they lead with I-O-related careers. And that led me to wonder if that could go even further: Do Psych majors who get a solid grounding in I-O have better employment and early career success than students who don’t? I’ll say right up front, I have no data on this but I have to suspect that it would be true.

I spent some time looking over the undergraduate curricula of several colleges and universities that have at least some I-O psychologists on the faculty, ranging from community colleges to Research I doctoral training programs. I was looking to see what sorts of courses were offered in what could be considered I-O psychology (i.e., not Statistics, even though lots of I-O faculty teach Statistics; not research methods because that is common across all areas of psychology; etc.). At many schools, there was one course in I-O: the standard “Intro to I-O Psychology” under a variety of names. In some cases, the same introductory content was covered in two courses: one “I” and one “O.” Occasionally there were some stray single courses on the books that clearly were linked to specific faculty members there, like a course in work motivation at a small college where the I-O person on faculty specializes in that area.

But in a few places, there was an extensive set of offerings of undergraduate courses in I-O topics. The broadest set of offerings I found in my very nonscientific search was six I-O related courses, including a 2-semester Intro I-O sequence, work motivation, leadership, personnel selection, and occupational health psychology. There are some schools with pretty impressive offerings of I-O-related undergraduate courses, and I have to suspect that undergraduate psychology majors who graduate having chosen to take personnel selection, leadership, occupational health psychology, work motivation, and similar courses are better prepared for the non-psychology-as-a-career workforce than those who haven’t taken such courses.

This brings me full circle to the idea that started this column. Right now, psychology is often lumped in with other liberal arts degrees that are presumed to be less desirable and valuable by some state legislatures and governors. However, it seems likely that we in I-O have the capacity, either now or with a few additional courses added to our curricula, to counter that argument, at least for a portion of our students. And in doing so, do we become more or less “fringe” in our departments?

I am eager to make use of the new all-digital format for TIP, and so I would welcome your comments on the my.SIOP forums. I’ll be happy to join in the conversation, as well! I am, as always, available to continue the discussion at marcus.dickson@wayne.edu.
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Dear Hugo

Paul M. Muchinsky*  
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Dear Hugo,

It’s been about 100 years since you left us in 1916. I thought I would fill you in on what you missed. I really don’t know where to begin. Don’t worry, not everything has changed. The professors in the basic areas of psychology still think they are better than us, and we still haven’t found negative variance. It had been a long 8 years for you since the Chicago Cubs last won the World Series. Now it’s up to 105 years since those poor bastards have tasted champagne.

Remember one day in 1915 you skipped class at Harvard and went to Fenway Park to see that exciting rookie pitcher of the Red Sox, Babe Ruth? I’m surprised the ball park was big enough to hold both of you. He went on to become the founder of modern baseball, and you went on to be recognized as the founder of industrial psychology. That’s right, Hugo. You are credited with establishing the field of industrial psychology! Remember Lillian Moller? She got married and her name became Lillian Moller Gilbreth. About 60 years after you, industrial married organizational. The field is now called industrial-organizational psychology.

We’ve made some real progress since your time. Remember how honked off you would get when your validity coefficients rarely got much above .40? We still have that same problem today, but we found a way to make ourselves feel smugly content using something called a correction formula. I’d tell you it is like putting validity coefficients on steroids, but you wouldn’t know what I meant. So I’ll say it is like sticking them in fertilizer and watching them grow. Sometimes they grow to be in excess of 1.00! Nobody seems to mind very much. But you have to hold your nose when you interpret them, if you catch my drift.

Remember the time you and Henry Ford were in that saloon when a water main broke outside the front door? Henry told everyone to leave through the back door. We now study that stuff. It’s called directive leadership. Then Henry saddled up to the bar, saying now there would be more beer for just the two of you. We study that stuff too. It’s called Machiavellianism.

This should make you feel real good. Remember that terrific meal your mother used to make? She called it Bavarian goulash. She would empty the cupboards and ice box, placing everything in a big bowl. She would mix it all up, adding a little of this and a little of that. Then she would make a few adjustments. She used to say if you really knew how to work it, you could fashion just about any result you wanted. Her resulting Bavarian goulash impressed everyone, although no one really understood what all was in it, or what exactly she did to make it turn out that way. Hugo, we are still following your mother’s recipe today! That’s right, except we no longer call it Bavarian goulash. Now it’s called meta-analysis.

Remember that time you caught your lab assistant goofing off, and you gave him a swift kick in the keister? We now study that, and call it the behavioral approach to motivation. Then you told him if he ever goofed off again, the only job he could ever get was shoveling shinola in Southie. We now study that too, and call it the cognitive approach to motivation. We now also study how supervisors like you respond when they are stuck with an employee like him. We call it bullying.

Remember how Yale would always kick Harvard’s ass in football? Nobody could figure out why. It turns out the Yale football coach was decades ahead of his time. He gave a test of intelligence to every Yale student and selected the people with the 12 highest test scores. The top 11 became starters, and one more made the team as a back-up in case someone got a brain cramp. In the 1970s we concluded that all you need to perform any job was intelligence. But we wimped out by not calling it intelligence and started referring to it by a more socially palatable term, “general mental ability.” We even gave it a symbolized abbreviation, g. So why did Yale always beat Harvard in football? Because Yale outnerded Harvard, that’s why. In honor of the old Yale football coach, nowadays after a player scores a touchdown, he yells out, “g-whiz!”

* Fan mail may be sent to pmmuchin@uncg.edu

The Industrial Organizational Psychologist
You missed some really big events over the last 100 years: two world wars, nuclear energy, lunar landings, and disco. So far you've missed out on two miracles. One was the '69 Mets winning the World Series. The second was we discovered you could increase the estimated validity of a test by decreasing its reliability. I swear both happened. I don't know which is more amazing.

All the professors today teach with something called PowerPoint. Except me. I still use chalk, just like you did. They say I am a dinosaur, but you are my hero. Remember the time you attended that fancy dinner party at Teddy Roosevelt's house? You said you spent the evening hobnobbing with J. P. Morgan, John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, and the rest of the high society crowd. For some reason I fixated on that story. Quite frankly, I'm probably known more for it than anything else.

Well, I don't want to take up too much of your time. Maybe you are playing horseshoes with Walter Dill and Walter Van Dyke. That's another thing about you I admire. You only needed two names, a first and a last, to have people know you. Not like these pretentious types who need three and four names. Perhaps now you've met a guy who was known by only one name. Some people think he was divinely inspired. He called himself "Elvis."

Your devoted descendent,

Paul

P.S. Next time I will tell you all about "tweets," or as you would have called them, "tveets."
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Late spring and early summer are usually quiet when it comes to major EEO court rulings. We were preparing a column previewing Supreme Court rulings on two important affirmative action cases that are expected later in 2013. Then on May 14, the 2nd Circuit ruled in the latest version of US & Vulcan Society v. City of New York, et al. This case started as a traditional disparate impact testing scenario that we are used to seeing in the police and fire personnel selection realm but has transformed into something we haven’t seen before. We think that the chronology of rulings will be of interest to I-O psychologists for a variety of reasons. As a set they represent an interesting disparate impact case where the plaintiffs prevailed. However, the most important issue in this case from our perspective is whether it is valid to charge pattern or practice for knowingly using written tests that produce adverse impact and, are arguably, not valid. For now at least, a divided panel of the 2nd Circuit says no, and we will explain how and why.

Some Broader Context

This column has recently devoted a substantial amount of space to rulings related to differentiating pattern or practice and disparate impact theories of discrimination. In fact, in the last 2 years we reviewed a controversial ruling in Grant v. Metro (http://www.siop.org/tip/jan12/11gutman.aspx) and Kayo Sady wrote a guest commentary on the ruling in Chin v. Port Authority (http://www.siop.org/tip/Jan13/07_gutman.aspx).

In Grant v. Metro (2011), a class alleged both pattern or practice and disparate impact based on stock statistics that compared workforce representation at various levels. A divided three-judge panel of the 6th Circuit Court considered a number of issues, and most relevant for this column was differentiating applicant flow disparities stemming from a facially neutral process (which, in our opinion, is the probative issue for a prima facie case of disparate impact) from anecdotal evidence of discriminatory decision making coupled with disparities between minority and nonminority employees in different job categories (which, in our opinion, is the probative issue for a prima facie case of traditional class-wide disparate treatment).

In Chin v. Port Authority of New York & New Jersey (2012), the persuasiveness of a disparate impact claim was determined via the combination of disparities stemming from a facially neutral selection procedure and anecdotal evidence. The disparities were not statistically significant according to the “Two or Three Standard Deviation” criterion, yet the Second Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the prima facie case was made when statistics were combined with anecdotal evidence. As Kayo Sady noted in his insightful article, the introduction of anecdotal evidence is historically the domain of pattern or practice cases and not disparate impact cases, but the ruling would suggest that if statistical analyses are inconclusive, strong anecdotal evidence may meet requirements for a prima facie case under disparate impact theory. This was unexpected, and it appeared as if tangential anecdotal evidence functioned almost as a nonstatistical measure of practical significance supplementing any actual disparity analyses of the process being scrutinized.

Art recently summarized a third case related to this issue in an April 2013 blog. In Puffer v. Allstate Ins. Co., the 7th Circuit upheld a lower court ruling rejecting class certification on technical grounds originally for pattern or practice, whereas the claim on appeal was for disparate impact. It’s a little more complicated than that, but in rendering the ruling, Judge Flaum, speaking for her two counterparts on a three-judge panel, made some important points

For Art’s review of the case click here (http://ofccp.blogspot.com/2012/04/7th-circuit-makes-important-ruling-on.html).
relating to the role of the Supreme Court’s ruling in Dukes v. Wal-Mart in rejecting the original claim for class certification on the pattern or practice charge, and the distinction between pattern or practice and disparate impact theory. In Art’s view, this ruling was worth highlighting because Judge Flaum wrote an insightful ruling and correctly differentiated between the two theories of discrimination, which doesn’t always happen.

As you can see, controversy and confusion around differentiating pattern or practice from disparate impact is alive and well 25 years after the Supreme Court confused the issue in Wards Cove v. Atonio (1989). Both theories involve class-wide allegations of discrimination but differ with regard to employer intent and the legal scenarios that follow. However, US & Vulcan Society v. NYC seems to be tackling a different but related issue. Instead of asking whether it is pattern or practice or disparate impact scenario, this case seems to be asking whether a history of potential disparate impact can transform into intentional discrimination. In other words, does (a) knowing about and living with consistent and significant disparities over time coupled with (b) not being entirely confident in the job relatedness of the selection procedures producing those disparities result in intentional discrimination?

The next section of the article reviews the chronology of rulings in US & Vulcan Society v. NYC, with particular emphasis on the appeals court ruling from May 2013. The early rulings focused on traditional disparate impact issues, and although these are of interest to I-O psychologists, they don’t tread much new ground. The last two rulings considered when and whether a disparate impact claim can transform into something more egregious. The article concludes with a consideration of the consequences of transformation from disparate impact to pattern or practice, whether that notion could make sense in some situations, and potential implications for I-O psychologists.

**Early Rulings**

In Ruling I (US v. City of New York, 2009), the Department of Justice (DOJ) sued New York City for its use of entry-level firefighter exams because they adversely impacted Black and Hispanic applicants, and were not proven to be job-related and consistent with business necessity. This ruling occurred on July 22, 2009.

The DOJ sought "appropriate action to correct the present effects of its discriminatory policies and practices." The Vulcans and several named individuals were then permitted to intervene. They joined the DOJ charge on adverse impact, added a pattern or practice charge for Black applicants, and added to the list of defendants the NYC Citywide Administrative Services (DCAS) and two individuals in the official and personal capacities (Mayor Michael Bloomberg and then Fire Commissioner Nicholas Scoppetta). The DOJ did not join these latter claims. District Court Judge Nicholas G. Garoufis granted summary judgment on the adverse impact claim but permitted the City to continue to use one of the tests on an interim basis pending its validation.

Ruling II followed shortly thereafter when, on September 29, 2009 (US & Vulcans v. City of New York, 2010), Judge Garoufis deemed the test to be invalid in accordance with the 2nd Circuit precedent for content validity in Guardians v. CSC (1980).

There was little debate on whether the exams produced disparities against Blacks or Hispanics. Every test that had been administered in the last decade produced significant disparities. Plaintiffs also used utilization analyses to show that the representation of minorities in the firefighter workforce was very low compared to census data for the area and to representation of firefighters in other large metropolitan areas, which is a traditional pattern or practice analysis.

There was more debate regarding the content-oriented validity research around the tests. To assess the appropriateness of this research Judge Nicholas G. Garoufis applied the validity standards from Guardians, in which the following five prongs for content-oriented validity were expressed:

1. The test makers must have conducted a suitable job analysis;
2. They must have used reasonable competence in constructing the test itself;
3. The content of the test must be related to the content of the job;
4. The content of the test must be representative of the content of the job; and
5. There must be a scoring system that usefully selects from among the applicants those who can better perform the job.

---

For a review of this important case, readers should refer to the column reviewing Grant v. Metro here (http://www.siop.org/lp/jan12/11gutman.aspx).
For those of you interested in the appropriateness of content-oriented validity research, we think that the 2009 rulings are worth reading. Judge Garoufis found the job analysis to be suitable and noted that the city avoided common pitfalls from previous litigation like (a) not demonstrating any relationship between abilities and tasks, and (b) not measuring only tasks and abilities that could be learned on the job. However, that was the only Guardians prong that Judge Garoufis ruled had been met. He noted that the test was not constructed in a competent way because firefighters were too heavily involved in item writing and SME review occurred too late for revisions to be made. He also found that the test content was not relevant to job content for a variety of reasons. One involved a literal interpretation of the Uniform Guidelines (1978) section on the appropriateness of content-oriented validation for certain worker characteristics. He noted that content validation is an inappropriate validation strategy if the exam seeks to measure internal, unobservable mental traits (in this case flexibility of closure, speed of closure, and problem sensitivity, as well as personality characteristics like integrity, adaptability, tenacity, work standards, and resilience).

We note that this Uniform Guidelines notion of content-oriented methods being inappropriate for abstract concepts (a) is controversial, (b) is inconsistent with contemporary professional theory and practice, and (c) has been ignored in much recent case law (see Gutman & Dunleavy, 2012 for review). Regardless, Judge Garoufis found this issue to be probative and also noted issues with factor and reliability analyses associated with the test as they related to prong 3. Given failure to meet prongs 2 and 3, prongs 4 and 5 were non-issues, but Judge Garoufis took the time to note that neither prong would be met even if they mattered. Perhaps the most obvious problem surrounded the test cut score, which was arbitrarily set at 70% because that is what is required in civil service rules.

Later Rulings

Ruling III occurred on January 13, 2010, when Judge Garoufis authored a ruling in which he granted summary judgment on the Vulcan's charge of pattern or practice but denied the charges relating to the added defendants. On the latter and more important issue (for our purposes), Judge Garoufis inferred from statistical evidence that the City's examination policy denied appointments to 144 Black applicants and that 112 Black applicants were denied approximately 34 year's worth of wages they would have received absent the policy. Judge Garoufis also credited "historical, anecdotal, and testimonial evidence showing that intentional discrimination was the city's standard operating procedure."

This was the game changer in the sense that the discrimination had transformed from unintentional disparate impact from tests to intentional discrimination. The disparities and validity evidence hadn't changed from Ruling II to Ruling III. What had changed was a more holistic approach to the story, which, coupled with the disparate impact ruling, created a pattern or practice of discrimination in the eyes of Judge Garoufis.

That brings us to Ruling IV, the 2nd Circuit's divided decision on May 14, 2013. The most important aspect of the Act III ruling by Judge Garoufis is that the defendants failed to successfully rebut statistical evidence presented by the Vulcans as it relates to the pattern or practice claim. It is on this issue, and this issue alone, that the 2nd Circuit was divided.

The two majority judges (Newman and Winter) opined that pattern or practice lawsuits (most notably the landmark ruling in International Brotherhood of Teamsters v. United States) follow the same rules as individual disparate treatment claims such that prima facie evidence of intentional discrimination requires the defendant to merely offer a nondiscriminatory reason for the challenged action, forcing the plaintiffs to prove that the explanation offered is a pretext for discrimination. The prima facie and defense burdens are considered lighter burdens of "production" leaving the pretext phase as the only one with a heavier burden of "proof." Or as stated by Judge Newman (writing for Judge Winter):

A central issue in the pending case is what showing an employer must make to satisfy its burden of production in a pattern or practice case. In Teamsters the Supreme Court stated that the employer's burden was "to defeat the prima facie showing of a pattern or practice by demonstrating that the Government's proof is either inaccurate or insignificant." The emphasized words raise a question as to whether the Supreme Court thought the employer's rebuttal evidence must be directed at the statistics that often constitute the prima facie case of discrimination or simply at the rebuttable presumption of discrimination that arises from those statistics.

In plain English, the question here is whether the defendant's burden of production (a) must directly rebut the plaintiff's statistics or (b) simply offer an explanation independent of the statistics that is nondiscriminatory. Judge Newman ruled
that the defendant is free to rebut the statistics (a much weightier task, particularly in this case), but does not have to do so. Then Judge Newman proceeded to explain why the city met its burden of production. Accordingly:

The City produced evidence attempting to rebut the inference that it had acted with a discriminatory intent. It articulated a nondiscriminatory reason for using the challenged exams—the fact that they were facially neutral. The City also relied on its contention that the exams had been prepared in an attempt to comply with “acceptable test development methods.”

In this scenario it was acceptable for the city to recognize that the tests, which are a facially neutral process, produced adverse impact, as long as they didn’t go into it with that expectation. As long as there was no intent to create a facially neutral selection procedure for the purpose of adverse impact against certain groups, then the test being facially neutral insulates the user from a pattern or practice allegation.

Judge Pooler dissented for several reasons. The gist of Judge Pooler’s arguments are (a) pattern or practices and individual disparate treatment scenarios are not the same; (b) the pattern or practice charge virtually demands direct statistical proof; and (c) the defendants were required to directly rebut the statistical evidence (and not simply offer a nondiscriminatory explanation). Or in her own words:

Rather than responding to the statistical evidence, the City only "argued that the Intervenors ha[d] not proved that the City harbored a subjective intent to discriminate against black applicants." In essence, the City ignored the inevitable conclusion of the statistics and tried to focus on intent. But, "[a]t this stage, lack of direct proof regarding the employer’s mental state is simply immaterial to the question of whether the City can rebut the presumption of unlawful discrimination created by the Intervenors’ prima facie showing." Despite the City’s correct assertion that what “actually motivate[s] the employer’s decision” is relevant departure from the Teamsters framework is "fatal" where the motivation did not address the statistical evidence.

This does not end the case; it merely reverses Judge Garoufis’ summary judgment relating to pattern or practice. From here, one of two things may happen. Divided three-panel rulings can lead to an en banc ruling by all available 2nd Circuit judges. Absent that, the case would go to trial, and whatever ruling occurs there will undoubtedly lead to an appeal to the Supreme Court. Judge Newman noted that, in view of some of the acerbic statements (e.g., that the City’s rebuttal evidence was “either incredible or inapposite”), the City won on its appeal to have Judge Garoufis disqualified to try the next phase of the case. Stay tuned.

Intentional Discrimination by Way of Disparate Impact

We think it is worth considering whether intentional discrimination by way of disparate impact makes sense. On a more general level, of course it can make sense. For example, after the 15th Amendment guaranteed former slaves the right to vote, White landowners used facially neutral criteria to limit this right (e.g., own land, read and write, pay poll taxes). It is hard to imagine lack of intent in that scenario. Even in Griggs v. Duke Power (1971), the case that started the disparate impact ball rolling, it is arguable that the defendant instituted certain requirements (e.g., high school diploma, passing scores on cognitive tests) because they knew those requirements would reduce Black participation in the hiring and promotion processes. There may also be scenarios where a selection process was intended to be facially neutral yet becomes a pattern or practice because it isn’t used in a way that is actually facially neutral. For example, administering a physical test to women but not to men or a writing sample to certain racial/ethnic minority groups but not to nonminorities are examples of how selection procedure use may result in patterns of intentional discrimination.

One other point is worth noting. From an outcomes perspective, the implications of a disparate impact claim transforming into a pattern or practice claim are meaningful. Pattern or practice claims of intentional discrimination may result in compensatory (i.e., for pain and suffering) and/or punitive (i.e., punishment for violations that are with malice or reckless indifference) damages, which are not available under a disparate impact theory of unintentional discrimination. In addition, many organizations have liability insurance that may cover damages associated with a disparate impact ruling against them but usually do not cover scenarios of intentional discrimination. Further, from an organizational image perspective, there are obvious differences between allegations of class-wide intentional discrimination as compared with allegations of using a selection procedure that produces disparities and is not job related.
Conclusion

At the end of the day the take home message of this case is an intuitive one. NYC simply needed to articulate that a test was facially neutral as the response to a pattern or practice allegation (a lighter burden) and didn’t necessarily need to rebut statistical disparities (a heavier burden) associated with that allegation. In other words, the fact that a selection procedure was facially neutral was the insulation against the pattern or practice allegation related to test use. Even if there was clear evidence that NYC knew they would lose a disparate impact allegation and continued to use the same selection process, it would appear that there needs to be additional evidence suggesting that the racial composition stemming from that process was what the city wanted (i.e., intent) in order for there to be a pattern or practice of discrimination. On a practical note, even if this ruling was reversed and the use of a potentially discriminatory test over time could mature into a pattern or practice of discrimination, we suggest that doing rigorous validation research before or during implementation and using that system in a facially neutral way decreases the likelihood that either form of discrimination happens.

For those of you that work in or with federal contractors, recall that pattern or practice allegations related to employee hiring still account for around 90% of the financial remedies OFCCP obtains in settlements for alleged victims of discrimination. These scenarios often have a different flavor relative to Title VII allegations (much to Art’s aversion), primarily because they are usually based on applicant flow disparities of unstructured and highly subjective hiring processes. In these cases, OFCCP often alleges intentional discrimination because processes are not facially neutral due to the lack of structure. This scenario leaves the door open for a pattern or practice allegation that protected group status could be used in deciding who to hire and who not to hire. Using a structured selection system that is facially neutral and consistently administered removes the pattern or practice allegation from the equation because by definition that process is facially neutral and not based on protected group status. Again, this approach may be the safest way to mitigate risk and ensure that employee hiring is conducted in legally defensible ways, regardless of which form of discrimination may be alleged. Communicating this message to compliance and legal professionals is important.

The potential role of ambiguous historical context in discrimination cases would also seem to support HR risk management strategies (in addition to validation research) that I-O psychologists are in position to implement effectively. For example, objective and proactive risk audits assessing disparities stemming from selection procedures and the quality and persuasiveness of evidence associated with those procedures would seem to be of value, particularly if informed decisions can be made based on these audits. We suggest that organizations seriously consider these types of audits (even if they function primarily as a form of knowledge management to eventually inform on the historical context) as we all navigate through the complex maze of equal employment opportunity compliance.

References and Cases Cited

Chin v. Port Authority of New York & New Jersey (2012) 685 F.3d 135 (2d Cir.).
Guardians v. CSC (1980) [630 F.2d 79].
International Brotherhood of Teamsters v. United States [431 U.S. 324].
In recent years there have been numerous discussions about where SIOP members are physically located in the U.S. in order to make various decisions in SIOP, such as where to hold the annual conference and the LEC. We analyzed available membership data to identify the geographic locations of all professional members. This article is based on the 2011 membership data and focuses on SIOP professional members located in the U.S.

All U.S. Professional Members

We were interested in identifying the geographic locations for all SIOP professional members (as listed on their 2011 membership application forms). All U.S. based professional members are plotted on a U.S. map in Figure 1.

The visual overview presented in Figure 1 suggests that a heavy majority of the professional members are located in the Eastern half of the U.S. with a few member groups in Colorado and along the West Coast. The Northeast region in particular has a heavy concentration of members (along the Washington, DC–Philadelphia–New York–Boston corridor). The Midwest, home to many industrial-organizational psychology graduate programs also has a large number of members.

The top-20 Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), the top-20 states, and the top-20 cities for SIOP members are listed in Table 1.
The rank orders of the MSAs in general are probably what we might expect and often reflect the general population size of various urban areas. Table 1 points out that a large number of our professional members ($n = 539$) are located in nonmetropolitan areas.

### Table 1

**Rank Orders of the Geographic Locations of All Full SIOP Members in the US**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)</th>
<th># of Members</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th># of Members</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th># of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-Metropolitan</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV MSA</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>New York-Newark-Jersey City, NY-NJ-PA MSA</td>
<td>218**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chicago-Naperville-Elgin, IL-IN-WI MSA</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Roswell, GA MSA</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI MSA</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Arlington (VA)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX MSA</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Alexandria (VA)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA MSA</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Washington (DC)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Houston-The Woodlands-Sugar Land, TX MSA</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD MSA</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA MSA</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO-IL MSA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Detroit-Warren-Dearborn, MI MSA</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA MSA</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fairfax</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA MSA</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Boston-Cambridge-Newton, MA-NH MSA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>San Diego-Carlsbad, CA MSA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>East Lansing (OR)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Charlotte-Concord-Gastonia, NC-SC MSA</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Portland (OR)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Orlando-Kissimmee-Sanford, FL MSA</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Bridgeville (PA)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Miami-Fort Lauderdale-West Palm Beach, FL MSA</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on the 2011 SIOP professional membership, only the top 20 ranked locations are included.

** When the NY/NJ/PA MSA is combined with the lower CT MSA, the # of members goes to 243.

### Metropolitan Statistical Areas

The rank orders of the MSAs in general are probably what we might expect and often reflect the general population size of various urban areas.

Table 1 points out that a large number of our professional members ($n = 539$) are located in nonmetropolitan areas.
areas. It turns out that 68% of these nonmetropolitan area members (n = 368) are academics, who are likely to be located in university/college towns. The first two ranked MSAs are probably not a surprise to anyone. The Washington, DC MSA and New York MSA (when the lower CT MSA is included) are virtually tied (247 vs. 243), however the Washington DC MSA has a much larger group of researchers than the New York MSA (69 vs. 5), whereas New York MSA has twice as many members in organizations (75 vs. 36).

What may be more surprising to some readers is the substantial number of professional members in the MSAs of Minneapolis (MSA n = 95), Pittsburgh (MSA n = 53), St. Louis (MSA n = 50), and Seattle (MSA n = 45). These cities have significant I-O psychology graduate schools, consulting firms, and/or business organizations that employ numerous members. It is a wonder why SIOP has ignored these cities as conference locations (surely hotel challenges could be overcome) and instead chosen urban areas with few SIOP members, such as Richmond (MSA n = 15), Charleston, SC (MSA n = 3), New Orleans (MSA n = 12), Honolulu (MSA n = 4), and Louisville (MSA n = 11).

It is worth noting some major MSAs that are not included in the top-20 rankings, such as Nashville (MSA n = 12), Indianapolis (MSA n = 13), Phoenix (MSA n = 17), San Jose (MSA n = 12), and Denver (MSA n = 21)

**States**

The top five ranked states for membership (CA, TX, VA, NY, IL) are clustered close together in number of members. For anyone familiar with our profession it is not surprising to see them at the top of the rankings. What may be unexpected is that Florida and Georgia are next in the rankings, as opposed to the four Midwest states that follow them. Florida has a large number of academic members (n = 64, 42% of the FL members), whereas Georgia has a large number of members in consulting (n = 71, 48% of the GA members) and in organizations (n = 42, 27% of the GA members).

Four states have over 200 professional members each and 12 states have over 100 members each. A few states only have one or two members (WY, MT, WV, VT, SD, ND). Hawaii, the site of next year’s annual conference, has only five members, but Houston, the site of this year’s annual conference, has 72 members in the MSA and 202 members in the state of Texas.

**Cities**

When reviewing the city rankings it is helpful to keep in mind that only members who provide addresses within the city limits are included. For some metropolitan areas many members are likely to live in suburbs outside the city limits.

Most of the cities listed in the top-20 rankings are known centers of I-O psychology (either for graduate schools [such as East Lansing], well known consulting firms [such as Pittsburgh], or large corporations [such as Seattle]). What is notable are the very high rankings for the cities of Minneapolis (#3), Pittsburgh (#9), and Seattle (#15); these are cities that SIOP has not used for conferences or meetings, although many of us know I-O psychologists in each of these cities. It is worth noting the cluster of four ranked cities near Washington DC: Arlington (#6), Alexandria (#7), Washington, DC (#8), and Fairfax (#14). This cluster may primarily reflect the large number of researchers located in this geographic area.

**Consultant Members**

As we have discussed in previous columns SIOP members were categorized into four employment categories based on 2011 member self-report data (Silzer & Parson, 2011):

- **Consultants:** 30.3% of professional members; in consulting firms and nonresearch consulting positions
- **Organization-based professionals:** 19.0% of professional members; in organizations and in government positions with a practice focus
- **Academics:** 43.5% of professional members; in universities and colleges
- **Researchers:** 5.1% of professional members; in research consulting firms & government research positions

We identified the geographic locations for SIOP professional members in each of these four employment categories. Figure 2 shows the geographic locations of professional members who are in consulting.
The U.S. map in Figure 2 shows a concentration of consultant members in the Eastern half of the U.S., particularly along the Eastern seaboard. They are also most likely to be located in and around metropolitan areas where their organizational clients are based. They are much less likely than academics to be based in nonmetropolitan areas. Table 2 lists the top-20 Metropolitan Statistical Areas, the top-20 states and the top-20 cities for SIOP members who are consultants (nonresearch).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)</th>
<th># of Members</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th># of Members</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City (VA)</th>
<th># of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV MSA</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Non-Metropolitan</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>New York-Newark-Jersey City, NY-NJ-PA MSA</td>
<td>78**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Roswell, GA MSA</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI MSA</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alexandria (VA)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chicago-Naperville-Elgin, IL-IN-WI MSA</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Metropolitan Statistical Areas

Again the Washington DC MSA (MSA \( n = 97 \)) and New York MSA (MSA \( n = 94 \); includes the lower CT MSA) are ranked at the top of the list with the most members in consulting compared to other MSAs. Minneapolis has a surprisingly large number of consultant members (MSA \( n = 54 \)), perhaps because of several notable consulting firms that are based there. This is probably also true for Pittsburgh (MSA \( n = 35 \)). The Atlanta MSA (MSA \( n = 70 \)) also has a surprisingly large number of consultant members.

Many large MSAs have few consultant members such as New Orleans (MSA \( n = 3 \)), San Jose (MSA \( n = 4 \)), Kansas City (MSA \( n = 5 \)), Phoenix (MSA \( n = 8 \)), and Philadelphia (MSA \( n = 10 \)). The small number of consultant members in these large cities may suggest business opportunities for SIOP members.

States

Many of the top ranked states are not surprises, just based on the size of the states. Again, Georgia \( (n = 71) \) and Minnesota \( (n = 54) \) may be unexpected, given the size of those states. Both, however, have well known I-O psychology graduate programs that support consulting careers, and both have large companies and regional business offices located in the state that hire local I-O consultants.

Some large states that have few consultant members include Arizona \( (n = 13) \), Wisconsin \( (n = 10) \), Oregon \( (n = 4) \), and Massachusetts \( (n = 12) \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA MSA</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX MSA</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA MSA</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Houston-The Woodlands-Sugar Land, TX MSA</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA MSA</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Detroit-Warren-Dearborn, MI MSA</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO-IL MSA</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT MSA</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA MSA</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>San Diego-Carlsbad, CA MSA</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL MSA</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Miami-Fort Lauderdale-West Palm Beach, FL MSA</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Boston-Cambridge-Newton, MA-NH MSA</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cleveland-Elyria, OH MSA</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on 2011 SIOP professional membership, only top 20 ranked locations are included.
** When the NY/NJ/PA MSA is combined with the lower CT MSA, the # of members goes to 94.
Cities

It is surprising that there are more consultant members living in the city of Atlanta \((n = 38)\) than in New York City \((n = 34)\). Perhaps Atlanta is a more livable city, whereas members in the New York region tend to live outside the city and commute into the city for work. Again Minneapolis and cities in the Washington DC area are hotbeds of consultants. Some large cities have few I-O consultants in the city limits, such as Los Angeles \((n = 7)\), San Francisco \((n = 6)\), Orlando \((n = 4)\), Seattle \((n = 4)\), and Philadelphia \((n = 0)\).

Members in Organizations

SIOP members who work in organizations and in government positions with a practice focus are identified on the U.S. map in Figure 3.

![Figure 3. Location of all full SIOP members employed in organizations in the United States.](map.png)

The SIOP members in organizations are frequently based at an organization’s headquarters, which often is located in a metropolitan area. Based on Figure 3, it seems that most of these members are located in the eastern half of the U.S and seem concentrated in urban areas. The top-20 Metropolitan Statistical Areas, the top-20 states, and the top-20 cities for SIOP members who are working in organizations are listed in Table 3.
### Table 3
*Rank Orders of the Geographic Employment Locations of Full SIOP Members Employed in Organizations in the US*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)</th>
<th># of Members</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th># of Members</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th># of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New York-Newark-Jersey City, NY-NJ-PA MSA</td>
<td>68**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Non-Metropolitan</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Roswell, GA MSA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV MSA</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chicago-Naperville-Elgin, IL-IN-WI MSA</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX MSA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA MSA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI MSA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Charlotte-Concord-Gastonia, NC-SC MSA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Houston-The Woodlands-Sugar Land, TX MSA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>San Francisco-Oakland-Hayward, CA MSA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA MSA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Frisco (TX)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Detroit-Warren-Dearborn, MI MSA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Washington (DC)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO-IL MSA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>San Diego-Carlsbad, CA MSA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Orlando-Kissimmee-Sanford, FL MSA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Marietta</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL MSA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Memphis, TN-MS-AR MSA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD MSA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Roswell (GA)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Baltimore-Columbia-Towson, MD MSA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT MSA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC MSA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Alexandria (VA)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN MSA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Englewood (CO)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Denver-Aurora-Lakewood, CO MSA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Round Rock</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on 2011 SIOP professional membership, only top 20 ranked locations are included.
** When NY/NJ/PA MSA is combined with lower CT MSA, the # of members goes to 75.
Based on Table 3, the New York MSA \((n = 75)\) with the lower CT MSA) has about twice the number of SIOP members in organizations as any other MSA. This is likely due to the large number of corporations based in NY, NJ, and lower CT. As might be expected the larger states (especially those with more business corporations) have more SIOP members in organizations than smaller states. Some midsize MSAs, such as Seattle (MSA \(n = 21\)) and Minneapolis (MSA \(n = 20\)), have more members in organizations than larger cities such as Philadelphia (MSA \(n = 7\)), Los Angeles (MSA \(n = 14\)), and Miami (MSA \(n = 5\)).

Generally larger states have more members who are in organizations than other states. States that have numerous corporate headquarters also are among the top-20 states, such as CT, MN, NJ, MD, and GA.

Some ranked cities seem clearly linked to one or more local business corporations, such as Purchase, NY \((n = 5)\), and Round Rock, TX \((n = 4)\).

Academic Members

SIOP members who work in academic positions are identified on the U.S. map in Figure 4.

Based on Figure 4 it appears that academic members are more dispersed across the country than other employment groups, although still primarily based in the Eastern half of the U.S. For those of you familiar with academic members’ affiliations, you can almost pick out the college towns where they are located.

Table 4 lists the top-20 Metropolitan Statistical Areas, the top-20 states and the top-20 cities where SIOP academic members are located.
Table 4
Rank Orders of the Geographic Employment Locations of Full SIOP Members Employed as Academics in the US

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Geographic Employment Location</th>
<th># of Members</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th># of Members</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th># of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-Metropolitan</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>New York-Newark-Jersey City, NY-NJ-PA MSA</td>
<td>67**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chicago-Naperville-Elgin, IL-IN-WI MSA</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV MSA</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>East Lansing</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD MSA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Houston-The Woodlands-Sugar Land, TX MSA</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>College Station</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA MSA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fairfax</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI MSA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO-IL MSA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>College Park</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Roswell, GA MSA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Boston-Cambridge-Newton, MA-NH MSA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Portland (OR)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Portland-Vancouver-Hillsboro, OR-WA MSA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX MSA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Bowling Green</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Detroit-Warren-Dearborn, MI MSA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Miami-Fort Lauderdale-West Palm Beach, FL MSA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Athens (GA)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Orlando-Kissimmee-Sanford, FL MSA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Champaign</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>San Diego-Carlsbad, CA MSA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>West Lafayette (IN)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cleveland-Elyria, OH MSA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Columbus (OH)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Dayton, OH MSA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ithaca</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT MSA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Akron, OH MSA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Murfreesboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on 2011 SIOP professional membership, only top 20 ranked locations are included.
** When NY/NJ/PA MSA is combined with lower CT MSA, the # of members goes to 69.
As might be expected a very large number of academic members are located in nonmetropolitan areas: small college and university towns. As expected the larger MSAs have more academic members—New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Houston—than smaller MSAs. However there are concentrations of academic members in some mid sized MSAs, such as Minneapolis (MSA $n = 21$), St. Louis (MSA $n = 21$), Portland (MSA $n = 17$), Detroit (MSA $n = 16$), Cleveland (MSA $n = 15$), and Orlando (MSA $n = 15$). Some notable MSAs with fewer academic members include Phoenix (MSA $n = 6$), San Jose (MSA $n = 4$), Denver (MSA $n = 6$), Baltimore (MSA (7), and New Orleans (MSA $n = 7$).

As we would expect, larger states have more academic members than smaller states. The state rankings are not as heavily dominated by Midwest states as they might have been in the past. More southern states are now in the top-20 states, such as Florida (MSA $n = 64$), Virginia (MSA $n = 46$), North Carolina (MSA $n = 41$), and Georgia (MSA $n = 33$).

The city rankings seem to reflect specific well known universities and colleges such as East Lansing, MI; Athens, GA; College Park, MD; and College Station, PA.

**Researcher Members**

SIOP members who work in research consulting firms and government research positions are included in the researcher employment category. Figure 5 represents the locations of these members on a U.S. map.

![Map of U.S. showing locations of researcher members.](image)

*Based on the 2011 SIOP professional membership.*

*Figure 5. Location of all full SIOP members employed as researchers in the United States.*

There are far fewer members in this employment category than the other categories, and they are typically located in government facilities or in the offices of research firms, such as in the Washington DC area. Table 5 provides the rank orders of the Metropolitan Statistical Areas, states, and cities where at least two researcher members are located.
Table 5

Rank Orders of the Geographic Employment Locations of Full SIOP Members Employed as Researchers in the US

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)</th>
<th># of Members</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th># of Members</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City</th>
<th># of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV MSA</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arlington (VA)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Non-Metropolitan</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alexandria (VA)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>New York-Newark-Jersey City, NY-NJ-PA MSA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Falls Church</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Houston-The Woodlands-Sugar Land, TX MSA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Washington (DC)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Baltimore-Columbia-Towson, MD MSA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Annandale</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kansas City, MO-KS MSA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cincinnati, OH-KY-IN MSA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dayton, OH MSA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sacramento-Roseville-Arden-Arcade, CA MSA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rockville (MD)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Knoxville, TN MSA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Oklahoma City, OK MSA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Roswell, GA MSA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Silver Spring (MD)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA MSA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Miami-Fort Lauderdale-West Palm Beach, FL MSA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pensacola</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Orlando-Kissimmee-Sanford, FL MSA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington, PA-NJ-DE-MD MSA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Colorado Springs, CO MSA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Bethesda</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC MSA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fairfax</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>San Antonio-New Braunfels, TX MSA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Vienna (VA)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on 2011 SIOP professional membership, only geographic areas with at least two researchers were included.
As might be expected a sizable group of researchers are located in the Washington DC area (MSA \( n = 69 \)) because for many of them their primary clients are in the federal government. The rest are dispersed across the U.S. Their concentration in the Washington DC area is also reflected in the state and city rankings.

**Conclusions**

Based on this data there are a few evident conclusions:

- Most SIOP members are located in the Eastern half of the US, with particular concentrations along the Northeast Corridor, in the New York MSA and Washington DC MSA, and in some larger cities.
- Some moderate sized MSAs have substantial numbers of members, including Minneapolis, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and Seattle.
- Generally larger states have more members; Florida and Georgia also rank high on the number of SIOP members in each state.
- Some large states and MSAs have a relatively small number of SIOP members.
- In addition to the New York MSA and the Washington DC MSA, there are substantial numbers of I-O consultants located in the Atlanta MSA, Minneapolis MSA, and the Chicago MSA.
- Members in organizations are concentrated in the New York MSA and larger states with numerous corporate headquarters.
- Academic members are primarily located in nonmetropolitan areas, probably in smaller university towns.
- Researchers are heavily concentrated in the Washington DC MSA, probably because many of their federal government clients are located there.

So how can this information be used?

- SIOP can use this information to make wiser decisions about where to hold annual conferences and LECs in order to go where SIOP members are located.
- SIOP can make critical decisions on initiatives, services, and funding in order to better serve the most members where they are located. One example is to focus licensing efforts on those states and MSAs with greater numbers of consultants and members in organizations.
- SIOP Executive Board can better monitor member trends in geographic locations and see the membership across the entire U.S. and not just favor traditional geographic locations or personal geographic preferences and whims.
- Members can see the number of like-minded I-O psychology professionals in their geographic area and then work to build and leverage a local professional network.
- Members can see what geographic areas may be underserved and look for business opportunities in those areas.
- Members and graduate students can find geographic areas with many SIOP members, which may offer the most promising job opportunities.

We recommend that SIOP complete this geographic analysis every 5 to 10 years in order to monitor changes in member locations and to provide better services to all SIOP members.

**Reference**

The Top Ten Things We Wished We Knew Before Graduate School

The University of Akron TIP-TOPics Team

When we began this column 2 years ago, we were first, second, and third year students, uncertain about how our futures would unfold as we marched onwards through graduate school and into the “real world.” Now, here we are writing our final column! We have learned much in the past 2 years. During that time, many of us gained valuable experience working as interns at local and national corporations. Others experienced the rewards that come from teaching others about the wonders of psychology. And for all of us there have been momentous experiences that occurred both in our academic lives and outside of them. These experiences range from passing comprehensive exams to defending dissertations, and from engagements to be married to the birth of a child. As we pass on the TIP-TOPics torch, we find ourselves thinking back to the very beginning of our graduate school journey. We pondered what we wished we had known when we started as graduate students at The University of Akron and decided for this last TIP-TOPics column to each leave the reader with a piece of our best advice, as well as to provide a glimpse of what lies in store for each of us in the years ahead.

1. Begin preparing for comprehensive exams very early.
   “Although comprehensive exams vary from school to school in structure and content, my understanding is that they are something of a harrowing experience everywhere. The other thing they have in common is that the earlier you start preparing, the better. I didn’t find out why ‘comps’ was a scary word until about halfway through my first year; it would’ve been nice to avoid going back and reorganizing all my class materials to fit into the study system I subsequently designed.”  
   Alison Carr (Alison is wrapping up her PhD and an internship with a Fortune 500 company; she is hopeful her next adventure will be launching a career in external consulting.)

2. Preserve your experiences.
   “I wish I knew that time zips by in graduate school. You are a prospective student in one moment, and in the next, you are nearing the end of the road to graduating. Finding ways to preserve these cherished moments is well worth the effort.”  
   Jessica Dinh (Jessica is entering her fifth year in the PhD program and hopes to enter academia and conduct research in areas that include ethical leadership, decision making, and moral information processing.)

3. Stay well rounded.
   “I wish I knew to keep my interests and involvements more broad throughout graduate school to stay well rounded, develop a deeper knowledge of the field, and to keep options open for various research or applied opportunities. It is important to try your hand at multiple aspects of the field during graduate school. You may be surprised at all that interests you.”  
   Noelle Frantz (Noelle is entering her fourth year of the PhD program and plans to be an internal I-O specialist when she graduates.)

4. Saying “no” can be a good thing.
   “In the excitement of wanting to ‘dive right in,’ it can be easy to overextend yourself and say yes to multiple projects (even if they are far outside your area). I wish I had known it was OK to say no to projects that did not resonate with who I was becoming as a researcher. Now, I’m careful to think about how projects fit into my program of work before saying ‘sign me up!’”  
   Allison Gabriel (Allison graduated with her PhD in May 2013 and will be joining the School of Business at Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond, VA, as an assistant professor of Management in August 2013.)

5. Sometimes you should take the night off.
   “There will be times when you feel behind or as if you should be doing something to get ahead. However, when you are exhausted, it can be healthy to leave everything at school for the evening. Not only will you be spared the guilt of untouched work, but you will also have more energy to handle tomorrow’s challenges.”  
   Mary Margaret Harris (Mary Margaret is finishing her dissertation and looking forward to a career in talent assessment and development.)

6. Get involved in research right away.
   “When you first start graduate school, you may find yourself getting used to the workload and your new respon-
sibilities, and may postpone your potential research agenda. However during your initial acclimation to graduate school, you can investigate research possibilities and collaborate with more senior students in your program. These opportunities allow you to learn from your peers while participating in meaningful research.” Stephen Hill (Stephen successfully defended his dissertation in May 2013 and plans to pursue a career in academia researching career development, retirement, and issues related to law enforcement officers.)

7. Walk in the footsteps of others.
“My single biggest misconception in undergrad was that I had to commit to a future before I even started graduate school. I wrongly believed that I had to choose a single pair of shoes to walk in (e.g., academic versus applied, a specific research area) and then get the maximum amount of mileage out of them prior to graduating. This does work well for some, but daring to try on novel roles and research areas can be equally fulfilling. In addition to discovering some genuinely surprising ‘fits,’ I have gained tremendous respect for the various types of shoes people fill in our field.” Ernest Hoffman (Ernest is entering his fourth year in the PhD program and hopes to pursue a career in academia.)

8. Stay social.
“Graduate school is demanding, but it doesn't have to negatively impact your social life. There are lots of great opportunities to get engaged in your community and interest groups. Join a book club, young professionals organization, gym, volunteer group, or anything where you can interact with individuals outside of graduate school. Doing so can help you de-stress and explore additional opportunities to foster interests and collaborate.” Aimee King (Aimee will be graduating with her PhD in August 2013 and pursuing a career in medical education and training at University of Texas–Southwestern.)

9. Don’t be afraid to learn.
“It is important to be oriented towards constantly learning and developing. If you don't know something, don't be scared: Learn. If you can embrace learning new things, seeking new perspectives, and being adaptable, you will achieve success.” Aaron Kraus (Aaron is entering his fourth year in the PhD program and plans to pursue an applied position at a management consulting firm after finishing his dissertation on generational differences and innovation.)

10. Take the advice that works for you.
“There will be many people who will graciously give you advice, tips, and suggestions as you go through grad school, and these are always great resources to have. But, at the end of the day everyone's experiences are unique. Find out what your own strengths and weaknesses are and use this time to figure out what works best to help you be successful.” Chantale Wilson (Chantale is entering her fourth year in the PhD program and hopes to obtain a research or consulting position with the government or public sector researching cross-cultural topics, performance management, and simulation/game-based training.)

Bonus Tip: Be flexible!
This column enters a new era as a new set of authors takes over, and TIP is entering a new era as well. With new leadership and a new online format, TIP will continue to evolve and grow over the years to come. We all agree that being flexible and adapting to change is key to success in graduate school. Assignments will arise when least expected and projects may not always go as planned. But, by keeping a positive attitude and finding the support of your peers and colleagues, we promise that each day will be better than the one before. We are eager to see TIP evolve into a strong online community for scientists and practitioners alike, and we wish the new editorial board and TIP-TOPics team much success with the journal!

With that said, we are signing off from the Midwest. Thank you to everyone for taking this 2-year journey with our team, and we will see you at the next SIOP in Hawaii!

TIP-TOPics Call for Graduate Student Columnist(s)

TIP-TOPics is a graduate student editorial column published in The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist (TIP) on a quarterly basis. The column provides information and advice relevant to SIOP’s student membership and has historically been very popular.
The editorial columnist(s) can be an individual or group, and the groups may be made up of students from the same school or different schools; however, you must be current Student Affiliates of SIOP in good standing. The TIP-TOPics columnist(s) will have a 2-year tenure beginning with the October 2013 issue and ending with the July 2015 issue. Columnists must be graduate students throughout this time period, thus all prospective columnists should be at least 2 years from graduation. Columns are approximately 2,000 words, due four times a year (August 15, November 15, February 15, and May 15), and written according to APA guidelines.

Submission Information

Statement of interest and one letter of recommendation (from a faculty member who is familiar with the work of the potential columnist/s) should be sent via e-mail to Morrie Mullins (mullins@xavier.edu) by July 11, 2013. The statement of interest should at a minimum address the following: (a) all potential columnist names and school affiliation and (b) how you will approach the content, style, and structure of the column, including a few potential column topics.

SIOP Awards and Grants deadline is June 30
Nominate or apply today at http://www.siop.org/awardsonline/main.aspx
I-Os and Funded Research

Ashley Walvoord
Verizon Wireless

Liu-Qin Yang
Portland State University

“Significant.”

This was the remark of a fellow I-O colleague at this year’s SIOP Annual Conference in Houston, as he offered his interpretation of the last three issues of Yes You Can. He was summarizing the extent of opportunity for I-Os to obtain research funding, as exhibited by the success stories from our field. From the “big picture” shared by Steve Kozlowski, to Lillian Eby’s federal grant examples and the variety of military funding priorities described by Eduardo Salas, the opportunity for I-Os is indeed showing itself to be significant.

But what if you are looking for a different type of funding structure, perhaps more specialized topics or more moderate in scope? Foundation grants and funding may offer a good match. To bring several examples to life, we invited Donald Truxillo, Autumn Krauss, and Talya Bauer to share their experiences with foundation funding and I-O research topics. Among Dr. Truxillo’s (Portland State University) research interests are applicant reactions, the aging workforce, and employee safety. Dr. Krauss is chief scientist at Sentis, an occupational health and safety consultancy based in Australia, and her research examines talent management and occupational health issues. Talya Bauer (Portland State University) researches relationships at work throughout the employee life cycle (e.g., initial employment interactions such as recruitment and selection, new employee socialization, and key organizational relationships such as those with leaders and peers). In addition, joining us with the inside scoop at the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) Foundation are Beth McFarland (Certified Association Executive; Director of Programs over Foundation publications, research, scholarships, and thought leadership initiatives) and Lynn McFarland (Research Coordinator).

Donald, Autumn, and Talya, “foundation funding” is a rather broad category, let’s start with some examples of the research funding you have obtained for I-O topics from specialized organizations.

Talya (PSU): Well, first Donald and I received two SHRM grants in the mid-2000s about using interactive voice response technology in hiring and how job applicants perceived this hiring process. These allowed us to apply a research interest (applicant reactions) to what was then a new technology (IVR). It was great to get this funding because it really helped us to move the project forward and to get two papers and several presentations from the series of studies we conducted.

Donald (PSU): Later, we teamed up with Autumn and applied for a SIOP Small Grant Award in 2010 for the development of an explanation typology and examination of the effects of explanations on applicant attitudes and behaviors. We used this seed money to fund a Study 1 and then built upon this research for a larger proposal to the SHRM Foundation. (SHRM’s call for proposals was quite broad; i.e., a range of HR topics would be of interest.) We subsequently received a SHRM Foundation grant to examine how to provide explanations to job applicants in the hiring process in an online application environment. So, we initially received a SIOP Foundation grant to get us started and develop the materials, and the SHRM grant allowed us to do the full-blown study, which is ongoing. The strength of this grant was that it examined whether an intervention (providing explanations to applicants) that has a good theoretical foundation and is effective in practice could be scaled to benefit a large pool of online applicants. Another strength is that it allowed us to bring our expertise in practice and in research to bear on the issue.
That sequencing of studies and funding is a great strategy! How did you identify the opportunities that could accomplish the foundation’s objectives as well as your own research objectives/interests?

Autumn (Sentis): It was a bit of an “organic” relationship to begin with, in that the three of us had known each other for several years and PSU had been placing interns with my employer at the time. Talya and Donald were talking with me about their research when we realized that we could put together a study that would be useful to employers and could advance science. One thing to take away from this is that we had already established this partnership so that when we recognized the opportunity we were able to move forward with it relatively quickly.

Talya (PSU): There were a number of sessions at the recent 2013 SIOP conference on science–practice partnerships and the persistence, patience, and collegiality all parties need to pull these off. It’s important to have these relationships developed, even in small ways (e.g., grad student placement, small studies, consulting) so that you know you can work together, identify good research collaborations, and make sure your styles, goals, and values match. For example, if you are an academic who wants to partner with a practitioner in funded research, you might want to “start small” and work with the practitioner on a less ambitious project or collaboration first so you can establish a strong foundation first.

Donald (PSU): As far as understanding whether your research project matches the interests of the funding agency, be sure to examine previously funded projects if available. And there is nothing like the personal touch. Talk to the program officer, and talk to people who have experience with that agency or foundation.

On that note, Beth and Lynn, how does SHRM Foundation structure or prioritize topics for funding opportunities?

Beth (SHRM Foundation): We have two funding cycles each year during in which researchers may submit proposals on any HR-related topic. The submission deadlines are April 1 and October 1. In addition, we occasionally request proposals on specific topics. For instance, we recently sent out a call for proposals on social media use in HR. The SHRM Foundation funds high impact HR research aimed at an academic audience while also having direct actionable implications for HR practice, whether the focus is on addressing current challenges or understanding emerging trends. Any topic will be considered, however the grant must be for original rigorous empirical academic research that advances the HR profession.

Once you think you have a “match” with a foundation’s interests, articulating that match in the research proposal seems critical. Do you have any suggestions for readers who would be new to writing proposals for foundation funding opportunities?

Donald (PSU): It’s important to consider who will be reviewing the proposal, to use their language and frame of reference. What is it that they want? Be sure to talk to your program officer and to others who have submitted to the foundation. When it comes to grants, the likelihood of completion and impact are almost always front and center, so speaking directly to those points is a key to success.

Autumn (Sentis): Sometimes a call for grant proposals may have research topics identified as particularly desirable by the foundation based on its current focus or interest; your chances of success are increased if your study can speak directly to one or more of these topics. You might also be able to contact the foundation and discuss your study ideas prior to submission, as this initial feedback is helpful to tailor your proposal.

How does SHRM Foundation structure the review process to evaluate the “match” of proposals to the priorities and standards of SHRM Foundation?

Lynn (SHRM Foundation): Researchers are instructed to submit two versions of their final proposal—one complete version and one “blind” version—via an online form. The foundation uses the blind version, which does not identify researcher names or universities, to conduct an initial “blind review” of the proposals. This minimizes any unintentional reviewer bias and allows the reviewers to focus solely on the research design, methodology, and potential impact of the study. Submitted proposals are reviewed by groups of volunteers including both academics and HR practitioners. The entire application process is conducted online. No hard copies are required. On average, approximately 15% of proposals receive funding.

Let’s talk money and planning. In your experience, do budgets for foundation grants differ substantially
from other funding sources or mechanisms?

Talya (PSU): Yes! In our experience, the budgets for nonfederally funded grants are much more straightforward and less bureaucratically complex. That doesn’t mean you don’t need to follow their guidelines carefully. If you have a question, ask the program officer. It is also common during the foundation granting process for the foundation to come back with an approved reduced budget and ask you to make associated changes to your project scope.

When you reflect on any experiences you may have had with unfunded proposals for foundation opportunities, what stands out?

Talya and Donald (PSU): The amount of feedback really varies considerably from foundation to foundation. For instance, we recently submitted a letter of intent to another foundation that was rejected because they had over 200 applications for four grants. We were disappointed but were glad that they saved us the trouble of continuing further. But other reasons include that it wasn’t a direct hit on what the reviewers were looking for in that particular call. Again, a program officer can help you to find out whether you can address the limitations and whether it is appropriate to resubmit.

Lynn (SHRM Foundation): It is important that grant proposals be grounded in the HR literature, built on a solid theoretical basis, based on sound methodology, and have clear implications for both research and practice. Proposals not meeting one of those criteria are not funded. The most common feature missing from proposals is a clear discussion of the practical implications of results. Oftentimes the stated practical implications are too indirect and the study results are not likely to offer HR professionals actionable advice.

Do you have any tips for success to provide for your peers who are interested in trying to pursue research funding for the first time?

Autumn (Sentis): Yes, choose people with whom you can work well, individuals who you feel are trustworthy and with whom you can communicate well. This is just good advice for colleagues of any sort but especially when the “deliverable” nature of the grant process means it’s challenging to “walk away” from a project.

Donald (PSU): Also, do what you say you’ll do, follow through, and do it on time. And be aware that all parties are dealing with organizational constraints on their end. Just like most relationships, effective communication is critical.

Talya (PSU): With foundations, it may be that an institution with relatively little knowledge of I-O psychology is funding your project for the benefit of its members, customers, or industry. This is an excellent opportunity to increase the visibility of I-O psychology; as a field, we want to use this opportunity wisely by demonstrating both the strong scientific underpinnings and practical relevance of our work.

Beth (SHRM Foundation): We encourage potential grant applicants to watch a recorded webinar on Preparing a Successful SHRM Foundation Grant Application available on the SHRM Foundation website. This provides additional tips on preparing a strong proposal. Researchers may also review abstracts and final reports from all the proposals the SHRM Foundation has funded since 2005. When you look at our funded projects, we have had considerable success. More than 80% of the research funded by the SHRM Foundation has been presented at national or international conferences and published in top journals such as the Journal of Applied Psychology, Academy of Management Journal, and the Journal of Management. How is that for motivation to apply!

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

Thank you to Donald, Talya, Autumn, Beth, and Lynn for sharing their reflections and experiences with foundation-based funding opportunities! In the next issue, we will examine the opportunities for research funding through the lens of the early-career I-O. Come back to learn how two of your colleagues balanced their early career priorities, leveraged support, and successfully landed funding for I-O topics!

‘Significant’ opportunity for I-O research funding is right. Which of the many funding mechanisms is appealing to you? Give it some thought, check out the foundation funding resources below, and until next time, remember: Yes You Can!
Example Foundation Grant Resources
www.shrmfoundation.org (all resources are under “Research Grants”)
http://www.shrm.org/about/foundation/research/Pages/GrantsAwarded.aspx
http://www.siop.org/foundation/information.aspx
http://www.siop.org/grants.aspx

Made in America: Another Small Way to Celebrate Work

Michael J. Zickar
Bowling Green State University

From my experience, most industrial-organizational psychologists are not particularly passionate about the topic that is the focus of their career: work. When I read personal statements of prospective graduate students, I often read humanistic statements about why they are choosing to pursue doctoral studies in a field that studies the working world. They mention bad experiences that their parents or grandparents or even they had while working and how as I-O psychologists they would like to create a better workplace. But something usually happens during the 4 or 5 years that we have a student for doctoral studies, and by the time they graduate, students become obsessed with the technical side of the field (methodology, experimental design, consultant delivery) and seem to forget that the topic that they are studying has the potential to meaningfully impact the lives of workers. I think it is important for I-O psychologists to have a real passion for the world of work; this passion can make our research more meaningful for a broader population. In addition, this passion can help sustain us during the inevitable ups and downs of our individual careers.

This lack of celebrating work is, however, a part of our great culture, which has lost respect for pride for a job well done, especially for people who work low-wage or entry-level jobs. I have several friends who work in the building trades (e.g., electricians, plumbers, boilermakers), and they lament that, even though the starting salaries for their fields are reasonably high, they have a hard time attracting talent because kids graduating from high school feel like they need to go to college so that they can become the next CEO.

There are lots of ways to cultivate your passion for work. One of my mentors, Chuck Hulin, urged his students to actually do the job that they were going to analyze in their research studies. This is important because many of us in the field have had limited work experiences, going straight from undergraduate school to graduate school to the working world. My summer jobs at Little Caesars Pizza and the University of Illinois cafeteria gave me a limited perspective on working! Although it may be impractical for us to attain more extensive working experiences, there are other ways to develop a passion for work. You can read histories of work (especially the industry that on which you are collecting data) and you can conduct interviews of people who have diverse working experiences, letting them tell their work stories using their language instead of filtering their experiences through a predetermined set of items (see Zickar & Carter, 2010).

Another way of cultivating a passion for the subject of work is collecting items relating to work. A few years ago, I compiled a list of work-related movies (Zickar, 2007) and later a list of songs (my favorite is They're Tearing the Labor Camps Down by Merle Haggard). It is possible to collect work-related memorabilia too. Perusing eBay, there are a variety of work-related objects including coal mining companies’ scrip (e.g., company money), postcards of factories, union lapel pins, and autographs of corporate and labor leaders. There are all kinds of directions that such hobbies could take (e-mail me if you have a work-related collection as I would love to hear about it!).

This August, the United States Postal Service (USPS) is planning on release a set of Forever stamps commemorating the American worker with a series of 12 stamps, each which includes a beautiful black-and-white image, each an iconic photograph showing a variety of types of work. Most seem to be from the 1920s through the 1930s. There are images of ironworkers building the Empire State Building, a seamstress, a railworker, and a millinery worker among others.

Surprisingly, there have been very few stamps honoring the workplace. There has been a stamp honoring Rosie the Riveter celebrating the role of women in the workplace during WWII as well as a stamp celebrating the childhood labor legislation that was passed in the early part of the 20th century. There have been stamps honoring labor and industry leaders (e.g., Gompers, Meany, Carnegie) as well as individual industries (e.g., the Steel Industry and for some reason the Poultry Industry), but these are rare compared to images of flags, flowers, animals, and lighthouses (nothing against any of those!). Topics related to work are not the only underrepresented subjects for stamps. Histo-
rian Ludy Benjamin Jr. pointed out that there had not been a stamp honoring psychology; at the time, a group of psychologists were advocating for a stamp honoring William James (Benjamin, 2003). There was a stamp honoring Professional Management (and Joseph Whorton) so colleagues in business schools can feel honored. In addition, Lillian Gilbreth has had her own stamp; she received a PhD in psychology, though she is more well-known as an industrial engineer.

On August 8th (subject to change), the United States Postal Service will issue sheets of the 12-stamp series Made in America, Building a Nation. They will cost the same as any other first-class stamp. I recommend that you buy as many sheets as you can. Because they are Forever stamps, they can be used for first-class postage even if prices rise (as they will). Use them to pay your bills, to mail birthday cards, and to surprise old friends with a long-deserved letter. And each time that you stick one of these beautiful stamps onto an envelope, use that as a way to remember that we, as I-O psychologists, are not just correlating scales and connecting paths and arrows in our structural equations models but that our work can and should have direct impact on the lives of the people we are studying.
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The SIOP Living History Series: An Interview With David P. Campbell

Kevin T. Mahoney
South Dakota State University

Jeff Cucina
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

The SIOP Living History Series, a continuing series of interviews of historic I-O figures conducted by the SIOP History Committee, was launched at the 2013 Conference. This year, David P. Campbell was interviewed by current SIOP Historian, Kevin T. Mahoney. Dr. Campbell is Smith Richardson Senior Fellow Emeritus at the Center for Creative Leadership and is well known for his contributions in vocational psychology and leadership development. Dr. Campbell is a recipient of the Distinguished Professional Contributions Award, the E.K. Strong, Jr. Award for Excellence in Psychological Research, and is a SIOP Fellow. He is author of 53 peer-reviewed publications, and three books for nonpsychologist audiences, one of which, If You Don't Know Where You're Going, You'll Probably End Up Somewhere Else (1974, 2007) has sold more than 600,000 copies. During the interview, Dr. Campbell talked about being the final research assistant for Donald G. Paterson, and the many ways Dr. Paterson had a positive influence on I-O psychology. Given Paterson was involved in the World War I Army Alpha program, Dr. Campbell noted that his career combined with Paterson’s spans the entire history of psychological testing. Dr. Campbell discussed starting his career as a University of Minnesota professor and demonstrated how he trained graduate students to write with clarity. He then discussed his long association with the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory, including the controversy he faced when there was a blue-colored form of the Strong-Campbell for men and a pink-colored form for women. Dr. Campbell shared insights about vocational interests and test construction he learned throughout his career. Dr. Campbell then looked back on nearly 4 decades working with the Center for Creative Leadership, offered his perspective on global leadership, and reflected on his experiences with leadership development.

Thanks to Jeff Cucina for his invaluable help in interview preparation.
The videos of the interview, linked below, were recorded by Bob Muschewske.
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZbUPLL8o9zc
Announcing the Jeanneret Symposium

Milton D. Hakel
SIOP Foundation President

I am delighted to tell you that Dick Jeanneret has provided another significant gift to I-O psychology, one that will create an event: the Jeanneret Symposium. The Jeanneret Symposium will be held sometime in 2014, and it will may provide a turning point for applied research and development in our field. The symposium idea grew out of conversations that Dick and I had earlier this year, and the story behind this announcement provides an illustration of how the SIOP Foundation can work with potential benefactors to build for the future of I-O.

The story starts with a phone call, one in which Dick asked about what opportunities the Foundation Trustees saw for advancing the field in coming years. Having just endowed the Jeanneret Award for Excellence in the Study of Individual or Group Assessment a year earlier, he was looking to initiate and contribute to something different, and in several subsequent conversations the idea for the symposium came into focus.

Reflections on I-O

We began by reflecting on the development of I-O research and development over the span of our careers. It is not news that there is a substantial gap in our field between the frontiers of research and the front lines of application. Academicians carry on in an ecology that places primary value on publication in peer-reviewed journals, while practitioners lament the unavailability of research relevant to resolving immediate, tangible problems. I-O psychology journals and conference discussions are filled with unanswered questions (“further research is needed…”), but only a small proportion of these questions ever receive subsequent attention.

Asking the right questions is one key to success in any field. Within I-O psychology over its past century, the discipline has been content for the most part to let individual researchers and the occasional group leader set the research agenda. We noted that this laissez-faire approach has been and continues to be quite successful; however, it may be possible to improve upon it by systematizing some steps in delineating and prioritizing the right focal questions.

We identified collaboration as another key to success in any field. Over the decades in I-O psychology, there have been several notable field research consortia, that is, collectives of individuals and groups that combine their resources and efforts to address focal problems or issues. Some exemplars include: The U.S. Army Research Institute’s Project A, studies of work analysis methodologies including the Position Analysis Questionnaire (sponsored by the Office of Naval Research) and O*NET (sponsored by the Department of Labor), SIOP’s Technical Assistance Program to the National Association of Secondary School Principals, and Division 14’s Methodology Conference cosponsored with the Center for Creative Leadership. Other large-scale collaborations include the GLOBE project on leadership, the R&D done by LIAMA/LIMRA over the decades, and even the Ohio State Leadership Studies. Outside of I-O, the Gordon Research Conferences organized by AAAS and the study committees of the National Research Council serve as worthy models. Common to these efforts is a well-defined and articulated organizational or institutional need, close collaboration among a small group of leading scholars, and determination to advance the impact of practice.

With “asking the right questions” and “field research consortium” identified as key concepts, the idea for a symposium began to materialize. I started drafting the memorandum of understanding (MOU) between Dick and the Foundation. In conversation we had lamented the fact that there is no simple English word for “scientist–practitioner,” but as I wrote I realized that there is an old Greek one.
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Praxis

In Ancient Greek the word praxis (πραξις) referred to activity engaged in by those who are free. Aristotle identified three types of knowledge: theoretical (theoria), for which the end goal is truth; poietical (poiesis), for which the end goal is production; and practical (praxis), for which the end goal is action.

The strategic and organizational usage of the word “praxis” emphasizes the need for a continuing cycle of conceptualizing the meanings of what can be learned from experience in order to reframe strategic and operational models. That cycle forms the core of what organizational psychologists embrace as the “scientist–practitioner model.”

The Jeanneret Symposium

The MOU specifies that the Jeanneret Symposium will address two aspects of the praxis cycle in particular: framing a focal question and collaborating to resolve it. The Trustees of the SIOP Foundation will take the lead in organizing and conducting the Jeanneret Symposium as a full test of a prototype process for establishing field research consortia. This will take place in two steps: (1) identify a focal question, and (2) plan and implement a launch event for forming a field research or praxis consortium. To carry them out, the Foundation Trustees will appoint a Steering Committee of subject matter experts from SIOP, other relevant organizations, and the Foundation itself to frame the question that will become the focus of the Jeanneret Symposium and also to plan and conduct the symposium. The Foundation Trustees will also commission an independent formative and summative evaluation.

Step 1: Identify a focal question. What makes a question the “right” one to ask? In hindsight right questions are easy to see, but in prospect the best path or paths forward are not so easy to spot. For organizational psychologists, action/application is the ultimate end goal, so focusing on questions that are likely to have big potential impacts on application should be preferred to others. Timeliness in finding answers is an additional criterion, where preference should be given to questions that could be resolved within a specified interval, say 5 years (that is to say, the foreseeable future). The Steering Committee may convene in person or meet by electronic means, and it is expected to seek input broadly as it identifies the content area (such as assessment or work analysis) for the symposium and then refines potential focal questions. The Steering Committee will appoint a Practice Panel, consisting of senior scientist–practitioners who are or have been active in application within the general content domain of the symposium, to consider and adopt the focal question for the symposium. The Practice Panel may be interdisciplinary, interorganizational, and international in its membership, and representative of issue or topic stakeholders. Its goal is to devise the succinct statement of a well-defined and articulated organizational or institutional need (i.e., the focal question). The report of the Practice Panel may be published in whole or in part by the Steering Committee.

Step 2: Collaborate to resolve the focal question. The Steering Committee will plan and conduct the Jeanneret Symposium as an event with the specific objective of organizing and chartering a field research consortium to pursue resolution of the focal topic and question identified in step one. The event might be held in conjunction with other events (such as a SIOP Conference or LEC meeting) or on a standalone basis. Principals in the event will be expected to contribute their time, although travel and other out-of-pocket meeting costs could be covered. Any intellectual property resulting from the symposium would be assigned to the public domain, to SIOP, or to the SIOP Foundation as might be consistent with the maintenance of its tax-exempt charitable status. The Steering Committee will adopt these and other ground rules with the intention of assuring close collaboration among participating scholars.

After the close of the Jeanneret Symposium, the independent evaluator will provide a public report to the Foundation Trustees summarizing the lessons learned in this venture about whether and how better to (a) refine focused research questions and (b) foster their collaborative resolution.

I mentioned at the outset that the Jeanneret Symposium might be a turning point for applied research and development in our field. If what we learn from this pilot venture warrants further action, the Foundation Trustees will seek to establish a series of SIOP Praxis Consortia as ongoing initiatives.

What focal questions would you like to see resolved? Interested in serving on the Steering Committee? Email me, at mhal@bgsu.edu.

Dick’s generosity in making the $50,000 contribution to conduct the Jeanneret Symposium is an outstanding leadership example for each of us. Help to encourage excellence and innovation for the future of I-O psychology.
José M. Peiró, President of IAAP, Receives the Life Time Award of the European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology (EAWOP).

The award was presented during the inaugural ceremony of the 16th Congress of the European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology, held May 22–25, 2013 in Münster, Germany. It is the first time EAWOP awards this distinction that aims to recognize the lifetime contribution to EAWOP and the outstanding services. Professor David Guest was in charge of presenting the “laudatio” and together with the President of EAWOP, Prof. Arnold Bakker, presented the award to José M. Peiró.

Jose M. Peiró is president of IAAP and director of the University research Institute of Human Resources Psychology, Organizational Development and Quality of Work life (IDOCAL) at the University of Valencia. He was former president of EAWOP and Fellow of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP) and the European Academy of Occupational Health Psychology (EAOHP; see www.uv.es/jmpeiro).