Welcome to Portland State University’s TIP-TOPics column! We are honored and excited to begin the next phase of this column for The Industrial–Organizational Psychologist. We’ve been inspired by the amazing work of the University of Akron team over the past 2 years and are thankful for the opportunity to share our perspective with you! We also look forward to learning from our readers and hope that this column will serve to spark conversation and help us develop relationships with students and faculty from other programs. Thanks to the diverse focus of our program at Portland State, we believe that we will be able to bring a fresh perspective on the graduate school endeavor. This being said, we would like to begin our first column with a brief overview of our program. This includes an explanation of our program’s history and structure, a description of our Occupational Health Psychology program, and an introduction to our faculty and students. We finish with a little insider information on what it’s like to live in Portland (a truly unique place) and what you can expect from our columns to come.

Portland State University’s (PSU) Industrial-Organizational Psychology Program is a PhD program located in the heart of Portland, Oregon, with a distinct dedication to our university’s motto, “Let Knowledge Serve the City.” Our faculty and students have a passion for serving our local, regional, national, and international communities. Some of our most meaningful work relates to our contributions to SIOP, the Society for Occupational Health Psychology (SOHP), the European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology (EAWOP), and the Portland Industrial & Organizational Psychology Association (PIOPA). We know that our work on TIP-TOPics will be likewise fulfilling and
challenge us to reflect on our identity as a program as we share our thoughts and ideas with you.

**Structure of the Program**

The first PhD in Applied Psychology with a focus in I-O at PSU was awarded in 1999. Prior to 1999, our program coexisted within the Systems Science Department here at PSU. Our psychology program is applied in nature, with the goal of advancing knowledge through a scientific approach to human behavior and addressing significant issues facing employees. We recognize the need for interplay between experimental and naturalistic methods in analyzing problems and testing solutions to real world problems. Nearly all of our research is conducted with community-partner organizations rather than in the lab. Requirements of our doctoral program include successfully completing coursework (including a rigorous multicourse statistics series), conducting and defending a master’s thesis, passing comprehensive exams, completing an internship, and conducting and defending a doctoral dissertation.

**Occupational Health Psychology Program**

Many of our I-O students minor in occupational health psychology and are passionate about conducting research that helps improve the health and well-being of employees and organizations. Our department hosts an occupational health psychology training program (http://www.ohp.psy.pdx.edu/) that has been funded since 2004 through a NIOSH Training Program Grant. Our OHP program includes a survey course and a variety of specialized OHP elective courses. In addition to offering graduate student training in OHP, our training program collaborates with Oregon Health & Science University’s (OHSU) Center for Research on Occupational and Environmental Toxicology (CROET), the Center for Health Research (CHR), and the University of Oregon’s Labor Education Research Center (LERC) as a part of the Oregon Healthy Workforce Center (OHWC), a NIOSH Center of Excellence.

**OHP Summer Institute**

Last year, Portland State hosted the first annual Occupational Health Psychology Summer Institute, which was a collaborative effort between PSU’s OHP program, OHSU, CROET, the Oregon Healthy Workforce Center (ORhwc), and Saint Mary’s University’s Center for Occupational Health and Safety. The Summer Institute provided an opportunity for faculty, graduate students, and applied researchers in OHP, occupational safety, human resources, and related fields to learn about current and future issues in OHP and network with other profession-
als from around the world who are committed to improving employee well-being. Speakers included Dr. Joseph Hurrell, who played a crucial role in the development of the field of OHP, and Dr. Dov Zohar, a leading safety climate researcher. This July, the second annual OHP Summer Institute was held at Saint Mary’s University in Halifax, Nova Scotia.

**Internship Program**

The goal of the internship program at PSU is to conduct scientific research and contribute to applied projects, offering innovative and practical solutions to the field. Our internships generally involve a field placement or off-campus research experience. Although each internship assignment is related to the student’s professional interests, placements should also expand understanding or introduce new areas of study. Students typically complete internships between their third and fourth year of the graduate program, with many taking internships after completing comprehensive exams yet before beginning work on the dissertation. Internships last a minimum of 3 months, though we have had several students who take longer internships ranging from 6 to 9 months. We value the opportunity to gain hands-on experience during our graduate school career and are fortunate enough to work with acclaimed researchers and practitioners from all over the country. In recent years, our graduate students have held internships in organizations such as Google, HumRRO, Liberty Mutual Research Institute for Safety, Logitech, the Oregon Museum for Science and Industry (OMSI), Sentis, and SuccessFactors.

**Faculty and Graduate Students**

Our program has five I-O faculty members: Drs. Charlotte Fritz, Leslie Hammer, Keith James, Donald Truxillo, and Liu-Qin Yang. Their research represents a wide range of topics, including recovery from work, the work–life interface, the aging workforce, person–environment fit, creativity, and leadership. Our faculty members also serve in a number of capacities outside of their formal roles within the department. For example, Dr. Donald Truxillo has served SIOP in a number of important capacities over the years, including as a past Program Chair and Conference Chair of the SIOP conference, as well as serving as the chair of SIOP’s International Affairs Committee. Dr. Liu-Qin Yang has coauthored a series of columns with Ashley Walvoord for *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist* entitled “Yes You Can: I-Os and Funded Research.” In addition to our five core I-O faculty members, our department collaborates regularly with several faculty members from PSU’s School of Business Administration. These faculty members
include Drs. Talya Bauer and Berrin Erdogan, who conduct research on a number of I-O-related topics, including relationships at work, leader–member exchange, and overqualification. We are proud to say that four of our faculty members—Talya Bauer, Berrin Erdogan, Leslie Hammer, and Donald Truxillo—have been named SIOP Fellows. Our faculty and graduate students regularly engage in cross-department collaborations, to the benefit of all involved. In a coming column, we will discuss several ongoing research projects within our department to expand on our experiences of working with a variety of community partners.

Our I-O program currently consists of 19 graduate students, 10 of whom make up the team of TIP-TOPics writers who will be contributing to the column over the coming 2 years. Our program is organized such that each graduate student works under the supervision of a specific faculty advisor, with each faculty member taking responsibility for several graduate students, forming the basis of our research labs. These relationships serve to ensure graduate students receive guidance and support throughout their graduate school careers. However, students often branch out during their time in the program to collaborate and publish with other faculty members, a practice that is highly encouraged in our tight-knit department.

Doctoral students in I-O, as well as those in Applied Social & Community Psychology and Applied Developmental Psychology (the two other areas that comprise our Psychology Department here at PSU), take an active role in helping to shape the graduate program and pursue civic and social engagement through the Psychology Graduate Student Association (PGSA). The group meets regularly to plan and execute professional development events, communicate with faculty about continuing to grow and improve the program, and schedule charity and social events. In recent years, PGSA has also organized prospective student recruitment events and developed a mentoring program for first-year graduate students. Examples of activities arranged by PGSA include organizing professional development panels focused on topics such as finding an internship, successfully passing comprehensive exams, and publishing peer-reviewed publications as a graduate student; food and toy drives for Portlanders in need; 5k charity walks supporting mental health awareness; and last but not least, planning happy hours and get-togethers.

One of our planned columns will focus on our graduate students’ service to the department. Our hope is that other students, faculty members, and administrators might find such examples useful while developing similar programs in their own departments.
Portlandia

We would be remiss to discuss our program without mentioning Portland itself. For those of you who have watched the show *Portlandia* or heard of the various Portland stereotypes, we’re here to tell you that they’re mostly true—but in the most amazing and endearing way. It’s not inaccurate to say that our city is full of people who think that not recycling is as serious a crime as aggravated assault. And most people are concerned about whether or not the chicken they’re eating for dinner had a happy life. But that’s what makes Portland awesome—we live in a city of unique characters, people who really care about the place they live. In addition, there are endless opportunities to do really fun activities outdoors: hang out on the beautiful Oregon coast, hike in the Columbia Gorge, go tubing/kayaking/rafting in the summer, and ski/snowboard/snowshoe in the winter. Oh, and did we mention we have some of the best food and beer in the world? (How do you think we get through grad school?)

Overview of the Upcoming/Future Columns

Given our program’s focus on research, applied work, and service in the local, national, and international communities, our group of students is excited to contribute commentary pieces for TIP-TOPics. We first plan to offer helpful columns on several important steps in the graduate school process that are applicable to new and returning students alike. These include pieces highlighting practical tips and tricks for making the most of grad school, recommendations for grad students interested in bolstering their programs’ internal strengths and infrastructure with student-led workshops, mentoring programs, and service work, in addition to columns dedicated to providing advice on building a CV with teaching and publishing experience. A how-to column will also be devoted to attaining a career in a specialty field, like OHP. In addition to these student-focused columns, we plan to discuss how our program has gained visibility through local and broader collaborations, thereby providing other programs with examples for working within their communities. Our last column will take a broader focus and discuss prosocial I-O more generally, specifically as it is an ongoing interest of SIOP. We hope by giving you a window into our program here at PSU we can not only inform you of our background and approach to the coming columns but also start a dialogue surrounding different approaches to the graduate school experience. As we embark on this new endeavor, we look forward to learning about the exciting and unique features of your program, as well! We would like to continue the University of
Akron’s practice of soliciting feedback from **TIP-TOPics** readers on column topics and content, as we feel such a dialogue contributes to a column that is ultimately more useful to our readers. Thus, at the end of each column, we will include a brief description of the upcoming article and an open call for correspondence including suggestions, ideas, and so on. As such, we offer a brief synopsis of the next column below.

**Our Upcoming Column**

Building on The University of Akron’s final column on “The Top Ten Things We Wished We Knew Before Graduate School,” our group of columnists will share advice with new graduate students on how to successfully make the most of one’s graduate school career. These practical tips and tricks come from a number of our own experiences in graduate school and include becoming involved in faculty research, making the transition from undergraduate to graduate school, finding study strategies that work best for you, how to get involved in additional service inside and outside of the department, networking and socializing with other graduate students, reducing stress, and learning to cope with the unexpected challenges or setbacks of graduate school. In writing this column, we will draw from materials gathered by our I-O program’s student socialization committee, which consists of senior graduate students and faculty advisors and is designed to socialize new I-O graduate students.

To correspond with the authors about this topic, please e-mail [portland-statetiptopics@pdx.edu](mailto:portland-statetiptopics@pdx.edu). In addition, to learn more about the graduate students at PSU as well as the writers of our column, you may view our graduate student website at [http://www.pdx.edu/psy/graduate-students](http://www.pdx.edu/psy/graduate-students). We look forward to contributing to the **TIP-TOPics** column over the next 2 years, and are excited to create an ongoing dialogue among **TIP**’s readers!

Jenn Rineer is a doctoral student in I-O Psychology at Portland State University with a minor in Occupational Health Psychology. Jenn is originally from New Jersey and graduated from the University of Pennsylvania with a BS in Psychology in 2007. Before graduate school, she was a Public Relations and Outreach Manager for a nonprofit fellowship program in Philadelphia. Her research interests include health and well-being, job design, safety, and aging. Jenn’s hobbies include dancing, camping and hiking, and exploring Portland’s amazing restaurant/bar scene.

Caitlin A. Demsky is a doctoral student working under the supervision of Dr. Charlotte Fritz. Caitlin graduated from Central Michigan University with her BS in English and Psychology in 2010 and completed her MS in Applied Psychology from Portland State University in 2012. Her research centers on re-
covery from work, work–life balance, and workplace aggression. She is currently completing her PhD in I-O Psychology with a minor in Occupational Health Psychology. Caitlin’s other interests include running, hiking, and experiencing Portland’s food and music scenes.

Tori L. Crain is currently working towards her PhD in Industrial-Organizational Psychology with a minor in Occupational Health Psychology from Portland State University. In 2009, Tori graduated with her BA in Psychology from Whitworth University in Spokane, WA. Her research interests include the interplay between work, family, and sleep, in addition to the role of family-specific social support in the workplace. In Tori’s free time, she loves to be with family and friends, playing soccer or exploring Portland’s hiking trails.

**Reviewers Needed!**

SIOP has received over 1,500 submissions for the 2014 Annual Conference. This is a positive sign for the conference but it means we need more reviewers!

Quite simply, we need your help. Please sign up today as a reviewer to play a critical role in the success of the conference.

To volunteer, click [HERE](#)!
Calling All Grad Students

What graduate student wouldn’t want more flexibility and more resources to pursue the research that is interesting to them? Inspired by the start of another academic year, we dedicate this issue to the population of I-O grad students, both rookie and “professional students.” Even at this early juncture in your career, you can land some serious cash to take your research and education to the next level! That’s right, research funding is not just for the well-seasoned, famous, and well-established I-O psychs!

There are many graduate student grant opportunities, and this quarter we’re giving you a peek at how three of your peers found success! **Ryan Johnson**, a student at the University of South Florida, discusses two grants he has received, one through a university-affiliated research center and the other through our very own SIOP. **Justina Oliveira** of Baruch College and The Graduate Center at the City University of New York explains how she received funding through the university. **Rachael Klein** from the University of Minnesota touches on her experiences successfully obtaining a fellowship through a national agency, the National Science Foundation.

**Colleagues, give us a “big picture” overview of your funding experience in grad school.**

**Rachael:** I received a Graduate Research Fellowship through the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program (GRFP). The fellowship offers graduate students 3 years of support including an annual stipend and an educational allowance that covers tuition and fees. The award allowed me to engage in academic coursework, research, and related activities while freeing me from teaching obligations.
Ryan: The first source of funding I received was through the Sunshine Education and Research Center, which is affiliated with the University of South Florida. The center itself is funded through the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), and the goal is to promote graduate training and research related to occupational health and safety. The center offers a pilot grant program each year, which is intended to act as seed money for preliminary studies to later support larger grants. The grants are not only open to USF faculty and students but also to other institutions and groups in Florida. My grant totaled about $11,000, and I used the money to conduct my dissertation study. I also received the Lee Hakel Graduate Student Scholarship from SIOP. This award aims to both recognize past achievements of graduate students and support their future research projects. [Check it out here. ] The $3500 award was also used to support my dissertation.

Justina: I received funding through the American Studies Archival Research Grant Program, which is hosted by the City University of New York’s Advanced Research Collaborative. This institute was developed to promote interdisciplinary research on critical contemporary issues. The specific grant I received provides summer support ($4,000) for doctoral students whose projects necessitate work with archival data.

And how did you find out about these opportunities?

Rachael: I found the program online while researching other funding opportunities and also received an email from my university’s psychology department. The GRFP is open to first and second year students who meet the other program guidelines.

Ryan: I was aware of the SIOP award through various communications through the SIOP website and newsletters, and also knew several past winners who encouraged me to apply. Two of the USF I-O faculty members are principal investigators on the larger grant that funds the Sunshine Education Research Center. They, along with past awardees, informed me of the award.

Justina: Periodically throughout the academic year I searched my university’s website as well as websites that tend to fund I-O psychology topics regarding grant opportunities for the upcoming academic year or summer. When I found one that fit into my topic area, I decided to apply, ensuring that I had enough time to produce a quality application.

Some readers may not be familiar with how to start or what the procedure is like. Can you describe the application processes you completed?

Rachael: Applications are due in the fall. I had to write three 2-page essays:
a personal statement, a statement describing my past research experience, and one about my proposed research. These topics are fairly similar to what was required for graduate school applications, so those served as a good starting point for writing the statements required by the GRFP. Transcripts and three references are required, and there is an online application to complete.

**Ryan:** The application process for the SIOP award was quite simple. I submitted a shortened 12-page version of my dissertation proposal along with my curriculum vitae and letters of support from my major professor and graduate program director. The application process for the NIOSH award was more rigorous, akin to a larger grant application. The main proposal was a 10-page document that included the sections that are required in an NIH grant (abstract, specific aims, background and significance, research design and methods, dissemination plan and future research, human/animal subjects, references, consultants/faculty advisors, and resources). I was also required to submit a detailed budget and justification. Fortunately, unlike a typical NIH grant, I did not have to go through several rounds of revisions.

**Justina:** The funding agency required a brief study description including the topic in general (approximately two pages), how it related to this specific grant (i.e., why I needed archival data), and a very general explanation of the study method. I also had to include my curriculum vitae and a writing sample. Then I waited and hoped for the best!

**The results suggest that you each submitted quality applications! What kind of support did you get from your mentor or major professor?**

**Rachael:** Because I was able to start working on a few projects with my advisor the summer before I started graduate school, I had a good sense of what research areas I wanted to explore and past research on the topic. In the essays, I was able to highlight this research experience, as well as several conference presentations I had submitted based on our research. She was very supportive and encouraging, and being able to work on research over the summer with her helped give shape to my research proposal.

**Ryan:** My major professor provided support in developing the dissertation research project that was ultimately awarded funding. In addition, she provided letters of support, and assisted in the development of the NIOSH application based on her previous experiences with other students applying for the award.

**Justina:** My dissertation advisor generously spent the time to look over my project description and was willing to give advice regarding the importance of being clear and concise, yet descriptive enough to show that I had a solid research idea. He was very supportive of even the attempt to obtain such funding for the learning experience.
Three cheers for great advisors! Looking back, what was the biggest challenge of your funding experience?

Rachael: Although I had a lot of ideas about my research and had recently submitted papers for the annual SIOP conference, I still hadn’t fleshed out all of the details about what I would be researching over the next several years. I had to think about the directions my research could go and decide what to highlight in my proposed research essay. Also, because applications are due in the fall, it can be hard to find time to work on the application given all of the other commitments one has as a student.

Ryan: Although the SIOP award was very straightforward, the NIOSH award has presented some challenges. The process of actually gaining access to the awarded funds was a big learning experience. In addition to communicating with the actual funding source, I also had to work with my own department’s grant administrator, a grant administrator in another department where the funding opportunity originated, and my university’s office of sponsored research and the business accounting office. In addition, I was responsible for soliciting outside vendors for things like printing needs and participant compensation. There have also been frequent progress reports and budget updates to generate, and managing the use of the funds has been a challenge. I’ve found that having a third party involved in your research leads to some relinquished control, and things can take much longer to accomplish than they might otherwise.

Justina: As graduate school requires constant juggling of responsibilities and projects, the most challenging aspect of this experience for me was to simply decide to spend the time to search out these opportunities in the midst of everything else required from me. I am now a big advocate for fellow graduate students to invest this time as it aids in building our experience surrounding grant proposals in general, which is often essential or perhaps even more important to our careers after we graduate.

Those examples provide a nice realistic preview for your peers! To complete the picture, tell us about the most rewarding part of obtaining that funding support!

Rachael: Being able to focus on research as a graduate student is rewarding. I have been able to devote a lot of time to my primary stream of research while also being able to work on a variety of other projects. This has allowed me to round out what I’ve learned in the classroom with a lot of “hands on” research experiences. I enjoyed having several projects each year to present at SIOP and was also fortunate to have the flexibility to be able to attend other conferences outside of the annual SIOP conference, including the SIOP Leading Edge Consortium on Sustainability at Work, the annual IPAC conference, the Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion confer-
ence, and student conferences at my university. The GRFP’s emphasis on the broader impacts of one’s research is also a good guiding principle that I have tried to emulate. Working with the University of Minnesota sustainability office on several of their initiatives has given me applied experience early on and has kept me focused on the practical implications of my research and how it can be applied in organizational settings. I have also enjoyed mentoring students who have worked with our research team. Keeping broader impacts in mind has helped me better communicate research findings and has made my research more rewarding.

**Ryan:** The SIOP award has been very rewarding in that it has provided my dissertation project with a lot of visibility among SIOP members. I was often stopped at the most recent conference and asked about my research, which was very exciting. The most rewarding part of both awards was having the ability to conduct high-quality research in a methodologically rigorous fashion. Without the funding provided by these awards, I would not have been able to collect the appropriate data for my dissertation study. In addition, I believe that showing evidence of previous funding will help my chances of receiving larger external grants in the future.

**Justina:** Honestly, one of the most rewarding parts was hearing back from the selection committee that I was awarded the grant! It is gratifying to know that my hard work paid off. Secondly, what was very rewarding was the time that it opened up for my research and dedicated focus to my dissertation.

**In closing, what advice would you give to graduate students seeking a grant similar to yours?**

**Rachael:** Spend some time looking at the program solicitation and successful essays and then tailor your essays accordingly. For instance, the NSF GRFP puts a heavy emphasis on broader impacts and intellectual merit of the research and makes ratings based on these criteria. Use language from the solicitation itself (e.g., “broader impacts”) to directly address and highlight how your research meets those criteria.

**Ryan:** Seek out the advice and help of past students who have applied for (and hopefully won!) the awards in which you are interested. For me, being able to see what a winning application looked like before applying was really helpful. Also, be sure to know your audience and specifically address the goals of the award for which you are applying. Although each of my awards was for the same research project, the focus of each application was very different. Some general advice for receiving funding is to search for opportunities, especially for less popular awards. Some awards have very few applications submitted. Many award applications are straightforward and relatively easy to complete, so I
would urge students to apply far and wide, and to also consider awards with descriptions that may not exactly match the type of research they want to conduct. Often you can carry out the research you want to as part of a larger project that meets the requirements of the funding source. Some I-O topics are less “fundable” than others, thus necessitating some creativity or collaboration with researchers in other content areas in order to apply for funding.

Justina: Go for it! There is really nothing to lose. Even if you don’t get funded, you will definitely walk away learning something new from the application process itself, which better prepares you for the next grant application.

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

Thank you Ryan, Rachael, and Justina for the realistic job preview of research funding during graduate school! It’s helpful to explore the variety of funding mechanisms and opportunities out there for graduate students—and it is inspiring to learn how peers have succeeded!

Stay tuned for upcoming issues in which we bring you stories of cross-discipline and cross-cultural collaboration, early career (postgraduate) start ups, and the “I-O world records” of grant experiences! So what characteristics would define your “ideal” funding opportunity as an I-O psychologist? Give it some thought and dare to get excited! And until next time remember: Yes You Can!

Graduate Student Funding Sources
- NSF graduate research fellowship program
- NIOSH Education Research Centers
  (many offer pilot grants that those in the region may be applicable for)
- SIOP Graduate Student Awards
- APA resources
- Association for Psychological Science (APS) resources
- SHRM resources (master’s students only)
- HumRRo Meredith P. Crawford Fellowship
Internship
The Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) is pleased to sponsor paid summer internship opportunities for graduate students in Industrial-Organizational (I-O) Psychology* accredited programs.

Application Deadline: February 1
For more information and application materials visit our website at www.humrro.org

* or students in closely related fields

HumRRO
Custom solutions for your human capital and measurement challenges

66 Canal Center Plaza, Suite 700, Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1578
Phone: 703.549.3611 Fax: 703.549.9661 www.humrro.org
Greetings TIP readers, and welcome to our second issue of the Spotlight on HWP column! In this column, we are focusing upon issues of humanitarian work psychology, that is, on the synthesis of industrial-organizational psychology with deliberate and organized efforts to enhance human welfare. In this issue, we are placing our spotlight on the work of Dr. Ruth Kanfer, Dr. Rustin Meyer, and Ms. Carla Burrus at the Georgia Institute of Technology, who through a partnership with CARE (www.care.org), one of the world’s largest and most influential international humanitarian agencies, are helping to improve healthcare delivery in India. The work of the team from Georgia Tech helps to illustrate the relevance of I-O psychology to the humanitarian and international development sector. Indeed, Melinda Gates, co-founder of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF), has cited this effort as a notable success in international development work (see this link; CNN-IBN, 2013).

CARE (Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere) is an international humanitarian agency that engages with a number of issues including water and sanitation, economic development, education, and health in over 80 countries around the world. Specifically, the Georgia Tech team is engaging with CARE on their Ananya Program—funded by BMGF—which seeks to transform public health in India’s poorest state of Bihar and to improve the health and survival of women, newborns, and children.

In large part, effective healthcare delivery in impoverished areas such as Bihar relies upon a policy approach known as task shifting. In the international develop-
ment community, task shifting refers to when “specific tasks are moved, where appropriate, from highly qualified health workers to health workers with shorter training and fewer qualifications in order to make more efficient use of the available human resources for health” (World Health Organization, 2008, p. 2). In the case of India, many tasks related to maternal health have been delegated to frontline healthcare workers who, at least from a traditional Western or U.S. perspective, might not normally be responsible for such duties. Frontline healthcare workers are critical in India due to a severe shortage of professionally trained doctors and nurses and to infant mortality rates of over 44 children per 1,000 live births (compared to 2.17 in Japan or 5.90 in the United States; Central Intelligence Agency, 2013). The need for these workers is especially great in Bihar, a state which lags behind others in India with poverty rates (53.5%) almost twice that of the rest of the country and with over half of its children under the age of 5 being underweight (United Nations Development Programme, 2013).

In general, Rustin and Ruth were charged with helping to increase the performance and cooperation of three different types of frontline healthcare workers. We now turn to the team at Georgia Tech to hear more about their work with CARE in India and about how I-O psychology has been, and can be, used to enhance humanitarian and development efforts.

An Interview With Drs. Rustin Meyer and Ruth Kanfer

Can you tell us more about how you came to work with CARE? Quite fortuitously actually. In 2011, a graduate student in our I-O program, Carla Burrus, described I-O to a CARE employee at a social gathering. The employee grew interested and contacted us to set up a meeting. Ruth has a long track record of working with international development organizations, and Rustin had become very interested in the growing subdiscipline of humanitarian work psychology, so this project was a great opportunity and a natural fit for our team. Ruth’s experience in this arena proved invaluable as she had both engaged with the issue of health worker
motivation (e.g., Franco, Bennett, & Kanfer, 2002) and had delivered a report on the subject for the United States Agency for International Development (Kanfer, 1999). Meanwhile, Rustin’s expertise in situational strength provided a lens through which we were able to help CARE develop a more effective incentive based intervention.

**What was your specific objective in the project?**

CARE had identified that a major obstacle to improving maternal and child healthcare was a lack of cooperation between three different types of frontline healthcare workers. One group, known as Accredited Social Health Activists (ASHAs), has the job of encouraging pregnant women in their communities to give birth in a modern hospital, providing education about prebirth health, and providing basic resources like iron folate tablets to keep women and their unborn children healthy. ASHAs are hybrid volunteers who are paid a small monetary incentive for every woman whom they convince to give birth in hospitals. The second group of frontline healthcare workers, women known as Anganwadi workers, are volunteers who are responsible for early childcare in their communities, including preschool education and the distribution of food rations. The third group, Auxiliary Nurse Midwives, are salaried employees who oversee the ASHA and Anganwadi workers. In the past, these three groups of frontline health workers did not see themselves as part of the same team, despite their overlapping objectives and the fact that they were supposed to hold monthly “health subcenter” meetings in their communities. Indeed, workers often reportedly grew resentful of others over issues of compensation, pay, and perceived beneficiary poaching.

Prior to our involvement in the project, CARE had begun to develop training resources for the frontline healthcare workers and a more effective monthly health subcenter meeting structure. The centerpiece of this intervention was a team-based incentive system that was intended to address performance and cooperation failures by providing the three groups of frontline healthcare workers with common goals in seven performance areas. For those health subcenter teams that met a given quarterly goal, all members of the team would receive a small nonmonetary reward from a list of household items (e.g., a nonstick cook pan). Because the framework for this program was already in place when we became involved, our role primarily revolved around “fine tuning” the specifics of this reward system (e.g., utilizing partial rewards of partial goal attainment, implementing rewards on a manageable quarterly basis, encouraging teams to set informal monthly goals) and focusing the meeting structure on team development and performance (e.g., by beginning each meeting...
with a pledge that workers recited to reaffirm their commitment to their team/community, formally tracking goal progress, encouraging employees to discuss potential solutions to difficult situations they have experienced).

The ultimate success of this initiative will be determined by whether teams at various health subcenters are able to improve their performance according to the specific targets set for them. To evaluate this program, subcenters where we introduced meeting reforms and incentives are being compared by an independent research team to those wherein only the new monthly meeting was introduced. Although final results are still pending, anecdotal evidence appears promising. In addition to our more “consulting oriented” role, CARE is helping us collect data on relevant psychological and team processes, which we hope will not only help inform the development of related interventions but might also be publishable in I-O journals.

How did I-O psychology play a role in this project?

In the course of working together with CARE, it has become apparent that nearly all international development work has an organizational component to it, but most development agencies’ areas of expertise lie in the domain of public health. Thus, they often do not have the expertise necessary to address the interpersonal and organizational dynamics that sometimes stand in the way of project success. By joining the project, we brought a complementary perspective to the CARE team by focusing in on human behavior, team processes, and theories of behavior change. This included insights from organizational development, training, team de-
The greatest contribution of I-O psychology to this, and similar projects, might be I-O psychologists’ interest in and focus upon organizational and behavior processes, as opposed to just outcomes. Development work is necessarily a heavily outcome-based industry because scarce resources need to be allocated to those projects that get results. However, it seems that insight into why projects did or did not work is often lost because theories and measurement of human behavior are underexamined.

**What difficulties have you experienced on this project that you have not in other applied-research projects?**

This project presented great challenges, both to our theories and our research methods. First, many cross-cultural norms and socioeconomic factors (e.g., low levels of literacy) were at play that we were not accustomed to in our work in the United States. For example, when we asked frontline health workers how they would like to change their jobs, we were met by blank stares because the idea that they could change the way they perform their job was a deeply foreign concept. Also, we had to consult with experts about how unforeseen external forces might affect both the outcomes of interest and team processes. For example, some communities experience prolonged geographic seclusion due to flooding, some have unique dynamics due to the presence of religious minorities, and the constraints of the social caste system inevitably play a role in access to scarce resources.

Second, our research methods were especially put to the test. For example, structured interviews were difficult due to the bustling health subcenters where standers-by would frequently disrupt the interviews, interviewees would consult with colleagues on their answers, and long delays due to translation issues (not to mention sitting on the dirt floors of non-air conditioned buildings in 110 degree heat!). Moreover, we tried to administer surveys with Likert scales, but there is a strong cultural norm of acquiescence among this population, and it was difficult for respondents to distinguishing between adjacent response options (e.g., strongly agree vs. agree)—both of which led to issues of severe range restriction. To circumvent these issues, we have since shifted to collecting very behaviorally driven response options, but this approach carries its own challenges, such as ensuring that behavioral options are maximally relevant and comprehensive.

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

One of the first things is to encourage I-Os to give a talk at a development organization in your area. We’ve found that [Guidestar](http://guidestar.org) is a particularly useful tool for finding not-for-profit agencies,
learning about their missions, and finding key contacts therein. In our limited experience in this area, we have been very pleasantly surprised by how favorably members of the development community have received our perspective and areas of expertise.

Second, take nothing for granted. Challenges operate at all levels of HWP research and practice. Obviously, socio-cultural variables play a major role in developing countries, and the multitude of direct and indirect ways that these variables affect employee attitudes and behaviors needs to be carefully taken into account. In politically unstable countries, the personal safety of employees (in particular women) may be a major barrier to even traveling to/from work, so issues of job design, team coordination, and so on often take a backseat to more pressing needs.

Operationally, there are also many challenges. Most obviously, you will travel to remote areas of the world, there are major time-zone differences with in-the-field colleagues, and this work often involves large and diverse teams with different priorities and timeframes. But beyond these logistical issues, there are also unresolved issues of construct validity/measurement equivalence stemming from translating measures, using instruments that have been validated in developed countries, the influence of cultural norms at every step, and gathering data among participants with low literacy rates.

Third, think broadly about what motivates employees in developing economies and non-Western cultures. In the developing world, financial rewards are often not possible due to a lack of resources, so attempts to increase work motivation and engagement must often rely on nonfinancial incentives. In India, a strong precedent is placed on social recognition and incentives that can be used to improve collectives. For example, many women we spoke to reported giving their incentives to their daughters or coordinating with their colleagues to select incentives they can share. As such, it is important to differentiate between those incentives that enhance work motivation, skill acquisition, and job engagement by encouraging skill learning and personal/professional development versus those that help to build stronger social/affiliative ties.

Fourth, understanding the complexities of multilevel forces that operate in development settings is critical. The volatility of the environment in developing countries makes analysis of motivational and performance problems more difficult. In contrast to developed countries, family and community memberships often exert strong influence on behavior that functions within a broader cultural context. Further, more top-down considerations such as governmental policies and even corruption might influence what is possi-
ble/prudent in a particular setting. Thus, interventions to enhance work motivation and performance may be best accomplished by identifying the overlapping goals of these different groups and creating environments and reward systems that promote new synergies for action.

Finally, jump right in. HWP work is inevitably interesting, challenging, and rewarding. Recognize that we have a skill set that the development community is looking for, which creates nontraditional opportunities for collaboration, research, and learning that will change your life.

**Conclusion**

Thank you to Drs. Meyer and Kanfer for their time in giving us a picture of their work with CARE in India. Their work there serves as a fantastic example of the relevance of I-O psychology to deliberate and organized efforts to enhance human welfare! As they illustrated, while I-O psychologists from Western/U.S. settings might encounter many challenging, and foreign, theoretical and practical dynamics when working in non-Western and lower-income settings, the potential contributions of I-O psychology are often extremely beneficial and stand the chance of dramatically improving the welfare of some of the world’s most vulnerable and marginalized populations. It seems likely that the need for task shifting will remain strong as the fight to improve maternal and child health continues. It obvious from the report from the team at Georgia Tech that I-O psychology has much to add to this effort and we are confident that their work is, and will be, only one example of I-O psychologists getting involved in this important global issue.
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The Latest on EEO Challenges to Background Checks

Introduction

Shortly before this article was due, EEOC lost a high profile background check challenge on summary judgment. The case, *EEOC v. Freeman*, ended when a judge ruled that the agency could not show that the criminal history check had adverse impact against black applicants. This ruling mirrored some aspects of another high profile summary judgment background check ruling against the agency in *EEOC v. Kaplan*, where a judge ruled that EEOC could not persuasively show that a credit screen had adverse impact against minority candidates. Interestingly, these rulings came after a series of background check settlements that were perceived by the EEO community as EEOC victories, including one against Pepsi and most recently, against J.B. Hunt. EEOC also recently publicized two other criminal history challenges, one against a BWM manufacturing facility and another against Dollar General.

Until recently, criminal history and credit screens used as background checks for employment were fairly uncommon when it came to EEO challenges. However, under the Obama administration, the EEOC has focused on a number of non-traditional selection tools, including these common post offer screens. Criminal history and credit checks are selection tools that can be challenged under both pattern or practice (if used in facially discriminatory ways) and disparate impact theories (if used in facially neutral ways but producing adverse impact against members of a protected group). In the disparate impact scenario, *Uniform Guidelines* style standards related to adverse impact measurement and validation research would seem to
apply. Most of the activity described in this article relates to disparate impact.

In this article we describe how and why criminal and credit screens ended up on EEOC radar. We review recent and historical EEOC and OFCCP guidance on the matter, as well as the rulings in Kaplan and Freeman. We also consider a recent response by nine state attorney generals, who have taken exception to EEOC challenges to criminal history screens. We conclude with implications for I-O Psychologists, and include some perspective from Kevin Murphy, who was involved in both Kaplan and Freeman on behalf of EEOC and was willing to share his view.

Some Context and Agency Guidance

In the spring of 2012, EEOC provided guidance on arrest/conviction records that largely went under the radar. That guidance really didn’t provide anything new, and instead reiterated standards from Green v. Missouri Pacific Railroad (or MOPAC), in which the 8th Circuit outlined factors for assessing conviction. MOPAC had an absolute policy of excluding individuals convicted of crimes other than minor traffic offenses. Buck Green served 21 months in prison for refusing military induction, and was excluded by MOPAC for a clerk job. The district court granted summary judgment for MOPAC, but the 8th Circuit reversed, ruling:

We cannot conceive of any business necessity that would automatically place every individual convicted of any offense, except a minor traffic offense, in the permanent ranks of the unemployed. This is particularly true for blacks who have suffered and still suffer from the burdens of discrimination in our society. To deny job opportunities to these individuals because of some conduct which may be remote in time or does not significantly bear upon the particular job requirements is an unnecessarily harsh and unjust burden.

The 8th Circuit then outlined four factors for assessing conviction records, namely: (1) nature and seriousness of the crime in relation to the job sought; (2) time elapsing since the conviction; (3) degree of the felon's rehabilitation; and (4) the circumstances under which the crime was committed. These factors were referred to as the “Green factors” during the commission hearing.

This updated guidance was followed up by a public hearing held in December of 2012. During the meeting representatives for ex-offenders hailed the EEOC guidance as a warning to employers to cease using criteria that adversely affect opportunities for Blacks and Hispanics to re-enter the workforce. Representatives of employers, however, complained that the guidance presents legal complications for employers using background
checks because they are compelled by federal, state, or local laws to exclude applicants based on particular types of past convictions.

About a year later, OFCCP published Directive 306, which essentially reiterated EEOC’s 2012 guidance, and stressed that employers should conduct an individualized assessment of the job-relatedness of a conviction to the job to which the candidate applied. OFCCP also adopted EEOC’s guidance that, where disparate impact occurs, employers must validate their criminal background check policies.

Both agencies cited numerous statistics reflecting that minorities are disproportionately disqualified by criminal background checks. For example, OFCCP indicated African Americans make up about 13 percent of the country’s population, but constitute 40 percent of the currently incarcerated population. The Directive also reported that 1 in 15 African-American men and 1 in 36 Hispanic men, as compared to 1 in 106 White men, are incarcerated during their lifetime.

To avoid unnecessary exposure, the agencies recommend that employers refrain from inquiring about criminal history on job applications. Where such information is requested, an “individualized assessment” that is “narrowly tailored to the essential job requirements and actual circumstances under which the jobs are performed” is needed. Mirroring Green standards, such consideration should include (1) the nature or gravity of the offense or conduct; (2) the time elapsed since the offense, conviction, and/or completion of the sentence; and (3) the nature of the job sought or held. An alternative approach is to conduct a validation study similar to that used in establishing the job relatedness of other selection tools.

With regard to credit checks, the commission had a similar meeting in late October 2010 that focused on the use of credit checks in hiring. The two basic views expressed were that credit history is unfairly exclusionary, particularly during times of economic recession, or that credit histories can be predictive in certain situations when they are limited in scope. SIOP’s own Michael Aamodt testified at the hearing on issues of job-relatedness, and concluded that there is considerable research on credit scores in relation to consumer decisions, but little research on their use in the employment context. He suggested that in view of the potential for discriminatory exclusion, it would be best to limit the use of credit history within the context of a thorough background check.
Early Contemporary Settlements

In early 2012 EEOC settled with Pepsi Beverages in a $1.3 million agreement to head off litigation. According to the EEOC, Pepsi used arrest and conviction criteria, which adversely impacted Blacks, and therefore were illegal under Title VII. More specifically, the EEOC noted:

When employers contemplate instituting a background check policy, the EEOC recommends that they take into consideration the nature and gravity of the offense, the time that has passed since the conviction and/or completion of the sentence, and the nature of the job sought in order to be sure that the exclusion is important for the particular position.

According to the press release, the EEOC began its investigation in 2007 after an applicant filed a charge with the EEOC for an arrest even though his case had yet to be prosecuted. Based on its investigation, more than 300 individuals were illegally excluded between 2006 and 2010. Apparently, Pepsi also excluded applicants guilty of minor offenses bearing no relationship to the requirements of the at issue jobs. Pepsi also agreed to hire class members in their top three job location preferences, and to report to the EEOC on a regular basis on its new background check policies, which were initiated prior to the actual settlements.

A more recent EEOC settlement involved J.B. Hunt. Although there is little detail in the press release, the allegation centers on a Black candidate for a truck driver position at a J.B. Hunt facility in San Bernardino, CA who was denied employment based on his criminal conviction record. There were no specifics relating to the actual criminal conviction(s) other than the EEOC’s assertion that it/they were unrelated to the job duties. The excluded applicant settled privately with the company.

More importantly perhaps was the EEOC’s examination of potential blanket prohibitions, which the EEOC warns against based on its Policy Guidance. Accordingly, J.B. Hunt agreed to a five-year plan to review its policies and revise them, if necessary. J.B. Hunt agreed to provide additional training relating to its hiring and selection policies in accordance with the Policy Guidance, and the EEOC will monitor compliance with the conciliation agreement.

Based on these settlements, EEOC appeared to have momentum based on voluntary settlements. That changed with the Kaplan ruling.

The Kaplan Ruling

EEOC v. Kaplan Higher Learning was decided on January 28 by Judge Patricia A. Gaughan of the District Court for the
Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division (2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11722). The EEOC claimed that Kaplan’s use of credit reports adversely impacted Black applicants. The defense challenged the EEOC’s expert report showing there was adverse impact. Judge Gaughan ruled that the EEOC’s report was inadmissible under Daubert standards, and therefore, there was no evidence of adverse impact. As a result, Kaplan was awarded summary judgment.

Kaplan’s use of credit checks was limited to certain sensitive positions and was designed to determine if applicants were under “financial stress or burdens that might compromise their ethical obligations.” The credit histories of applicants given a conditional offer of hire were first reviewed by an outside credit agency, General Information Services (GIS), to determine the presence of one or more of ten potential “flags.” If the flags existed, the credit history was then reviewed by Kaplan’s controller who could override the flags if other evidence suggested the flags were not an accurate picture of potential financial stress for a particular applicant.

EEOC argued that this credit history review had adverse impact against Black applicants and was not job related. Kaplan’s two experts argued that EEOC’s analyses had two serious flaws: (1) no control for important variables such as the job applied for, and (2) because race information was not available for the full set of applicants, EEOC’s use of “race raters” to determine race from applicants’ driver’s license photos was unreliable.

The key ingredient in Judge Gaughan’s rulings was that the proof of adverse impact, based entirely on the EEOC’s expert report, was not based on objective self-report tallies of applicant race, but rather, subjective approximations based on agreement among raters on race classifications (e.g., African American, Caucasian, Hispanic, Asian, or other). Kaplan called the “race rater” technique “guesswork” and offered reasons why it failed under Daubert standards, which require evidence that: (1) a technique or theory can be or has been tested; (2) whether it has been subject to peer review and publication; (3) the known or potential rate of error of the technique or theory; (4) the existence and maintenance of standards and controls; and (5) whether the technique or theory has been generally accepted in the scientific community. Kaplan’s attorneys challenged the EEOC’s expert report on each of these dimensions, and Judge Gaughan agreed, ruling:

Upon review, the Court finds that the expert reports and testimony provided by [EEOC’s expert] are inadmissible because plaintiff fails to present sufficient evidence that the use of "race raters" is reliable. Simply put, plaintiff offers no evidence sufficient to satisfy any of the Daubert factors.
The Freeman Ruling

_EEOC v. Freeman_ first made headlines back in 2012 when Freeman attorneys moved to depose EEOC on its own use of background checks. It isn’t surprising to hear that many federal agencies, including EEOC, use background checks in one way or another as part of their selection system. This early ruling was decided in August of 2012 by Judge Charles B. Day, Magistrate for the District Court of Maryland. The facts are that the EEOC sued Freeman on grounds that its use of background checks and criminal records adversely impacted Blacks, Hispanics, and males. Freeman then moved to depose the EEOC regarding its own use of background checks and criminal history, to which the EEOC filed a motion for a protective order and Freeman filed its own motion. Judge Day rejected both motions and ruled that a hearing on them is unnecessary. Judge Day examined three issues.

First, the EEOC argued that the deposition would not discover information relevant to claims and defenses in this case because Freeman has (1) not pled an equitable estoppel defense and (2) its business necessity defense lacks merit. On the estoppel issue, Judge Day ruled:

> Because Defendant failed to include equitable estoppel as an affirmative defense in its Answer and has not yet obtained leave to amend its Answer to include this defense, discovery of matters relating to this affirmative defense are not relevant, and Defendant cannot depose Plaintiff on topics related to this defense.

And on the issue of the business necessity defense, Judge Day ruled that the EEOC:

> [C]annot avoid a deposition because it believes that Defendant's business necessity defense is baseless. Arguments regarding the merits of claims or defenses asserted in pleadings "[are] not the kind[s] of argument[s] that the Court can adequately entertain in a discovery dispute."

Second, the EEOC argued it cannot be deposed because the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) formulates and conducts all hiring procedures and, as a result, it does not itself have the authority to make “suitability determinations.” Judge Day’s ruling on this issue was:

> [E]ven if Plaintiff uses OPM's federally mandated procedures, the facts show that Plaintiff is involved in the hiring process, and so Defendant's 30(b)(6) deposition of Plaintiff regarding its actual involvement in that process and the process itself would provide relevant information.
Third, the EEOC argued that a deposition would be "unduly burdensome, duplicative and interfere with agency functioning" because (1) such information is already available and is, therefore redundant; (2) Freeman already had ample opportunity to obtain the information it wanted; and (3) “the burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit.” Judge Day rejected all three arguments.

An actual ruling on the merits of the case was handed down in August of 2013 by Judge Roger W. Titus of the District Court of Maryland. After much wrangling, the case reduced to whether adverse impact was identified. It boiled down to an evaluation of selection rates for two classes, including: (1) 51 Black applicants passed over between March 23, 2007, and Aug. 11, 2011 because of credit histories, and (2) 83 Black and male workers passed over between Nov. 30, 2007 and July 12, 2012 based on criminal records. In attempting to make a prima facie cases of adverse impact, the EEOC’s expert submitted an initial report that was admittedly flawed. A second report designed to correct the flaws was then submitted, and independently replicated by another expert. According to Judge Titus, despite the attempt to deflaw the data, there remained a “mind-boggling number of errors,” most notably using “cherry-picked” data that supported the EEOC’s theory of adverse impact, but did not include data on all available applicants for the two classes for the entire class period. Judge Titus used various descriptors of the analysis, including “flawed,” “skewed,” “rife with analytical errors,” “laughable,” and “an egregious example of scientific dishonesty” designed to fit the EEOC’s theory. He also cited the EEOC’s failure to isolate a specific selection practice that purportedly caused the adverse impact.

In summary, in both Kaplan and Freeman rulings, the merit of the credit and criminal history screens were never formally evaluated. This was because in neither case did EEOC meet the first prong under disparate impact theory, identifying meaningful adverse impact. When considered together, these rulings appear to be a major roadblock to EEOC’s initiative. Yet another potential hurdle was waiting in July of 2013.

State Attorney Generals Weigh in

On July 25, 2013, a letter was submitted to EEOC authored by West Virginia Attorney General Patrick Morrisey. He was joined by attorneys general from Alabama, Colorado, Georgia, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, South Carolina and Utah. The letter was reprinted in the West Virginia Record. The letter was in response to recent lawsuits against Dollar General (the 28th largest private employer in
Morrisey disagreed with EEOC’s position that criminal background checks that adversely impact African Americans are often not job related, and that the EEOC’s actual concern is to expand Title VII protections to former criminals. He suggested that this protection is something that Congress has never required. He also asserted that the EEOC lawsuits “defy common sense,” noting:

An employer may have any number of nondiscriminatory reasons for not wanting to hire people who cannot pass a criminal background check. Even if the use of criminal background checks in hiring might seem unfair to some, the law does not prohibit it. It is not the commission’s role to unilaterally expand the protections of Title VII under the pretext of preventing racial discrimination.

He concluded that the lawsuit against Dollar General occurred in conjunction with West Virginia’s concerns that its businesses already face “multiple of burdensome regulations” and that “the last thing we need is another federal agency freelancing and imposing even more unnecessary requirements.” At the time this TIP article was written, there had been no formal response to this letter.

**Implications for I-O Psychologists**

We hope that the above sections illustrate the roller coaster ride that has been the contemporary EEO enforcement of background check issues. In the last 3 years we have seen public hearings, new guidance, major settlements in favor of EEOC, two major court rulings against EEOC, and a letter from nine state attorneys general requesting that EEOC stand down. Importantly, we think that this topic has implications for I-O psychologists doing selection work.

First, whether you know it or not, there is a good chance that your organizations or your client organizations are using a background check in some form. Recent survey data from SHRM suggests that the majority of its members use a background check in some capacity. Given this scenario, it is critical to have a clear understanding of what those processes are measuring, how they are being implemented, and whether they include
individualized assessment or have been more formally validated.
Second, it is important to consider whether these tools have adverse impact in practice. As the Kaplan and Freeman rulings show, this may be a more difficult research question to answer. We find this to be a particularly interesting issue. Broad societal data were used in agency policy documents to support the need for contemporary guidance on these issues (or at the very least a reminder that this guidance has been around for 30 years). In practice it is clear that there may not be readily available self-report applicant flow data to assess whether a particular screen has adverse impact against minorities for a particular job in a particular organization. Given this scenario, the question becomes whether EEOC could leverage other data sources. In the case of Kaplan, an alternative to self-report was race coding by raters, which was not well received. Perhaps the agency is also considering some type of utilization analysis under an “adverse inference” theory that would function as a proxy in the absence of applicant flow.

Third, it is important to note that conducting traditional validation research on background check screens may be difficult to impossible. From a criterion perspective, low base rate outcomes coupled with restriction of range may render criterion strategies impossible. This was essentially noted in Mike Aamodt’s testimony to EEOC on credit checks that we mentioned earlier. Mike scoured traditional and non-traditional literature and identified only ten studies that had empirical data linking credit data to work outcomes. There is even more-limited data on criminal history data. Given this scenario, could some type of content linkage be feasible? We think that it could be in some situations. Using job analysis methods to understand exposure to various background check content areas (e.g., money, sensitive information, other people, public trust) and the opportunity to engage in counter productive work behaviors may allow for reasonable inferences to be made. Presenting these considerations in a matrix form and linking them to specific background check requirements may provide initial linkage data that supports use for some jobs and not others. To our knowledge this approach has not been challenged in court, but on its face we consider it promising.

From our perspective, EEOC’s choice to challenge Kaplan and Freeman on their background check policies was interesting. We aren’t involved in either of these cases and don’t know the exact details, but based on what is known publically, these cases don’t seem like low hanging fruit. In some ways the screens used by Kaplan and Freeman sound consistent with EEOC policy guidance. They appeared to use well-structured systems in
which background checks were not automatic exclusionary factors. The checks were tied to specific types of jobs where they seemed relevant, and flags were followed up to determine whether applicants should be excluded.

Even more puzzling is the EEOC’s current complaint against Dollar General. Although we have not seen the statistical significance analyses regarding adverse impact, based on what has been made public it appears that 90% of Black applicants passed the criminal history check compared to 93% of non-Blacks. This difference doesn’t appear to be practically significant. Furthermore, as with both Kaplan and Freeman, Dollar General used a targeted approach in which it considered the nature of the crime as well as the amount of time that had passed since the conviction/release from jail.

Having said that, we caution employers to refrain from ignoring EEOC guidance on background checks on grounds that Kaplan and Freeman are indicative of how all such cases will go in the future. Critically, neither of these cases got to a defense phase, which undoubtedly will occur in a future case if the EEOC does a better job of proving adverse impact. The best practice here is to be prepared to justify the use of your background check process.

We end the column in an unusual but interesting way. As mentioned earlier, Kevin Murphy was involved in both cases as an expert for EEOC. Given common themes across the two cases related to an inability to demonstrate adverse impact, we thought it would be useful to reach out to Kevin to see if he would be willing to provide context and lessons learned. Obviously Kevin wasn’t excited about how these two cases played out, and he is coming from the perspective of working with EEOC on both cases. Regardless, he was generous enough to share some perspective, and we appreciate it.

Kevin’s Perspective

Recent decisions in *EEOC v. Kaplan* and *EEOC v. Freeman* represent significant setbacks to EEOC’s attempt to challenge the use of credit and criminal background checks in screening job applicants. The issues in both cases are clear. There is evidence that credit checks have adverse impact against Black and Hispanic applicants and that criminal background checks have adverse impact on male, Black and Hispanic applicants in a wide range of settings. There is scant evidence that credit or criminal background checks have real probative value when they are used for broad screening. For example, research on criminal background checks shows that the potential value of these checks for screening declines as the time between
the offense and the employment decision increases or as the similarity between the offense and the specific behavior to be predicted decreases (e.g., past theft predicts future theft, whereas past drug use may not predict future drug use).

As Eric and Art noted, in both cases the court ruled that the EEOC had not presented credible evidence of adverse impact. The Kaplan decision has already been appealed; EEOC is considering an appeal of the judge’s decision in Freeman. The issues in these two cases both carry important lessons for I-O psychologists working in employment litigation.

In Kaplan, the organization claimed that it did not know or record information about the race of its applicants, which would make it difficult to hold them liable for using employment practices that had adverse impact. EEOC considered a number of strategies for recovering this information, and determined that information could be obtained from various Departments of Motor Vehicles that would enable them to determine the race of applicants. Some states record race, but most provided drivers license photos. Panels of behavioral scientists with experience working in multiracial contexts viewed photos, and stringent criteria were set to accept their judgments as valid indicators of the race of applicants whose photos were viewed. The court rejected this procedure, noting that it has not been subject to scientific peer review and that the error rate could not be established. In their appeal of the Kaplan ruling, EEOC has presented an extensive review of research showing that even when race identification via pictures is made purposefully difficult (e.g., when pictures are altered using photo morphing software or when subjects are chosen who have mixed heritage), error rates are very low, and that the procedures used are more rigorous than those accepted by other courts. However, this judge’s ruling does carry an important lesson. Even if a proposition seems on the face of it to be obvious, strong evidence is better than a strong logical argument. Here, the proposition that we cannot identify race by looking at a picture seems on the face of it wrong (ask yourself how you know that John Elway is white and that Lawrence Taylor is black), but EEOC did not present compelling evidence for the validity of their procedures in their initial filings.

In Freeman, the organization complied with discovery, but presented their data files in piecemeal fashion. It is not clear if they did this purposefully, but a good lawyer would certainly advise them that it is not their job and is not in their interest to make the EEOC’s task of reassembling the data provided into a coherent whole an easy one. In Freeman, the court concluded that EEOC had not been
sions of the organization. The subset of data that was reliable and uncontested was not sufficiently large or representative, and the data that represented the entire organization and time period was not sufficiently reliable to establish adverse impact. Here, the lesson seems to be that enforcement agencies and the experts who work with them may have to deploy greater forethought and precision in framing discovery requests and to be in a position to deploy money and resources in increasing orders of magnitude to make sense of the data they receive.

Stay tuned everyone. It will be interesting to see if an appeals court agrees with Kevin’s perspective on these and other issues.
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“Big Data” Technologies: Problem or Solution?
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“Data is not information, information is not knowledge, knowledge is not understanding, understanding is not wisdom.” - Clifford Stoll

By now, you have probably heard about the new “big data” trend and seen a plethora of articles that discuss the topic. To most practitioners and researchers within the field of industrial-organizational (I-O) psychology, big data isn’t new. Quite the contrary: I-O psychologists have been leveraging large amounts data to predict human behavior and make organizational decisions for decades (Putka, 2013). In fact, I-O psychologists have long understood that “big data” can improve training practices, help track performance over time, provide a basis for new recruitment techniques, and streamline
selection and hiring practices and much more. However, what is new is the realization that there is a nearly constant imbalance between how much data we are able to collect and how quickly and appropriately we can make sense of the data, says Mike Hruska, CEO of Problem Solutions. In addition, there are new technologies that are changing the abundance of data being collected, availability of data, and data interoperability, thus increasing the number of ways in which we can use data to improve workplace practices.

Even though big data may not be new to I-O psychologists or other related fields, we all still have much to learn and gain from the immense amount of data available and new technologies that are providing access and an ability to handle these data. Our goal for this column is to expose a few of the new technologies and the benefits they bring to areas such as training, recruitment, and selection as well as some of the risks these new technologies introduce. We will briefly discuss ways I-O psychologists can manage big data, leverage these technologies to move forward, help organizations address the risks, and support the development of evidence-based solutions or interventions.

**Big Data Opens New Frontiers in Practice and Research**

“Big data is most simply a lot of data. It could be defined by the volume or by the potential associations within the data,” says Mike Hruska, and it is quickly accruing due to new technologies that allow the collection, storage, and analysis of data in new ways that were not previously available to researchers. Big data analytics is not only opening new frontiers to inform organizational decisions, but it is serving as the foundation for state-of-the-art interventions.

**Big Data Allows for Adaptive and Individualized Training**

U.S. organizations spent approximately $156.2 billion on employee learning and development in 2011 with an increasing amount spent on technology such as mobile learning, virtual collaborative workspaces, and distributed simulations (ASTD, 2012). Such big data technologies include ones that allow for adaptive training or accelerated learning to take place. In other words, these technologies are personalizing training by selecting an appropriate training event or changing the content within the event based on the learners’ competence level or other characteristics. The technologies that tailor or adapt the training experiences include but are not limited to intelligent tutoring systems or computer-based tutoring systems. Within an event, effective solutions tailor feedback, provide opportunities for reflection, and change the content, direction, pace, and challenge level of instruction to optimize learning (e.g., acquisition of
knowledge or skills). Most notably, they select optimal instructional strategies to meet the specific learning needs of individuals or teams (Sottilare, Brawner, Goldberg, & Holden, 2012). Whether the event or training content is being adapted, the goal is to maintain the optimal level of challenge for trainees, provide support, and correct errors, which can all lead to greater training efficiency (Durlach & Ray, 2011).

Other technologies are being designed to capture large amounts of data about the learner and their experiences in order to describe what is happening in any given situation or training event (formal or informal) and collect data at various levels (e.g., individual, team, organizational). One example is the Learning Record Store (LRS), developed through initiatives at the Advanced Distributed Learning (ADL) Co-Lab, which is a storage system for user activity (ADL, 2013a). In addition, ADL along with the Department of Defense is also developing a new online learning standard called the Experience API (xAPI) that gives learners, instructional developers, and instructors the opportunity to track diverse types and modalities of experiences and access data that far exceeds the current capabilities (ADL, 2013c). In conjunction with the learning technology, xAPI will allow the community to track within traditional and nontraditional environments that were otherwise not able to be captured by previous standards such as SCORM (ADL, 2013b). Other technologies such as learning management systems (LMS) are also being enhanced in order to track learner data that might occur in an informal training environment such as mobile applications, game-based learning, and virtual environments.

These technologies are just a few of many efforts that will afford instructors and organizations the ability to collect activity across a variety of systems enabling virtually any other system to report who did what, when, and in what context. These are huge advancements that are pushing the bounds of how we capture and analyze associated data of trainee performance within a training event or other experiential learning opportunities that do not happen within the walls of a formal classroom. For example, organizations will be able to collect data on current books or articles that a learner might be reading, conferences they attend, virtual world interactions, and much more. As you might suspect, this is moving organizations in a direction of capturing a significant amount of data, which allows them to view learning paths that people take through the mapping of formal, informal, and experiential learning data. Take for example a 10,000 person organization that begins tracking 50 things per day per user; that’s about 18.2 million
data points per year! Furthermore, the collection of such data allows these systems to support point-of-need training in environments where human tutors are either unavailable or impractical.

**Human Resource Professionals Are Applying Real-Time Utilizations of Big Data**

Based on current market trends, it is likely that organizations will continue to invest in big data technologies that support recruiting and hiring practices as well. Recent reports show that less than 20% of human resource (HR) professionals, according to SHL’s *Global Assessment Trends Report*, are satisfied with their current technology systems’ ability to manage their talent data. Another survey, conducted by [CareerBuilder](https://www.careerbuilder.com), indicated that 12% of the HR professionals planned to use big data management and interpretation within the following 6 months to improve hiring and recruiting efforts.

One new company, Gild, has developed new big data software for recruitment and hiring purposes (Ritchel, 2013). This technology evaluates potential candidates for engineering or programming positions by analyzing their actual code from virtual communities such as GitHub or BitBucket, where they spend time developing software and code. In addition to analyzing their coding skills, this new technology also analyzes the candidate’s professional knowledge and then creates a score for each candidate, providing companies with an assessment of the candidate’s talent (Ritchel, 2013). Other technologies are using big data and analytics, and integrating them directly into the intervention. In other words, big data analytics can apply real-time utilizations of big data and the decisions rules derived from the analytics. For example, some new recruiting technologies use search engine and social media data to directly suggest jobs to potential recruits (Kutik, 2013). You may have noticed, for instance, that LinkedIn provides job suggestions based on your interests and skills. These technologies can also keep track of where the best sources to recruit candidates are by tracking the number of qualified applicants, the number of applicants interviewed, and also the number that were hired.

As you can see, there are many new big data technologies evolving and playing a larger role in the way organizations are recruiting, hiring, training, and managing their employees. I-O psychologists need to be aware of these technologies and help organization leverage them appropriately.

**With Big Data Opportunity Comes Big Risk**

Although there are many potential benefits of leveraging big data technologies, there are still many risks and problems that can result if the data are not
managed properly. Applications of big data must be guided by clear objectives and an understanding of organizational theories that drive data analysis methods. The potential risks stemming from careless, uninformed use, or even abuse, of big data and analytics may come in many forms. Below are just a few examples of these risks and issues.

**Investment in Big Data Can Lead to Financial Loss**
Big data can increase efficiency and reduce the cost of programs if leveraged correctly, but it can also have poor return on investment by unnecessarily increasing the costs of collecting and managing the data. Organizations need to determine if big data initiatives add value above and beyond a more traditional and less resource-demanding alternative. In other words, they need to determine if the gain from using big data technologies will justify the investment. Successful organizations do not adopt a methodology simply because it is accessible or fashionable. They do so because it adds value.

**Failure to Deeply Understand the Data Could Lead to Wrong Conclusions**
“There’s collecting and aggregating data and then there is understanding the results. That is where the disconnect is,” says Dr. Theodore Hayes, personnel research psychologist of the Assessment & Evaluation Branch of U.S. Office of Personnel Management. Uninformed users of big data applications believe that as long as the data volume is big, the velocity is fast, the source is novice, and the analytics are advanced, then “big data” will do its own magic. Some users also believe that the utility of big data comes from simply fishing around in the hope of finding relationships between any variables and that theory or carefully planning analysis is irrelevant. Other big data enthusiasts even go as far to suggest that researchers may need to stop worrying about the underlying cause of the phenomena and focus instead on that fact that it exists and learn how to manage it (Mayer-Schönberger & Cukier, 2013).

However, “big data is still imperfect data,” says Dr. Theodore Hayes, and just because the data are big, diverse, and pervasive, it does not make it a source of all relevant information. Simply put, effective organizational interventions should be based on sound theory and empirical evidence. Psychological and organizational theories can improve efficiency and effectiveness in data exploration by zooming in on the important aspects, providing a comprehensive perspective in the search of predictive and explanatory variables. This ensures that the data are being interpreted in a sensible manner and that development of any solutions are done so by uncovering the true relations at the construct level and not based on spurious associations.
Uninformed Analysis Can Lead to Violation of Fair Treatment

If organizations use the wrong data or analytics, it can lead to the wrong conclusions or a wrong intervention, which could result in significant issues. Not to mention potential lawsuits. These risks can even lead to unintended consequences such as unfair treatment. Developers and users of organizational interventions using big data need to be cognizant of the impact they have on individuals. If the interventions can lead to the change of the individuals’ employment status (e.g., whether being hired, whether getting a promotion, whether getting terminated, etc.), then the process leading to the decisions will still be subjected to regulatory scrutiny. “Any process that has a consequential nature for someone’s employment status relative to an organization is subject to regulation,” says Dr. Hayes. In selection applications, for example, a careless use of predictive analytics may lead to the use of race, gender, and age variables (or close proxies of them) as part of the selection decision, which is not defensible and could potentially lead to a lawsuit. An understanding of psychological measurement and employment law is vital in this case.

Careless Use of Data Can Lead to an Increase in Privacy Concerns

Though many organizations nowadays want to project a vigorous, tech-savvy image, misuse of big data or the failure to implement a proper communication plan may damage an organization’s image or relationship with its employees. Within an organization, big data driven interventions using untraditional data collection schemes (e.g., email communication trails, electronic monitoring), though well-intended and legal, may backfire if employees or job seekers feel that there is an invasion of privacy, a lack of trust, or a lack of transparency. For example, one study found that applicants who believed they were being remotely proctored during an assessment negatively reacted to the testing technology (Karim, Kaminsky, & Behrend, 2013). Furthermore, according to a recent Pew Report, 57% of individuals using mobile applications will remove or simply not download an app due to the perception that the app is collecting and using their personal information.

How Can I-O Psychologists Help?

Staying ahead of the big data curve requires that organizations have technology systems to support the collection, storage, and analysis of this data but more importantly that they have the appropriate human talent to interpret the use of this data (McIlvaine, 2013; Putka, 2013). Quite frankly, organizations need help making sense of what to do with all of the data and determining which big data approach is even neces-
sary (McIlvaine, 2013). Who better than I-O psychologists to help handle data and serve as advisors to organizations about how best to collect, analyze, and use big data to drive organizational decisions (Facteau, Mitchel, Manzullo, Carlisle, & Burke, 2013; Putka, 2013).

Whether it is I-O psychologists or others in related fields, the fact is we need to ensure that someone with training in psychometric principles, research theory and design, principles of organizational phenomena, organizational development, and interventions is assisting with these big data processes. This expertise is key to good data analysis and interpretation along with the development of appropriate interventions (Facteau et al., 2013; Putka, 2013).

There are many big data areas that I-O psychologists and others with similar backgrounds can assist with and facilitate best practices. Overall, these areas include:

- Leveraging data and analytics to inform and develop solutions that satisfy organizational issues.
- Facilitating the proper use of big data by providing substantive theories.
- Defining and evaluating the return on investment for technological solutions based on big data.
- Providing methodological guidance on data collection, management, and analysis.
- Ensuring data are representative of targeted populations, inclusive of critical predictor and criterion constructs, and are subjected to less errors or “noise.”
- Applying measurement theories to facilitate the design of big data driven assessments and evaluate the validity of the outcomes they produce.
- Assessing and addressing risks stemming from unintended consequences of big data applications.
- Document and report the effective use of big data applications to create a model for the future.

In short, I-O psychologists can help improve big data applications by ensuring organizations are collecting data in a more relevant, efficient, effective, and defensible way. As we know, technology is continually playing a bigger role and impacting our daily work; therefore, we must continue to stay ahead of the curve so we can know how best to use and leverage them appropriately. This is especially true for big data technologies. It is critical for I-O psychologists to stay up to date with current efforts and solutions that are changing the way organizations collect data so we can be there throughout the whole process to help inform practice. As Putka (2013) put it, big data is a “golden marketing opportunity” for the field of I-O psychology! As a sneak preview, our next article will focus on how each of you can create greater visibility
and personal brand as an I-O psychologist by leveraging these cutting-edge technologies and social media tools.

Follow us on Twitter @themodernapp and tell us how you are using #bigdata!
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Our journey through the metaphorical construction site that is organizational neuroscience (ON) begins with an exciting interview with Daniel Simons. Most of us know him for his famous experiments about inattentional blindness that shocked those of us who think of ourselves as perceptive. If the prior sentence sounded nonsensical, then watch Daniel Simons’ video here before continuing to read. As we mentioned in our first issue, we’re taking a “big tent” approach to ON that embraces a variety of methods and perspectives on our attitudes and behaviors, and that’s exactly what Daniel Simons’s work aims to do. In this issue, we discuss how we can fail to notice things in plain sight and how our intuitions can influence data and prediction.

We would far exceed our word limit if we were to spell out all of Daniel Simons’s accomplishments as a psychologist, so what follows is a very brief summary. Dr. Simons is a professor in the Departments of Psychology, Advertising, and Business Administration at the University of Illinois. He received a BA in psychology and cognitive science from Carleton College and a PhD in experimental psychology from Cornell University. His research has been funded by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and General Motors. In 2003, he received the Distinguished Scientific Award for Early Career Contribution to Psychology from the American Psychological Association. In addition to over 50 peer-reviewed publications, a book, numerous general press articles, keynotes,
and workshops, Dr. Simons has earned several awards for his pedagogical work at Cornell, Harvard, and the University of Illinois.

During the interview, we talk about Dr. Simons’ work researching inattentional blindness, change blindness, and mechanisms that explain why some people see gorillas and others fail to notice what we previously thought would be obvious.

What research projects are you currently conducting?
In addition to documenting failures of awareness and demonstrating failures of awareness, my work explores the mechanisms of perception, attention, and awareness. Demonstrations are useful because they bring home the point in a powerful way—they illustrate that an effect applies to many people, but it’s necessary to study such effects more systematically in a lab if you want to understand the mechanisms; there are only so many things you can do by putting people in a gorilla suit.

If there’s one unifying theme for my work over the past 5 years or so, it’s that our intuitions about how our minds work don’t always match the reality of how our minds work. I’m interested in that mismatch, why it matters, and when it matters. This isn’t a new idea, of course, but it’s an interesting one.

One of my recent studies (with coauthor Christopher Chabris) looks at how people think memory works. People hold really strong beliefs about how memory works—when it’s accurate and when it’s not—and a lot of those intuitions are wrong. Many are strikingly different from what we’ve known for 30 or 40 years from research on memory. For example, many people think memory works like a video camera. They know that’s not true for things like remembering a phone number or where you parked your car, but for things that are personally important, people feel like they’ve got a video record of what they experienced. People think that they remember important stuff vividly. That’s because when they recall it, it feels vivid, and they rarely check to see if they’re right! It’s an intuitive idea that we rarely question. In Harry Potter, Dumbledore extracts memories from his head and then reviews them. The idea is so intuitive that the implausibility doesn’t bother us. I’m interested in a variety of intuitions like this one, cases in which we think we understand how our mind works but don’t.

Another line of research explores individual differences in attention and awareness. With the gorilla video, about half of the people notice it and the other half don’t. The question I get most frequently is, “What is it about that 50% of people who notice it—are they somehow different from those who don’t?” The assump-
tion is that there must be something different about them that leads them to notice. But are there really noticers—people who are more likely to see these things? Are there missers—people who are oblivious? It’s remarkable how poorly we can predict who will notice. People who are really good at tracking things moving around on a display are no more likely to notice something unexpected. Working memory capacity doesn’t seem to have much if any effect. We’ve been exploring these types of individual differences for a while, and we really haven’t found any cognitive abilities that consistently predict whether someone will notice something unexpected. Cognitive abilities like working memory capacity can predict how well you’ll be able to stay on task and ignore distractors that you know about and are trying to ignore. It doesn’t predict how likely you are to notice something that you weren’t expecting in the first place. There might be some individual differences in personality that predict noticing, such as how inclined you are to remain focused on doing the task. But, even those predictors aren’t too reliable. If you can get people to try harder on the task or if you make the task harder, more people will miss something unexpected. But, it’s much harder to predict which people will notice.

I’m pretty skeptical about claims of unconscious processing. I don’t think there’s particularly compelling evidence for rich, meaningful processing happening outside of awareness. Of course the light from the gorilla hits your retina and is processed at some level without awareness, but I don’t think that you process the gorilla as a gorilla without awareness. It’s remarkably hard to show that something was processed entirely without awareness, and the inattentional blindness task is not a great way to do that. Just because people don’t report something doesn’t mean they weren’t aware of it at some level. Maybe people processed the gorilla as “stuff” but it got grouped with the team in black so they didn’t process it any more than that. Maybe people actually saw the gorilla, but were hesitant to report it because it’s so strange. So it can be hard to separate the question of whether or not they reported it from the question of whether or not they processed it at all. What’s necessary to claim that something is implicit is not a simple question.

What sort of basic behavioral measures are you using to study these different phenomena?
My feeling is that methods are a means to an end. We want to make sure that what we’re studying has real-world relevance and that we can measure it systematically. So in some studies we’ll
show videos and collect self-report data. In other studies, we’ll use response time measures over many trials and get a range for performance. We use eye tracking to gauge where people are looking across several displays to get a sense of what draws attention by using the eyes as a proxy for attention. I really like converging methods.

**What do you think are the most important lessons from your findings about attention and memory for people in organizational settings—both from a researcher’s perspective and a practitioner’s perspective?**

One biggie is don’t trust focus groups. I think there’s a real danger in trusting people’s introspections, especially if you are asking why they like something or, really, anything that requires them to have some sort of insight about how their mind is functioning and what the mechanisms are—that’s likely to be flawed because our intuitions about the mechanisms of our mind often are based on incomplete information. I think that’s probably the most consistent mistake I’ve encountered: When I talk to organizations that are trying to evaluate whether their employees are content, for example, they’ll just ask people, “What makes you happy?” That’s okay, but when they then ask people to explain the reasons why and base organizational changes on those introspections, they’re headed for trouble. People often have no idea why they like what they do, but they’ll give you a reason anyway.

The cognitive biases that affect how we make decisions also creep into managerial decisions like performance and hiring. And that’s not surprising—those biases are part of human nature and are completely reasonable based on the evidence that’s available to us. It’s just that the evidence itself is misleading. If you’re a manager, and you’re evaluating someone’s performance, all you have are the little snippets in front of you from when you evaluated their performance. You don’t have the broader context, you don’t have the comparison to what happens when you weren’t observing them. What’s striking is how often we don’t notice or think about the evidence we’re missing. If I had to point at one thing that I think is probably common in a lot of organizations, it is the assumption that you understand things better than you actually do. There’s something we call the illusion of knowledge that is a tendency to think you understand something much more deeply than you actually do. My colleague Leon Rozenblit did work on this in which he asked people if they knew how common objects worked. For example, if you ask people if they know how a toilet works, most people are fairly confident that they do. If you then ask them what causes the water to leave the toilet
Leon calls this sort of mistaken belief an illusion of explanatory depth. It plays out when you have a manager trying to evaluate an employee. They probably have information about what that person has done but no information about that person’s motives or that person’s capacities other than what they’ve produced. If you have somebody to whom you’re giving boring assignments, and they’re completing those assignments, you might conclude that that’s what they’re good at without realizing they’d be great at revamping the entire strategy for your business. So you make jumps from the limited information that you have and, although reasonable, those jumps can be really off.

**Are there any final points or conclusions you’d like to leave with the TIP readers?**
The main thing is that while some intuitions are really accurate, others can be flawed in critical ways. If you ask someone what they’re preferences are, they’ll be able to tell you. People know what types of ice cream they like or that they find someone attractive. If you ask them why they like that ice cream or why they find someone attractive, then you’ve got a problem. Knowing when your intuitions are most likely to be right is the key to getting good information as opposed to misleading information.

**Conclusions**
A hearty “thank you” to Daniel Simons for his insightful answers that remind us to consider our intuitions when soliciting information in organizations. We think that these points have important implications for both ourselves as well as the participants in our studies. Thinking about how our brains process changes in our environments has relevance for performance ratings, training programs, and managerial decision making to name a few. The variety of approaches he uses to study how our minds work makes his work an excellent model to draw from and emulate as we build ON.
HOGAN
PREDICTS
PERFORMANCE
THE SCIENCE OF PERSONALITY
A strategic emphasis for SIOP is making our research and practice more visible and promoting I-O psychology outside our membership. We are experts at producing research and applying principles of psychology to work; many of us are less expert on publicizing the value, outcomes, and implications of what we do to consumers of our work. As noted (Reynolds, 2013), efforts are underway to brand SIOP to advance our goal of being the “visible and trusted authority on workplace psychology.” Having a consistent and compelling brand will help convey the content and context in which we work.

How do we leverage enhanced branding to fully realize the vision of increasing the extent to which our expertise is utilized? Making inroads with partner organizations, organizations with similar goals for improving the workplace but from different approaches and/or perspectives, can lead to interesting opportunities for multidisciplinary research and practice, and enhanced visibility through groups that have substantial reach and connections with potential end users of our work. In this column, I review ways in which the Professional Practice Committee is building bridges with organizations that can serve as vehicles for publicizing and disseminating our work. I also pose questions to several I-Os working internally at such organizations who can speak to the awareness and embeddedness of I-O in their organizations and ways in which I-O psychology can realize its role as a visible and trusted authority through partner organizations.

**Making Inroads With Partner Organizations**

Partner organizations can include professional organizations, fellow APA divisions, multidisciplinary research...
centers, and government units that represent professions and specialties that share a focus on “work” with I-O psychology. These organizations (e.g., Society for Human Resources Management, SHRM; Equal Opportunity Employment Commission, EEOC) can help advocate for the practice of I-O psychology as distinct from other practices and can help make what we do obvious to groups they represent. As a committee, Professional Practice strives to forge relationships with external organizations that can help serve this purpose. Current examples of this include:

**The SIOP/SHRM Science of HR Series:** This evidence-based series is designed for the more than 250,000 members of SHRM. This includes a set of white papers written by SIOP members on topics chosen by SHRM representing areas of interest to HR professionals. A recent extension of this collaboration is the creation of a series of “Top-10” lists of key research findings that have impacted I-O practice.

**SIOP Task Force on Contemporary Selection Practices Recommendations to EEOC:** This task force of experts has been assembled to summarize the state of research and practice on topics of relevance to EEOC. This information is likely to culminate in a series of best practice papers to be housed on the EEOC website.

**Liaising with the APA Center for Organizational Excellence’s Psychologically Healthy Workplace program and other health and well-being organizations:** The Professional Practice committee is currently working with APA to promote SIOP’s mission and extend our influence to the broader APA community. In addition, partnerships are being forged with other organizations that have the reach and influence to promote research and practice conducted by I-Os related to occupational/employee health and well-being.

### I-Os on the Inside of Outside Organizations

To highlight the role that partner organizations can play in the visibility of I-O psychology, I posed several questions to SIOP members who work in such organizations. Thanks to Alex Alonso and Jim Kurtessis (Society for Human Resources Management), Cristina Banks (Lamorinda Consulting and Berkeley Center for Healthy Workplaces), and Rich Tonowski (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission) for their experience and insights, shared below in summary form. Collectively, this panel works in or with government, law, and human resources, fields with obvious ties to areas of I-O practice.

**You are the only or one of few I-O psychologists in your organization. For what topics do your colleagues view you as an expert as a result of your training/background in I-O? Put another way,**
**What kind of work do your colleagues think you do?**

Perhaps most importantly, the panel underscored that I-Os assume that professionals from other disciplines aren’t aware of I-O, so they spend a substantial amount of time informing others who are commonly in the dark. Once understood, people “get it” and understand that our remit is measuring and describing work and what people do on the job, and that involves traditional areas of I-O practice, including job analysis, assessment, competency modeling, validation, litigation support, survey research, and statistical analysis. When people know us, it’s often because organizations have a problem which requires our expertise and they need help describing and measuring work. In this regard, I-O is inextricably linked to solving the problem, whether it’s providing the necessary job analytic information to help attorneys win cases or evaluating and defending the use of an assessment in a discrimination case. In cases where I-Os work alongside other disciplines (economics, law, statistics, sociology) or even other areas of psychology, these disciplines understand that I-Os are experts in unique and specific areas and that anything involving “work” as the context requires I-O expertise to knit together diverse elements such as work design, company culture, and employee rewards and performance.

**How has I-O psychology been linked to “mission critical” objectives of your organization?**

The panel indicated that I-O research and practice are tightly linked to organizational objectives, whether it’s embedded in SHRM’s goals and objectives (e.g., development of a competency model for HR professionals) or woven with the mission of an organization (e.g., work performed as part of litigation support for EEOC). Likewise, the panel underscored a distinction between the extent to which I-O is linked to top level objectives and how it’s carried through an organization. For instance, one of the most prestigious awards at SHRM is the Michael R. Losey award (honoring lifetime contributions in HR research), which has been presented to an I-O psychologist nearly every year of its existence. In contrast, I-O psychology isn’t readily known or understood by the majority of SHRM members, as evidenced by results of a survey conducted by SHRM and SIOP in 2012. Interestingly, however, the average HR professional almost definitely knows about goal setting theory, Kirkpatrick’s hierarchy of training outcomes, and characteristics of providing good feedback. They may not know these theories and concepts stem from I-O psychology or which researchers developed or tested the theories, but this information has been filtered well to HR professionals and are considered gold standards and not even just “best practice” for HR practice.
In what ways has I-O research and practice been communicated (directly or indirectly) to the “end users” of your organization? In what other ways can your organization serve as a vehicle for communicating research and practice conducted by I-Os?

The panelists indicated that if we want to promote the widespread use of I-O expertise and better connect with end users who can take advantage of our research and services, we need to go where the people go: social media, trade magazines, popular press, educational webinars, and employer conferences. We spend a lot of time contributing to the profession by publishing in scientific journals so that peers can stay up to date with research findings. Citation indices show that some of the most impactful articles in our field are cited by hundreds of other authors. Although the journals allow us to “talk” to each other to learn from other experts and extend the body of research, we also need to be talking to the people who can take advantage of such research. Consider that the SHRM Research Organization has 20,000 Twitter followers. Collaborating with SHRM and other HR analysts to point their members to mainstream articles written by I-Os could have tremendous impact in growing awareness of problems I-Os can solve and maximizing the extent to which our expertise is sought.

A Shared Responsibility for Enhanced Visibility

Enhanced branding has the potential for more clearly distilling and communicating what our specialty is all about, but it’s clear that branding is just one success factor to fully realizing SIOP’s goal of becoming the visible and trusted authority on workplace psychology. Work underway by the Professional Practice Committee shows external organizations are interested in forming ties with SIOP to learn from our research and practice. Although we will continue to build formal relationships with partner organizations, our value will only continue to be shown (or enhanced) if each of us, as members of SIOP, continues to hone our skills at providing demonstrable and obvious benefits of the work we do to our colleagues and friends in other disciplines and organizations where I-O is relatively unknown.

Identifying collaboration opportunities is only the first step in maximizing the potential for working with partner organizations. Whether it’s an official partnership designed by SIOP or the work we do every day with organizations, it is up to each of us to inextricably link our work to other fields and potential end users, frame our work in terms of what other professions value, and make our work and contributions obvious.
Deciding Whether to Persist With a Paper or Let it Die

When I was in elementary school, one of my favorite types of books to read was “Choose Your Own Adventure” books. The books were written in such a way that, at various times throughout the story, the reader was asked to decide where the story should go. There was a magical feeling knowing that, as a child, I could impact the outcome of the story by choosing whether I, as the main character, would turn left and head down the creepy alley, go straight through a mysterious red door at the end of the corridor, or turn right and venture into the forbidden woods. As a kid whose seemingly only decision points included what I would wear to school that day or who I would sit with at lunch, getting to make these “tough” decisions was exciting.

Now, as an adult, I find that there are so many decisions I have to make that it can sometimes be exhausting. In fact, I sometimes joke that I wish we had uniforms for work so it would be one less decision I’d have to make each day. (And, for the record, I’d like those uniforms to be scrubs because they look so incredibly comfortable, like professional pajamas!) Maybe, in the spirit of “me-search research,” the phenomenon whereby some researchers tend to focus their work on issues that are personal in an attempt to gain a better understanding of themselves, it is this disdain for having to make decisions in my own life that has led to my most recent research interests in the area of judgment and decision making.

One of the more recent studies that I’ve been working on in this area involves escalation of commitment, or the tendency to continue to invest resources in the
form of time, money, or effort toward unproductive or failing courses of action. As the authors of a recent meta-analysis on escalation of commitment wrote, "One of the most robust and costly decision errors addressed in the organizational sciences has been the proclivity for decision makers to maintain commitment to losing courses of action, even in the face of quite negative news" (Sleesman, Conlon, McNamara, & Miles, 2012, p. 541). Yep. That sounds like me. Take for example the following letter from an editor:

Dear Dr. Culbertson,

I have now received two reviews of your manuscript. In addition to having two experts in the field read your work, I have also read your manuscript several times. Both reviewers had similar comments, and my own thoughts mirror their points. I believe the reviewers do a fine job of detailing their concerns, so I will not repeat them here. Suffice it to say that you cannot accept your manuscript for publication at this time nor will we be inviting a revision. Indeed, we strongly recommend that you save future reviewers and editors the extreme misfortune of having to read such a pitiful attempt at research by never, ever submitting it anywhere ever again. In fact, we urge you to burn all evidence that this rubbish ever existed and purge it from your thoughts forever. We thank you for the interest in the journal and hope you continue to consider us for future submissions (unless of course they are as bad as this one, in which case we ask that you pass us by or else we'll have to contact your doctoral granting institution and have your PhD revoked).

Warm regards,

Editor

Okay, fine. You caught me. This isn't a real letter from a journal editor that I've received. But it's close. Come to think of it, I am pretty sure I've gotten letters that requested a resubmission that were almost as negative as this. Aren't those called "high risk" and meant to encourage us to work even harder on our revisions, to really impress the reviewers, especially that pesky Reviewer #2? That's just how the review process is, right? According to my mom, if it were easy, it wouldn't be worth it (R. Youngcourt, personal communication, June 8, 1983). Presumably, then, when we get a rejection, we're supposed to persevere. We're supposed to keep on trying, revising and resubmitting, until the paper finds a home, right? Like the iconic image of the frog that is choking the stork while the stork is trying to swallow it, we're never ever supposed to give up! Wayne Gretzky reminded us that we miss 100% of the shots we don't take. Fascinat-
ing. And, if I've learned anything from motivational posters at the dentist's office, it's that success is measured by a willingness to keep trying!

But wait. Yoda, renowned Jedi Master himself, said "Try not. Do, or do not. There is no try." A popular demotivational poster suggests that we give up, because, at some point, hanging in there just makes you look like an even bigger loser. And W. C. Fields is quoted as saying, "If at first you don't succeed, try, try again. Then quit. There's no point in being a damn fool about it." So, who am I to believe? Do I keep trying, like the "The Great One" (Gretzky) suggests, or do I throw in the towel as the comic genius (Fields) suggests, lest I look like a fool? Do I continue persisting with a paper, despite rejection (or multiple rejections) or do I cut my losses, let the paper die, and move on? If only I knew what Chuck Norris would say on the matter...

Well, I don't know what Chuck has to say about it. My guess is he wouldn't know what to say because he's never been rejected from anything, ever. He does the rejecting. And he's too busy rubbing two ice cubes together to make a fire to be bothered with the question. So, because I can't get advice from Mr. Walker, Texas Ranger himself, I opted to ask the next best people (presented in alphabetical order): Bruce J. Avolio, Ph.D., Professor of Management, Mark Pigott Chair in Business Strategic Leadership, and Executive Director of the Foster Center for Leadership at the University of Washington; Mindy Bergman, associate professor in the Department of Psychology at Texas A&M University; Lisa Finkelstein, professor of Psychology at Northern Illinois University; Scott Highhouse, professor and Ohio Eminent Scholar in the Department of Psychology at Bowling Green State University; and Gary P. Latham, Secretary of State Professor of Organizational Effectiveness and Professor of Organizational Behaviour and HR Management at the University of Toronto. I thank each of these individuals for their insights on this issue.

Is Letting a Paper Die Even an Option?

I first asked my panel of experts whether they have ever let a paper die. The short answer is that yes, it seems that abandoning a paper is the decision several have made at one point or another. This definitely wasn't the norm, however, and was usually done after careful consideration and/or numerous failed attempts. As Highhouse noted, "I definitely have let papers die. I am not a journal snob, so it wasn't because I couldn't get it into an 'A' journal. It was usually because I realized the reviewers were right." A similar sentiment was voiced by Avolio, who noted that papers of his that have died were ones that spent "several years in reviews, went thru A, B, and C level journals, and got similar critiques."
Reasons to Let a Paper Die

So, what makes a paper more likely to be abandoned, destined for the ol' research file drawer, if you will? According to Bergman, "If I cannot see a future for the paper—if I step back and put my 'reviewer's eye' on it and see fatal flaws that additional data cannot resolve, it dies." So, what are these fatal flaws? Avolio noted that a paper may be more or less doomed when it has such things as "a weak conceptual framing, methodological deficiencies that limit its contribution, for example, testing a longitudinal process with a cross-sectional design, relatively small and unique sample, single sources, [or] not very good criterion measures." Highhouse similarly noted that methodological and sample-related issues were likely problems that wouldn't be overcome. As he noted, "Unfortunately, experiments with naive participants are doomed to failure. I am hoping that the availability of real people on Mturk will reverse that situation (insert sarcasm). It is very trendy now to have repeated administration of measures, so I guess you're doomed without it."

As Highhouse noted, "reviewers are pretty good at pointing out weaknesses (more sarcasm), but seriously you can get a pretty good idea if your study is fatally flawed." Of course, you don't have to wait for reviewers to point out a study's flaws. Latham relayed invaluable advice he received from Ed Fleishman in 1974. "He told me to always send my manuscripts to my "enemies" (he was using hyperbole to make his point) because they would gladly point out its shortcomings while my friends would tell me how good it is. I have followed that advice religiously before I submit a paper to a journal. I ask people to please, please critique everything from experimental design to grammar." Of course, Latham also noted that we can be our own critics as well, recounting the story of the first time he met Henry Tosi, at a party Ken Wexley held in honor of Latham's passing the oral defense of his dissertation. Tosi told Latham, "Kid, always critique your own work. It will drive your enemies nuts and you will likely get another publication out of it." Perhaps it is because of these nuggets of advice that, since their first paper was published in 1975, Latham and Ed Locke have never had a manuscript they coauthored that has failed to get published!

Beyond methodological concerns, however, sometimes it's the paper's likely contribution or the waning of personal interest. As Finkelstein noted, the death of papers has occurred for her "when there is just no movement on it for months and months, and there isn't enough there that would warrant the amount of work it would take." Indeed, it seems like this is what happens with many people and their dissertations. The
The mere thought of having to cut a lengthy dissertation down to size after spending so long getting it built up is just too daunting for some individuals.

**Reasons to Persist With a Paper**

Clearly, there are reasons a paper may be doomed. In these cases, perhaps W. C. Fields was right in that you're a damn fool if you persist too long. But what are some reasons to persist with a paper, despite numerous rejections? In what cases should you listen to all of motivational quotes on Pinterest and refuse to give up? Is there a situation in which you should look at the paper, despite rejection after rejection, and say, "I'm never gonna give you up"? Well, according to my panel of experts, one of the biggest factors that will make them persist has do with the importance of the research question. Regarding this point, Highhouse noted that the biggest factor for him in terms of whether he will persist or not is the message of the manuscript. If it's important enough, and he feels the data should be published, he will persist. Avolio similarly noted that he is willing to persist with a paper when he thinks it is something that "will push the literature in a new direction." Another issue that is relevant, of course, is whether the previously mentioned flaws can be addressed. As Bergman and Highhouse pointed out, sometimes additional data and/or another study will help to salvage a seemingly doomed paper and make it more likely to be accepted somewhere.

In terms of persistence, Latham recommends that you remember that publishing is about both substance and style. If a paper is getting rejected but is based on sound theory and there are no methodological flaws, it could be that you're simply not packaging it well. He suggests examining one's writing style to make sure clear, straightforward sentences are being used. As Fred Fiedler once told him, people should use "sentences that people would read and easily remember while watching television with children playing nearby." By working through some of the stylistic issues, persistence may pay off.

**Recommendations for Deciding Whether to Persist or Abandon a Paper**

I think it's fair to say that the decision of when to persist and when to cut one's losses isn't always clear. Although it is probably more common to be dismayed when a paper gets rejected, there are certainly times when a paper is accepted that we thought was going to be doomed. I hear statements on both sides after the SIOP conference acceptance and rejection notices are sent out, and I'm sure I'll hear similar ones this go around. I can almost hear them now: "Wow! I can't believe this paper didn't
get in! It was golden! Now how am I supposed to get an authentic Hawaiian shirt to complete my 'Shirts from All 50 States' collection?" Or, on the flip side, "Wow! I can't believe this paper got in! We just threw some words together using a random sentence generator with the hopes of getting something accepted so that we could go to Hawaii. Whoo hoo... Honolulu here we come!"

Given that it isn't always clear, what advice do our panelists have with regard to persisting or dropping a paper? Avolio makes the following suggestion: "Like in finance, have a diversified portfolio based on risk assessment of your work. Don't persist to the exclusion of other possibilities." He continued by noting that "Science by its very nature is based on a high level of rejection, good science. So persisting is what we do to be successful." Bergman suggests the decision be made on the basis of the previously mentioned points (e.g., the fatal flaws) and also suggests that, if you continue to keep abandoning papers, you conduct a “post mortem” to figure out why it keeps occurring, “so you can see how the choices you made led to the situation you’re in.” Then there's Finkelstein's zen-like advice: "Think about how you think you would feel if you just let it go. Did you just feel lighter? Slightly calmer? That might be a sign." And, last but not least, there is Highhouse's sage advice: "Don’t publish something you will be embarrassed about in 5 years."

Hmm... I wonder if that includes TIP columns... I guess, just like how many licks it takes to get to the Tootsie Roll center of a Tootsie Pop, the world may never know.

Yes, if you clicked on this link, you were just Rickrolled. You're welcome.

Reference

In 2010, SIOP’s Executive Board instituted the International Affairs Committee. This committee was launched in an effort to support the works of the Alliance for Organizational Psychology brought to fruition by Gary Latham and Milt Hakel in partnership with IAAP and EAWOP leaders. For me (Alex), this was a very personal event because it shifted thinking among SIOP leaders around international affairs. Prior to this moment, International Affairs was a subcommittee of the Professional Practice Committee and the only formal mechanism available to the Executive Board operationalizing international relations. Before 2010, the subcommittee, which I chaired at that moment, was responsible for one thing: SIOP’s International Reception at the annual conference. Then, one day in May 2010 I received an email from Dave Nershi and Donald Truxillo (then External Relations Officer) indicating that the committee had been promoted to a full committee and that I needed to start with an agenda and a roster. Naturally, I was surprised. Still, I turned to colleagues like Mo Wang to help me extend the committee’s agenda and lay out a vision supporting the Alliance.

Among the first objectives of the agenda was to create venues for international practitioners to share their lessons learned with SIOP membership. Similarly, we looked for opportunities where SIOP members could share lessons learned with the international community. The first venue established nearly 2 years ago was this very recurring column that you are reading. This column is designed to provide international prac-
tioners with a forum for discussing relevant topics from their practice. But this column is not the only venue developed by the committee. In 2010, the committee also launched a white paper series under the leadership of new committee chairperson, Donald Truxillo, and committee members, Lynda Zugec and Alok Bhupatkar. This white paper series was designed to publish collaborative international practice ideas on SIOP's website. Today, the white paper series is a thriving example of international collaboration. It is for this reason that we have used our current column to describe the accomplishments of this initiative.

To highlight the white paper series initiative, we have called upon two committee leaders, Lynda Zugec, the committee member leading the initiative, and Angelo DeNisi, the current committee chairperson.

In 2007, Lynda Zugec founded a human resources consulting firm named The Workforce Consultants. Following extensive experience in human resource positions throughout North America, Europe, and the Middle East, Lynda recognized a need to combine the teaching and research expertise of highly qualified academics with the management teams responsible for human resource policy and practice throughout the business community. This inspired the organizational strategy of The Workforce Consultants. Prior to creating her own company, Lynda was a Human Capital Advisory Services consultant with Mercer Human Resources Consulting Ltd., one of the world’s premier human resources consulting firms. Lynda holds an honors degree in Psychology and Applied Studies along with a specialization in Human Resources Management from the University of Waterloo and a master’s degree in Industrial-Organizational Psychology from the University of Guelph. Lynda also has the distinct honor of being our first contributor and the first two-time contributor to this column.

Angelo DeNisi is professor of Organizational Behavior, and Albert Cohen Chair in Business. Prior to coming to Tulane, he was the head of the Management Department at Texas A&M University and held faculty positions at Rutgers, The University of South Carolina, and Kent State University. He has also taught credit and non-credit courses in Singapore, Santo Domingo, Kuala Lumpur, and Hong Kong. His research interests include performance appraisal, expatriate management, and work experiences of persons with disabilities. His research has been funded by the Army Research Institute, the National Science Foundation, and several state agencies. His work has also been published in a number of top journals in our field, and his research has received awards from the OB...
The idea behind the International Affairs Committee (IAC) White Paper Series is to present the most recent topics of interest to the international I-O community. The end goal of these white papers is to make research evidence accessible to both scientists and practitioners around the globe. In addition, along with the Professional Practice Committee at SIOP, we have partnered with the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) to publish certain white papers (http://www.siop.org/siop-shrm/default.aspx), which will illustrate the value of industrial and organizational psychology to business, policy makers, and the SIOP and SHRM societies at large. The goal of our partnership is to introduce the science generated by the I-O psychology and human resources disciplines into daily use within the workplace.

Background
The history of the IAC White Paper Series dates back to 2009 and is based on discussions among a number of SIOP, EAWOP, and IAAP members, including Donald Truxillo, Kurt Kraiger, and Jose Maria Peiró. During that time, Donald and Jose Maria thought of using some of the International Research Incubator topics for future white papers. In addition, during 2010–2011, Lynda Zugec and Alok Bhupatkar were researching different white paper models and had several conversations with chairs from other committees, including Stuart Carr (Massey University) from the separate Work Psychology White Papers (WPWP) Steering Committee. These initial discussions were supported by both Lori Foster-Thompson (SIOP) and Milt Hakel from the Alliance. The April 2012 TIP article written by Stuart Carr contains a description of our history.

White Paper Series Committee Members
The current IAC White Paper Series committee members include Angelo DeNisi...
(Tulane University) as IAC Committee Chair and Lynda Zugec (The Workforce Consultants) as the IAC White Paper Series Sub-committee Chair. Through the past few years, many have served on this committee and we look forward to inviting both new and experienced members to ensure the continued success of the IAC White Paper Series. After multiple discussions, the IAC committee sent invitations to internationally renowned experts in the field of I-O psychology and created the International Affairs White Paper Series Board (IAWSB).

**International Affairs White Paper Series Board**
The IAWSB board members were selected based on their affiliation to international organizational psychology committees and expertise in the field of I-O. The two main purposes of the IAWSB are to (1) identify the white paper topics and lead authors for the International Affairs Committee White Paper Series and (2) review and provide feedback on the white papers as they are completed. Three members—Fernanda Afonso, Barbara Kozusznik, and **John C. Scott** (representatives from EAWOP, IAAP, and SIOP)—served as board members for the 2012–2013 year. We wish to thank the three of them for their efforts in furthering the IAC White Paper Series. John C. Scott will continue to serve as a board member for the 2013–2014 year and two new board members who represent the international I-O community will be welcomed.

**Work to Date**
The IAC Committee started the development of the white paper publication process in 2011. An overview of the white papers published in 2011-12 and 2012-2013 is presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>What We Know About Applicant Reactions on Attitudes and Behavior: Research Summary and Best Practices</td>
<td>Talya N. Bauer, Julie McCarthy, Neil Anderson, Donald M. Truxillo, and Jesús F. Salgado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>Achieving Well-Being in Retirement: Recommendations from 20 Years’ Research</td>
<td>Mo Wang, and Beryl Hesketh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanitarian Work Psychology: Concepts to Contributions</td>
<td>Stuart C. Carr, Lori Foster Thompson, Walter Reichman, Ishbel McWha, Leo Marai, Malcolm MacLachlan, and Peter Baguma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How to Access the IAC White Papers**
There are several websites where you can download the IAC white papers from. These are listed below.
SIOP Website
White papers can be accessed on the SIOP homepage (www.siop.org) under the “Publications” tab. Once under this tab, click on the heading “White Papers” or simply access it here: http://www.siop.org/WhitePapers/default.aspx

AOP Website
The SIOP IAC White Papers are also available at the Alliance for Organizational Psychology (AOP) website and can be downloaded here: http://www.allianceorgpsych.org/WhitePapers.aspx

SHRM Website
As part of the research collaboration between SIOP and SHRM, the white papers can also be downloaded here: http://www.shrm.org/Research/Articles/Pages/default.aspx
Once at this web address, click on the section titled “SHRM/SIOP Collaboration.”

See You Next Time!

We leave you with this parting thought: “What, exactly, is the Internet? Basically it is a global network exchanging digitized data in such a way that any computer, anywhere, that is equipped with a device called a ‘modem,’ can make a noise like a duck choking on a kazoo.” These words from Dave Barry, although obviously humorous, also highlight the importance of venues for global networking. The International Affairs Committee White Paper Series is one such venue and thankfully one devoid of the modem-like screeching. Until next time, ciao, au revoir, 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: change management strategies. 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.

Reference
The purpose of this column has always been to discuss our “classroom capacity” — how we can be the most that we can be as I-O educators (though admittedly I’ve strayed from that topic on a few occasions). This time out, I want to focus a bit on the technologies that are commonly in use in college classrooms and how we can make best use of them in the I-O classroom. I’ll focus on one technology that’s pretty common (clickers), one that isn’t common enough (nonlinear web-based case studies), and one that’s just my favorite new thing I’ve seen in quite a while (the MicBall).

“Clickers” or Other Student Response Systems

A couple of issues ago, I wrote about a model that Ben Biermeier-Hanson and I had presented about the stages of readiness for adoption of educational technologies, and we talked about it in the context of using Student Response Systems, or clickers. I’ve been using clickers for several years now. When I say this, I often hear people say “clickers are great!”, or “I used clickers once, and they were horrible.” Both of these are incorrect statements, because as with all educational technology, it isn’t usually the technology itself that is good or bad – it’s what you do with it, and whether it helps you achieve your pedagogical goals.

If you’ve ever watched Who Wants to Be a Millionaire? or even America’s Funniest Home Videos, you’ve seen clickers in use. They are small hand-held devices that allow people to cast “votes” or answer questions, and it is possible to tell who answered what on a given question. The results of the poll can then be displayed, usually as a bar graph. In the classroom, this can allow an instructor to:
· ask for students’ opinions on specific topics and to share the results with the class;
· ask quiz questions and know how each student answered;
· “check in” with students to see whether they are understanding a topic being presented;
· use “peer instruction,” in which students are given a question that goes beyond the readings or lecture, which they first answer independently, then discuss with their neighbors in class, and then answer a second time, allowing for learning to occur through the conversation with peers;
· do many, many other things involving soliciting student responses.

There are a number of companies that sell stand-alone clickers, with the two largest being i>clicker (owned by MacMillan; www.iclicker.com) and Turning Technologies (http://www.turningtechnologies.com/). In addition, there are web-based technologies, which allow a student to use a laptop, tablet, or smart phone to respond. The one I’ve most often seen used in classes is called Top Hat Monocle (https://tophat.com/). Finally, both i>clicker and Turning Technologies have “hybrid” systems, so that some students can use hand-held clickers and others use web-based software on their own device. All of these companies have options that allow for either multiple-choice answer formats, or alphanumeric answer formats.

For me, the benefits of using clickers have been numerous and significant. I use them for all of the purposes described above. After explaining what a correlation is or how to interpret regression results, I put a question up on the board that looks like a test question on that topic and ask the students to answer it. If 80% of them can, then I feel comfortable moving on to a new topic. If only 30% answer it correctly, then I know immediately—not a few weeks later, after exam results are in—that something isn’t clear, and I need to go back over it again.

I also ask students their opinions about topics that might be less comfortable to talk about at first. For example, I can ask students how they feel about affirmative action, or Michigan’s new Right to Work laws, or preemployment drug testing. Then, once the results are in and I show on the board how the class as a whole feels, I can ask “How do you think someone who says that they strongly oppose preemployment drug testing might explain their support?” That allows people to answer the question and participate in the discussion without necessarily stating that they personally hold an unpopular position. In the drug testing example, I can prod students to think more
deeply than simply, “They oppose it because they want to keep taking drugs” by asking “Are there reasons that someone who doesn’t use drugs might also oppose that sort of testing?” Finally, I can highlight the actual responses in the classroom, which makes it hard for anyone to assert that “everyone I know agrees with me on this,” when the data suggest a wide range of opinions or responses.

In short, the benefit for me of using this particular technology really has little to do with the technology itself. The benefit is that it allows me to quickly and efficiently gather data that can help me be more effective in the classroom. It might mean giving a topic additional review because I know students are not “getting it,” it might mean having a more productive discussion than we would have had simply relying on people to state their opinions, and it might mean allowing students as peers to instruct each other by discussing challenging questions and figuring it out for themselves. All of these could happen without clickers—they’re just easier, and faster, with clickers. (Again, for me, maybe not for you.)

Online Cases

Many of us use cases in our teaching, and the traditional I-O/management case follows a pretty standard, linear path. That’s because we read it, and so we read it in the order it comes on the pages. But not all cases are like that, and cases don’t have to be that way. There aren’t a lot of examples out there, but one of my favorites is called “Play,” written/developed by Joe Harder. It’s published by Darden Business Publishing and is web-based, with lots of video clips. The focus of the case is leadership and culture management: The culture of the organization is very strong, but is very much embodied in the CEO. Now that the organization is growing and expanding to a new location, how will the culture carry over when that leader is no longer on site nearly as often?

One thing I love about this case is that it is nonlinear. Students can choose what topics to focus on in the case or they can “walk through” a map of the office and “stop in” to different employees’ offices to see interview videos about their thoughts, as well as notes, questions, and other videos about life in the company. In many ways, the experience of the case mimics what one could experience as a new consultant entering the organization, without quite knowing where to look first to understand what the real issues are, and what’s really going on.

The case is a little older now, but it doesn’t feel dated. My concern as someone interested in using effective educa-
tional technology in the classroom is that there are not enough cases like this out there. But give this a look if you’re looking for something different for your students to investigate leadership and culture issues, or if you simply want them to have a different experience of learning about an organization and its challenges. You can get information on Play from sales@dardenbusinesspublishing.com.

The MicBall

I first saw a MicBall at a conference, and knew we had to have one in our department. It’s mostly good for larger classrooms, classrooms large enough that you may not be able to hear students’ questions clearly, or where students aren’t able to hear other clearly. That may not be a lot of I-O classrooms, but I know it certainly is some.

A MicBall is a leather-covered ball, sort of like a soccer ball but a little smaller. Inside the ball is a wireless microphone. There is a push-to-talk button and a laser pointer. When a student has a question or wants to make a comment, he or she simply raises a hand, and the other students can then toss (not throw!) the ball that direction until it gets to the student who wants to speak. Because of the push-to-talk button, there’s no extra noise as the ball moves along. If the student has a question about something on screen, the built-in laser pointer allows the student to point to exactly the thing on screen that he or she is wondering about.

MicBalls come with all of the audio equipment (including a battery charging station) that you need to connect to a lecture hall’s existing sound system. Fundamentally, it’s just like adding another microphone in to the system, except with this one, you don’t have to run around the classroom to hear the students or repeat back their questions so everyone else can hear them, and so on. Check it out at www.micball.com.

We’ve just ordered our first MicBall, and by the time you read this, we’ll have had it in use for a while. Send me a note to ask how it’s going, or to talk about any of the other educational technology topics I’ve mentioned here. I’m at marcus.dickson@wayne.edu.
Three Bold Ideas

SIOP 2013 in Houston inspired three bold ideas that are the basis for this column. This new electronic format for *TIP* permits me to expand the envelope in the presentation of *The High Society*. For the first time in history I will include photographs in this column. I am so excited!

I. SIOP 2014 Workshops

I was walking down the hall in the convention hotel minding my own business when a member of the Workshop Committee cornered me. He said the committee was afraid the SIOP 2014 workshops may be poorly attended. He asked me to use my creative verbal talents to gin up some exciting workshops. He obviously had no sense of shame, thinking that *The High Society* had a request line and that it was open to him. I must have even less shame because I agreed to this gig. So here is the deal. I propose that because SIOP 2014 will be held in the tropical paradise of Hawaii, it is time for some organization–environment congruence. That’s right; in 2014 there will be no florescent lighting, PowerPoint slides, or stuffy air in our workshops. All workshops will be held outdoors. Here are five workshops that I think would not only appeal to our members but would also play to our being situated just this side of heaven. I would not be proposing these particular workshops if SIOP were being held in, for example, Cleveland.

1. Branding a State

It is one thing for an organization to be based around the persona of one individual. It is quite another for one individual to symbolize an entire state. Yet that is the story of Hawaii. Since the
granting of statehood in 1960, singer Don Ho and his signature song, “Tiny Bubbles,” became the iconic identity of Hawaii. This workshop will be held at Diamondhead and will be led by Don’s lovely wife, Heidi. She will describe what it was like to brand a state through relentless creative marketing. Breakout groups will be led by their three sons, Land, Gung, and Westward. The workshop will close with the signing of a formal proclamation that the next time our group comes to Hawaii, we will refer to ourselves as the Society for Hi-Ho Psychology.

2. **Performance Evaluation—Hawaiian Style**
   This workshop will be held at Waimea Bay, home of huge waves that have attracted surfers from around the world. Each participant will be provided with a 16-foot surfboard. Participants will be classified into three groups based upon their performance in riding home a 70-foot wave. The first group will slice the wave, hang 10, and be the embodiment of Hawaii cool. The second group will desperately wrap their arms and legs around the board, pray to some island deity, and promise themselves if they can just survive, they will never again leave a landlocked state. The third group will not have their careers be plateaued or derailed, but wiped out. Their performance evaluation will result in what the locals call a “burial at sea.”

3. **Hawaiian Treasure Hunt**
   This workshop emphasizes competition among participants as they fan out across the islands in search of the grand prize, Barack Obama’s birth certificate. Participants will be encouraged to look high and low for this coveted document. The winner will no longer need SIOP, as he or she will become an instantaneous international celebrity. The participants who fail to locate the Holy Grail but who ruffled a lot of feathers while searching will undoubtedly enter into a long term relationship with the Secret Service. This workshop will be led by Donald Trump.

4. **Displaying Culture-Specific Emotions**
   This workshop will be held at Waikiki Beach with participants wearing grass skirts and a pair of strategically placed coconuts. The exact positioning of the coconuts will depend upon the gender of the participant. The workshop will assess proficiency in avoiding culturally inappropriate displays of emotion. The word “lei” is endemic to the Hawaiian culture and is no laughing matter to the locals. Participants who either giggle or smirk during their orations will be
voted off the island. The participant who remains stoic throughout this intensive assessment will be declared the winner. Before the winner is graced with a prize (a you-know-what), EMT personnel will first ascertain that the individual has a pulse.

5. Assessment With a Hawaiian Purpose
Participants will first use the method of peer ranking to establish among themselves who is first on down to who is last, without knowing what is in store for them. They will then be airlifted to an exciting remote location, an active volcano. The participants will form a human chain. The person who was ranked last will be closest to the rim of the volcano. The clever schmuck who used a combination of guile and aggression to be ranked first gets to fill a bucket with molten lava. All participants will develop a greater appreciation for why we always must first establish the reason for assessment before doing so. The bucket-holder undoubtedly will also reach a terminal understanding of why I-O psychologists invented simulations.

II. Birth of a New Concept
I have reached the point in my career that after writing 10 editions of my textbook spanning over 30 years, I decided it was time to take on a coauthor starting with the 11th edition. I wanted my coauthor to be the very best: bright, motivated, and innovative. After much deliberation I asked Tori Culbertson of Kansas State University to help me carry on the tradition of *Psychology Applied to Work* deep into the future. To my great delight, Tori agreed. As I only get to see Tori at SIOP, I thought it would be propitious for us to be photographed together, sort of a formal portrait shot emblematic of the forthcoming era of my book.

We agreed to meet in the hotel lobby at 9:00 pm for the photo shoot. I looked for her and couldn’t find her. The only person I saw was someone of diminutive stature sporting a thick moustache that would be the envy of Tom Selleck. The person approached me and whispered, “Paul, it’s me, Tori.” While I was wearing a cowboy hat befitting Houston, Tori’s get-up exceeded my standards for innovation. The fact she was exhibiting more testosterone than me made it even more surrealistic. Here is the official portrait of the two of us.
Even after taking the photograph I still couldn’t wrap my brain around the fact I just agreed to partner with a highly competent, heavily moustached woman. It was then I realized a new concept had just been born in I-O psychology: the validity–perversity dilemma.

III. SIOP Now Has an Official Drink

This is the story of highly reactive creativity. The aforementioned Tori Culbertson led a group of graduate student volunteers in stuffing conference bags with promotional items provided by sponsors. I had an item that promoted my book, a semi-stiff flyer. The students were stuffing the bags in an assembly line fashion. One student volunteer, Daniel Shore of George Mason University, happened to be stuffing the bags with my particular item. In the midst of this fast-paced process, he discovered he may have inadvertently stuffed two copies of my flyer in one bag. He then uttered the prophetic words, “Oh-oh, I think I just gave someone a double Muchinsky.” A second student working the line next to him, Laura Lomeli of Texas A&M University, said, “A ‘Double Muchinsky’ sounds like the name of a drink.” Then spontaneous intellectual combustion occurred. The two young entrepreneurs decided the ingredients for a Double Muchinsky were two shots of Russian vodka, orange juice, pineapple juice, a splash of grenadine, topped off with a plastic sword impaling a cherry and orange slice. The final adornment would be one of those cute little umbrellas.

Mr. Shore and Ms. Lomeli wondered if I would find this story to be amusing. In short, they questioned whether I have a sense of humor. Can you believe that? Do bears disburden themselves in the woods? Obviously, neither one of them reads The High Society. Dr. Culbertson assured the creators that by sharing this story with me I would neither physically harm them nor sabotage their careers.

Before too long Mr. Shore hurried himself to my booth in the Exhibition Hall, telling me with great excitement that he and a fellow student had just developed the official drink of SIOP, the Double Muchinsky. Needless to say, I thought it was a brilliant idea, but the umbrella had to go. I informed him that because
he was the first to tell me about the new drink, he would get first-author credit for it. Shortly thereafter, Ms. Lomeli also shows up in my booth to share in the afterglow of discovery. I politely informed her she would be second author in creating what would be known as the “Shore-Lomeli Double Muchinsky.” Without so much as providing a shred of empirical evidence, she says the “Lomeli-Shore Double Muchinsky” would be more appealing. I couldn’t help but agree with her judgment. I then turned the occasion into what we professors like to call a “teachable moment” with students. Mr. Shore learned you should never count your chickens before they hatch, as first authorship had just been swiped right out from under his nose for political reasons. Ms. Lomeli, the more socially adroit of the pair, learned that sometimes you can get your way by just appealing to face validity. I trust that her dissertation will exhibit more methodological rigor. So on that day, April 12, 2013, the “Lomeli-Shore Double Muchinsky: The Official Drink of SIOP,” was created.

I was so happy for these kids. Graduate students in I-O psychology can feel special by getting publications, but to be immortalized by having the official drink of SIOP named after you is unique. I just hope they haven’t reached the peak of their careers while still in graduate school. Given the professional visibility I have afforded them, I don’t think I would be out of line to expect each of them to name their first-born male child after me. However, given the specific nature of their accomplishment, I wouldn’t be surprised if they each had twin boys.

That night we went to the hotel bar. I emphatically told the bartender, “I want a Double Muchinsky. A Lomeli-Shore Double Muchinsky.” It sounded like a line from a James Bond movie. Somehow I got roped into buying about 10 of them for the pioneering authors, plus the members of their ever-increasing entourage. They told me the drink sort of looked like the cover of the current edition of my book. It did. Here is a photo of the drinks on the bar. The second photo is of the two authors each holding a Double Muchinsky, one of them holding the two flyers that birthed the drink, and me, not holding a Quadruple Muchinsky, but a pair of Double Muchinskys.
The final photograph shows the person who incubated this whole affair, the two authors, me, and in the background a growing gaggle of groupies who I proclaimed to be the designated drinkers.

Kuder-Richardson, Spearman-Brown, Myers-Briggs, Schmidt-Hunter, and now, Lomeli-Shore. Barely out of puberty, these two kids have hit the hyphenated big time. The only way my name will ever achieve hyphenated immortality is if the Double Muchinsky becomes known as the Muchinsky-Muchinsky. I don’t see it happening. There are few things more pathetic than professors who coattail off of student accomplishments. I can assure you that I am not the first to do so.

I have two major reactions to this wonderful moment in my life. First, I am honored by the “Lomeli-Shore Double Muchinsky: The Official Drink of SIOP.” Second, I am relieved that Lomeli-Shore did not propose the ingredients of the Double Muchinsky be two shots of prune juice and a splash of Geritol with a Viagra chaser.
Equity Theory at 50

In the November 1963 issue of the *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Belgian born social psychologist J. Stacy Adams published an article entitled “Toward an Understanding of Inequity,” which marks the beginning of equity theory (Koppes, 2007; Latham & Budworth, 2007). At the time, Adams had what must have been a great job working at General Electric’s Behavioral Research Service (BRS), among noteworthy I-O psychologists (and eventual SIOP Fellows) Herbert Meyer (1917-2006) and Melvin Sorcher. There was even an advisory group for the BRS which included social psychology legend Leon Festinger (1919-1989) and Nobel Prize Winner Herbert Simon (1916-2001; M. Sorcher to G. Latham, personal communication, August 28, 2013). Adams once relayed the story of how he became interested in inequity to his PhD student, Robert Folger. Apparently, one of Adams’s coworkers at GE would express guilt at being paid too much money. It astounded Adams that someone would be so upset about being overpaid. Adams developed an interest in what he called “advantageous inequity” (Folger, personal communication, August 27, 2013).

Adams’ 1963 article presents the theory of inequity as a special case of Festinger’s cognitive dissonance theory. Adams insists that, “The fairness of an exchange between employee and employer is not usually perceived...simply as an economic matter. There is an element of relative justice involved that supervenes economics and underlies perceptions of equity or inequity” (p. 422). In the course of the article, Adams introduces much of the language we associate with equity theory. “Inputs” are variables a person brings to a social exchange (to the job) such as education, experi-
ence, and, most importantly, effort. Inputs need not be recognized by the other party of the exchange. Adams provides a memorable example of this, considering Parisian and non-Parisian born bank clerks working together. Parisians viewed their breeding as an input, entitling them to higher wages. Bank management didn’t consider birthplace an input relevant for pay. “Outcomes” were rewards individuals received for their services, including pay, intrinsic rewards, and status symbols. (Adams, 1963). Adams explains that perceptions of inequity emerge from comparing one’s own inputs and related outcomes to some comparison others’ inputs and related outcomes; the comparison other usually a coworker. Adams provides signature tenets of equity theory: “When the normative expectations of the person making social comparisons are violated—when he finds his inputs and outcomes are not in balance in relation to those of others—feelings of inequity result” (p. 424). Adams insists that inequity results regardless of whether the comparison is favorable or unfavorable. Experienced inequity then triggers tension (as in Festinger’s 1957 cognitive dissonance theory), of which individuals are motivated to rid themselves. Adams suggests several ways individuals may act to reduce inequity (decreasing inputs relative to another, psychologically distorting inputs and outcomes, changing the comparison other, even “leaving the field”). Adams concludes with several experimental and observational studies (some of which he conducted himself at GE) as evidence for his new theory.

In 1965, Adams published a chapter in Advances in Experimental Social Psychology entitled “Inequity in Social Exchange.” This has become a more popular paper (it has more than 8,000 cites on Google Scholar, in comparison to fewer than 4,000 for the 1963 article, for example), and may have served to obscure the earlier publication. Clearly, Adams had refined his definition of inequity by this point: “Inequity exists for Person whenever he perceives that the ratio of his outcomes to inputs and the ratio of Other’s outcomes to Other’s inputs are unequal.” There was no talk of “ratios” in the earlier publication. Furthermore, the handy equations we know so well and associate with equity theory pop up, for example \( \frac{O_p}{I_p} > \frac{O_o}{I_o} \) reflects a comparison where the person perceives overpayment. Still, much of the content of the book chapter seems drawn from the earlier article.

Research into equity theory followed. As Latham and Budworth (2007) explain, equity theory faced early criticism for lacking precision (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, & Weick, 1970) and for lacking the predictive power of expectancy theory (Lawler, 1970). In this publication, equity theory was classified as a “not-so-
useful theory;” though laboratory research on equity theory had been successful, it had not moved to a specific application (Miner, 1984). Adams himself had become less interested in equity theory by the mid-1970s (Folger, personal communication, August 27, 2013). Overall, research into equity theory may be best viewed as mixed (Levy, 2013).

What sort of impact has equity theory had after 50 years? Motivation expert Gary Latham suggests equity theory, “has great explanatory power on why some of us are satisfied versus dissatisfied with our pay” (Gary Latham, personal communication, August 29, 2013). In particular, he applauds the brilliance of the idea of a comparison other. Equity theory explains how, for example, a psychology professor whose comparison other is a professor at another psychology department may perceive equity, but if the comparison other is in a business department, they may feel underpaid (Gary Latham, personal communication, August 29, 2013). Regardless of where we work, whether we perceive inequity in our pay may depend simply on our choice of comparison other.

Equity theory has also spurred research and fostered the development of new organizational theories. Adams’ famous PhD student, Robert Folger, along with others such as Jerald Greenberg, have taken elements of equity theory (distributed justice) and added other components (procedural justice) and created organizational justice theory (Gary Latham, personal communication, August 29, 2013; Latham & Pinder, 2005). Organizational justice theory continues to have an enormous impact both on the overall field of I-O (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, & Porter, 2001) as well as on specific areas like performance appraisal (Folger, Konovsky, & Cropanzano, 1992). Equity sensitivity, the individual difference in how people are affected by overreward or underreward, is another influential offshoot of equity theory (Levy, 2013). For I-O psychologists, perhaps the most lasting impact of equity theory will be that it “made the subject of justice and fairness a noteworthy arena of theory and research” (Folger, personal communication, August 27, 2013).
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**AVAILABLE FOR PRE-ORDER**

**Diversity at Work: The Practice of Inclusion**

Nonmember Price: $80.00  
Member Price: only $64.00!

Bernardo Ferdman and Barbara Deane outline key issues involved in framing, designing, and implementing inclusion initiatives for organizations and groups. The book also includes information from topic experts, including internal and external change agents and academics.
As the only completely online Master of Industrial/Organizational Psychology offered by a major research institution, our curriculum will immerse you in the research process and provide practical skills for translating findings into results-driven, action-oriented leadership and human resource solutions.
Weighing In on Telecommuting

Telecommuting has been heightened in the national conversation since being raised with humor and fervor in the press in reaction to Yahoo’s decision to curtail telecommuting. I-O psychologists contribute to research-based policies that allow organizations to successfully compete and implement strategy. Anecdotally, telecommuters can save the company costs, bring workers satisfaction, and positively affect productivity. However, having workers cut off from the company culture and information stream may have negative effects. Some CEOs worry about slacking off and using company time for personal and household chores. Our hypothetical CEO asked about the pros and cons of telecommuting based on our observations of the literature. The real estate and facilities staff are busy analyzing their cost savings. While operations leaders are conducting a pilot study, we have an opportunity to frame the discussion from our perspective.

We immediately notice that the literature is multidisciplinary and some of the discussions in HR forums are based on what large companies such as IBM and AT&T do with their workforces. Mamaghani (2012) cites that the Census Bureau recorded a 61% jump in telecommuting between 2005 and 2009. They describe the primary challenges to telecommuting as security and technical concerns. There are hardware, software, and training needs to meet these requirements. He also suggests that employee commitment and productivity should be examined with productivity including hours, intensity, and efficiency as well as an adjustment for additional support required from the organization. Some findings suggest that the extra productivity from telecommuting comes from the assumption that travel time for telecommuters is recommitted to work.
A research-based article by Dutcher (2012) examined the role of routine versus creative tasks as they impact productivity of telecommuters. Students were given a primary task intended to simulate data entry. In the second creative work condition, subjects identified unusual uses for common objects. Students were incented and could shift to a secondary distracting task—playing tic tac toe—in both conditions. Students were randomly assigned to work in a lab or outside of the lab. Their results showed that working in the lab resulted in higher productivity for the primary boring task and working out of the lab resulted in higher productivity for the creative task. The researcher also looked at procrastination and need for control as mediating variables; nonprocrastinators and those not needing control were more productive in the lab on the mundane task. Procrastinators and those needing control were more productive outside the lab on the creative task. This study, while limited, points to the need to consider the tasks and the context.

A meta-analysis conducted by Gajendran and Harrison (2007) found that telecommuting was related to higher perceived autonomy, lower work–family conflict, and positive relationships with supervisors. Low intensity (office-centered) telecommuting does not have a relationship with coworker relationships but high intensity (home-centered) telecommuting had a negative correlation to coworker relationships. The authors concluded that telecommuting was mostly positive based on their analysis of 46 studies. However, our CEO is also interested in how the organization is impacted. If coworker relationships are impacted by high intensity telecommuting, how might that affect the organization? One possible place to examine is knowledge transfer.

Taskin and Bridoux (2010) provide a conceptual frame to examine knowledge transfer given that managerial and professional workers are represented in telework. Telecommuters tend to be more highly educated, have higher income levels, and be knowledge-based workers. The framework that they provide includes shared mental models, identification with the organization’s goals and values, and close relationships. They set out to consider how telecommuting can affect these dimensions. Shared mental models and ways of thinking are developed through multiple channels such as social interaction, body language, and verbal narrative. They point out that numerous studies suggest that workers identify less with a company after moving from office-based work to telecommuting. Of course, location of telecommuting and frequency would play roles in the frequency of contact.
At a more macro-level, Mayo, Pastor, Gomez-Mejia, and Cruz (2009) worked with 122 CEOs to examine a variety of “fit” variables, including firm size and age, workforce composition, and CEO leadership style and their relationship to the adoption of telecommuting policies. Previous research suggests that younger firms and smaller firms are more likely to adopt progressive policies such as telecommuting (c.f., Cardon & Stevens, 2004; Leung, 2003). Firms with international workers must rely on a variety of nontraditional methods to manage employees. Telecommuting and connecting through information technology, the authors argue, is a management tool that can help manage employees across borders. The authors further argue that leaders that utilize a contingency reward leadership style will also be more likely to adopt telecommuting policies. This leadership style is characterized by the establishment of clear expectations for performance and clearly identified rewards for achievement. Through archival research and interviews with the 122 CEOs, the authors found support for several of their hypotheses. Telecommuting is more likely to exist in organizations that are smaller, have a high percentage of international employees, and emphasize variable (contingent) pay. The authors also found a few significant interactions; younger companies and internationally oriented organizations are much more likely to adopt telecommuting policies if they are led by CEOs having a contingency-reward approach to leadership.

As our CEO analyzes her pilot of telecommuting in our fictitious organization, we can suggest that the infrastructure and ongoing costs of support are considered in alignment with productivity impacts based on the work. We may want to consider measuring how frequency of telecommuting, light to heavy, impacts our workforce. In addition, because our company has key strategies that require learning organization capacity, we may want to further examine how informal knowledge is captured and organized in order to allow us to understand how telecommuting will impact our employees. We would also want to compare her own beliefs and practices regarding reward systems to ensure they are compatible with telecommuting. Although it seems clear that telecommuting can have a positive impact on our workforce, or CEO is equally interested in managing the impacts on financial performance.
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International SIOP Members; Recognition Equity: Does SIOP Value Practitioners?

Over the years SIOP has gained numerous international members. In this article we identify the locations and employment categories of the international professional members of SIOP. Recently we identified the geographic locations of all SIOP U.S.-based professional members (Silzer & Parson, July, 2013b). We also provide a 2012-2013 update on membership representation among SIOP new Fellows, Award winners, Appointments and Executive board, and discuss whether SIOP has made any progress in recognition equity among its membership.

SIOP International Professional Members

Over the years SIOP has made some effort to attract international members. We were interested in finding out more about this membership group. All international SIOP professional members (non-U.S. based) were identified in the 2011 membership database and are summarized by country in Table 1.

The top ranked locations of international members (top 10 ranks, 11 countries with at least four members) are primarily in Europe (5 countries) and Asia (4 countries), although Canada, with 101 members, has 40.7% of all international members. Here is a membership breakdown by geographic region:

- North America (non-U.S.): 3 countries, 104 members
- Europe: 14 countries, 63 members
- Asia: 9 countries, 63 members
- Middle East: 4 countries, 15 members
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Academics</th>
<th>Consultants</th>
<th>Practitioners in Organiz.</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Cayman Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Inclusion in an employment group was determined by 2011 member self-report data
• South America: 2 countries, 2 members
• Africa: 1 country, 1 member

These data indicate that we have as many SIOP members in Asia as we do in Europe. Given all the attention SIOP has devoted to connecting with EAWOP (European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology), it might have been expected that SIOP would have more Europe-based members. However some Asia-based members are actually Americans who are working in Asian countries, such as Singapore and China. It is surprising that we have so few members in South America. Many countries in South America have substantial numbers of psychologists, such as Argentina and Brazil, but there are no SIOP members in either of these two countries.

It is worth noting that the overwhelming majority of international members (191 members, 77%) are academics and researchers. In only a few countries are international members more likely to be consultants/practitioners in organizations than academics/researchers – India, Belgium, Mexico, Cayman Islands and Venezuela – and the numbers here are fairly small. Here are the employment categories of international members:
- Consultants (n = 40) 16%
- Organizational-based practitioners (n = 17) 7%
- Academics (n = 184) 74%
- Researchers (n = 7) 3%

These data raise the question of why SIOP is attracting international academics and not international practitioners. Perhaps SIOP needs to do more to attract practitioners who are based in other countries. Should SIOP do more to connect with our international membership and do a better job of reaching out to I-O practitioners in other countries? Many of our U.S.-based practitioners are doing work in other countries; maybe SIOP should be more actively building an international I-O practice network and not just an international academic network (i.e. AOP, see below).

The top international locations for SIOP members in particular employment focus categories are listed in Table 2. The academics listed in Table 2 (top 10 countries) are evenly split between Europe (5 countries, 39 members) and Asia, (3 countries, 39 members), after considering Canada (70 members). The consultants (nonresearch) listed in Table 2 (countries with at least 2 consultants) are primarily in Canada (17 members) and in Asia (3 countries, 10 members), with Europe a distant third (2 countries, 5 members).

We were interested in trying to deter-
mine how many of these internationally based members are Americans or at least U.S. educated. Although we know there are a number of Americans working overseas, such as in Singapore, Australia, and China, we could not accurately determine who among the international members are Americans based on the 2011 membership database. But the data did provide the graduate institution and graduate major for most of these members. Table 3 identifies how many members in each country hold U.S. graduate degrees versus non–U.S. graduate degrees.

There is a clear trend in some countries. In Canada, 71% of the international members (72 members) hold non–U.S. degrees, presumably from Canadian institutions (also 76% of these members are academics or researchers). The predominance of non-U.S. degrees is also true of other countries such as England (72% non–U.S. degrees), Germany (100%), Italy (100%), and Netherlands (80%).

However, other countries, particularly in Asia, have greater percentages of international members who hold U.S. graduate degrees, such as Australia (60% U.S. degrees), China (60%), India (100%), Israel (64%), Singapore (67%), and South Korea (100%).

The global trend is pretty clear:
- Europe based members (14 countries): 70% non–U.S. degrees, 30% U.S. degrees
- Asia based members (9 countries): 25% non–U.S. degrees, 75% U.S. degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
International SIOP Members by Employment Focus and Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Inclusion in an employment group was determined by 2011 member self-report data
These data suggest that European-based members are highly likely to be European-educated academics and join SIOP to affiliate with a U.S. academic-oriented I-O psychology organization. However, our Asia-based members are highly likely to be U.S.-educated and probably Americans who have moved to Asia for employment opportunities. Although Europe has more established I-O psychology academic institutions and professional communities, Asia is the region of the world that is undergoing significant economic development and currently may offer more employment opportunities for U.S.-educated I-O psychologists.

We also identified the graduate majors for all 2011 international members and determined whether they were associated with non-U.S. or U.S. graduate degrees (see Table 4). As the data suggest for most graduate majors there is a mix of U.S. and non-U.S. graduate degrees. However international members are more likely to hold a non-U.S. degree if their graduate major is in organizational psychology (76% non-U.S. degrees) or organizational behavior (57% non-U.S. degrees). One complication is that this is based on self-report data, and therefore, the self-identified graduate major may not be entirely accurate or may not be comparable to a U.S. graduate major with the same name.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Non-U.S. Degree</th>
<th>U.S. Degree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayman Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 142 100 242*  

* Data is based on 2011 member self-report of doctoral level degrees
A few conclusions can be drawn about the SIOP international members.
- The largest group is in Canada, while Europe and Asia have equal numbers of members.
- The overwhelming majority of international members are academics.
- Consultants and organization practitioners are most likely found in Canada and Asia.
- Members in Canada and Europe are most likely (71%, 70%) to hold non-U.S. graduate degrees.
- Members in Asia are most likely (75%) to hold U.S. graduate degrees.

Over the years SIOP has promoted itself as focused on “Integrating Science and Practice at Work” (SIOP website, www.SIOP.org, 8-14-13). This has been expressed in several ways:
- **The Society’s mission** is to enhance human well-being and performance in organizational and work settings by promoting *the science, practice, and teaching* of industrial-organizational psychology.
- **The SIOP Vision** is “To be recognized as the premier professional group committed to *advancing the science and practice* of the psychology of work.”

### Table 4

*International SIOP Members by Graduate Major Holding U.S. and Non-U.S. Doctoral-Level Degrees*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Non-U.S.</th>
<th>U.S. Degree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial-Organizational Psychology</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Behavior</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Psychology</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Psychology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>212*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data is based on 2011 member self report of doctoral level degrees
** The degree and major field of some members is unknown
The first Core Value of SIOP is “Excellence in education, research, and practice of I-O psychology.

These statements suggest that SIOP is providing equal support to I-O practitioners as it does to academics/researchers, and equal recognition of excellence in the practice of I-O psychology. SIOP members seem to widely profess support for the science–practice integration model for our profession. Therefore it seems reasonable to expect that practitioners should be valued and recognized by SIOP for their work and contributions as much as academics/researchers.

Unfortunately, current reality does not seem to match these stated goals. In fact, there is a clear pattern within SIOP of unequal treatment of I-O practice and practitioners in Fellow designations, award decisions, and key appointments (Silzer & Parson, 2012a). This bias may also be finding its way into official SIOP language in SIOP’s current definition of I-O psychology: “What is I-O?: Industrial-organizational (I-O) psychology is the scientific study of the workplace” (SIOP website, www.SIOP.org). What happened to I-O psychology practice? Is the bias now being institutionalized?

In previous articles we have reported on SIOP’s track record in awards, appointments, officers, and Fellow designations (Silzer & Parson, 2012a; October, 2012c). Those data documented that I-O practitioners are not being adequately recognized in these areas. In this article we are updating the data for 2012–2013 to identify any recent progress.

As we have discussed in previous columns SIOP professional members were categorized into four employment categories (based on 2011 membership self-report data):

- Consultants: 30.3% (in consulting firms and nonresearch consulting positions)
- Organizational-based professionals: 19.0% (in organizations & in government positions with a practice focus)
- Academics: 43.5% (in universities and colleges)
- Researchers: 5.1% (in research consulting firms & government research positions)

An update of these data is reported in the SIOP Progress Dashboard found in Table 5.

First it should be noted that SIOP members who are consultants (nonresearch) and professionals in organizations are 49.3% of the SIOP full membership (compared to the 48.6% who are academics/researchers), and are 56% of the professional members who hold
PhDs in I-O psychology. They clearly are a major sector of the membership.

As the data in Table 5 indicate there has been no progress or little progress in Fellow designation, key appointments, and SIOP officers. Only in the Awards category has there been modest progress, and this may be partially due to awarding the 2013 Professional Contributions Award (what used to be the Professional Practice Award) to two practitioners (instead of an academic/researcher). Although this award progress is welcome news, the lack of progress in general is discouraging and suggests an ongoing lack of membership representation in SIOP recognitions.

### Table 5

**Representation of SIOP Members in 2012–2013 Fellows, Awards, Appointments and Executive Board**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIOP Progress Dashboard</th>
<th>Academics/researchers*</th>
<th>Consultants/practitioners in organizations*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011 membership</strong></td>
<td>48.60%</td>
<td>49.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011 members with I-O PhDs</strong></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fellows</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2013</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2013</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Appointments</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2011</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2013</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIOP Officers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Presidents 2002–2012</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012 Executive Board</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–2013 Executive Board</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Inclusion in an employment group was determined by 2011 member self-report data

**% may not add up 100%, employment focus of some members is unknown

*** Key appointments were for the 4/2012–4/2013 time period, see Table 6 for list of appointment groups.

As Table 5 indicates there has been no progress in recognizing practitioners
as SIOP Fellows. This lack of representation has not changed over the years, with only 17% of Fellows being practitioners (the only noticeable exception was in 2010 when 38% of the newly named Fellows were practitioners; Silzer & Parsons, 2012a). It is disappointing that the major contributions of senior practitioners in organizations and consulting firms seem to be seen as undeserving of Fellow designation when compared to an early career academic who has published a limited number of articles in academic journals that are largely unread.

One possible reason for this bias is likely that SIOP and the academic decision makers who influence these decisions do not know how to objectively evaluate practitioner contributions in organizations and consulting, and have shown little interest in outlining appropriate evaluation guidelines. An alternative Fellow designation for practitioners was proposed and quickly dismissed by a Fellowship Committee Chair. The resistance to change and to practitioner recognition seems to run deep.

**SIOP Awards**

As Table 5 indicates there has been only modest progress in recognizing practitioners in SIOP awards. A total 31% of the awards in 2013 were given to consultants and professionals in organizations. This is a modest improvement over previous years, but it remains to be seen if this is sustainable or improved upon in 2014.

Some have suggested that a group of insiders have undue influence in SIOP affairs (Muchinsky, 2012; Silzer & Parsons, 2013a). Compromising personal biases have been observed in several areas including the SIOP awards process, leadership appointments, and the presidential election balloting procedures. Insider members (almost all former SIOP presidents and heavily dominated by academics) have previously been able to personally change the election ballot (see Reynolds, Collela, & Salas, 2012), inappropriately influence award decisions, and bias leadership appointments in favor of academics. (They also meet annually for a dinner restricted to insiders at the SIOP conference, e.g., the Past Presidents dinner). This raises ethical, fairness, and conflict of interest issues and suggests that SIOP needs to establish and follow clear ethical guidelines and transparent procedures for these decisions. (Recently SIOP did outline changes in the election process as a result of pressure from the membership on the SIOP leadership.)

It would also seem important that all award committees/decision makers have a balanced membership representation among the committee members because these awards can often be decided by majority vote. In addition SIOP
has done a poor job in developing awards that appropriately recognize practitioners’ achievements and contributions. Even the new award for psychological assessment contributions was given to researchers in 2013, and the award guidelines seem to guarantee that only researchers will be considered in the future. (Award is given to “the best refereed journal article or other publication that furthers public and professional understanding of individual or group assessment in the field,” see SIOP website.)

Part of the problem is the ongoing lack of support for practitioners that exists in the SIOP Foundation (see below). The SIOP Executive board seems to have almost abdicated many of its award responsibilities to the Foundation Board, which has done little to recognize or support I-O practitioners and practice (Silzer & Parson, 2013a). Only “insiders,” former SIOP presidents, are current Board members, so they have complete control of all board decisions. A breakdown of the key appointments is provided in Table 6. The greatest lack of balance occurs in the appointments for AOP representatives, Publication Board, the Organizational Frontiers Books Editorial Board, and the SIOP Foundation Board. Even the Professional Practice Books Editorial Board had 58% academic/researcher members and the LEC (originally developed for practitioners) recently had academics in 67% of the chair positions.

Even 71% of the committee chair positions, appointed by the SIOP presidents, were filled by academics/researchers. This is an example of how SIOP presidents (dominated by academic insiders), when given decision discretion show a bias against practitioners.

**Key Appointments**

Key appointments in SIOP are a way for SIOP to recognize outstanding members and to benefit from their expertise and experience. The bias against appointing practitioners (consultants and professionals in organizations) to key appointments positions is long standing (see Table 5). There has been no progress in this area over the years.

We have demonstrated that practitioners volunteer for committee work in approximately similar proportions as other members (Silzer & Parson, 2012a), yet the appointment decision makers have not fully included or recognized practitioners in these appointments. Most of these decisions are usually left to the discretion of the SIOP presidents, so they are in a position to quickly address this inequity if they want to do so.
The SIOP Foundation is another good example of this lack of practitioner inclusion. The Foundation’s mission states: “The Foundation’s resources are intended to further the outreach of both the practice and the science of I-O psychology” (SIOP website, www.SIOP.org, 8-14-13).

However the Foundation Board has always been chaired by, and dominated by, academics/researchers and currently all Board members are former SIOP presidents (SIOP website, www.SIOP.org, 8-14-13). There is a history of the board always being dominated by academics/researchers and former presidents. The board itself nominates and votes on their own new members, which no doubt contributes to the unrepresentative Board membership. The Foundation does little to support I-O practice or recognize the contributions of I-O practitioners. When challenged on this, the Foundation has stated that they “do not know what to do for practitioners” (Silzer & Parson, 2013a). Part of the problem is that academic/researcher insiders control all foundation decisions (including their own board membership) and seem to have little understanding of the needs, interests or contributions of I-O practitioners. This is an example of the drawbacks of letting a member single employment group dominate any Board or committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
<th>Membership Representation in 2012-2013 SIOP Appointments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011 membership</strong></td>
<td><strong>2011 members with I-O PhDs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>48.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIOP Appointments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø SIOP Foundation (n = 6)</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø SIOP Representatives to AOP (n = 4)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø Leading Edge Consortium Chairs (n = 3)</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø Publication Board (n = 8)</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø Book Series Editors (n = 3)</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø Professional Practice Books Editorial Board (n = 12)</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø Organizational Frontiers Books Editorial Board (n = 9)</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø Fellowship Committee (n = 10)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø Strategic Planning Committee (n = 5)</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø Key Committee Chairs (n = 28)</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Inclusion in an employment group was determined by 2011 member self-report data
** % may not add up 100%, employment focus of some members is unknown

Part of the problem is that senior academics are typically the decision makers on key appointments. They tend to have a strong bias in favor of other academics/researchers, which leads to the gross inequities. Unfortunately several of these
senior academics (former SIOP Presidents) have made a career being a SIOP officer or chair and as a result have been major contributors to the ongoing bias against practitioners. Including an equal number of Practitioners in these appointments seems not only the fair and right thing to do, but it is also critical for the future of the profession as a whole.

**SIOP Executive Board**

SIOP has made little progress in electing an Executive Board that is fully representative of the whole membership (see Table 5). Hopefully this will change in the future as members, particularly practitioner members, realize that having balanced representation on the Board is in their own best professional interests.

**Conclusions**

SIOP promotes the organization in its vision, mission, and values as supporting and recognizing the importance of both science and practice to the profession. Yet it is not balanced or inclusive in its recognition and awards. There continues to be significant disparity between what SIOP says it values and what it recognizes. There has been little or no progress in including I-O practitioners in Fellow designation, Awards and Key Appointments, and on the Executive Board.

Why does this disparity continue? Perhaps the decision makers (academics/insiders), favor their own academic colleagues, have little understanding of I-O practice in organizations and consulting firms, and know few I-O practitioners outside their own academic/research networks. Unfortunately the lack of inclusion seems to be spreading. We have seen this in the I-O Journals where the current editors of several journals have intentionally created all academic Journal Editorial Boards (Silzer & Parson, 2012b).

If SIOP wants to address this lack of inclusion there are some steps that SIOP could take:

1. Ensure that all SIOP Boards, Committees Chairs, awards committees, and Key appointments are evenly split (50/50) between Practitioners (nonresearch consultants and organizational practitioners) and Academics / Researchers. In addition no member should be allowed to hold more than one key position or appointment at one time.

2. Ensure that practitioners and academics/researchers are equally included and recognized (50/50) for SIOP Awards and Fellow designations.

3. Have the SIOP presidency alternate every year between a practitioner and an academic/researcher. This should also apply to other significant
SIOP positions, such as Foundation Board Chair, Program Chair, etc.

4. Establish ethical guidelines and decision rules for all award committees and decisions.

5. Establish, promote and deliver on a specific set of SIOP initiatives for supporting and recognizing excellence in I-O practice, such as developing objective guidelines for evaluating practitioner contributions.

Member inclusion issues have been identified in the past, but unfortunately SIOP presidents have not adequately addressed them. At what point will SIOP Officers find that these practices are unprofessional and unfair? We hope that will happen soon, while the current Practitioner members are still in their professional careers.

\(^1\) In this article the term “Practitioner” refers to the 50% of the membership who are employed in organizations or in consulting firms in non-research positions. Some academics and researchers may also see themselves as practitioners but are included here as academics / researchers based on their current self reported primary employment focus.

\(^2\) To access a copy of the 2012-2013 SIOP Officers and Committee Chairs roster, please click here.
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Announcing the HRM Impact Awards

The lifeblood of any profession flows from the creative imaginings and timely implementations of bright ideas.

Here is a bright idea: Reward A while hoping for A. We’ve been hoping for evidence-based human resource management practices for some time now, so let’s try rewarding them.

I am delighted to tell you that the first-ever Human Resource Management Impact Award winners are—
a drum roll, please:

**The HRM Impact Award Winners!**

Click anywhere in this paragraph and a new window will open to reveal the winners.

Welcome back to the Foundation Spotlight column if you clicked the link paragraph above. If you skipped it, take a look. The winners show the best in evidence-based human resource management practices.

Because the list of winners was embargoed while this column was being written, I could not tell you about the four winners and the honorable mention. But thanks to the bright idea of electronic publishing, inclusion of the link gets you both the news about the winners and the backstory that I want to tell you in this Spotlight column.

**The Backstory**

The story behind the HRM Impact Awards provides an illustration of how the SIOP Foundation works to build for the future of organizational psychology. The story starts with an email from Gary Latham, reporting...
brainstorming conversations among Howard Klein, Rich Klimoski, Wayne Cascio and himself, all strong supporters of SIOP. Howard dreamed up the basic idea during the Opening Plenary session of the Chicago 2011 SIOP Conference. Gary emailed me an attachment containing a rough sketch of a partnership with SHRM and the SHRM Foundation, and said “After you have had time to digest it, let’s chat by phone. I think it is a ‘winner’.”

The SIOP Foundation Trustees discussed the basic concept for the award program and decided to explore it in depth. With assent from SIOP’s Executive Board, a Steering Committee was formed with representatives from SHRM, SIOP, the SHRM Foundation and the SIOP Foundation. A Memorandum of Understanding was drafted, and following its approval by the four partners a year ago, the Steering Committee carried on the work of turning the basic concept into an operational reality.

There was a fair amount of uncertainty about whether there would be any applications for the award. Some speculated that there would be only three or four entries, while I hoped for 100 (never mind that the logistics of judging them would be a nightmare – I think it would be a delightful problem to have). When the submission deadline arrived on July 1, there were 21. All were credible entries. Wayne Cascio, the chair of the award committee, described the top seven entries winnowed from the first round of evaluations as “really fantastic”, and another judge described them as “phenomenal.” Wayne said, “This award program should have been established years ago.” And in what I consider to be among the strongest kinds of evidence in support of a practice, namely, that we use the practice on ourselves, Wayne said he will feature the winners’ HRM practices in his teaching and writing.

The Next Story

What is special about SIOP’s partnering with SHRM is the opportunity to bring the research-based best practice we do to the attention of SHRM’s 270,000 members in 140 countries.

Imagine a logo like this on your organization’s HR website, or your client’s.
Will the HRM Impact Awards program contribute to the success of today’s global and local work organizations, making them better places to work? Will it help others to adopt successfully implemented, innovative HRM initiatives? Will it eventually take on the hallmarks of the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval or the Underwriter’s Laboratories Certification marks? Only time will tell, and you can be certain that a continuing flow of bright ideas will be needed to make it happen.

Your calls and questions to the SIOP Foundation are welcome. So are your bright ideas. So are your year-end tax-deductible contributions. The SIOP Foundation would like to be among your beneficiaries. Join us in building for the future. Shine on brightly!

The SIOP Foundation
440 E Poe Rd Ste 101
Bowling Green, OH 43402-1355
419-353-0032 Fax: 419-352-2645
E-mail: LLentz@siop.org