



Volume 62
Number 1
Summer 2024
Editor: Adriane M. F. Sanders

[Advertising](#) | [Back Issues & Archives](#) | [TIP Policies](#) | [Board](#) | [Complete PDF](#)

EDITORIALS

[Editor's Column: ADHDing, One Year Later](#)

Adriane M. F. Sanders

[President's Column](#)

Alexis Fink

FEATURES



[Calling all I-O Program Directors \(and Other Interested I-O Faculty\)!](#)

Adriane M. F. Sanders

[A Content Analysis of Diversity in Undergraduate I-O Psychology Textbooks](#)

Cynthia Prehar, Patrick McGonagle, & Rachael Hansen-Garshong

[Max. Classroom Capacity: An Interview With Dr. Alicia Grandey](#)

Loren J. Naidoo

[All the Better to Hear You With: Using Social Media for Employee Listening](#)

C. S. Ju, E. A. Liguori, & N. M. Savage

[The Bridge: Connecting Science and Practice](#)

Sarah Layman, Jen Harvel, & Apryl Brodersen

[Elevating Recruitment: Spectrum's Innovative Transformation of Selection Processes](#)

Laura Fields, Sara Andrews, Matt Albar, Erin Scheuer, & Carter Gibson

[Connecting for Growth at SIO P 2024: A Look Inside This Year's Consortia](#)

Amber Burkhardt

[Promoting SIO P Volunteer Leadership: Lessons From the Trenches](#)

Maryalice Citera, Bill Handschin, Eileen Linnabery, Meisha-Ann Martin, Robert Calderón, Jill May, Comilla Shahani-Denning, Donna Sylvan, Alan Tomassetti, Angela Ackerman, Meredith Burnett, & Dennis Ochieng

REPORTS

[2024 Membership Survey Results](#)

Survey Subcommittee of the SIO P Membership Committee: Katye Griswold, Cameron Klein, Rushika De Bruin, Harry Kohn, Kelsey Byerly, Ziyad Muflahi, & Tianjun Sun

[The Innovation & Learning Speaker Series: Helping the United Nations Explore the Use of AI In Selection](#)

Jenna McChesney, Chelsi Campbell, Elissa Perry, & Mark L. Poteet

[LETTER TO THE EDITOR: Combatting Predatory I-O Training Programs](#)

Afra S. Ahmad & AJ Thurston

[SIO P Award Winners and New Fellows Members in the Media](#)

Amber Stark

[IOTas](#)

Jenny Baker

Editor's Column: ADHDing, One Year Later

Adrianne M.F. Sanders



I'm writing this summer column from a delightful local beer garden where my regular writing group has been meeting since last fall. This joint has coffee, adult beverages, wifi, pizza, and a handful of fellow academics who are desperate for both companionship and *actual* time to work, so there's really no reason for me to leave. It's a come-as-you-are writing group, and all of us almost always make progress on something each meeting—rarely totally giving in to our need for socialization but appreciating that when that happens, our time was just productive in a different way.

If you've done any perusing of developmental psych or watching young toddler behavior, you might call this productive co-behavior "parallel play." If you've ever gone in search of ADHD hacks, you might call it "body doubling" (#ADHDtok does). And upon reflection, it may be how most of us got through our grad programs, working alongside other grad students in your prof's research lab. The idea is that being near or seeing others on task (a "body double") may inspire, motivate, regulate you enough to also stay on task. There are even social media accounts that live stream themselves writing, reading, cleaning house, and so forth so that others may benefit from an on-task buddy.

The premise of body doubling as a tool for individuals with ADHD is prevalent enough on the internet that I assumed the concept was well established (bad scientist!). To provide you, dear reader, with only the most cutting-edge research and resources, I naturally turned to Google for some quick references on body doubling. One of the first sites that came up was from the Attention Deficit Disorder Association, which is a long-running nonprofit organization dedicated to "helping adults with ADHD lead better lives" (ADDA, n.d.). In their "time and productivity" resource section, they have a fairly recent article on the subject that begins with, "Can something as simple as another person's presence make it easier to stay on task? While there's no research to prove its effectiveness, ADHD body doubling is helping many people get things done" (ADDA, 2024). [Say what now?](#) NO RESEARCH? The staff writer goes on to say this strategy was born out of working with one of their ADHD therapy clients, and the rest of the article is actually a republication from their website in 1996. So just to recap, this idea/phrase emerged out of clinical practice and was published on a prominent ADHD resource website 28 years ago. Google Scholar only returned two hits in which ADHD and body doubling were central to the research: a poster from the Association for Computing Machinery's (ACM) Conference on Computers and Accessibility (Eagle et al., 2023) and a Computer Science master's thesis (Annarapu, 2024). As these outlets suggest, the authors are exploring the concept from a technologically assisted perspective, and their studies *combined* included 260 participants. Clearly there is still much opportunity for research approaching the topic from a variety of other disciplines. I have two points in bringing you down this little rabbit hole: (a) Even if you don't "need" a body double, you might benefit from the practice for a variety of reasons and (b) it is difficult to find actionable, evidence-based strategies for adults with ADHD, and ok, (c) Bonus! Are there any I-Os researching this as practitioners continue to gain momentum on incorporating neurodiversity as another part of DEI and accessibility in the workplace?

Now, I could continue with what I think may be the world's tiniest, most informal lit review, but this was really just a long way of telling you that I think writing groups are the bee's knees and to get body doubling on your radar as a potential strategy to consider for yourself, friends, or family of any age. It's been 1 year and 3 months since my column [Women & ADHD on Front Street](#), where I shared my experiences

with what ultimately became a diagnosis of ADHD. Since then, I have heard from so many readers identifying as women who were having/had similar experiences. The reason I know it's been just over a year since that column is because before I walked into my writing group today, I received the most thoughtful and exciting thank you email from a reader who was now celebrating a fresh diagnosis at age 50. Similarly, I was at a *neighborhood party* and ended up chatting with a K12 teacher I had never met before. We were talking about how frenetic life feels with small children, and she happened to share that she thinks she might have ADHD. I told her a little about my journey and mentioned I had written an editorial about my experience. When I pulled it up to text her the link, she saw the website and said "Oh I've already read that! My friend sent it to me when I started talking about my symptoms." My mouth dropped open. I cannot tell you how powerful and meaningful these notes and conversations have been. The appreciation I have for those who take the time to write or tell me that I've been a positive part of their own journey is even greater because I am very aware of the special combination of motivation, interest, working-, short-, and long-term memory, and maybe even celestial alignment that is often necessary to carry out such a task in the face of ADHD symptoms. I am so happy that my little article, that I almost never published, is actually reaching people. Hearing that I've had anything to do with someone finding support and encouragement and even empowerment to take action feels like receiving a hug from the universe.

I also thought you may want a little update on what it looks like for me a year into this diagnosis. I tried a couple of different medications in the initial months following the diagnosis and have found one that seems to "work" for me (though a supportive therapist continues to be my best treatment). I say "work" because I had unrealistic expectations about what medicine would do. Some ADHDers describe their medicated selves as turning down the volume of their ongoing mental chatter so that they can focus better. My mental chatter still operates at full tilt, unrelated to medicine. Where I seem to notice the pharmacological assist is being able to initiate and/or sustain effort on tasks that I really don't want to do. Don't get too excited; that doesn't mean I just hop on such tasks without painfully procrastinating first, but it's generally better than it was.

I've also had a recurring thought that my symptoms actually seem worse in some ways. The frequency and/or depth of my issues related to working memory and forgetfulness feel like they're at an all time high, as is the impulse to do low-priority or irrelevant tasks before the high-priority ones.¹ However, I'm wondering if these symptoms aren't actually getting worse or more frequent but instead they are just more obvious now that I'm only infrequently trying to mask them. I've learned that everyone does not have these same struggles, and being able to acknowledge and accept they are indeed struggles for me is oddly liberating! Having just seen *Inside Out 2*, it's like a new connection has grown in my "sense of self" this year. This experience has empowered me to acknowledge that this is how I operate, which in turn, allows me to focus more on how to work *with* myself and not against myself. Granted, that's a whole other quest I have embarked on that continues to require deep reflection and deliberate practice, but even getting this far has brought me so much more self-appreciation and compassion. It's provided a vocabulary for meaningful and funny conversations with people who matter to me personally and professionally. Thinking deeply on this is where I'm currently at—relishing the additional authenticity and understanding of myself while testing out little day trips on that new quest to work with and not against. I also want to point out that the official diagnosis is not what made this possible. While a diagnosis can provide a sense of validation and opportunity for more formal supports, seeking to better understand who and how you are right now and how you can care for and support that version of you is completely free.²

I hope anyone reading this or my original ADHD column will continue to reach out if so inclined. I'm happy to share anything else about what I've learned or experienced, and I just love being able to share

a little personalized encouragement as you navigate your own journey. I have felt so much of that same support and what to give it back to you!

Here's to a summer of whatever you need most! May you grant yourself the space and love to do just that.

Note

¹ My spouse has always been equally humored and perplexed by my tendency to clean out a closet (or other space that no one sees) when we have limited time to tidy the house for company. Similarly, I had to reorganize my to-do lists before I finished writing this column even though I only have an hour of childcare.

² Anyone can use ADHD-informed techniques if they help with your struggles, regardless of a diagnosis (and the same is true for techniques meant to help those with anxiety, depression, autism, OCD, learning and executive function disorders for example).

References

- Annavarapu, S. (2024). *Comparative study of body doubling in extended reality*. Unpublished master's thesis. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. <https://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/5fcc5824-46de-4614-b2b0-835646e58dff/content>
- Attention Deficit Disorder Association (ADDA). (n.d.). *About us*. <https://add.org/about-adda/>
- Attention Deficit Disorder Association (ADDA). (2024, April 19). *The ADHD body double: A unique tool for getting things done*. <https://add.org/the-body-double/>
- Eagle, T., Baltaxe-Admony, L. B., & Ringland, K. E. (2023, October). Proposing body doubling as continuum of space/time and mutuality: An investigation with neurodivergent participants [poster]. In *ASSETS '23: Proceedings of the 25th International ACM SIGACCESS Conference on Computers and Accessibility* (pp. 1-4). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3597638.3614486>

President's Column

**Alexis Fink
Meta**



Decades ago, I started describing our annual conference as my “annual intellectual honeymoon.” Every year, I am excited by the ideas presented and delighted by the connections made with friends old and new. In an effort to keep that conference buzz going just a little longer, I’m sharing a slightly shortened version of my closing plenary remarks below.

Every year, our SIOP Annual Conference is full of new ideas, inspiration, and friends. I hope you left the 2024 conference happy and excited about the power of industrial-organizational psychology, the impact we can have on the world, and the bright future ahead.

I love the description of things happening gradually, then all at once. It seems like we are at an intersection of two of those at the same time. First, industrial-organizational psychology has a century of science behind us, and yet in the past few years, we are suddenly the hot new thing! Second, in the larger world, remarkable computer power is available enough that advanced models have taken off in a way that felt like science fiction just a few years ago.

For many of us, SIOP *IS* the annual conference and the content and relationships we find here. You might not know that SIOP also produces a second conference—the Leading Edge Consortium, which will be on leadership and hosted in Minneapolis this fall. We also help set educational standards, support members with activities like our regular salary survey, advocate on issues related to work and workers, and of course, partner with the SIOP Foundation to fund awards and grants, among many other activities.

SIOP, as an organization, needs to adapt and evolve to meet this moment. In good news, this work is already underway. We are looking ahead and determining how our Society needs to evolve in support of our members, our profession, and society; we also need to evolve how we operate our organization.

We are incredibly lucky to have both a dedicated professional staff and an ENORMOUS number of volunteers. I know that, for me, volunteer roles within SIOP have helped build professional relationships and useful skills that I wasn’t able to develop in my day job. Although it is definitely extra work, I have found it to be incredibly rewarding. Like so many things, you get out of it what you put into it!

As we refresh our strategy, we also need to refresh our operations as an organization. Some of this you will notice—like our website refresh that is coming later this year. Other things will be less obvious to most of our members. Like so many organizations, we have evolved over time, and in many cases, we’ve had the same good idea more than once, resulting in duplication and inefficiency. After a decade or two, that results in thousands of web pages (literally), dozens of orphan social media accounts (also literally), and time- and energy-wasting duplication of activities.

And why are we doing all this? Now, more than ever, the world needs our insight, our scientist–practitioner approach to addressing essential questions of work and working, for example, supporting [fair and effective hiring practices](#) as organizations experiment with the new capabilities enabled by advanced techniques.

At this year's annual conference, we saw tremendous content brought forward by our members—content that helps position us as a community of scientist–practitioners to support effective organizational practices. The richness and depth of the work we do matters, and helping ensure a bright future for work of this rigor and quality is the animating force behind our plans and aspirations for the coming year.

SIOP has been a foundational community for my adulthood. I've had opportunities to stretch and grow, made friends across the country and globe, and built a spectacular professional network. It is the honor of a lifetime to have the opportunity to play a role in stewarding SIOP through this pivotal moment, and in so doing, to support healthy workers, effective organizations, and a thriving society. I am excited to do this work in partnership with literally hundreds of you as volunteers, as well as our professional staff, colleagues, and partners. I am so excited for what the future will hold, and I am looking forward to seeing you all next year in Denver!

Calling all I-O Program Directors (and Other Interested I-O Faculty)!

Adriane M. F. Sanders

Did you know there is a community of master's and doctoral program directors that meets regularly during the school year to hash out challenges in our programs, share resources and information, and provide support and encouragement? It's called the I-O Program Directors Alliance (IOPDA).

We began meeting in 2020 under the guidance of the incomparable unifier **Juliet Aiken**, and I took over for her sometime the following year. Early on we pulled all program director names off SIOP's Graduate Program Finder page and emailed to see if they wanted to attend our meetings. We started our own listserv that we could manage in house rather than through APA. After that big recruitment push, awareness of our group became more word of mouth. We have some upcoming plans for a new recruitment push and ideas on how we can ensure folks know we exist should they want to join. Every annual conference we find some additional directors that didn't know about us and wished they had!

Our combined efforts have resulted in meaningful impacts for programs, including drafting materials and providing volunteers who were instrumental in working with Lewis-Burke Associates to get the I-O Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code on the Department of Homeland Security's Federal Register of STEM designated degree programs. We also help each other with various benchmarking efforts and resource requests that our institutions like to throw at us as well as having meaningful conversations about recruitment and selection in our programs, emerging trends in higher ed, modern student challenges and needs, as well as network and share information from our various volunteer activities in SIOP and other professional organizations.

I wanted to put a little plug in before fall semester starts so that you can add our meetings to your calendar if you'd like! People drop in as they're able, whenever they're able. It is a very welcoming and inclusive group—that's how it started and what we value.

IOPDA meets for an hour via Zoom, the **second Monday of each month at noon central time. Our first meeting of fall 2024 is September 9.**

If you're interested, you can email me (sandersAM@apsu.edu) to get the Zoom link for the meetings and how to join our listserv. (FYI, I'm on summer break and will likely batch these emails, but I WILL get you all the info you need before our first meeting!)

We hope you'll join us!

A Content Analysis of Diversity in Undergraduate I-O Psychology Textbooks

Cynthia Prehar & Patrick McGonagle
Framingham State University

Rachael Hansen-Garshong
University of Ghana

The Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP) recently created the “DIP” (Diversifying I-O Psychology) Program, whose mission is to “increase diversity within the field of I-O psychology, and ultimately SIOP, by increasing the diversity of students who are applying to and accepted into funded I-O doctoral programs” (SIOP, 2022). However, amid a recent surge of anti-DEI legislation in higher education (Flannery, 2024), educators in many parts of the United States are becoming legally constrained in how explicitly inclusive they can be. This may require instructors to turn to more subtle ways of signaling to minority group members that they are appreciated, valued, and welcomed. Choosing inclusive undergraduate textbooks might be one such way to do this (see Chaney & Sanchez, 2018; Howansky et al., 2022; and Kelly & Patrice, 2019 for more on identity safety cues).

Although multiple diversity analyses of introductory psychology textbooks have been published (e.g., Hogben & Waterman, 1997; Lonner & Murdock, 2012; Whaley et al., 2017), less is known about representation in textbooks for more specialized courses, like I-O psychology. Accordingly, the current paper includes two studies of diversity content in undergraduate industrial-organizational (I-O) psychology textbooks. The first study analyzed diversity messaging via written content. Two research questions guided our analyses in the first study:

Q1: (How) is diversity defined in undergraduate I-O psychology textbooks?

Q2: How prominent are diversity topics in undergraduate I-O psychology textbooks?

Whereas the first study analyzed text for diversity messaging, the second study focused on the textbooks’ images. In the second study, we explored the following research questions:

Q3: In undergraduate I-O textbooks’ images, what proportion of people are racially diverse, female, and depicted with visible disabilities?

Q4: How do the rates of women, people of color, and visibly disabled people in undergraduate I-O textbooks’ images compare to U.S. national averages for undergraduate college students?

Study 1 Method

Textbook Selection

To identify undergraduate I-O psychology textbooks, we consulted SIOP’s teaching resources (SIOP, 2017), college textbook publisher’s websites (e.g., McGraw Hill, Wiley), and Amazon. We also re-searched “older” textbooks (e.g., Schultz & Schultz, 2005) that did not appear in the first three searches.

We only included undergraduate textbooks that covered both “I” and “O” content and that were marketed toward a North American audience. This yielded eight undergraduate I-O textbooks (see Table 1).

Defining Diversity

A definition of diversity was of central importance. Because our textbooks' definitions varied (see Table 2), we adopted one from the American Psychological Association's (2023) *Inclusive Language Guide*. Text/words were considered diverse if they involved

[T]he representation or composition of various social identity groups in a work group, organization, or community. The focus is on **social identities that correspond to societal differences in power and privilege, and thus to the marginalization of some groups based on specific attributes—for example, race, ethnicity, culture, gender, gender identity and expression, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, religion, spirituality, disability, age, national origin, immigration status, and language**. There is a recognition that people have multiple identities and that social identities are intersectional and have different salience and impact in different contexts. (APA, 2023, p. 3; emphasis added)

We coded content as diverse if it discussed any of the aforementioned groups. We also counted legislation and programs that address systemic discrimination, such as the Civil Rights Act and affirmative action.

Exclusion Criteria

We did not code sentences that included the word diverse, or variations thereof, if it was not clear that the authors were referring to demographic diversity. We also did not count cross-cultural content unless it highlighted underlying power differentials between groups (per the aforementioned APA definition). Last, we did not code ancillary chapter information in the first study (e.g., images, figures, tables).

Coding Procedures

Using an online sentence counter, the second author counted the total number of sentences in every textbook chapter; these served as the denominator when calculating percent diversity content in a given chapter. Concurrently, the first and second authors, one Caucasian woman and one Caucasian man, independently identified diversity content in the main text of each chapter. Once we located content, we then independently coded it for number of sentences, nature of the social group(s) represented (e.g., gender, disability, race, religions, applies to multiple groups), and chapter topic (e.g., training, motivation, job analysis). All disagreements were resolved through calibration discussions.

Study 1 Results

Research Question 1: Defining Diversity

Our first research question examined how, and if, diversity was defined in undergraduate I-O textbooks. As shown in Table 2, we could find no diversity definitions in two of the eight books. Furthermore, the term was only included in one of five glossaries (three textbooks did not have glossaries). When the term was defined in the books (in the glossary, or elsewhere in the text), a common theme was that diversity involved demographic differences between people. Some definitions/discussions broadened the concept, however, to also include nondemographic individual differences such as abilities, values, and attitudes.

Research Question 2: The Prominence of Diversity in Text

Our second research question concerned the prominence of diversity in the text of the books. We examined this in a few ways. First, we explored whether any textbooks devoted a whole chapter to diversity; none did. Conte and Landy (2019), however, devoted an entire module to the subject (in a chapter with 3 independent modules). And Howes and Muchinsky (2022) devoted several pages to discussing diversity in a new (to this edition) chapter entitled “The Context of Work.”

Second, we examined the proportion of text devoted to diversity (see Table 3). Each book had 14–15 chapters, and across all chapters, the proportion of text devoted to diversity topics ranged from 4.3%–8.4%. Chapters with the highest proportions of diversity content were typically personnel selection (13.8–42.7%), introduction to I-O psychology (8.6%–14.2%), and leadership (4.2%–19.2%). In contrast, research methods (0–0.6%), employee motivation (0–.5%), and organizational theory/development (0–.9%) had little to no diversity content. Within chapters with the most diversity content, the protected classes most typically mentioned were sex/gender (e.g., sexual harassment, women in leadership) and multiple groups (e.g., affirmative action).

Study 2: Method

Procedure

Using the same textbooks from the first study, the second and third authors independently coded the images in all textbooks. The coders were of different sexes and racial backgrounds; the second author is a Caucasian man, and the third author is an African woman. Over the course of several months, the raters met at least once a week to calibrate their codes within a given textbook and address any discrepancies. If possible, discrepancies were resolved through discussion, with most discussions resulting in consensus. However, images with unresolved discrepancies were placed in a tiebreaker section. The first author, a Caucasian woman, utilized the Study 2 codebook to provide the tiebreak codes. Across the 2878 demographic coding decisions (929 people x 3 demographic variables), there were only 17 disagreements, resulting in 99.4% agreement between the coders.

Study 2 Codebook

Textbook images were first identified by page number. Images could include people, animals, scenery, and/or objects anywhere in a chapter. The images could be photographs and/or line drawings (e.g., cartoons). If multiple images were located on one page, they were coded from the top to bottom of the page and left to right. Similarly, if multiple people were present in a single image, they were each individually coded from top to bottom and left to right (i.e., the first person coded was nearest the top of the image and to the left-most side of it). Raters also made notes to ensure they were discussing the same images and people during their calibration meetings.

Images were first coded for their print color (black/white or in color). Then, they were evaluated for the presence of people. A person was defined as any human body that had a visible face. If images had only objects and/or nonhuman animals in them, they were not further analyzed. Each person in an image was coded for multiple demographic features (described below). However, given the importance of facial features and skin color in our operational definitions (see Table 2), a person was only coded if at least 50% of their face was visible.

To address our fourth research question, we coded the race, presence of physical disabilities, and gender of each person in the images. We chose these demographics as they were the ones we felt most confident deducing from pictures. (Accurately inferring sexual orientation or presence of invisible disabilities, like asthma or schizophrenia, would be nearly impossible from a picture alone.)

Race was the first demographic variable coded. As shown in Table 4, we primarily relied on the Massey-Martin Skin Color Scale (2003) and operational definitions adapted from Reddy-Best et al. (2018) to code people as *Black*, *Brown*, *White*, or *Asian*. There were also options for “*Contains another person of color*” and “*Cannot determine race.*”

After race, we next coded the people in the images for presence of a visible physical disability (yes or no). Physical disabilities were coded as present when observable assistive aids, such as wheelchairs, braces, canes, and/or hearing aids, existed in an image.

Our last demographic variable, gender, was coded based on operational definitions adapted from Reddy-Best et al. (2018; see Table 4). Women were defined by visible breasts, curved hips, and soft facial features, while men were defined by the presence of facial hair (e.g., a thick beard and/or mustache), angular jawline, and broad shoulders. There was also an option for “*Could not determine gender.*”

Study 2: Results

Research Question 3: Demographic Representation in Images

To describe representation in the textbooks’ imagery, we calculated the percentage of people depicted in each race, disability, and gender category. Across all eight textbooks, 929 people were clearly displayed in images. Of these 929 people, 626 were White (67.4%), 127 were Black (13.7%), 83 were Brown (8.9%), 88 were Asian (9.5%), 1 was another person of color (0.1%), and 4 people’s race was unable to be determined (0.4%). Table 5 shows the racial distribution by textbook. In all books, White people were the dominant racial group depicted (ranging from 51.4% to 77.4% of the people depicted in the images). In six textbooks, the second most frequently represented racial group was Black (11.3–22.9% of depictions). The least represented racial groups were Brown (3.8–9.1%; 5 books) and Asian (5.7%–11.5%; 3 books).

In terms of gender, 422 people appeared to be female (45.4%), 506 appeared to be male (54.47%), and 1 person’s gender could not be determined (0.1%). In three of the eight textbooks, however, women outnumbered men (see Table 5).

Last, only 4 (0.3%) of the 929 people shown in the textbooks’ images had a visible physical disability. As shown in Table 5, these four images were dispersed across four different textbooks.

Research Question 4: Representation Relative to Undergraduate Demographic Composition

Our final research question asked whether the rates of representation in the textbooks’ images reflected the demographic composition of the United States’ undergraduate students, on average. To explore this question, we performed *chi-square goodness-of-fit* analyses, and we relied on numbers from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) for our expected values. We chose the NCES because it is “the primary statistical agency of the U.S. Department of Education” (National Center for Education Statistics, n.d., About NCES, para 1).

Race

With respect to race, the NCES reports college enrollment rates for White, Black, Hispanic, and Asian students. We did not have a coding system for Hispanic individuals, however, and we were not confident that our codes of “Brown” skin tone exclusively reflected people of Hispanic heritage. Thus, we analyzed only the data for people coded in our study as White, Black, and Asian ($n = 841$). For our expected values, we utilized the undergraduate enrollment rates of White, Black, and Asian students in 2018 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2019a). The chi-square goodness-of-fit analysis for race was not significant $\chi^2 (2, n = 841) = 4.82, p = .09$. In other words, racial groups were represented in the images at proportions relatively similar to the 2018 enrollment rates in the United States’ undergraduate population (e.g., 614 White people expected in the images, 626 observed; 149 Black people expected, 127 observed).

Gender

The NCES also reports the gender breakdown of young adults enrolled in U.S. college and universities. Since 1979, women have outnumbered men in undergraduate college enrollment, and in 2018, women comprised 57% of the 18–24-year-olds enrolled in college (National Center for Education Statistics, 2019b). With a significant chi-square result, however, this trend was not reflected in our sample of textbooks published between 2018 and 2021, $\chi^2 (1, n = 928) = 50.30, p = .001$. Women were depicted at lower rates than expected (422 vs. 529, respectively), and men were depicted at higher rates than expected (506 vs. 399, respectively).

Disability

Last, we had planned to compare the observed rates of people with visible physical disabilities with the expected rates of physically disabled people enrolled in college. However, because we observed fewer than five images of physically disabled people across all of our textbooks, we did not satisfy the necessary assumptions for a chi-square goodness-of-fit test (Pallant, 2013).

General Discussion

Recent SIOP attempts to make I-O psychology more inclusive inspired this work (e.g., Shyamsunder et al., 2020; Sim & Hewitt, 2023; SIOP, 2022). The American Psychological Association (APA), SIOP’s parent organization, has established similar goals (American Psychological Association, 2019, 2021; Pappas, 2022). The study primarily concentrated on undergraduate education due to its optimal potential for attracting students from historically underrepresented groups to I-O graduate programs. Furthermore, preliminary studies suggest that inclusive classrooms have positive effects on student achievement and attitudes. For instance, in their quasi-experiment, Kelly and Patrice (2019) manipulated diverse imagery in PowerPoint slides across four introductory psychology classes. Black students who were exposed to Black imagery in the slides had higher final course grades than Black students in the White imagery condition. Howansky et al., (2022) also found positive effects when they manipulated various identity safety cues (ISC) in the classroom. When students perceived that their professor tried to create an inclusive environment, they reported a higher sense of belonging and fewer absences compared to the control classroom. Although neither of these studies measured the impact of an inclusive textbook, they suggest that small changes in pedagogy may have a meaningful impact on student behavior.

Overall, we found that the undergraduate I-O psychology textbooks in our sample lacked a unified definition of diversity, and none focused an entire chapter on it (cf. Conte & Landy, 2019). In addition, the chapters that covered research methods, motivation, and organizational development frequently lacked sufficient diversity material. We encourage textbook authors to adopt standardized definitions of diversity and related terms (e.g., equity, inclusion, intersectionality). Furthermore, we also recommend that authors devote an entire chapter to discussing diversity and/or that they conduct a “diversity audit” to ensure they intentionally include diversity content in all chapters.¹ For example, research studies that describe reactions to coworkers with non-normative gender identities (e.g., Waite, 2021) would provide more inclusive content in a research methods chapter.

In contrast to low levels of diversity messaging observed in the text of some books, we found adequate racial representation in the textbooks’ images (relative to the racial composition of the likely textbook consumers, i.e., undergraduate students). However, more men than women were depicted in the images, despite the fact that there are more female college students than male. Furthermore, people with visible physical disabilities were almost nonexistent in the textbooks. To the extent that textbook authors have control of the images in their textbooks, we encourage them to be mindful of selecting images with more women and more diverse body abilities.

Multiple limitations were present in this study. First, defining diversity more broadly than the APA (2019) definition would lead to more “hits.” We opted to embrace the more APA definition, however, because it centered on historically marginalized groups, the focal groups for SIOP efforts like the DIP (SIOP, 2022). Second, we only coded the main text in Study 1, excluding tables and other pedagogical aids. This choice likely led us to undercount diversity content in that study. We recommend that future researchers explore the amount of diversity content found in pedagogical aids; this research could help inform instructors how often diversity topics are centered in a given book (vs. treated as peripheral reading).

In the context of rising anti-DEI legislation, inclusive textbooks could be a subtle, yet powerful, way to attract minoritized undergraduates to the I-O profession. Of course, textbook selection is based on many factors, and we encourage instructors to consider diversity content as they contemplate their next I-O psychology textbook selection. We hope that these findings help instructors in that endeavor as well as provide textbook authors with insights on how to make their next editions more inclusive.

Note

¹ For more guidance on diversity audits, we recommend the Racial Equity Course Review from the University of Pennsylvania’s Center for Excellence in Teaching, Learning and Innovation (n.d.) website and the preface of Riggio and Johnson (2022).

References

- Aamodt, M. G. (2018). *Industrial/organizational psychology: An applied approach* (3rd ed.). Cengage.
- American Psychological Association, APA Task Force on Race and Ethnicity Guidelines in Psychology. (2019). *Race and ethnicity guidelines in psychology: Promoting responsiveness and equity*. <http://www.apa.org/about/policy/race-and-ethnicity-in-psychology.pdf>
- American Psychological Association. (2021). *APA resolution on harness psychology to combat racism: Adopting a uniform definition and understanding*. <https://www.apa.org/about/policy/resolution-combat-racism.pdf>

- American Psychological Association. (2023). *Inclusive language guide*.
<https://www.apa.org/about/apa/equity-diversity-inclusion/language-guidelines.pdf>
- Bulger, C. A., Schultz, D. P., & Schultz, S. E. (2020). *Psychology and work today* (11th ed.). Routledge.
- Center for Excellence in Teaching, Learning and Innovation. (n.d.). *Racial equity course review*. University of Pennsylvania. <https://cetli.upenn.edu/resources/inclusivity/racial-equity/>
- Chaney, K. E., & Sanchez, D. T. (2018). Gender-inclusive bathrooms signal fairness across identity dimensions. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 9(2), 245–253. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617737601>
- Conte, J. M., & Landy, F. J. (2019). *Work in the 21st century: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology* (6th ed.). Wiley.
- Flannery, M. E. (2024, March). *Anti-DEI laws: Is your state next?* neaToday. https://www.nea.org/nea-today/all-news-articles/anti-dei-laws-take-aim-students-color-and-lgbtq-students?utm_source=highered&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=20240229_he&ms=email_highered_20240229_he&j=9442833&sfmc_sub=58542071&l=15915_HTML&u=180873274&mid=1059756&jb=9002
- Hogben, M., & Waterman, C. K. (1997). Are all of your students represented in their textbooks? A content analysis of diversity issues in undergraduate psychology textbooks. *Teaching of Psychology*, 24(2), 95–100. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328023top2402_3
- Howansky, K., Maimon, M. & Sanchez, D. (2022). Identity safety cues predict instructor impressions, belonging, and absences in the psychology classroom. *Teaching of Psychology*, 49(3), 212–217. [doi:10.1177/0098628321990362](https://doi.org/10.1177/0098628321990362)
- Howes, S. S., & Muchinsky, P. M. (2022). *Psychology applied to work* (13th ed.). Hypergraphic Press.
- Kelly, K., & Patrice, K. (2019). Incorporating Black images and references to increase African American student performance in introductory psychology: A pilot study. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 45(1), 52–62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095798418825168>
- Kiranantawat, K., Suhk, J. H., & Nguyen, A. H. (2015). The Asian eyelid: Relevant anatomy. *Seminars in Plastic Surgery*, 29(3), 158–164. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0035-1556852>
- Levy, P. E. (2020). *Industrial/organizational psychology: Understanding the workplace* (6th ed.). Worth Publishers.
- Lonner, W. J., & Murdock, E. (2012). Introductory psychology texts and the inclusion of culture. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1115>
- Massey, D. S., & Martin, J. A. (2003). *The NIS Skin Color Scale*. Office of Population Research, Princeton University.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (n.d.). *About NCES*. U.S. Department of Education. <https://nces.ed.gov/about/>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2019a, September). *Total fall enrollment in degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by level of enrollment, sex, attendance status, and race/ethnicity or non-resident alien status of student: Selected years, 1976 through 2018 (Table 306.10)*. U.S. Department of Education. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d19/tables/dt19_306.10.asp
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2019b, December). *Total fall enrollment in degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by attendance status, sex of student, and control of institution: Selected years, 1947 through 2029 (Table 303.10)*. U.S. Department of Education. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d19/tables/dt19_303.10.asp
- Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS survival manual* (5th ed.). McGraw Hill.
- Pappas, S. (2022, November). Psychologists are working to diversify the undergrad curriculum and make classrooms more inclusive. *Monitor on Psychology*, 53(2), 70. <https://www.apa.org/monitor/2022/11/inclusive-undergraduate-psychology>

- Reddy-Best, K. L., Choi, E., & Park, H. (2018). Race, colorism, body size, body position, and sexiness: Critically analyzing women in fashion illustration textbooks. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 36(4), 281–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887302x18779140>
- Riggio, R. E., & Johnson, S. K. (2022). *Introduction to industrial/organizational psychology* (8th ed.). Routledge.
- Schultz, D. P., & Schultz, S. E. (2005). *Psychology and work today: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology* (9th ed.). Taylor & Francis.
- Shyamsunder, A., Ferdman, B. M., Solberg, E., Sawyer, K., Carr, S., & Gilrane, V. (2020). The what, why, how, who, and where of inclusion: Highlights and the way forward from the SIOP 2020 theme track. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 58(2). <https://www.siop.org/Research-Publications/Items-of-Interest/ArticleID/4751/ArtMID/19366>
- Sim, J. J., & Hewitt, C. A. (2023). Increasing representation in the industrial-organizational psychology curriculum. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 60(4). <https://www.siop.org/Research-Publications/Items-of-Interest/ArticleID/7463/ArtMID/19366/preview/true>
- Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. (2017). *I-O psychology textbooks*. <https://www.siop.org/Events-Education/Educators/I-O-Resources-for-Teachers/I-O-Textbooks>
- Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. (2022). *The DIP: SIOP diversifying I-O psychology program*. <https://www.siop.org/About-SIOP/The-DIP>
- Spector, P. E. (2021). *Industrial and organizational psychology: Research and practice* (8th ed.). Wiley.
- Truxillo, D. M., Bauer, T. N., & Erdogan, B. (2021). *Psychology and work: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Waite, S. (2021). Should I stay or should I go? Employment discrimination and workplace harassment against transgender and other minority employees in Canada's federal public service. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 68(11), 1833–1859. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2020.1712140>
- Whaley, A. L., Clay, W. A. L., III, & Broussard, D. (2017). Cultural diversity in Introductory Psychology textbook selection: The case for historically Black colleges/universities (HBCUs). *Psychology Learning & Teaching*, 16(1), 19–35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475725716679533>

Table 1

Textbooks Examined in Studies 1 & 2 (in alphabetical order by first author)

| Author(s) & publication year | Title & publisher |
|--|---|
| Aamodt, M. G. (2018) | <i>Industrial/organizational psychology: An applied approach</i> (9 th ed.). Cengage. |
| Bulger, C. A., Schultz, D. P., & Schultz, S. E. (2020) | <i>Psychology and work today</i> (11 th ed.). Routledge. |
| Conte, J. M., & Landy, F. J. (2019) | <i>Work in the 21st century: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology</i> (6 th ed.). Wiley. |
| Howes, S. S., & Muchinsky, P. M. (2022) | <i>Psychology applied to work</i> (13 th ed.). Hypergraphic Press. |
| Levy, P. E. (2020) | <i>Industrial/organizational psychology</i> (6 th ed.). Worth Publishers. |
| Riggio, R. E., & Johnson, S. K. (2022) | <i>Introduction to industrial/organizational psychology</i> (8 th ed.). Routledge. |
| Spector, P. E. (2021) | <i>Industrial and organizational psychology: Research and practice</i> (8 th ed.). Wiley. |
| Truxillo, D. M., Bauer, T. N., & Erdogan, B. (2021) | <i>Psychology and work: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology</i> (2 nd ed.). Routledge. |

Table 2

Textbooks' Diversity Definitions

| Textbook | Glossary definition | Definitions elsewhere in the textbook |
|----------------------|--|--|
| Aamodt (2018) | Not included in glossary | We could not find a definition of diversity in this textbook. It was not mentioned in subject index or in the "key terms" at the end of each chapter. A review of the table of contents found one feature labeled "Focus on Ethics: Diversity Efforts" (p. 225, Chapter 6: Evaluating Selection Techniques & Decisions). Diversity was not defined in this passage, however. |
| Bulger et al. (2020) | N/A- no glossary in this textbook | Although there were multiple entries for diversity in this textbook's subject index, we could not find an explicit diversity definition. The closest we could find was in a Selection chapter that stated: "The goal of most selection systems is to ensure that the workforce is representative of the diversity of people, both their demographic diversity and their diversity of backgrounds, experiences, and ideas and influences." (p. 109, Chapter 5: Employee Selection Systems and Decisions). |
| Conte & Landy (2019) | "Diversity in demographic characteristics; also includes differences in values, abilities, interests, and experiences." (p. 579) | This textbook has an entire module on diversity (as part of a 3-module chapter on Fairness, Justice, and Diversity in the Workplace). The diversity definition in this module is the same as the one in the glossary (see prior column). |

| | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| | | |
| Howes & Muchinsky (2022) | N/A- no glossary in this textbook | "The practice or state of having broad representation of people with different personal characteristics, including backgrounds, demographics, and viewpoints." (p. 64, Chapter 3: The Context of Work). |
| Levy (2020) | Not included in glossary | "diversity- broadly defined to include things like race and ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic status, among other characteristics" (p. 15, Chapter 1: I-O Psychology: Then and Now). Later in the chapter, the author also states that the workforce can be diverse in terms of "thoughts, expectations, and culture" as well (pp. 18–19). |
| Riggio & Johnson (2022) | Not included in glossary | Although there were multiple entries for diversity in this textbook's subject index, we could not find an explicit diversity definition. However, in the chapter on teams, the authors discussed how teams can vary on "deep-level characteristics (such as personality) and surface-level characteristics (such as race and gender)" (p. 367), and how group diversity—"in cultural and ethnic background, gender, and perspectives"—influences group/team processes (p. 371). |
| Spector (2021) | Not included in glossary | "Differences among people (cognitive and/or demographic)" (p. 296, Chapter 12: Work Groups and Work Teams). |
| Truxillo et al. (2021) | N/A- no glossary in this textbook | Although there were multiple entries for diversity in this textbook's subject index, we could not find an explicit diversity definition. The closest we could find was in the chapter on teams: "Diversity can include demographics such as gender, race, or age. In addition, diverse experiences, abilities, cultures, and physical characteristics may also be factors on which people differ." (p.503, Chapter 13: Teams at Work). |

Table 3*Diversity Content (in Words) by Book*

| | Aamodt (2018) | Bulger et al. (2020) | Conte & Landy (2019) | Howes & Muchinsky (2022) | Levy (2020) | Riggio & Johnson (2022) | Spector (2021) | Truxillo et al. (2021) |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| % diversity text across entire book | 7.6% | 5.0% | 4.8% | 4.3% | 8.4% | 6.7% | 5.3% | 4.6% |
| Chapters with the most diversity content | Selection & personnel law (38.9%) job analysis (8.7 %) predictors (5.2%) | Selection & personnel law (31.6%) intro to I-O (10.2%) teams (17.7%) | Fairness, jus- tice, & diver- sity (19.2%) leadership (17.5%) selection & personnel law (13.8%) | The context of work (42.7%) training (11.8%) leadership (4.2%) | Selection & personnel law (42.7%) predictors (18.4%) training (17.5%) | Intro to I-O (33.4%) job analysis (18.7%) leadership (10.1%) | Selection & personnel law (14.2%) leadership (12.7%) job analysis (10.2%) | Leadership (16.2%) selection & personnel law (14.5%) predictors (9.4%) |
| Chapters with the least diversity content | Org. theory/ dev. (0.3%) motivation (0.5%) work atti- tudes (0.8%) | Engineering psychology (0.3%) predictors (0.4%) job analysis (0.7%) | Research methods (0%) org. the- ory/dev. (0.7%) work attitudes & emotions (1.3%) job analysis (1.4%) | Motivation (0%) union/man- agement rela- tions (0%) criteria (0.71%) org. the- ory/dev. (0.74%) | Occupational health/stress (0%) motivation (0.4%) research methods (0.6%) org. the- ory/dev. (0.9%) | Motivation (0.3%) communica- tion (0.3%) org. the- ory/dev. (0.3%) research methods (0.9%) | Research methods (0%) training (0%) motivation (0%) org. the- ory/dev. (0.1%) | Research methods (0%) criterion measurement (0%) motivation (0%) org. the- ory/dev. (0%) |

Table 4*Study 2's Operational Definitions for Race, Physical Disability, and Gender*

| Demographic attribute | Massey & Martin (2003) Color Scale | Adapted operational definitions from Reddy-Best et al. (2018) | Additional notes |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Race: Black | 7–10 on the scale | Dark-colored skin, larger facial features (nose and lips), and/or Black hair style (e.g. straight, natural, dreadlocks, braided). | |
| Race: Brown | 3–6 on the scale | n/a | People who appeared to be from the country of India were coded as brown. |
| Race: White | 1–2 on the scale | White or light skin color, visible crease in eyes, and/or pupil almost entirely visible. | |
| Race: Asian | n/a | Eye is narrow, single eyelid, less exposed and darker iris, straight and dark hair, and/or flatter bridge on nose with round tip. | See also Kiranantawat et al. (2015) for a discussion and images of a characteristic Asian eyelid. |
| Visible physical disability | n/a | n/a | Presence of an assistive device, such as a wheelchair, cane, brace, and/or hearing aid. |
| Gender: female | n/a | Visible breasts, curved hips, soft facial features, and/or clothing with feminine characteristics such as flowers or ruffles. | n/a |
| Gender: male | n/a | No breasts, angular body shape, angular jaw line, facial hair (thick beard and/or moustache), and/or broad shoulders. | |

Table 5*Demographic Representation of People in the Textbooks' Images*

| Demographic attribute | Aamodt (2018) | Bulger et al. (2020) | Conte & Landy (2019) | Howes & Muchinsky (2022) | Levy (2020) | Riggio & Johnson (2022) | Spector (2021) | Truxillo et al. (2021) |
|------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Race: Black | 8/35 (22.9%) | 7/61 (11.5%) | 17/131 (13%) | 6/53 (11.3%) | 41/292 (14%) | 9/73 (12.3%) | 9/55 (16.4%) | 30/229 (13.1%) |
| Race: Brown | 6/35 (17.1%) | 12/61 (19.7%) | 14/131 (10.7%) | 2/53 (3.8%) | 25/292 (8.6%) | 5/73 (6.8%) | 5/55 (9.1%) | 14/229 (6.1%) |
| Race: White | 18/35 (51.4%) | 35/61 (57.4%) | 85/131 (64.9%) | 41/53 (77.4%) | 197/292 (67.5%) | 49/73 (67.1%) | 35/55 (63.6%) | 166/229 (72.5%) |
| Race: Asian | 2/35 (5.7%) | 7/61 (11.5%) | 13/131 (9.9%) | 4/53 (7.5%) | 28/292 (9.6%) | 10/73 (13.7%) | 6/55 (10.9%) | 18/229 (7.9%) |
| Gender: female | 18/35 (51.4%) | 33/61 (54.1%) | 52/131 (39.7%) | 21/53 (39.6%) | 127/292 (43.5%) | 42/73 (57.5%) | 24/55 (43.6%) | 105/229 (45.9%) |
| Gender: male | 17/35 (48.6%) | 28/61 (45.9%) | 79/131 (60.3%) | 32/53 (60.4%) | 165/292 (56.5%) | 31/73 (42.5%) | 31/55 (56.4%) | 123/229 (53.7%) |
| Visible physical disability | 0/35 (0%) | 1/61 (1.6%) | 1/131 (0.8%) | 0/53 (0%) | 1/292 (0.3%) | 0/73 (0%) | 0/55 (0%) | 1/229 (0.4%) |

Note. The first number in each cell represents the # of people who were coded with that demographic. Then we divided that number by the total # of people observed in the book to calculate the ensuing percentages.

Max. Classroom Capacity: An Interview With Dr. Alicia Grandey

Loren J. Naidoo
California State University, Northridge



Dear readers,

It is my pleasure to present to you a conversation that I had with **Dr. Alicia Grandey**, SIOP's 2024 Distinguished Teaching Contributions Award winner! Dr. Grandey is a full professor of I-O psychology at Penn State University. Her ground-breaking and influential research on topics such as emotional labor and employee health has been published in top-tier academic journals. In addition to being a first-rate researcher, she is also a committed and decorated teacher and mentor.



Loren Naidoo: Dr. Grandey, congratulations on winning the 2024 SIOP Award for Distinguished Teaching, and thanks so much for agreeing to speak with me for Max. Classroom Capacity!

Alicia Grandey: Thanks so much! It's an honor to be among all those amazing teachers and mentors in our field.

LN: I think I first became a fan of your research on emotions when I was in graduate school in the early 2000s. You remain a prolific and influential researcher today, having won numerous best paper awards, achieved fellowship in SIOP and APS, published dozens of papers in top-tier journals, and racked up 30,000+ citations, among other achievements. What may be less well-known is how you became an I-O psychologist in the first place. What drew you to the field?

AG: Wow thanks for all that!

Like many of us, I came to the I-O field circuitously. In college, I knew I loved psychology and that I wanted to apply it, but I wasn't sure if I could handle the emotional demands of counseling. I was at the University of Oregon, which didn't have an I-O program, but in my senior year one of my professors informed me that I-O existed. I applied to a handful of graduate programs with professors studying emotions and stress and am grateful I ended up at Colorado State with **Dr. Russell Cropanzano**, who had just published the affective events theory paper with his advisor **Dr. Howard Weiss**! In short, I wasn't sure I could handle the emotional demands of counseling, but I-O was a way I could study emotional demands and apply that knowledge to improve well-being.

LN: It's funny how so many of us barely had an idea of what I-O psychology was before we entered the field. I don't think I knew the difference between the "I" and the "O" until my 3rd year of grad school... So, you completed your PhD and (at some point) were faced with the choice of looking for academic positions or "real" jobs. What made you decide to go into academia?

AG: I don't think I knew for sure whether I wanted to go applied or academic until my 4th year. I was driving my advisor crazy with indecision! At first, I wanted to be a consultant helping to reduce stress in organizations or develop stress training for EAPs. Then I taught a few small classes and finally got a grad-

uate teaching fellowship, teaching two sections of introductory psychology to 250 students each. I realized I loved teaching, and that, in combination with having a few publications, made landing an academic job both a desired outcome and practically feasible.

I thought I wanted a more teaching-focused school but applied to a few R-1s like Penn State just to see what would happen. And it worked out!

LN: What made you realize that you loved teaching? Can you point to any early teaching experiences that really cemented that realization for you?

AG: There are two things that come to mind.

As a graduate student, I took a seminar on the dramaturgical perspective of teaching. That helped me to realize that I could leverage my high school theater experience to be a better teacher and that I could keep my love of theater alive as part of my job. I use drama skills to ensure my body posture and vocal dynamics to convey excitement and passion for my topic and signal my curiosity and interest in what students say. I start off with a structured “script” of slides and discussion points if I’m teaching something new, but as I get more comfortable with the topic then I move to a more “improvisational” approach that rolls with audience/student input.

The other was realizing that students needed to feel seen as individuals and that often their college course instructors treated them as a mass or a chore. I always take the time to learn their names—in big classes, offering 1-point extra credit if they came to my office hours the first week. I had several students share their personal struggles with me that really opened my eyes to how I, as a teacher, can help students learn and grow by seeing them and valuing them as individuals.

LN: On learning students’ names—I totally agree, and I refer readers back to the [Max. Classroom Capacity column](#) on the topic. How interesting that your background in theater has informed your approach to teaching—I didn’t see that coming! I’ve always felt that teachers should be interesting and fun and that being so doesn’t have to come at the expense of substance. I think this aligns with what you said. It sounds like you use your theater training to convey your own interest and enthusiasm in what you’re teaching and in your students’ ideas. Do you think “putting on a good show” as a teacher has other benefits? Also—while we are on the topic—what are your top 3 movies about teaching?

AG: Yes, and it’s not about simply performing or putting on a “show,” it’s about conveying the material in a way that engages students. This can be as simple as using changes in my voice—getting louder and then quieter, using a conversational tone rather than a monotone, and changes in posture and motion, like moving around the room so they never know where I’ll be or what I’ll do. When a theater or movie is predictable, we get bored and tune out; likewise, I don’t want my behavior or the material to be obvious or predictable. I also try to start class with a curious problem or a tension to resolve (i.e., are financial rewards controlling or supportive?), invite them to wrestle with what they think based on their experience, and then present some evidence to interpret. And I tend to share my own experiences and invite them to share theirs so that it feels real and engaging to their own lives, just like theater resonates with us personally. The benefit of that is that it can help us understand our own past experiences better and understand what matters to us moving forward.

I love the movie *Dead Poets Society*. In fact, I’ve jumped up on desks in my Introduction to Psychology large classes in a nod to Robin Williams’ character to make a point about social norms. I love seeing the

power of a teacher to connect with individual students and their personal development. (I cry every time I see Ethan Hawke get on that desk.) *School of Rock* is fun, and, at a deeper level, is about connecting with what moves the students and trying lots of strategies to get them engaged. And *Mr. Holland's Opus*—I want to be the teacher who inspires their students by pushing them to be their best, even if they don't appreciate it until years later (way after the class ratings are submitted).

LN: Wow. You nailed that movie question! It's impossible not to cry at that moment in *Dead Poets Society*! OK, we've talked quite a bit about inspiring and connecting with students, and I think that's very important. But, thinking of the (dozens of?) graduate students or early career teachers who read Max. Classroom Capacity, do you think that this aspect of teaching can be taught? In other words, is this aspect of teaching inherently personal and not replicable? The idea of jumping on a desk might make some instructors feel uncomfortable or inauthentic. Can you be an effective instructor without inspiring and connecting with students? What advice would you give to instructors out there on this issue?

AG: Sure, everyone has their own teaching and self-presentational style, and it has to be authentic for it to work in front of a classroom. Let me clarify that a lot of early teaching is simply getting familiar with the content that is being taught, and confidence about the content has to be there to build the foundation for effective teaching styles.

But with confidence and practice, you get past focusing on WHAT you are teaching and can focus more on HOW. And more than ever these days, we have to be thinking about HOW to get students to engage with the material. They can get the WHAT from Wikipedia, a Google search, or ChatGPT. As instructors, we have to teach them skills so they know HOW to summarize, analyze, synthesize, and question the information they can find online. I try to do that by inspiring and connecting with them personally, but as long as the students feel curious and engaged with the material, that's what matters.

More specifically, to get students to engage in the material, I take several steps.

1. Find out what they think they know. This can be with a prequiz, or ask them to evaluate a work practice for its efficacy.
2. Show discrepancies in what is known. Have them share their (differing) views with each other or show competing results in science.
3. Ask them why it matters. Personal experiences/cases are a good place to start here or cases where work went badly.
4. Ask them to generate solutions. What science or practice is needed to solve the problem? Does that exist (search and evaluate)?

LN: I love this framework! Do you have any final words of advice for new instructors or those simply looking to up their game?

AG: When I first started teaching, I didn't know what I was doing. I was teaching Intro Psych and basically learning the material the week before the students did (especially the neuroscience sections!). I had to say "I don't know" a lot, but then I'd learn and come back to class with new insights. I was surprised when I got really good evaluations. That's when I learned that being a good teacher is about being motivated to learn and engage with the material, not about being the most knowledgeable person in the room.

Over time, teaching styles should grow and change—that means you should never feel bored or like you have it figured out. It's not about having the perfect slides or the best activity or the most knowledge.

Every time we teach is different because there are new problems and new science, plus every class has its own dynamics based on the students and how they show up. That variety is challenging and exciting—and a big part of why I love teaching.

Thanks again to Dr. Grandey for agreeing to be interviewed! Readers, please email me with your comments, feedback, or your favorite movies on teaching! Loren.Naidoo@csun.edu

All the Better to Hear You With: Using Social Media for Employee Listening

C. S. Ju, E. A. Liguori, & N. M. Savage*
Old Dominion University

Social Media and Employee Listening

Understanding employee voice in organizations is essential, as issues employees face may not always formally reach an organization's top decision makers. Employee voice refers to the informal and voluntary expression of ideas, suggestions, concerns, information on issues, or opinions regarding work-related matters by an employee to leaders or management who have the potential to enact relevant changes or improvements (Morrison, 2014). Acknowledging voices of employees can help leaders make changes that are important to the direction of the organization (Ashford et al., 2009). Research suggests that employee perceptions of voice are related to a myriad of important workplace outcomes, such as employee performance, justice perceptions, job attitudes, relational outcomes, and withdrawal behaviors (Bashur & Oc, 2015). Thus, ensuring that the voices of all employees are heard by management is important to consider for the health of the employees and the organization as a whole.

Social Media (SM)

With the majority of Americans using some form of social media, including Facebook, TikTok, and YouTube (Pew Research Center, 2024), it is worthwhile to consider its use as a means of listening to employees. Holland et al. (2016) identified the influence of job satisfaction on employees' inclination to use social media for voicing work-related concerns, but it is important to note that their study predates the widespread emergence of TikTok and Instagram Reels, which have changed the landscape of online expression. Holland et al. concluded that social media was not commonly utilized for the purpose of expressing work-related grievances at the time of their study; however, the subsequent rise of short-form content platforms may have shifted this behavior among contemporary employees.

Although some research has focused on social media as a means of recovery from work demands, the results are mixed. Cheng and Cho (2021) found that social media use could be an effective at-work recovery activity to improve relaxation and psychological detachment but found similar results for breaks that did not involve social media, suggesting that, overall, having a break from work is what is important. Alternatively, some research has found that using social media for connectivity and social support, rather than disengagement, can provide additional benefits to employees, unique from the support they may receive in person (Cole et al., 2017). Furthermore, many brands engage in social listening in which they use social media to listen to their consumers; so how, then, can organizations use social media as another "tool in their toolbox" to better hear their employees' appreciations and concerns?

One method could be to have an internal social media site to minimize concerns about susceptibility to online scams, sharing confidential information, or other legally questionable situations (SHRM, n.d.), in which employees can share information and make connections with one another (Mishra, 2023). For instance, internal social media sites can help break down hierarchical barriers, further promoting open dialogue within the organization (Mishra, 2023), which can then facilitate the generation of creative and innovative ideas (Keum & See, 2017). Furthermore, by having online groups and communities in which employees can participate, such as communities of practice or social groups based on a part of an employee's identity, employees are more likely to be engaged (Mishra, 2023; SHRM, n.d.) and employers then have a central source of information from which to "hear" employees' praises and concerns. This

type of organizational infrastructure can also allow leadership to learn of concerns that particular groups of employees may be experiencing and to identify ways of mitigating potential issues.

Social Media: A Space for Commiseration

Social media is commonly used as a space for people to share humor, personal stories, and create their own communities. The internet phenomenon known as “story time,” which originated on the popular social media platform TikTok a few years ago, remains highly popular to this day. The story time trend involves individuals recounting their specific experiences, many of which have occurred in the workplace. The widespread accessibility and viewership on TikTok enable these stories to reach vast audiences, with many users personally relating to similar instances. The hashtag #storytime, as of March 2024, has over 21 million posts on TikTok, which demonstrates the continuing appeal and influence of this content within the platform’s community. The personal stories people share vary widely in topic, but many of these videos involve employees speaking about situations in their current or former employment, the hiring process, or other work-related experiences.

Although story times often adopt a serious tone, other social media trends on Tik Tok and Instagram frequently incorporate humor. It may be surprising how many of these amusing trends can be related to popular I-O topics. For example, in the following Instagram post, this user is making a quip about how many meetings employees have to attend each day (i.e., the “meeting before the meeting”; to watch, click [here](#)). Although comical, this employee may be experiencing role conflict as the “meeting before the meeting” is taking time away from other “in role” performance tasks. As we know, role conflict, a type of hindrance demand, is related to negative employee outcomes such as burnout (Schaufeli & Taris, 2014). From this video, a practitioner may glean that employee time is limited and some meeting topics could be handled in a less time-consuming manner (i.e., via email). Another popular corporate satire includes workplace jargon and the overall tone of meetings (to watch examples, click [here](#) and [here](#)). Although humorous, this may allude to a culture that promotes surface acting. Meta analysis has shown that emotional labor, which includes surface acting, is positively associated with outcomes such as burnout and negatively associated with job satisfaction (Hülshager & Schewe, 2011). From this, a practitioner may surmise that leaders should promote authenticity in meetings and leave the corporate jargon behind.

Overall, these are just a few examples of videos and trends that social media users have made to commiserate about some of the bothersome parts of their workday. Sharing these experiences gives space for employees to voice their concerns without scrutiny from their company. We posit that this also provides an opportunity for practitioners to hear these trending workplace perspectives, which likely would not be shared with management.

Social Media Amplifying Voices of Minority Employees

As noted, voicing dissent toward a leader or policy within the workplace can be difficult for any employee, as voice behaviors have been negatively associated with important facets of career progression, such as promotions and salary increases (Seibert et al., 2001). Importantly, the difficulty of voicing dissent may be compounded when the conflict is voiced from an employee with a minority identity. The ability to vocalize dissent in the workplace stems from having positions of power and privilege; thus, the voices that become muted tend to be those with less powerful organizational positions (i.e., individuals with minority identities; Meares et al., 2004). Furthermore, when employees in lower power positions speak out in their organization, they may not be able to counter the impact their identity may have on voice recognition from their boss, as research has found racial majority employees experience more

voice recognition from their supervisors compared to employees with a racial minority identity (Howell et al., 2015). In some cases, if an employee with a marginalized identity does voice dissent, it can be criticized for how it is expressed. Erksine and Bilimoria (2019) note that when Afro-Diasporic women voice frustrations, they are often tone policed and encouraged to voice their opinions in a calmer way. Building on this idea, Rabelo et al., (2021) reviewed tweets from women of color regarding their experiences with White display rules within the workplace and how those rules impose norms of Whiteness on Black women. Importantly, they note how some women experienced the angry Black women (ABW) stereotype reinforced in their workplace. For example, when they simply voiced dissent, or critical feedback, during a meeting it was seen as “overly opinionated.” All in all, these experiences of tone policing and enforcement of the ABW stereotype create environments that make voicing future concerns difficult for individuals with minority identities.

Since the silencing of these voices has been brought to attention, much of the extant allyship literature emphasizes the importance of amplifying the voices of individuals with marginalized identities (Akam et al., 2021; Kam et al., 2022; Przybylo & Fahs, 2021; Radke et al., 2020), as this gives space for those often silenced voices to be heard. We propose social media may serve as an avenue for employees to voice their broad workplace grievances without the risk of negatively impacting their career progression (Siebert et al., 2001), with the exception of disclosing private organizational information or breaking company policy. Furthermore, management has the opportunity to use social media as a tool to identify these important issues of which they may not be aware.

Cautions of Social Media for Workplace Decisions/Practitioner Use

We propose that social media can be a valuable resource for researchers to explore new research avenues and for practitioners to stay updated about current workplace issues and trends. Nonetheless, we caution the integration of social media into formal workplace decisions and, especially, the hiring process. Although social media has provided pathways for connecting job seekers and recruiters (e.g., LinkedIn), the use of social media in the selection and recruitment process raises concerns regarding fairness, privacy, and potential discrimination. If the applicant does not disclose their social media profiles and activity but the employer locates and browses the information anyway, it could arguably constitute an invasion of privacy. Further, job candidates are likely to share personal information online that is not relevant to their job application, such as sexual orientation and religious beliefs, both protected classes under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This information may then trigger a recruiter's biases, whether intentionally or unintentionally, and can lead to discriminatory practices, as suggested by a hiring experiment conducted by Acquisti and Fong (2020). This study found that employers in Republican counties and states exhibited significant bias against a fictitious Muslim job candidate compared to a fictitious Christian candidate. Thus, the implicit biases formed through the use of social media in the hiring process can potentially lead to violations of antidiscrimination laws.

In addition to the legal and ethical concerns, the use of social media in the hiring process raises questions about the reliability and validity of the information gleaned from these platforms. Currently, there is no standardized and validated approach for evaluating job seekers' online activity and presence (Landers & Schmidt, 2016; Roth et al., 2016). This lack of measurement and consistency can result in subjectivity that is influenced by biases or stereotypes rather than objective criteria related to job qualifications. Furthermore, job applicants may not always portray themselves accurately on social media outlets. As highlighted by Landers and Schmidt (2016), recruiters are realistically constrained in their ability to consider the contextual influences when making judgments about the job seeker's personality, attitudes, and values through social media posts. For a more comprehensive exploration of the use of social media in the hiring

process, we recommend consulting the book *Social Media in Employee Selection and Recruitment: Theory, Practice, and Current Challenges*, edited by Richard Landers and Gordon Schmidt.

Conclusion

The interplay of social media and various workplace dynamics and processes is nuanced. However, we propose that social media can be a valuable tool to understanding prevalent workplace issues more broadly. We suggest that social media may be especially useful for hearing the issues facing employees with minority identities, who are often silenced. Nevertheless, we caution practitioners' use of social media to explicitly seek what their own employees are posting online or using social media as part of any formal selection process. We propose that practitioners should use social media to identify broad workplace trends existing within the workforce as a starting point. Subsequently, any trends that may seem salient can be further examined through anonymously surveying employees as a means to protect their privacy. Furthermore, given that current empirical work on voicing concerns through social media precedes the advent of TikTok and Instagram Reels (Holland et al., 2016), where most of the recent workplace issue videos trend, future research should re-examine social media's role in voicing workplace concerns with the inclusion of those two social media sites.

Note

*indicates equal work and authors only sorted alphabetically

References

- Acquisti, A., & Fong, C. (2020). An experiment in hiring discrimination via online social networks. *Management Science*, 66(3), 1005–1024. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2018.3269>
- Akam, E., Azevedo, C., Chaney, A. M., Dhanvantari, S., Edwards, K. J., Henry, K. E., Ibhagui, O. Y., Ijoma, J.N., Ikotun, O. F., Mack, K. N., Nagle, V. L., Pereira, P. M. R., Purcell, M. L., Sanders, V. A., Shokeen, M., Wang, X. (2021). Visions by women in molecular imaging network: Antiracism and allyship in action. *Molecular Imaging Biology*, 23, 301–309. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11307-021-01597-x>
- Ashford, S. J., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Christianson, M. K. (2009). Speaking up and speaking out: The leadership dynamics of voice in organizations. *Voice and Silence in Organizations*, 175, 202.
- Bashshur, M. R., & Oc, B. (2015). When voice matters: A multilevel review of the impact of voice in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 41(5), 1530–1554. DOI: 10.1177/0149206314558302
- Cheng, Y. S., & Cho, S. (2021). Are social media bad for your employees? Effects of at-work break activities on recovery experiences. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 96, 102957.
- Cole, D. A., Nick, E. A., Zelkowitz, R. L., Roeder, K. M., & Spinelli, T. (2017). Online social support for young people: Does it recapitulate in-person social support; can it help? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 68, 456–464.
- Erskine, S. E., & Bilimoria, D. (2019). White allyship of Afro-Diasporic women in the workplace: A transformative strategy for organizational change. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 26(3), 319–338. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051819848993>
- Holland, P., Cooper, B. K., & Hecker, R. (2016). Use of social media at work: a new form of employee voice? *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(21), 2621–2634. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1227867>

- Howell, T. M., Harrison, D. A., Burris, E. R., & Detert, J. R. (2015). Who gets credit for input? Demographic and structural status cues in voice recognition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(6), 1765. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/apl0000025>
- Hülsheger, U. R., & Schewe, A. F. (2011). On the costs and benefits of emotional labor: A meta-analysis of three decades of research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 16(3), 361–389. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022876>
- Kam, J. A., Cornejo, M., Mendez Murillo, R., & Afifi, T. D. (2022). Communicating allyship according to college students with deferred action for childhood arrivals. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 39(6), 1623–1647. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02654075211061715>
- Keum, D. D., & See, K. E. (2017). The influence of hierarchy on idea generation and selection in the innovation process. *Organization Science*, 28(4), 653–669. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2017.1142>
- Landers, R. N., & Schmidt, G. B. (Eds.). (2016). *Social media in employee selection and recruitment: Theory, practice, and current challenges*. Springer International Publishing/Springer Nature. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-29989-1>
- Meares, M. M., Oetzel, J. G., Torres, A., Derkacs, D., & Ginossar, T. (2004). Employee mistreatment and muted voices in the culturally diverse workplace. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 32(1), 4–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0090988042000178121>
- Mishra, S. (2023, June 12). *The transformative role of social media in employee relations*. LinkedIn. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/transformative-role-social-media-employee-relations-sushovit-mishra/>
- Morrison, E. W. (2014). Employee voice and silence. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 173–197. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091328>
- Pew Research Center. (January 31, 2024). *Social media fact sheet*. Washington, DC: Author. <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/fact-sheet/social-media/>
- Przybylo, E., & Fahs, B. (2021). Fatness, friendship, and “corpu-allyhood” stratagems. *Fat Studies*, 10(3), 297–311. doi.org/10.1080/21604851.2021.1907046
- Rabelo, V. C., Robotham, K. J., & McCluney, C. L. (2021). “Against a sharp white background”: How Black women experience the White gaze at work. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 28(5), 1840–1858. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12564>
- Radke, H. R. M., Kutlaca, M., Siem, B., Wright, S. C., & Becker, J. C. (2020). Beyond allyship: Motivations for advantaged group members to engage in action for disadvantaged groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 24(4), 291–315. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868320918698>
- Roth, P. L., Bobko, P., Van Iddekinge, C. H., & Thatcher, J. B. (2016). Social media in employee-selection-related decisions: A research agenda for uncharted territory. *Journal of Management*, 42(1), 269–298. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313503018>
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Taris, T. W. (2014). A critical review of the job demands-resources model: Implications for improving work and health. In G. F. Bauer & O. Hämmig (Eds.), *Bridging occupational, organizational and public health: A transdisciplinary approach* (pp. 43–68). Springer Science + Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5640-3_4
- Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Crant, J. M. (2001). What do proactive people do? A longitudinal model linking proactive personality and career success. *Personnel Psychology*, 54(4), 845–874. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2001.tb00234.x>
- Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM). (n.d.). *Managing and leveraging workplace use of social media*. SHRM. <https://www.shrm.org/topics-tools/tools/toolkits/managing-leveraging-workplace-use-social-media>

The Bridge: Connecting Science and Practice

Sarah Layman, DCI; Jen Harvel, Amazon; Apryl Brodersen, Metropolitan State University of Denver



“The Bridge: Connecting Science and Practice” is a *TIP* column that seeks to help facilitate additional learning and knowledge transfer to encourage sound, evidence-based practice. It can provide academics with an opportunity to discuss the potential and/or realized practical implications of their research as well as learn about cutting-edge practice issues or questions that could inform new research programs or studies. For practitioners, it provides opportunities to learn about the latest research findings that could prompt new techniques, solutions, or services that would benefit the external client community. It also provides practitioners with an opportunity to highlight key practice issues, challenges, trends, and so forth that may benefit from additional research.

In this issue, **Laura Fields, Sara Andrews, Matt Albar**, Erin Scheuer, and **Carter Gibson** build upon the insights shared in the spring edition of The Bridge column, which detailed Spectrum’s innovative use of selection science through the introduction of a “Fit Finder” tool. In this column, the authors describe the full suite of updates made to their recruitment and selection processes amidst the transformation of Spectrum stores into dynamic hubs for consumer engagement and service provision. Updates included the Fit Finder tool, a Virtual Job Tryout assessment, and tools that allow candidates to self-schedule interviews at their convenience. Through a comprehensive overhaul of its selection procedures, Spectrum exemplifies a forward-thinking approach aimed at fostering a mutually beneficial environment for both job seekers and the company.

Elevating Recruitment: Spectrum's Innovative Transformation of Selection Processes



Laura Fields, Sara Andrews, Matt Albar, & Erin Scheuer
Spectrum

Carter Gibson
HireVue

Charter Communications, Inc. (NASDAQ:CHTR) is a leading broadband connectivity company and cable operator serving more than 32 million customers in 41 states through its Spectrum brand. Spectrum employs over 101k employees from field technicians to on-air broadcast talent. Today, over 5,000 of those employees support Spectrum stores.

Prior to 2019, Spectrum stores were primarily a place to pay bills or exchange equipment. During this time, the use of a prehire assessment was discontinued because the poor candidate experience of the assessment resulted in a 60% completion rate, leading to insufficient applicants from which to choose.

With the launch of Spectrum Mobile, retail stores were transformed into something more—a place to shop for new products and get support with internet, mobile, and TV services, as well as pick up equipment and make payments. With the addition of the mobile experience to the stores, the business needed a different success profile for store specialists. Although the role always called for people and communication skills, the stores now needed employees who could sell products and services, solve technical problems, keep up with technology changes, and align customer needs with various service packages. Spectrum stores needed a hiring program that would predict success in this new role as well as one that would support efficiency in the recruiting process, as Spectrum was rapidly increasing the number of retail stores within the footprint.

Overview of the Solution

Spectrum's Selection & Assessment team partnered with HireVue to overhaul the entire selection process with an eye toward automation and embedding science to ensure effective decisions were made at each step. The solution included a pre-application Fit Finder assessment, a Virtual Job Tryout, candidate self-scheduling of a virtual interview, and a video interview. These solutions and their impacts are described below.

The first challenge was guiding candidates to the right roles. Spectrum receives over a million applications annually, most of which are for frontline roles, including field technicians, call center representatives, inside sales, outside sales, and retail sales roles. The challenge was how to make sure candidates were applying to a role that was best suited to them. That is, what if a call center applicant would be better suited for a retail sales role or a field technician would be more likely to have success in a call center role? One of Spectrum's newest tools, Fit Finder (FF), was designed and implemented to

help job seekers identify roles that would provide the greatest fit, leading to better retention and performance. In 2021 and 2022, the store specialist role was one of the most frequently recommended jobs by Fit Finder and led to over 500 direct applications to this role. (See the spring edition of The Bridge column titled “Spectrum Drives Value by Letting Candidates Find Their Fit” for a full description of the Fit Finder tool and its business impacts).

Once an application was received, a prehire assessment, called the Virtual Job Tryout (VJT), was automatically launched to quickly screen candidates using a validated, job-related tool that would predict success on the job as well as retention. The VJT included a realistic job preview and assessment items that were highly customized to the role of a Spectrum store specialist. For example, the assessment includes a customized problem-solving section that requires applicants to pair a customer’s unique needs with the cable/internet package that best suits those needs. The concurrent validation for this VJT shows uncorrected correlations in the low thirties with ratings of supervisory performance and high teens/low twenties for objective sales metrics. Test fairness is an important issue, especially with the aggressive cut score used. Spectrum found the VJT greatly exceeded legal standards with an average 4/5ths ratio for all protected groups of .95.

Upon earning a qualifying score, candidates were invited, via a self-scheduling tool, to schedule an interview at their convenience. Previously, this was a manual step requiring recruiters to reach out and schedule interviews for each applicant. Once scheduled, the interview was able to be conducted either on-site or virtually. This flexibility in approach was critical to Spectrum’s ability to adapt its hiring process in 2020. Prepandemic, all new store specialists needed to pass a hiring manager interview, typically on-site at the retail location where they would work. Due to pandemic restrictions and concerns for the safety of both staff and applicants, this step was no longer possible to do in person. With just a small configuration change, Spectrum shifted all interviews to HireVue’s video interview platform.

Given Spectrum’s business model, many of its applicants are also customers. This means that even if an offer is not extended, it’s important that candidates have a positive experience throughout the hiring process. To gauge successful achievement of this goal, candidates had the option of providing feedback at several steps along the hiring process.

After completing Fit Finder, job seekers could rate their reactions using a Likert scale, including whether the recommended jobs were interesting to them (85% agree/strongly agree), whether their results made them aware of jobs at this organization that were new to them (86% agree/strongly agree), whether their results would help inform their job search at this organization (89% agree/strongly agree), whether they would like to apply for one or more of these jobs (88% agree/strongly agree), and whether they learned something about their personality and interests by taking this inventory (89%). Although it’s hard to determine a causal explanation for this effect, the data strongly suggests that Fit Finder plays a role in applicant engagement.

After completing the VJT, candidates indicated it provided them with a better understanding of the role (98% agree/strongly agree), that having participated in the VJT experience better equipped them to determine if the role was right for them (99% agree/strongly agree), and that based on their experience they would gladly tell their friends about employment opportunities at Spectrum (99% agree/strongly agree). In a posthire new hire survey, new store specialists indicated they had a positive interview experience (97% agree/strongly agree) and a positive experience taking the assessment for their position (95% agree/strongly agree).

Last, candidates were asked to provide any additional comments they wished to share throughout the process. Results from these items echo the quantitative feedback. Although candidates may not have an explicit seat at the table in determining the hiring process, this work gives them a voice in the process and is one of the strongest sources of HRM impact.

Business Impact

Spectrum was able to demonstrate a significant business impact of this new selection process with performance and retention prediction. In the store specialist role, performance is measured as percent to goal attainment. For example, if a goal was \$100 in sales and a specialist sold \$100, that would be 100% goal attainment. In 2020–2021, highly recommended candidates outperformed those in proceed with caution by 4.2% on mobile goal attainment (their goal of adding new mobile customers) and 2.5% on core goal attainment (their overall sales goal). Because Spectrum was able to hire primarily from the “highly recommended” category, this led to hundreds of additional sales per employee per year.

Spectrum and HireVue conducted a follow-up predictive validation of the assessment in 2021 to refine the scoring of the VJT. Following that, in 2022, first-year turnover was lowest for those highly recommended—a full 7.5% lower than proceed with caution and 4.3% lower than the average. That year, 3,092 store specialists were hired, 1,829 of which were highly recommended (59%). Those hires saved Spectrum, conservatively, \$817,928.80 in salary and \$330,317.40 in recruiting costs, resulting in a total retention savings of \$1,148,246.20.

The prediction improvement between the 2020 and 2022 underscores the need to constantly monitor the performance of each piece of a selection process. Spectrum and HireVue plan to do exactly that and have plans for additional VJT analyses in 2024. Spectrum also plans to expand the connection to Fit Finder participants, with reminders about open positions that are aligned with their work styles and preferences. All these efforts are targeted at maintaining or improving the impact on Spectrum stores and other frontline roles.

Conclusion

Spectrum is proud of its candidate-centric selection process. Spectrum offers job seekers the ability to make an informed job choice through the FitFinder assessment, which provides individuals information on their unique work persona and suggests jobs at Spectrum that are aligned with that persona. Job seekers who choose to apply to a store specialist role will be provided a realistic job preview and the opportunity to learn about common scenarios faced on the job within the Virtual Job Tryout. Finally, candidates who move forward in the process have the convenience of self-scheduling their phone screen. Because HireVue’s selection science is the foundation for these steps, putting the candidate first has delivered measurable impact for Spectrum’s bottom line.

Connecting for Growth at SIOP 2024: A Look Inside This Year's Consortia

Amber Burkhart



The Consortia Committee continues to make strides in enhancing the professional growth of SIOP's student and early career members. This year, the committee emphasized the importance of integrating the consortia attendees into the broader SIOP conference and ecosystem and fostering connections that extend beyond the event itself. Through innovative and experimental approaches in programming and engagement and working with committees, members, and leaders across SIOP, the Consortia Committee aimed to provide quality and impactful programming for the attendees.

This year the four consortia drew an incredible 175 registrants! Across the various virtual and in-person consortia, there were more than 25 different sessions with more than 60 presenters, panelists, and mentors who helped make the event a success. Consortia attendees were appreciative of the work; those who completed the postconsortia survey rated the consortia as a good use of their time (93% favorable) and indicated they would recommend the consortia to fellow students or colleagues (93% favorable).

Thank you to the committee members, and our amazing student volunteer **Nadine Maliakkal** (Hogan Assessments), for developing programming that benefitted the professional development of members at various stages across SIOP's membership. Please read below to hear more about the programming from each consortium. Plus, do not forget to look out for the amazing consortia programming next year with **Kristina Bauer** (Illinois Institute of Technology) moving into the Consortia Chair leadership role!

Master's Consortium

2024 marked another successful Master's Consortium! Building on feedback from the previous year, we expanded the virtual consortium to twelve sessions over 3 weeks. The Master's Consortium drew 60 participants who registered for the speaker series. Postevent feedback was overwhelmingly positive, with attendees commonly describing the experience as informative, engaging, helpful, organized, insightful, inspiring, thoughtful, and fun! When asked if the SIOP Consortia was a good use of their time, participants strongly agreed, averaging a 4.5 out of 5. We kicked off the consortia with a networking session, and we heard feedback from students that they used the connections they built in the consortium to connect with fellow students at the conference.

This year's consortium featured 10 keynote speakers representing various top avenues that master's I-O students pursue postgraduation: internal consulting, external consulting, assessments, and government.

- Kirsten Mosier, consultant at Aon: *External Consulting: Is This the Right Career for Me?*
- **Amanda Quijada-Crisostomo**, lead consultant at Target: *Internal Consulting: Practicing I-O to Support Your Employer, Their Employees, and Business Outcomes*
- **Samy Saad-Haukjaer** and **Kaila Graham**, testing specialists at the City of Chicago: *I-O Psychology and the City of Chicago*
- Jocelyn Hays, director of Product Development at Hogan Assessment Systems: *Getting to Know All About You: Talent Assessment Today*

- Barbara Patchen, founder, head coach, and principal consultant at Moonlight Strategy: *Storytelling Mastery for Influence: Techniques to Captivate and Persuade*
- Megan Snodgrass, HR strategy and design project manager at Physical Rehabilitation Network: *It's Not You, It's Me... A Modern-Day Layoff Story*
- Abigail Kost, senior manager of Client Success Operations at Integra Connect: *Translating I-O Into Business*
- Lyndi Zavy, CEO and founder of Rivers and Roads Organizational Development: *Cultivate Your Personal Brand (Without Losing Your Soul)*
- **Amber Burkhart**, director of Talent and Data Analytics at Valmont Industries: *Getting and Staying Involved at SIOP*

Several additional presentations were developed and delivered by Chair **Beth Adams** (Ankura) and Cochair **Cody Warren** (Hogan Assessments). Beth presented “Best Practices and Considerations for the Job Hunt: Applying, Interviewing, and Negotiating Salaries.” Cody debriefed the students’ Hogan Assessment results. Both speakers and participants had wonderful experiences, many of which were shared via LinkedIn.

SIOP is delighted to contribute to the launch of new I-O careers, and the Masters’ Consortium serves as one of the excellent avenues through which SIOP can support soon-to-be graduates as they prepare to enter the workforce. On behalf of all the members of the Consortia Committee, thank you for your participation, and we wish you all the best in your future endeavors!

Lee Hake! Doctoral Consortium

This year, more than 60 I-O psychology and organizational behavior/human resource management doctoral students attended the Lee Hake! Doctoral Consortium at the SIOP conference! Students came from over 50 programs, representing over 25 U.S. states and 6 non-U.S. countries. Students with an interest in joining academia or industry upon graduation attended a series of 1-day, in-person professional development sessions.

The first segment of the Doctoral Consortium focused on the dissertation process. Two presenters, **Tianjun Sun** (Kansas State U. & Rice U.) and **Desmond Leung** (SHL), shared their experiences, approaches, and tips for completing an award-winning dissertation. Tianjun and Desmond shared their varying perspectives on how to approach and complete a dissertation with the goal of entering careers in academia and industry, respectively.

Moving onto the second session, students who plan to pursue a career in academia joined discussions with an academic-oriented panel, including **Eden King** (Rice U.), **Liu Qin Yang** (Portland State U.), **John Lynch** (U. of Illinois Chicago), **Lindsey Greco** (Oklahoma State U.), and **Nancy Stone** (Middle Tennessee State U.). Students who plan to pursue a career in industry joined discussions with a practice-oriented panel, including **Randy Lim** (McKinsey), **Rachel Callan** (Atlassian), **Meredith Coats** (Google), and **Jon Willford** (Dropbox). Each of these speakers has extensive experience with and insights into their respective job markets. Speakers shared practical advice on various stages of the job search, including search strategies and selection criteria, dos and don’ts for application materials, interviews, and job talks.

In the afternoon, the third segment began with a panel of experts with extensive experience with industry–academia partnerships. **Richard Landers** (U. of Minnesota), **Emily Campion** (U. of Iowa), **Georgi Yankov** (DDI), and **Chase Winterberg** (Hogan) shared their thoughts on the benefits and challenges of these partnerships and the strategies they have used to navigate them. They also shared advice on how

students can stay connected with collaborators from “the other side of the aisle” as they enter their respective careers in industry or academia.

The Doctoral Consortium wrapped up with students choosing one of two sessions to gain additional preparations for the field. A group of students attended a peer review bootcamp led by *Journal of Applied Psychology* (JAP; joint session with Early Career Faculty Consortium). This peer review bootcamp was led by **Lillian Eby** (U. of Georgia) and her editorial team, including **Kristen Shockley** (Auburn U.), **Talya Bauer** (Portland State U.), **Allison Gabriel** (Purdue U.), **Alicia Grandey** (Penn State U.), **Jasmine Hu** (Ohio State U.), **Fred Oswald** (Rice U.), and **Jenny Hoobler** (Nova School of Business and Economic). Students who attended the bootcamp read and wrote a review for a paper in advance of the conference and discussed and received feedback during the session. Alternatively, students could join attendees of the Master’s Consortium in attending a series of presentations on applied topics. **Steven Jarrett** (Talogy), **Ali O’Malley** (Reflexion Group), **Jaclyn Menendez** (Colorado State U.), and **Daniel Gandara** (DDI) presented on topics such as creating a successful elevator pitch and project management.

According to the postconsortia survey, the Doctoral Consortium received positive feedback from the students. On average, students indicated that the Doctoral Consortium met their expectations (3.92/5.00), they learned a great deal throughout the consortium (4.19/5.00), and they would recommend the Doctoral Consortium to other students (4.42/5.00).

Once again, the Doctoral Consortium Cochairs **I-Heng (Ray) Wu** (U. of South Alabama) and **Daniel Ravid** (U. of New Mexico) would like to thank all the attendees, panelists/speakers, and everyone that made this year’s Doctoral Consortium a success! We wish all the very best in your doctoral studies, career, and beyond!

Early Career Faculty Consortium

We are pleased to share that the 2024 Early Career Faculty Consortium was a success! The ECFC hosted 13 early career academics from various universities and departments. Participants interacted with esteemed midcareer and senior scholars in academic positions across I-O psychology and organizational behavior.

The fully in-person consortium kicked off the day with a panel on Teaching Undergraduate and Graduate Courses, led by **Marcus Fila** (Hope College), **Lisa Finkelstein** (Northern Illinois U.), **Marcus Dickson** (Wayne State U.), and **Loren Naidoo** (California State U., Northridge).

Then, participants learned about Surviving and Thriving through the Promotion and Tenure Process and Managing Marketability from recently tenured faculty, including **Russell Matthews** (U. of Alabama), **Enrica Ruggs** (U. Houston), **Amanda Thayer** (Florida Institute of Technology), and **Scott Tonidandel** (U. of North Carolina, Charlotte).

In the final panel session, panelists spoke about Research and Pipeline Tips & Tricks. Panelists included **Bob Sinclair** (Clemson U.), **Quinetta Roberson** (Michigan State U.), **Reeshad Dalal** (George Mason U.), and **Julie Wayne** (Wake Forest U.).

To finish off the day, the *Journal of Applied Psychology* (JAP; editor: Dr. Lillian Eby) led a reviewer bootcamp. Participants were invited to prepare a practice review of a paper in advance of the session. During the session, participants were paired with JAP’s editors or action editors (Lillian Eby, Kristen

Shockley, Talya Bauer, Allison Gabriel, Alicia Grandey, Jasmine Hu, Fred Oswald, and Jenny Hoobler). Discussion focused on high-level themes of the paper, how to structure reviews, and best practices for constructive and developmental peer reviews.

Feedback from the consortium was overwhelmingly positive, with the majority of participants being extremely satisfied with the panels and reviewer bootcamp. Participants suggested that the most valuable part of the consortium was hearing “pointers that could be applied easily,” “the honest and candid responses,” and “the ability to talk with the panelists after their sessions and networking opportunities with other attendees.” As one attendee noted, “The opportunity to hear from others that have walked the walk was very reinforcing, motivating, and inspiring.” The participants also provided excellent suggestions to improve the 2025 Early Career Faculty Consortium.

From Chair and Cochair **Alex Harris-Watson** (U. of Oklahoma) and **Rachel Williamson Smith** (Georgia Southern U.): Thank you to the early career faculty for participating. We wish you all the best in the future! And to the wonderful panelists, thank you all so much for dedicating your time and helping make the consortium a success!

Early Career Practitioner Consortium

Organized by **Jan Harbaugh** (SHL) and **Vanessa Gaskins** (Corning Incorporated), the in-person 2024 Early Career Practitioner Consortium (ECPC) was attended by more than 30 practitioners. Designed for practitioners less than 5 years into their I-O careers, this year’s ECPC emphasized the importance of building professional agility to develop in an applied career and was centered around the following goals:

- Foster camaraderie amongst next generation I-O leaders,
- Equip I-O early career practitioners with knowledge, skills, and resources to accelerate their careers,
- Improve I-O early career practitioners’ professional agility, and
- Give exposure to different I-O career paths.

The consortium included a full program of I-O experts who shared their career histories, lessons learned, and advice on building agility and developing as an I-O practitioner.

In a preconference virtual event, attendees had the chance to meet their fellow ECPC participants, learn about the 2024 theme of professional agility, and hear how assessment can build self-awareness and enhance professional development. Participants also received guidance on preparing for the in-person event and completing prework, which included identifying for discussion a challenge they were facing in their current role and completing SHL’s Occupational Personality Questionnaire (OPQ).

Participants were encouraged to use the “six degrees of Kevin Bacon” concept to think about networking at ECPC and throughout the SIOP conference. They were challenged to make new connections to expand their networks and reduce the degrees of separation between them and other members of SIOP.

During the in-person event, ECPC participants heard from distinguished I-O professionals **Cathy Maraist**, **Lauren McEntire**, **Lauren Robertson**, **Chris Rotolo**, and **Nancy Tippins**, who shared experiences from their illustrious and diverse careers and gave insights into critical experiences that shaped their professional agility. They also provided advice on professional development, discussed the value of curating and consulting a personal board of directors, and gave tips for strategically building a personal brand.

ECPC Cochair Jan Harbaugh, managing consultant at SHL, talked with attendees about how assessments can be powerful tools not only in their work as practitioners but also in their own development as I-O professionals. She also provided guidance on how to interpret their OPQ results and build a personalized development plan.

Rose Fonseca, Andre Hennig, Anna Hulett, Laura Lomeli, Jackson Roatch, and Valerie Rogers served as mentors for the afternoon. In a panel discussion, these mentors shared their personal career experiences, including how they are personally working to grow professional agility and examples of when they have shown agility. They also shared practical advice for responding in the moment when you are not sure of the answer, reevaluating success metrics and goals as needed, and adapting your style to different situations and audiences.

Attendees spent the remainder of the afternoon joining small breakout groups with the mentors where they engaged in rich dialogue on a variety of topics, including their pre-identified challenges, development as practitioners, career aspirations, and insights from the prework assessment. This time also allowed attendees to strengthen connections with other I-O practitioners.

ECPC participants walked away with a better understanding of professional agility, what it looks like in action, and how to grow it in their own careers. The experience helped them to feel more connected to SIOP and eager to be more involved in the SIOP community. We are energized by the positive impact of the 2024 ECPC and are looking forward to ECPC 2025!

Promoting SIOP Volunteer Leadership: Lessons From the Trenches

Maryalice Citera, Bill Handschin, Eileen Linnabery, Meisha-Ann Martin, Robert Calderón,
Jill May, Comilla Shahani-Denning, Donna Sylvan, Alan Tomassetti, Angela Ackerman,
Meredith Burnett, and Dennis Ochieng

At SIOP 2024, the Local I-O Group Relations Committee conducted a workshop using appreciative inquiry to explore how to create peak volunteer experiences. Appreciative Inquiry focuses on looking at positive experiences and highlights what went well in these experiences. Bushe described appreciative inquiry (AI) as “a method for studying and changing social systems (groups, organizations, communities) that advocates collective inquiry into the best of what is in order to imagine what could be, followed by collective design of a desired future state that is compelling and thus, does not require the use of incentives, coercion or persuasion for planned change to occur” (2013, p. 41). We adapted Bushe's (pp. 42-43) four stage (4D) model:

- **Discovery.** Participants reflected on and discussed the best experiences they had as volunteers. They wrote these experiences down and described why they were peak experiences.
- **Dream.** Participants were encouraged to discuss their experiences within their circle and to identify the conditions that existed at the time of their peak experiences. Participants identified common or shared themes across these experiences and grouped them into categories.
- **Design.** Participants developed concrete proposals by brainstorming ideas for creating peak volunteer experiences.
- **Delivery/Destiny.** Participants generated "pearls of wisdom" and key takeaways that they would be likely to act on in the future.

Approximately 30 SIOP attendees participated. They were organized into two discussion groups. Members of the SIOP Local I-O Groups Relations Committee served as facilitators. Following appreciative inquiry, we used a collaborative process to identify participant goals and suggestions for implementation. Participants described a variety of different positive volunteer experiences. This article summarizes the input of session participants.

Peak Volunteer Activities: Common Themes

Participants identified key characteristics of these shared volunteer experiences by sorting them into categories and labeling the themes. Five broad themes were identified: impact and learning opportunities, connectedness and community, leadership, recognition, and positive affect.

Impact and Learning Opportunities

For many participants, peak volunteer experiences were ones where they used their knowledge and skills, especially their expertise in I-O psychology. Making a difference gave them a sense of accomplishment. They felt it was personally rewarding to be a part of the story and contribute toward the mission. By paying it forward and giving back they felt a sense of contribution to a mission that was bigger than themselves. Many participants reported that a hallmark of peak volunteer experiences involved creating opportunities for engaging in challenging and interesting work with a purpose. Opportunities for developing new skills and knowledge motivated volunteers and satisfied their desire for lifelong learning.

Connectedness and Community

The social connections volunteers made were the most cited benefit of volunteering. Building relationships and being part of a network were identified as keys to building engagement among volunteers and a sense of community. Peak experiences involved volunteer experiences that provided opportunities to interact with diverse groups of people, collaborate, and work as part of a team to accomplish a mission.

Leadership

Peak experiences involved situations where a facilitator/leader helped monitor progress, kept volunteers on track, set clear expectations, and ensured success. Being mentored and “shown the ropes” was an important part of the volunteer experience. They noted that leaders should make it easy for people to contribute and feel part of the group. Volunteer groups that had clear succession plans were able to develop quality leaders and provide volunteers a blueprint for getting involved.

Recognition

Showing gratitude for volunteer efforts, acknowledging the value of volunteers' expertise, and letting volunteers know how their contribution made a difference was essential. Peak experiences involved creating feedback systems, ceremonies, and processes to recognize volunteers. These included recognition events, shout-outs in newsletters, and written thank you letters. They also noted the importance of celebrating successes and wins along the way so that volunteers felt valued.

Positive Affect

Volunteers found peak experiences led to positive feelings and attitudes. They found these experiences satisfying and fulfilling. They felt more committed to accomplishing the mission. Participants also expressed that situations that encouraged volunteers to voice their opinions, and respected and valued differences across participants led to feelings of psychological safety.

Creating Peak Volunteer Experiences

Recommendations for optimizing volunteer experiences highlighted the primary themes of impact and learning opportunities, connectedness and community, leadership, and recognition. Participants also called attention to the need for volunteer orientation and onboarding. Here are recommendations for each, in the words of session participants.

Promoting Impact and Learning Opportunities

- Offer opportunities to learn.
- Find activities that allow participants to directly experience the results of their efforts.
- Help volunteers incorporate volunteer participation into their developing identities.
- Balance volunteering activities that tap participants' expertise with those that take participants outside their comfort zone.
- Develop opportunities that grow the volunteers' skill sets.
- Encourage cross collaboration and capitalize on shared interests.
- Be explicit about what they can expect to learn during recruitment.
- Allow the grace to make mistakes.
- Foster experiences where volunteers can pay it forward.
- Meet the vocational needs of volunteers.

Creating Connectedness and Community

- Provide opportunities for frequent connections: such as networking events, fun events like trivia or happy hour, provide food.
- Reinforce the networking opportunities with appropriate levels of guidance and direction. Don't assume individuals know how to network.
- Establish a welcoming environment that gives people a voice.
- Design the space and time for people to meet socially and develop meaningful relationships with each other.
- Build a team through effective recruitment strategies.
- Embrace diversity and create an inclusive and collaborative environment for volunteers.

Effective Leadership

- Pick a knowledgeable and effective leader.
- Create a mentorship program to facilitate leadership development and succession planning.
- Establish clear goals, timeframes, and expectations for each volunteer.
- Manage the big audacious goals by breaking them into bite-sized chunks.
- Have a facilitator connect people to the tasks that need to be accomplished and identify the best fit for the roles needed.
- Create a collaborative environment to discuss the work that needs to be done.
- Give everyone a voice in the process.
- Define structure and tasks to better illustrate volunteer contributions.

Recognition

- Make success outcomes visible to those outside of the group.
- Verbally thank volunteers for their time and effort.
- Write notes of appreciation acknowledging volunteer contributions.
- Acknowledge volunteers on a grand scale.
- Develop a regular process for celebrating small and large successes.
- Create volunteer spotlights and shoutouts.
- Explicitly celebrate progress and impact.
- Create both internal and external appreciation events.
- Show your personal excitement to your volunteers.

Volunteer Orientation and Onboarding

- Do advanced planning and preparation when new volunteers join.
- Create onboarding materials to clarify expectations and help volunteers understand their roles.
- Create a collaborative environment that gives everyone a voice in identifying their best fit for the roles needed.
- Provide examples of prior success stories.

Final Thoughts and Pearls of Wisdom

As one participant said: "There are many opportunities for volunteers and benefits. It is our job to tap them." Here are the four key take-aways:

1. Volunteer work should make an impact and provide lifelong learning opportunities.
2. Volunteer organizations should build a climate that encourages a sense of community and belonging.

3. Leadership should be knowledgeable and effective at creating a clear structure regarding activities and expectations
4. Volunteer groups should celebrate success and recognize volunteer efforts.

The process of appreciative inquiry as an intervention is an example of positive psychology that creates positive energy and momentum. Local groups could use this approach to discover how to improve member engagement and to build upon the transformational process that it creates. Future research can build on the session participants' input to clarify and create concrete how-to recommendations.

We, as I-O psychologists, know what is required to create an effective workplace and to motivate and engage the workforce. Those actions listed above apply to work in general but are even more important for the unpaid work of volunteers. What SIOP and Local I-O Groups can do to improve the engagement of their volunteers aligns with I-O psychology best practices and principles.

Reference

Bushe, G. R. (2013). The appreciative inquiry model. In E.H. Kessler (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of management theory* (Vol. 1, pp. 41–44). Sage Publications.

2024 Membership Survey Results

Survey Subcommittee of the SIOP Membership Committee: Katye Griswold, Cameron Klein, Rushika De Bruin, Harry Kohn, Kelsey Byerly, Ziyad Muflahi, and Tianjun Sun

SIOP conducts an annual Membership Survey to evaluate member satisfaction and identify any areas for improvement to enhance membership experience. This year, the survey was live from January 23 to February 2, 2024, and nearly a thousand of you provided feedback. We thank you for taking the time to give feedback and help make sure SIOP is doing its best to continue to serve you, our members, and affiliates. Respondents included approximately 14% of SIOP's total membership ($n = 969$ of 7,017 invitations that were sent)—a 4% increase from last year.

Our focus in this article is to share a high-level overview of the results. A more detailed report of the results can be found on the SIOP [Membership Surveys Page](#). Throughout the coming year, the SIOP Membership Committee, in conjunction with SIOP staff, will continue to review the Membership Survey results to identify further opportunities for action.

Headlines

- Overall member engagement, which measures satisfaction, advocacy, pride, and commitment, is 82%, which marks a 2% decrease from 2023.
- Membership satisfaction emerges as an area to watch this year (73%) and has demonstrated a steady decrease since 2021 (79%).
- The top three drivers of engagement include membership benefits, resources available to members, and SIOP's criticality in practicing I-O psychology.

Key Focus Areas

- **Benefits and Resources:** Benefits compared to other professional organizations and satisfaction with resources are top drivers of engagement but are associated with lower levels of satisfaction (60% & 60%, respectively). Additionally, both items saw moderate decreases this year, -5% and -3%, respectively, suggesting greater need to focus here. Qualitative comments reveal that better delineation of information around what resources and benefits are available could improve satisfaction. Additional suggestions include improved access to research journals, best practice guides for practitioners, teaching materials, and discounts beyond those already available for conferences and workshops.
- **SIOP Direction and Visibility:** This year, satisfaction with SIOP's efforts to promote I-O psychology emerged as a key driver of engagement, with 65% of participants reporting that they are satisfied with these efforts. Though this is up 2%, only 19% of respondents indicate that others outside of the field understand what they do as an I-O psychologist or practitioner—a decrease of 6%. Despite the low association with engagement, visibility efforts geared toward promoting outside the field may yield high returns.

Awareness of and satisfaction with SIOP's strategic direction are relatively low (53% and 58%, respectively), with strategic goal satisfaction decreasing 5% from 2023. Although awareness and satisfaction are similar in favorability, 26% responded they are unaware of SIOP's strategic goals, whereas only 7% responded they are not satisfied with SIOP's strategic goals. Taken together, these

results suggest that SIOP leadership may want to further engage membership to understand what strategic direction they are looking for from the organization and that prioritizing awareness before considering the re-alignment of strategic goals may be of value.

- **Inclusion:** Inclusion remains a key driver of membership engagement. Though 77% of participants reported feeling that members treat each other with respect, only 69% reported that SIOP supports an environment where differences of opinion are valued and encouraged. This suggests that there is an opportunity to foster conversation around the diversity of thoughts within SIOP. Comment data revealed an especially strong pull for including those with a master's degree in full membership status.

Connections to SIOP's Strategic Goals

Goal 1: Collaborate with organization leaders, communities, and policymakers to understand and confront relevant real-world problems and translate scientific knowledge to promote individual and organizational health and effectiveness.

- Although the value of I-O psychologists and practitioners is recognized in respondents' workplaces (69%), less than a quarter of respondents (19%) indicated that others outside the field understand what they do as an I-O psychologist or practitioner. This suggests an opportunity to provide increased awareness and understanding of such professionals to those outside the field.

Goal 2: Build a diverse, inclusive, and agile SIOP that maximizes our impact through effective people, process, technology, and data infrastructure.

- Scores regarding inclusion suggest that SIOP creates a respectful environment, but there is room to improve on valuing differences of opinion. Similar to last year, 68% of SIOP members reported that SIOP creates an environment where differences of opinion are valued (down 4% since 2022), and 77% reported that everyone is respected and valued (no change in 2022 or 2023).
- Many comments also suggest that financial barriers limit the accessibility of the annual conference. Less than half of members reported that they receive full funding from their employers for SIOP membership (38%), annual conference registration (40%), or webinar registration fees (20%), indicating an opportunity to better message the benefits of SIOP membership and events to employers.

Goal 3: Use and strengthen our ability to gather, energize, and align all those invested in understanding and improving work and workplace issues in ways that inspire action and inclusive dialogue.

- When asked about the most valuable aspect of SIOP membership, qualitative comments suggested members find value in being able to connect and network with others, specifically by attending the SIOP Annual Conference.
- Similar to 2023, 59% agreed that SIOP allows them to connect with affinity groups, and 22% indicated that they participate in local I-O events. Together, these results demonstrate an opportunity to better facilitate connection with communities of interest and local groups beyond the SIOP Annual Conference.

Goal 4: Create an ecosystem that generates future I-O psychology capabilities to advance and advocate for both science and practice by guiding education and lifelong learning.

- 2023 gains in satisfaction with resources available to members have diminished in 2024 (down 3% to 60%). That along with the somewhat low score suggest room for improvement in resources such as journal accessibility, as well as clarity in what resources are available.

- Qualitative comments in response to the question “What can SIOP do to improve the promotion of I-O psychology?” give several suggestions to increase awareness of I-O and SIOP in the workplace and education system. Top themes include:
 - Improvements to branding and marketing strategy: Improving social media presence, hiring marketers, leveraging high-profile I-O psychologists, engaging with media outlets more actively, and overcoming the field's naming and branding challenges.
 - Increase engagement with nonacademic and wider audiences: Enhance the public's academic exposure to I-O (e.g., integrate I-O content into introductory courses and textbooks) to create a stronger presence in industry, undergraduate education, and professional settings.
 - Credentialing and accreditation: Providing official certification or credentials in I-O psychology (e.g., something akin to APA accreditation).
 - Research translation and practical impact: Translating I-O research findings into practical tips, tools, and best practices, and increasing visibility of I-O work in the business press as ways to translate our scientific research and make adoption and potential impact clearer to a nontechnical audience.

Thank you to all who participated in this year's Membership Survey! We encourage you to review the full results on the SIOP [Survey Website](#), which include further insights around topics such as employer financing for SIOP-related activities, SIOP publications, and more! We'd also like to thank [Talent Metrics Consulting](#), specifically, **Mike Chetta**, **Sy Islam**, and **Jade Brown**, who provided the platform, survey administration, and resulting data set.

**The Innovation & Learning Speaker Series:
Helping the United Nations Explore the Use of AI in Selection**

Jenna McChesney, Chelsi Campbell, Elissa Perry, & Mark L. Poteet

In late 2017, the SIOP–United Nations (UN) Committee, in partnership with the UN Office of Human Resources Management (OHRM), launched the Innovation & Learning Speaker Series. The series provides opportunities for SIOP experts to present and discuss with UN human professionals relevant research, theory, and evidence-based practices on various I-O psychology topics, with an emphasis on helping the UN understand how other large international organizations are addressing important human resources challenges. Presented in person and virtually, the series is capable of reaching a wide audience of professionals located in several global UN offices. The overarching goal behind this effort, as is the case with several of the SIOP–UN Committee’s activities, is to help the UN deliver on its mandate by leveraging the science of work psychology.

To date, several presentations have been made by SIOP members on topics such as survey design, 360-degree feedback, assessment of integrity for selection, human resources management in the digital era, performance management, applying behavioral insights to HR, and data-based talent management. For more information on this effort and these presentations, including the SIOP members who have generously contributed their time and expertise, please read Sheikh et al.’s (2018) *TIP* article, “[The Innovation & Learning Speaker Series: A Partnership Between the Society for Industrial-Organizational Psychology \(SIOP\) and the United Nations Office of Human Resources Management \(OHRM\).](#)”

In the fall of 2023, we had the opportunity to organize another Innovation & Learning Series event to facilitate dialogue between SIOP members and UN Secretariat Human Resources staff on an emerging HR-related topic. With the rise of generative AI, there is an increasing interest in how these modern technologies will impact selection and assessment. Working in partnership with SIOP member **Julie Weintraub**, human resources officer in the UN, SIOP–UN Committee members **Chelsi Campbell**, **Jenna McChesney**, and **Elissa Perry** organized a panel discussion titled, “Using AI in Selection: Challenges and Opportunities.”

Speaking to a group of about 40 HR professionals within the UN Secretariat, SIOP member panelists **David Morgan**, **Gema Ruiz de Huydobro**, and **Harold Goldstein** provided insights into the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into the selection process. The discussion kicked off with an overview of AI, covering its broad applications and specific aspects like generative AI. Examples illustrating AI’s use in selection, including job matching and AI-scored interviews, were presented. The conversation then delved into employer perspectives, exploring the opportunities and challenges associated with integrating AI into selection processes, especially for large multinational organizations.

Throughout the conversation, David Morgan drew from his experiences in crafting AI-powered talent tools for large organizations like Estée Lauder, Meta, and Amazon. Gema Ruiz de Huydobro, manager of Industrial-Organizational Psychology Science at HireVue, offered best practices and legal considerations for the cross-cultural integration of AI in selection. As an I-O psychology professor at Baruch College, Harold Goldstein contributed findings from his extensive work and research in personnel selection.

The discussion primarily centered around the advantages and possibilities of AI in this space. One attendee remarked, “I found the presentation quite intriguing. I hadn’t anticipated such a favorable portrayal of AI’s role in the selection and assessment process.” Another participant suggested that the

session could have been extended, given the breadth of topics to explore, expressing, “This session was exceptional and could have easily lasted for 2 hours!” And ideas for future sessions were shared, including managing risks associated with AI.

In summary, this session provided a rich forum for SIOP practitioners, researchers, and UN HR professionals to discuss the complexities of incorporating AI into their selection processes. This session exemplified SIOP’s commitment to advancing organizational effectiveness and workforce science on a global scale.

The SIOP–UN Committee continues to look for additional ways to provide service to the UN and is open to any questions or suggestions from SIOP members. We also invite SIOP members who wish to be a part of such future efforts to indicate their interest in SIOP’s [Corporate Social Responsibility, Pro-social, and Humanitarian I-O Psychology Registry](#) and to ensure their content areas are updated in the Member Directory and Consultant Locator, as applicable.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Reminder: All *TIP* submissions, including Letters to the Editor, are peer reviewed before acceptance for publication. All accepted submissions are subject to editor revisions for clarity, formatting, length, and adherence to [TIP policies](#) while maintaining the spirit of the original submission. Opinions expressed are those of the writers and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology or *TIP* unless so stated.

Combatting Predatory I-O Training Programs

Afra S. Ahmad & AJ Thurston
George Mason University

In her recent [TIP Column](#), (now past) SIOP President **Dr. Tara Behrend** addressed the state of education and training in industrial-organizational (I-O) psychology. I-O psychology continues to grow rapidly, faster than average compared to other professions.¹ This growth comes with a major downside: opportunity for predatory training programs with resources to market new I-O psychology programs. These programs tend to sell themselves aggressively to nontraditional students such as veterans,² but they can leave students unprepared for the workforce³ and burdened with debt.⁴ This could also tarnish the I-O psychology brand identity among our stakeholders. Dr. Behrend outlines several strategies for addressing poor-quality training for doctoral programs at the SIOP level, including new tracking metrics of graduate programs. To reinforce these global efforts, she calls on individual I-O psychology education and training programs to maintain our level of rigor while finding ways to combat the appeal of predatory programs.

Some existing I-O programs are well positioned to meet the SIOP president's call by leveraging best practices for rigorous training in I-O for nontraditional students. Previous commentary has highlighted the efforts of a master's degree-level program to provide quality training, and these solutions overlap with this call to address broader training needs.⁵ Specifically, these efforts include

- maintaining training rigor consistent with in-person, traditional training,⁶
- addressing predatory practices head-on by offering flexibility, belongingness, and a return on investment.

Maintaining Training Rigor

The quality of any program is contingent on the quality of the faculty involved in it. This means a distinguished faculty cadre must be at the forefront of these programs. From the students' perspective, this affords them the opportunity to truly learn the scientist-practitioner approach by learning from faculty who lean more toward the former camp (i.e., senior faculty) and those who lean more toward practice (i.e., adjunct faculty). It is imperative to have manageable cohort sizes to facilitate mentoring opportunities. The mentorship model should include both faculty and peers providing support. Indeed, nontraditional students often have a wealth of experience to share, usually from a variety of position levels, jobs, and industries. Mentorship can occur within formal class settings, such as senior students speaking to entry-level students during live office hours or outside the classroom through program-wide engagements and various platforms such as Slack and Discord. Rigorous training can be attained through the support of faculty and collaborative mentorship models.

Addressing Predatory Practices

Predatory programs attract nontraditional students by promising flexibility and acceptance. In response, programs can leverage an asynchronous learning environment to help nontraditional students learn at their own pace and/or provide a compressed training schedule. Our graduate training programs can engage in many activities to show their commitment to promoting inclusion. For example, live office hours facilitate deeper connections with faculty and opportunities to network with senior cohort members, alumni, and distinguished external guest speakers. Broader program-wide events, such as weekly colloquia and social events, can be held in hybrid formats to include both on-ground and online students. Such tactics afford students the opportunity to build community within and across related programs at the same institution. Finally, partnerships and promotions with affinity groups, such as [Blacks in I/O Psychology](#), can support diverse students' needs. In sum, a strong organizational culture is the key to student success, regardless of the training environment.

The second major marketing advantage predatory programs offer is promising a return on investment. These programs invest in expensive⁷ advertisements, and any single I-O program or even a SIOP-led effort is unlikely to compete here. However, faculty, students, and alumni play a critical role in educating applicant decision makers less familiar with the field with information about what constitutes a reputable training program and the return on their educational endeavors. This means, students and alumni need to engage with graduate programs and share career outcomes so that, in turn, training programs can share this metric with applicants. This collective effort must be emphasized to all stakeholders to maintain the field brand. In addition, our training programs need to add/extend marketing-related job tasks to market programs effectively. One low-cost/low-time investment marketing tool is offering virtual open houses, where prospective students are afforded the opportunity to learn more about a program and have specific questions answered in real time. These tools may help blunt the marketing effectiveness of predatory programs and steer prospective students toward high-quality training.

Conclusions

SIOP (Past) President Dr. Behrend has called on the I-O community to address the quality of I-O education and training. A perceived dearth of high-quality, convenient I-O training programs means predatory programs are filling the gap, causing short-term harm to nontraditional students, with the potential for long-term damage to our field's reputation for reliable and quality insights as I-O psychologists. SIOP, as an institution, can only do so much to address this issue, requiring support from high-quality, individual programs to buttress national efforts.

Notes

¹ National Center for O*NET Development. (n.d.). 19-3032.00 - *Industrial-organizational psychologists*. O*NET OnLine. <https://www.onetonline.org/link/summary/19-3032.00>

² United States Government Accountability Office (GAO). (2014). *VA education benefits: VA should strengthen its efforts to help veterans make informed education choices*. <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-14-324>

³ Deming, D. J., Goldin, C., & Katz, L. F. (2012). The for-profit postsecondary school sector: Nimble critics or agile predators? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 26(1), 139–164. <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/jep.26.1.139>

⁴ <https://researchcghe.org/publications/working-paper/promising-or-predatory-online-education-in-non-profit-and-for-profit-universities/>

⁵ Ahmad, A. S., Stagl, K. C., Zhou, S., & Zaccaro, S. J. (2022). Optimizing an online I-O program: Tips and lessons learned from launching an online master's program. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 15(2), 195–199. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2022.22>

⁶ Editor's note: In-person or "traditional" programs are not synonymous with quality and rigor, just as online programs are not synonymous with low-quality, low-rigor, or predatory practices. It is up to applicants to thoroughly research prospective programs. SIOP provides resources to help raise student awareness of relevant criteria to evaluate program quality, for example, [How to Choose a Graduate Training Program](#).

⁷ <https://www.webfx.com/digital-advertising/pricing/cost-to-advertise-on-national-tv/>

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Reminder: All *TIP* submissions, including Letters to the Editor, are peer reviewed before acceptance for publication. All accepted submissions are subject to editor revisions for clarity, formatting, length, and adherence to [TIP policies](#) while maintaining the spirit of the original submission. Opinions expressed are those of the writers and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology or *TIP* unless so stated.

Combatting Predatory I-O Training Programs

Afra S. Ahmad & AJ Thurston
George Mason University

In her recent [TIP Column](#), (now past) SIOP President **Dr. Tara Behrend** addressed the state of education and training in industrial-organizational (I-O) psychology. I-O psychology continues to grow rapidly, faster than average compared to other professions.¹ This growth comes with a major downside: opportunity for predatory training programs with resources to market new I-O psychology programs. These programs tend to sell themselves aggressively to nontraditional students such as veterans,² but they can leave students unprepared for the workforce³ and burdened with debt.⁴ This could also tarnish the I-O psychology brand identity among our stakeholders. Dr. Behrend outlines several strategies for addressing poor-quality training for doctoral programs at the SIOP level, including new tracking metrics of graduate programs. To reinforce these global efforts, she calls on individual I-O psychology education and training programs to maintain our level of rigor while finding ways to combat the appeal of predatory programs.

Some existing I-O programs are well positioned to meet the SIOP president's call by leveraging best practices for rigorous training in I-O for nontraditional students. Previous commentary has highlighted the efforts of a master's degree-level program to provide quality training, and these solutions overlap with this call to address broader training needs.⁵ Specifically, these efforts include

- maintaining training rigor consistent with in-person, traditional training,⁶
- addressing predatory practices head-on by offering flexibility, belongingness, and a return on investment.

Maintaining Training Rigor

The quality of any program is contingent on the quality of the faculty involved in it. This means a distinguished faculty cadre must be at the forefront of these programs. From the students' perspective, this affords them the opportunity to truly learn the scientist-practitioner approach by learning from faculty who lean more toward the former camp (i.e., senior faculty) and those who lean more toward practice (i.e., adjunct faculty). It is imperative to have manageable cohort sizes to facilitate mentoring opportunities. The mentorship model should include both faculty and peers providing support. Indeed, nontraditional students often have a wealth of experience to share, usually from a variety of position levels, jobs, and industries. Mentorship can occur within formal class settings, such as senior students speaking to entry-level students during live office hours or outside the classroom through program-wide engagements and various platforms such as Slack and Discord. Rigorous training can be attained through the support of faculty and collaborative mentorship models.

Addressing Predatory Practices

Predatory programs attract nontraditional students by promising flexibility and acceptance. In response, programs can leverage an asynchronous learning environment to help nontraditional students learn at their own pace and/or provide a compressed training schedule. Our graduate training programs can engage in many activities to show their commitment to promoting inclusion. For example, live office hours facilitate deeper connections with faculty and opportunities to network with senior cohort members, alumni, and distinguished external guest speakers. Broader program-wide events, such as weekly colloquia and social events, can be held in hybrid formats to include both on-ground and online students. Such tactics afford students the opportunity to build community within and across related programs at the same institution. Finally, partnerships and promotions with affinity groups, such as [Blacks in I/O Psychology](#), can support diverse students' needs. In sum, a strong organizational culture is the key to student success, regardless of the training environment.

The second major marketing advantage predatory programs offer is promising a return on investment. These programs invest in expensive⁷ advertisements, and any single I-O program or even a SIOP-led effort is unlikely to compete here. However, faculty, students, and alumni play a critical role in educating applicant decision makers less familiar with the field with information about what constitutes a reputable training program and the return on their educational endeavors. This means, students and alumni need to engage with graduate programs and share career outcomes so that, in turn, training programs can share this metric with applicants. This collective effort must be emphasized to all stakeholders to maintain the field brand. In addition, our training programs need to add/extend marketing-related job tasks to market programs effectively. One low-cost/low-time investment marketing tool is offering virtual open houses, where prospective students are afforded the opportunity to learn more about a program and have specific questions answered in real time. These tools may help blunt the marketing effectiveness of predatory programs and steer prospective students toward high-quality training.

Conclusions

SIOP (Past) President Dr. Behrend has called on the I-O community to address the quality of I-O education and training. A perceived dearth of high-quality, convenient I-O training programs means predatory programs are filling the gap, causing short-term harm to nontraditional students, with the potential for long-term damage to our field's reputation for reliable and quality insights as I-O psychologists. SIOP, as an institution, can only do so much to address this issue, requiring support from high-quality, individual programs to buttress national efforts.

Notes

¹ National Center for O*NET Development. (n.d.). 19-3032.00 - *Industrial-organizational psychologists*. O*NET OnLine. <https://www.onetonline.org/link/summary/19-3032.00>

² United States Government Accountability Office (GAO). (2014). *VA education benefits: VA should strengthen its efforts to help veterans make informed education choices*. <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-14-324>

³ Deming, D. J., Goldin, C., & Katz, L. F. (2012). The for-profit postsecondary school sector: Nimble critics or agile predators? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 26(1), 139–164. <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/jep.26.1.139>

⁴ <https://researchcghe.org/publications/working-paper/promising-or-predatory-online-education-in-non-profit-and-for-profit-universities/>

⁵ Ahmad, A. S., Stagl, K. C., Zhou, S., & Zaccaro, S. J. (2022). Optimizing an online I-O program: Tips and lessons learned from launching an online master's program. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 15(2), 195–199. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2022.22>

⁶ Editor's note: In-person or "traditional" programs are not synonymous with quality and rigor, just as online programs are not synonymous with low-quality, low-rigor, or predatory practices. It is up to applicants to thoroughly research prospective programs. SIOP provides resources to help raise student awareness of relevant criteria to evaluate program quality, for example, [How to Choose a Graduate Training Program](#).

⁷ <https://www.webfx.com/digital-advertising/pricing/cost-to-advertise-on-national-tv/>

SIOP Award Winners and New Fellows

SIOP would like to congratulate the following members and others who were honored at the 2024 SIOP Annual Conference. Complete information is available in the [SIOP Salutes brochure](#).

Distinguished and Career Awards

Dunnette Prize: Ruth Kanfer & Phillip L. Ackerman

Distinguished Scientific Contributions Award: Russell S. Cropanzano

Distinguished Service Contributions Award Jeff McHenry

Distinguished Early Career Contributions Award—Practice: Peter J. Reiley; Carter Gibson

Distinguished Early Career Contributions—Science: Trevor Foulk

Distinguished Teaching Contributions Award: Alicia A. Grandey

SIOP Humanitarian Award: Julie B. Olson-Buchanan

Wayne Cascio Scientist–Practitioner Award: Allan H. Church

Achievement and Best Paper Awards

S. Rains Wallace Dissertation Award: Hyunsun Park

William A. Owens Scholarly Achievement Award: Paul R. Sackett, Charlene Zhang, Christopher M. Berry, & Filip Lievens

M. Scott Myers Award for Applied Research in the Workplace: William Shepherd, Lynn McFarland, & Robert Ployhart

Raymond A. Katzell Award in I-O Psychology: Benjamin L. Butina

Joyce and Robert Hogan Award for Personality and Work Performance: Brian S. Connelly, Samuel T. McAbee, In-Sue Oh, Yongsuhk Jung, & Chang-Wook Jung

Wiley Award for Excellence in Survey Research: William Shepherd, Eric D. Bookmyer, Jaci Jarrett Masztal, & Lynn A. McFarland

Jeanneret Award for Excellence in the Study of Individual or Group Assessment: Louis Hickman, Nigel Bosch, Vincent Ng, Rachel Saef, Louis Tay, & Sang Eun Woo

Schmidt-Hunter Meta-Analysis Award: Jeromy Anglim, Patrick Damien Dunlop, Serena Wee, Sharon Horwood, Joshua Wood, & Andrew Marty

Joel Lefkowitz Early Career Award for Humanistic Industrial-Organizational Psychology: Katina Sawyer

Research Grants

Douglas W. Bray and Ann Howard Research Grant: Sylvia G. Roch

Hebl Grant for Reducing Gender Inequities in the Workplace: Aqsa Dutli

Graen Grant for Student Research on Leaders and Teams: Thao Phan Hanh Nguyen

Zedeck-Jacobs Adverse Impact Reduction Research Grant: Hamed Ghahremani

Small Grant Program (3 awards)

Kristen M. Shockley, Natalie Crawford, Hope Dodd, Aqsa Dutli, & Katina Sawyer

Ashley Sylvara

Elisabeth Rose Silver, Michelle (Mikki) Hebl, & Fred Oswald

SIOP International Research and Collaboration (IRC) Small Grant: James M. Diefendorff, Tae-Yeol Kim, Xin Wei Ong, & Meghan A. Thornton-Lugo

Fellowship and Scholarships

Leslie W. Joyce and Paul W. Thayer Graduate Fellowship: Abigail Johnson

Lee Hakel Graduate Student Scholarship: Mahira Ganster

Mary L. Tenopyr Graduate Student Scholarship: Rohit Piplani

George C. Thornton, III Graduate Scholarship: Wiston Rodriguez

Benjamin Schneider Scholarship by the Macey Fund: Yingyi Chang

SIOP Graduate Student Scholarships: Wiston Rodriguez, Cassandra Phetmisy

Conference Awards

Best Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender (LGBT) Research Award: Lindsay Y. Dhanani, Jerry Liu, & David F. Arena, Jr.

Best International Paper: Alise Dabdoub & Anne-Marie Paiement

John C. Flanagan Award for Best Student Contribution at SIOP: William Ward

New SIOP Fellows

Gary A. Adams

Frederik Anseel

Susan J. Ashford

Ramona Bobocel

Lynn Collins

Jeffery M. Curina

Jason Dahling

Jeremy F. Dawson

Erica I. Desrosiers

Alison R. Eyring

Harold W. Goldstein

Mirian M. Graddick-Weir

Gary J. Greguras

Joeri Hofmans

Jason L. Huang

Kaifeng Jiang

Dana Joseph

Hendrik J. Kriek

Tim McGonigle

Christopher O.L.H. Porter

Christopher T. Rotolo

Nicolas Roulin

Kristin N. Saboe

David E. Smith

Emily G. Solberg

Lorraine C. Stomski

Rong Su

Anna Marie Valerio

Bart Wille

Liu-Qin Yang

Members in the Media

Amber Stark Marketing and Communications Manager

Awareness of I-O psychology has been on the rise thanks to articles written by and/or featuring SIOP members. These are member media mentions found from March 10, 2024, through June 9, 2024. We share them on our social media and in this column, which you can use to find potential collaborators, spark ideas for research, and keep up with your fellow I-O colleagues.

We scan the media on a regular basis, but sometimes articles fall through our net. If we've missed your or a colleague's media mention, please email them to astark@siop.org.

Hiring

Allie Wehling on AI in HR, best practices for exploring the delicate balance between innovation and compliance and strategies for implementing AI in HR safely, ethically and intentionally:

<https://www.hrpodcasters.com/whos-afraid-of-the-big-bad-wolf-approaching-ai-with-clarity-and-intent/>

Neil Morelli on the importance of quality job descriptions:

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/brandonbusteed/2024/03/29/why-job-description-laziness-is-killing-skills-based-hiring/?sh=6cd8e63b3512>

Louis Hickman on the reliability and validity of AVI personality assessments: <https://wtop.com/business-finance/2024/03/can-algorithms-assess-job-candidates-better-than-humans-virginia-tech-research-says-yes/>

Tomas Chamorro-Premuzic, Heather Myers, Beth Bynum, and Ben Porr on pre-employment personality tests: <https://www.marketplace.org/2024/04/08/tech-is-supercharging-pre-employment-personality-tests/>

Ryan O'Leary on skills-based hiring: <https://www.spiceworks.com/tech/it-careers-skills/guest-article/skills-based-hiring-benefits/>

Louis Hickman on the use of artificial intelligence during the hiring process:

<https://www.wdbj7.com/2024/05/15/ai-hiring/>

Future of Work

Kevin Hoff on the gap between U.S. job openings and workers' interests:

<https://www.bridgemi.com/business-watch/michigan-has-plenty-jobs-too-bad-workers-find-so-many-boring-study-finds>

Chu-Hsiang (Daisy) Chang on the potential effects of a reduced workweek, including labor history and potential implications: <https://msutoday.msu.edu/news/2024/ask-the-expert-what-to-know-on-push-for-a-shorter-us-workweek>

Gale LaRoche on how flexible work is reshaping how organizations approach employee well-being, productivity, and engagement: <https://allwork.space/2024/06/experts-share-best-practices-for-embracing-the-new-era-of-flexible-work/>

Malissa Clark on the new etiquette of being sick: <https://www.oprahdaily.com/life/health/a46873411/the-new-etiquette-of-being-sick/>

Misc.

Ludmila Praslova on how to better support neurodiversity: <https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/diverse-teams-thrive-with-four-elements-of-belonging/>

Tomas Chamorro-Premuzic on bringing your whole self to work: <https://www.fastcompany.com/91068490/why-best-employees-dont-bring-their-whole-self-to-work>

Ronald Riggio on tone and ethics in email: <https://www.yahoo.com/news/mark-zuckerbergs-aggressive-email-staff-184410062.html>

Taylor Sullivan on the connection between divergent thinking and creativity: <https://builtin.com/articles/divergent-thinking>

Shonna Waters and **Lisa Steelman** on how to give constructive criticism: <https://builtin.com/articles/constructive-criticism>

Carrie Ott-Holland on work motivation and employee incentives: <https://hbr.org/2024/05/what-really-motivates-you-at-work>

IOtas

Jen Baker
Sr. Manager, Publications & Events

SIOP President Alexis Fink as well as John Boudreau, Marc Effron, and Anna Tavis have been named to the 2024 top 100 HR tech influencers by Human Resource Executive. See the full list at <https://hrexecutive.com/2024-top-100-hr-tech-influencers/>

