

## INTRODUCTION

---

# From the Editor

---

This journal provides a forum for the exchange of perspectives. Each issue contains two focal articles that take a position on a topic of importance to the field of industrial–organizational (I–O) psychology. These focal articles are first posted on SIOP’s Web site, and readers are invited to submit commentaries in response. A set of commentaries—some of which support and extend the focal article and others that challenge or add new perspectives to the focal article—are selected to be published with the article, along with an integrative response from the authors of the original article.

The first focal article in this issue, by Rob Briner and Denise Rousseau, is entitled “Evidence-Based I–O Psychology: Not There Yet.” In recent years, many areas of professional practice have embraced the “evidence-based” label and renewed their commitment to using evidence to inform practice. Given that the scientist–practitioner model is a core aspect of I–O psychology’s identity, the evidence-based movement should resonate with those in our field. Right? The focal article launches the discussion by describing key characteristics of evidence-based practice and assesses the extent to which they characterize I–O psychology. The article is followed by 13 commentaries that expand on, question, or express caution in response to the focal article. In their response, Rob and Denise clarify what they see as misunderstandings and acknowledge important ideas that did not get enough attention in their focal article.

The second focal article, “Experiencing Work: An Essay on a Person-Centric Work

Psychology,” was authored by Howard Weiss and Deborah Rupp. Sparked by an invited address by Howard at the 2009 American Psychological Society conference, the article advocates for a new paradigm in I–O psychology that focuses on the worker and the subjective experience of working. The article is followed by 10 commentaries, most of which express a fair amount of agreement with the need for a more worker-centric paradigm but offer different views of what such a paradigm might entail. In their response, Howard and Deborah use the points made by commentary authors to clarify and reiterate their position.

There was no special design on my part to pair these two articles that both raise questions about I–O psychology as a field. It just happened that the time frame within which they emerged and developed fit with the deadlines for this issue. Looking at them together sparked two reflections. First, the two articles examine our field through two starkly different lenses—yet both are critically important perspectives. Second, the article that advocates for a more radical departure from the mainstream of the field (i.e., *Experiencing Work*) received much less push back in the commentaries. At first that seemed surprising, but on reflection, I could imagine a number of explanations. For instance, any critique of a core aspect of our identity (i.e., “scientist”) is bound to bring out a wide variety of passionate viewpoints. And an argument for a new paradigm may more naturally attract responses from those who agree; stronger opposition may only come when the new begins infringing on the resources and attention paid to existing paradigms.

Deserving special thanks for their contribution to the success of this issue are the people who reviewed the focal articles and commentary submissions: Seymour Adler, Michael Frese, Milt Hakel, Beryl Hesketh, Ann Howard, Jeff Johnson, Rich Klimoski,

Kevin Murphy, Ann Marie Ryan, John Scott, and Ben Schneider.

Cynthia D. McCauley  
*Center for Creative Leadership*