

INTRODUCTION

From the Editor

This journal provides a forum for the exchange of perspectives. Each issue contains two focal articles, which 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 which 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 Silzer and Richard Jeanneret, is entitled “Individual Psychological Assessment: A Practice and Science in Search of Common Ground.” Rob and Dick are not only accomplished practitioners of individual psychological assessment (IPA) but are also thought leaders on the topic and continue to probe its complexities. Their article addresses several of the criticisms often leveled at IPA but also advocates for increased research attention, improved graduate training, and continuous improvement by current practitioners as important components of advancing IPA. The article is followed by 10 commentaries—perhaps the most diverse set of commentaries yet in response to a focal article. Clearly, more work is needed to find the common ground that Rob and Dick are encouraging us to seek and that they continue to advocate for in their response.

The second focal article, “How Work–Family Research Can Finally Have an Impact in Organizations,” was authored by Ellen Ernst Kossek, Boris Baltes, and Russell

Matthews. These authors are concerned with what they see as a gap between what we know from research on the work–family interface and what is put into practice in organizations. They argue for better and different research and recommend four potential paths of action for the work–family researcher. I received a record number of commentary submissions (35) in response to this focal article—which both signifies the investment many I–O psychologists have in this topic and confirms the importance of the issues raised by the focal article. The tough part is that we only had space to publish 13 of the commentaries. In their response article, Ellen, Boris, and Russell share reactions to each commentary—where they agree, where they would be cautious, and where they see additional complexities.

The exchanges on both topics in this issue point to the often discussed science–practice gap in I–O psychology: practices somewhat adrift from science and research-based knowledge not put into practice. However, what I saw with each focal article were authors working to reach across that gap and join with others to narrow it. My hope is that the journal continues to be a forum for such efforts.

Deserving special thanks for their contribution to the success of this issue are the individuals who reviewed focal articles and commentary submissions: Tammy Allen, Janet Barnes-Farrell, Gina Eckert, Jeff Greenhaus, Ted Hayes, Beryl Hesketh, Joel Moses, Hannah Rothstein, and Valerie Sessa.

Cynthia D. McCauley
Center for Creative Leadership