

INTRODUCTION

From the Editor

The focus of this journal is on an exchange of perspectives. The typical issue contains two focal articles, which summarize a body of conceptual and/or empirical literature on a topic of broad interest and offer a point of view about that body of work. Each focal article is followed by a set of commentaries, reflecting research, practice, and international perspectives on the issues raised in the focal article. These commentaries are followed by an integrative response from the author(s) of the focal article. (See www.siop.org/journal/siopjournal.aspx for details about the journal.)

The first focal article in this issue is by Rob Silzer and Allan Church and titled “The Pearls and Perils of Identifying Potential.” They review various perspectives on the concept of identifying individuals with high potential for subsequent advancement and offer an integrated perspective on viewing potential. Their article is followed by eight commentaries that offer a variety of perspectives on conceptualizing and assessing potential. These are followed by an integrative response from Silzer and Church.

The second, by Kevin Murphy, is titled “Content Validation Is Useful for Many Things, but Validity Isn’t One of Them.” He argues that in settings where a set of tests exist that exhibit positive manifold (i.e., uniformly positive correlations with one another and with the criterion of interest), choosing a subset of tests based on careful matching of test content to job content will not produce a battery that will exhibit reliably higher criterion-related validity than choosing tests randomly. Hence, the feature that drives criterion-related validity of such a battery is not content matching, leading

Murphy to question what is accomplished by using a content validation strategy. The article is followed by 12 commentaries and an integrated response from Murphy.

For each focal article, a project team was assembled to review commentary submissions. For the focal article on potential, the team was made up of Eric Braverman, David Day, and Doug Reynolds. For the article on content validation, the team was made up of Marcy Andberg, Jerry Kehoe, and Mort McPhail. They deserve thanks for their contributions to this issue.

This issue brings my term as editor to a close. It’s been quite a journey to bring this new journal from conception to reality. It’s one thing to say “a format where multiple commentators respond to a focal article would be interesting”; it’s another to invite commentaries on a specific focal article and then face the question “will anyone respond?” To my delight, the membership has responded: we publish an average of 8 to 10 commentaries on each focal article, and we must be selective as to the number of commentaries we can select. Research, practice, and international communities have all been represented in each issue of the journal.

I will remember many critical incidents that remind me of what a special group of people make up the SIOP membership. I asked one member to review commentaries on short notice and got the reply “I’m on vacation, but if you need me I’ll work on these late at night after my family has gone to bed.” I sent a rejection notice for a commentary submission and got a reply reading “No hard feelings; while I’m disappointed, I wanted to let you know how much I enjoy

the journal." I asked one member to commit to reviewing 10 commentary submissions; we received twice as many submissions as I expected, and the reviewer cheerfully took on a double-sized review load.

Many members who were asked to be part of the review team for an issue replied not just by agreeing to serve but by saying

"thanks for the opportunity to be a part of this." And that's my position too as I pass the editorship on to Cindy McCauley: "Thanks for the opportunity to be a part of this."

Paul R. Sackett
University of Minnesota