



Canadian Society for Industrial & Organizational Psychology
Le regroupement canadien des psychologues industriels et organisationnels
<http://www.sscl.uwo.ca/psychology/csiop>

NEWSLETTER

The Industrial-Organizational Section of the Canadian Psychological Association

Volume 17, Number 4

July 2001

CONTENTS

1. Comments from the Chair
2. Membership Report
3. CSIOP Student News
4. The I/O Files
5. Controversial Corner
6. Theory & Practice: Emotional Intelligence
7. What's New...In Science
8. What's New...In Practice
9. Recent Canadian Legal Case
10. New Newsletter Editor
11. Newsletter Sponsorship
12. Job Opening
13. A Word From IPAT
14. CSIOP EXECUTIVE

COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR

John Meyer, The University of Western Ontario

This is my last column as CSIOP chair. It seems like just yesterday that I wrote my first. Time flies when ... (you're having fun, getting old, or both).

A major focus of the year's activities was the planning of the CPA convention – the bulk of the responsibility being in the hands of Shaun Newsome, our program coordinator. I trust that those of you who attended the conference found that it was time well spent. We had a

very full program. Indeed, due to the high submission rate, there were times when we had overlapping sessions. This made for some difficult decisions by attendees. I suppose this is the price one pays for success. Thanks to Shaun for his hard work, and to all of you who shared your ideas and research in posters, paper sessions, workshops, and symposia. Thanks also to the Military Section for inviting us to join them for a joint-reception at the Officers' Mess of the Royal 22^{ieme} Regiment at La Citadelle de Quebec – this was definitely a highlight of the convention!

We were successful this year in co-sponsoring two invited addresses, one by Jerald Greenberg and the other by Norbert Schwarz. These are world-class researchers and I'm sure that anyone who attended the presentations knows why. Of course, we can't forget that we have our own world-class researchers who also played a major role in this year's convention. The two Garys (Latham and Johns) were particularly conspicuous on the program. Finally, thanks to the efforts of Peter Hausdorf, our workshop coordinator, we were able to encourage two more noted I/O psychologists, Peter Hom and Rodger Griffeth, to offer a pre-convention workshop on employee retention. So, if you didn't attend this year's convention, this is what you missed. Just remember there's always next year in Vancouver!

As an aside, there is another advantage to getting together at the CPA conference that I would like to emphasize -- it keeps us in touch with our roots. For some time now, I've been concerned that, because of our interests, when we read outside the I/O literature, it is often the business literature we turn to. This is understandable and, by itself, is not a problem -- we need to understand how what we do fits with general business practices. My concern is that we don't spend enough time keeping up with developments in other areas of psychology. There is much to be learned about behaviour in the workplace from theory and research in social, clinical, and cognitive psychology (to name a few sub-disciplines). Indeed, this was the theme of one of the symposia at this year's convention, and the jointly sponsored presentations by Greenberg and Schwarz are further testament. The CPA conference continues to be small and "friendly" enough that there should be opportunities to interact with, and learn from, non-I/O psychologists. One way to facilitate this exchange might be to encourage more joint submissions where I/O and non-I/O psychologists (or psychologists in-training) address a common theme. For example, I/O, social, and clinical psychologists could discuss theory and research pertaining to behavior change. I/O psychologists who are interested in overcoming resistance to change in an organizational context might learn a great deal from those studying behavior change in other social or clinical settings (and vice versa). I'm sure there are many other areas where our interests overlap with those in other subdisciplines of psychology. Let's be creative. But more importantly, let's remember that we are psychologists.

Two other issues we addressed this year were increasing membership and enhancing the visibility of I/O Psychology in Canada. Our membership numbers are continuing to

go up. There are probably several reasons for this, including the growth of I/O graduate programs in Canada, and the efforts of our membership coordinator, Arla Day. There are also increasingly obvious benefits to membership, including an ever-expanding and highly informative newsletter (speaking of the newsletter, we are now in the process of trying to find a new sponsor. We are deeply grateful to Societe Pierre Boucher for sponsoring the newsletter for the past two years. If you, or your organization, are interested in sponsorship, please contact Kim Baron or myself for more information.)

As for enhancing the visibility of I/O Psychology in Canada, there are several initiatives currently underway. Some of these are being conducted in conjunction with CPA. For example, as I've mentioned in previous newsletters, CPA and CSIOP invite you to submit a short article for publication on the HR.com website. This is an excellent way to inform HR practitioners about your own research or other valuable contributions made by I/O psychology. To submit an article, or to get more information on how to do so, contact the editor, Gary Latham. As another example, Yvonne Sell, our communications coordinator, is currently working on a position paper outlining the potential benefits of I/O psychology for Canadian business and society. This will be something CSIOP can use for self-promotion, and will be part of a package to be used by CPA in promoting psychology in general. It will likely be followed by several other initiatives currently in the planning stages.

To conclude, I want to thank the very dedicated executive of CSIOP for all the hard work they've done this year. Gary Johns, past chair, Kim Baron, newsletter editor, Yvonne Sell, communications coordinator, and David Stanley, student representative, are leaving the executive. Gary has been a stabilizing force for the last three years and Kim has done wonders with

the newsletter for the last two. As I mentioned earlier, Yvonne is finishing off a two-year stint in communications by drafting a position paper on the contributions of I/O psychology – this has the potential to be a very important document. In addition to keeping us informed of student issues, David designed some very creative recruitment ads to help in attracting new student members. Arla Day leaves the membership coordinator's position after a very successful two-year stint, but returns reincarnated in the form of chair-elect (I'll leave it to her to decide whether that reflects reward or punishment). Joan Finegan did such a fantastic job of managing our books for the past two years that we couldn't let her go (no matter how much she kicked and screamed) – she was acclaimed again as secretary-treasurer (and webmaster). Shaun Newsome and Peter Hausdorf will continue in the program and workshop coordinator roles, respectively. Given their successes this year, I can't wait to see what they come up with next year. Finally, Ramona Bobocel takes over as chair and will no doubt provide excellent leadership. She's joined by some fresh new faces – Veronica Stinson as membership coordinator, David Zweig as communications coordinator, Lori Francis as newsletter editor, and Laurie Barclay as student representative. Good luck to all!

MEMBERSHIP REPORT

Arla L. Day

I'm pleased to announce that our membership numbers are at their highest level! We have 30 associate members, 168 Full CPA members, and 91 CPA student members. Although we lost about 40 members this year, 85 new members joined. I am confident we can surpass the 300 level this year!

I'm also pleased to welcome our new membership coordinator, Veronica Stinson. Veronica is eager to take over the reins of

this position and explore new ways of increasing membership. You can direct any membership inquiries to her:

Veronica Stinson, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
Saint Mary's University
Halifax, NS B3H 3C3
Phone: (902) 420-5861
Fax: (902) 496-8287
E-mail: Veronica.Stinson@StMarys.ca

WELCOME TO OUR NEW MEMBERS:

CPA Full Members:

Paul Arnold-Schutta, #200, 10140-117 Street, Edmonton AB T5K 1X3;
parnoldschutta@boscohomes.ca;
780-482-7596, x222.

Douglas Brown, Dept of Psychology, University of Waterloo, Waterloo ON N2L 3G1; djbrown@watarts.uwaterloo.ca;
519-888-4567, x5421

Kate Charles, National Research Council of Canada, Institute for Research in Construction, Indoor Environment, Program, Building M-24, 1500 Montreal Rd., Ottawa ON K1A 0R6; kate.charles@nrc.ca;
613-991-0930

Tara Cree, 712-255 Glenlake Ave, Toronto ON M6P 1G2;
tara_cree@aonconsulting.aon.ca;
4165425664

Joerg Dietz, 1151 Richmond Street North, Ivey Business School, London ON N6A 3K7; jdietz@ivey.uwo.ca; 519-661-4169

John (Jack) Duffy, 1944 Connaught Avenue, Halifax NS B3H 4E1;
Jack.Duffy@dal.ca; 902-494-1838

Maurizio Fani, Via Traversa, 127 - 41054 Marano sul Panaro, MODENA, Italy;
michele@qualita-leadership.com;
055364659

Thomas Foard, 83 Glenforest Road, Toronto ON M4J 2A1; 416-350-8872

Eugene Kalita, 11420 - 161 Ave, Edmonton AB T5X 2L1; gkalita@netcom.ca;
780-488-2200

Bastian Kruidenier, 2237 Utah,
Ottawa ON K1H 7W6;
bastian.kruidenier@psc-cfp.gc.ca; 613-996-8842

Terrence Laughlin, 1006 Plante Drive,
Ottawa ON K1V 9E6;
terrenceandkaren@sympatico.ca

Lucie Morin, 17 Thornton Ave, Mont Royal
QC H3P 1H3; lucie.morin@umontreal.ca;
514-343-6628

Sylvia Spallin, 205 - 151 Slater Street,
Ottawa ON K1P 5H3; cpamemb@cpa.ca;
613-237-2144

Minhtri Truong, 49 Wigan, Nepean ON
K2E 6L2; minhtri.truong@canadapost.ca;
613-734-3442

Minhtri Vachon, C P 1371, Hearst ON P0L
1N0; rovachon@academe.boreal.ca;
705-362-6673

Craig Weaver, 202-255 Glenlake Avenue,
Toronto ON M6P 1G2; weaver@primus.ca;
416-361-3454

Sheila Webber, John Molson School of
Business, 1455 de Maisonneuve Blvd.
West, GM503-11, Montreal QC , H3G 1M8;
swebber@vax2.concordia.ca; 514-838-2902

David S. Weiss, 378 Walmer Road,
Toronto ON M5R 2Y4

CPA Student Members:

Anne Audy, 3008 ave. d'Entremont #5, Ste-
Foy QC G1X 1K4; ann_audy@hotmail.com

Ann-Renee Blais, Department of
Psychology, The Ohio State University,
1885 Neil Avenue Mall, Columbus, OH,
43210, USA; BLAIS.8@OSU.EDU; 614-292-8114

Patricia Edelstein, 100 Cheyenne Cr. NW,
Calgary AB T2L 0Z2;
edelstep@telusplanet.net; 403-394-3896

Lisa Elliot, 699 Ash Street, Winnipeg MB
R3N 0R5; l Elliot@home.com; 204-489-9755

Julie Galarneau, 717, rue Seigneuriale,
Beauport QC G1B 2B4;
julie3236@caramail.com

Joanna Heathcote, 807-699 Talbot Street,
London ON N6A 5L8;
jmheathc@julian.uwo.ca

Elizabeth Kelly, 1093 Richmond St,
London ON N6A 3K3; ekelly2@uwo.ca

Henryk T Krajewski, Dept of Psychology,
7th Fl, SSC, UWO, London ON N6A 5C2;
htkrajew@julian.uwo.ca

Michel Lariviere, 1521 Briarfield Cr,
Orleans ON K4A 1Z9;
mlariviere@intranet.ca;

Elena Levov, 210 Palmer Ave, Richmond
Hill ON L4C 4Z5;
elena75@burningmail.com; 416-802-7948

Stacey A McNulty, 44 Brighton Ave, Apt 2,
Ottawa ON K1S 0T2;
smculty@ccs.carleton.ca; 613-730-1240

Deborah Powell, 1231 Richmond St, Spt
1106, London ON N6A 3L9;
dpowell@uwo.ca

Michael Teed, 79 Glenwood Drive,
Moncton NB E1A 2M8;
emT1657@umoncton.ca

John P Walsh, 349 Somerset St E, Ottawa
ON K1N 6W6; jpottawa@hotmail.com; 613-862-8620

David Zweig, 906 Sheppard Avenue W.,
#514, Toronto ON M3H 2T5;
dizweiq@watarts.uwaterloo.ca; 519-888-4567 x 3786

PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING ADDRESS CHANGES:

Robert W. Fair, 622 Linkleas Ave, Victoria
BC, V8S 5C1

Donna Reid; 211-1144 Rockland Avenue,
Victoria, BC V8V 3H7

Colleen O'Brien-Wood; Self Management
Group, 155 Rexdale Blvd, Suite 304
Toronto, ON, M9W 5Z8; PhD; F

CSIOP STUDENT NEWS

Laurie Barclay, University of British Columbia

I would like to take the time to thank everyone for participating in the student activities and presentations at the annual CPA convention. We had a wonderful turnout, and it was great to see all of the excellent research being conducted by the I/O community. I was privileged to assume the position of student representative at the conference from David Stanley (University of Western Ontario). I would like to extend my thanks to him for his hard work over the past year.

I would like to briefly introduce myself. I completed my B.A. (Honours) at the University of Calgary and am currently working on my M.A. at the University of British Columbia. My research interests include organizational justice, organizational culture, and employee health. I am currently examining how organizational culture influences perceptions of justice in the workplace.

I am very pleased to be serving as CSIOP's student representative. I hope to use this role to work towards increasing the exposure of Industrial/Organizational psychology within the student community, improving connections between students and CSIOP, and providing a voice for students within the I/O community. Many of you have also indicated specific areas you would like addressed through the student survey that David recently conducted. I will be working towards fulfilling those objectives, but if there are any additional areas that you would like addressed please contact me.

I am looking forward to getting to know each of the student members better, and I would really like to hear from you about any specific concerns you would like addressed, or any general comments that you may

have. Please feel free to contact me via mail or email (laurieav@interchange.ubc.ca) with your comments.

THE I/O FILES

Arla Day

The CSIOP section of the CPA conference was a smashing success. Compliments go to the organizer (Shaun Newsome) and all of the participants. The I/O sessions were full (sometimes with simultaneous sessions occurring) throughout the conference. The new CSIOP executive was appointed during the Annual Business Meeting. During the meeting, suggestions were made regarding upcoming conferences, and the executive reviewed some of the initiatives that it has been undertaking. Check out the details on the CSIOP Web site.

UPCOMING CONFERENCES

Academy of Management: August 3-8, Washington, D.C. Check out their Web site: <http://www.aom.pace.edu/meetings/2001>.
SIOP is going to be held in Toronto, April 12-14, 2002. Submissions are due September 19. Check their Web site: <http://www.siop.org>

NOTES

While you are browsing the SIOP Web site, you should check out the membership survey and see how you compare with the rest of SIOP's members in terms of salary (especially if you need to convince your boss you need a raise!). The median salary for members with either a master's or doctorate degree is \$93,000 US for men and \$77,000 US for women. Oh well...so much for extrinsic job satisfaction.

CONGRATULATIONS TO...

Dr. Colleen O'Brien-Wood... who graduated from York University last month. Her dissertation research focused on organizational change and coping responses as predictors of employee well-

being. In addition to the new degree, Colleen recently was promoted to Director of Professional Services at the Self Management Group, a management consulting firm that specializes in the design and validation of psychometric profiles for use in personnel selection, development, and succession planning.

Aaron Schat... who was the recipient of the RHR-Kendall Award.

Julian Barling... who has received the National Post's "leadership in management education award" for the Ontario region.

Welcome to....

All of our new & renewed I/O members (see the long list in the membership section)! **Lisa Keeping...** who recently (i.e., last week) joined the business faculty at Wilfred Laurier University. She received her PhD in I/O from the University of Akron. Since graduating last October, she has been working as a consultant in Toronto. Lisa's husband, Doug Brown, joined I/O faculty member at the U of Waterloo last year.

If you have news to share with us, please e-mail me at Arla.Day@StMarys.ca.

CONTROVERSIAL CORNER: The trials, tribulations and payoff of field research.
Theresa Kline, University of Calgary

Over the past several years I have had the unfortunate opportunity to observe several students (graduate and undergraduate) run headlong into the problems inherent in field research. The result is that there are no results – there are not even any data... Thus, there seems to be a healthy skepticism around my workplace about whether one should even try to do field research. The lab looks so much more inviting with the strength of control over site, participant recruitment, running the study, etc. Not only are all of these niceties there, but one also gets to claim "internal validity" at the end of the day to boot! So why would

anyone in their right mind do field research?

I believe the answer to that is that field research matters. Even if at the end of the day you have far fewer knowledge claims to make because of so many other possible confounding variables; or because you just could not get the power you needed to run your stats because the organization you were collecting your data at got sold in the middle of your project and your key contact was rightsized. You still have a tale to tell.

What you will have at the end of the day is a wealth of street smarts about what really goes on in a field setting and more importantly from a "future research studies" perspective, an excellent understanding of the phenomenon of interest. So, often the tale you have to tell to your scientist peers is one that needs to be woven carefully – with a heavy sprinkling of cautionary notes but also a liberal dose of anecdotes that will whet their appetites as well.

So what can you do to mitigate the problems that you will most likely encounter in running a field research project? I have developed a "laundry list" in my own mind that seems to work well for me. So if you aren't interested, or know them all already, then just move on to the next section in the newsletter. If you have more tips I'd like to hear them myself!

First, identify "what's in it for them"? What will the organization and/or employee participants get out of spending their valuable time with you? If you can't articulate this in three sentences you are not going to grab their attention.

Second, start as early as possible to identify potential research sites. It is never too early to start thinking about what your research topic is and who will make up your sample.

Third, have MANY potential sites lined up. Do not put your eggs into any single basket.

If one organization does not come through then you need to quickly move to Plan B, C or D.

Fourth, make sure to include non-profit and public institutions in your thinking. They are often willing to allow researchers access to their employees because of the learning they can gain from the project.

Fifth, make sure you speak with the correct contact person at the organization. It may or may not be someone in Human Resources. Many times line managers have jurisdiction over soliciting their employees to participate in a study and you can get approval quickly by working directly with them.

Sixth, make sure that your institutional ethics approval process won't hold you up. If the organization wants you in NOW to do the study you have to be there NOW. Make sure that you have written your ethics application in a general enough manner so as to be able to move between organizations, to use different data gathering methods (e.g., hard copy paper & pencil surveys or email surveys), to use different contact methods (e.g., cold calls, letters, email announcements, etc.).

Seventh, make sure that you provide a summary of the results to your participants. If you ever want to do research again in your community they will remember if they participated in a study you conducted four years ago for which you never provided the results.

Eighth, if you do not know your contact, first send them a written note (letter or email) that briefly (2-3 paragraphs) describes the study. Then follow up with a personal phone call within two weeks. People don't like to be disarmed on the phone with a request (unless they know you) and so if you've told them in advance that you are going to call then they have at least had the opportunity to be forewarned. By the way, you can

assume that they probably did not read the note very carefully so you should be prepared to tell them again.

Ninth, make the meeting time with the employee as convenient as possible. Go to them – don't make them come to you and be prepared to be their first or last appointment of the day.

Tenth, don't take up more than one hour of a participant's time. Almost everyone these days is running ragged and doesn't have more than an hour to provide to a researcher.

Eleventh, if you can collect your data at multiple sites you will find your task easier. For example, if you want to gather data on IT employees, it would be best to gather the data at different organizations to minimize the intrusion on the organization's time.

Twelfth, be polite in requesting that people provide you with time. It is likely the most valuable resource people have today. Indicate that you appreciate the time they have taken to help you. Be prepared to come back to an organization to give a presentation of your findings in return.

Finally, don't give up. The field is a great place to conduct research. Despite all of its problems, I (and so have my students) have always found I learn a lot from just having to "get out there and interact" with the participants. They are as much a part of my research program as I am – they live and breathe the phenomenon I am interested in and are almost always helpful in sharing their thoughts and ideas about a topic area. Their "working theories" are very insightful.

Good luck!

THEORY AND PRACTICE: EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

WOULD THE REAL EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE PLEASE STAND UP?

Shaun Newsome, Newsome Associates & Arla Day, Saint Mary's University

Over the past few years, we have received several calls from HR practitioners asking us if we could assess the emotional intelligence (EI) of job candidates. These requests are reflected in the overwhelming success of Daniel Goleman's (1995) book (it has become the best-selling psychology book with 5 million copies sold) and the vast number of media reports on the topic. EI has also become a hot topic for practitioners, as evidenced by the large number of posters and presentations on EI at the recent CPA and SIOP conferences.

Despite the increasing attention afforded to EI, many researchers question this construct. Their concerns fall into two main categories: the variety of unrelated definition and measures of EI, and the unsubstantiated claims regarding the predictive ability of EI.

Jack Mayer and his colleagues are credited with coining the phrase "Emotional Intelligence" and developing the first ability-based measure of EI. According to this perspective, EI is a group of abilities that are distinct from the traditional dimensions of intelligence and that facilitate the perception, expression, assimilation, understanding, and regulation of emotions, so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

Conversely, other researchers claim that EI is composed of non-cognitive related competencies, traits, and skills such as motivation, optimism, and adaptability (Bar-On, 1997; Goleman, 1995).

Measures of these two EI perspectives tend

to be uncorrelated with each other (Fillion, 2001; Livingstone & Day, 2001). Moreover, the trait-based measures tend to be highly correlated with personality measures and uncorrelated with cognitive ability (Newsome, Day, & Catano, 2000), whereas ability-based measures tend to be uncorrelated with personality measures and slightly correlated with cognitive ability. The patterns of these relationships suggest that these two measures cannot be measuring the same construct.

Mayer and Salovey (1997) argued that measures of emotional intelligence must assess actual abilities as opposed to self-reports of constructs such as optimism and motivation. That is, the trait-based measures of "EI" are really measuring a construct or constructs other than EI. We agree with this position and feel that measures of dispositional characteristics labeled as intelligence measures mislead the general public.

The other major concern of researchers pertains to claims made about EI ability to predict success. Goleman (1995, 1998) and Bar-On (1997) claimed that EI predicts life and work success. Goleman even surmised that because IQ is thought to account for about 20% of the variance in life success, EI likely accounts for the remaining 80%. However, no research has substantiated this claim.

There is some evidence that certain measures of EI may be related to life outcomes, such as life satisfaction, relationship quality, ability to manage moods (Ciarrochi, Chan & Caputi, 2000), perceived ability to cope with environmental demands (Bar-On 1997), and a preference to achieve higher goals for the sake of personal improvement (Martinez-Pons, 1997). Furthermore, some evidence suggests that EI is related to aspects of organizational life such as career commitment (Carson & Carson, 1998), positive interview outcomes

(Fox & Spector, 2000), and organizational advancement, (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2000). What we have not discovered in the literature is evidence that measures of EI are consistently related to job performance.

Despite the lack of evidence, organizations are using EI tests (or tests that claim to measure EI) for selection purposes. We stand by our claim that there is inadequate data to justify using measures of EI as selection tools (Newsome et al., 2000).

When examining the popularity of this construct, it is not difficult to understand why the trait-based view of EI has so quickly attained a prominent position in popular culture. If you are motivated, optimistic, and adaptable, it seems reasonable that you should be more "successful." Despite the lack of consensus regarding the definition of EI, it appears that EI may be on its way to garnering the same level of popular interest as intelligence. As a society, we have a need to explain seemingly unexplainable behaviour problems and violence in our communities. Society is in need of a panacea, and it appears that EI provides hope (albeit primarily unsubstantiated hope).

Arguments concerning the usefulness of this construct in I/O Psychology are reminiscent of those concerning the use of personality measures. Although there was plenty of evidence suggesting personality was related to important life outcomes, it wasn't until the development of a unifying framework that research in the area advanced to the point that we were comfortable using personality tests in selection. In terms of EI, theoretical frameworks remain divergent.

In order to advance this research in I/O settings, we believe that several things must occur. In the first place, a consensus must be reached about what constitutes emotional intelligence and the most effective method of measurement. At the same time,

we need to identify what constructs these trait-based "EI" measures are assessing. Even though the trait-based perspective may not truly be measuring EI, these measures appear to be related to psychosocial outcomes, and more research should examine these alternative constructs. Second, careful consideration must be given to outcome criteria. Traditional measurements of job performance (usually in terms of supervisory ratings) might be too restrictive to allow us to adequately assess the relationship between EI and job performance. The types of behaviour that EI might predict may not be adequately represented in current performance ratings. However, until the real EI stands up, we still advise caution in using such measures to make organizational decisions.

References

- Bar-On, R. (1997). Emotional Quotient inventory: Technical Manual. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- Carson, D.K., & Carson, P.P., (1998). Career commitment, competencies, and citizenship. Journal of Career Assessment, 6, 195-208.
- Ciarrochi, J.V., Chan, A., Caputi, P., (2000). A critical evaluation of the emotional intelligence construct. Personality and Individual Differences, 28, 539-561.
- Dulewicz, V. & Higgs, M. (2000). Emotional intelligence: A review and evaluation study. Journal of Management Psychology, 15, 341-372.
- Fillion, F. (2001, July). Construct Validity of Emotional Intelligence, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association. Ste. Foy, QC.
- Fox, S., & Spector, P.E., (2000). Relations of emotional intelligence, practical intelligence, and trait affectivity with interview outcomes: It's not all "G". Journal of organizational Behavior, 21, 203-220.
- Goleman, G. (1995). Emotional intelligence. New York: Bantam.
- Livingstone, H., A. & Day, A., L. (2001, July). The Role of Emotional Intelligence as a Predictor of Job Satisfaction and Psychological Well-Being. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association. Ste. Foy, QC.
- Martinez-Pons, M. (1997). The relation of emotional intelligence with selected areas of personal functioning. Imagination, Cognition, and Personality,

17, 3-13.

Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey and D. Sluyter (Eds.). Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications. (pp.3-34). New York: Basicbooks, Inc.

Newsome, S., Day, A. L., & Catano, V. M. (2000). Assessing the predictive validity of emotional intelligence. Personality and Individual Difference. 29, 1005-1016.

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE IN ORGANIZATIONS: THE PRACTICE

Steven J. Stein, Ph.D., MHS Organizational Effectiveness Group

When Dan Goleman wrote his book "Emotional Intelligence," he had no idea it would become the best-selling psychology book in history, with more than 5 million copies sold worldwide. The book was largely based around studies by various other psychologists, such as John Mayer, Peter Salovey, Reuven Bar-On, Martin Seligman, Robert Hare, Maria Kovacs, and others. Even the title was taken from Salovey and Mayer's work. Nevertheless, the book struck a cord, mostly with company CEO's, school administrators, and human resource professionals. Psychologists, and especially I/O psychologists, largely ignored the book and its implications.

The question often asked, with good reason, is whether or not this is just another organizational fad. After all, we've been through reengineering, quality management, the big five, principled leadership, searching for excellence, six sigma, management by objectives, and countless other management trends. One difference with emotional intelligence (E.I.) is that the concepts and principles have been around for as long as there have been human beings who, for one reason or another, had to interact with each other. While there is insufficient space here to review the science and rapidly increasing number of publications on E.I., the interested reader is

referred to Bar-On and Parker (2000) for a review from the leading theorists and researchers working in this area.

Another factor that differentiates E.I. from other management trends is the development of sound empirical measures that allow one to evaluate E.I. interventions in the workplace. Most psychological tests are normed (many in the I/O field are not normed at all) on approximately 1,000 Americans. The Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) had a North American data pool of 10,000 people that were stratified to a sample of over 3,800. Additionally, there are numerous translations and specific internationally-based norms. The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) is based on a sample of 5,000 adults.

There are a fast growing number of well-designed studies illustrating the practice of E.I. in organizations. However, there is room here to focus on only a few examples. Generally, there are three areas where E.I. has benefited organizations: selection, development (and coaching), and career counseling.

Selection

There are many organizations worldwide that have used the EQ-i responsibly as part of their selection process. These include large organizations (such as the US Air Force), as well as smaller companies and businesses. The example selected for discussion here has been published in a peer-reviewed journal (Bachman, Stein, Campbell, and Siteranios, 2000).

A large national (US) collection agency was looking for a way to improve their selection of collection agents (known as account officers). They had noticed a wide variation in success among their several hundred account managers and were in search of a way to identify "best practice" among their most successful account officers. Part of the

process involved supervisors selecting individuals who in their opinion represented "best practice" and others who represented "least successful" officers. All officers operate with specific, individualized quotas.

The first group consisted of 36 account officers, 24 "best practice" and 12 low performers. All 36 were administered the Bar-On EQ-i and their performance quotas were compared. There was a significant difference in EQ-i scores, with the "best practice" group averaging 110 and the low performers scoring 102. When performance was checked, high performers collected 100% of quotas while low performers were at 47% of quota, validating supervisor selection of high and low performers.

A composite formula was calculated based on the pattern of the 15 EQ scale scores of the two groups. This formula was applied to a new group of 34 hires that were tested, trained and followed up for their performance. Supervisors were blind to the employee test scores. Each employee was designated as high or low scoring based on the EQ formula. After three months on the job, the account officers predicted by the formula to be high functioning collected 163% of quota while the low-scoring group collected 80% of quota.

Development

Emotional intelligence, unlike personality, is believed to be trainable. If that is the case, then EQ scores of individuals being trained with effective programming should show increases. Also, if E.I. is related to performance, then actual job performance, in addition to test scores, should show improvement.

One set of studies looking at the effects of E.I. training was carried out at American Express Financial Services (a division of American Express, a company with \$21 billion in sales). While these studies were carried out for internal purposes, and not for academic publication, they have been

reported in several publications (Goleman, 1998; Stein and Book, 2000; Schwartz, 2000), including Fast Company Magazine. The studies began when it was discovered that more than two-thirds of American Express clients chose not to purchase life insurance from AmEx, even though their profiles showed a need for it. According to a small group assigned to investigate the situation, the problem was not the product, nor its cost. Rather, the problem was emotional.

After studying AmEx's most successful advisors it was found that they approached the situation much differently than the others. They were able to take the perspectives of their clients and forge relationships with them. They were also more connected to their own personal core values and motivations for selling insurance. Strikingly, they were much more aware of their own feelings, better able to manage those feelings, and more resilient in the face of disappointment.

In order to test whether increasing these "emotional" factors would affect sales success, a study was set up with two groups. One group of advisors was given 12 hours of training that focused on getting them to understand their emotions better. Another group was selected and given no training and served as a control group. Both groups were administered the EQ-i along with a few other measures pre-training and some time after the training. During the training, called "Focus on Coping Under Stress," advisors were taught to be more aware of their emotions, were given tools to change negative emotions to positive ones, offered ways to rehearse mentally before stressful events, and were provided a way to get in touch with deeper personal values that motivated them at work.

Following the training, sales results were compared between the two groups. Nearly

90% of the advisors in the training group reported significant increases in their sales. Additionally, differences were found in specific factors of the EQ-i scores.

After fine-tuning the training program, a second, more controlled study was carried out. It now became more focused as an "emotional competence" program as it was felt that it was the emotional aspects of the training that were most beneficial. In this case, advisors in the training program increased their sales by 18.1% compared to control subjects who increased by 16.1%. The 2% difference, in this case, resulted in tens of millions of dollars in revenue.

This program has continually been improved and expanded to include all new financial advisors at AMEX. Since 1993, more than 5,500 new advisors have had the training as well as 850 other "high potential" managers who have voluntarily enrolled.

Career Counseling

Finally, E.I. can be a useful component of career counseling. Traditional career counseling focuses on the use of vocational interest and personality tests in guiding people to potentially rewarding career options. Vocational interest tests look at how the individual's interests compare to interests of people working in various occupations. So, if you're interested in the same things as a group of telephone customer service representatives (CSRs), you may enjoy being a CSR. Similarly, personality tests are used to see if the personality of CSRs is similar to your personality.

What about E.I.? Well, let's suppose you take an E.I. test, and your Interpersonal Relationship, Assertiveness, and Stress Tolerance skills are low. This indicates that the probability of success as a CSR (based on existing research with that group) may be low. If you decide you really want to be a CSR, you may want to try and increase these skills. Or, on the other hand, you may want to consider alternative careers you may be more suited to emotionally. The implication here is that you may have

interests similar to CSRs, you may have similar personality characteristics, such as high extraversion, low anxiety. But, you may not be patient dealing with people, especially difficult people. You may not express your feelings, thoughts and beliefs diplomatically enough to be effective.

The consideration of emotional skills as part of the career counseling process has been found to be effective for many career counselors.

While these are just a few examples of how E.I. has been used in organizations, there are now hundreds of organizations in a variety of sectors that have focused on these issues. While I/O psychologists have played a relatively small role in this area, there are many possibilities for involvement. There is a need for better controlled studies of the effects of E.I. training on organizational performance.

In a recent review and meta-analysis of the literature on the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance that included more than 60 years of research, 312 samples, with a combined N of 54,417, Judge, Thoreson, Bono, and Patton (2001) concluded that the study of emotion in the workplace is one of the most critical elements of this "holy grail" (satisfaction-performance relationship) of I/O psychology. Let's hope that I/O psychologists heed the call.

References

- Bachman, J., Stein, S.J., Campbell, K., & Sitarenios, G. (2000). Emotional intelligence in the collection of debt. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 8 (3), 176-182.
- Bar-On, R. & Parker, J.D. (Eds.) (2000). *Handbook of emotional intelligence*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Judge, T.A., Thoresen, C.J., Bono, J.E., & Patton, G.K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review, *Psychological Bulletin*, 127 (3), 376-407.

Schwartz, T. (2000). "How Do You Feel?" *Fast Company*, June, 297-312.

Stein, S.J., & Book, H.E. (2000). *The EQ edge: Emotional intelligence and your success*. Toronto, Canada: Stoddart Publishing Company.

WHAT'S NEW... IN SCIENCE
Building Client Trust through Effective Client Management
Sheila Simsarian Webber, Concordia University

Service organizations are particularly interested in customer-intimate, co-production relationships because their clients or customers are essential to the activities of these organizations (Mills & Morris, 1986; Schneider & Bowen, 1995). In service organizations, the service provider employee who is the primary manager of the client relationship plays a pivotal role in facilitating a long-term relationship by building a trusting relationship with the client (Bowen & Schneider, 1988). Service organizations such as Industrial/Organizational Psychology consulting organizations, accounting firms, management consulting organizations, advertising and PR firms, as well as information technology service organizations, use project managers to manage the client relationship. Surprisingly however, little research has been offered to better understand the project manager's role as a client relationship manager and its implication for building both cognitive trust (trust based on competence and dependability) and affective trust (trust based on care and concern).

This research utilizes what organizational researchers know about interpersonal relationships from agency theory, stewardship theory, interpersonal trust, relationship management and project management to investigate how the project manager builds client trust. Two perspectives, agency theory and stewardship theory, illustrate the different

types of relationships that can occur between a principal and an agent or steward (i.e., control-oriented or involvement-oriented). I build on the work of Sharma (1997) regarding the client-agent relationship and extend stewardship theory to the client-steward relationship to contrast two perspectives on the nature of client-project manager engagements.

Agency theory, applied to the client-professional relationship, proposes that a professional must be controlled to stay within the boundaries of the contract or what the principal has requested of the agent (Sharma, 1997). In this regard, control mechanisms are used to ensure that the agent reliably completes the set of tasks outlined in the specifications of the project and does not go beyond these tasks to achieve self-serving outcomes. An agency relationship is highly control oriented; therefore, deviance from the specific task objectives is not desirable. Thus, a professional project manager operating in an agency relationship as an agent is held accountable for performing the desired or assigned tasks.

Stewardship theory is based on the assumption of an empowered, involvement-oriented relationship where the steward identifies him/herself with their organization and therefore, above all else, desires the success of the organization (Donaldson & Davis, 1994). Davis et al. (1997) propose that people who strongly identify with the organization are likely to be stewards and engage in citizenship behaviors. Therefore, Davis et al. argue that a steward will (1) work toward the goals of the organization, (2) solve the problems that emerge from the organization, and (3) overcome the barriers that are inhibiting the success of the organization.

In spite of the recent developments and conceptual arguments regarding stewardship theory (Davis et al., 1997), the

application of this theory to the client-project manager relationship has not yet been demonstrated. Consistent with the arguments above, I propose that stewardship as an involvement-oriented relationship is well grounded in management theory (Donaldson & Davis, 1991) and consistent with the idea of a customer-intimate relationship. Therefore, it would also seem to have value for modeling the client-project manager interface. However, the specific processes performed by a project manager as a steward remain to be investigated. Utilizing bodies of literature in the areas of relationship management/marketing and product development/project management, we offer a more sophisticated description of the specific processes performed by a project manager as steward.

Arguments regarding the need for involvement-oriented relationships are found in the relationship management/marketing literature (Gronroos, 1990; Webster, 1992). Recent research by Duncan and Moriarty (1998) proposed the intersection of communication research with relationship management research in the marketing area. They state that any exchange involves two-way communication, a transactional communication that includes conversation and dialogue. Within the project management/product development literature, researchers have suggested that championing is a critical aspect of project management (see Howell & Higgins, 1990). "Championing" or "entrepreneurship" means (a) selling new ideas to others; (2) getting resources; (3) being aggressive in championing his/her "cause"; and (4) taking risks (Roberts, 1997). Archilladis, Jervis, and Robertson (1971) define champions as those who actively and enthusiastically promote innovation through the critical stages of a product's life. Project champions seek creative ideas from information sources and then enthusiastically promote

them within the organization. Roberts (1997) coins the term "idea-exploiter" as the innovation champion who takes his/her own and others' ideas and attempts to get them supported and adopted.

In summary, the literature in the areas of relationship management/marketing and product development/project management contributes to our understanding of the processes performed by the project manager in the successful management of an intimate client engagement. Specifically, from these bodies of research, I propose the expansion of stewardship theory to the client-project manager engagement by advancing the importance of key project manager processes such as information management, seeking and championing new ideas, and personal reputation management as steward behaviors.

Client-Project Manager Engagements and Trust

Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman (1995) define interpersonal trust as "the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party" (p. 712). McAllister (1995) suggests in the interpersonal trust literature that there are two types of trust, affective and cognitive. Affective trust is grounded in reciprocal interpersonal care and concern or emotional bonds, while cognitive trust is grounded in individual beliefs about peer reliability and dependability, as well as competence. This distinction is consistent with Johnson-George and Swap's (1992) distinction between "reliableness" and "emotional trust" in the social psychology literature. Further, these dimensions are similar to the work of Cook and Wall (1980) who state that interpersonal trust at work may be placed along two different dimensions: (1) "faith in the trustworthy intentions of others, and (2) confidence in the ability of others, yielding

ascriptions of capability and reliability" (p. 40).

Applying these ideas to the client-project manager relationship, the argument can be made that trust among business partners is multi-dimensional, consisting of both affective and cognitive aspects. Accordingly, affective trust consists of the client's belief in the project manager's care and concerns for, or emotional bond to, the client.

Cognitive trust is the client's belief about the project manager's reliability, dependability, and competence. As McAllister's results demonstrate, these two aspects of trust are related to each other; however, affective trust is argued to persist even when faced with contrary evidence and setbacks, therefore, it is particularly important to business relationships.

Research in the area of interpersonal trust has proposed the antecedents that promote the development of trust in an interpersonal relationship. To illustrate, Mayer et al. (1995) proposed a model of dyadic trusting relationships. They identify three conditions that lead to trust which have been captured across a variety of studies on dyadic trust: ability, benevolence, and integrity. Examining the antecedents to both affective and cognitive trust, McAllister (1995) studied managers' peer relationships. He proposed that reliable role performance will be positively associated with cognitive trust and that both citizenship behavior and interaction frequency will be positively associated with affective trust. Here, reliable role behavior is described as success of past role-related duties. Interaction frequency is described as the frequency of interaction between two individuals. Finally, citizenship behaviors include behaviors that are personally chosen rather than role-prescribed, serve legitimate needs, and demonstrate interpersonal care and concern. These types of behaviors correspond to organizational citizenship behavior which is defined as behavior

intended to provide help and assistance, but outside the individual's work role and not directly rewarded (Organ, 1988; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). Consistent with his prediction, McAllister found that interaction frequency and the demonstration of citizenship behaviors did lead to affective trust. However, he uncovered less support for the impact of reliable role behavior on cognitive trust.

Applying this research to the client-project manager engagement, I propose that reliable project performance will be positively related to cognitive trust and that information management, seeking and championing new ideas, and personal reputation management will be positively related to affective trust.

Methodology

The research was conducted in two information technology service organizations in the Northern Virginia area. Information technology service organizations as well as Industrial/Organizational Psychology consulting companies, management consulting companies, advertising agencies, and accounting firms, to name a few, use teams of employees to develop, design, and implement organizational solutions. In these organizations, project managers are managing the relationship between their organization and the client organization.

Professional project managers spend considerable time with their relationships outside the direct boundary of the project team (e.g., with the client). In fact, in some cases, they and their team are temporarily located on the client's site. Overall, the management of client relationships by the project manager can ultimately impact the loyalty of the client, and therefore the success of the service organization.

Partnering organizations agreed to participate in both interviews and surveys

with project managers and their primary client contacts. The two service organizations provided a total of 66 project managers to contact for the research. Sixty-six project managers were contacted by phone with follow-up e-mails sent to all project managers. Of the sixty-six project managers, 63 completed the survey (95%) and 49 provided contact information for his/her client contact to complete the survey. Of the 49 clients contacted, 43 completed the survey (88%). A total of 106 project managers and clients completed the survey.

Results and Discussion

Correlations were used for the analyses. The results showed that reliable project performance was positively and significantly related to cognitive trust ($r = .33, p < .05$). The results also show that information management, quality and quantity, are significantly and positively related to affective trust ($r = .29, p < .05$; $r = .23, p < .10$, respectively) and that seeking and championing new ideas is significantly and positively related to affective trust ($r = .34, p < .05$). Finally, the results show a significant positive relationship between personal reputation management and affective trust ($r = .37, p < .05$). Interestingly, these extra role behaviors were not significantly related to cognitive trust.

This research offers a variety of theoretical and practical implications. One of the primary theoretical implications is the application of agency and stewardship theories to the client-project manager engagement. This examination demonstrated the additional value of stewardship theory for understanding the client-project manager relationship and the implications of this relationship for service organization financial gains demonstrated through client loyalty.

Secondly, the present research provides guidance on the types of client relationship

management processes that impact the affective trust of the client. Specifically, this research shows that project managers who have put forth extra effort by providing effective and continuous communication with their primary client contact, propose new ideas or ideas to meet client needs, and assist their client in managing his/her personal reputation achieve greater client affective trust.

A final large theoretical contribution of this research is the focus on the interpersonal relationship between a project manager and his/her primary client contact. This research shows that the client-project manager engagement is a critical interpersonal relationship. Further, evidence from this research demonstrates that having an intimate interpersonal relationship between a project manager and client is a critical boundary relationship resulting in significant effects on the development of client trust.

Several practical implications for service organizations emerging from the present research are worth discussing. First and foremost, this research demonstrates that the project manager within service organizations who provides business-to-business services is in a critical strategic position for building and sustaining client trust. Secondly, this research demonstrates how a project manager can build the client's cognitive and affective trust. Each aspect of trust is developed using different relationship management processes. Not surprisingly, the most important predictor of cognitive trust is reliable project performance. In the case where that is being done successfully, project managers can increase affective trust by putting forth extra role behaviors such as providing effective and continuous information management, seeking and championing new ideas, and assisting the client in personal reputation management.

References

- Archilladis, A., Jervis, P., & Robertson, A. (1971). Success and failure in innovation. Project Sappho, Sussex: University of Sussex Press.
- Bowen, D.E., & Schneider, B. (1988). Services marketing and management: Implications for organizational behavior. Research in Organizational Behavior, 10: 43-80.
- Davis, J., Schoorman, F.D., & Donaldson, L. (1997). Toward a stewardship theory of management. Academy of Management Review, 22: 20-47.
- Donaldson, L., & Davis, J.H. (1991). Stewardship theory or agency theory: CEO governance and shareholder returns. Australian Journal of Management, 16: 49-63.
- Donaldson, L. & Davis, J.H. (1994). Boards and company performance—Research challenges the conventional wisdom. Corporate Governance: An International Review, 2: 151-160.
- Duncan, T., & Moriarty, S.E. (1998). A communication-based marketing model for managing relationships. Journal of Marketing, 62: 1-13.
- Gronroos, C. (1990). Relationship approach to marketing in service contexts: The marketing and organizational behavior interface. Journal of Business Research, 20: 3-11.
- Howell, J.M., & Higgins, C.A. (1990). Champions of technological innovation. Administrative Science Quarterly, 35: 317-341.
- Johnson-George, C., & Swap, W. (1982). Measurement of specific interpersonal trust: Construction and validation of a scale to assess trust in a specific other. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43: 1306-1317.
- Mayer, R.C., Davis, J.H., & Schoorman, F.D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. Academy of Management Review, 20: 709-734.
- McAllister, D.J. (1995). Affect- and cognitive-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 38(1): 24-59.
- Mills, P.K., & Morris, J.H. (1986). Clients as "partial" employees of service organizations: Role development in client participation. Academy of Management Review, 11: 726-735.
- Organ, D.W. (1988). Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington, MA: Lexington.
- Roberts, E. (1997). Managing invention and innovation: What we've learned. In R. Katz (Ed.) The human size of managing technological innovation: A collection of readings: 580-599. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schneider, B. & Bowen, D. E. (1995). Winning the service game. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Sharma, A. (1997). Professional as agent: Knowledge asymmetry in agency exchange. Academy of Management Review, 22: 758-798.
- Smith, C.A., Organ, D., & Near, J. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68: 653-663.
- Webster, F. E., Jr. (1992). The changing role of marketing in the corporation. Journal of Marketing, 56: 1-17.

WHAT'S NEW...IN PRACTICE

Copyright © 2001, e-Selex.com, San Diego, California, all rights reserved.

Why Are Biodata Prediction Systems Better Than Tests?

Terry W. Mitchell, Ph.D.

CEO, e-Selex.com, San Diego, California

The Internet now provides the medium of choice for delivering the broad range of biodata-based prediction systems provided by e-Selex.com. These systems offer several important advantages compared to traditional knowledge, skill, and ability tests. The following provides a brief overview of some important differences between biodata prediction systems and tests, and describes the huge practical and legal advantages.

Tests measure individual characteristics that may not be job-relevant.

Tests are developed to measure characteristics of a person, such as knowledge, skill or ability. Unfortunately, these personal characteristics are not necessarily related to a job-relevant outcome such as job success. For example, a person's bookkeeping or accounting skill is probably not relevant to success as a firefighter or peace officer.

By contrast, each of our prediction systems is designed to focus first and foremost on a specific outcome (or criterion measure) that an organization wants to impact. Each predictor attempts to capture a portion of

that outcome in advance of its occurrence.

Test items are developed for internal consistency not predictive validity.

Tests are developed through item analyses to increase internal consistency. The goal is to make each item a parallel version of every other item, thereby creating a pure measure of that internal characteristic.

Conversely, items on our predictor scales are developed to have very low internal consistency, but each item contributes criterion-related validity for predicting a specific outcome measure, such as job performance.

Because our predictors have low internal consistency across items, the validity of each item adds *directly* to the validity of the other predictor items. Because tests are developed to have high internal consistency, whatever criterion-related validity happens to be provided by each test item overlaps with the validity of other test items, and therefore is non-additive. This produces a lower overall predictive validity for the test, compared to the overall validity of our predictor systems against specific outcome criteria.

With tests, the trick is to find the one right answer.

Test items are written to have a single right answer. By design, test items are constructed to score *nearly correct* answers as incorrect answers. In fact, the principal method, used by test developers to increase the difficulty of a test item, is to make one or more of the wrong answers appear to be correct, but to be *technically incorrect*. Having a single correct answer to each item makes tests highly vulnerable to various types of cheating. This fundamental feature of testing has been a particular problem with the Internet administration of tests.

Again, by contrast, our predictor items are

scored using an empirical keying procedure. This procedure generally results in positive scores for more than one option to each item. The actual relationship between each predictor item and the relevant criterion is often curvilinear, making it extremely difficult to raise one's score by giving false answers. In fact, our prediction systems differ from tests at the most fundamental level: The basic *nature of the task* presented to the respondent. With tests, the response task is to choose the *right answer* from the options. By contrast, our prediction systems ask the applicant to give the answer that is most accurate, truthful or factually correct in describing previous performance. Our items focus on verifiable outcomes, facts, and achievements. The correct answer is the one that gives the most accurate description of the person, and this *right answer* is going to be a different answer for different people.

Tests measure peak ability, not typical performance.

Tests are *maximum performance* tasks. They tell how well a person can perform under circumstances of peak motivation, but do not tell how well a person will perform on a typical, day-to-day basis.

Unlike tests, our prediction systems focus on past and present outcomes of *typical* performance. We use those past outcomes to predict typical outcomes in the future. This strategy derives directly from the old axiom: The best predictor of future behavior is past behavior. Evidence of past achievement captures the individual's ability to achieve, and also indicates the necessary motivation to achieve, because both ability and motivation are required for that past achievement to have occurred.

In other words, maximum performance measures such as skill and ability tests may tell the employer if a person can do a problem-solving task. At best, however, this is only half of the equation. By comparison,

past achievement shows that a person *can do* and that a person *will do* what is needed to achieve a related successful outcome.

Tests have adverse impact on protected minority groups.

Most employment tests, particularly cognitive ability tests, show massive differences in average scores for minority and non-minority groups. In statistical terms, these differences are often a *full standard deviation* or more. By contrast, our prediction systems often show near zero differences in average scores for minorities and non-minorities. Even when differences in average predictor scores are present, they tend to be small, and are almost always less than the difference in average minority and non-minority scores *on the criterion itself*.

In legal terminology, cognitive ability tests will almost always show *adverse impact* on protected minority groups, whereas our prediction systems almost never do. A finding of adverse impact alone establishes a *prima facie* case of employment discrimination. The employer must then defend the use of the test through evidence of its validity and fairness. Even when the employer prevails, this can be an extremely expensive proposition in legal fees alone.

What's the bottom line?

All in all, these differences are huge practical and legal advantages for Internet administration of our prediction systems. Compared to tests, our predictors are developed to provide predictive validity against specific outcomes such as actual job success. Our predictors are ideally suited to Internet administration due to factual content and verifiability, making them highly resistant to falsification. This predictive validity and resistance to falsification, coupled with little if any adverse impact on protected groups, offers a unique combination of usefulness and legal

defensibility for the employer.

RECENT CANADIAN LEGAL CASE

Hyland v. Royal Alexandra Hospital
Decision rendered on July 6, 2000
Silvia Bonaccio, Concordia University

The case described in the following paragraphs concerns a termination of employment. The Plaintiff, Mr. Robert Hyland, had done something outside working hours that could cause prejudice to his employer's business.

The Complaint

Mr. Robert Hyland, a Chartered Accountant, was employed as Manager of Internal Audits at the Royal Alexandra Hospital in Alberta. He began this job in June 1991. In April 1993, the Hospital terminated Mr. Hyland without severance pay due to the manner in which he purchased a vehicle for personal use: the Plaintiff had avoided paying the GST on the vehicle. Mr. Hyland felt the termination was unjustified.

B. The Evidence and Counter-Evidence

A co-worker informed Mr. Hyland of a way of avoiding paying the GST when acquiring a new car. As a Treaty Indian, Mr. Hyland's wife was exempt from payment of the tax when buying a new vehicle, as long as the new vehicle was delivered to an Indian Reserve. After consulting information bulletins from Revenue Canada, Mr. Hyland decided that he was not infringing the law by purchasing the vehicle under his wife's name in order to avoid paying the GST.

In March 1993, Mr. Hyland negotiated the purchase of his new car. Subsequently, he went to the dealership with his wife and had her sign the Bill of Sale. On the same day, a second Bill of Sale was signed. This transaction transferred ownership from Mr. Hyland's wife to himself. However, the dealer refused to deliver the vehicle to an Indian Reserve. Instead, it was brought to

the Plaintiff's residence.

Mr. Hyland's superior, Mr. Morris, was worried about the nature of the transaction. He called a meeting with the Plaintiff to discuss the transaction. Mr. Hyland assured his supervisor that he had conducted enough research on Revenue Canada's policies to know that the transaction was legal. However, Mr. Morris was still concerned, as he felt that Mr. Hyland's taking advantage of this "tax loophole" could be perceived by co-workers and the public as questionable ethical behaviour and a lack of good judgement, especially for someone responsible for internal audits. After this meeting, Mr. Morris spoke to senior officials of the Hospital, and decided to terminate Mr. Hyland since they felt they could "no longer rely on his judgement".

Two experienced Chartered Accountants were questioned to address whether the Plaintiff's behaviour had infringed the ethical obligations of Chartered Accountants and if it complied with GST legislation. Both witnesses agreed that Mr. Hyland should have paid the GST since the car was not delivered to an Indian Reserve, as required by Revenue Canada. On the other hand, the witnesses disagreed about whether Mr. Hyland had breached his ethical obligations as a Chartered Accountant. One witness believed that Mr. Hyland's behaviour was wrongful since the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Alberta's Code of Ethics stated that a member "shall not sign or associate himself with any letter, report [...] financial statement which he knows [...] is false or misleading". This witness believed the Bill of Sale signed by Mr. Hyland's wife as the purchaser of the vehicle was misleading since she was not the true purchaser: she had not chosen the car, bargained its price or paid the insurance. The other witness characterized Mr. Hyland's behaviour as "tax avoidance", but he did not think it violated the Code of Conduct.

C. The Law

A previous and often quoted case was used in Mr. Hyland's trial (U.S.W.A. v. port Arthur Shipbuilding Co.):

"If an employee has been guilty of serious misconduct, habitual neglect of duty, incompetence, or conduct incompatible with his duties, or prejudicial to the employer's business, or if he is guilty of willful disobedience to the employer's orders in a matter of substance, the law recognizes the employer's right summarily to dismiss the delinquent employee."

In this case, the ground for dismissal is a behaviour "incompatible with [Mr. Hyland's] particular employment duties". It was believed that misconduct outside working hours was prejudicial for the Hospital.

D. The Decision

Throughout the case, Mr. Hyland never attempted to hide his behaviour from his employer. He believed that he had not engaged in wrongful practices at any point in the transaction. However, since Mr. Hyland's wife never really purchased the car, and since it was not delivered to a Reserve, Mr. Hyland should have paid the GST. The tribunal thought that Mr. Hyland was especially responsible for his behaviour since he was "not an unsophisticated person who made a hasty decision". By nature of his profession, Mr. Hyland was aware of the rules concerning taxes, and should not have tried to avoid paying them. In particular, Mr. Hyland's behaviour was thought to affect the credibility of the Hospital as a public institution. The Hospital wanted to completely adhere to Revenue Canada's laws. Therefore, they believed that relying on Mr. Hyland's judgment as an auditor was no longer possible. Moreover, the Plaintiff was given time to correct his actions after meeting with Mr. Morris, but he chose not to.

The tribunal decided that the Hospital had a valid reason to terminate Mr. Hyland from his duties of Manager of Internal Audit. However, Mr. Hyland was compensated for not having been given appropriate notice prior to being terminated.

E. Analysis

Mr. Hyland's case is interesting since it shows that misconduct in one's personal life can have serious repercussions on one's professional life. Had Mr. Hyland occupied another position in the Hospital (for example as a nurse), he would probably not have been terminated for taking advantage of a grey area in Revenue Canada's policies. However, since Mr. Hyland was a Chartered Accountant, he was expected to behave in a legal and ethical manner during both work and non-work hours.

Reference

This case and other cases related to employment can be found in *Canadian Legal Cases on Employment Law*.

Hyland v. Royal Alexandra Hospital is in the Third Series, Volume 5, pages 63 to 72.

NEW NEWSLETTER EDITOR

Starting with the September issue, the CSIOP newsletter will be edited by Lori Francis. Lori is a PhD student in Industrial/Organizational Psychology at the University of Guelph. To submit letters to the Editor or inquire about publishing advertisements and articles in the CSIOP newsletter, please feel free to contact Lori.

Lori Francis
Department of Psychology
University of Guelph
Guelph, Ontario
N1G 2W1
phone: (519) 824 - 4120 ext. 8931
email: lfrancis@uoguelph.ca

NEWSLETTER SPONSORSHIP

Ramona Bobocel, Chair

As a member of the Canadian Society for

Industrial and Organizational Psychology I'm sure you're aware of the importance of keeping abreast of what's happening within the I/O community in Canada. Our quarterly newsletter serves that purpose well with regular articles on "What's Happening in Science" and "What's Happening in Practice," along with the "Controversial Corner" and other interesting features.

The newsletter is sent to all members of CSIOP free of charge. Of course, there are costs associated with producing the newsletter. Our editor and contributors are all volunteers, but copying and mailing costs must be covered by CSIOP. In the recent past, we have been fortunate to have a sponsor for our newsletter, which has helped to keep membership costs down. We are currently looking for a new corporate sponsor for the newsletter and are therefore writing to all CSIOP members. We would appreciate it if your organization would consider sponsorship.

We estimate that the cost of copying and mailing each issue of the newsletter is approximately \$400 to \$500. Ideally, we would like to find a sponsor willing to cover the costs for all four issues of the newsletter for 2001-2002, but we would also consider sponsors for single issues. The sponsor is publicly thanked in the newsletter and the sponsor's name will appear on the bottom of each page of the newsletter. Previous sponsors have found that this gives their organization a great deal of visibility within the Canadian I/O community.

If your organization would be willing to serve as a sponsor, please contact me at the following by e-mail (rbobocel@uwaterloo.ca), phone (416-698-5598) until September 1 and 519-888-4567 ext. 3622 thereafter) or letter (Department of Psychology University of Waterloo, 200 University Ave. W, Waterloo, ON, N2L 3G1). Our next newsletter is scheduled for September 2001. I look forward to hearing from you.

JOB OPENING

NRC-CNRC

The National Research Council of Canada (NRC) is a dynamic, nationwide R&D organization committed to helping Canada realize its potential as an innovative and competitive nation. Combining our strengths – outstanding people, core science expertise and information, research programs focused on key technologies and technology diffusion – with those of industrial and academic partners, we foster Canada's emerging national system of innovation. You can make a difference at NRC!

Assistant or Associate Research Officer in Environmental Psychology/Human Factors Institute for Research in Construction (IRC), Ottawa, Ontario

This is a continuing position, subject to a two-year probation period.

Your Challenge

You will contribute to the achievement of Indoor Environment program goals, to develop cost-effective technologies for the design and operation of indoor environments that maximize the comfort, productivity, health and safety of people in buildings. You will also join existing teams and develop new lines of investigation in areas related to human behavioural consequences of the physical indoor environment (including but not limited to acoustics, thermal comfort, lighting, and ventilation/indoor air quality). Part of the job requires working to put research findings into building practice through communicating to practitioners and other interested parties.

Your Credentials

You possess a Ph.D. in Psychology with specialization in Environmental Psychology, or Human Factors/Ergonomics, or in other related subfields of Psychology (e.g., social psychology, industrial/organisational psychology, or health psychology). You will have: experience in behavioural science research concerning the effects of the built environment on performance, health, mood, and comfort (some scholarly publication in this area is essential); experience with a variety of research designs and statistical techniques for both laboratory and field research is essential.

Knowledge of English is essential and an Enhanced Reliability Check will be required.

Salary Range: Commensurate with qualifications, in the range C\$43,890 - C\$63,609 (Assistant RO) or C\$65,451 - C\$77,479 (Associate RO), plus \$7,000 terminable allowance, and superior benefits package. Relocation costs will be determined in accordance with NRC's relocation policy.

To explore this opportunity, send your application by July 31, 2001, indicating reference number 44-01-01 to: Sylvie Brault, Human Resources Systems Coordinator, National Research Council Canada, Building M-20, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0R6, by fax at (613) 954-5984, or e-mail at sylvie.brault@nrc.ca. Please visit our web-site at www.nrc.ca/lrc/.

We thank all those who apply and advise that only those selected for further consideration will be contacted.



National Research Council Canada
Conseil national de recherches Canada

Canada



SOFTWARE FOR HARD DECISIONS.

Matching people with positions just got easier with IPAT Select Software.

Now you can use your own computer to administer and score our 16PF® Select Questionnaire. Plus, this convenient, flexible tool enables you to:

Retain and modify the personality characteristics necessary
for effective performance for each unique job

Scan answer sheets or hand enter item responses

Generate 16PF Select interpretive reports

Create a disk for test administration on a remote computer

Import 16PF Fifth Edition test data from IPAT's OnSite
software to generate 16PF Select reports

The 16PF Select Questionnaire measures 12 primary factor personality scales, requires only 20 minutes of testing time, and uses your predetermined criteria to refine candidate selection. IPAT Select Software puts this valuable information at your fingertips – literally.

CALL FOR MORE INFORMATION ON IPAT'S SELECTION SOLUTIONS AND HOW YOU CAN RECEIVE FREE SOFTWARE. OUR JOB IS TO MAKE YOUR JOB EASIER.



1-800-225-4728, EXT. ACSS

WWW.IPAT.COM

2001 CSIOP EXECUTIVE

Dr. Ramona Bobocel, Chair
Department of Psychology
University of Waterloo
200 University Ave. W.
Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1
rbobocel@watarts.uwaterloo.ca
(519) 888-4567, ext. 3622

Dr. John Meyer,
Past Chair
Department of Psychology
University of Western Ontario
London, ON N6A 5C2
meyer@julian.uwo.ca
(519) 661-3679

Dr. Arla Day, Chair-Elect
Department of Psychology
Saint Mary's University
923 Robie St.
Halifax, NS B3H 3C3
arla.day@stmarys.ca
(902) 420-5854

Dr. Veronica Stinson,
Membership Coordinator
Department of Psychology
Saint Mary's University
Halifax, NS B3H 3C3
Veronica.stinson@stmarys.ca
(902) 420-5861

Dr. Shaun Newsome,
Program Coordinator
Sobeys Inc.
115 King St.
Stellarton, NS B0K 1S0
shaun.newsome@sobeys.com
(902) 752-8371

Dr. Joan Finegan
Secretary-Treasurer
Department of Psychology
University of Western Ontario
London, ON N6A 5C2
finegan@julian.uwo.ca
(519) 661-2111 x 84932

Laurie Barclay, Student Representative
Department of Psychology
University of British Columbia
2136 West Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z5
laurieav@interchange.ubc.ca
(604) 298-9992

Dr. Peter Hausdorf,
Workshop Coordinator
Department of Psychology
University of Guelph
Guelph, ON N1G 2W1
phausdor@uoguelph.ca
(519) 824-4120, ext. 3976

Kimberlea Baron,
Newsletter Editor
SPB, Business Psychology
375 Roland-Therrien Blvd., Suite 501
Longueuil, QC J4H 4A6
kbaron@spb.ca
(450) 646-1022

Dr. David Zweig
Communications Coordinator
zweig@utsc.utoronto.ca

Note: The articles in this newsletter do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the Canadian Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology.