CSIOP

Canadian Society for Industrial and 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 16, Number 2 **January 2000**

CONTENTS

COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR

Gary Johns, Ph.D., Concordia University

All the best to you for the New Year and the new millennium! This is CSIOP's 25th anniversary, and we can take pride in its past accomplishments while planning its future contributions. Speaking of planning, the CSIOP Executive committee (listed at the back of your *Newsletter*) will be meeting in Montreal on March 18. If you have questions, concerns, or issues that you would like to appear on our agenda, please contact the relevant Executive member or me. In this issue's column, I will address a subject that is of particular relevance to our academic membership. In my column in the next issue I will cover a subject of particular concern to practicing I-O psychologists.

The new year and indeed the new millennium is a time for reflection, and I have been reflecting a bit on why so many submitted manuscripts are rejected by academic journals in I-O psychology and related disciplines. I recently realized that I have spent about forty person-years on the editorial boards of such journals, not counting much additional ad hoc reviewing. I share here with you some observations gleaned during this period. In my opinion, both the technical quality and the relevance to practitioners of articles published in the better outlets have never been higher. However, as you are probably aware, these journals tend to have rejection rates that hover around 85%. How is it that so many submitted papers are rejected?

One of the most common reasons for the rejection of manuscripts (especially for the better journals) is a lack of theory. To put this another way, it is not apparent to the informed reader why the study was conducted in the first place. Borrowing from Robert Sutton and Barry Staw (Administrative Science Quarterly, 1995), and adding some of my own observations, a theory is not a string of references, a list of variables, or a even a set of hypotheses. Furthermore, it is certainly not the very data that are included in the manuscript. Rather, a theory is simply a compelling argument for how the variables being studied are expected to be related to each other and why this is important. A theory does not have to be a "Capital T" theory such as equity theory, expectancy theory, or charismatic leadership theory. Rather, it has to be a logical cover story for the expected results. In fact, in an attempt to "include some theory," one often sees the Capital T theories inappropriately invoked at the expense of a logical home-grown theory that might justify the research and account for the expected results. Research without theory is simply ungrounded, disconnected data. Dustbowl empiricism is inefficient, redundant, and capitalizes on chance. Theoretical justification is as necessary for more applied research as it is for more academic research. In applied research, good theory guarantees that the cost associated with a particular intervention is appropriate to how the intervention is supposed to work (e.g., do you want to pay for a short-term Hawthorne effect?). It also aids in the tailoring of such interventions to your own local organizational conditions.
A second common reason for manuscript rejection has to do with the utilization of research methods that are inadequate to answer the questions posed in the introduction of the paper. One of the most common problems is poor operationalization of key constructs. This is particularly painful to the reviewer when problem number one (lack of theory) is not a problem. Many reviewers have experienced "Method Shock," reading a good introduction to a paper and really looking forward to seeing the results, only to find out that the methodology is fatally flawed by poor operationalization. I once read a great introduction to a paper purported to be about stress at work. One page into the method section, it was apparent that the authors had not measured stress but rather job satisfaction, hoping to capitalize on the work stress fad. This reengineering of old data to fit some current problem is as obvious to reviewers as it is common. While you can reanalyze data and even invoke some theory post hoc, it is very hard to fix bad measurement after the fact. A subtle but related problem is that you can seldom add a measure after the study is conducted (unless it is archival). This can be a particular problem when trying to publish in the very best outlets. The most common version is that the researcher failed to measure a critical mediating variable that is invoked to explain the results, results that are open to a wide variety of interpretations. Careful planning is necessary at the research design stage to ensure that the chain of evidence from your theory to your expected results is well expressed in measurement.

Space allows me to consider just one more reason for rejection, a reason that is avoidable before submission. Too many manuscripts are submitted in a condition that is simply too premature for review. I have become particularly aware of this problem in my recent role as Consulting Editor for the Journal of Organizational Behavior. The general problem is that the reviewers and editor have so many questions about a manuscript that it is impossible to discern the basic quality of the reported research from the initial submission. In this case, asking for a revision is equivalent to asking for a new initial submission to see if the paper merits revision! I have simply refused to expose our reviewers (who are so generous of their time) to this kind of circular co-authorship. Before they are submitted, most papers will profit from very careful review by colleagues who are good researchers and have a low need for affiliation. At this stage, the paper needs critics, not cheerleaders.

That's all for this issue. I welcome your reactions in a letter to the Editor.

CPA CONVENTION 2000

Stéphane Brutus, Ph.D., Concordia University

As the program coordinator for CSIOP I would like to invite you to the 61st Annual Convention of the Canadian Psychological Association that will be held in Ottawa from June 29th to July 1st. The conference marks the 25th year of CSIOP! This year's program has been modified slightly to highlight our silver anniversary. For one, the first ever Distinguished Contribution to I-O Psychology in Canada award will be bestowed on Dr. Pat Rowe from the University of Waterloo. In addition to receiving this prestigious award, Dr. Rowe has been asked by CPA to give an invited address. How could you possibly miss that! We are also planning an invited symposium entitled: "Celebrating 25 Years of the Canadian Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Past Chairs Reflect". A few names for you: Latham, Catano, Hackett, Johns— need I say more?

Of course, the bulk of the program consists of your submissions. This year you'll have the opportunity to attend six symposia (composed of 28 submissions) and peruse 35 posters. The quality of each submission has been corroborated by three blind reviewers (I especially thank the St. Mary's crew and my colleagues here at Concordia for this effort). As usual, the academic side of the conference is well taken care of. However, my limited experience tells me that CSIOP members are not only thirsty for I-O knowledge! Well, for all you Calgary and St. Mary's grad students (these were randomly chosen to make my point of course) we'll have a joint social hour with the Military section again this year. Remember that in this new millennium, the last day of the conference will coincide with our country's national holiday!!! See you there!

CPA PRE-CONVENTION WORKSHOP

Marjory Kerr, Ellis Associates – Workshop Coordinator

June 28, 2000, 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Westin Hotel, Ottawa, ON

The CSIOP executive is pleased to announce that Kevin R. Murphy, Ph.D., will be conducting this year's pre-convention workshop at CPA. The title for the workshop is **"Honesty in the Workplace"**, and it will include lots of opportunity for discussion and interaction. This workshop is intended to provide participants with an understanding of the critical issues associated with the assessment of honesty, both benefits and potential pitfalls, and to assist them in making informed decisions about how and when to assess honesty in the workplace. Read on to find out why we think you and your colleagues will be interested in attending.

The issue of honesty (and dishonesty) in the workplace has gained increasing attention in Canadian organizations, and has generated much discussion amongst human resource managers and I-O psychologists. Ongoing concerns include the costs of dishonest employee behaviour to organizations; the recruitment and selection of honest, ethical employees; and the psychometric, practical, legal and ethical considerations associated with testing and screening for honesty. A wide range of methods for detecting deception and for making inferences about honesty have been proposed, and there is a large body of research on how and why these methods succeed or fail. The workshop will examine the problem of employee dishonesty and various organizational responses, ranging from polygraph examinations and drug/alcohol tests to paper-and-pencil inventories designed to measure integrity. We will also look at strategies that have been used to deal with (dis)honesty in the workplace. Some of these strategies focus on changing the person (e.g., through applicant screening, or investigations of workplace incidents), while others attempt to change aspects of the work situation that appear to encourage workplace dishonesty.

Kevin Murphy's areas of research include personnel selection and placement, performance appraisal, and honesty in the workplace. He is well-known to I-O practitioners and academics, and recognized for his expertise in the area of assessing honesty and integrity.

We've included a poster for the workshop in this newsletter– please post it in your department, office, or any other location where the information may reach a potentially interested audience. Feel free to make photocopies and pass it on as well. Additional information will be provided in Psynopsis. In the mean time, put the workshop on your calendar and be sure to let your colleagues know about it. Hope to see you there!

2000 CSIOP MEMBERSHIP DIRECTORY

Arla Day, Ph.D. – Membership coordinator

We are updating our membership information in order to create a year 2000 Membership Directory. In order to make the directory more useful to our members, we have added four new information categories: your highest degree attained, the year your highest degree was granted, the institution that granted this degree, and your current job title or position.
I have enclosed a Membership Directory Information Sheet with your newsletter. Don't be left out of the new directory! Please take a few minutes to complete this form now and send the information to me. **In order to be included in the 2000 Membership Directory, I need all of your information by February 21, 2000.** Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions! Thank you very much!

NEWS FROM THE STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE

Martin Royal, Saint Mary's University

Hi everyone! This year for the CPA conference, we will once again be trying to organize three successful student events: the student symposium, the "mentor outing", and the Kendall Award. The student symposium will consist of presentations from the best five I-O psychology student abstracts submitted to CPA. The best student abstracts have been selected from all the abstracts received. Thanks to all for your submissions!

This year, the mentor outing will be taking the form of a semi-formal networking/informational cocktail in which students will be paired with a "mentor" with similar interests. We're hoping to invite mentors from different work settings (university, business, military, etc.) to share their experience from both a scientist and a practitioner perspective. If you would like to have a particular practitioner or academic at this year's mentor outing, please contact me with the name of that person (and any contact information you can give me, if possible) so that I can, in turn, have them join us. This will be an exciting opportunity to discuss the work of I-O psychologists in different work environments.

Over the past years, the Kendall Award has been conferred to the best I-O psychology student paper presented at the CPA conference. To standardize the selection process and provide students presenting an oral presentation or a poster the same opportunity to receive the award, the papers will be collected and reviewed before the conference. If you want to be considered for the Kendall Award, send a copy of your paper to the CSIOP program coordinator, Stephane Brutus (brutus@vax2.concordia.ca), before **June 1st, 2000**. Your paper will be submitted to an independent committee and reviewed before the conference. Only papers received before the deadline will be taken into account for the award. The award, with a monetary compensation, will be given to the student with the best paper at the CPA conference. I invite everyone who submitted an abstract to CPA to participate and send us a copy of your paper!

On a final note, if you have not received an email from me so far, I may not have your email address in our database. Send me your email address as soon as possible so that I may include it. For more information about the student events or if you have any other questions, please feel free to contact me at mroyal@apexmail.com. Thank you.

A PLEA FROM THE NEWSLETTER EDITOR

Kimberlea Baron, M.A.Sc., Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM) and Société Pierre Boucher

Just a quick note to beg our readers to send us feedback! So far, we have not received any reactions to September's issue, and we would desperately like to include your comments (and yes, even constructive criticism) in our newsletters. If you have anything to say about the articles we have included (for example, a reaction to our Controversial Corner pieces), or have suggestions for articles that you would like to see in the newsletter, send them to me at baronk@cirano.umontreal.ca. Please!!

GET YOUR Ph.D. FROM UBC!

Daniel P. Skarlicki, Ph.D., University of British Columbia

The Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration at UBC offers a Ph.D. program in organization behaviour and human resource management. The faculty members who supervise Ph.D. students are a very active research group who is highly involved in the Academy of Management and SIOP. Many faculty members have been successful recipients of research awards and Federal government grants. UBC's business school often obtains more Federal government research grants than any other Canadian business school.

Faculty members include Merle Ace (Minnesota), Brian Bemmels (Minnesota), Peter Frost (Minnesota), Dev Jennings (Stanford), Tom Knight (Cornell), Nancy Langton (Stanford), Sally Maitlas (Sheffield), David McPhillips (UBC), Sandra Robinson (Northwestern), Daniel Skarlicki (Toronto), Mark Thompson (Cornell), and Skip Walter (Berkley). The research interests of the faculty members are numerous and include organizational justice, psychological contracts, retaliation in the workplace, leadership, issues affecting our natural environment, labor union processes, and gender issues.

The OBHR program has an active research seminar series throughout the year in which guest speakers come from around the continent. Some of our speakers from the past year have included: Bill Starbuck, NYU; Terry Mitchell, U of Washington; Howard Aldrich, UNC @ Chapel Hill; John Jermier, U of Florida; Matthew Kraatz, U of Illinois; Kathleen Valley, Harvard University; and Elizabeth Morrison, NYU.

There are approximately 8-10 students at various stages in their Ph.D. program. Our students often begin their research careers as co-authors on projects in their very first semester. As such, our students not only obtain publications during their four years with us, but many also earn recognition and awards as well. For example, one of our current Ph.D. students, Dora Lau won the "Best Publication in Organizational Behaviour in 1998" at last year's Academy of Management for her recent AMR article with Keith Murnighan. Another of our current students, Charlene Zietsma, won the award for "Best Symposium- OMT Division" at last year's Academy of Management Meetings, and a "Best Paper" award at last year's Administrative Science's Association of Canada Meeting.

And finally, it goes without saying that obtaining a Ph.D. at UBC provides a fantastic opportunity to live in one of the most beautiful locations in the world. We have a moderate climate year round, and a cosmopolitan, diverse city that is both clean and safe. Our campus, although located within the city, is bordered by the ocean, vast beaches, and miles of trailed forest. A half hour takes you to the mountains, where you can ski or hike. Two hours will take you to Whistler, considered one of the top ski resort locations in the world.

For more information about our program, please contact Sandra Robinson: robinson@commerce.ubc.ca.

360 FEEDBACK: COMMENTS FROM AN ACADEMIC AND A PRACTITIONER

We thought our readers might find it interesting that we tackle a hot issue in I-O psychology— 360 Feedback— from both an academic and a practical perspective. We therefore requested Stéphane Brutus, a professor at Concordia University, who specializes in 360 Feedback research, and François Berthiaume, a partner at Raymond Chabot Grant Thornton who regularly uses 360 Feedback with his clients, to write a short article.

I-O, hype and 360-degree feedback. An Academic's Perspective

Stéphane Brutus, Ph.D., Concordia University

Over the past few years I've had the opportunity to do quite a lot of work, of both an academic and applied nature, with 360-degree feedback. I thought that it might be interesting to jot down, in a very loose fashion, some of my thoughts on the topic.

"360-degree feedback" is, indeed, a fad. Waldman and Atwater (1998) referred to 360^0 feedback as "...perhaps the most notable management innovation of the 1990s" (p. ix). In our field, your time is usually up when you're referred to as such. The shelf life of management tools is quite short and I'd be quite surprised if the term "360" is still used in a few years. However, I believe that this disappearance will be a mere question of semantics. The term "360" will indeed fall out of favor but the basic principles underlying it will remain.

"Multi-source feedback" is here to stay! A core characteristic of Multi-source feedback (MSF) is the use of multiple sources to evaluate individual performance.

I can identify at least three forces that will continue to move performance appraisal processes in this direction. One, the democratization of organizations: employees are becoming more comfortable in evaluating their peers and supervisors—soon they'll be expecting it. Two, the increase in managers' span of control is shifting appraisal duties from supervisors to other relevant co-workers. Three, it is simply good practice, from a psychometric point of view, to use multiple raters in performance assessment. Of course, the fact that these raters possess different perspectives creates some problems, but these are empirical issues that are currently being dealt with (see Greguras & Robie, 1997; Mount, Judge, Scullen, Systma, & Hezlett, 1998).

"Feedback for development" is also here to stay!

Do you know of any area in I-O that is as chaotic as leadership research? I don't! However, one of the few consistent threads cutting across current leadership thinking is self-awareness and the need for leaders to understand and manage others' perceptions. MSF, when used for development, is aimed directly at increasing self-awareness. Church (1998) offered some empirical evidence of the link between self-awareness and managerial effectiveness. Also, the provision of MSF has been found to lead to performance improvement (e.g., Smither, London, Vasilopoulos, Millsap, & Salvemini, 1995; Walker & Smither, 1999). In sum, MSF appears to be effective as a development tool. It works, and for that reason will continue to be used in the future.

MSF for decision-making: the jury is still out!

It is unclear to me what the future holds for MSF as a decision-making tool. My biggest concern with this issue is that when making a decision using MSF, an overall performance score (across raters at least) must be computed. Which aggregation procedure should one use (unit weight per source, unit weight per raters, more weight to the supervisor)? If challenged, how do you defend your procedure in court? MSF as an assessment tool is appealing because it recognizes the multi-dimensional aspect of individual performance, however, the transformation of MSF ratings into a single index runs counter to the nature of the assessment. I'll let the legal system clarify this one, as I expect challenges to this use to hit the higher courts very soon.

Some research gaps

The practice of MSF is far ahead of what we know about this process. If you look at what is being done out there, you'll be amazed by its variety. Some of it's good, but some of it's also bad. My favorite example: Olympic scoring. You delete the highest and lowest rating of an individual's assessment—Ouch!!! Recently, Johnson and Ferstl (1999) found that, for some managers (those that over-rate their performance), the provision of MSF led to a decrease in performance. Think about it! My point is not to say that MSF is not conducted properly in organizations, rather I want to emphasize the need for research in this area. I list a few gaps that I've noted in what we know about the MSF process:

<u>Impact of rater selection on evaluations</u>

Most MSF relies on focal individuals to distribute the surveys to others (in terms of ownership of HR systems, I don't think you can top that one!). What strategies are these individuals using in selecting raters? What is the impact of these strategies on the actual ratings?

<u>Impact of new technology</u>

I truly believe that the emergence of MSF in the early 1990's is a direct product of advances in information systems technology. Without advanced scoring and processing systems, MSF simply does not exist—it's just too cumbersome a process. Most MSF is now offered on-line and I wonder about the implications of on-line data collection and feedback.

Customer ratings
We hear of customer ratings but not a lot of work has been done on this unique source of ratings.

Design of feedback reports
This is a big beef of mine! MSF generates tons of information for the focal manager; the typical MSF report contains literally dozens of pages. What is the most effective way to display this information if the goal is to increase self-awareness? Graphs, item-level data, ratings separated by sources, etc.?

These are but a few of my thoughts on multi-source feedback. I hope that this column has stimulated your thinking on the topic. Of course, your feedback would be greatly welcome.

References:

Church, A. H. (1997). Managerial self-awareness in high performing individuals in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 281-292.

Greguras, G. & Robie, C. (1997). A new look at within-source interrater reliability of 360-degree feedback ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83(6)*, 960-968.

Johnson, J.W. & Ferstl, K.L. (1999). The effect of interrater and self-other agreement on performance improvement following upward feedback. *Personnel Psychology,* 52(2), 271-304.

Smither, J.W., London, M., Vasilopoulos, R.R., Millsap, R.E., & Salvemini, N. (1995). An examination of the effects of an upward feedback program over time. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 1-34.

Waldman, D.A. & Atwater, L.E. (1998). *The power of 360-degree feedback*. Gulf Publishing: Houston,TX.

Walker, A.G. & Smither, J.W. (1999). A five-year study of upward feedback: What managers do with their results matters. *Personnel Psychology*, 52(2), 393-424.

360° feedback and the end of illusions. A practitioner's perspective

François Berthiaume, M.Ps.
Partner, Raymond Chabot Grant Thornton

About twenty years ago, people thought that in order to be successful in life, you had to be daring, bilingual, be good at golf and get along well with your boss. Many people thought that those competencies were enough to achieve their professional goals. Their best strategy: Never admit any weakness or mistake.

North American culture has put a huge emphasis in the past decade on results orientation, intellectual abilities and autonomy as determinants of success. Much less attention was given to other competencies, whose importance we now recognize, such as self-awareness, adaptation to the environment, team work or motivating others.

The introduction of 360° feedback represents the end of a myth- the myth of being perfect if objectives are met. It proposes a more realistic paradigm: everyone has a certain number of strengths and should improve some aspects of their behaviour.

When an organization decides to measure not only results, but also the way they are to be achieved, 360° feedback represents a powerful tool, because it allows individuals to measure and manage their impact, to reach a better fit between their behaviours and their job requirements. In fact, it allows one to adjust in a dynamic way to changes in their work environment. 360° feedback allows adjustments to the status quo before it is too late.

Some will say that, from a psychometric point of view, the validity of 360° feedback is biased by the intentions of respondents and is of little value:

- Some people might obtain inflated results because their evaluators do not consider them able to hear the truth.
- Some might have average results because they are not well-known by the rater.
- Others might have low results due to revenge and do not deserve such radical treatment.

From a practical point of view, even a biased result deserves to be considered. In any case, reality can't be defined by any other way than how we perceive it. If I am wrongly perceived as a bad team player, it is my responsibility to correct those perceptions by adopting expected positive behaviours. Contrary to classical performance evaluation, whose goal is often only to assess performance, 360° feedback aims at improving it.

In fact, 360° feedback allows one to focus and adjust to a rapidly changing environment. It also helps to develop self-awareness and to stimulate workers to commit to a continuous improvement process by enticing them to reflect upon what they do well and what they could improve upon.

360° feedback has been used in organizations for some time now. However, its usage on a large-scale basis is more recent. As in all learning processes, a few mistakes are commonly made in such contexts. Among the most frequent are:

- Implementing it too slowly, thus reinforcing resistance to change. No change can be made if we wait until all members of an organization are ready–people need to be pulled out of their comfort zones.
- Putting too much emphasis on confidentiality of results. People in the environment already know what one's development needs are. It is important that one receives support in developing these areas.
- Some managers have a tendency to impose 360° feedback on their employees without participating themselves, which creates mistrust instead of the openness necessary for improvement.
- Linking promotions or layoffs to results of the 360° feedback, since it encourages respondents to bias results.
- Using 360° feedback to measure individual performance–performance is not a popularity contest.

A winning strategy in 360° feedback is, according to us, integrating it in a complete performance management system simultaneously using:

- Specific indicators for measuring performance results.
- 360° feedback to measure P-E fit.
- Training and development tools for helping and stimulating employees in their development process.
- A relationship between competency improvement and salary progression. The global competency profile is a better predictor of long term performance than achievement of short-term, punctual goals.

Sadly, few organizations can brag that they integrate these four principles in a coherent process and there is still a long way to go in this regard.

When 360° feedback was introduced, many thought it was simply one more management fad that would last just a few years. Our experience shows, however, that it is an interesting tool for change and improvement, for individuals as well as organizations. More I-O psychologists should devote attention to it, as a practical tool or as a research field.

CONTROVERSIAL CORNER: IS THE SCIENTIST-PRACTITIONER MODEL DEAD OR JUST HIBERNATING FOR THE WINTER?

Vic Catano, Ph.D., St. Mary's University

We commonly accept the "scientist-practitioner" model as the basis for training in industrial and organizational psychology. We expect I-O psychologists to develop new knowledge as well as to apply new and existing knowledge to the solution of "real world" problems. We expect that both the development and the application of knowledge be based on empirical evidence rather than "gut feelings" or "intuition". We expect scientists to be concerned with "real world" problems as we expect practitioners to apply solutions that have a solid "scientific" grounding.

So much for the ideal! After reading the commentaries by Gary Johns (1998) and Marc Berwald (1998) in the recent Canadian Psychology special issue on I-O psychology, one can't help but wonder whether the scientist-practitioner model is working. Both commentaries made the point that we need to do more to ensure that the results of I-O research are applied in organizations and that our research addresses the human resource needs of organizations. These commentaries suggest that we, as a discipline, are more concerned with science than with its application. There is additional evidence for the failure of the scientist-practitioner model that was not presented in those two commentaries. How do we ensure that practitioners will apply only that knowledge which has a solid scientific basis?

As a case in point, consider the widespread acceptance of competency-based selection and performance systems by human resource practitioners. Increasingly, organizations have followed Lawler and Ledford's (1992; Lawler, 1994) suggestion to move away from a focus on jobs to a focus on individuals and the competencies they possess. Many organizations have developed competency profiles for their employees. These are generally broken down into "core competencies", which are related to the organization's mission or goals and which are expected to be found in all employees, and "specific (or functional) competencies", which are related to success in a given position. Many consulting firms and organizations have developed "competency dictionaries" to help identify requisite competencies. We have consultants and practitioners offering training seminars to other practitioners on how to identify competencies and on how to develop competency based selection and performance systems. Competency-based systems are "hot".

If you examine the I-O and HR literature, you will discover a few distressing facts. First, there is no agreed upon definition of what constitutes a "competency". Second, there is no agreed upon methodology for identifying competencies (and the methods that do exist may lead to very different outcomes). Third, with a handful of exceptions, there has not been any research that has critically examined the bottom-line effectiveness of job-based vs. competency–based systems or which validates competency-job performance relationships. The validity and superior performance of competency-based systems seems to have been accepted by practitioners without benefit of research. Existing competency-based research appears limited to identifying competencies related to either occupations or professions or to demonstrating methodologies used to identify competencies. Klein (1996) called for empirical research on the reliability and validity of competency-based systems to avoid litigation. That call does not appear to have been taken up by either scientists or practitioners.

My point here is not to attack competency-based systems but to illustrate another failing in the scientist-practitioner model. We not only have scientists, according to Johns and Berwald, who may not be producing research that has any real-world application, but we also have practitioners who are applying solutions which may not have any empirical support. How do we foster greater communication between I-O scientists and I-O practitioners? We may change our graduate programs to develop respect for the scientist-practitioner model among our students, but how do we maintain that respect once scientists must confront the demands of tenure and grant applications and practitioners must find immediate solutions for their clients' problems?

I don't have any answers. Perhaps we need to discuss mechanisms which would allow greater interaction between scientists (most of whom are located in academia) and practitioners. Some of these mechanisms might include temporary job exchanges between scientists and practitioners, more research carried out by practitioners (and publication of that research in academic journals), more involvement of academics in consulting work, and more roundtables at professional meetings where scientists and practitioners may explore topics from their different perspectives. These are only a few suggestions; you probably have already thought of quite a few more. We do have to come up with solutions or we will begin to see ourselves as two distinct groups to the detriment of our profession.

Berwald, M.C.A. (1998). The challenge of profound transformation for industrial and organizational psychologists: Are we meeting the challenge. *Canadian Psychology, 39*, 158-163.

Johns, G. (1998). The nature of work, the context of organizational behaviour, and the application of industrial-organizational psychology. *Canadian Psychology, 39*, 149-157.

Klein, A.L. (1996). Validity and reliability for competency-based systems: Reducing litigation risks. *Compensation and Benefits Review, 28*, 31-37.

Lawler, E.E. (1994). From job based to competency based organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,15*, 3-15.

Lawler, E.E. & Ledford, G.E. (1992). A skill-based approach to human resource management. *European Management Journal, 10*, 383-391.

AN I-O PSYCHOLOGIST'S JOURNEY TO THE PRESIDENCY OF CPA

Gary Latham, Ph.D. University of Toronto

Background

Upon graduating from Dalhousie in 1967, I went to the US to pursue graduate work in I-O Psychology. There was no opportunity, to my knowledge, to obtain a Ph.D. in our discipline at that time in Canada. My mentor at Dalhousie, H. D. (Ace) Beach kept a watchful eye on me through my masters program at Georgia Tech, my two years as staff psychologist with the American Pulpwood Association, and my two years working toward my Ph.D. from the University of Akron. In 1973, Ace was at the University of Victoria when I was hired as Weyerhaeuser Company's first staff psychologist. Only a half-hour away from one another by plane, he invited me to conduct a workshop on the critical incident technique at CPA, and in addition, to present the results of my doctoral dissertation. I did so in 1974, the year that he and psychologists such as Jean Pettifor were forming the applied division. When I complained that I saw no I-O psychologists, Ace responded that there is a reciprocal effect between environment and behavior, i.e., "do something about it".

Bob Haccoun (then Bell Canada, now University of Montreal) was at Ohio State when I was at Akron. We knew one another through the friendship among our respective mentors, Milt Hackel, Gary Yukl and Ken Wexley. Haccoun had unlimited use of Bell's telephone lines. We were aware of the Public Service Commission's psychologists in Ottawa, especially Ken Grant and Len Slivinski as well as their journal, Studies in Personnel Psychology.

In 1975, CPA met in Quebec City. Bob Haccoun, Ken Grant, Ron Burke, John Tivendell, and I formed the I-O interest group. I was named Chair. We agreed to read the journals for any papers that had I-O content where the author was in Canada, and to subsequently cajole that person to join us via Bell's telephone. In 1976, CPA met in Toronto. Among the I-O participants were Pat Rowe (Waterloo), Lorne Kendall (SFU), Bob Adams (SFU), and Bob Morrison (then Toronto, later US Naval Research). I-O was fully under way. I served a second and final year as the interest group's Chair.

CPA Board

In 1990, I returned to Canada to accept an endowed chair at the University of Toronto. In 1993 Rick Hackett asked if I would be willing to be nominated for a seat on the CPA Board. In 1994 I joined the Board with Jean Pettifor as our President. Each board member had a portfolio. She assigned me responsibility for the annual convention to be held in PEI in 1995.

A possible metaphor for psychology in the 20th century can be found in a sentence that made the Smothers Brothers millions of dollars. Gary Johns and I saw them perform in Las Vegas. They used no four letter words nor sexual innuendoes in their act. For 90 minutes the crowd laughed hilariously to the accusation that "mom always liked you best". To the present day, the scientists from universities in Canada believe that the health care practitioners dominate CPA; the health care practitioners feel in their heart of hearts that CPA exists only for the scientists. What I, as an I-O psychologist, brought to the Board was a belief in the scientist-practitioner model. A belief that science is meaningless if it never has any bearing on practice; and practice is not well informed if it is not based on science. As the convention chair, as an I-O psychologist, I had as my goal to take concrete action steps to ensure that the chair of scientific affairs, the chair of professional affairs, and the respective section chairs walked away believing that they were loved by Mom, that the CPA convention was their convention, that CPA enhances both the science and practice of psychology. Is there a better model than I-O psychology?

I know of none. David Evans the CPA President who followed Jean, asked me to be the convention chair for the following year in Toronto. I did so for a second, and gratefully a final time.

The next year Janel Gautier served as President. He asked me, as an I-O psychologist to assist the Board on strategic planning and goal setting. Among Janel's goals was to hold a conference of 50 leading psychologists to discuss ways to get the Federal government to understand what psychology can contribute to Canada as a society. Among these 50 scholars was Pat Rowe.

Because of my teambuilding skills as an I-O Psychologist, Janel asked me if I would be the facilitator of this three-day conference in Aylmer, Quebec in 1997. Getting three distinct and at times, hostile, camps (neuroscientists, health practitioners, social/development psychologists) to think, feel, and behave on behalf of psychology as opposed to their respective disciplines was among the most difficult assignments I have tackled. It was at the conclusion of Aylmer that it was suggested that I run for the Presidency of CPA. Until that weekend the thought had never occurred to me to do so because as an I-O psychologist I am not involved in health care disputes and I have no desire to become knowledgeable of neuroscience.

The Presidency
I won the election. I won, I believe, because our colleagues see I-O psychology as having an appreciation of them, namely science and practice.

As I write this article in January 2000, I am in the middle of my presidency, having served a year as President Elect. To paraphrase Kurt Lewin, there is nothing so practical as a good theory. Three theories have thus far served me extremely well as President. Based on goal setting theory, specific, difficult goals have been sent for each Board member. We will issue a report card on goal attainment in Psynopsis. Social Cognitive theory has provided ways of increasing Board member efficacy that the goals can be attained. Finally, organizational justice theory has been exceedingly helpful, and very well embraced by the Board. It educated the Board on the importance of procedural justice relative to distributive justice. It has driven home the importance of voice. It has driven home to our colleagues the importance of I-O psychology research for science and practice.

NEWS FLASH

Québécois may currently become a registered psychologist if they are bearers of a Masters degree in psychology. However, in November 1999 the office of The Order of Quebec Psychologists (l'Ordre des psychologues du Québec) decided unanimously that in the future, a Ph.D. would be required. This decision does not take effect immediately, however, and must be ratified by the Office of Professions as well as the provincial government.

CONFERENCE ANNOUNCEMENT

The National Training Conference of the International Personnel Management Association - Canada will be held May 14-17, 2000 in Edmonton, Alberta at the beautiful and historic Hotel Macdonald overlooking the North Saskatchewan river. The conference theme is that of "Reaping Human Dividends: Realizing Your Organization's Wealth", geared towards putting the "human" back in human resources. Keynote speakers include: Dr. Barbara Moses, David Irvine, Gordon Collins, James E. Dixon, and Ben Wicks. For more information, please contact Loverne Gretsinger, Registration Committee Chair, by email at loverne.gretsinger@ualberta.ca or by phone at (780) 492-8165.

JOB OPPORTUNITY AT LAURENTIAN UNIVERSITY

The Department of Psychology Laurentian University is seeking to fill one tenure-track position in Industrial/Organizational Psychology at the Assistant Professor level to begin July 1, 2000. The successful candidate must have a Ph.D. Any area of Industrial/Organizational Psychology will be considered. In addition to Industrial Psychology, the candidate ideally would be expected to teach personality. Candidates with a problem-solving orientation are particularly encouraged to apply. We are seeking an individual committed to excellence in undergraduate teaching and to scholarly activity. Opportunity exists to participate in a Master's program in Human Development. The department website can be accessed at www.laurentian.ca. Send applications, a curriculum vitae, and three letters of reference to: Dr. Elizabeth Levin, Psychology Department, Laurentian University, Sudbury, Ontario, P3E 2C6. Competition deadline February 15, 2000. In accordance with the University's Policy on Bilingualism, Laurentian has a requirement of passive bilingualism (French/English) as a condition of tenure. Laurentian is committed to equity in employment and encourages applications from all qualified applicants, including women, aboriginal peoples, members of visible minorities and persons with disabilities. In accordance with Canadian Immigration requirements, this advertisement is directed to Canadian citizens and permanent residents of Canada. If suitable Canadian citizens and permanent residents cannot be found, international applicants will be considered.

JOB OPPORTUNITY AT GCORI

Executive Director Position Available

The Guelph Centre for Organizational Research Inc. (GCORI) is seeking applications for the position of Executive Director effective immediately.

Reporting to the Board of Directors, The Executive Director is expected to:

- market and sell GCORI consulting services
- coordinate and manage a range of consulting projects
- supervise and engage in the professional development of research consultants and staff
- develop budgets and business plans and maintain financial controls

The successful candidate must have a willingness to:

- sell research consulting services to business, industry and government
- accept responsibility for generating revenue for GCORI

We are looking for an individual with a graduate degree in Industrial/Organizational Psychology or other appropriate discipline and relevant consulting experience.

Compensation package to be negotiated, but will be primarily commission-based.

Please submit a detailed CV by Friday, April 28, 2000 to:
Dr. Steven F. Cronshaw, Chair, GCORI Board of Directors,
402 - 304 Stone Road West, Unit 3
Guelph, Ontario N1G 4W4
Fax: (519) 767-2613
Tel: (519) 824-4120, Ext. 5072
Email: GCORIED@psylab.css.uoguelph.ca

Sponsored by: **Société Pierre Boucher, Industrial Psychology Inc.**
1-800-798-1022 or serviceclients@spb.ca

JOB OPPORTUNITIES AT SOCIÉTÉ PIERRE BOUCHER

Business Psychologist, Organizational Performance Division – Ref. OP

As a specialist in human behaviour in organizational settings, you will be expected to, in partnership with our clients, intervene in the following sectors: organizational diagnosis, change management, team orientation, improvement and implementation of human resource processes, and organizational culture analysis in development, merger or acquisition situations.

To succeed within our Organizational Performance team, you will need the following key abilities: a solid background in the intervention contexts described above, are an effective communicator in English and French, be familiar with modern quantitative analysis methods, have a cognitive style that enables you to grasp the main elements of a problem quickly and to propose ingenious solutions, have good business sense, are an effective team collaborator and distinguish yourself through your leadership.

Business Psychologist, Individual Performance Division – Ref. IP

Your first responsibility will be to advise clients with respect to acquiring and retaining human assets. Your work will consist mainly of acting as a management selection expert and helping clients select future managers by conducting managerial assessments. You will also be asked to assist in the personal development of managers by establishing development plans that clearly specify the direction to be taken in order to optimize their contribution to the workplace.

You are known for your efficiency, your team spirit, your professionalism when working with a demanding clientele and finally, you are a member of, or are admissible to, the Ordre des Psychologues du Québec.

Our corporate culture

Société Pierre Boucher, Industrial Psychology Inc. has earned a solid reputation in the sector of management potential appraisals, as well as in the improvement of human performance in organizational contexts.

Our primary goal is to optimize human capital performance in organizational contexts.

Our values such as rapidity, personalized relationships, professionalism in our dealings, a rigorous approach and leading-edge tools have helped set us apart from other firms, and have allowed us to establish solid partnerships with our clients.

We also have the goal of being the employer of choice by providing members of our community with the work conditions necessary for professional fulfillment. Our internal climate encourages a feeling of community where professional autonomy, respect, camaraderie, innovation, learning and team spirit are fostered.

If one of these challenges interests you, please forward your resume by email to the following address: cbellerose@spb.ca.

1999-2000 CSIOP EXECUTIVE

Dr. Gary Johns, Chair
Department of Management
Concordia University
1455 de Maisonneuve Blvd. West
Montreal, QC H3G 1M8
garyj@vax2.concordia.ca
(514) 848-2914

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

Dr. Lorne Sulsky, Past Chair
Department of Psychology
University of Calgary
2500 University Drive NW
Calgary, AB T2N 1N4
lmsulsky@ucalgary.ca
(403) 220-5050

Dr. Yvonne Sell,
Communications Coordinator
Deloitte & Touche
2400 Scotia Centre, 700-2nd St. SW
Calgary, AB T2P 0S7
ysell@dttus.com
(403) 267-1793

Dr. John Meyer, Chair-Elect
Department of Psychology
University of Western Ontario
London, ON N6A 5C2
meyer@julian.uwo.ca
(519) 661-2111 x 84640

Martin Royal,
Student Representative
Department of Psychology
Saint Mary's University
Halifax, NS B3H 3C3
mroyal@apexmail.com
(902) 496-8759

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

Dr. Marjory Kerr,
Workshop Coordinator
Ellis Associates
2025 Sheppard Ave E. Suite 4409
Willowdale, ON M2J 1V6
mkerr@wwonline.com
(416) 491-8385

Dr. Stephane Brutus,
Program Coordinator
Department of Management
Concordia University
1455 de Maisonneuve Blvd. West
Montreal, QC H3G 1M8
brutus@vax2.concordia.ca
(514) 848-2912

Kimberlea Baron,
Newsletter Editor
Société Pierre Boucher
375 Roland-Therrien Blvd., Suite 501
Longueuil, QC J4H 4A6
baronk@cirano.umontreal.ca
(450) 646-1022