✦CSIOP

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 18, Number 2   **January 2002**

CONTENTS

COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR
Ramona Bobocel, PhD
University of Waterloo

All the best to everyone for 2002!

The start of a new year symbolizes the opportunity for growth and development, and on that note I would like to bring your attention to an upcoming change in the way that we deliver this newsletter to you. Over the last two years, members have increasingly requested electronic delivery of our newsletter. After discussing the issues at both last year's Long

Range Planning meeting as well as at the past two General Meetings (at CPA), we will, by popular demand, begin electronic delivery of the newsletter for the next—April—issue. In her column in this issue, Lori Francis provides more details on the move to electronic delivery and the information we need from you to accomplish a smooth transition. We hope that you will bear with us in the event of any unforeseen short-term complications that arise as we rocket into cyberspace....

Thanks are extended to the Department of Psychology at Saint Mary's University for generously sponsoring this issue of the newsletter.

And now for other announcements. The CSIOP Executive Committee will be meeting in Waterloo in early March for our annual Long Range Planning meeting. If you have questions, concerns, or issues that you would like to have appear on our agenda, please contact the relevant Executive member (see the back of this newsletter for a listing of members) or me.

Remember that CSIOP will be a presence at SIOP this April in Toronto. Arla Day has devoted many hours to increasing our visibility at SIOP and in her column directs your attention to several events she and others have

been working on. Similarly, plans for the CSIOP program at the annual CPA meeting in Vancouver (in June) are shaping up nicely—see Shaun's and Laurie's columns for more on this. We hope to see you at both venues.

Over the last several years, I have read very interesting and informative commentaries in the *Newsletter* by members of CSIOP reflecting on the current state and future of I/O psychology in general and in Canada in particular. It is clear that the mandate of I/O psychology is both important and daunting. As John Meyer aptly concluded in his April 2001 column, there is great diversity within the field of I/O psychology in how we strive to realize that mandate. John made the compelling argument that to succeed as a field we need to embrace this diversity in our approaches. In the remainder of this column, I would like to echo this sentiment and briefly expand on it within one particular context.

One sometimes hears the view expressed within I/O psychology that lab-based research has very limited value in our sub-discipline. I find this view surprising for at least three reasons that come to mind immediately. [Note that there are many excellent and more thorough discussions of this and related issues in the published literature, such as Locke's 1986 edited book: *Generalizing from laboratory to field settings* and Sackett & Larson's (1990) chapter 8 in Vol. 1 of the *Handbook of I/O Psychology*.]

First, good lab-based research is useful for generating and developing theory about the problems that people face in the workplace. Indeed, some of the theories currently viewed as among the more important in our field were initially generated and developed in the lab. As a case in point, I will refer to the area of research with which I am most familiar— organizational justice—in particular, the finding that people's perceptions of fairness are influenced not only by what they receive from authorities (i.e., the outcomes of allocation decisions) but also by how allocation decisions

are made (i.e., the process by which outcomes are allocated). The first systematic conceptual work and empirical demonstrations of the independence of people's concerns with process and outcomes were made by Thibaut and Walker and their colleagues in lab simulations of the courtroom using student samples. We have gained tremendously as a field by applying the basic findings on procedural justice to the workplace, and in doing so we better understand many important workplace phenomena.

Second, there is a great potential for insights to be gained from thinking about how lab findings translate in organizations—and why they might not. As one illustration, this process may lead to the identification of important moderating variables or new processes and mechanisms not previously understood. For example, in applying research on procedural justice to organizational settings (and to other field settings), it has become increasingly evident that people's sense of injustice can be strongly influenced by the quality of interpersonal treatment that they receive from authorities. Such findings not only have direct practical value, but also have helped in building theory about justice in work settings. Of course, some of the new processes and mechanisms that are highlighted by translating basic findings to the organizational context may be best probed further in the lab prior to another field cycle. As Jerry Greenberg illustrated in his keynote address at CPA last year, there can be and should be an interactive relation between lab and field research.

Third, when the results of lab and field research converge, this provides compelling evidence for the hypothesized relations among variables. Given that each of the tools in our methodology "toolkit" is imperfect in itself, it is highly desirable when we, as a field, can demonstrate convergence in findings using multiple methodologies. The validity of our practical interventions hinges on the validity of our

empirical findings, which in turn hinge on the quality of our theories.

I am definitely not saying that we need less field-based research! On the contrary, we need far more good field-based research. And, to be clear, I am certainly not saying that lab study is always appropriate. There are many questions in I/O psychology for which lab study is inappropriate. Clearly, one's research method should be determined by the research question at hand. In many cases, this will involve studying the problem in the field. But in many other cases, it will mean taking the problem to the lab. There is a need and a place for both approaches. This is but one area where the diversity in approaches that characterize I/O psychology can only help us to achieve our common mandate.

And now, back to the lab/field!

I look forward to seeing you all in Toronto in a few months. And keep in mind that, as always, letters to the Editor are welcome.

MOT DE LA PRÉSIDENTE
Ramona Bobocel, Ph. D., Université de Waterloo (Translated by Kathleen Boies, MA, University of Western Ontario)

Meilleurs voeux à tous pour l'année 2002! Le début de l'année représente une occasion de se développer et de grandir. À ce sujet, j'aimerais attirer votre attention sur un changement imminent dans la façon dont ce bulletin vous sera distribué. Ces deux dernières années, de plus en plus de membres ont demandé la transmission électronique de notre bulletin. Après avoir discuté de ces questions à la réunion sur la planification à long terme ainsi qu'aux deux assemblées générales (à la SCP), nous commencerons à distribuer électroniquement, à la demande populaire, le prochain bulletin (celui d'avril). Dans sa chronique, Lori Francis présente plus de détails sur cette transmission électronique ainsi que sur l'information dont nous aurons besoin afin

d'effectuer la transition sans problèmes. Nous espérons pouvoir compter sur votre patience si des problèmes mineurs devaient survenir pendant notre transition dans le cyberespace. Je tiens également à remercier le département de psychologie de Saint Mary's University, pour leur généreuse contribution à cette édition du bulletin.

Maintenant, d'autres nouvelles. Le comité exécutif de CSIOP se rencontrera à Waterloo, au début mars, pour notre réunion annuelle de planification à long terme. Si vous avez des questions, préoccupations ou commentaires que vous aimeriez voir apparaître à notre ordre du jour, veuillez contacter le ou la membre du comité exécutif responsable (vous trouverez une liste des membres au verso de ce bulletin) ou moi-même.

Rappelez-vous que CSIOP sera présente à SIOP en avril à Toronto. Arla Day a consacré plusieurs heures afin d'augmenter notre visibilité à SIOP et, dans sa chronique, attire votre attention sur plusieurs événements auxquels elle et d'autres personnes ont contribué. De plus, les plans pour CSIOP à la rencontre annuelle de la SCP à Vancouver (en juin) s'annoncent bien. Veuillez lire les chroniques de Shaun et Laurie pour en savoir plus. Nous espérons vous voir à ces deux rencontres.

Ces dernières années, j'ai eu l'occasion de lire des commentaires intéressants et instructifs dans le *Bulletin*, écrits par des membres de CSIOP réfléchissant sur l'état actuel et futur de la psychologie I/O en général, et au Canada en particulier. Il est évident que le mandat de la psychologie I/O est important et considérable. Comme John Meyer l'a judicieusement conclu dans sa chronique d'avril 2001, il existe, à l'intérieur de la psychologie I/O, une grande diversité dans la façon d'accomplir notre mandat. John concluait que pour que notre domaine connaisse du succès, nous devons encourager cette diversité dans nos approches. Le reste de cette chronique se veut donc le

reflet de ce sentiment et l'illustre brièvement dans un contexte particulier.

Il nous est souvent donné d'entendre que les recherches en laboratoire ont très peu de valeur en psychologie I/O. Je trouve cette opinion étonnante pour au moins trois raisons. [Veuillez noter qu=il existe plusieurs discussions, excellentes et plus complètes, portant sur ce sujet et des sujets similaires dans la littérature actuelle, comme le livre édité par Locke (1986): *Generalizing from Laboratory to Field Settings* et le chapitre 8 dans le volume 1 du *Handbook of I/O Psychology*, par Sackett et Larson (1990).]

D'abord, une bonne étude en laboratoire est utile afin de générer et d'élaborer des théories portant sur les problèmes auxquels sont confrontés les gens dans leur lieu de travail. En effet, certaines des théories les plus importantes de notre domaine ont d'abord été élaborées en laboratoire. Afin d'illustrer cet argument, je me référerai à un domaine de recherche que je connais bien - la justice organisationnelle - et plus spécifiquement, au fait que les perceptions de justice sont influencées non seulement par les bénéfices octroyés aux employés par les personnes en position d'autorité (les bénéfices résultant des décisions en matière de distribution) mais également par la façon dont ces décisions sont prises (le processus de distribution des bénéfices). Thibault, Walker et leurs collègues, par des simulations de tribunaux et l'utilisation d'échantillons composés d'étudiants, ont démontré empiriquement pour la première fois l'indépendance de la perception des bénéfices et des processus, et ont présenté le premier travail conceptuel systématique sur le sujet. Nous avons bénéficié grandement de l'application des résultats sur la recherche en matière de justice de procédure dans les organisations, et par conséquent, nous avons maintenant une meilleure compréhension de plusieurs phénomènes organisationnels importants.

Deuxièmement, le fait de penser à la façon dont les résultats d'études en laboratoire pourraient se traduire - ou non - dans les organisations peut nous éclairer de plusieurs façons. Ce processus peut conduire à l'identification de variables modératrices importantes ou de nouveaux processus ou mécanismes que l'on ne comprenait pas jusqu'alors. Par exemple, en appliquant les recherche sur la justice de procédure aux organisations (et à d'autres milieux), il est devenu évident que la qualité des interactions entre les employés et les personnes en position d'autorité peut influencer fortement les perceptions d'injustice des employés. De tels résultats sont non seulement importants au point de vue pratique, mais ont également contribué à l'élaboration de théories sur la justice dans les organisations. À l'évidence, il est souvent nécessaire, avant d'entreprendre un nouveau cycle de recherche sur le terrain, de soumettre à un examen plus approfondi en laboratoire certains des nouveaux processus et mécanismes résultant de la traduction de résultats provenant de recherches fondamentales au contexte organisationnel. Comme Jerry Greenberg l'a dit dans son discours d'ouverture au congrès de la SCP l'année dernière, l'interaction entre la recherche en laboratoire et sur le terrain est non seulement possible mais souhaitable.

Troisièmement, lorsque les résultats d'études en laboratoire et sur le terrain convergent, cela soutient de façon convaincante les hypothèses concernant les relations entre les variables. Étant donné que chaque outil dont nous disposons dans notre boîte à outils méthodologiques est imparfait, il devient important, pour notre domaine, de démontrer la convergence de résultats provenant de différentes méthodologies. La validité de nos interventions pratiques repose sur la validité de nos résultats empiriques, elle-même dépendant de la qualité de nos théories.
Mon but n'est pas d'affirmer que nous avons moins besoin de recherches sur le terrain! Au contraire, nous avons davantage besoin de bonnes recherches en milieux pratiques. De

plus, pour être bien claire, je ne dis pas que les études en laboratoire représentent toujours la meilleure approche. Plusieurs questions en psychologie I/O ne peuvent être étudiées en laboratoire. La méthode de recherche devrait donc être guidée par la question de recherche. Dans plusieurs cas, des recherches sur le terrain seront plus appropriées. Dans plusieurs autres cas, cependant, des études en laboratoire seront également pertinentes. Il existe un besoin et une place pour ces deux approches. La méthodologie représente l'un des domaines où la diversité dans les approches caractérisant la psychologie I/O peut contribuer à l=atteinte de notre but commun.

Et maintenant, retournons au lab/terrain!

J'ai hâte de vous voir à Toronto dans quelques mois. Et rappelez-vous que, comme toujours, les lettres à la rédactrice en chef sont bienvenues.

CONFERENCE NEWS
Shaun Newsome, PhD, Program Coordinator
Newsome Associates

The 2002 CPA conference is drawing closer, all submissions have been reviewed, and CPA is working on the final schedule of events. For the most part, our program is now complete. I would like to thank all of this year's reviewers. Based on the submissions we have seen, this year's program promises to be another informative one.

We are especially excited that Dr. Bruce Avolio will be this year's Keynote speaker. Dr. Avolio is Co-Director of the Global Center for Leadership Studies, State University of New York at Binghamton. He is currently transitioning to the Donald and Shirley Clifton Chair in Leadership at the University of Nebraska in the College of Business Administration. Professor Avolio has an international reputation as a researcher in leadership having published over 80 articles and book chapters. He consults with an

increasingly large number of organizations in the North America, South America, Africa, Europe, Southeast Asia, Australia, New Zealand and Israel. His research and consulting includes work with the militaries of the United States, Singapore, Sweden, Finland, Israel, South Africa, and Europe. The title of his talk is "How Advanced Information Technology Mediates Leadership: Disruption, Corruption or Enablement?" CSIOP is very appreciative of the financial support provided by the Canadian Forces Leadership Institute for this year's keynote speaker.

Dr. Linda Scratchley will be facilitating our Saturday morning program. She is the Chief Psychologist with HR Decisions Ltd./HRD Technologies Inc., of Vancouver, B.C. Her work focuses on the development, validation, and application of assessment instruments for selection, promotion, career development and performance review. The title of her presentation is 'Building to Last: Assessing Human Capital from Janitor to CEO'. In the talk, Linda will be describing an integrated approach to HR assessment. Thanks to Dan Skarlicki from UBC for making the initial contact with Linda.

Dr. Chuck Evans of Jackson Leadership Systems will be presenting a full day workshop entitled *Organizational Change and Leadership: Developing Skills for Leaders.* This workshop, designed for HR and I/O practitioners, researchers and consultants, will take place on May 29, 2002. Further details and registration information can be found in the workshop announcement printed in this issue of the newsletter. Thanks to Peter Hausdorf for his efforts in organizing the workshop.

We hope to see you all at the CPA conference.

THE RHR KENDALL AWARD: Call for Papers

Capt. John Johnson
Royal Military College

The Canadian Society for Industrial Organizational Psychology in collaboration with RHR is sponsoring the RHR Kendall Award, our annual competition to recognize outstanding papers by undergraduate and graduate CSIOP student members. The winner of this award will receive a prize of $250. The award is named in honour of Dr. Lorne Kendall, a Canadian psychologist and member of CPA whose work on job satisfaction and various psychometric issues contributed greatly to the field of I/ O Psychology.

All papers, posters, and presentations accepted in any part of the program of the annual convention of CPA submitted by graduate or undergraduate students are eligible. The work must have been carried out by a student, but may be part of a larger research program directed by someone else. The student must also be first author on the paper submitted.

Submissions will be judged by the following criteria: (a) Quality of conceptual background, (b) Clarity of problem definition, (c) Methodological rigour, (d) Appropriateness of interpretations/ conclusion, (e) Clarity of presentation. Criteria (c) is omitted for theoretical and review papers. Papers will be reviewed anonymously by three CSIOP members representing both industry and academia.

Entrants must provide a letter from a faculty member certifying that the paper was written by a student. Entrants should submit four copies of an article-length paper. The name of the author(s) should appear only on the title page of the paper. The title page should also show the authors' affiliations, mailing addresses, and telephone numbers. Papers are limited to 12 double-spaced pages, including title page, abstract, tables, figures, notes, and references. Papers should be prepared according to current edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association. Entries (accompanied by letters from the faculty members) must be received by April 29, 2002. Winning papers will be announced at the Conference in Vancouver. Entries should be submitted to: RHR Kendall Award Committee, C/O Lorne Sulsky, PhD, University of Calgary Department of Psychology, 2500 University Drive, NW, T2N 1N4.

MEMBERSHIP REPORT
Veronica Stinson, PhD
Saint Mary's University

Our CSIOP membership has increased by 2 to a total of 298 members: 176 non-students, 93 students, and 29 Associates. If you haven't renewed your membership, please contact CPA (for full or student memberships) or me for an associate membership. We'd like to increase our membership, so if you know of anyone with I/O interests who aren't members of CSIOP, please encourage them to contact me at veronica.stinson@stmarys.ca. Below you'll find a list of our new members and some changes in contact information.

Welcome to our new members!

CPA Full Members:

Dr. John Lavery, 210-50 South Forster Park Dr., Oakville, ON L6K 1Y8
Beatrice Lawrence, Hayman, Souliere & Lawrence Consulting & Psychotherapy, 306 - 383 Parkdale Ave., Ottawa, ON K1Y 4R4
Richard Locas, 9042 Andre-Grasset, Montreal, QC H2M 2B3; Tel: *514-737-4717*; richard.locas@sympatico.ca
Dr. Phanikiran Radhakrishnan, 148 Ellsworth Ave., Toronto, ON M5G 2K6; Tel: 416-287-7338.

New CSIOP Associate members:

Dr. Lisa Keeping, School of Business & Economics, Wilfrid Laurier University, 75 University Avenue W., Waterloo, ON N2L 3C5; O: 519-884-0710 x 2555; lkeeping@wlu.ca
Chris Hartley, 357 East River Road, New Glasgow, NS B2H 3P8; Tel: 902-755-0202; sc.hartley@ns.sympatico.ca

Changes in contact information:
Kate Charles, Tel: 613-991-0939; Fax: 613-954-3733; email: kate.charles@nrc.ca; F
Henry Hornstein, Assistant Professor, Applied Human Sciences, Concordia University, 7141 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, QC H4B 1R6; Tel: 514-848-2259; Fax: 514-848-4200; henryh@alcor.concordia.ca; F
Kenneth Howard, Tel: 204-669-5360, e-mail: kennethhoward@shaw.ca; F
Linda Johnston, 720 Guelph Line, Suite 203, Burlington, ON L7R 4E2, *W:* 905-632-4414; F
Elizabeth Kelly, 5 Renwick Ave. Upper Apt., London, ON, N6A 3; S
Holly Livingstone, 214 Oceanview Drive, Bedford, NS, B4A 4G9; Tel: 902-475-1857; S
Deborah Miller, 55 Yarmouth St., Apt 607, Guelph, Ontario N1H 7R4; Tel: 519-824-4120 x 8931; demiller@uoguelph.ca; S
Sunjeev Prakash, 87 Manhattan Crescent, Ottawa, ON K2C 4B7; Tel: 613-761-9467 sprakash@sprint.ca; S
John M. Schiel, Tel: *780-401-2810, Fax: 780-429-0256;* shiel@wucc.ca; *F*
Sonya Smithers, 335 Moirs Mill Rd, Bedford, NS, B4A 3Y3; Tel: 478-0040; S
John Stoten, John Stoten Consulting Inc., Suite 2201-10104 103 Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0H8; Tel: 780-448-9151, Fax: 780 425 0530; email: jstoten@interbun,com;_F

CSIOP STUDENT NEWS
Laurie Barclay, BA
University of British Columbia

As we dive into a New Year, I hope that you are all settling into the new semester and all of the chaos that comes along with it. As is traditional with the start of a New Year, I've come up a few resolutions I'd like to work on to help CSIOP student members better connect with each other and to enhance the benefits associated with being a member.

The first initiative that I have been working on involves the creation of a student mailing list. I have sent an inaugural email to those students who have provided their email address to the CSIOP registry. It is my hope that the mailing list will act as a resource for students to connect with other student members who have similar interests as well as provide a means for the student representative to keep in better contact with student members. If you have not provided your email address to CSIOP or did not receive the email and would like to be added to the list, please send me an email at laurieav@interchange.ubc.ca.
A second project that I will be working on is a student-oriented event for the Vancouver conference. Any suggestions about what type of event you would like to see at the conference would be greatly appreciated.

Finally, in the September issue of the newsletter, we started our column aimed at responding to I/O students' questions and concerns. I would like to continue with this project, so please feel free to send in any questions that you are concerned about. Remember, if you are concerned about something, it's a good bet that other people share your concerns. Likewise, if you need some more information on a topic, it's likely that others are looking for the same information. Please send your questions or comments to me so that other students can benefit from the answer to your question.

Best wishes to all of you for the New Year.

THE I/O FILES: Chronicles of the paranormal in I/O Psychology
Arla Day, PhD
Saint Mary's University

Happy New Year to everyone! I hope you had a great holiday season! If you haven't already

done so, please remember to renew your CPA and CSIOP memberships.

Upcoming Conferences

CPA will be held May 30-June 1 in Vancouver. Registration information should be posted shortly at www.cpa.ca. Check Shaun's article in this newsletter for all of the details on the I/O Program.

ASAC (Administrative Sciences Association of Canada) is holding its conference on May 25-28 at the Hotel Fort Garry in Winnipeg. If you are heading to CPA from the east, leave a few days earlier and stop off in Winnipeg on you way to Vancouver! Check out their Web site: www.asac.ca.

SIOP update: The SIOP conference will be held April 12-14, 2002 at the Sheraton Centre Hotel in Toronto (the workshops start on the 11th). Of the two conference hotels, the Sheraton is sold out, but the Hilton still has availability. You can register at their Web site: www.siop.org/Registration/. CSIOP and the Military Leadership Institute in Kingston are sponsoring a guest speaker at SIOP. Robert House will talk about his Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness Research Program (GLOBE). GLOBE is a cross-cultural study of societal institutional practices and values, organizational practices and values, and leadership in 62 cultures.

CSIOP will also have a booth at SIOP. We need volunteers to help staff the booth (the time commitment is minimal). Please let me know if you will be attending SIOP and would be willing to spend an hour helping out CSIOP.

Gary Latham has organized and will chair a "Canadian All-Stars symposium" including Ron Burke, **Steve Cronshaw, Gary Johns, John Meyer,** Craig Pinder, **Pat Rowe, Dan Skarlicki, Lorne Sulsky,** and Vic Vroom. Looks interesting!"

Maria Rotundo has organized a SIOP Preconference Tour of the Skydome, which includes lunch and a ball game (see www.siop.org/tip/TipJan02/29tour.htm for details).

Congratulations TO…
…**Lorne Sulsky,** who will be the new editor of Canadian Journal of Behavioural Sciences. Lorne officially takes over January 1, 2003, but he is "in training" for the 2002 volumes.
…. I/O graduates:
Jessica Sherin, François Fillion, and **Julie Pyper** have all successfully defended their masters theses at the U of Guelph. Jessica has started her Ph.D. at Guelph. François is currently with Societe Jean Pierre Brisebois and Julie has accepted a position as a consultant at Aon in Toronto.
…**David Zweig,** who won the IAHRR (International Alliance for Human Resources Research, a group affiliated with HRPAO) award for best HR dissertation for 2001. Marie-Helene Daigle won the IAHRR award for best HR masters thesis.

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

CONTROVERSIAL CORNER: Do we need a new I/O psychology for the new economy?
E. Kevin Kelloway, PhD, Saint Mary's University.

For the last decade a variety of researchers have documented extensive changes in the way work is conducted and organized. The growth of part-time and contingent work, the erosion of job security, the need for ongoing retraining and active career management have all been identified as resulting from a variety of pressures including the increased use of technology, increased competitiveness, globalization, new modes of production and, of course, ever shrinking budgets.

Although these changes are well documented, a more recent suggestion is that we are entering (or have entered) a "new economy" wherein

8

individual and organizational knowledge have become the new gold standard. Management guru Peter Drucker has gone as far as to suggest that a firm's ability to recognize and manage organizational knowledge will be the single most important determinant of firm survival. Not surprisingly, "knowledge workers" are identified as the main players in the new economy and a great deal of attention is given to how to recruit, retain, and motivate these employees.

Paralleling this focus has been the suggestion that the existing body of knowledge we have accumulated about organizational behavior is no longer relevant. That is, the advent of knowledge work is seen as substantially rewriting the assumptions and managerial practices of the past. Proponents of this view assume that "knowledge workers" somehow represent a new breed of worker with different needs, values, and motivators than traditional workers. "New" features of employment contracts offered to some workers (e.g., signing bonuses, retention bonuses, on-site health care, laundry services etc.) are cited as examples of how employers must accommodate the demands of this new breed of workers. Similarly, the practitioner literature abounds with articles about how knowledge workers demand more autonomy and enhanced opportunities for skill development.

Although new models of human resource management are frequently called for, my reading of this literature suggests that recommendations as how to best manage "knowledge workers" are often substantially the same as those contained in the existing literature. I doubt that there is a group of "non-knowledge" workers who would not benefit from compensation, more autonomy and enhanced skill development. In framing recommendations for this "new" group of knowledge workers, I believe that we run the risk of putting "old wine in new bottles" as existing knowledge is repackaged in the language of the "new economy".

If knowledge work is truly the way of the future, then it follows that there is some benefit to understanding what knowledge work actually is and who is involved in this type of employment. At least three approaches to defining knowledge work(ers) have appeared in the literature.

Approach #1: Knowledge work as a profession
Knowledge work is most frequently defined in terms of a circumscribed list of occupations typically comprising professional occupations and those associated with information technology or high tech industries. For example, a typical definition of knowledge workers would be "a group that includes scientists, engineers, professors, attorneys, physicians, and accountants". Either explicitly or implicitly, proponents of this view see knowledge workers as a new class of workers with different motives than other workers.

This is an elitist view that finds its roots in the Tayloristic tradition of separating "thinking" and "doing" in organizations. This separation is a holdover from an earlier age that ignores the expanding role of production workers under new forms of work organization. In contrast to current models of production and organization that require the active involvement of all workers, this definition of knowledge work relegates non-professional workers to the scrap heap. Ironically, almost every major analysis of workplace change in recent years has identified increased worker participation as a central feature of the new environment

I would suggest that defining knowledge work in terms of a discrete set of occupations is a poor strategy for understanding the nature of knowledge work. Researchers who try to operationalize the construct of knowledge work in this way risk muddying the waters by focusing on a diverse and heterogeneous "category" (i.e., knowledge workers) comprising many individual subcategories (i.e., occupations).

9

Approach #2: Knowledge work as an individual characteristic

In partial recognition of these problems, some authors have begun to define knowledge workers in terms of individual characteristics as opposed to characteristics of the job. Such definitions emphasize personal qualities such as creativity and innovation. An extension of this strategy is to define knowledge workers in terms of what they contribute to the organization; i.e., the value added by employees' personal qualities.
Such a definitional strategy confounds ability and opportunity and may result in theories that simply mirror the hierarchical nature of organizations. Most organizations are designed along lines that create opportunities to contribute for some individuals and take away opportunities for others.

Approach #3: Knowledge work as an individual activity

A final and still emerging definitional strategy has been to define knowledge work in terms of the balance of "thinking" and "doing" activities. In this approach the focus is on what employees actually do in their day-to-day activities (e.g., the creation of ideas; work that entails high levels of cognitive activity; individuals who work with information to make decisions). Of course, if all work is rightly understood as knowledge work, then the category is superfluous. I would suggest that this is indeed the case and that the categorical definition of "knowledge work" and "knowledge workers" is misleading

I believe that knowledge work is best understood, not as an occupation but as a dimension of work; i.e., as a form of organizational behavior. All employees have the potential to engage in some form of knowledge work and the most appropriate focus for researchers is on the use of knowledge in the workplace. While occupations may be expected to vary in the role that knowledge plays, there is also expected to be considerable variation within occupations as individuals choose (or choose not) to use their knowledge to aid the organization.

In pursuing this line of enquiry, I do not think it useful to discredit all that we know about organizational behavior and how to enhance organizational outcomes. Indeed, the defining feature of the "new" knowledge economy may well be the increased emphasis on human resource practices in organizations. I/O psychologists are well suited to contribute to this development, but only if we move beyond the rhetoric to the development of rigorous definitions and valid measures of knowledge work.

RECENT CANADIAN LEGAL CASE:
Galbraith v. Acres International Ltd.
(Decision rendered on March 22, 2001)
Silvia Bonaccio, BA, Concordia University.

The case described in the following paragraphs concerns termination of employment. The Plaintiff, Mr. David Galbraith, was dismissed following a reorganization of work functions.

A. The Complaint
Mr. David Galbraith started working for Acres International Ltd (Acres) in 1988 as a controller with an understanding that he would replace the chief financial officer, who was nearing retirement. By 1989, Mr. Galbraith had been promoted to Vice-President of Finances of Acres. In 1997, Acres hired a team of management consultants to assist in the reorganization of the corporate officers' functions. However, the reorganization supported by Acres' President, Dr. Oskar Sigvaldason, was in reality a demotion for Mr. Galbraith. It was recommended that Mr. Galbraith take over some responsibilities that were once carried out by his subordinates and that he report to an officer hired to replace him.

B. The Evidence and the Counter-Evidence
The consultants had recommended that "fresh younger members be introduced to the

management team" (p.70). Shortly after, Dr. Sigvaldason argued for the reorganization of the officers' responsibilities. A new financial officer would be hired to take over some accounting responsibilities from Mr. Galbraith. In turn, the Plaintiff would carry out the responsibilities of treasurer and corporate secretary, two functions that were presently under his supervision. Under the new hierarchy, Mr. Galbraith would be reporting to the new financial officer, the position he presently occupied.

Through further discussions with his President, it became apparent that an underlying reason for the reorganization was to hire a younger person to perform the duties of chief financial officer. Mr. Galbraith clearly informed Dr. Sigvaldason that he thought the demotion, loss of status, as well as the freeze in salary were insulting. Furthermore, Mr. Galbraith felt unqualified to undertake the responsibilities of treasurer, since he had no experience in preparing tax returns and financial statements.

Medical reasons prompted Mr. Galbraith to leave work for three months. During his absence, a new chief financial officer was appointed. This appointment, as well as the imminent demotion, gave Mr. Galbraith reason to believe that he was dismissed. As a result, Mr. Galbraith requested to begin severance negotiations with Acres. However, Acres did not believe that Mr. Galbraith's change in duties amounted to a dismissal, thus, if he failed to come to work, it would be considered a resignation.

C. The Law
Previous cases were used to determine whether or not Mr. Galbraith had reasons to believe that he had suffered a constructive dismissal, defined as a "unilateral change in terms of [an] employee's employment" (p. 66). The evidence gathered during the hearing was sufficient proof that Mr. Galbraith had, in fact, been subjected to constructive dismissal. Although his new position would still be of an executive level, it

was obvious that its responsibilities and authority were greatly diminished.

D. The Decision
Mr. Galbraith was able to provide enough evidence to support the allegation that he had been wrongfully constructively dismissed. Moreover, there was substantial evidence that his demotion was fuelled by the desire to hire a younger executive. Mr. Galbraith was therefore allowed 18 months of severance pay, based on his annual salary, as well as the value of the company stocks he possessed.

E. Analysis
Mr. Galbraith's case is particularly interesting since company restructuring, either internal or done through mergers and acquisitions, have been a recurring theme in the last decade. I/O Psychologists are often called to work with such companies. It is therefore important, as consultants and researchers, to be sensitive to the matter of changes in job functions, as well as their repercussions on employees.

F. Reference
This case and other cases related to employment can be found in *Canadian Cases on Employment Law*. Galbraith v. Acres International Ltd. is in the Third Series, Volume 8, pages 66 to74.

THEORY & PRACTICE: LEADERSHIP

THEORY: Assessing transformational leadership with the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: More than a feeling?

Douglas J. Brown, PhD, University of Waterloo and Lisa M. Keeping, PhD, Wilfrid Laurier University

This article is an abbreviated version of a two-study manuscript that is currently in progress. The present paper contains a partial set of the analyses reported in the full manuscript. Readers interested in more details regarding this paper can contact either author: djbrown@uwaterloo.ca or lkeeping@wlu.ca. First introduced by Burns (1978) and later elaborated by Bass (1985), transformational leadership is characterized by a leader's ability to articulate a shared vision of the future, intellectually stimulate employees, and attend to individual differences in employees (Lowe et al., 1996). Most commonly, transformational leadership has been operationalized with the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (1995). According to these authors transformational leadership can be divided into five subdimensions: Idealized influence-attributed, Idealized influence-behavioral, Inspirational motivation, Intellectual stimulation, and Individualized consideration. Research with the MLQ clearly demonstrates that perceptions of transformational leadership are robustly related to a wide assortment of organizational outcomes (Bass, 1997).

Although considerable attention has been devoted to examining transformational leadership, most of this research has aimed to document the outcomes associated with transformational leadership, with little energy dedicated to understanding the construct itself (Bass, 1999). In the current research we redress this oversight by more closely scrutinizing transformational leadership, as assessed by the MLQ. Because much of the support for the efficacy of transformational leadership hinges upon subordinate-generated ratings utilizing the MLQ (Lowe et al., 1996) it is important to study the factors influencing subordinates' ratings. This issue appears particularly important given that, to a large degree, transformational leadership exists in the "eye of the beholder" (Yammarino & Dubinsky, 1994, p. 805), suggesting that raters themselves may have a profound effect on previous research findings.

To date, no work has considered possible affective influences on MLQ ratings. Theoretical and empirical data however indicate that the impact of affect may be considerable. For instance, models of impression formation suggest that perceivers automatically store information regarding the affect felt toward a target (Srull & Wyer, 1989) and that many times raters rely on these affective summaries to generate target ratings (Schwarz, 1990). Empirical data further bolsters this notion, suggesting that affect biases performance judgments (e.g., Cardy & Dobbins, 1986). Based on this research, our interest in the present paper was to assess the degree to which affect represents an important influence, both in terms of the measurement of transformational leadership and the structural relationships between it and previously established outcomes.

Method

The sample for the current study consisted of 120 individuals recruited from a large university. The sample was 33% male, with an average age of 23 years. On average, these participants worked 28.5 hours per week, had been working with their current supervisor for 12 months, and employed in their current position for 18 months.

Initially, participants completed a large mass-testing questionnaire that contained a four-item supervisory liking scale. Three days later, participants returned for a second testing session during which they completed a second booklet containing demographic items, the MLQ (Form 5x-short), job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) measures.

Results

To assess the degree to which liking influenced rater responses to the MLQ, structural equation modeling (SEM) techniques outlined by Williams and his colleagues (e.g., Williams, et al., 1996) were adopted. As a first step, a measurement model in which liking was allowed to relate to the transformational leadership items (Liking Method Model) was statistically contrasted with a model that did not allow for these relationships (Baseline Liking Model). Thus, with the exception of estimating the 20 paths between liking and the MLQ indicators, the Liking Method Model and Baseline Liking Model were the same. A chi-square difference test revealed that freely estimating the paths between liking and the indicators significantly improved the overall fit of the model, suggesting that liking accounted for significant variance in the MLQ responses ($\Delta\chi^2$=129.70, p<.05).

Although this analysis provides initial evidence for a significant liking effect at the item level, it does not test the uniformity of the effect across all items of the MLQ. To test the effect of liking on each of the items we utilized a bootstrapping procedure (Mooney & Duval, 1993). Based on this analysis 95% confidence intervals for each of the 20 MLQ items in the Liking Baseline Model were generated. We then compared factor loadings from the Liking Effect Model to ascertain whether, once liking was taken into account, these estimates fell outside the 95% confidence interval. Overall, the results of the bootstrapping analysis indicated that most factor loadings were significantly influenced by liking, suggesting that liking has a pervasive effect on responses across all five subdimensions of the MLQ.

Finally, to obtain a more straightforward picture of the overall effect of liking on the transformational leadership items, the systematic variance of each of the indicators in the Liking Method Model was partitioned. In particular, we divided the variability in each

item into a component associated with its substantive transformational leadership dimension and one associated with liking. These estimates were obtained by squaring the factor loadings from the completely standardized LISREL estimates for the 20 leadership indicators, as suggested by Williams et al. (1996). This analysis indicated that, on average, 31% of the variance in the indicators was accounted for by their relevant transformational leadership subscales (range = .13% to .57%) while 22% of the variance, on average, was accounted for by liking (range = .01% to .54%). Together, the three sets of analyses suggest that a significant amount of the variability in item responses was dependent on the degree to which a rater liked his or her superior.

In the next series of analyses we examined the extent to which liking may drive the structural relationships between transformational leadership, job satisfaction, affective commitment, and OCB. A latent variable representing transformational leadership was constructed and utilized, with the items previously reflecting each of the five subscales combined to form five four-item parcels.

As with the analyses reported previously, two models were estimated. First, a Structural Baseline Liking Model was estimated which included transformational leadership and the three outcome constructs described earlier, as well as the liking factor, which was uncorrelated with these other constructs. Second, the Structural Method Liking Model was estimated where the paths from liking to the 16 indicators of the substantive constructs were estimated, in addition to the paths from the substantive constructs to their respective indicators.

Initially a chi-square difference test was computed between the Liking Structural Baseline Model and the Liking Structural Method Model. The result of this test revealed a significant chi-square difference ($\Delta\chi^2$=122.90, p<.05), suggesting that liking accounted for

13

significant variance in the indicators of the constructs. The extent to which liking influenced the substantive relationships can be seen in Table 1. An examination of the coefficients in Table 1 indicates that the paths between transformational leadership and each of the outcome constructs was reduced once the influence of liking was taken into account (i.e., Liking Structural Method Model). To test whether these reductions were statistically significant, bootstrapping procedures were utilized. Comparing the coefficients from the Liking Structural Model with the 95% confidence intervals generated by the bootstrapping procedure, suggested that the relationship between transformational leadership and both affective commitment and job satisfaction were significantly affected by liking.

Table 1. Substantive Relationships for Structural Models Involving Transformational Leadership and Outcome Constructs

Substantive Relationship	Liking Structural Baseline Model (95% CI)	Liking Structural Method Model
TL – AOC	.45* (.26-.62)	.15*$^{\phi}$
TL – OCB	.23* (.03-.43)	.03
TL – JS	.56* (.40-.69)	.19*$^{\phi}$

TL= Transformational Leadership; AOC= Affective Organizational Commitment; OCB= Organizational Citizenship Behavior; JS= Job Satisfaction
$^{\phi}$ Structural path falls outside the 95% CI and that liking significantly reduced the path
*p<.05

Discussion

Overall, our analyses suggest that transformational leadership, at least as assessed by the MLQ, is significantly influenced by the degree to which subordinates like their leaders. At the measurement level, our results indicated that liking accounts for a large percentage of the variance in MLQ item responses. Moreover, the data suggested that most of the indicators were influenced by liking, indicating that liking's effect is not isolated to a single MLQ dimension. Similarly, at the structural level, the relationships between transformational leadership and organizational outcomes appear to be driven in part by liking.

While it seems clear that liking exerts a considerable effect on the MLQ, future research is needed to better delineate how liking fits within our current understanding of transformational leadership. Here, there appear to be at least three possibilities that deserve future consideration. First, liking may mediate the relationship between transformational leadership and outcomes. In other words, it is possible that transformational leadership behaviour leads subordinates to form a strong affective attachment to a leader. Second, it may be that subordinate liking is a precursor to transformational leadership behaviour in that the subordinate liking prompts a leader to engage in transformational behaviour. Third, it is possible that some portions of the relationships that have been demonstrated between the MLQ and organizational outcomes are simply spurious. For instance, liking may simultaneously influence the perception of transformational leadership and organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction. Although the correlational data presently reported inform us of the need to investigate liking further, future longitudinal and experimental work will be needed in order to understand which of these potential explanations best describes the association between liking, transformational leadership, and organizational outcomes.

References

Bass, B.M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? American Psychologist, 52, 130-139.

Bass, B.M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8, 9-32.

Bass, B.M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1995). Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire technical report. Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.

Burns, J.M. (1978). Leadership. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Cardy, R.L., & Dobbins, G.H. (1986). Affect and appraisal accuracy: Liking as an integral dimension in evaluating performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 672-678.

Lowe, K.B., Kroeck, K.G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational leadership and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review. Leadership Quarterly, 7, 385-425.

Mooney, C. Z. & Duval, R. D. (1993). Bootstrapping: A nonparametric approach to statistical inference. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Schwarz, N. (1990). Feelings as information: Informational and motivational functions of affective states. In E.T. Higgins & R. Sorrentino (Eds.), Handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundations of social behavior (pp. 527-561). New York: Guildford Press.

Srull, T. K., & Wyer, R. S. (1989). Person memory and judgment. Psychological Review, 96, 58-83.

Williams, L.J., Gavin, M.B., & Williams, M.L. (1996). Measurement and nonmeasurement processes with negative affectivity and employee attitudes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81, 88-101.

Yammarino, F. J., & Dubinsky, A. J. (1994). Transformational leadership theory: Using levels of analysis to determine boundary conditions. Personnel Psychology, 47, 787-811

PRACTICE: Designing Effective Leadership Development Programs
Jackson Leadership Systems Inc.

Jackson Leadership Systems is a group of I/O psychology consultants specializing in the assessment and development of leaders. We deliver customized programs to motivate existing leaders, fast-track high-potential leaders, and assess overall leadership bench strength. In this article, we would like to open a dialogue with other practitioners who work in the area of leadership development. We have learned a great deal about leadership development over the years, however we have found that leadership development is a challenging area of practice, and we do not represent ourselves as the sole authority in this diverse field. Therefore, we invite you to comment on the principles that will be shared with you in this article and to provide us with some of your ideas regarding what you have found to be effective in developing leadership talent within organizations.

Many of the organizations we work with are concerned about developing leaders for the future – to have individuals who are skilled and ready to step up and take on leadership roles when needed. But developing leaders is not a simple or short-term process. It is one that takes time and a long-term commitment from both the individual participant and the supporting organization. As a result, succession-planning processes need to be strategically linked to leadership development programs with the shared goal being to identify and develop high-potential leaders at all levels.

One of the most difficult problems we face as practitioners is how to develop a leadership program that will accelerate *individual* growth. We know from both experience and research that enrolling leaders in training programs or asking them to read books is not the answer to developing their leadership skills. To be successful at developing leaders, we must take a customized approach that takes into account each individual and considers their current career stage. We must also structure appropriate learning experiences that will allow leaders to practise new behaviour and learn through on-the-job challenges.

In this article we would like to share with you three fundamental ingredients that we have found to be critical to developing leaders. These are:

1. Structure a Development Program relevant to the individual's experience at leading.
2. Work with the leader to set a job-relevant Developmental Plan.
3. Provide the leader with strong and consistent support.

1. Structure a Development Program relevant to the individual's experience at leading.

In our work with leaders, we have found that individuals typically progress through three main leadership stages during their career: Emerging, Mid-Level, and Executive.

15

Although a great deal of individual consideration is necessary to account for the special needs of each developing leader, we believe that certain themes run across all stages. *Emerging leaders* are new supervisors, management trainees, and project team leaders who are experiencing their first brush at getting results through others. They need opportunities to learn and practice new skills, make mistakes, and receive feedback and coaching. At this stage, these new leaders are stepping into a role that requires them to have a whole new set of behaviours including: planning and thinking from a long-term perspective, gaining comfort leading others, getting results through others and increasing exposure to senior management.

It is not unusual for the emerging leader to ask themselves: *Do I want to be a leader?* Your role as a leadership coach should focus on listening, and helping these individuals to address both the skills issues as well as the career choices they must make at this point in their development.

Mid-level Leaders are typically at a point in their careers at which they are preparing for a broader leadership role. During this pivotal stage a leader begins to achieve greater self-awareness, and to develop a strong central core of values and teachable perspectives. The contents of the central core are critical elements used by an effective leader to communicate with others and provide meaning and purpose to the work that gets done.

To help these leaders build skills to be effective in their current roles and prepare them for more senior positions in the future, their development program should focus on: understanding their own "central core", developing and motivating others, contributing to organizational strategy and business development, managing change initiatives, managing their own career path and participating in succession planning for their division.

For the mid-level leader the principal question is: *What will my leadership be about?* This is where the line between management (achieving pre-determined objectives), and true leadership (setting a defining vision for followers) is crossed. It is important to check in frequently with the leader to ensure he/she stays focused on goals, and is able to grapple with challenges centred on leading versus managing.

Executive Leaders are at the pinnacle of their careers and have had a broad range of managerial experience. At this leadership stage, the actual *content* of the leader's role takes a back seat to the way their role is carried out – *how* they do it. At this stage, the leader is more on his or her own than ever before, yet they are more dependent on the people around them to fulfil business objectives. The challenge often faced by the executive leader is the need to develop a strong senior leadership team that draws on each individual's particular talents to ensure that the organization's vision and mission is effectively implemented. To set the direction, they need to share the story of where the organization is going in a way that will engage those under them, above them, and even beyond the organization itself.

For the Executive Leader one should ensure that their Leadership Development Program centres around: articulating vision and values, implementing that vision, working effectively with key stakeholders and Boards of Directors, developing a senior management team, coaching and supporting leaders in key positions, leading change initiatives, aligning people with business strategy and implementing a succession plan.

It is also important to remember that the more senior a leader is, the less direct feedback he/she receives. As a leadership coach, you can provide this honest and open feedback to support the leader in reaching leadership goals and business objectives.

16

2. Work with the leader to set a job-relevant Developmental Plan.

Many organizations are making Developmental Plans a priority in their leadership programs. Unfortunately, these plans are often too broad to be measurable, and do not include specific actions linked to individual growth. Typically these plans focus on the end result (e.g. Become more self-confident), without including the appropriate opportunities to practice new behaviour, or gain exposure to challenging situations.

From our experience, a good Developmental Plan should include the following key components:

Stretch Assignments: Leaders need "stretch" assignments in order to grow. A stretch activity would be one for which 25 - 50% of the skills required to carry out the activity are new to the individual.

Taking Risks With New Behaviours: Leaders will develop best when challenged to try new behaviours in their current role. It is important to ensure that a consistent feedback process is built into the Developmental Plan to ensure that the leader is supported when taking risks.

Linking Learning Experiences to Business Strategy: To design effective learning experiences, it is important to link competency gaps with the organization's business strategy. During the process of crafting a Developmental Plan, one should determine: what the individual needs to achieve strategically for their particular business unit, vis-à-vis the overall strategy for the organization, what the individual needs to learn to be effective at that level and what job experiences the individual needs to have to fill that learning gap.

3. Provide the leader with strong and consistent support.

For leaders to be successful in addressing their developmental challenges, it is critical that adequate mechanisms be in place to support and encourage growth. As practitioners we can play the role of coach – someone who will work with leaders to provide strong and consistent support throughout their Leadership Development Program. The most effective way to do this is to check in with leaders on a regular basis – every 3-4 months – to listen, and discuss any difficulties they might be having with job challenges. At the same time, it is important to hold these leaders accountable to the Developmental Plan that they set at the beginning of the program.

During these support sessions, you will often be called on to provide behavioural coaching. For example, you will be asked to discuss problem areas with the leader and to suggest new behavioural strategies to use in those areas. Providing the leader with "homework" at this stage is a very helpful way of ensuring that they will try new behaviour, take some risks, and push themselves to really develop as leaders. At a later session, debrief their experiences.

Putting in place internal support mechanisms, such as assigning an internal coach and mentor to each developing leader, is also essential. These programs have the added benefit of helping to reinforce the creation of a developmental culture within the organization. We recommend that an internal coach (usually the individual's boss), as well as a mentor (a leader two or more levels removed from the targeted leader) be assigned to work with the individual over a two-year period. The individual's coach is effective in encouraging action and modelling the way to change, while the mentor can be an effective person to support the leader with their career progression and in achieving their personal development goals.

We hope the fundamental ingredients for a successful leadership development program that we have shared in this article are helpful to you, whether you are working with individual leaders or leadership teams now or in the future. We would be very interested in receiving your feedback on the ideas presented here, as well as getting any additional ideas that

you have found useful in developing leaders. Please feel free to email us at: leaders@jacksonleadership.com.

COMMENTS FROM THE EDITOR
Lori Francis, MSc
University of Guelph

Over the past couple of years a number of our members have requested that we distribute an electronic version of our quarterly newsletter. On several occasions, the CSIOP executive has discussed offering an electronic service. We have decided, starting with the April 2002 issue, to begin electronic delivery of our newsletter. We believe that receiving an electronic, rather than a printed, version of the newsletter will be more convenient for our readers. The electronic format will allow for easy computer filing of and access to our issues. In addition, we feel that with advanced technology available to most of us, an electronic format is an environmentally responsible choice.

Starting in April 2002, members will receive the CSIOP newsletter as a PDF attachment to an email message. PDF format will allow readers to open the file in an adobe reader and print the newsletter if they so desire. Instructions regarding how to open the attachment, including how to download Adobe Acrobat, will be contained in the email message that accompanies the newsletter.

Those members who believe that electronic delivery is not feasible for them, for instance, those who do not have regular access email, can request to have a printed version of the newsletter delivered by mail. Please be advised that we are not able to offer both electronic and printed copies to an individual. If you prefer to continue receiving a printed copy, rather than an electronic one, please contact me, Lori Francis by phone at (519) 824-4120 ext. 8931 or by email at lfrancis@uoguelph.ca.
To facilitate the move to electronic delivery, we have printed a list of our most up to date email

information for all of our members below. Please check the list to ensure that your email is listed correctly. Note that the list is arranged by Associate, Full and Student membership categories, so it is not fully alphabetical. If your email address is inaccurate or is not listed please contact our membership co-ordinator Veronica Stinson by email at Veronica.stinson@stmarys.ca.

We are excited to provide an electronic service to our membership. We hope that you are also excited about this change and we ask that you support us as we go through the transition to electronic delivery.

Associate Members

Jacques Barrett	
CharlesBenabou	
Daniel Bentley	
John Clarke	
Timothy DeGroot	
Jean-François Ducharme	
Cam Ellison	
Melanie Gilbert	
Rick Goffin	
Diana Hartel	
Chris Hartley	sc.hartley@ns.sympatico.ca
Naome Howe	
Lisa Keeping	lkeeping@wlu.ca
Mary Lynne Kelly	
Marina Kolesnikova	
Laurent M. Lapierre	
James Lea	
K. Gerald Long	
John Marshall	
Teal McAteer-Early	
Michael McCarrey	
John Michela	
Donna Reid	
Erika L. Ringseis	
Karen Romaniuk	
Pascal Savard	p_savard@hotmail.com
John Stoten	jstoten@interbaun.com
C. Ward Struthers	
Jim Wuest	

Full Members

Mona Abbondanza	abbondanza.mona@uqam.ca
Gerard Alberts	
Natalie Jean Allen	nallen@uwo.ca
Gary Michael Allen	
Richard Allon	rallon@iprimus.ca

18

Terry J Prociuk tprociuk@ucalgary.ca

Phanikiran Radhakrishnan

Alain Reid

Sandra Rever-Moriyama

Michael Richards spocker@xtra.co.nz

Natalie Rinfret

Mary Anne Robblee nelsongrp@cyberus.ca

Palma Robinson

Mitchell Rothstein mrothste@ivey.uwo.ca

Maria Rotundo rotundo@mgmt.utoronto.ca

Patricia M Rowe prowe@uwaterloo.ca

Sharyn Salsberg Ezrin sharyn@globalserve.net

Douglas Saunders douglas.saunders@utoronto.ca

Andre Savoie

Rebecca Schalm rschalm@rhrinternational.com

John M Schiel shiel@wucc.ca

Gerard Seijts Gseijts@ivey.uwo.ca

Yvonne Sell Yvonne_Sell@haygroup.com

Ralph Shedletsky

Masud H Siddiqui

Harvey A Silver

Suzanne Patricia Simpson ssimpson@hrmcanada.com

Carole M Sinclair csinclair@hincksdellcrest.org

Daniel Skarlicki dan.skarlicki@commerce.ubc.ca

Sylvia Spallin sbcs@mailexcite.com

Barry Spinner spinner@unb.ca

Steven J Stein president@mhs.com

Peter Stephenson

Veronica Stinson veronica.stinson@stmarys.ca

Peter Strickland

Jill Sullivan jsulliva@cmhc-schl.gc.ca

Lorne Sulsky

Lisa M Talvak ltalvak@osi-consult.com

John A Tanasichuk

John Tivendell tivendj@umoncton.ca

Brenda A Tomini thepoohs@sprint.ca

Minhtri Truong minhtri.truong@canadapost.ca

Greg Tyndall

Robert Vachon rovachon@academe.borealc.on.ca

John Vavrik

Jennifer Ann Veitch jennifer.veitch@nrc.ca

Clement Von Kirchenheim ika@telus.net

Robert W Walker bob.walker@cas.gov.on.ca

Patrick Walls

Aida Warah

Peter Warshaw pwarshaw@rhrinternational.com

Craig Weaver weaver@primus.ca

Sheila Webber swebber@vax2.concordia.ca

Charles Weinstein

David S Weiss klee@grwconsultants.com

Willi H Wiesner wiesner@mcmaster.ca

Ross Woolley

Christoph Wuerscher wuerscher@home.com

David Zweig zweig@utsc.utoronto.ca

Johanne Lapointe

Student Members

Arni Ahronson arniahronson@aol.com

Anne Audy ann_audy@hotmail.com

Shelley Balanko balanko@emporium.on.ca

Christina Bandomir cbandomi@uoguelph.ca

Laurie Barclay laurieav@interchange.ubc.ca

Mathieu Baril matbaril@hotmail.com

Kimberlea Baron

Francois Bernatchez f.bernatchez@videotron.ca

Ann-Renee Blais arblais@netzero.net

Kathleen Boies kboies@julian.uwo.ca

Julie Bourbonnais

B Lynn Bradley lynn.bradley@sympatico.ca

Alejandra Cadena-Perez

Sarah K Campbell

Concetta Arianna Capotorto acapotorto@home.com

Jody Lynn Carrington carringj@uregina.ca

Sarah A Carroll scarroll@ucalgary.ca

Anuradha Chawla achawla@uoguelph.ca

Greg A Chung-Yan gchungya@uoguelph.ca

Lisa Clatney clatney@sask.usask.ca

Tracy Cocivera

Wendy Darr

Antoine Devinat

Lina Di Genova linadigen@hotmail.com

Peter Dougans peterdo@unixg.ubc.ca

Craig Dowden cdowden@ccs.carleton.ca

Judy Eaton jeaton@yorku.ca

Carolin Eberman c_eberman@hotmail.com

Patricia Edelstein edelstep@telusplanet.net

Lisa Elliot lelliot@home.com

Neil Fassina fassina@mgmt.utoronto.ca

Mary-Ann Mladen Faulhaber Mfaulhaber@advancedmeasures.com

Francois Fillion ffillion@uoguelph.ca

Lori Francis lfrancis@uoguelph.ca

Julie Galarneau julie3236@caramail.com

Helen Gardiner helen.gardiner@home.com

Harjinder Gill hgill@julian.uwo.ca

Irina Goldenberg ezfit@cyberus.ca

Joanna Heathcote jmheathc@julian.uwo.ca

Lynne Herscovitch lherscov@julian.uwo.ca

Theresa M Hill

Anna Ieroncig

Rhena Louise Izzo

R Blake Jelley rbjelley@julian.uwo.ca

Ranjana Jha ranjanajha@hotmail.com

Russ Johnson russj@cadvision.com

Pierre J (John) Johnston john.johnston@rmc.ca

David A Jones dajone@ucalgary.ca

Gordon Josephson gordonj@uottawa.ca

Elizabeth Kelly ekelly2@uwo.ca

Janine Knackstedt

Lucie Kocum lkocu091@uottawa.ca

Tammy Kondratuk

Henryk Krajewski htkrajew@julian.uwo.ca

Annie Lanteigne Lanteigne_a@hotmail.com

Michel Larivière mlariviere@intranet.ca

20

Saint Mary's University: Programs & News

Closely tied to each other, the Psychology M.Sc. and Management Ph.D. programs provide students with a rigorous education program that prepares them for careers in government and private sectors.

Certificate in Psychology & HR Management

We offer the largest concentration of I/O undergraduate programs in Canada. Students who major in psychology may also take course toward a certificate in HRM by taking a selection of interdisciplinary courses.

Masters in Applied Psychology (I/O Psychology)

The M.Sc. in I/O Psychology has been offered since 1980. Our graduates have gone on to be professors, independent consultants, "in-house" human resource specialists, military researchers and department heads, government researchers, and personnel specialists.

Ph.D. in Management

The Ph.D. Program in Business Administration (Management) is the first business doctoral program to be offered in Atlantic Canada. The first intake of Ph.D. candidates was in the Summer of 2000. We currently have nine students in the program, two of whom are graduates of our M. Sc. I/O program. The Management Department is in the process of hiring a Canada Tier 2 Research Chair.

Centre for Occupational Health Psychology (COHP)

Faculty in the Psychology and Management Departments have been working together to create a Centre for Occupational Health Psychology. COHP will provide an infrastructure for conducting applied research and consulting in the areas of work stress, work and family conflict, occupational health and safety, and workplace violence.

Happy Birthday to us! SMU is 200 years old

Saint Mary's University is celebrating its 200th birthday this year! Events are being planned on campus, in the Halifax Regional Municipality, and with SMU alumni around the world. Canada Post will issue a Saint Mary's University commemorative stamp in May, 2002.

For more information on Saint Mary's University, check out our Web site: www.stmarys.ca

Sponsored by: Saint Mary's University Psychology Department