Industrial and Organizational Psychology, *10(4), pp 503–506 December 2017.*
 doi:10.1017/iop.2017.71

Introduction

From the Editor

The goal of focal articles in *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice* is to present new ideas or different takes on existing ideas and stimulate a conversation in the form of comment articles that extend the arguments in the focal article or that present new ideas stimulated by those articles. The two focal articles in this issue stimulated a wide range of reactions and a good deal of constructive input.

The Current Issue

In our first article, "Most Frequently Cited Sources, Articles, and Authors in Industrial-Organizational Psychology Textbooks: Implications for the Science–Practice Divide, Scholarly Impact, and the Future of the Field," Herman Aguinis, Ravi S. Ramani, P. Knight Campbell, Paloma Bernal-Turnes, Josiah M. Drewry, and Brett T. Edgerton have provided a robust, pluralistic perspective of scholarly impact to help advance the study of a number of critical issues in our field. Specifically, these authors present a comprehensive analysis of author, article/book, and source citations in popular industrial and organizational (I-O) textbooks to advance discussion on several vigorous debates occurring in our field, including (a) the science–practice divide, (b) definition and measurement of scholarly impact, (c) the migration of I-O psychology academics to business schools, and (d) the future of I-O psychology as a field. In the spirit of open science, Aguinis et al. have also provided access to their database for readers to conduct their own analyses.

Three core themes emerged from the commentaries to this focal article: (a) the need to rise above the exhaustively debated science–practitioner divide and work toward building bridges that ensure both rigorous and relevant solutions to organizational challenges, (b) the need to reexamine and reframe the criteria used to measure impact for both academics and practitioners, and (c) the need to address and more fully understand the impact that business school migration is having on the identity of I-O psychologists.

Related to the first theme, several commentaries argue that it is time to give up on the artificial boundaries that separate academics and practitioners and strive toward a partnership that balances rigor and relevance. One commentary extended this notion by arguing that this gap can be

similarly closed between the I-O psychology and management fields if the focus can move away from a "rigor versus relevance, win–lose mindset" to one that is focused on crafting well-defined, evidence-based research that has a clear and significant impact on organizational outcomes. An additional gap that was highlighted in both the focal article and a commentary is gender disparity in authorship of publications within the field of I-O psychology. The authors point out that this is particularly troubling, given that the members of our field are well versed in matters of workplace discrimination and equity.

Several commentaries addressed the criteria used by the focal article authors and, although applauding the extensive research effort, questioned the validity and viability of the metrics used to determine impact. One of the commentaries featured the perspectives of six I-O psychology textbook authors who clarified how and why certain citations are selected for these textbooks. This is a particularly useful companion to the focal article, as it helps to explain some of the focal article's findings—particularly the number of citations from researchers in business schools.

In relation to the inevitable migration of I-O psychologists to business schools, one commentary questioned whether highlighting the distinct identities between these two groups was helpful in understanding and bridging the research–practice gap. Another commentary argued that this migration creates an I-O psychology–general psychology gap, which serves to disconnect members of the I-O field from their historical identity as psychologists. These authors believe that the discipline of psychology holds important knowledge that can help advance our theories and practice, and therefore an effort should be made to maintain strong connections between business school I-O psychologists and the psychology discipline.

In our second article, "A Call for Conceptual Models of Technology in I-O Psychology: An Example From Technology-Based Talent Assessment," Neil Morelli, Denise Potosky, Winfred Arthur, Jr., and Nancy Tippins argue for a theoretical framework to guide research and practice regarding the impact of technology on the field of I-O psychology. The authors offer up a working definition of technology and use an example of measurement equivalence across mobile devices to demonstrate the benefit of a conceptual model when attempting to understand the dynamic interaction between technology and user.

The commentaries presented several themes in response to the focal article. The first set of commentaries argued for a broader, multidisciplinary approach for theory development. These commentaries highlight that a number of other fields are already heavily focused on technology-oriented research and theory development in the workplace. By collaborating with these other fields (e.g., human-computer interaction, cyberpsychology,

https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2017.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press

human factors), researchers and practitioners can leverage existing models to adapt to I-O applications—and avoid starting from scratch.

Several other commentaries questioned whether theory development is in fact wise in this context. One of these commentaries recommended that the best path forward should be through the development of flexible conceptual frameworks of technology that are driven by a combination of inductive and deductive research methods. These authors contend that the "theory-first" approach promulgated by the field's top journals can frequently lead to theories and research of questionable value. Another commentary expressed frustration that theory development in this fast-paced field is generally outdated by the time it is needed. These authors argue that theory can support the field's evolution, but it rarely leads the way.

Another commentary encouraged future research to extend the emphasis on psychological processes beyond cognition and behavior to include affect and motivation. The authors believe that by integrating components of technology into existing models of response behavior (affective and motivational processes), technological innovations can be proactively designed with specific goals in mind (e.g., minimize measurement error). Several other commentaries extend the focal article by offering unique applications of technology (gig economy, training) that focus on the new era of work.

It would not be possible to publish this journal without the hard work of talented reviewers. I appreciate the significant help and input of Michael Burke, Alan Witt, Jeff Johnson, Satoris Howes, Fritz Drasgow, Jeffrey Stanton, and James Illingworth.

John C. Scott

Practice Forum

In the Practice Forum, Thomas J. Braun, Bryan C. Hayes, Rachel Frautschy DeMuth, and Olya Taran present their work to enhance Humana Inc.'s employees' abilities to identify, implement, and manage change. Presented against a backdrop of the forces driving the need for change at Humana, the authors cite some challenges they and others have experienced with implementing change. In response, Humana created an internal program designed to enhance employees' change readiness skills. Braun et al. discuss the development, validation, and application of an individual agility and resilience measure that was used as part of this program to provide feedback to employees to guide their ongoing development in managing change. The authors provide some program outcomes and lessons learned from developing and applying the measure, including implications from using the measure outside of the change readiness program. As an example of where applied

I-O psychology research and practice can help address an organizational problem, their work also highlights some findings that might propose avenues for future applied research and application.

Mark L. Poteet

https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2017.71 Published online by Cambridge University Press