

INTRODUCTION

From the Editor

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

The first focal article in this issue, by Leaetta Hough and Fred Oswald, is titled "Personality Testing and Industrial–Organizational Psychology: Reflections, Progress, and Prospects." Personality has become one of the most studied issues in the field, and reactions to the emerging pattern of findings range from strongly supportive to highly skeptical. Hough and Oswald address a series of issues, focusing on what we still need to learn and offering their perspective on routes for getting there. The article is followed by eight commentaries and a response from the authors.

The second focal article, by Scott Highhouse, is titled "Stubborn Reliance on Intuition and Subjectivity in Employee

Selection." The article posits beliefs on the part of decision makers, which lead to a preference for intuition and resistance to structured and standardized selection devices. The article is followed by 10 commentaries and a response from the author.

For each focal article, a project team was assembled to review commentary submissions. For the focal article on personality, that team was made up of Murray Barrick, Nicole Dudley, Eric Heggstad, Jeff Johnson, Dan Newman, and Len White. For the article on intuition and subjectivity, that team was made up of Rick DeShon, Jerry Kehoe, and Nathan Kuncel. They deserve thanks for their contributions to this issue.

I also want to thank all authors contributing focal articles to this and other issues of the journal for their willingness to participate in the exchange of perspectives that is the heart of this journal. Authors put their work forward, not knowing what reaction their work will receive. Will the commentaries be supportive and encouraging? Will they be highly critical? All readers of the journal benefit from their willingness to submit their writing to this degree of scrutiny and the field benefits from the opportunity to see the range of perspectives on a given topic.

Paul R. Sackett
Department of Psychology
University of Minnesota