Industrial and Organizational Psychology, *11*(1), pp 1–3 March 2018.
Copyright © 2018 Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. doi:10.1017/iop.2017.90

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, "A Systems-Based Approach to Fostering Robust Science in Industrial-Organizational Psychology," James Grand, Steven Rogelberg, Tammy Allen, Ronald Landis, Douglas Reynolds, John Scott, Scott Tonidandel, and Donald Truxillo present a set of observations and recommendations designed to generate dialogue regarding the state of research practices in the field of industrial and organizational (I-O) psychology. This work is the result of the authors' participation on a Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP)-commissioned task force that was charged with evaluating the scientific practices that are foundational to I-O psychology and, as appropriate, to provide actionable recommendations that SIOP leadership can endorse and reinforce.

Grand et al. contend that although detrimental research practices (DRPs) and acts of misconduct do occur in I-O psychology, there is also evidence that our science is healthy on a number of fronts. That being said, the authors argue that it is necessary to proactively address existing and potential issues with how the I-O scientific enterprise functions in order to get ahead of any "gathering storm." Grand et al. provide a vision for what defines and characterizes a robust science and propose a set of behaviors required from the scientific ecosystem to achieve this vision.

The initial set of commentaries extend the propositions put forth in the focal article by providing specific suggestions for accomplishing the vision of a robust and credible science in I-O psychology. The first commentary argues for a more direct, transformative, and top-down approach that assigns unambiguous accountabilities for change to key stakeholders, such as editors of top-tier journals. This particular set of stakeholders is in a uniquely powerful position to lead this paradigm shift. The next commentary suggests

https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2017.90 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that SIOP should lead by example by creating an online-only journal that conforms to all Open Science Guidelines. Similarly, the third commentary argues that the I-O profession's adoption of Open Science principles would serve to address all six of the defining principles for robust science outlined in the focal article. In fact, platforms such as the Open Science Framework already exist as a resource for facilitating full transparency throughout the entire scientific process. The fourth commentary provides a critical perspective on the need for a rigorous postpublication review process whereby errors in analyses or interpretation can be corrected and disseminated online to journal readers.

The next two commentaries in this set take a practitioner's perspective, calling for I-O research to be more relevant to organizational and employee interventions by focusing on descriptive and application research, as well as improving on the translation of I-O science to a practical audience The final commentary takes a somewhat contrarian view to the focal article and other commentaries by suggesting that HARKing is not always necessarily wrong and that there may be instances where it can actually serve to further science.

In our second article, "Beyond Blaming the Victim: Toward a More Progressive Understanding of Workplace Mistreatment," Lilia Cortina, Verónica Caridad Rabelo, and Kathryn J. Holland debunk the theory of victim precipitation, which has surfaced in I-O psychology research to help explain workplace mistreatment. This theory, which was abandoned decades ago by the field of criminology, argues that victims invite abuse based on their own actions or personal characteristics and are consequently at fault for the wrongdoing of others. In its place, Cortina et al. propose a new analytic paradigm, *perpetrator predation*—which provides a more nuanced and progressive explanation of workplace mistreatment that, while not ignoring victim characteristics, removes blame from the victim. The authors demonstrate how this new paradigm has significant positive implications for organizational interventions that address workplace mistreatment.

The commentaries served to extend the focal article's points from a variety of perspectives. Several commentaries argued that before we can move to a new paradigm it is important to more clearly define the workplace aggression and mistreatment constructs (e.g., incivility, abusive supervision, bullying) so that they can be more adequately measured. Concern was raised that the perpetrator predation framework does not provide adequate conceptual coverage for all constructs covered under the "mistreatment" label. Other commentaries cautioned against simply replacing the victim precipitation paradigm with one that focuses solely on the perpetrator because there is clearly an interaction between two active actors within an organizational context and that both sides (i.e., perpetrator and victim) must be considered as well as the overarching context (e.g., organizational culture,

https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2017.90 Published online by Cambridge University Press

power hierarchies in the organization). One commentary took this a step further and indicated that whether or not victims influence the contexts that facilitate victimization in the workplace is an empirical question and that this research should continue within I-O psychology due to (a) a lack of evidence to support the exclusion of the victim precipitation paradigm and (b) the potential harmful premise of its replacement, the perpetrator predator paradigm. Two final commentaries extend the discussion of the victim precipitation paradigm to raise awareness of its long-term negative impact on both women (gender wage disparities) and race-based social hierarchies (police shootings). These authors detail what I-O psychologists can do to address this outdated paradigm to create meaningful and lasting change.

It would not be possible to publish this journal without the hard work of talented reviewers. I appreciate the significant help and input of Alex Alonso, John Antonakis, Talya Bauer, Nathan Bowling, Mort McPhail, Kathi Miner, Ernest O'Boyle, Kristine Olson, Fred Oswald, Hannah Rothstein, and Ann Marie Ryan

John C. Scott

Practice Forum

In the Practice Forum article entitled "Civil Service Mandated Cutoff Scores: Challenges and Practice Recommendations," Calvin Hoffman presents his efforts to address the challenges that arise when setting selection cutoff scores that comply with civil service rules and guidelines. The author discusses how complying with civil service requirements can run counter to professional standards, and he frames this dilemma within the context of legal and fair employment practice, employee performance, and professional guidance perspectives. Hoffman also discusses the benefits and limitations of some methods for addressing these challenges and provides practice-based recommendations illustrated through case study examples. Hoffman also offers some recommendations for how practitioners might influence civil service policies to better align with good professional practice.

Mark L. Poteet

https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2017.90 Published online by Cambridge University Press