Industrial and Organizational Psychology, **4** (2011), 433–434.
Copyright © 2011 Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. 1754-9426/11

INTRODUCTION

From the Editor

This journal provides a forum for the exchange of perspectives. Each issue contains two focal articles that take a position on a topic of importance to the field of industrial and organizational (I–O) psychology. These focal articles are first posted on SIOP's Web site, and readers are invited to submit commentaries in response. A set of commentaries—some of which support and extend the focal article and others that challenge or add new perspectives to the focal article—are selected to be published with the article, along with an integrative response from the authors of the original article.

The first focal article in this issue, by Lise Saari and Charles Scherbaum, is entitled ''Identified Employee Surveys: Potential Promise, Perils, and Professional Practice Guidelines.'' The use of identified surveys that allow organizations to link survey data to other individual employee data are on the rise. Saari and Scherbaum note the benefits of these surveys but also highlight concerns that need more attention before we wholeheartedly endorse this approach. The article is followed by 11 commentaries, many of which are written by practitioners who share their own experiences and lessons learned as they moved from anonymous to identified surveys. Overall, the commentary writers express more enthusiasm for identified surveys than did the focal article authors. In their response, Scherbaum and Saari reiterate that they too see identified surveys as useful and appropriate *in the right context* and emphasize taking the employees' perspective (in addition to the organization's) when assessing their value.

The second focal article, ''The *Uniform Guidelines* Are a Detriment to the Field of Personnel Selection,'' was authored by Michael McDaniel, Sven Kepes, and George Banks. Based on inconsistencies between the *Uniform Guidelines* and science-based professional practice, these authors argue that the primary federal regulation concerning employment testing in the United States should be rescinded or extensively revised. The 11 commentaries that follow the focal article offer different views on the extent of inconsistencies, on the purpose served by the *Uniform Guidelines*, and on the likelihood of changing federal regulation—and thus see different paths forward. McDaniel, Kepes, and Banks were influenced by some of these arguments. In their response article, they note which arguments were most compelling to them; however, they continue to emphasize that mean racial differences in job-related attributes are not going away anytime soon and that SIOP should be more active in finding ways to influence federal regulations.

Both of the topics in this issue highlight that there are multiple stakeholders in our practices as I–O psychologists—and these stakeholders (i.e., employees, management, survey and test developers, government, political parties) have different views on what serves them best. Dialogue and debate on these topics hopefully broadens our perspectives as each of us decides where we stand in relation

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2011.01368.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

to multiple stakeholders in our local contexts.

Deserving special thanks for their contribution to the success of this issue are the individuals who reviewed focal articles and commentary submissions: Karen Barbera, Allan Church, Fritz Drasgow, Kris Fenlason, Scott Highhouse, Jerry Kehoe, Allan Kraut, Karen Paul, Piers Steel, and John Scott.

Cynthia D. McCauley
Center for Creative Leadership

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2011.01368.x Published online by Cambridge University Press