Industrial and Organizational Psychology, *10(2), pp 141–143 June 2017.*
Copyright © 2017 Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. doi:10.1017/iop.2017.24

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

Our first article, "The Licensure Issue in Consulting and I-O Psychology: A Discussion Paper," by the Licensure of Consulting and I-O Psychologists (LCIOP) Joint Task Force, examines the hotly debated and factious issue of licensure for industrial-organizational (I-O) and consulting psychologists. The LCIOP argues for collaborative engagement on this issue so that I-O and consulting psychologists can practice legally within their scope of competence and more effectively impact the future direction of the laws and regulations that govern professional psychology. The authors point out that if we as a profession fail to engage with the legislative and regulatory process, others will determine how I-O and consulting psychology is regulated – likely resulting in the inadvertent development of problematic laws and regulations. This article provides a comprehensive review of the issues, the players, and recommendations for moving forward.

Not surprisingly, the response to this focal article was fast and furious. With only one exception, the commentaries argued forcefully against licensure and reiterated that there should be no requirement for I-O practitioners to register or be licensed in order to practice their profession. In fact, there were a number of significant concerns raised across these commentaries about the long-term viability of I-O psychology should the profession become regulated. That being said, many of these authors agreed that I-O psychologists should be allowed to be licensed if they desire (or if required) and that SIOP should provide guidance to state licensing boards regarding how to evaluate the education and training of an I-O psychologist (as per its current policy). There were two commentaries that offered an international perspective, with one providing a cautionary tale based on 6 years of licensure experience. As a

https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2017.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

counterpoint to this discussion, one commentator argued that there are powerful cultural forces at work in our profession that are sustaining an untenable resistance to regulation and that this puts us at odds with the broader cultural heritage of psychology, which we all proclaim to value. This author argues that change management efforts are needed to reconcile these contrary cultures and overcome the opposition to professional licensing.

In our second article, "Survey Key Driver Analysis: Are We Driving Down the Right Road?," Jeffrey Cucina, Philip Walmsley, Ilene Gast, Nicholas Martin, and Patrick Curtin explain how survey key driver analysis (SKDA) has become part of mainstream practice despite the dearth of empirical literature on its effectiveness. The authors present a spirited challenge to SKDA through the presentation of a number of significant methodological issues that limit the usefulness of SKDA in applied settings. Cucina et al. leverage a publicly available dataset to demonstrate the impact that these methodological issues have on the interpretation of SKDA results. These authors propose an alternative to SKDA that draws upon the scientific method and treats surveys as psychometric instruments. Cucina et al. argue that the field should attempt to derive causational inferences about the "drivers" of the targeted constructs rather than relying upon correlational designs and analyses.

The commentaries present a variety of thoughtful perspectives on the issues raised in the focal article. Several of the commentaries provide additional cautions against accepting the practice of SKDA and expanding its use to other statistical methods. One commentary offered some possible explanations for why practitioners and organizations may rely upon SKDA and provides recommendations for I-Os to better leverage their skills in this area. Another commentary argued that the focal article didn't go far enough with its recommendations for organizational interventions and provided research-driven steps for designing and implementing these interventions. A number of other commentaries countered that the focal article went too far with its recommendations and in fact overstates the risks associated with the purported methodological issues. Several of these commentaries provided data that contradicts the conclusions raised in the focal article and conclude that although SKDA can certainly be misused, it can also be conducted in a responsible and rigorous manner – and when positioned appropriately, provides an invaluable starting point for interpreting, communicating, and acting on survey results.

It would not be possible to publish this journal without the hard work of talented reviewers. I appreciate the significant help and input of Talya Bauer, Jeff McHenry, Ann Marie Ryan, Theodore Hayes, Allen Kraut, Sara Weiner, and Dan Putka.

https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2017.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Practice Forum

In the third article to appear in the new Practice Forum, Bill Schiemann reports on the 2016 HRM Impact Award winner, Jack in the Box, and its efforts to use employee surveys, analytic models, and management practices to impact key business outcomes.

Using a creative conversational interview approach with key stakeholders from the project, including from Jack in the Box, Lenny Comma, CEO; Mark Blankenship, Chief People, Culture & Corporate Strategy Officer; Jerry Rebel, Chief Financial Officer; and Eric Tunquist, Vice President, Operations; and from Metrus Group, Inc., Jerry Seibert, Vice President of Assessment and Survey Services; the author presents insights into the business challenges being experienced by Jack in the Box and steps it took to partner with Metrus Group and leverage its People Equity model. The author describes some findings that resulted the analyses, the subsequent actions that were taken to address the findings, and the business impact of those actions. The author concludes by presenting the interviewees' thoughts on lessons learned that other organizations could use when conducting similar work.

John C. Scott

https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2017.24 Published online by Cambridge University Press