Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 8(2), p 141 June 2015.
Copyright © 2015 Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. doi:10.1017/iop.2015.39

Intorduction

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, Landers and Behrend argue that the traditional preference for organizational samples over other types of convenience samples is not well grounded in terms of the quality or generalizability of the data obtained and argue for the utility of alternative methods, particularly online sampling. Twelve comment articles examine in depth the experience of serving as a subject in online research, the concrete indicators of data quality that can be used to evaluate different sampling methods, the determinants of external validity, and the ways our sampling could be improved.

In our second article, Neubert, Mainert, Kretzschmar, and Greiff argue that work is becoming more complex and that the need for valid and scalable assessments of complex and collaborative decision making has increased. They describe a program of research that has led to the development of measures that are included in large-scale student assessments and argue for their application to the world of work. Seven comment articles examine ways in which changes in the nature of work are influencing the skills and abilities needed on the job, suggest ways of applying existing competency models to the evaluation of the relevance of these skills, and suggest ways that existing assessments of cognitive abilities and skills might be used to obtain information about these emerging skills.

It would not be possible to publish this journal without the hard work of talented reviewers. I appreciate the help and input of Jose Cortina, Fritz Drasgow, John Hollenbeck, Ann Marie Ryan, Lisa Saari, and John Scott.

Kevin R. Murphy

https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2015.39 Published online by Cambridge University Press