Celebrating Five Years of GMU’s I/ON Newsletter: A Look Back

By W. Benjamin Porr

Sitting down for the IOPSA meeting on graduate student orientation day was an uncomfortable feeling. I am not a sociable person when I am placed in unfamiliar settings. I sat patiently and anxiously listening to every word about the I/O program. Then a topic came up that piqued my interest. As described to me, the I/ON newsletter was a tool in which George Mason University’s I/O program communicated with present and past students, while informing the business and academic world of the developments of the program. It was remarkable, most of the incoming class at that orientation signed up to volunteer for the newsletter. At the time most of us did not fully understand the history and hard work it took to produce the newsletter.

First, let me give some general background on the I/ON. The I/ON is distributed three times a year (August, November, and March). The I/ON is edited and produced by GMU’s I/O graduate students (both M.A. and Ph.D.). It is currently distributed to 500+ people, including current students, faculty, alumni, and friends (both academic and applied) across the United States; and even several colleagues in Canada and Great Britain!

Now for some history…The very first issue of the I/ON was produced in May 1997 with then doctoral student, Marisa Diana (now Dr. Diana) as editor, and financial resources provided by Dr. Richard Klimoski. Marisa and Dr. Klimoski wanted to promote communication within the program. Additionally, they sought to share with students varying perspectives on issues relating to the field of I/O. The inaugural issue was six-pages in length. Dr. Klimoski and Wendy Casper set the tone by each writing a column on their experiences at SIOP. Dr. Jose Cortina, being his usual inimitable self, made an imprint in that issue as well. He demonstrated how the newsletter could be an important communication tool as long as the students are involved, but reminded us that “all business and no play” makes an uninterested and bored Jose. Throughout the years, Dr. Cortina has traded barbs (in humor, of course) with former GMU faculty member, Dr. Stan Gully (currently at Rutgers University), Dr. Steve Zaccaro, and, yes, even George W. Bush, Jr.

In that first issue Marisa wrote a column that I’d like to share with you. “We hope you enjoy your first issue of the I/O Network newsletter (I/ON). The I/ON is an idea generated by the graduate students of the I/O Psychology Department, and is designed to ‘connect’ our colleagues within the department, that is, the students and faculty alike. This newsletter is a medium through which we hope to bring a bit of understanding and communication to you. Most of all, we look forward to hearing from you as we begin our journey through the graduate program.”

How many of you remember this introduction? I bet it’s not the one you were thinking of. I think Marisa’s column was applauded throughout the department, and in fact, the I/ON was well received in the graduate student body and faculty alike.

For the next several issues, Marisa wrote a column that I’d like to share with you.

Dr. Jose Cortina.

Dr. Cortina was his usual inimitable self, made an imprint in that issue as well. He demonstrated how the newsletter could be an important communication tool as long as the students are involved, but reminded us that “all business and no play” makes an uninterested and bored Jose. Throughout the years, Dr. Cortina has traded barbs (in humor, of course) with former GMU faculty member, Dr. Stan Gully (currently at Rutgers University), Dr. Steve Zaccaro, and, yes, even George W. Bush, Jr.

In that first issue Marisa wrote a column that I’d like to share with you. “We hope you enjoy your first issue of the I/O Network newsletter (I/ON). The I/ON is an idea generated by the graduate students of the I/O Psychology Department, and is designed to ‘connect’ our colleagues within the department, that is, the students and faculty alike. This newsletter is a medium through which we hope to bring a bit of understanding and communication to you. Most of all, we look forward to hearing from you as we begin our journey through the graduate program.”

How many of you remember this introduction? I bet it’s not the one you were thinking of. I think Marisa’s column was applauded throughout the department, and in fact, the I/ON was well received in the graduate student body and faculty alike.
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Comprehending Comprehensive Exams:
A Survey of I/O Psychology Programs’ Comprehensive Exam Procedures & Practices

By Lisa Boyce, Tara Carpenter, and Kara Incalcaterra

How knowledgeable are you of other I/O programs’ comprehensive exam procedures?

If you answered “not very”, you are not alone. Nearly half of all I/O psychologists graduating from an I/O psychology graduate program in the U.S. are required to successfully complete comprehensive exams (SIOP, 2000). Yet, nearly 50 percent of the academicians, practitioners, and students surveyed last year indicated that they had no knowledge of comprehensive exam procedures in programs in which they have no affiliation. As a result, there appears to be a strong need within the general I/O community to systematically characterize comprehensive exam practices and procedures. This data could yield several practical benefits, including informing faculty members’ decisions.

(see “Comprehensive Exams” page 14)
A Word from the Editor

By Mike Ingerick

Salutations everyone and welcome to another issue of GMU’s I/ON newsletter! First off, I would like to make several announcements. As evident from the front page, the newsletter is celebrating its fifth anniversary. Yes, it’s been five years! As part of the I/ON’s history, I would like to thank all of the students, alumni, faculty, and friends who have contributed their time and talents to the I/ON newsletter over the years. I think I speak for everyone involved in the I/ON (past and present), when I say that we look forward to seeing the newsletter continue to prosper and grow in coming years. Over the years, the I/ON has fostered connections among current students, faculty, and alumni, as well as connecting our program to the larger I/O community. I fully expect that to continue, and encourage everyone to take advantage of the newsletter as an outlet for maintaining (and extending) these connections. Ten years, here we come!

Second big announcement, I would like to introduce everyone to the incoming editor, W. Ben Porr. Ben will be taking over as I/ON editor starting with the August issue. Ben is a first year Masters student, who was recently accepted to our Doctoral program. I can think of few people to better pass on the I/ON editorship to. Please join me in welcoming and congratulating Ben.

Third (and final) big announcement, IOPSA recently renovated its website. You can check it out at: www.gmu.edu/org/iopsa. In addition to receiving a “facelift”, new content (including pictures) has been added to the website. Most directly related to the I/ON, its website. You can check it out at: www.gmu.edu/org/iopsa. In addition to receiving a “facelift”, new content (including pictures) has been added to the website. Most directly related to the I/ON, its website.

As for highlights, in this issue you will find: a brief history of the I/ON newsletter (see page 1); a report by Lisa Boyce, Tara Carpenter, and Kara Incalcatera on comprehensive exam procedures and practices in I/O psychology (see page 1); observations from Dr. Lance Seberhagen on how organizations defend invalid tests with adverse impact (see page 17); the latest IOPSA-related news from President Crystal Harold (this page); an announcement regarding our upcoming SIOP reception (see page 3); details on this year’s Distinguished Alumni Award winner, Dr. Debbie Whetzel (see page 4); a spotlight on Dr. Paul Blesie (see pages 5); tips on choosing course electives outside of I/O (see page 7); a listing of our many contributions to SIOP 2002 (see pages 8-10); a guide to Toronto, site of the upcoming SIOP conference (see page 11); and words of wisdom from two of our Masters’ alumni, Diane Brown Maranto and Dave Thornton (see page 20).

Finally, as some of you already know, this is my third and final issue as editor of the I/ON. I would like to take this time to thank all of the students, alumni, faculty, and friends who contributed to the newsletter during my tenure as editor. People often say how impressed they are by the newsletter, and single me out for my “great work” as editor. While I'm honored by everyone’s praise, truth be told, my job is easy. In my mind, the real praise should go to the hard work, talents, and efforts, of the writers and photographers who contribute to the I/ON. These individuals have made my job as editor infinitely easier. In particular, thanks to Nikki Dudley (former editor), Drs. Rich Klimoski and Steve Zaccaro, for their feedback and suggestions over the past year. In my mind, the I/ON is truly a collaborative effort. Without the work of its contributors (students, faculty, alumni, and friends), the I/ON would not be what it is. So, kudos to everyone who served on this year’s team!

What’s New at GMU?

By Sidney Fisher

Major renovations have been made to the IOPSA website! You can check out the new website at: www.gmu.edu/org/iopsa. Feel free to add a link to the site on your personal webpage, or to share the new site’s address with friends and colleagues. Kudos to Patrick Fleming, Chelsey Hibbard, Mike Ingerick, W. Ben Porr, and Janet Yun for their hard work on the website. In addition, a special thanks to Gonzalo Ferro, Brian Holtz, Dr. Rob Ployhart, and Luciano Viera, Jr. for contributing content and/or feedback on the new website during its development. Also, thanks to all the faculty and students who contributed ideas and input on the new website. I think you will agree, the new website looks great!

In computer-related news, a common lab area with five Pentium (IIs-Ills) computers has been set-up in the Robinson Hall labs (Room 213). Additionally, a new HP LaserJet printer has been purchased for the lab. In the near future, all computers will be networked to the printer, so that students can print from any of the computers. The lab area is open to all students in the I/O program.

Going to SIOP this year? A quick reminder that the (final) deadline for applying to the Graduate Student Travel Fund for the 2001-2002 academic year is April 26th. Information and application forms can be found at the following website, www.gmu.edu/org/gstf. Both Masters and Doctoral students attending professional conferences are eligible to apply.

The end of the semester is fastly approaching! Hard to believe but the Spring semester is drawing to a close. As you are working on your term papers/class projects, keep in mind these important dates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theses and Dissertations due</td>
<td>May 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2002 graduation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Day of Classes</td>
<td>May 6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Day</td>
<td>May 7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Period</td>
<td>May 8th-May 16th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convocation</td>
<td>May 16th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement</td>
<td>May 18th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Important graduation information can be found on the Registrar’s website at: www.registrar.gmu.edu/grad/graduation.html. Congratulations to all our graduating Master and Doctoral students!

IOPSA Action

By Crystal Harold

It’s hard to believe it, but the school year is slowly winding down, and my tenure as IOPSA President is just about up. In this last edition of the I/ON, I wanted to take the opportunity to thank the many people who contributed to the success of IOPSA over the past year, as well as introduce next year’s officers.

First off, we all owe a big “thank you” to our current IOPSA officers: Karin Orvis (Vice President); Nikki Dudley (Treasurer); Brian Lappin (Secretary); Brian Griepentrog (Social Chair); and Mike Ingerick and Janet Yun (Webmasters). This year IOPSA worked long hours to bring you more IOPSA-sponsored activities, both professional and social. With the introduction of weekly brown bags, social hours, and the unveiling of the new IOPSA website (www.gmu.edu/org/iopsa), the current officers...
had a lot on their plates. They did an excellent job in ensuring that the goals of IOPSA were achieved and that all of our students’ needs were met. Please take some time to thank them for their efforts this year.

Second, I would also like to thank the faculty who contributed to various IOPSA events throughout the year, especially everyone that presented at one of our brown bags. Your involvement contributed to IOPSA’s success this year, and was greatly appreciated.

Lastly, a very special thank you to YOU, the students of GMU’s I/O Program! Thank you for taking time out of your busy schedules to attend IOPSA-sponsored events, present at brown bags, volunteer your time, and host social gatherings (to name but a few). More importantly, thank you for the many helpful suggestions, comments, and feedback you provided throughout the year. I hope that you will continue to show your support for IOPSA through your attendance at future events and by continuing to remain an active voice in the life of our program.

Finally, I’d like to introduce to you the students who will be taking over the “reins”, and serving as officers next year. They are:

President: Katie Baughman
Vice President: Crystal Harold
Treasurer: Gabrielle Tarmy
Secretary: Brian Holtz
Social Chairs: Gonzalo Ferro & Cary Kemp
Webmasters: W. Ben Porr & Luciano Viera, Jr.

Congratulations and best wishes, guys (and gals). My advice to next years’ crew is to work together, and to stay focused on what’s best for the program and students as a whole. Sometimes you can’t please everyone (and man did I learn that), so keep your chins up!

In closing, I enjoyed my time as IOPSA President. It was definitely a learning experience, but ultimately a rewarding one. For those that are graduating this year, congratulations! Best wishes and good luck in your future endeavors! And to all the alumni, current students, and faculty, see you in Toronto!

Who’s Who at GMU?

We enthusiastically acknowledge our current students and faculty members’ achievements. If you would like to acknowledge someone, please email us at: ion@gmu.edu.

By Karin Orvis

Kudos to Dr. Jose Cortina for being named an Associate Editor for the Journal of Applied Psychology! Dr. Cortina started his six-year term in January.

Congratulations to Dr. Rob Ployhart! Dr. Ployhart was recently named Program Chair for the 2004 Society of Industrial/Organizational Psychology (SIOP) conference to be held in Chicago, IL.

Very warm congratulations to Lisa Boyce and her husband, Scott Dudley. On Thursday, February 28th, Lisa and Scott welcomed their first baby (a boy), Colton Ky Dudley, to the world. Despite arriving a few weeks early, Colton came in at a healthy 6 lbs., 1 oz., and 19.5 inches. Here’s to the first member of GMU’s Class of 2024!

Please extend a warm round of applause to Dr. Louis Buffardi, Dr. Rob Ployhart, Dr. Steve Zaccaro, and recent alums, Drs. Wendy Casper, Michelle Marks, Jennifer Martin, and C. Shawn Burke for their recent (or upcoming) publications:


Join Us for a Continuing Tradition! The Fifth Annual GMU-SIOP Reception

By Nikki Dudley and Crystal Harold

Come one and all! The students and faculty of the I/O Psychology program are proud to announce that we will be hosting our 5th Annual GMU reception at the upcoming SIOP Conference in Toronto, Canada. The reception will be held on Friday evening (April 12), from 7:30-10:00pm at the Sheraton Centre Toronto Hotel in the Essex Ballroom. Not only will there be a variety of hors d’oeuvres and beverages to sample, but you can also enjoy the melodious tunes of a jazz band. At 8:30pm, we will be presenting our 2nd Annual Distinguished Alumnus Award (this year’s winner is Dr. Debbie Whetzel, see page 4 for details), so be sure not to miss it! The reception promises to be a great opportunity to mingle with faculty, students, alumni, and colleagues. Your official invitation to the GMU reception is included in this newsletter. We hope to see you there!
I/ON – GMU’s I/O Network

Dr. Debbie Whetzel Wins IOPSA Distinguished Alumni Award for 2002

By Crystal Harold

I am proud to announce that this year’s recipient of the IOPSA Distinguished Alumni Award is Dr. Debbie Whetzel. Dr. Whetzel is a graduate of GMU’s I/O Psychology M.A. program. She later received her Ph.D. from George Washington University’s Social and Organizational Psychology program.

The IOPSA Alumni Committee had no easy task on their hands this year. The caliber of this year’s nominees was outstanding. However, it was clear to the committee that Dr. Whetzel exemplified excellence across all of the criteria on which the award is based.

Dr. Whetzel contributes significantly to our students’ professional development, through the courses she instructs and the internship opportunities she is instrumental in providing to our students. Dr. Whetzel, currently employed at Caliber Associates (in Fairfax, VA), spends a great deal of time mentoring and advising junior staff; many of whom are current and former GMU students. She also served a mentoring role to several GMU graduate students while working at the U.S. Postal Service.

Dr. Whetzel recently taught PSYC 640, Techniques in Industrial and Organizational Psychology, here at GMU. This course introduces students to the basic mechanics and practical issues related to applying I/O psychology to the world of work. For many students, it was their first experience with conducting job analyses and test development, techniques that are the foundation of much of what I/O psychologists do. As a demonstration of her OCB (organizational citizenship behavior), Dr. Whetzel was working on a project based in Kansas City, while concurrently instructing this course. Every week, she returned to the D.C. area primarily to teach the Techniques class. Her dedication to the field and to our program is reflected in actions such as this.

In addition, Dr. Whetzel has achieved distinction through her professional contributions to the field of I/O via publications and conference presentations. Her work has appeared in the Journal of Applied Psychology, Psychological Reports, and the Journal of Creative Behavior, as well as professional conferences such as SIOP. Her edited book, Applied Measurement Methods in Industrial Psychology, is considered a practical “how to” guide to I/O psychology, and has been used as a standard text in several practice-oriented courses. On the service side, Dr. Whetzel is a past President of the Personnel Testing Council-Metropolitan Washington D.C. Chapter (PTC-MW). Not only do her achievements and professional activities promote the visibility of our program, but they are indicative of her strong commitment to the field of I/O psychology as a whole.

What else can be said about Dr. Whetzel? She contributes significantly to the development of our students, achieves distinction through her publications and activities in professional associations, and exemplifies best practices in the research and application of I/O. In sum, she is an excellent representative of GMU’s I/O program, and without a doubt, highly deserving of this years’ Distinguished Alumni Award.

Please join me in congratulating Dr. Whetzel on her many accomplishments, and thanking her for serving as such an exceptional representative of our program and model for our students. In recognition of her contributions, Dr. Whetzel will be receiving a plaque and a small gift at our annual SIOP reception. We invite everyone to join us in celebrating Dr. Whetzel’s accomplishment.

Dr. Robert Kilcullen Receives Distinguished Alumni Award

By Mike Ingerick

Congratulations are in order to Dr. Robert Kilcullen, last year’s Distinguished Alumni Award winner. Dr. Kilcullen visited GMU in November to present a brown bag on his consulting work with professional sports teams. At the conclusion of his presentation, Dr. Kilcullen received a plaque in honor of his winning IOPSA’s Distinguished Alumni Award. In addition to the plaque, Dr. Kilcullen received a sweatshirt with the words “GMU I/O Psychology” on the front as a small gift of appreciation from the members of IOPSA.

In March, the university will formally recognize Dr. Kilcullen for receiving the Distinguished Alumni award. This recognition will take place at GMU’s annual “Celebration of Distinction” banquet currently scheduled for April. Please join us in congratulating, Dr. Kilcullen, on his recent accomplishment.

Moving? New Address?

Alumni and friends, please keep us updated of any changes in your mailing address! To update your mailing information, send us a quick e-mail at ion@gmu.edu. Thanks!
Surviving the Proposal Defense

By Dr. Jose Cortina

Having now seen a fair number of proposal defenses, it seems to me that all of the successful ones have certain things in common, as do all of the unsuccessful ones. If these seem obvious, remember that, more often than not, at least one of these rules gets violated. Read them. Learn them. Live them. They are your friends.

1. Thou shalt obey thy advisor.

This one is pretty simple. If your advisor says to take something out of the proposal, take it out. If your advisor says to put something into the proposal, put it in. Do not, under any circumstances, give the impression that you are going to do as you were asked to and then fail to do so. If you feel that what your advisor has asked you to do is at odds with what you think you should do, discuss it with your advisor ahead of time.

2. Thou shalt not surprise thy advisor.

This is related to Rule #1. Your advisor expects certain things at the defense. First, s/he expects that the document that you defend is the one that s/he approved plus any additional changes that s/he asked you to make. Personally, I usually read the draft of the proposal that went out to the committee on the day of the defense. The reason is that, as far as I know, the document should be almost identical to the one that I approved. When that doesn’t turn out to be the case, I am unpleasantly surprised. Second, your advisor expects you to stick to the time limit for your presentation and to answer questions about your project and the literature on which it is based in an intelligent fashion. I’ll discuss these below. Parenthetically, it is wise to keep track of the suggestions that your advisor (and other committee members) has made. We sometimes forget what we suggested, but if you can document a given request, then we are much less likely to cause trouble in the defense.

3. Thou shalt not dig in thy heels (but neither shalt thou roll over).

If the committee feels that you need to make a particular modification, you should feel free to discuss the modification with them. However, if in the end, they agree that the change needs to be made, agree to make that change, and move on. This is not to say that you should accept every suggestion/criticism uncritically. Feel free to chew over suggestions/criticism during the defense. That is, after all, one of its purposes.

4. Thou shalt be the most knowledgeable person in the room about thy project.

If one of your committee members knows more about the details of any portion of your project than you do, it reflects VERY badly on you. By the time that you get to the defense, if you don’t know the project backwards and forwards, then you haven’t invested enough energy in it. Know the relevant literature off the top of your head. Know your hypotheses verbatim. Know your methods down to the smallest detail. Period. This is not a matter of studying as much as it is the culmination of a the work that you have done up to that point. You should, by virtue of the attention that you have paid to the project, be the most knowledgeable person with respect to your project. If you aren’t, then you probably aren’t ready to defend.

5. Thou shalt take thy presentation seriously.

The fact that people whose primary interest is your development will surround you should not lead you to believe that you can take the presentation lightly. If you do, the committee may feel that the most developmental action that they can take is to have you defend again. To enter a proposal defense with an unpolished presentation is to court disaster. It makes you look bad and it embarrasses your advisor. Do a couple of dry runs in front of other students. This will tell you how much time you are taking, which parts you need to practice further, which parts you need to rework, etc. Remember that you lose very little by preparing, but you stand to lose a lot by failing to prepare.

Spotlight on...
Dr. Paul Bliese

By Janet Yun

Dr. Paul Bliese is currently a researcher at Walter Reed Army Institute of Research (WRAIR). Dr. Bliese was recently an invited speaker at an I/OPS A brown bag at GMU, where he discussed the research he has been involved with at WRAIR. Additionally, he has collaborated with Dr. Rob Ployhart on two forthcoming book chapters on multilevel statistical techniques. Let’s learn more about Dr. Bliese’s background and research interests.

Dr. Paul Bliese

Where did you grow up? What did you want to be while you were growing up?

I was born in Ethiopia and except for an occasional year or two spent in the U.S. I grew up in East Africa. My father is a linguist/missionary, and has spent the last 40 years working on translation projects of the B6 or so languages indigenous to Ethiopia. I spent my early childhood in the rural regions of Ethiopia and later our family moved into the capital city of Addis Ababa (I took Rob Ployhart to eat Ethiopian food once - it’s fun introducing someone who grew up in Fargo to the Ethiopian bread injera). I rounded out my last two years of high school in a boarding school in Kenya.

I really don’t know what I wanted to be when I grew up. In college and in high school I was always impressed by people who had career paths clearly laid out (I even know several people who actually executed their plans) - I guess that I felt like I was (and still am) making it up as I go along.

How did your interests in I/O psychology develop?

I like to joke that I got my bachelor’s degree in psychology largely by accident. I went to a very liberal, liberal arts college and somewhere around my junior year I had to declare a major. It so happened that I had more psychology courses than
anything else, so I went with that as a major. Around the time that I was finishing up my BA, I realized that I had to get an advanced degree in something to really be marketable. In addition, I liked college (great vacation plan), and wasn't ready to start working full time. My roommate in college was a business major, so I started looking into I/O as a way to combine psychology and business. Probably like a lot of undergraduates, I didn't really know much about the field other than the fact that it somehow merged psychology and business.

*When and where did you earn your Ph.D.? What's the title of your dissertation? Who did you work with?*

I earned my degree in 1991 from Texas Tech University. The title of my dissertation was "The effects of goal setting on dyad strategy development." Perhaps the most memorable aspect of my dissertation was that my group task was "Space Invaders" played on an old ATARI system. When subjects didn’t show up, or when a session ended early, I got to practice Space Invaders. I got pretty good at the game by the time I finished my dissertation. Unfortunately, I've found that having near expert skills in Space Invaders doesn't really do so much for you.

In graduate school I worked primarily with Dr. Clay George. Dr. George was one of those professors who had done a bit of everything over his career. What Dr. George instilled in me was a real love of statistics and analysis. One of his favorite sayings as we analyzed data was "let's try to figure out what nature is telling us." Interestingly, I feel like Clay's phrase pretty much summarizes what I've been doing in my post-graduate career.

*What courses are you teaching (graduate-level)? What do you enjoy about teaching?*

I periodically teach a graduate-level course on multilevel modeling at the University of Maryland, College Park. The course is part statistics and part theory with a heavy emphasis on working with and analyzing data using the open source language R. I get a lot out of teaching the course because it really helps me see where there are gaps in my own understanding, and it lets me evaluate software and documentation that I've written for certain analytic problems that I've encountered. I also really enjoy getting those great questions from students that showing something has caught their interest.

*What are your primary areas of expertise (e.g., personnel selection, groups/teams, research methods/statistics)?*

My primary area of expertise is in research methods and statistics; however, I'm interested in applying these skills to a substantive area, so I focus on occupational stress, health and performance. A number of my publications center on testing and extending aspects of occupational stress theory.

*Where do you currently work? Are there opportunities for internships for GMU graduate students?*

I currently work at the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research (WRAIR). To the outside world, we are often confused with the Walter Reed Army Medical Center (the hospital) or with the Army Research Institute (ARI). We are confused with the former because we share a same name; with the latter because ARI is well-known for behavior science research so any behavior science researchers in the Army are assumed to be from ARI.

As a short plug for the WRAIR, I will mention that WRAIR is probably best known for the infectious disease research, but there is a strong group of behavioral scientists in the institute as well. We do not have an internship program, but we do have post-doc opportunities for individuals who are interested in our work and want to remain civilians. For the brave-hearted, there are opportunities to join the Army on a direct commission and come in as an officer. Honestly, this doesn't really require one to be brave-hearted. I joined post-graduate school, and I knew nothing about the military (much to the amusement/horror of my NCOs who had to coach me on the basics every time we ventured out to some Army post). In my 10 years of service, I've never regretted my decision to join (well, there was a period when I was living in a warehouse in Haiti where I might have had second thoughts).

*Please give us some details about your current and/or future research projects (any links to GMU I/O program).*

Currently, I'm working on several projects. One that has kept me busier that I would have expected is writing, documenting and maintaining the "multilevel" library. This is a set of routines that run within the open-source computing language R allowing one to do a wide range of multilevel functions (calculate rwg, ICCs, conduct Random Group Resampling (RGR), etc.). The multilevel library is one of the tools that I have students use in the course that I teach.

A second area I have been working on in conjunction with Dr. Rob Ployhart is methodological research related to the application of random coefficient models to the analysis of longitudinal data. The longer I work in the area of I/O, the more convinced I become that the field needs to more routinely model longitudinal data, so I'm interested in doing what I can to make these data analytic techniques accessible. Incidentally, my interest in this area stems from the fact that the analysis of longitudinal data and the analysis of multilevel data share some key similarities.

Finally, on the occupational stress front, I'm working on a project attempting to measure and model soldiers’ adaptation and response to being activated for homeland defense post September 11. This activation is interesting because it involves a number of National Guard and Reserve units who had very little preparation time. We are following about 500 of these individuals over the next year or so to see what types of issues (if any) develop.

*What are your interests outside of I/O? (e.g., If you had a free I/O-less Saturday, what would you do?)*

This is an interesting question because my current answer reflects the fact that I have a two-year old daughter. Right now my answer is pretty boring - on my days off I love going to the park, the zoo and the hiking trails with my wife and daughter. When Emma’s preoccupied at the park I work on juggling 5 balls much to the amusement of the other kids who like to watch the balls fly in all directions (Emma's pretty bored by it now, and also knows that there is a certain degree of danger with being too close - needless to say I'm not very good at juggling 5). A couple of years ago I would have told you that birding was my main interest - it's a strange hobby, but my wife and I have seen (and identified) some 800+ birds in fun places like Thailand, the Amazon Basin in Peru, Kenya, Tanzania, Ethiopia, Guatemala, etc. When Emma's older, I'm sure I'll dust off the binoculars again and give her a chance to see a Verreaux's Eagle or a White-cheeked Turaco. Until then, we will stick with feeding the ducks at the Rio shopping center.

Dr. Paul Bliese can be contacted at Paul.Bliese@NA.AMEDD.ARMY.MIL

If you are member of the I/O community and are interested in being featured in an upcoming issue of the I/ON, or if you’d like to present at an IOPSA brown bag, please e-mail us at ion@gmu.edu. We look forward to hearing from you!
Navigating Course Electives: Classes Outside of I/O

By Laura Poms and Chelsey Hibbard

Wow, you're finally at that point in your program, M.A. or Ph.D., where you actually get to select some electives. What will you do with that type of ‘free time’? Take more I/O classes? Or perhaps you are feeling a little more daring, say, by taking classes outside our department, maybe at SOM or ICAR or UDRP or some other alphabet soup department. What do all these acronyms mean and how do they apply to electives? So many options, so little time.

This is what prompted the authors to write this article. While we see the same people (for the most part) in similar classes, once in a while, someone is missing. Where are they, and why?

To clear up the situation a bit, if you are in the M.A. program, you can take up to six credits of electives outside of the department, with your advisor’s approval, of course. Ph.D. students can take up to 12 hours of electives, nine of which may be taken outside the department (as long as they are on the approved list). So, with this freedom, where is everyone going?

In our typical scientific manner (see Hibbard & Poms, 2001-November 2001 issue of the I/ON Newsletter), we conducted our usual random stratified sampling. Okay, actually, we took answers from anyone who shared!

Here are some of our findings:

Brian Griepentrog went for the business end of things: MBA 612 and 613, in the School of Management (SOM), which encompass financial and managerial accounting. His rationale? “I was, and still am, quite interested in management consulting when I finish my graduate schooling. What I perceived to be one of my major weaknesses was a lack of real world business knowledge and experience.” For Brian, these classes gave him insight into what he was missing; how managers and boards cut costs, make decisions, and where they invest capital. Brian also used these classes to help identify the benefit of I/O psychology in the financial world.

While Brian is learning to manage the dollars and cents of a corporation, Paige Bader is taking EDCD 605, Introduction to Counseling, this semester because she thought “it would be really helpful when working one-on-one with people during consulting by developing good listening skills and knowing which questions to ask.”

Along those same lines, Patrick Fleming took CONF 501, Introduction to Conflict Resolution, and CONF 731, Conflict in Organizations, at GMU’s internationally recognized Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution (ICAR). Patrick feels the introduction class was a great preview of conflict management. “We read case studies and books about actual large scale conflicts, using these as illustrations of basic theories and principles of conflict and resolution.” PSYC 731, Conflict in Organizations, was a more theory-based class, meaning less actual application. While that was a bit of a disappointment, the material was relevant (and overlapping) to I/O and management literature. Both classes were useful because it gave Patrick a “different perspective on organizational processes and also a good experience to contribute my own expertise and knowledge to students and faculty in the conflict program.”

Laura Poms also took CONF 501 and highly recommends it as well. While less empirically oriented than the courses we are used to in I/O it offers an opportunity to practice the qualitative research skills we don’t use as often. As a graduate teaching assistant (GTA) in the Communication Department, she also suggests looking into COMM 635, Organizational Communication, which focuses on analyzing communication systems and processes within organizations; factors that can have a huge impact on the many processes that we look at in I/O.

Another student who is looking towards resolution of conflict is Evan Brownstein. Evan has been taking mediation classes sponsored by the University Dispute and Resolution Program (UDRP). “I am really interested in the interpersonal/organizational side of the workplace. I feel that mediation can be highly advantageous for one who desires to go the applied ‘O’ route.” Evan feels that mediation will be useful on many levels, from strife between co-workers to tensions between two companies. He will eventually earn a certification as a mediator in the state of Virginia.

Chelsey Hibbard will be taking computer classes this semester. Her main interest will be scripting classes, such as JavaScript and/or Perl (depending on what’s being offered). While that may seem like it’s coming out of “left field”, a large chunk of what she currently does involves programming web surveys and other web-based projects, such as training. The more skills she develops in the programming area, the better. New technology comes out all the time, and it’s a very good idea to stay on top of it.

Some of us have opted to take a non-I/O elective within the Psychology department:

Crystal Harold is taking PSYC 701, Cognitive Bases of Behavior as an elective. When prompted for the reason, Crystal said, “I did a lot of my undergraduate research in the field of Cognitive Psychology, and was originally planning to pursue a Ph.D. in Cognitive Psychology, but changed my mind once I learned about I/O. I think that there is a lot out there in the cognitive literature that would be a good compliment for some of the research that I’m doing.”

While Crystal is looking into people’s brains, Charlotte Katz is interested in the behavioral/personality aspects of different cultures and individuals. She feels that it is very important that we have a better understanding of the beliefs and behaviors of other people and cultures, because as this country continues to grow (especially given recent events), to be insular is to be ignorant. Good point! Course electives not only help to engender a more well-rounded view of psychology, but also the world.

Just in case none of the classes noted here appeal to you, according to Dr. Lou Buffardi, in past years students have also selected electives from the Public Administration, and Social and Organizational Learning (PSOL) programs.

We would like to say thank you to everyone who shared their interests and the classes they’re taking. Perhaps what is the best lesson to walk away with is that different classes, and hence, different perspectives can only help. As we all know, I/O is a program that can encompass and relate to many other programs and lines of study, so it only makes sense that we all looking to expand our horizons in some way.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bader, P. K., Fleming, P. J., Zaccaro, S. J., &amp; Barber, H. F.</td>
<td>The developmental impact of work experiences on adaptability.</td>
<td>Friday, 3:30 PM, Conference G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barger, E. J. &amp; Carpenter, T.</td>
<td>Meta-analysis and test for partial mediation involving goal commitment.</td>
<td>Saturday, 1:00 PM, Sheraton Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyce, L., Carpenter, T., &amp; Incalcata, K. A.</td>
<td>Industrial/organizational psychology programs’ comprehensive exam procedures and practices.</td>
<td>Saturday, 3:30 PM, Sheraton Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter, T. &amp; Barger, E. J.</td>
<td>The use of simulation and training effectiveness: A meta-analysis.</td>
<td>Saturday, 3:30 PM, Sheraton Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, G.W., Dorsey, D.W., Incalcata, K. A., &amp; Wasserman, M. E.</td>
<td>O*NET and IT occupations.</td>
<td>Sunday, 10:30 AM, Conference F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler, C. W., McFarland, L. A., &amp; Harold, C. M.</td>
<td>Personality test responses and reactions: The role of language and culture.</td>
<td>Saturday, 10:30 AM, Essex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen, G. &amp; Klimoski, R. J.</td>
<td>Modeling early newcomer role performance: The roles of distal individual differences and proximal motivational and interpersonal processes.</td>
<td>Friday, 3:30 PM, Conference G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortina, J. M.</td>
<td>Methodology contributions by I/O: The blind leading the visually acute?</td>
<td>Friday, 11:30 AM, Grand West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortina, J. M.</td>
<td>Understanding the nature, antecedents, and moderators of test-related perceptions.</td>
<td>Saturday, 10:30 AM, Dominion North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley, N. M., McFarland, L. A., &amp; Goodman, S. A.</td>
<td>Social desirability scales: Do race differences exist?</td>
<td>Friday, 2:00 PM, Kenora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes, S. C., &amp; Ployhart, R. E.</td>
<td>Using cultural mistrust to understand black-white test-taking and test performance differences.</td>
<td>Saturday, 10:30 AM, Dominion North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>8 AM</td>
<td>Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>8 AM</td>
<td>York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>Sheraton Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>12:30 PM</td>
<td>Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>Dominion North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>Sheraton Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>Civic South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>12:30 PM</td>
<td>Windsor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(see “SIOP 2002” on page 10)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morath, R. A., Donahue, L., &amp; Anderson, L. E.</th>
<th>Developing taxonomy of IT occupations. In R. J. Vance (Chair) and K. Pearlman (Discussant), Describing IT jobs/occupations: Challenges, approaches, and implications for occupational analysis.</th>
<th>Sunday, 10:30 AM, Conference F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ployhart, R. E., &amp; Hayes, S. C.</td>
<td>The test-taker’s bill of rights: What do applicants want? In J. M. Cortina (Chair), M. Ingerick (Chair), D. Lev-Are Margalit (Chair), and M. A. Campion (Discussant), Understanding the nature, antecedents, and moderators of test-related perceptions.</td>
<td>Saturday, 10:30 AM, Dominion North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ployhart, R. E., Weekley, J. A., Holtz, B. C., &amp; Kemp, C. F.</td>
<td>Web-based vs. paper-and-pencil testing: A comparison of factor structures across applicants and incumbents. In F. L. Oswald (Chair), J. M. Stanton (Chair), and M. M. Harris (Discussant), Virtually hired? The implications of web testing for personnel selection.</td>
<td>Friday, 3:30 PM, Essex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasilopoulos, N. L., McFarland, L. A., Cucina, J. M., &amp; Ingerick, M.</td>
<td>A comparison of measures of faking across types of warnings and levels of job familiarity. In L. A. McFarland (Chair) and A. M. Ryan (Discussant), Applicant faking: New perspectives on an old issue.</td>
<td>Saturday, 10:30 AM, Essex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasserman, M. E., Orvis, K. A., Fisher, S. L., &amp; Barry, T.</td>
<td>Trainee reactions to learner control features: An important link in the e-learning equation. Paper presentation. In K. G. Brown (Chair), K. Kraiger (Discussant), and J. K. Ford (Discussant), e-Learning participation and outcomes: Evidence from the field.</td>
<td>Sunday, 8:00 AM, Windsor Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekley, J. A., &amp; Ployhart, R. E.</td>
<td>Situational judgment and training experience: Antecedents and correlates. In F. Drasgow (Chair) and N. Schmitt (Discussant), Situational judgment tests: Constructs, validity, and faking.</td>
<td>Saturday, 3:30 PM, Huron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yun, G., Donahue, L. M., Dudley, N. M., &amp; McFarland, L. A.</td>
<td>Rater personality, rating format, and social context: Implications for performance appraisal accuracy. In R. B. Kaiser (Chair), S. B. Craig (Chair), and R. T. Hogan (Discussant), 360-degree feedback and personality at the crossroads.</td>
<td>Saturday, 1:30 PM, Civic South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaccaro, S. J. (Chair), Banks, D. (Chair), and Van Velsor, E.</td>
<td>Developmental experiences and growing leadership capacities: Theoretical and empirical perspectives.</td>
<td>Friday, 3:30 PM, Conference G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaccaro, S. J., Rittman, A. L., Orvis, K., Marks, M. A., &amp; Mathieu, J. E.</td>
<td>Leadership processes in multi-team systems. In J. C. Ziegert (Chair), K. J. Klein (Chair), and S. W. J. Kozlowski (Discussant), Team leadership: Current theoretical and research perspectives.</td>
<td>Sunday, 8 AM, Grand Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziegert, J. C., Ployhart, R. E., &amp; McFarland, L. A.</td>
<td>Perceived stereotype threat: Development of a self-report scale. In R. E. Ployhart (Chair) and P. Sackett (Discussant), Stereotype threat in testing contexts: A critical examination.</td>
<td>Saturday, 12:00 PM, Dominion South</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wondering About Toronto, Eh?
A Guide to the Sights and Sounds of Toronto

By Gonzalo Ferro and Kathryn Baughman

Heading to the SIOP conference this year, and know nothing about the host city of Toronto? Don’t have time to research the city given your coursework and current research projects? Well, here is the low down on this great city.

Contrary to popular belief, Toronto is NOT the capital of Canada (Ottawa is), but it is the capital of the province of Ontario. In 1834, it was given the name of Toronto, which means “meeting place.” Toronto has a very diverse population totaling 2.5 million, out of which 48% are immigrants. There are about 100 different languages spoken in the Megacity, but English will definitely get you around. Just make sure you don’t say “y’all”, and remember to spell things with an “u”, like “neighbourhood” or “colour.”

For all of you who think Toronto is way up North, here is a little known fact. About half of all the U.S. population lives within a one-day drive of Toronto! There are some differences, though. For example, Canada operates on the metric system. Therefore, the temperature will be in degrees Celsius. The average high for April is 11.9 (53.4 Fahrenheit), with a low of 3.2 (37.8). So make sure you bring a flexible wardrobe (Canada is all “aboot” layers).

Getting around will also be important, and Toronto has a great transportation system. You can get around via the bus, the subway (not metro), and even trolleys. If you want more information, visit the transportation website (www.ttc.ca); there you will find maps, price information, and a schedule of when things stop running. They also have information on how to get from the airport to the downtown area. As an experienced traveler to Toronto there are two options: 1) you can take a local bus to the subway station, then a subway downtown (total cost is about $2.25 – in Canadian dollars); or 2) you can take one of the charter buses that will take you directly to the downtown hotels (for about $15-17).

For those of you from small towns, don’t be afraid. Canadians are well known for being the friendliest people around. Toronto was actually ranked the safest metropolitan area in North America by Places Rated Almanac (one point for the Canucks). If you want to do a little research on your own, we suggest checking out the following websites: www.city.toronto.on.ca, www.wheretoronto.com, www.torontotourism.com. For those of you who are too busy preparing for SIOP, here is our virtual tour of Toronto.

Cultural Sites

There will be something to do for everyone, since Toronto is a vibrant, cultural and recreational center. The city is home to four professional sports teams. In hockey, there are the Maple Leafs, (www.torontomapleleafs.com); for football, the Argonauts; (www.argonauts.on.ca), for basketball, the Raptors; (www.nba.com/raptors); and baseball, the Blue Jays (www.bluejays.com).

For those who are into the theatre and plays, Toronto has the third largest English-language theatre center in the world (behind London and New York).

If you are into museums, and have the time to explore, you might want to check out the Toronto Museum Passport. It is a pay-one-price ticket which includes admission to: 1) the Royal Ontario Museum, 2) Historic Fort York, 3) the Gardiner Museum of Ceramic Art, 4) Spadina Historic House and Gardens, plus five other city museums. Tickets cost $20 for students, $25 for adults, and you can purchased online at www.ticketking.com. Here is a brief breakdown of some of the more popular places:

Royal Ontario Museum (www.rom.on.ca): The Royal Ontario Museum (ROM) has over 45 galleries, which showcase art, archeology, and science. Besides the permanent exhibitions, in April there will be a special South Asian and East Asian Religious Sculpture exhibit, and a couple of others titled “Silver: the Sterling Choice”, and “More Than Cool: Chinese Fans and Fan Paintings.” If you visit the ROM make sure you take a walk around the neighborhood, because it is located in one of the trendiest parts of town, Yorkville (see the section on “Restaurants and Shopping” for further details).

Museum of Contemporary Canadian Art (www.mocca.toronto.on.ca): The third largest museum in Toronto, it is devoted to the visual arts. The museum’s mission is to promote contemporary art by living Canadian artists.

The Art Gallery of Ontario (www.ago.net): The Art Gallery of Ontario (AGO) is the eighth largest museum in North America. The collection comprises more than 24,000 works representing 1,000 years of extraordinary European, Canadian, modern, Inuit, and contemporary art.

The Gardiner Museum of Ceramic Art (www.gardinermuseum.on.ca): The first museum in North America devoted to ceramics and ceramic research. Located across from the ROM, its collection contains ceramics from Europe, Asia, and the Americas.

Other Places of Interest

CN Tower (www.ctntower.ca): A trip to Toronto is not complete without stopping at the CN Tower to check it out. In 1995, the Tower was classified as one of the Seven Wonders of the Modern World. It is the world’s tallest building and free-standing structure. At a height of 553.33 m (1815 ft, 5 inches), you can see why! If you decide to pay and go to the top, make sure you stand over the “glass.” There is a glass floor in the upper sphere from which you can look down (not for those who suffer from vertigo) to the ground, far, far below. But don’t worry, it can withstand the weight of 14 large hippos. The CN tower has three restaurants where you can grab a bite: 360, Horizon’s Cafe, and Marketplace Cafe.

(see “Toronto” page 12)
Toronto Zoo (www.torontozoo.com): A world-class zoo! It has 5000 animals representing 459 wildlife species: gorillas, orangutans, Siberian tigers, polar bears, elephants and rhinos. The zoo even has even a South American bird-eating spider.

The Harbourfront (www.harbourfront.on.ca): An innovative non-profit cultural organization which creates, for a diverse public, events and activities of excellence that enliven, educate and entertain. There is no admission charge. All programs are offered at reasonable prices or completely free of charge.

The Ontario Science Centre (www.ontariosciencecentre.ca): All sorts of great science exhibits and live demonstrations, it is a very interactive place with an excellent website.

**Restaurants and Shopping**

Toronto is a great place for shopping, especially for Americans (the exchange rate is $1 U.S. = $1.57 Canadian). If you are interested in going to “nice” (i.e., expensive), designer name boutiques we suggest the Yorkville area (get off at the Bay St. subway stop or at Museum and walk north). Yorkville is found between the streets of Bloor St. West – Davenport Rd. and Avenue Rd. – Yonge St. There you will find a great selection of stores for all tastes, as well some of the best restaurants in Toronto.

If you want an extravagant dinner, we highly recommend Sotto Sotto (www.toronto.com/sottosotto) an incredible Italian restaurant, with an extensive wine list (prices range from $30 to $3000) and the best, freshly made food in town. Note, however, that reservations should be done at least 10 days in advance for dinner.

There are numerous restaurants from all over the world, and at night some of them turn into lounges where you can relax, listen to some jazz, and enjoy a Martini. If you are into Latin dancing, make sure that Friday night you go to Ba-Ba-Luu (Phone: 416-588-7804) the place is hopping with the rhythms of Salsa and Merengue. Closer to downtown, the Bohemian Café (Phone: 416-944-3550) is a great dance/bar.

If you definitely don’t like dancing, there are plenty of sit-down English-style pubs, like the Brunswick House (Phone: 416-964-2242). Otherwise, head to the Entertainment District (along Queen St., between Bathurst and Yonge St.). There are all sorts of bars, restaurants, and shops in that area.

**On the Waterfront**

We hope this serves as a useful guide and cultural passport to discovering a great metropolitan centre. Toronto has something to offer everyone, regardless of age or taste. We are definitely looking forward to SIOP (for the conference, of course) and the opportunity to head “out” and “aboot.”

In the immortal words of brothers, Bob and Doug McKenzie (SCTV), “Take off you hoser!”

---

“I/ON” from page 1

I think the I/ON is very helpful in creating and maintaining an active graduate student culture that is extremely helpful to us in recruiting, both faculty and particularly students. Also getting the I/ON to faculty and other professionals not associated with our program is especially helpful in raising our visibility and contributes significantly to the reputation of the program.

**Dr. Lou Buffardi**: I think our alums and friends enjoy reading about our activities and each other (e.g., Who’s Who, SIOP pics). To some extent it reminds me of those Christmas newsletters everyone sends. The I/ON highlights what we’ve done and plan to do via a practical medium. It helps everyone stay connected, while saying, “we’re thinking of you” to our extended family. I can remember being at SIOP and having strangers walk up to me and congratulate GMU on our successes that they read about in the I/ON. It helps keep our I/O world closer even though GMU’s I/O psychology “family” is spread across the U.S.

**Dr. Lynn McFarland**: I was amazed that the students wrote, edited, and distributed the I/ON on their own accord. It takes dedication to do that.

**How do you think the I/ON helps our program?**

**Lisa Boyce**: I think our alumni and friends enjoy reading about our activities and each other (e.g., Who’s Who, SIOP pics). To some extent it reminds me of those Christmas newsletters everyone sends. The I/ON highlights what we’ve done and plan to do using via a practical medium. It helps everyone stay connected, while saying, “we’re thinking of you” to our extended family. I can remember being at SIOP and having strangers walk up to me and congratulate GMU on our successes that they read about in the I/ON. It helps keep our I/O world closer even though GMU’s I/O psychology “family” is spread across the U.S.

**Dr. Lou Buffardi**: I think the I/ON is very helpful in creating and maintaining an active graduate student culture that is extremely helpful to us in recruiting, both faculty and particularly students. Also getting the I/ON to faculty and other professionals not associated with our program is especially helpful in raising our visibility and contributes significantly to the reputation of the program.

**Dr. Steve Zaccaro**: It is an excellent medium to keep students, alumni, and faculty informed about the GMU I/O program. It also helps the broader I/O community know what is going on in the program, and thus raises our visibility.
**I/ON – GMU’s I/O Network**

**Dr. Jose Cortina:** It helps in a lot of ways. First, it is a vehicle for keeping people who aren’t here involved with, or at least informed about, what we are doing. That includes alums, faculty from other schools, prospective students, etc. Second, it is a means for getting a large number of students involved on a regular basis. Third, it is a vehicle for providing information that students are likely to find useful.

*What got you started as the I/ON editor?*

**Dr. Marisa Diana:** While at GMU I thrived on the conversations and interactions with colleagues. We shared research interests, career aspirations, and our personal and professional lives during our tenure at GMU. Conducting and writing my dissertation took me out of “the loop,” and I found I had lost those interactions I cherished, as other colleagues entered dissertation mode or graduated and focused on career tracks. In addition, I remember feeling that the GMU graduate students were engaged in such diverse research projects (both through GMU and through their work/practicum experiences) that it was tough to keep apprised of all the research everyone was engaged in. A newsletter seemed like a great forum for staying connected with current GMU grad students and my friends whose careers brought them all across the country. The newsletter also could help newcomers to GMU to get a clear picture of “who’s who” and what’s happening within the graduate program.

**Dr. Stephanie Payne,** the I/ON’s second editor, wrote a letter to future I/ON editors in which she explained why she devoted so much time and effort to the newsletter. First, the I/ON promotes the program. This is one way a student can give back to the I/O program at GMU. Second, there is an intrinsic enjoyment in sharing information with others, plus it is fun being the first to know some of the latest news in the program. Third, it has given students the opportunity to work closely with other faculty and each other, to learn about marketing a program, and to see how a graduate program is successfully run when it is considered a business. **Dr. Payne** observed that when she interviewed for jobs post-graduate school she was frequently asked how she would go about marketing a program. In responding to the question, she said, “little bells went off—newsletter, webpage, alumni relations, etc.” Fourth, the newsletter has given a number of students the opportunity to demonstrate (and develop) practical “real world” skills (e.g., leadership, project management, written communication, teamwork, etc.).

One thing, I personally love about the I/ON is the consistency and creativity. The consistency lies in the fact that there are always students willing to write, and there are cornerstone articles that provide the newsletter’s foundation (e.g. Who’s Who, What’s New, Spotlight on…, Partners in Education, A Word From Our Alumni, etc.). The creativity is shown through new articles and ideas in each newsletter. This is attributed to the “think outside the box” mentality that GMU students seem to thrive on.

I have only been a part of the GMU I/O community for seven months yet I have seen the desire and motivation faculty, students, and alumni have in making this program the best. Not the best in I/O necessarily (of course, we would like that too), but the best atmosphere for learning. Like the Army, we strive to be all we can be and beyond.

I would like to leave you off with two examples. The first is I/O-related. When I decided to write this article I compiled a list of all the people who could give me insight into the inner workings of the I/ON. I sent an e-mail out to past editors and present faculty asking for their thoughts on the subject. By the time I sat down to write this article I had a 100% response rate from my e-mails. Now tell me, where in the field do you find this?

The second example is from the first I/ON editor, Dr. Marisa Diana. A couple of days before I planned on writing this article I had not heard from the Dr. Diana. I was beginning to get concerned because she was the co-founder of the newsletter, and I felt it was important to get her insights. The night before I wrote the article I received an email from Dr. Diana. She explained that she had been out-of-town for a while and just received my email. By the next morning she had answered all of my questions extensively. I feel this summarizes GMU students and alumni. They are quick, efficient, and dedicated, and this is reflected in products like the I/ON newsletter.

In closing, the first five years of the newsletter have seen and documented significant growth (both for the newsletter and the program). I expect the next five years will prove to be equally eventful. As a preview, I’d like to leave you with some photos from I/ONs past.
in reviewing, revising, and adopting effective comprehensive exam systems, serving as input to emerging discussions regarding guidelines for graduate training, and providing invaluable advice and insight on “best practices” to students preparing to take an exam.

The present study addressed four major questions related to comprehensive exams: (1) What are the purposes of comprehensive exams? (2) What are and should be the competency areas assessed with comprehensive exams? (3) What are the procedures and formats used to administer comprehensive exams? and (4) What practices (preparing and evaluating) are associated with comprehensive exams? In addition, the relationships of the responses to these questions to satisfaction and other organizational outcomes were also examined.

Method

For this study, comprehensive exam was defined as “a final written/oral exam, which must be passed in order for a degree to be awarded” (SIOP, 2000).

Data were collected from faculty members, alumni, and students from I/O graduate programs administering comprehensive exams. According to the 2000 SIOP Graduate Training Program Directory, 95 U.S. universities and colleges have an I/O psychology graduate program. Communications with the program chair of 90 of these schools identified 46 doctoral and 20 masters programs as administering comprehensive exams. Program directors from 42 doctoral and 20 masters programs agreed to support the study.

Two mail surveys were administered: (1) a Comprehensive Exam Procedures Survey and (2) a Comprehensive Exam Practices Survey. The Procedures Survey measured policies, content, and structure of each program’s comprehensive exam. The questionnaire consisted of 45 items divided into five sections: (1) purpose and content (2) written exam structure, (3) oral exam structure, (4) evaluation procedures, and (5) preparation procedures. One survey was completed per program by a faculty member identified as having a thorough knowledge of their respective program’s exam procedures.

The Practices Survey targeted faculty, alumni, or post-comps graduate students. Three versions of the questionnaire each consisted of 100 items of similar content but tailored to the particular participant. The majority of items requested the respondent to rate, using a five-point Likert-type scale (e.g., 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree], the emphasis placed on reasons for giving comprehensive exams and the content areas assessed on the exam. The remaining questions focused on respondents’ perceptions of exam practices.

Results

Of the 62 participating programs, 74% completed the Procedures Surveys (N = 46). On average, a program’s comprehensive exam had been in operation for nearly eight years, though nearly half of the programs indicated policy revision during the last five years. Most programs indicated less than 20 students had taken their exam in the last five years, but several master’s program representatives estimated as many as 50 to 175 students.

Of the 1,188 Comprehensive Exam Practices Surveys distributed, a total of 377 were returned (29.8% of faculty, 53.3% of alumni, and 23.3% of student surveys). Seventy-three surveys were dropped from subsequent analyses as the respondents’ indicated that they were not currently affiliated with an I/O program or had no involvement with their program’s exam. The following results are based on 304 (73 faculty members, 123 alumni, and 108 graduate students) responses. Sample characteristics are reported in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Represented</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Representative Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>- Mean time at current program: 13.5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>- Currently employed in an I/O Psychology related job: 95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Comps Graduate Students</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>- Average annual salary: $70,550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Total responses represent 56 of the 66 I/O psychology graduate programs administering comprehensive exams.

Purpose of Comprehensive Exams

I/O psychology programs’ official representatives were asked to indicate the primary and supplemental purposes of their program’s comprehensive exams. A cluster analysis was performed to identify programs with similar exam purposes. The three major purpose clusters identified included 1) Evaluate Knowledge, 2) Other (e.g., Developmental Opportunity), and 3) Integrate Knowledge. Each of these clusters was structured around a primary purpose (evaluate knowledge, other, or integrate knowledge) with several alternate purposes such as assess basic skills and meet university requirements.
Faculty members, alumni, and students were also asked to indicate what they perceived to be the primary purpose of their program's comprehensive exam. Overall, the majority of program representatives (87%) reported that evaluate and integrate knowledge is the primary purpose of their exam. However, there were inconsistencies among faculty, alumni, and students' responses regarding their exam's primary purpose.

A closer examination of the data by primary purpose demonstrates that less than 60 percent of respondents reported the same primary purpose as indicated by the official program representative, with faculty (on average) more likely to identify the same purpose than students. If the supplemental purposes of a program's exam are taken into consideration, the level of agreement is much higher. When considering any of these purposes (primary and supplemental), over 80 percent of the respondents agreed with the responses of the official program representative regarding one or more of the purposes of the exam.

Finally, respondents were also asked to rate the emphasis that is placed on 14 reasons comprehensives exams were used in their program. The greatest amount of emphasis was placed on screening for requisite knowledge, integration of graduate education, and learning experience for students. Interestingly, students indicated a greater amount of emphasis on the use of exams as a “rite of passage” than faculty members.

**Content Areas Assessed in Comprehensive Exams**

I/O psychology programs' official representatives were asked to indicate the content and type of questions on their program's comprehensive exams. A cluster analysis was performed to identify programs with similar content. The two higher-order clusters identified centered on the content of the exam (General I/O and Specialized) with four subclusters focusing on question type (e.g., applied, theoretical, statistical, methodological, specialty topic).

Twenty-five competency areas as identified in the 1998 *Guidelines for Education and Training at the Doctoral Level in Industrial Organizational Psychology* were rated by faculty, alumni, and students on the extent to which the content areas "should be" assessed in comprehensive exams and whether or not they were covered by their program's exam. Table 2 provides the means and standard deviations of these ratings. Content areas receiving the greatest overall emphasis ratings were research methods and personnel recruitment, selection, and placement. Over 88 percent of the respondents indicated their program's exam actually assessed these competencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Areas</th>
<th>Overall Emphasis Ratings Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Content Area Assessed Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>4.09 (0.89)</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Recruitment, Selection, and Placement</td>
<td>4.01 (0.86)</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Methods/Data Analysis</td>
<td>3.84 (0.95)</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Appraisal and Feedback</td>
<td>3.87 (0.84)</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Motivation</td>
<td>3.83 (0.86)</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and Management</td>
<td>3.78 (0.90)</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training: Theory, Program Design, and Evaluation</td>
<td>3.77 (0.88)</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion Theory and Development</td>
<td>3.65 (1.03)</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job/Task Analysis and Classification</td>
<td>3.60 (1.01)</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Development</td>
<td>3.55 (1.03)</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Differences</td>
<td>3.55 (1.01)</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Ratings made on a 5-point scale (1=no emphasis; 5=maximal emphasis).

**Procedures (Written and Oral)**

Using the responses of program representatives on the Procedure Surveys, a cluster analysis was performed to identify programs with similar written and oral procedures. Only the 44 programs administering written exams, and the 16 programs conducting or describing their oral exams or oral defenses of written exams, were used in the written and oral cluster analysis, respectively. Three higher-order written clusters reflecting on the program degree (masters or doctoral) and program faculty responsible for writing and evaluating the exam (program faculty or student selected committee) were identified. Two higher-order oral clusters focusing on committee formality (formal or informal questions) were also identified.

(see “Comprehensive Exams” on page 16)
Practices: Preparing and Evaluating

In response to the questions regarding the possession of written policies and procedures, only 9 programs (20%) reported having written policies covering the purpose, preparation, evaluation, and failure procedures for their exams. However, over 45 percent of program representatives responded that their programs had some type of written policy addressing at least one of these issues.

Comprehensive exam information is disseminated through several sources. The most popular methods for dissemination were student handbooks (61%) and faculty meetings (24%). Eleven percent of the programs indicated having no formal information dissemination method. Responses to questions inquiring about the adequacy of information dissemination, understanding of policies and procedures, and faculty guidance, are summarized in Table 3. In general, faculty have a much more favorable view than alumni and students of the adequacy of information dissemination, level of understanding, and adequacy of guidance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequacy Rating</th>
<th>Faculty (n=73)</th>
<th>Alumni (n=103)</th>
<th>Students (n=108)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of Written Information Dissemination to Faculty</td>
<td>3.92 (1.11) ^1</td>
<td>3.31 (1.02) ^2</td>
<td>3.11 (1.12) ^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of Written Information Dissemination to Students</td>
<td>3.68 (1.15) ^1</td>
<td>3.22 (1.38) ^3</td>
<td>2.68 (1.36) ^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Understanding of Exam Policies &amp; Procedures</td>
<td>4.56 (0.82) ^1</td>
<td>3.90 (1.09) ^2</td>
<td>3.50 (1.14) ^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Understanding of Exam Policies &amp; Procedures</td>
<td>3.85 (0.81) ^1</td>
<td>3.74 (1.14) ^1</td>
<td>3.09 (1.18) ^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of Student Guidance Received from Faculty</td>
<td>4.15 (0.74) ^1</td>
<td>3.34 (1.34) ^2</td>
<td>3.00 (1.49) ^2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Ratings were made on a 5-point scale (1 = very inadequately or not very well; 5 = very adequately or very well). Means in the same row that do not share superscripts differ at p < .01 using Sheffe’s post-hoc comparison test.

Most students spent eight or more weeks preparing for the exam and less than $200. However, over 40 percent of students reported spending greater than 12 weeks and over $200 preparing for the exam, with nearly 10 percent spending greater than $800. Over 70 percent of students indicated that they felt very or extremely stressed while preparing for the exam. Additionally, a majority of students reported a low to an extremely low quality of life during exam preparation. Students’ responses appear to differ from those of faculty members. Over 70 percent of faculty responded that students needed to commit, on average, 4 to 11 weeks and less than $200 to successfully prepare for and pass the exam. Similarly, the majority of faculty members (77%) believed students had a moderate to high quality of life while preparing for the exam.

Over 90 percent of the programs focus on content (e.g., thoroughness, relevancy, and accuracy) when evaluating exams. Less than 60 percent of programs focus on writing style (organization - 59%, readability - 50%, and grammar - 28%). The majority of doctoral programs and some masters programs also consider references and professional language when grading exams.

The large majority of programs (85%) indicated that comprehensive exam results were made available to students within one month. Feedback on the exam was predominantly oral (48%). In terms of types of feedback, over a third of the programs (39%) only provide pass/fail information. Faculty also had a more favorable view of the adequacy of feedback than students.

A sizeable majority of programs (80%) reported a student failing in the last five years. Most programs allow students to retake the entire exam (67%) and/or retake the failed portion of the exam (52%) or perform remediation activities (35%). Nearly 22 percent, however, disenroll students from the program. Several programs (48%) did not have a formal appeals procedure.

Organizational Outcomes

Table 4 reports correlations among preparation, examination, and program effectiveness-related variables. As seen from the table, there are significant intercorrelations (p < .01), ranging from -.52 to +.28, among exam preparation-related variables (e.g., time spent preparing, money spent preparing, stress level, quality of life during exam preparation). Exam preparation experiences are significantly related to examination-related perceptions. Specifically, money spent preparing, self-reported stress level, and quality of life during exam preparation were all significantly associated (p < .05) with quality of life during the exam, exam satisfaction, and attitudes regarding necessity of exam revision; correlations ranging from -.45 to +.48. Exam preparation and examination-related perceptions (e.g., stress level, quality of life...
and compared graduate program's comprehensive exam procedures and practices. As a result, general trends can be identified as well as specific assessments made between program procedures, exam practices, and organizational outcomes.

In summary, the major findings of our study are: (1) comprehensive exams are administered for multiple reasons, however, there are some inconsistencies across program representatives, faculty, students, and alumni regarding the purpose of their program's exam, (2) faculty, students, and alumni are generally in agreement over the content that should be assessed, and generally these areas are covered by most exams, (3) faculty members and students have differing perceptions regarding the adequacy of exam preparation guidance and feedback, and (4) some specific features of programs' comprehensive exams are significantly related to organizational outcomes, such as alumni salaries and student satisfaction.

We would like to thank George Mason University's (GMU) Psychology Department and GMU's Center for Behavioral and Cognitive Sciences for the research support as well as Drs. Richard Klimoski and Ted Gessner for their advice and insight. A special thanks is also extended to all the program chairs, faculty members, students, and alumni who supported and responded to the survey.

If you would like a complete copy of the research report, please contact Lisa Boyce (lboyce@gmu.edu) or visit the poster presentation at SIOP (see GMU Contributions to SIOP, page 8).
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How Employers Defend Invalid Tests Which Have Adverse Impact

By Dr. Lance Seberhagen, Seberhagen & Associates

You would not believe what some employers will do to try to defend an invalid employment test that exhibits adverse impact by race, sex, or other protected classification. At the risk of providing a how-to-do-it guide for “skuzzy” testing, I will describe some of the desperate, wicked, and unfortunately sometimes successful defense tactics which I have witnessed during my 20 years of work as an expert witness in employment discrimination cases. These tactics are not found in textbooks, and I hope everyone in the I/O profession rejects them, but I/O students should be aware that they exist.

At the outset, I should also mention that I think I/O professionals, as scientist/practitioners, should be strong advocates of valid selection procedures, good testing practice, and equal employment opportunity. Accordingly, I/O professionals should try to maintain a neutral position in employment litigation and not be an advocate for the plaintiff or the defendant. However, anyone who attends SIOP conferences cannot fail to detect a certain tilt in favor of defendants (i.e., employers) and a general attitude that EEO enforcement agencies are “the enemy.” This
bias may inevitable because I/O professionals work primarily for management and may feel that they need to protect management's interests if they want to keep their employment. However, being management-friendly at the expense of objectivity has the unfortunate consequence of undermining the integrity and credibility of I/O as a profession (just look at what the Enron situation did for the accounting profession), as well as discouraging minorities from joining SIOP and entering the I/O profession, particularly on the I-side of I/O.

Of course, some SIOP members think I am biased in favor of plaintiffs because when I have worked as an expert witness, I have testified for plaintiffs in about 90 percent of my cases. My answer to that criticism is that I spend about 75 percent of my time working as a management consultant, and none of my own employment tests have ever been challenged in court. Thus, I have never had to defend my own tests, unlike many of my critics.

Dr. Lance Seberhagen
Most of the questionable defense tactics I will describe are not the kind of thing which I/O professionals would be likely to do but are probably the work of HR staff, attorneys, or others who have no training in I/O and are highly motivated to create a successful defense. However, at least some of the tactics below have been used by I/O professionals.

1. No data. Under the Uniform Guidelines, employers are supposed to monitor the adverse impact of their employment tests, but many employers fail to collect reliable data, much less analyze it, making it difficult for plaintiffs to prove adverse impact. Employers who fail to collect adverse impact data may be presumed to have adverse impact if the employer's workforce is not representative of the relevant labor pool, but such disparities are difficult to prove and in any event are unlikely to reflect the impact of a particular test. Beyond the issue of adverse impact, employers will sometimes make sure to collect no data or to destroy any existing data (e.g., test answer sheets, interviewer notes, negative research findings) which might be harmful to the defense of a given test. Validation reports sometimes also have a way of failing to mention important details that could affect the interpretation of the report.

2. Stonewall. When a lawsuit is filed, there is a "discovery" period in which each side may request relevant information from the other. A surprisingly effective defense tactic is simply to refuse to provide certain documents or to answer certain questions on the grounds that the request is too vague, too burdensome, or not relevant. Some of these defense concerns are legitimate; some are not. The court ultimately decides what must be provided if the two parties cannot resolve the matter informally between them, but some important I/O data requests often get lost in the mix.

3. Delay. Delay is always to the advantage of the defense in litigation. Memories fade, documents get lost, enthusiasm wanes, expenses increase, limited resources become exhausted. A particularly frustrating tactic is when defendants delay in providing requested data well beyond their "deadline," while no corresponding adjustment is made in the deadline for the report of plaintiffs' expert, giving the plaintiffs' expert little or no time to conduct a proper analysis of the data. Plaintiffs are partly to blame for falling into this trap, but the courts often permit this defense tactic to succeed by maintaining inflexible trial schedules.

4. Difficult data. Sometimes when employers do provide data, they intentionally provide the data in the most difficult or unusable form. For example, paper copy is provided instead of electronic data. Photocopies are so faint or illegible that they cannot be read. Key pages are missing from documents and reports. Certain requested fields are omitted from spreadsheets, usually without explanation. Once I requested data that could be easily provided in a one-page table. The defendant responded by providing a 5,000-page computer printout, with the pages in random order. It took me all day to go through the printout to find the one page which contained the relevant data I had requested.

5. Biased job analysis. Job analyses can be manipulated to produce a desired result by relying on only one particular job analysis method (as opposed to the usual multi-method approach), selecting an unrepresentative or biased sample of subject matter experts, limiting the questions to certain topics, using slanted rating scales, and using certain formulas for identifying "critical" job elements (e.g., multiplicative versus additive combinations of Importance and Frequency). The worst example of this type of thing is what I call a "reverse validation study" in which one tries to justify an existing test by designing the job analysis around only those job duties and/or worker characteristics that might reasonably be measured by the test, thereby giving the test an inflated appearance of content validity.

6. Statistical games. In criterion-related validation studies, one must always check the arithmetic very carefully, starting with the original data. Common ways in which validity can become inflated are use of unrepresentative samples, improper deletion of subjects from samples, inclusion of impossible outliers in samples, computational errors, misreading of statistical tables, use of one-tailed significance tests (often without note), use of multiple significance tests without controls to maintain the experimentwise Type I error at 5 percent, and improper statistical corrections of validity coefficients.

7. Wacky opinion. I have seen opposing experts defend poorly validated tests by saying that the tests did not comply with legal and professional standards but were the "state of the art" or "a reasonable effort" at time of their development and use. Defendants will sometimes also exaggerate the time, cost, and technical difficulty of complying with legal and professional standards in an effort to justify poorly developed tests.

8. Memory loss. When all else fails, the last resort of many witnesses, when being cross-examined at deposition or trial, is to respond to important questions by saying, "I forget" or "I can't recall." No one is expected to have a perfect memory, but it is amazing how often memory loss occurs at the most critical times.

EEOC is currently in the process of revising the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978), and SIOP is in the process of revising the Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures (1987). Let's hope that these revisions will attempt to correct at least some of the problems I have outlined here.

Dr. Seberhagen is a consulting I/O psychologist located in Vienna, VA. He has worked as a full-time practitioner for over 30 years and is a founding member and past president of the Personnel Testing Council of Metropolitan Washington (PTC-MW). Questions and comments are welcome. Please contact him at sebe@erols.com.
Partners in Education

This column is designed to highlight community partnerships that contribute to the professional development of our students. These partnerships offer students tremendous opportunities to apply the knowledge and skills learned in the classroom to real-world problems. While the objectives are consistent, each arrangement is unique. We are proud of our corporate sponsors! Any current GMU students interested in sharing his/her work experiences, or the experiences of colleagues working within your organization, please e-mail us at ion@gmu.edu. In this edition we interviewed Crystal Harold, Karin Orvis, and Jessica Rice about their experiences as research assistants with GMU’s School of Management (SOM).

GMU’s School of Management

By Jessica Rice & Marilee Vagalebre

Tell us about your position with the School of Management (SOM).

Jessica Rice: I’m an editorial assistant for Dr. Ellen Fagenson Eland for the Academy of Management Executive. The Academy of Management Executive is the practitioner journal of the Academy of Management (AoM). The primary goal of the AoM Executive is to give practicing executives relevant management tools and information based on the latest theory and research from HR and I/O psychology. The articles are intended to enhance knowledge regarding the process of managing an organization, as well as reflect techniques, trends, and issues stemming from recent management research.

Karin Orvis: I’m a research assistant for Dr. Mike Wasserman, who is a professor of Business Strategy and Policy. Dr. Wasserman’s current research interests include the strategic components of human capital development, specifically examining the role of knowledge management, organizational learning, and managerial cognition. Dr. Wasserman also conducts research on the impact of computer-mediated learning strategies on organizational performance.

Crystal Harold: I work for Dr. Kevin McCrohan, a marketing professor. Dr. McCrohan’s research focuses on the use of competitive information operations by organizations, barriers to electronic commerce, and the marketing and public policy implications of informal markets.

Why did you choose to get involved with a faculty member at the SOM?

Jessica Rice: I wanted to learn more about the publication process and gain exposure to applied management issues.

Crystal Harold: I thought that Dr. McCrohan’s research sounded interesting and I wanted to get involved.

What sort of work have you been involved with at the SOM?

Karin Orvis: I’m working on a study regarding user-reactions to e-learning based training programs.

Crystal Harold: I have been working on a study examining how personality and risk sensitivity influence individuals’ information security behavior within an organization. In this study, Dr. McCrohan and I will be using undergraduate students in three different conditions and present the individuals in each condition with different lectures on security breaches (ranging from no information on security breaches to some information to a high amount of information). Then we will teach the subjects how to create robust passwords. They will write down their password on a piece of paper. The subjects will come back about two weeks later and log on to a special website created for the experiment where they have to use a password to log on. We will code their passwords for robustness and correlate the robustness with the subjects’ intelligence, personality, and risk sensitivity. This study will be applicable to organizations because we hope to identify certain individual differences that relate to choosing robust passwords. We also want to find out which type of introductory message about security breaches leads people to create the most robust passwords.

Jessica Rice: Every step in the editorial process is done electronically. Dr. Eland receives about 75 manuscripts per year, all through e-mail. I have been helping Dr. Eland with all phases of the editorial process. For instance, I help select reviewers for the manuscripts, send the manuscripts to reviewers, ensure that they are received, and keep all the manuscripts and reviews organized.

How does your work in the SOM relate to I/O Psychology?

Crystal Harold: I have been looking at individual differences and how they are related to individual behavior and organizational climate. The relationship between individual differences and work-related behavior and organizational outcomes are core topics in I/O psychology.

Jessica Rice: The publication process is important to our field, and many of the manuscripts that we receive are directly related to I/O issues, so I get to read some of the latest work in the field. The manuscripts that we receive are very applied in nature. A typical article published in the AoM Executive might include case studies, or pose certain questions and issues that executives might encounter in the field and recommendations (informed by current research and theory) on how to best deal with these issues. It has been interesting to read applied work that takes a different approach from the typical academic article that you would see in a more technically oriented journal.

What are some valuable lessons that you have learned from working at the SOM?

Crystal Harold: While the research we are doing is very interesting theoretically, it can be difficult to get organizations to actually use what we give them. Ultimately, we are in the field of applied psychology, but it’s difficult to implement theory to organizational practices. Organizations are often hesitant to change their policies and procedures to implement practices that research shows to be most effective.

Jessica Rice: It has been interesting to see the publication process in action. I have been able to read some interesting manuscripts. Additionally, being able to read reviewers’ comments has taught me a lot about the work involved in writing articles, and the publication process in general.

How can other students get involved with faculty members in the SOM?

Crystal Harold: I recommend calling the School of Management for information about position openings. Most professors have research assistants every year. You can look at the SOM website (www.som.gmu.edu) to see what kind of research the faculty are working on and if there is a particular professor that you would like to get involved with, you can contact them directly to ask if they need an RA.

Jessica Rice: Keep your eyes open for e-mail announcements advertising research assistantships at SOM that are periodically posted on the IOPSA and Psychology Department listservs.
A Word from Our Alumni

GMU’s I/O program alumni have pursued a wide variety of careers, ranging from academia to more applied routes. Current students could certainly benefit from the experiences of our alums. If you are interested in being interviewed for the column or would like to be added to our alumni web page (www.gmu.edu/org/iopsisa), please e-mail us at ion@gmu.edu. And now, a word from our featured alumni…

Dianne Brown Maranto

*When did you graduate and who was your advisor?*

I completed my M.A. in I/O psychology in 1989. Dr. Lou Buffardi was my advisor.

*Where did you work while at GMU, and who was your mentor?*

I worked for the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) and I credit Dr. Janice Laurence (another GMU alum) with mentoring me on the job.

*Where have you been since you graduated?*

After several years with HumRRO, I took a job as a research psychologist for the Edison Electric Institute’s (EEI) Industry Testing Program. After only 1 1/2 years, APA lured me away to work in their Office on Testing and Assessment. I was eventually promoted to Director of Testing and Assessment and worked in that office for about 10 years.

*Where are you now?*

I am still with APA (going on 12 years now) but currently the Director of Psychology in the Workplace. This is a new position in the Science Directorate of APA and my focus is to provide support and develop programs for applied psychologists, particularly those whose research is applicable to workplace issues. I also keep my hand in testing and assessment by consulting on the side.

*What are your current projects/interests?*

I am currently working on enhancing the visibility of I/O and other applied psychologists in federal and legislative policy. This typically means monitoring federal activity and seizing opportunities when they present themselves. For example, the White House’s Office of Science and Technology Policy recently requested information from APA on psychological research that has relevance to counter-terrorist efforts. I included information on the methodology psychologists have refined to develop selection instruments and training programs. As the federal government implements new screening measures for airport security personnel, prior examples of selection methods for other security and public safety positions will undoubtedly be of service.

On a broader level, I am developing an infrastructure at APA that will help us to better represent applied scientists. This includes a database of subject matter experts in everything from human factors engineering to affirmative action research. When issues emerge in policy arenas or in the media, APA should be responsive and have the appropriate expert psychologists to call upon. I am also developing more material for APA’s web pages highlighting the work of I/O psychologists. Presently these pages provide links to applied research centers and institutes, but we hope to link this kind of information in the future to a web-based member referral system. As these activities evolve, I envision more direct marketing campaigns to potential consumers of applied research.

*What do you enjoy most about what you do?*

The opportunity to (truly) support the profession. I wasn’t meant to make my mark with groundbreaking research findings. But I do seem to have the ability to translate technical concepts into lay language and to connect those concepts to relevant policy debates. And I’m a born networker. This job gives me the opportunity to network on a grand scale!

*What aspect of your graduate experience was most helpful/useful?*

Aside from the fact that GMU’s faculty is top notch, I’d have to say my practicum. I was able to develop a suitable project at work and that experience helped me bridge what I was learning at school with real world research questions and challenges. The support of HumRRO was invaluable.

*How do you stay involved in the I/O community?*

That’s a natural with my job. I need to stay in close contact with SIOP and other divisions of APA, so I know what professional concerns they have that APA should address.

*What one piece of advice would you give to GMU students?*

You need to network and don’t be afraid to approach I/O psychologists out there in the field. I’ve found that I/O psychologists generally tend to be a friendly and helpful bunch. Don’t be intimidated by someone’s stature or reputation. You have good examples of highly respected psychologists at GMU who are as down to earth and as approachable as they come.

*Are you interested in having students contact you for advice/internship opportunities?*

APA sometimes has summer internships or temporary part-time research positions and we’ve hired GMU students in the past, so I’d love to hear from you. My email is dmaranto@apa.org and phone is (202) 336-5949. You’ll probably get much better advice from the faculty at GMU, but I’d also be glad to share whatever advice I’ve got.

Dave Thornton

*When did you graduate and who was your advisor?*

I graduated in May of 2000. Dr. Buffardi was my advisor. I also sought counsel from Dr. Jose Cortina.

*Where did you work while at GMU, and who was your mentor?*

During my second year, I picked up a second internship at HumaniR, Inc., an Organizational Development Consulting Firm.
Where have you been since you graduated?

I have been with HumanR since the day I graduated working as an Organizational Development Consultant.

What are your current projects/interests?

At present, I'm working on a variety of projects. My main interest area at this point is employee retention where I'm managing several projects looking at the employee life-cycle (New Hire Surveys, Recruiting Surveys, Employee Opinion Surveys, and Exit Interviews). I've also managed to attach myself to some of our Performance Management/Competency Modeling projects.

What do you enjoy most about what you do?

The most satisfying thing about my job is seeing our findings being implemented in the organizations we work with. It's always nice to see that your work means something!

What aspect of your graduate experience was most helpful/useful?

Statistics. In addition to 611 and 612, I took Regression with Dr. Cortina. This class really taught me how to approach data analysis. I've also found that my statistics background helps to gain 'buy-in' with clients.

How do you stay involved in the I/O community?

I attend SIOP on a yearly basis and occasionally venture to a local IO/OD event.

What one piece of advice would you give to GMU students?

If you are looking to go applied, get experience. My internships were invaluable!

Are you interested in having students contact you for advice/internship opportunities?

Absolutely! Feel free to shoot me an email anytime at dthornton@humanr.com

Alumni Updates

By Lisa M. Donahue

In this age of electronic communication, I have found it easiest to contact you by e-mail with requests for information regarding your recent professional and personal achievements. However, my e-mail contact list is quite dated, and I'm afraid that I have not been able to successfully contact some of you. With the goal in mind of creating an accurate, up-to-date e-mail listing of M.A. and Ph.D. alumni, would you please send your most recent e-mail address to me at ldonah1@gmu.edu? This list will only be used for contacting you to gather information to appear in this column. Much thanks for your assistance in this effort!

On the Move

Congratulations to Dr. Lee Kiechel Koles who has taken a position with Windwalker Corporation, a consulting firm in McLean, Virginia, that specializes in implementing and evaluating training programs.

Dr. Michelle Marks has accepted a tenure-track position with the School of Management here at GMU. Congratulations,
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Michelle! We look forward to having you back in our "neck of the woods."

Dr. Ray Morath has recently been promoted to the position of Managing Associate at Caliber Associates. Much success to you, Ray, in your new position!

Suzanne Logan has relocated to Riverview, Florida and has taken a position with the Home Shopping Network in the Organization Development and Learning department. Her team is responsible for the leadership development and interpersonal skills programs, as well as a large variety of organizational development interventions. Best of luck to you, Suzanne!

Other Updates

We are happy to report that Dr. Lori Zukin recently gave birth to a healthy baby boy. Evan Lewis Rotker entered the world on March 6th. Congratulations to you and Mike, Lori on the new addition to your family. We wish you much happiness!

IOPSA Brown Bags Series (Spring 2002)

Below is a list of the IOPSA brown bags for the remainder of the Spring 2002 semester. Hope you can join us!

March 22, 4 PM
Dr. Steve Zaccaro, GMU
“History of I/O Psychology”
Johnson Center, Assembly Room C

March 29, 4 PM
SIOP Presentations
SUB II, Rooms 3 & 4

April 5, 4 PM
SIOP Presentations
Robinson Hall B, Room 111

April 19, 4 PM
Dr. Nick Vasilopoulos, George Washington University
Johnson Center, Assembly Room B

April 26, 4 PM
Dr. Ted Axton,
Edison Electric Institute (EEI)
Robinson Hall B, Room 111

May 3, 4 PM
Dr. Ted Gessner,
GMU
Johnson Center, Assembly Room B

If you are interested in speaking at an IOPSA Brown Bag, feel free to contact us at ion@gmu.edu. We graciously welcome outside speakers. Past speakers have included: Dr. Lori Berman and Seth Hayes (Hay Group); Dr. Paul Bliese (Walter Reed Army Institute of Research); Dr. Cassi Fields (Fields Consulting Group); Dr. Elaine Pulakos (PDRI); Nathan Sloan and Tyler Maxey (Human R, and GMU alums!); and Dr. Suzanne Tsacoumis (HumRRO).
Thank you to the Friends and Supporters of George Mason University’s I/O Psychology Graduate Students!

The Consortium Research Fellows Program, founded in 1981, is a unique educational and research partnership that focuses on the training and development of young scientists. The Fellows Program collaborates with the twelve Consortium universities and colleges in this area. Over the past ten years, George Mason’s I/O program has played an important and impressive role in the partnership. With this donation, we express our deep appreciation of a program with which we are proud to collaborate. For more information on the Consortium Fellows Program please contact the Director, Dr. Robert S. Ruskin (ruskin@ari.army.mil).

PDRI, the premier research and consulting firm in the field of industrial/organizational psychology, designs, develops, and implements human resource systems based upon recent advances in the behavioral sciences and the highest principles of professional practice.

PDRI’s Washington DC area office is located at 1300 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 1000, Arlington, VA 22209. If you would like more information about PDRI visit our website at www.pdri.com, or contact Elizabeth Marino at (703) 812-3081.

Since its inception in 1951, HumRRO has maintained a solid reputation for enhancing the effectiveness of our clients’ human resources. HumRRO’s professional staff is dedicated to the application of state-of-the-art scientific principles and technologies to improve individual, team and organizational performance. If you would like more information about HumRRO, please contact Dr. Beverly Dugan at (703) 549-3611 or bdugan@humrro.org.

GMU’s Friends and Supporters Program

We gratefully acknowledge the generous support of our Friends and Supporters. Their support is instrumental to the publication of our newsletter, the I/ON, and to other IOPSA-sponsored initiatives.

Information on Friends and Supporters can also be found on our website at: www.gmu.edu/org/iopsa/friends.htm. If you would like to become a Friend and Supporter of GMU’s I/O students, please contact Nikki Dudley at ndudley@gmu.edu. You may also download information and forms from the website. Thank you!
Thank you to the Friends and Supporters of George Mason University’s I/O Psychology Graduate Students!

Douglas Brown
Research Associate, HumRRO

Stephanie Payne
Assistant Professor, Texas A & M University

HumanR is a leading provider of organizational development services and enterprise performance management software tools. The company has core competencies in employee and customer surveys, performance management, developmental assessment and training.

HumanR’s office is located at 6 Pidgeon Hill Drive, Suite 300, Sterling, VA 20165. If you would like more information about HumanR, please visit our website at www.humanr.com or contact Mary Saily at 703-450-1101.

CPS Human Resource Services has been the nationwide test administration and selection services expert for Public Agencies for over 65 years. CPS has extensive experience in coordinating occupational tests and licensing and certification exams. The knowledgeable and resourceful team of industrial organizational psychologists provides professional and innovative technology for all human resource services including assessment centers, organizational development, performance management, recruitment, selection and more. If you would like additional information about CPS Human Resource Services, please contact Dr. Bruce Davis at 1-800-822-4277 or Bruce@cps.ca.gov.
GMU I/O Program

The Industrial/Organizational Psychology Program at George Mason University is housed in the Psychology Department. The department itself is a part of the college of Arts and Sciences, Daniele Struppa, Dean. For further information on the I/O Program, please contact Dr. Richard Klimoski at (703) 993-1356 or rklimosk@gmu.edu or the graduate secretary at psycgrad@gmu.edu. Please also visit our web site at: http://www.gmu.edu/org/iopsa

I/O Alumni

Please keep us informed of your life changes, from your mailing address to SIOP fellowship nominations. If you are willing to be interviewed for our alumni column or wish to contribute to the newsletter in any way, please e-mail us at ion@gmu.edu.

I/ON Website and E-mail

Our website is at http://www.gmu.edu/org/iopsa. We can all be contacted at ion@gmu.edu.

I/ON Newsletter

The I/ON newsletter is published by graduate students of George Mason University’s Industrial/Organizational Psychology program. This newsletter is intended to serve as an impartial forum for information pertinent to the students and faculty of the program, as well as the general I/O community. We would like to thank the previous I/ON editors, Dr. Marisa Diana, Dr. Stephanie Payne, and Lisa Boyce.

If you would like to be included or removed from the mailing list, please e-mail us at ion@gmu.edu. The deadline for contributions to the newsletter is three weeks before distribution, which occurs on or around the first of April, September, and November.

I/ON Newsletter Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past Editor</th>
<th>Nikki Dudley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present Editor</td>
<td>Mike Ingerick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming Editor</td>
<td>W. Ben Porr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributors</td>
<td>Paige Bader, Katie Baughman, Lisa Boyce, Tara Carpenter, Dr. Jose Cortina, Lisa Donahue, Nikki Dudley, Gonzalo Ferro, Sidney Fisher, Crystal Harold, Chelsey Hibbard, Brian Holtz, Kara Incalcaterra, Mike Ingerick, Dalit Lev-Arey Margalit, Karin Orvis, Laura Poms, W. Ben Porr, Jessica Rice, Andi Rittman, Dr. Lance Seberhagen, Marilee Vagalabre, Luciano Viera, Jr., Janet Yun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>