



## INTRODUCTION

---

# From the Editor

---

One of the most frequent questions I receive as editor of *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice* is who is eligible to submit comment articles. The answer is simple. Anyone who can make a contribution is welcome to submit. We have received articles from graduate students, faculty, practitioners, executives, and international authors. All comment articles go out for blind review, and the question is not who you are but rather what you have to say.

I see focal articles as starting points for a conversation among industrial and organizational (I–O) psychologists and among people interested in our field. Your job as a potential author of a comment article is to think about how to move this conversation along in a constructive way. There are really only two ground rules. Articles that focus on the flaws of the focal article or that pretty much ignore the focal article and offer free-floating commentary stand little chance of publication. Beyond that, the only limit is that comment articles should be relatively short (typically 10 pages or less). If you have an idea that you think will add to the discussion that the focal article provokes, go at it!

### The Current Issue

If the goal of focal articles is to get a lively and constructive conversation going, the current issue certainly met that goal. We received 48 comment article submissions, and in this issue, we publish 23 of them.

Our first focal article, by Rosemary Hays-Thomas and Marc Bendick, Jr., asks whether this is the right time for developing professional standards in the area of diversity and inclusion. They lay out the challenges such standards might entail and argue that the potential benefits of high-quality standards make the costs worth considering. Eleven comment articles take up a range of topics, including whether standards are needed, whether they could be imported from other related areas, and how science, values and the preferences of clients and practitioners might shape the effort to define these standards.

Our second focal article, by Sven Kepes and Michael A. McDaniel, asks the provocative question of whether our scientific literature is entirely trustworthy and, if not, what might be done about it. The trustworthiness of scientific research has been in the news quite a bit in recent months, and Kepes and McDaniel argue that I–O psychology is not immune from the types of problems encountered in other fields, ranging from retooling hypotheses to fit the data to outright falsification. They propose a range of solutions that include more use of data registries and more transparency. Twelve comment articles ask a range of questions, including whether the problem is really as bad as it appears and whether the solutions are worse than the problem. They explore challenges to effective data sharing and suggest that we could use the methods and theories of I–O psychology to better understand why I–O psychologists might engage in some of these practices and how to deal with these problems.

I want to thank a number of reviewers who helped to deal with this large set of comment articles. They include Beryl Hesketh, Jeff McHenry, Hannah Rothstein, Nancy Tippins, and Fritz Drasgow. One of the secrets to the success of this journal is the willingness of distinguished I–O

psychologists to take on the review of a large number of papers with an absurdly short deadline, and they deserve not only my thanks but yours as well.

Kevin R. Murphy  
*Lamorinda Consulting LLC*