Introduction

From the Editor

The goal of focal articles in *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice* is to present new ideas or different takes on existing ideas and stimulate a conversation in the form of comment articles that extend the arguments in the focal article or that present new ideas stimulated by those articles. The two focal articles in this issue stimulated a wide range of reactions and a good deal of constructive input.

The Current Issue

In our first article, Enrica Ruggs, Michelle Hebl, Verónica Caridad Rabelo, Kayla Weaver, Joy Kovacs, and Andeneshea Kemp address a pressing social issue concerning law enforcement's use of force against minority citizens. These authors posit that, in at least some instances, racial bias likely plays a role in influencing an officer's choice of behavior. The authors present several lines of research for studying the cognitive and attitudinal factors that may influence the unwarranted use of force, including priming, stereotyping, racial profiling, shooter bias, and subtle discrimination. Ruggs et al. illustrate through this research that race can serve as an automatic cue to trigger implicit biases, which in turn can lead to errors in decision making. Although the authors acknowledge industrial–organizational (I-O) psychologists' historical impact in assisting law enforcement agencies, particularly in the areas of selection, training, and performance management, they argue for an expanded role—through research and practice—to help detect and reduce racial bias and unwarranted force in the context of police work.

The commentaries extend the focal article in a variety of ways, from more clearly defining "force" in the context of police work to offering relevant theoretical frameworks for contextualizing, understanding, and designing potential solutions and techniques.

In our second article, Tomas Chamorro-Premuzic, Dave Winsborough, Ryne Sherman, and Robert Hogan explore the disruptive impact that the digital revolution is having on the talent identification industry. These authors provide an organizing framework and a set of heuristics for evaluating digitally driven assessment tools against a backdrop of tried-and-true measures and relevant criteria. Chamorro-Premuzic et al. highlight the pros and cons of four emerging methods (digital profiling, social media analytics, big data,

and gamification), explain what makes them so attractive to nescient users, and detail specific concerns for their use.

This topic evoked a number of well-reasoned and impassioned commentaries that addressed and extended the key themes from the focal article. Several commentaries noted that the I-O field needs to get out in front of this digital revolution and lead with robust theoretical frameworks and a clear understanding of business needs to establish the conditions under which new technology-based methods should be implemented. These commentaries juxtapose the value of the scientist–practitioner approach with the ever-increasing, fad-driven landscape that puts pressure on I-O practitioners. Several other commentaries make the case that gamification is in fact a promising technique that has been misapplied and misunderstood by I-O psychologists in assessment contexts. These authors provide recommendations for a research agenda and guidance around a theoretical framework.

Another commentary examines federal court cases related to the use of social networking websites in various employment practices and discusses the implications of organizations having a formal social media policy.

It would not be possible to publish this journal without the hard work of talented reviewers. I appreciate the significant help and input of Ann Marie Ryan, Stephen Steinhaus, Rick Jacobs, Sara Weiner, and Tracy Kantrowitz.

John C. Scott