

INTRODUCTION

From the Editor

This journal provides a forum for the exchange of perspectives. Each issue contains two focal articles that take a position on a topic of importance to the field of industrial–organizational (I–O) psychology. These focal articles are first posted on the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology’s Web site and readers are invited to submit commentaries in response. A set of commentaries—some of which support and extend the focal article and others that challenge or add new perspectives to the focal article—are selected to be published with the article, along with an integrative response from the author(s) of the focal article.

The first focal article in this issue is by Cary Cherniss, entitled “Emotional Intelligence: Toward Clarification of a Concept.” When Paul Sackett, the former editor of the journal, asked editorial board members a few years back to rate various topics in terms of whether they would make for good articles for this journal, the topic of emotional intelligence (EI) was high on the list. And when I asked colleagues who knew this topic well to nominate an author who could provide a thoughtful perspective on it, Cary Cherniss’s name came up often. I am grateful that Cary was willing to take on the task. In the article, he tackles core issues of contention in the definition, measurement, and significance of EI. Eleven commentaries represent a wide range of responses to his proposed definition of EI and to his perspectives on the measurement and potential contribution of the construct. Cary’s response harks back to the “big idea” that initially led to interest in the concept of EI, clarifies his original position,

and notes new ideas that emerged from the commentaries.

Adam Meade and Scott Tonidandel are the authors of the second focal article, “Not Seeing Clearly With Cleary: What Test Bias Analyses Do and Do Not Tell Us.” They raise issues about a method that most I–O psychologists learn about in their first test development or personnel selection course: the Cleary method for evaluating test bias. And they recommend a more comprehensive set of steps for evaluating bias in tests used for selection and illustrate how judgments about the suitability of a test depend on views of fairness. The commentaries both challenge and extend aspects of the arguments laid out in the focal article. In their response, Adam and Scott clarify the nature and scope of their recommendations and address some of the more critical comments on their work.

One thing I have quickly learned as editor of the journal: It often takes prompting to get commentary writers to express their perspectives *in relation* to the focal article rather than to simply state their perspectives about the topic of the focal article. Perhaps this is something we need to get better at as a field so that we can have a dialogue about issues rather than simply advocate for particular points of view.

Deserving special thanks for their contribution to the success of this issue are the reviewers of the focal articles and commentary submissions: Herman Aguinis, Neal Askanasy, José Cortina, David Day, Fritz Drasgow, Diana Dureck, Bill Gentry, Chuck Lance, Marian Ruderman, and Paul Sackett.

Cynthia D. McCauley
Center for Creative Leadership