

Industrial and Organizational Psychology, **7** (2014), 1. Copyright © 2014 Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. 1754-9426/14

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 focal article, Byrne, Hayes, McPhail, Hakel, Cortina, and McHenry examine aspects of the current training of industrial—organizational (I–O) psychologists that are most valued by employers and clients, the competencies I–O graduates need to demonstrate, and the ways graduate training can be improved to enhance the skills of I–O psychologists. Eighteen comment articles discuss how undergraduate education, masters's programs, PhD programs, and the organizations that hire interns and PhD graduates should respond to the challenges of developing I–O psychologists and to the proposals of Byrne

et al. An unusual feature of this set of comment articles is that several of them came from members or representatives of SIOP committees that are involved in defining our profession and developing its members.

In our second focal article, Guenole calls attention to important changes in the way personality is conceptualized and measured in clinical psychology, and discusses the relevance of these changes for I–O psychology. In particular, he argues that emerging understandings of maladaptive personality have clear and immediate implications for understanding negative behavior in organizations. Eleven comment articles discuss the continuity between normal and maladaptive personality and the implications of clinical conceptualizations of maladaptive personality for understanding negative behavior in the workplace.

It would not be possible to publish this journal without the hard work of talented reviewers. I appreciate the help and input of Winfred Arthur, Allan Church, Fritz Drasgow, Jerry Kehoe, and Rich Klimoski.

Kevin R. Murphy Colorado State University