ABSTRACTS

Prof. Dr. Neil Anderson, University of Amsterdam, NL (KD 1)
The Science – Practice Divide in IWO Psychology: Responsibilities of Scientists and Strategic Bridging Mechanisms

In this paper I will develop and extend the argument that the divide between science and practice in our discipline is widening, and that this inevitably produces harmful effects for both scientists and practitioners. Countering earlier arguments, I will propose a constructive model for the natural distance between scientific work and day-to-day practice in applied psychology. Drawing from examples of my ongoing research, I will propose a series of key responsibilities for upcoming scientists in IWO psychology. Examples will be drawn from several fields, including personnel selection and assessment and innovation and creativity management in the workplace. I will propose that although all scientists, including early career researchers, have some responsibility for the dissemination of their findings into practice, this relationship is a far more complex and vexed one than has been acknowledged in the past. Examples of effective and ineffective links between science and practice will be highlighted, and a range of strategic level bridges noted, which can be used by scientists to maximize their production of 'pragmatic science' and increase the uptake of their findings by practitioners internationally. In conclusion, I will assert that the upcoming generation of scientist-practitioners needs to build upon these strategic bridges far more effectively, but not become preoccupied with myopic concerns of the existence of some kind of divide to the preclusion of conducting highly impactful pure and fundamental research.

Prof. Dr. Neal Schmitt, Michigan State University, MI, USA (KD 2)
Validation, Meta-analyses and the Scientific Status of Selection

The current meta-analytic data base documenting the relationship between individual difference measures and job performance is extensive, but it also has limitations. Important data on the samples in these studies were not collected or recorded, including sample size, range restriction, and criterion reliability, as well as the characteristics of the sample. In addition, it is quite rare to have any information on the organizational setting in which the data were collected, so no opportunity to assess multilevel issues exists. Finally, most of this data base, at least in the US, is 30 to 80 years old. Given these various limitations of our primary data base, selection researchers should aim to conduct additional large scale or consortium studies like Project A (Campbell, 1990). These studies should include the following characteristic

1. They should be both predictive (i.e., longitudinal with data collection at multiple points) and concurrent, and of sufficient sample size to allow for adequate power in testing hypotheses. Large scale studies in which organizations continue data collection over time on an ever-expanding group of participants should be initiated.
2. Multiple criteria should be collected to allow for the evaluation of various KASO performance relationships.
3. Data should be collected to allow for artefact corrections such as unreliability in the criteria and range restriction.
4. Unit level data should be collected to allow for the evaluation of multilevel hypotheses. These data should include basic unit characteristics as well as outcome data.

5. Demographic data should be collected to allow for the evaluation of subgroup differences in the level of performance, as well as differences in KASO-performance relationships across subgroups.
6. Data on constructs thought to be related (and unrelated) to the target constructs of interest should be collected to allow for the evaluation of broader construct validity issues.

Obviously, these studies would necessitate a level of cooperation and planning not characteristic of multiple researchers, much less multiple organizations across countries. However, real advancement in our understanding of individual differences in KASOs and performance will probably not come from additional small scale studies, or meta-analyses of primary studies, which address traditional questions with sample sizes, research designs and measurement characteristics which are not adequate and which may be obsolete.

Prof. Dr. Adrian Furnham, University College London, UK (KD 3)
Emotional Intelligence at Work

This paper will consider the history and operationalisation of EI. There now exist over 20 multiple "intelligences", most of which are loosely defined. The origin of EI in the multiple intelligence literature will be explored and critiqued for being inaccurate, faddist and a misnomer. Then the two opposing camps of trait and ability EI will be discussed in full, with a particular critique of the latter. Thereafter the history of test development will be discussed. The bulk of the paper will look at the validation of a measure of TRAIT EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE. The research on the role of emotional intelligence at work will then be discussed. One issue is how emotional intelligence differs from older concepts like interpersonal and social skills. Finally, various areas of potential application will be considered.

Prof. Dr. Frank Schmidt, University of Iowa, IA, USA (KD 4)
How to Detect and Correct the Lies that Data Tell

In psychology and related fields there is excessive faith in data as the direct source of scientific facts, and an inadequate appreciation of how misleading most data are when accepted at face value. Because of distortions created by research artifacts, such as sampling error, measurement error, dichotomization of measures and so on, observed data often lie to researchers. Detecting and correcting these lies requires the use of meta-analysis methods that remove the biases and distortions created by these artefacts. I will present examples showing how this process often leads to conclusions which are radically different from those produced by naïve interpretations of research literature based on statistical significance tests, and I will discuss the implications for the attainment of cumulative scientific knowledge in psychology.

Prof. Dr. Joyce Osland, San José State University, CA, USA (KD 5)
Global Leadership

Global leadership is a relatively young, but extremely important field. With the rise of globalization, leaders face qualitatively different challenges. To date, the empirical research on this topic is limited and restricted primarily to competency studies. More foundational research is needed in construct definition, antecedents of effectiveness, performance measures as well as assessment measures, and there is a lack of longitudinal studies on development and developmental methods. In this Keynote, Dr. Osland will present the accumulated

findings on global leadership. She will discuss the unique challenges of doing research in this field. Finally, she will present her own research on expert cognition in global leaders.

FIRESIDE CHATS

FSC 1

Prof. Dr. Neil Anderson, University of Amsterdam, NL

Prof. Dr. Neal Schmitt, Michigan State University, MI, USA

Publishing

FSC 2

Prof. Dr. Jürgen Wegge, **Technical University of Dresden, DE**

Leadership of Research Teams

FSC 3

Prof. Dr. Martin Kleinmann, University of Zürich, CH

Application for Research Grants: How to Become Successful!