EDITORIAL

PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY WILEY

Editorial: Celebrating 75 Years of *Personnel Psychology*

It was a pleasure putting this special issue together, marking the occasion of the 75th anniversary of *Personnel Psychology*. This was a monumental task, and as the last three editors of the journal—Berrin Erdogan, Maria Kraimer, and Brad Bell—we were excited to tackle this task together. We reviewed the journal going back three decades to identify the areas where it made the most impact. We identified themes and then authors to represent those themes. While we wanted to include even more articles, more topics, and more authors, ultimately we decided to invite 10 authors to represent the biggest (in our view) contributions the journal has made to the study of people at work. We are thrilled that every single author we approached agreed to our invitation and contributed these seminal reviews of their respective literature. We hope that you will find these articles useful.

When it came time to write our introduction, we decided to step back, and yield the stage to those who came before us, finishing with remarks from the incoming editor. We approached every former editor who is still active in the field to share their reflections on the journal, the field, and the future. We hope you enjoy their reflections on the journal and the fascinating history of *Personnel Psychology*.

Milt Hakel (Editor-in-Chief, 1973–1984; Owner, 1984–2004)

Personnel Psychology was founded by Frederic (Fritz) Kuder, Charles Mosier, and Erwin Taylor in 1948. Four quarterly issues totaling 512 pages were published, and the subscription price was $6. Skim through Vol. 1 to see its original focus on the psychology of people at work, the bridging of science and practice, and what's changed and what remains to be done.

I became an Editor of the Winter issue in 1973, taking over from Rains Wallace upon his untimely passing. He had held that role for 9 months, taking over from Fritz, who was the Publisher and chief stockholder. In 1971, the journal adopted a $30 per printed page charge and avoided bankruptcy—the subscription price was $15. I had decided to cancel my subscription, but Paul Thayer persuaded Fritz to recruit Rains as Editor. Rains got an authority to waive the page charges for one article per issue, accepted the editorship, and then asked me to join his Editorial Board. Issue No. 3 of Vol. 27 bears the fruits of his labor. It is a special issue in his honor and includes his ultimate statement about criteria.

The main challenge during my editorship was attracting submissions of sufficient quality. Existence of the page charge branded *Personnel Psychology* as likely to be a vanity publisher. The challenge was met by inviting articles, expanding the size of the editorial board, implementing blind review, and exercising substantial editorial independence. Among the high points are publication of (a) the review of the psychology of work in Europe, (b) the editorial introducing Beehr and Newman's job stress reviews, (c) the Mel Sorcher's InterFace Project in South Africa, and (d) at 101 waived pages the grandest epic, the validity generalization "debate" (see 40 questions below). Add to that an occasional pointed reminder and bits of whimsy. Among the low points was rejecting an invited article—the reviewers found it to be too obvious, and I subsequently agreed.

The vanity publisher challenge was finally resolved in 1984. The ever-present foot-high stack of submissions and reviews awaiting action wore me out, so I decided to resign the editorship pending the appointment of a new editor.

That decision precipitated not just a search for a successor but also, I learned after several months, a decision by the six stockholders that a new publisher should select the new editor. Then I was asked to consider buying the corporation. I was gratified to learn that *Personnel Psychology*, Inc. was solvent. Long story short, I became the Publisher, and Lee, my partner and wife of now 60 years, became the Managing Editor. Her business savvy allowed us to eliminate the page charge forever, add student subscriptions, and reduce production costs by 40% in the first year. I recruited Paul Sackett as the new editor, and subsequently Mike Campion, John Hollenbeck, and Ann Marie Ryan. *Personnel Psychology* has grown and prospered ever since.

Today the societal and global challenges strongly resemble those of the chaos of the 1960s—racism, warfare, and toxic politics. Going forward much remains to be done in conducting and applying research in the world of work. This is a time for courageous inquiry and inclusive action.

Paul Sackett (Editor-in-Chief, 1984–1990)

I served as editor of *Personnel Psychology* from 1984 to 1990. The journal was privately owned at the time, and Milt Hakel, my predecessor as editor, acquired the journal from the journal's founders and became publisher of the journal. I was then asked to serve as editor. In retrospect, a lot has changed about journal operations since then. We received roughly 200 manuscripts per year, and we had no associate editor structure: I made editorial decisions on all of them. Today electronic submission is taken for granted; I am so pleased that we have left behind the era of mailing three copies of your manuscript to the editor, who kept one and mailed two to reviewers, who mailed reviews back to the editor, who mailed decision letters to authors.

I served in an era where *Personnel Psychology* had a very distinct identity. The journal title reflected a focus on what were then labeled "personnel" issues, primarily, though not solely, the "I" side of Industrial and Organizational psychology. Listed prominently among our publication criteria was "immediacy of implications for personnel practice." I took that very seriously. My editorial board was a balance of academically based and organizationally based psychologists, and I strove for one reviewer from each setting for each paper. This focus resulted in a clear sense of what a "*Personnel Psychology* paper" was, and the authors targeted the journal based on this focus on applications. Later editors reduced this focus, and welcomed strong work across all areas of IO psychology, regardless of the "immediacy of implications" criterion. The journal has certainly remained prominent, but my sense is that the distinctiveness has been lost. The move away from the "I" side is understandable, as the "O" side of the field is considerably larger, and papers are more highly cited as a result. Nonetheless, I have a pang of regret for the era of clearer differentiation between journals.

My primary focus was on building a record of efficient operations. We had a publicly stated goal of 60-day turnaround on manuscripts, and rarely missed this—even with the time loss of mailing manuscripts and reviews back and forth. We averaged just over 50 days. I also wanted authors to feel justly treated. No one is happy with a rejection, and with some frequency authors wrote to challenge reviews and editorial decisions. I would seek additional reviews under such circumstances to test the premise that initial reviews were misguided. Few, if any, decisions were changed, but claims of biased reviews could be countered.

One important special feature during my editorship was "40 Questions About Validity Generalization and Meta-Analysis," in which Schmidt, Hunter, Pearlman, and Hirsh (1985) identified questions raised and offered their response. I assembled the team of Schmitt, Zedeck, Tenopyr, Kehoe, and myself to react to each response. The result helped clarify areas of agreement and disagreement about the topic. Also of particular importance was a special issue on the Army's Project A, the wide-ranging investigation of both the predictor and criterion domains for performance in military occupations.

At a personal level, serving as editor was a transformative experience. My perspective broadened a lot, as I needed to develop a level of expertise on a much broader range of topics than my own research specialties. I discovered that

reviewers tend to recommend that almost everything be rejected—we are good at finding flaws and limitations. I realized that my role was to decide which of the "rejected" papers should be published anyway: what moves us forward, even if imperfect. There is a clear tradeoff: serving as editor is time-consuming, but I am a much better scholar for having done it.

Michael Campion (Editor-in-Chief, 1990–1997)

I was the Editor of *Personnel Psychology* from 1990 to 1997. We received 180–220 articles per year. The acceptance rate was about 15%, with about 30 articles published per year. There were about 28 editorial board members and no associate editors for the main part of the journal. The journal was considered A-class in those days, most similar to the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, but a greater emphasis on Industrial Psychology (Human Resources) than Organizational Psychology (Organizational Behavior) topics and a somewhat greater interest in practical applications of the science. It also had a book review section, with Theodore Kunin as the Associate Editor and a new "Innovations" section (described more below). Some of the key innovations during my term were as follows:

1. We implemented double-blind reviews as opposed to single-blind.
2. We increased the number of reviewers from two to three for each article. We had three goals: to increase the reliability of the review process, to include a practitioner reviewer on each article, and to increase participation in the review process by involving hundreds of ad hoc reviewers. The increase in practitioner reviewers was partly due to the more practice-oriented research the journal attracted, but also to reinforce the science-practice model of our profession and reduce any perception of a growing divide.
3. We created the Article Review Checklist, which is a 200-item list of criteria to evaluate when conducting scientific reviews (1993). The goal was to improve the thoroughness and consistency of the review process. We created it with the input of hundreds of reviewers to ensure it was accurate and to increase adoption.
4. We followed that up by creating the Rules for References (1997), but the goal was more to improve the use of citations by providing best practices (e.g., how to pick citations) rather than a checklist of criteria.
5. We created a new section in 1993 for reporting research that was primarily practice-oriented called "Innovations in Research-Based Practice." The first editor was Richard J. Campbell. It published about five articles per year.
6. We had two special issues, one on reviews of theory and one on reviews of methods. The journal had a history of publishing critical reviews as well as original empirical research, so the innovation was only the special issues, which were broad to attract as many submissions as possible.

I observe the following trends as they relate to the editorial process. First, the top journals have become so selective that they only publish major discoveries and not incremental work on research streams or replications. This has the potential to build literature around fads and provocative findings, rather than systematic progress on fundamental issues. Second, I am not worried about HARKing (which is about framing) as much as I am about selective reporting (which is about chance findings). Third, I think the review process exacerbates these problems. Reviewers in effect coach authors into reframing hypotheses and only reporting what is significant, and authors willingly comply to get their articles accepted. As an editor, I made the decision on the manuscript at the end of the methods section to reduce the likelihood of being influenced by significant results. Fourth, the review process of regular submissions should be totally based on judging the quality, not the topic. We can use special issues to encourage submissions on current topics. Fifth, *Personnel Psychology* no longer has a greater focus on Human Resources as opposed to Organizational Behavior. I recall the discussion maybe 15 years ago about whether to retain that focus or instead encourage more OB papers because there was a greater supply of those papers, and I agreed with the

change. However, even though I am very happy with the journal today, I worry that it has lost this distinctiveness. We no longer have a preferred publication outlet for accumulating the important and well-conducted research in practice. This is a problem for an applied science and it widens the unnecessary science-practitioner divide.

On a personal level, editing PPsych was one of the most developmental experiences of my life because it taught me how to look for what is right as opposed to just what is wrong with a study. That improved me as a scientist forever.

John Hollenbeck (Editor-in-Chief, 1997–2002)

I took over after Mike Campion in 1997–1998 and did a 6-year sentence—I mean "term." This was the last shift where there were no Associate Editors and like Mike, I handled every manuscript myself. We were getting roughly 240 manuscripts a year at that point. I believe I got the job because I won Mike's coveted "Junk Yard Dog" reviewer award 3 years straight.

Imagine my shock when I took over as editor and learned I had to "accept something" roughly 40 times a year. I lost sleep. In terms of personal and professional development, this changed my life. I went from trying to write manuscripts that would not be rejected—which is very, very difficult—to writing papers that would be accepted. Much easier.

The journal was in excellent shape when I took it over after 12 years of very strong leadership by Mike Campion and Paul Sackett. Milt Hakel owned the journal at that point, and he was also a very strong and visionary leader. He was the most empowering boss I ever had. My wife Patty and I would meet once a year in Bowling Green with Milt and his wife Lee for my annual performance appraisal. I would ask Milt if I was about to be fired and he would ask me if I was about to quit. We would both say no, and then we would meet our spouses for a great dinner. Seriously, Milt's approach to the journal had a very powerful impact on me in terms of feeling personal accountability and ownership. And I certainly did not want to drive this lovely couple to the poor house by mis-managing the journal.

There was much to be proud of. First, there were a few years where our impact factor was higher than the impact factor for the *Journal of Applied Psychology* (JAP). We had a relatively aggressive attitude toward developing manuscripts with the board because at that time, the fact was we were often getting papers that were rejected at JAP. The shared understanding was that there was no way we were going to just "accept and reject" our way to glory. We were going to try to match JAP's impact with their own rejects. This was not always the case, but it inspired a certain type of "playing from behind" mentality that worked for us.

Second, the "Innovations in Research-Based Practice" section started by Mike, evolved into the "Scientist-Practitioner Forum" that was deftly edited by Jim Smithers. This was in keeping with the journal's historically strong tie to practice and Jim was the perfect person for this role, having worked in both academia and in "the real world." I have never stepped a foot into the real world and so we were very complementary players at the journal during that period. Both Mike and Jim were like brothers to me, and they both greatly expanded my world view.

Third, and closely related to this 75th Anniversary event, I was an Editor for our 50th Anniversary event. Yes, I am old. In fact, I remember our 5th Anniversary like it was yesterday. We used the 50th as an opportunity to highlight the five most highly cited articles during each of the five previous decades, illustrating the journals foundational role in measurement (the faces scale), leadership (the debut of initiating structure and consideration), personnel selection (structured interviews), occupational health (stress) and personality assessment (the five-factor model). The journal has been home to many citation classics that stood the test of time and we celebrated that.

The fascinating thing I learned in going through this process (where we had the authors retrospectively make sense of what happened and why their work went viral) was that none of the authors intentionally set out to write a citation classic. Instead, they were really doing the next logical thing in a program of research that they were committed to, and events outside of their awareness at the time just took over. That gave me hope.

We implemented many changes and innovations during my term. First, operationally, we went to two reviewers for original submissions where I served as the tie-breaking third reviewer in most cases. We very often brought on a third

reviewer at the revise and resubmit stage because (a) that was a more efficient use of the limited reviewer pool, and (b) I often wanted a fresh view of the revised manuscript that was not colored by knowing the original and the "check the box" version based on responses to reviewer comments. We wanted to make sure the paper made sense to someone who was not part of the original review process—especially because we were being so aggressive in developing papers.

Second, we had our authors rate the review process, including the chance to give feedback specifically to me and the specific reviewers. Several more experienced people told me that we were crazy to do this and that we were going to get ourselves killed. That was not the case at all. Most authors simply did not take advantage of the opportunity, but those that did were totally measured and reasonable. What I learned was that in so many cases, the limits of a study were not so much that the authors did not know the imperfections in their work, as much as that they did not have control over their research context in a way that would allow them to do the work perfectly. The unique constraints of working in applied contexts became so very salient to me. I became way less judgmental.

Third, I hired my wife Patty as manuscript manager. She is a trained nurse with excellent process management skills and protocols--and she was very charming when it came to getting recalcitrant reviewers to submit their reviews on time just leveraging guilt and nothing more. Plus, I knew the job—on top of my regular day job—would cut into our time together so we made it a joint venture. Since I am a way better co-worker than husband, my overall average score as a relational partner improved.

A few thoughts on the future of our field: I think we are developing increasingly complex data analytic techniques that generate statistically significant results that are nonrobust. If (a) one removes this or that control variable from a list of 20 or (b) allows these two covariances to covary or (c) one uses the latent score instead of the observed score or (d) if one centers it this way versus that way, and so on, all bets are off in terms of drawing the same inferences had different tweaks been made.

The push for transparency we see now is great, where people provide syntax and output, but this transparency does not translate into replicability or a robust set of findings. I hope we never lose the tradition of publishing the full correlation matrix and descriptive statistics for all variables just to provide some grounding of the results in a reality beyond linear combinations of linear combinations of linear combinations that we see in the tables that come after that. For a journal like *Personnel Psychology* which is grounded in practice, if you can only detect the effect after putting the correlation matrix through a blender of linear combinations, no one who tries to leverage the inference in practice will ever see it, and that destroys our credibility.

Extra credit: funny things that happened along the journey

We were not electronic, and so at the end of 6 years, we got a gift from UPS for generating so much business for them. We asked our Editorial Board if they wanted to go electronic in 2002 and the idea was roundly rejected because they did not feel it was fair to ask them to print out all the papers on their own printer and paper. It was a different time.

We got the totally blind submission. Three copies of a paper appropriately stripped of identity, but with no letter or return address. We had no idea where it came from or who. We sent it out for review anyway. Later we saw the paper listed as a SIOP presentation and solved the case prior to getting the reviews back.

The first year I was an Editor, I got a manuscript to review from JAP where I was one of the authors. I told the AE that if I could survive 6 years at PPsych without making the same mistake, I would give him a hard time. I failed. Thanks to Deniz Ones for sending that paper back unreviewed, my bad.

We had a paper that was at the revise and resubmit stage for over 2 years. Every year we would ask the author if they wanted an extension and they always said yes, so we kept it alive. The paper was eventually resubmitted two and a half years later. Via overnight delivery.

Ann Marie Ryan (Editor-in-Chief, 2002–2007)

I served as the editor between 2002 and 2007. The journal was vibrant with an excellent pipeline. It was considered a top journal in the field of organizational psychology and was known for its focus on applied work.

There are several changes that occurred that I am proud to have spearheaded. The first is that prior to my editorship we will still doing paper submissions (yes, mailing in multiple copies of a manuscript that were then mailed out to reviewers!). With the work of Milt Hakel (who was then the publisher of PPsych) and Jen Baker (the managing editor), we successfully launched the first electronic submission portal for PPsych.

A second change was that after my first year of editorship, I invited Murray Barrick to serve as an Associate Editor. Prior to then, one individual made all the editorial decisions and wrote all the decision letters for the main section of the journal. Realizing during my first year that the volume was up to 180 submissions (which increased over my tenure as editor), it became clear that handing off at least a portion of the decisions would be a wise move (for the journal and especially for me).

Finally, I am proud that during my tenure we still had a vibrant Scientist-Practitioner Forum, edited first by Jim Smither and then by Nancy Tippins. The journal provided an outlet for publishing rigorous work focused on issues of practical importance to those working in organizations. When people bemoan the relevance and usefulness of academic journal publications, I point back to when we specifically encouraged and prioritized publishing work that was on pressing applied problems and of high practical utility.

When I was an Editor, we had started to publish work on DEI topics and on the work–family interface. Those are now considered mainstream topics, so I would anticipate we would continue to see the same sorts of evolutions on other emerging topics. I appreciate the advancements we have had in terms of more rigorous methodological approaches and would think that will continue. I would hope that we move away from the obsession with theory development to recognize the impact of more inductive and practice-focused research.

Michael Burke (Editor-in-Chief, 2007–2010)

I served as EIC from July 2007 to December 2010. Prior to taking on the EIC role in July of 2007, I served from October 2006 as an Associate Editor. As EIC, I had the pleasure of working with a talented editorial board, a highly competent set of ad hoc reviewers, and a dedicated group of Associate Editors: Lillian Eby, Ron Landis, Fred Morgeson, Jeff Johnson (Scientist–Practitioner Forum), and Bart Craig (Book Review Editor).

The journal was in good shape when we took over from Ann Marie Ryan as EIC. Ann Marie had left me with a sufficient number of accepted papers to fill several issues of the journal. Also, Jenny Domanski (outgoing managing editor) and Susan Pauli (incoming managing editor) worked well together in transitioning journal operations to Tulane and continuing the journal's transition throughout 2007 from Blackwell Publishing to (the merged company) Wiley-Blackwell Publishing.

There was a lot to be proud of. First and foremost, publishing high-quality articles that advanced the field and the stature of the journal. Evidence of the journal's increasing influence in applied psychology came from the annual Wiley-Blackwell Publisher's reports that documented the annual increases in downloads of articles, the journal's impact factor, and international subscriptions to the journal.

Second, I am proud of what we accomplished in regard to publishing some of the best applied psychological research from abroad as well as with respect to increasing the breadth of articles on relevant topics/issues in organizational behavior.

Finally, two related accomplishments concern increasing the average number of articles published in the main section of the journal (from typically five to seven) and leaving a sizeable backlog of accepted papers for Fred Morgeson to

publish as incoming EIC. Notably, at the close of 2010, the queue of accepted papers awaiting publication had risen to a level where we supplied Fred with articles for all (four) issues of Volume 64 (2011) and the first full issue of Volume 65 (2012) with seven articles apiece.

During my term, I expanded international representation on the editorial board. Up to my term as EIC, the journal had somewhat low international board member representation. As indicated in a Spring 2008 editorial, I expanded the editorial board where "The new editorial board is unique in its international representation, with board members from 12 countries. This expansion of the board in a global sense is indicative of the advancing internationalization of research and practice in applied psychology." My reasoning behind this expansion was to have an editorial board that represented the most competent I-O psychologists on a global basis and to encourage the submission of the best applied psychological research being conducted abroad. By the end of my term as EIC, we were receiving a relatively large number of paper submissions from outside the United States with approximately 20% of the articles published in 2009 and 2010 having non-US senior authors.

Second, I encouraged journal submissions from all areas of applied psychology and organizational behavior and expanded the editorial board expertise to handle submission more generally. In making the announcement concerning this overall expansion, I stated in the Spring 2008 announcement that "Although the journal is well recognized as a leading outlet for empirical research on human resource topics, we encourage the submission of all types of research on topics within the domain of applied psychology, including those on organizational behavior issues." My reasoning in making this announcement and adding more board members with expertise in organizational behavior topic areas (such as leadership, careers/mentoring, work–life balance, work stress, and organizational change) was to enhance the journal's ability to publish the best research in relevant areas of applied psychology and organizational behavior and to enhance the journal's overall stature. As evidenced by papers accepted during my term as EIC, we partially achieved this aim. That is, by the end of my term, the journal had clearly shifted to also include some of the best research on leadership.

My hope is that the field will continue research and practice efforts in relation to social justice (Diversity-Equity-Inclusion), advances in technology and artificial intelligence, climate change, and the achievement of United Nations Sustainability Goals as we have unique expertise to contribute in regard to addressing aspects of these issues both within organizations and in regard to public well-being.

Fred Morgeson (Editor-in-Chief, 2010–2013)

I appreciate the opportunity to reflect on my time as Editor-in-Chief of *Personnel Psychology*. I have a long history with the journal that started with serving as an ad hoc reviewer for then-Editor Mike Campion in the mid-1990s. I served on the Editorial Board for 8 years before beginning a 3-year term as Associate Editor (July 2007 to June 2010). Following this role, I became Editor-in-Chief of *Personnel Psychology* for 3 and a half years (July 2010 to December 2013), before returning to the Editorial Board in 2014.

My role as Editor-in-Chief began after completing a 3-year term as Associate Editor under Michael Burke. My Associate Editor experience taught me so much, and when I was asked to take on the Editorship of the journal I did so with an excellent foundation and distinct ideas about what I wanted to achieve. My first act was to assemble a team of four Associate Editors (Bradford Bell, Maria Kraimer, Hui Liao, and Chad Van Iddekinge) and 84 Editorial Board members (an over 30% increase from the previous Editorial Board). Then, I set out to adapt the journal to the challenges we were facing at that time.

As I saw it, *Personnel Psychology* was at risk of becoming marginalized in the broader human resource management and organizational behavior domain. There were those that saw the journal as having a narrow purview focused on industrial psychology and human resource management topics (e.g., personnel selection, training). This perception was problematic for many reasons, the least of which is that it was untrue. The journal had, from its inception, published

articles across the full range of industrial and organizational psychology, human resource management, and organizational behavior topics. If scholars and decision makers saw the journal as overly narrow, they might think of it as a "niche" journal not deserving of its rightful place among broader and more diverse journals. In addition, as more and more scholars were working in management departments and business schools, the risk was that *Personnel Psychology* would be seen as irrelevant and thus not "count" as a top-tier outlet for these scholars. Were this to happen, quality submissions would decline, and *Personnel Psychology* might become a causality of misperceptions or changes in the field.

My goal as Editor, then, was to address this issue directly. First, I changed the journal subtitle from "A Journal of Applied Research" to "The Study of People at Work" and redesigned the journal cover (to the now-familiar blue and white checkerboard). This was done to clarify and signal the intent of the journal founders when they proclaimed in their initial editorial that "Personnel are People!" My redesigned cover was meant to convey that something was different whereas the journal subtitle emphasized that *Personnel Psychology* was broadly concerned with the study of people at work.

Second, I realized that the world of journal publishing was changing and that academic decision-makers (e.g., Deans, Department Chairs) were increasingly focusing on journal impact. If we could enhance our impact, then it would be more difficult to relegate the journal to the nontop-tier, niche category. As such, I sought to understand and focus on the potential impact of articles we accepted at the journal. We had great success with this approach. During my editorial term, the journal achieved the highest ranking in the last 20 years in the "Psychology, Applied" and "Management" Web of Science categories (#2 and #6, respectively).

Third, to signal that the journal had a broad focus and to encourage research and submissions on important and emerging topics, I commissioned two special issues. One special issue focused on corporate social responsibility and the other special issue focused on the global context. These were very successful special issues, producing some of the most highly cited articles from that time period and demonstrating the scope of the journal. Fourth, I deliberately sought to reach out to business schools and management departments in addition to our traditional focus on industrial and organizational psychology departments. I added a journal reception at the Academy of Management conference (in addition to our existing reception at SIOP), reached out directly to business school Deans to promote the journal, and expanded the number of business school faculty on the Editorial Board.

I am proud of what I was able to accomplish and of how many of the innovations introduced during my editorship continue to this day, including standardization in the review and editorial decision-making process. I am also proud of the success of the editorial team I assembled; they were a big part of the journal's success. I am especially proud that two of the Associate Editors I selected (Bradford Bell and Maria Kraimer) subsequently became *Personnel Psychology* Editors in their own right. I also sought to acknowledge the hard work of the Editorial Board with an annual gift (remember the *Personnel Psychology*-branded flashlights, luggage tags, and USB drives?) and holiday card. Just small tokens of appreciation for a typically thankless task. Thus, in many ways my editorial legacy lives on in numerous ways, whether it be the now standard AOM reception, the *Personnel Psychology* cover and associated graphics, or the editorial review process. In these many ways, I feel that I am still contributing to editorship of the journal and the field more broadly.

Finally, the editorship was an enormously developmental experience for me personally, showing me a side of the field that is otherwise often unseen. Putting together a team, setting up systems to handle an ever-increasing number of submissions, working with the journal publisher to put together each issue, handling the myriad of day-to-day problems, seeing a different side of authors and reviewers, representing and promoting the journal to current and potential stakeholders, and seeking to enhance the impact of the journal provided an invaluable education. Many of the lessons learned I was able to apply in my next editorial venture: Founding and serving as Editor in Chief of the *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior* (AROPOB). I am immensely proud that AROPOB has become one of the highest-impact journals in the field. Overall, I will be forever grateful for my years with *Personnel Psychology* and am excited to see what the future holds for one of the most important journals in our field.

Bradford Bell (Editor-in-Chief, 2014–2016)

I served as the Editor of the journal from January 2014 through December 2016, although my affiliation with the journal started much earlier. I published my first top-tier article in *Personnel Psychology* in 2002, during John Hollenbeck's term, which was instrumental in helping me get my first, and still only, faculty appointment at Cornell University. I was invited to join the Editorial Board (my first) in 2007, during Michael Burke's term, and had the privilege of serving as an Associate Editor for 3 years under Frederick Morgeson. I was honored to be chosen as Editor, but also nervous about living up to the high standards set by my predecessors.

My mantra from the outset was, "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." I inherited a journal that was in excellent shape. Both the number and diversity of submissions were on an upward trajectory, as was the journal's impact. Thus, I set out to build an excellent team of Associate Editors (Wendy Boswell, Berrin Erdogan, John Hausknecht, and Nathan Podsakoff) that would sustain these trends. Our strategy was simple: publish research centered around people at work that exemplifies both high levels of rigor and organizational relevance. I believe we faithfully executed this strategy and, in the process, hopefully, left the journal a little better off than we found it. I also recognized that we needed a strong managing editor in order to provide an excellent experience to both our authors and reviewers and was very fortunate to have Christine Cotton fulfill this role for the entire term. Christine made sure that our operation functioned smoothly and was also responsible for choosing the fabulous gifts (e.g., cooler, beach towel) we distributed at our conference receptions, which to this day people tell me they continue to use.

Our team worked hard to promote and market the journal, both within and beyond the academic community. We participated in editorial panels at SIOP, AOM, and EWOP, contributed an overview of the journal to the *Encyclopedia of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, and partnered with Wiley to increase mentions of the journal in social media and the popular press. This was also a period of growing attention to issues of transparency and openness, which led to new policies and procedures, which were further developed and expanded by Maria Kraimer and her team.

My time as an Associate Editor and Editor-in-Chief at *Personnel Psychology* was both challenging and rewarding. For a 6-year period, I did not go anywhere without a manuscript in tow. I recall sneaking peaks at manuscripts during halftime of my kids' sporting events and while on the beach on vacation; certainly not the model of work–life balance. But it was exciting to be the first to see the cutting-edge work being done across an array of different topics. I also became a better reviewer and scholar by observing firsthand others that had mastered the art. Given all of the change and disruption that has occurred over the past few years, and its wide-reaching implications for people at work, the research being published in *Personnel Psychology* is more necessary and important than ever. I look forward to the next 75 years, or at least as much of it as I am fortunate to be around to witness.

Maria Kraimer (Editor-in-Chief, 2017–2019)

My experience with *Personnel Psychology* began in 2001 as an early-career author where I was fortunate to have a developmental review process experience leading to two papers accepted by the then Editor, John Hollenbeck (and I recall anxiously checking the postal mail for an envelope from Michigan State U with my decision letters). In early 2010, I received a surprise phone call from Fred Morgeson asking me to join his editorial team as an Associate Editor (no doubt this was a critical positive "event" in my career). I then served as the Editor of the journal from January 2017 to December 2019, along with my outstanding Associate Editor team (Jim Diefendorff, John Kammeyer-Mueller, Patrick McKay, Marie Mitchell, and Zhen Zhang). Like the previous Editors have noted, serving in this role has been the most rewarding experience of my career, thus far, and I was honored that I was able to serve the field in this capacity.

When I began my Editor term, I inherited a journal in excellent shape. In terms of the Journal Citation Reports Impact Factor scores, in 2016, *Personnel Psychology* was ranked number 4 of 80 journals in Applied Psychology and 18 out of 194 journals in Management. The number of submissions had grown from 379 in 2016 to 421 in 2017 (11% growth). The five most downloaded articles of those published in the first half of 2017 were on OB-topics (i.e., work stress, psychological safety, work–family balance, voice behaviors, and cultural intelligence), which reflected the increasing trend of OB topics, rather than HR topics, appearing more often in *Personnel Psychology*. Overall, the journal was continuing to grow with much of it coming from OB scholars.

I expanded the editorial board from approximately 80 members to 130 members, adding many scholars located outside the United States and junior scholars (pre-tenure). My goal in doing this was to have the editorial board better reflect the authors submitting papers to the journal (45% of submissions are from authors outside the United States) and to reward junior scholars conducting quality reviews by appointing them to a top-tier journal editorial board. I also was pleased that the number of submissions continued to increase during my term and that I was able to leave the next editor with a strong pipeline of papers that were "in press" or at the advanced revision stage.

I introduced a new step in the review process for all empirical papers: at the "conditional accept" stage, authors were now asked to submit the analytical output from the statistical software package that reports the results of all analyses that appeared in the paper. The action editor would compare the analytical output with the results reported in the paper both to ensure the accuracy of the results and the description of the analyses. Around this time, concerns about the integrity of research practices were increasingly being questioned so this was a change intended to help ensure the integrity of research results reported in *Personnel Psychology* and to minimize corrections after publication. At the end of my term, the consensus among my Associate Editor team was that this new step was worth the time and encouraged authors to be more careful in reporting their results.

In terms of future trends, I think the special issues that were assembled under Berrin Erdogan's team reflect where the field is going: the role of technology in the future of work; the aging workforce and diversity in the workforce, more generally; and better understanding entrepreneurial firms from a micro perspective. The additional topic I would add, due to the COVID pandemic, is how tele-commuting changes what we know about supervision, job stress, work–family balance, employee interactions, job performance, career success, and so forth.

Berrin Erdogan (Editor-in-Chief, 2020–2022)

I have the privilege of writing my reflections while serving the last 2 months of my term as the Editor. As I do not have the advantage of time to look back and reflect, it is hard to know long-term how I was able to shape the journal, and how the journal shaped me. All I can say is that it was a job that challenged me and energized me every day for the past 3 years. If I am invited to write a reflection when the journal is celebrating its 100th anniversary, I promise to offer more insights about how it all worked out.

I've had a long history with the journal, much like the editors who came before me. PPsych published my first top-tier article, and probably changed the trajectory of my career. At the time, as a new Assistant Professor, I was tired of all the rejections my work was getting, and was questioning my capabilities to ever make it in the field. The highly developmental reviews I received from Murray Barrick during Ann Marie Ryan's term led to one of my most highly cited papers, and an addictive joy and excitement around the publication process. I went on to publish at PPsych several more times and I eagerly accepted the invitation to be an AE when Brad Bell asked me. I learned so much as a board member and AE of PPsych that served me well over the years. Being an EIC was a whole different ballgame though, and it stretched my abilities in new and unexpected ways.

I took on the role of EIC in January 2020. My AE team (Erich Dierdorff, Rebecca Kehoe, Jennifer Nahrgang, Shaul Oreg, and Zhen Zhang) was the dream team with respect to how strong they were as authors, reviewers, and Editors. Three months into our job, Covid-19-related closures took over our lives. It was a stressful and lonely time to be an

Editor. For 2 years, there were no more SIOP or AOM receptions, or connecting with authors and reviewers face to face. We quietly processed papers (over 500 each year) while many reviewers and authors were combating child care or elder care-related crises. The journal remained in great shape as we put around 70% of all papers we received under review, and committed ourselves to a 60-day turnaround time for first-round reviews. As of this writing, we are at 49 days on average. Our acceptance rate hovers around 7%.

I am proud of the special issues we put together—on Age and Age-related differences, Artificial intelligence, Machine Learning, and Big Data, and OB-HR perspectives in Entrepreneurship. An important change we instituted was to make special issues an open, competitive process beginning with a call for proposals. We strived to be an inclusive journal, welcoming OB, HR, and I-O articles and scholars to the fold, while always risking the disappointment of our authors and reviewers that felt we are not OB, HR, or I-O enough! I am also excited that we are more international now than ever. Our Editorial Board has 171 members, representing 12 countries. Submissions where corresponding authors are from the United States represent only 37% of all submissions, suggesting that the journal has a broad reach.

The greatest challenges I faced in my role were often related to PPsych being part of the portfolio of a big publisher with over 1000 journals. This results in a desire for greater standardization across journals in terms of how journals are managed. Gone are the days where editors work with managing editors side by side. I worked with a distributed Editorial Office, journal managers, and production teams scattered around the world, often working for multiple journals from different disciplines. There are clear advantages to being part of a large publisher, such as the open access agreements Wiley has been signing with university systems, resulting in more and more of our articles being published open access. There are also unexpected challenges, such as waking up one morning to find that there was now a new submission portal we had not seen before. Some of these changes were easy to implement and good for science, such as the publisher making the decision to include data availability statements in all articles. Others received a pushback from me, such as eliminating formatting guidelines (which, in my view, standardizes the look and feel of articles and makes it easier for reviewers to focus on the content, even though it is a burden on authors at times). I am grateful for the support I received from everyone I worked with, and appreciate their patience and understanding as I struggled to explain how something that is standard practice in medical research is unheard of in OB/HR/I-O.

I am looking forward to what is in store for the journal and for our field in the next 25 years!

Zhen Zhang (Editor-in-Chief, 2023–2025)

I started to serve as the Editor of *Personnel Psychology* on January 1st, 2023. I am very fortunate to receive the journal in a great shape from Berrin Erdogan and her Associate Editors. Because I was an Associate Editor in both Maria Kraimer's (2018–2019) and Berrin's (2020–2022) teams, I've learned tremendously from them in understanding the journal's operation and its unique strengths. For the next 3 years, I will work closely with my "dream team" of six associate editors (Hong Deng, Kaifeng Jiang, Jessica Methot, Lauren Simon, Brian Swider, and David Welsh) and the editorial board to continue the journal's success that our previous editors have worked so hard to achieve in the past 75 years.

During my term, I have two priorities in managing the journal: (1) to promote the participation of underrepresented groups of authors and reviewers, and (2) to encourage a diverse set of research topics and methodologies for the journal. These practices will help us to attract and publish a larger number of high-quality submissions from many topic areas and geographic regions. I believe that they can enhance the position of our published works in the world of scholarship, and further elevate the international stature of the journal.

It is humbling to think about how big the Editor's shoes are for me to fill. My practices will focus on accumulating "small wins" every day in my work with the associate editor team, our board members, and the journal office. Looking forward, I will have had a total of 8 years of service at the journal by the end of my term. Eight years is a substantial

portion of anyone's academic career, and I feel so fortunate to have the opportunity to serve the journal. In my 3-year term, I will work with everyone together to continue building *Personnel Psychology* as the primary venue for new insights and discoveries in our scientific study of people at work and augmenting the remarkable reputation that the journal has enjoyed since 1948.

Happy 75th Birthday from All of Us, PPsych!

The Editors