University of Nebraska at Omaha
DigitalCommons@UNO

Psychology Faculty Publications

Department of Psychology

10-2015

Revising SIOP's Guidelines for Education and Training Graduate Program Director Survey Results

Stephanie C. Payne
Texas A & M University

Whitney Botsford Morgan
University of Houston, Downtown

Joseph A. Allen
University of Nebraska at Omaha, josephallen@unomaha.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/psychfacpub

Part of the Psychology Commons

Revising SIOP's Guidelines for Education and Training: Graduate Program Director Survey Results

Stephanie C. Payne
Texas A&M University

Whitney Botsford Morgan
University of Houston-Downtown

Joseph Allen
University of Nebraska at Omaha

SIOP commissioned the Education and Training Committee to revise the *Guidelines for Education and Training at the Master's and Doctoral Levels in Industrial-Organizational Psychology*. As a part of that effort, the committee sent a survey to all the directors of graduate programs in industrial and organizational psychology and related fields per SIOP records.

To identify who to send the survey to, the following three lists of e-mail addresses were compiled and cross-referenced resulting in 317 potential respondents: (a) points of contact within SIOP's Graduate Training Program database, (b) respondents to the 2011 SIOP program benchmarking survey (Tett, et al., 2012), and (c) the SIOP I-O Program Directors' discussion list.

The survey launched July 14 and closed August 2, 2015, and per SIOP guidelines on surveys, one reminder message was sent. A total of 107 individuals responded for a 34% response rate, but only 89 of those respondents provided usable and complete rating data.

Survey responders indicated that 36 of them were a part of a master's program, 20 a PhD program, 31 both master's and PhD programs, and 4 indicated "other." The majority of the respondents (66/86; 77%) indicated the label used to refer to their graduate program was "industrial-organizational psychology." The majority (71/85; 84%) of these programs were in psychology departments. On average, respondents indicated they had completed their degree 19.72 years ago (*SD* = 11.48).

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of each competency listed in the current PhD guidelines for a master's and a PhD degree on a five-point scale (1 = *optional/not necessary*, 5 = *essential*). A summary of the paired *t*-test results appear in Table 1, rank ordered by PhD ratings. Generally competencies were rated as more important to the PhD degree than master's degree, but the overall rank ordering of the importance of the competencies to the two degrees was quite similar. Nevertheless, a significant difference emerged between the ratings for master's versus PhD degrees for 15 competencies (as

Table 1

Importance Ratings Rank Ordered Within the PhD Degree Column

		N	PhD M (SD)	Master's M (SD)	Master's rank order
1	*Research methods	78	5.00 (0.00)	4.58 (0.68)	5
2	*Statistical methods/data analysis	78	4.97 (0.16)	4.72 (0.53)	2
3	Personnel recruitment, selection, & placement	78	4.72 (0.60)	4.76 (0.56)	1
4	Ethical, legal, & professional contexts of I-O psychology	77	4.60 (0.78)	4.60 (0.73)	3
5	*Work motivation	76	4.53 (0.72)	4.13 (0.81)	8
6	*Criterion theory & development	77	4.48 (0.84)	4.12 (1.05)	9
7	*Individual differences	78	4.47 (0.70)	4.10 (0.92)	10
8	Performance appraisal & feedback	75	4.53 (0.72)	4.56 (0.66)	6
9	*Job/task analysis & classifications	78	4.38 (0.96)	4.59 (0.65)	4
10	Training: theory, program design, & evaluation	78	4.27 (0.92)	4.38 (0.81)	7
11	*Leadership & management	78	4.23 (0.87)	3.88 (0.95)	12
12	*Attitude theory, measurement, & change	78	4.17 (0.97)	3.74 (1.03)	14
13	*Small group theory & team processes	78	4.05 (0.91)	3.63 (0.93)	15
14	Organizational development	78	3.81 (1.05)	3.81 (1.03)	13
15	Consulting & business skills	79	3.76 (1.04)	3.96 (1.13)	11
16	*Health & stress in organizations	79	3.70 (1.01)	3.23 (1.03)	17
17	*Organizational theory	78	3.68 (1.09)	3.23 (1.12)	17
18	Individual assessment	78	3.59 (1.17)	3.38 (1.15)	16
19	*Judgment & decision making	77	3.30 (1.08)	2.58 (1.01)	20
20	*Fields of psychology	77	2.90 (1.19)	2.34 (1.05)	22
21	*History & systems of psychology	77	2.62 (1.18)	2.05 (0.92)	24
22	Career development	77	2.51 (1.14)	2.42 (1.17)	21
23	*Job evaluation & compensation	78	2.54 (1.14)	2.82 (1.25)	19
24	Human performance/human factors	78	2.33 (1.21)	2.22 (1.12)	23
25	Consumer behavior	77	1.65 (1.00)	1.64 (0.95)	25

Note. Respondents rated each competency on a five-point scale (1 = *optional/not necessary*, 5 = *essential*).
*$p < .05$

marked by an asterisk). Among these, 13 of the 15 were rated as significantly more important to the PhD degree. *Job/task analysis & classification* and *job evaluation & compensation* were rated as significantly more important to the master's degree. Overall, there appears to be strong support for including all of the competencies except *consumer behavior* in both sets of guidelines. Interestingly, in the current set of master's guidelines, *consulting and busi-* *ness skills*, *health & stress in organizations*, *individual assessment, judgement and decision making,* and *leadership & management* are excluded, and *compensation and benefits* (granted not exactly the same as *job evaluation & compensation*) is deemed "desirable but not essential."

In some ways, the 10 competencies for which there were not significant differences in the ratings is just as interesting.

Table 2
Ratings of Importance of Committee Proposed Competencies

	N	PhD M (SD)	Master's M (SD)
*Grant writing/proposal development	72	3.69 (1.15)	2.01 (1.08)
Diversity-related interpersonal skills	76	3.63 (1.24)	3.64 (1.23)
*Course development & delivery/teaching	76	3.49 (1.17)	1.72 (0.89)
Technology-oriented/related skills (e.g., computer programming)	74	2.70 (1.30)	2.59 (1.29)

Note. Respondents rated each competency on a five-point scale (1 = *optional/not necessary*, 5 = *essential).*
*$p < .05$

Some of these included *personnel recruitment, selection, and placement*, *ethical, legal, and professional context of I-O psychology*, *performance appraisal and feedback*, and *training theory, program design, and evaluation*. Given how highly 24 of the 25 competencies were rated to both degrees, it is unclear if two different sets of guidelines are necessary. Related to this, respondents were asked if they think there should be a separate set of competencies (and therefore guidelines) for each level of education (master's and PhD).

Sixty-two respondents indicated "yes," and 16 checked "no." Fourteen respondents checked "it depends" and were given the opportunity to elaborate. In their elaboration, respondents noted program differences (e.g., "*differences in practice vs. research focus of the programs*") and commented on breadth and depth of the competencies.

Respondents who checked "yes" they thought there should be a separate set of competencies were prompted to describe

in what ways the master's guidelines should be different from the doctoral guidelines. Across the board, respondents mentioned breadth and depth of the competencies (e.g., "*For MS, breadth is important and skill development. For PhD, depth is important and when possible breadth*."), particularly with regard to statistics (e.g., "*This [difference] may need to be amplified for specific methods (e.g., SEM, HLM, etc.) that may be essential for PhDs but not master's level practitioners*."). Similarly, many respondents noted differences in proficiency levels across the two degrees (e.g., "*I think the competency list should be the same for both MAs & PhDs but define each competency, into different proficiency levels.*"). Respondents also commented about preparing for applied versus research-oriented or academic careers (e.g., "*Master's guidelines should focus on marketable applied skills. PhD guidelines should focus on academic research skills*").

Respondents were also asked to rate the importance of four additional competencies proposed by the committee that ap-

pear in Table 2. Again, these topics tended to be rated as more important to the PhD degree than the master's degree, especially and not surprisingly, "Grant writing/ proposal development" and "Course-development & delivery/teaching."

Respondents were also given the opportunity to review slightly revised descriptions of each of the current competencies and provide comments and suggestions for changes. This information is now being incorporated into the revised guidelines, and the survey data are being presented to the Executive Board for review and feed-

back at the September meeting. We thank **Laura Koppes Bryan, Anne Herman**, Larry Nader, Yimin He, and the committee members for their assistance with the survey and all respondents to the survey.

Reference

Tett, R. P., Brown, C., Walser, B., Simonet, D. V., Davis, J. B., Tonindandel, S., & Hebl, M. (2012). The 2011 SIOP I-O Psychology Graduate Program Benchmarking Survey: Overview and selected norms. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist, 50*(2), 25–28.

Contents	Features	Editorials	Reports	my.SIOP

White Papers

The SIOP White Paper series organizes and summarizes important and timely topics in I-O psychology for business and HR professionals, members of the press, and interested individuals.

SIOP White Papers are produced by three SIOP committees: International Affairs, Scientific Affairs, and Visibility.

For more information about the SIOP white papers, click HERE.