



EDITOR'S NOTE

How can organizations most effectively implement multi-source appraisal systems? What is a firm's liability for reasonable accommodation under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)? How can we most effectively discipline and compensate teams? In an era of increasing employee expectations about their own career development, what happens to those employees who expect to be promoted, but are not? The field of HR management is changing all around us, and the need for high quality and timely research is especially acute. In this issue of *HRMJ* we are very fortunate to have seven outstanding papers that focus on these very topics.

The first two papers focus on 360-degree performance appraisal. Bracken, Timmreck, Fleenor, and Summers provide a comprehensive analysis of the factors leading to the successful implementation of 360-degree feedback processes. Arguing that 360 feedback is very useful but often incorrectly implemented, they provide a framework to guide practitioners in implementing these processes. Church and Waclawski describe the results of a study that used a 360-appraisal process to evaluate the differences between line and staff employees across a variety of personal attributes. In a large retail firm they found that employees in staff positions were significantly more effective in their social relationships than were those in line management positions, while those in line positions were significantly more task- or customer-oriented than were employees in staff positions.

The next two papers focus on the legal issues associated with disabilities and with

sexual harassment. Barbara Lee reviews the implications of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) for employers. She notes that while the ADA was intended to provide protection against employment discrimination for people with disabilities, most plaintiffs do not prevail in court. Lee's findings suggest that if employers provide both reasonable accommodation and an individualized assessment of each disabled employee's needs, legal liability can be minimized. In a similar vein, Bland and Stalcup note the dramatic increase in sexual harassment claims received by many organizations. They outline a series of 10 steps that managers can adopt to limit the occurrence of, and their liability for, sexual harassment claims.

The next two articles focus on teams. Liden, Wayne, and Kraimer note that the shift from individual- to team-based work structures in many firms has brought with it a number of benefits; however, a number of practices that were well understood in the "individualized" environment have received very little attention in team structures—with disciplinary decisions a prominent example. They found that individual team members tended to make more lenient disciplinary decisions than did groups or formal managers. Since groups are more likely to have better information on individual employee contributions than are formal managers, firms may want to consider transferring disciplinary decision-making to teams—and not just to team leaders. McClurg's paper presents data on the usage of team-based reward systems. In a mail survey she

finds that fewer than half of the organizations she studied had adopted team-based rewards. In a follow-up study within a single firm, she found employees to be most satisfied with team-based rewards when there were high levels of involvement in the design of the reward system, high levels of communication about the plan, and the perception that the system was fair.

This issue concludes with Dale Lake's review of *Making Change Happen One Person at a Time* by Charles H. Bishop. Lake points out that Bishop has carved out an interesting niche in the many books on change by focusing on how to pinpoint and develop the people best able to plan, direct, and achieve crucial changes, and how to gauge whether a department—or entire company—is ready to support their efforts. Lake expresses concern, however, that no underlying theoretical structure is presented as a basis for Bishop's assessment recommendations.

This collection of articles represents some of the best examples of *HRMJ's* scientist/practitioner model. I hope that you enjoy these papers as much as I have.

Editorial Transitions

This issue also marks two very important transitions in *HRMJ's* editorial team. After serv-

ing as an Associate Editor for six years, and as a member of the editorial team for more than a decade, Craig Eric Schneier has taken a well-deserved respite from his editorial role at *HRMJ*. Craig was tireless in his efforts to help authors improve the quality of their work, and *HRMJ* is the better for it. I am sure that I speak for Dave Ulrich, Gerry Lake, the University of Michigan, The Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), and John Wiley & Sons, Inc., when I thank Craig for all he has done for *HRMJ*. Craig made a huge contribution to the journal over the years, and he will be greatly missed.

This issue also marks the addition of Daniel Feldman as an Associate Editor. Daniel is a Distinguished Professor of Management at the University of South Carolina. He has written prolifically on career development issues in management and is an award-winning scholar and teacher. Daniel has long been a friend of *HRMJ*, providing insightful and developmental reviews in his role as a member of the Editorial Board. We are very fortunate to have him join us in his new role as Associate Editor. We look forward to a long and productive collaboration.

Mark A. Huselid
Editor