Chapter One

The behavior of individuals acting as members of formal organizations has a tremendous impact on many aspects of our lives. Everything—the food we eat, the cars we drive, the houses we live in—depends on the coordinated effort of individuals in organizational settings. This impact, in fact, is so great that we typically take it for granted. In most cases, we only take notice when the results are either very good or very bad. For example, we marvel at the coordinated effort of a professional sports franchise that is highly successful and express disdain when corruption occurs in a government agency. Most of the time, however, the impact of behavior in formal organizations goes relatively unnoticed.

Organizational psychology is a field that utilizes scientific methodology to better understand the behavior of individuals working in organizational settings. This knowledge is also used, in a variety of ways, to help make organizations more effective. Effective organizations are typically more productive, often provide higher-quality services to customers, and are usually more financially successful than less effective organizations. For private organizations, financial success often results in greater job security for employees, and increased shareholder wealth for investors. For public organizations, such as police departments, municipal governments, and public universities, success means higher-quality services and cost savings to taxpayers.

Successful organizations provide employment opportunities, which helps to foster the economic well-being of society as a whole. Also, in many instances, employees in successful organizations are more satisfied and fulfilled in their work than employees in less successful organizations. These positive attitudes may carry over to non-work-related roles such as parent and community member. Consumers also benefit from enhanced organizational effectiveness
than their less successful competitors. Such cost savings are often passed on to consumers in the form of lower prices. In sum, everyone is a potential winner when organizations function effectively. Organizational psychology seeks to enhance the effectiveness of organizations through scientific research and the application of research findings.

WHAT IS ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY?

This book is designed to provide students with a comprehensive treatment of the science and practice of organizational psychology. In the most general sense, organizational psychology is the scientific study of individual and group behavior in formal organizational settings. Katz and Kahn, in their classic work, The Social Psychology of Organizations (1978), stated that the essence of an organization is patterned human behavior. When behavior is patterned, this implies that some structure is imposed on the behavior of individuals. In organizations this structure typically comes from things such as job descriptions and organizational policies. Many organizations also have a more general set of values that they want employees to abide by. Thus, an organization cannot exist when people just “do their own thing” without any awareness of the behavior of others.

Given Katz and Kahn’s defining characteristic of organizations (e.g., patterned behavior), it is easy to see that there are many organizations in this world. A group of five people who regularly play poker on Friday nights would fit this definition, as would a major multinational corporation. Therefore, a formal organization is one that exists to fulfill some explicitly stated purpose, and that purpose is often stated in writing. Formal organizations also typically exhibit some degree of continuity over time; that is, they often survive far longer than the founding members do. Business organizations obviously exhibit these defining characteristics of a formal organization, as do many other nonprofit organizations and government agencies.

In contrast, an informal organization is one in which the purpose is typically less explicit than for a formal organization. Going back to the previous example of five poker players, these individuals are obviously spending time together because they enjoy playing poker and, in all likelihood, each other’s company. It is doubtful, though, that these reasons for playing poker are formally stated in writing, or even explicitly stated. It is also doubtful (though obviously not impossible) whether this small group would continue to exist if three of the five members moved to another city or simply lost interest in poker.

The field of organizational psychology is concerned with the study of formal organizations. That is not to say that the formal organizations of interest to organizational psychologists are always businesses or profit-making organizations (a common misconception that we have noticed among many of our colleagues trained in other areas of psychology). Throughout the chapters in this book, many studies will be described that have been conducted not only in businesses but also in government agencies, universities, and nonprofit social service agencies.

Another point worth noting is that the groups and organizations. It has been shown, for example, that informal friendship ties exist in formal organizations, and they have important implications for employees (Riordan & Griffith 1995). In this same vein, processes that occur in informal groups and organizations may provide researchers with valuable insights into processes that occur in formal organizations. For example, the manner in which a status hierarchy develops in an informal group such as a sports team may help researchers better understand the emergence of leadership in formal organizations.

Another point of clarification in the previous definition provided has to do with the term psychology itself, since organizational psychology is part of this larger field. Psychology is the scientific study of individual human behavior and mental processes. Two things are important to note about this definition. First, organizational psychologists use methods of scientific inquiry to both study and intervene in organizations. This simply means that organizational psychologists use a systematic, data-based approach to studying organizational processes and solving organizational problems. The “data” used by organizational psychologists may come in a variety of forms, including survey responses, interviews, observations, and, in some cases, organizational records.

The other important part of this definition is that psychology focuses on individual behavior. This may seem a bit odd to some readers, given that a substantial portion of this text is devoted to both group and organizational-level processes. What it means is that regardless of the level at which some phenomenon occurs, psychologists view group and organizational-level variables, we must focus on how they influence, and are influenced by, individual behavior. Groups and organizations don’t behave; people do. This strong focus on individual behavior also serves to distinguish organizational psychology from other social science disciplines (e.g., sociology, economics, political science) that attempt to explain organizational processes but are less focused on individual behavior. It is also one way in which organizational psychology differs from the closely related field of organizational behavior (see Comment 1.1).

ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY IN CONTEXT

While organizational psychology represents a legitimate field of study in its own right, it is also part of the broader field of industrial/organizational (I/O) psychology. I/O psychology is defined as the application of the methods and principles of psychology to the workplace (Spector, 2006). Figure 1.1 provides a comparison of the topics that are typically of interest to those in the industrial and organizational portions of the field. Notice that the topics listed on the industrial side are those that are typically associated with the management of human resources in organizations. Contrast these with the topics on the organizational side, which are associated with the aim of understanding and predicting behavior within organizational settings.

Given this distinction between the industrial and organizational sides of the field, it is very tempting to polarize into different “camps” based on one’s professional interests. Unfortunately, this “I” and “O” dis-
ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY VERSUS ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR: WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE?

Many readers, particularly those who have received at least a portion of their training in a university business school, have heard of the field of organizational behavior. What is the difference between organizational psychology and organizational behavior? In all honesty, these two fields are quite similar—so much so, in fact, that many faculty who teach organizational behavior in business schools received their training in departments of psychology. Though less common, there have been some instances where faculty who teach organizational psychology received their training in business schools.

Despite the outward similarities, there are actually subtle differences between organizational psychology and organizational behavior. Moorhead and Griffin (1995) define organizational behavior as "the study of human behavior in organizational settings, the interface between human behavior and the organization, and the organization itself" (p. 4). If we focus only on the first part of this definition, there is no difference between organizational psychology and organizational behavior. However, the differences lie in the portion of the definition stating that organizational behavior is concerned with "the organization itself." Specifically, the field of organizational behavior is concerned not only with individual behavior in organizations, but macro-level processes and variables such as organizational structure and strategy are viewed as interesting and worthy of study in their own right.

Organizational psychology is also concerned with the impact of macro-level variables and processes, but only to the extent that such variables and processes have an impact on individual behavior. Much of the reason for this difference is that organizational behavior draws from a greater variety of disciplines than does organizational psychology. While organizational psychology draws primarily from various subfields within psychology, organizational behavior draws from a variety of disciplines including psychology, sociology, anthropology, economics, and labor relations, to name a few. This greater variety provides organizational behavior with a somewhat more eclectic theoretical base than organizational psychology, although both fields largely study the same phenomena.

Perhaps the most tangible difference between organizational psychology and organizational behavior is that organizational behavior is in salary levels. Faculty in business schools who teach organizational behavior are typically paid significantly more than faculty who teach organizational psychology within psychology departments. This explains why many who are trained in psychology want to teach organizational behavior in business schools; in fact, a perusal of the background of faculty at business schools will show that many have been trained in psychology. In recent years, however, the hiring of psychologists has waxed a bit. This is due to the job market in general, and the fact that business schools now produce more Ph.D.s than they did 25 to 30 years ago.


To illustrate this point, let's say a life development some form of job analysis to find
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The Scientist-Practitioner Approach

The Scientist-Practitioner Approach will see, socialization and occupational stress are important topics within organizational psychology.

This point can also be illustrated by taking an "O" topic and describing the relevance of the "I" side of the field. Let's say the U.S. Army is interested in improving decision-making and communication processes among the small groups that comprise special-forces units. Fortunately, in organizational psychology, there is considerable literature on group effectiveness and processes, and the Army could draw on these sources to help guide its efforts (e.g., Guzzo & Shea, 1992). Can issues that are relevant to the "I" side of the field be ignored? Absolutely not. To be effective, a group must have a certain mix of skills, abilities, and personality traits. Thus, regardless of the team processes that are taught to these units, care must be taken to select the right mix of individuals in the first place. It is also unlikely that decision-making processes would improve unless these teams receive accurate and timely performance feedback. Selection and performance appraisal, of course, are two of the major topics on the "I" side of the field.

THE SCIENTIST-PRACTITIONER APPROACH

Organizational psychology should be viewed as a science. In fact, much of the content of this book is based on scientific studies of behavior in both organizational and laboratory settings. Organizational psychology, however, is also concerned with the application of scientific knowledge to enhance the effectiveness of organizations. The scientist-practitioner model captures this dynamic interaction between generating scientific
model states that science and practice are not independent and, in fact, often feed off each other.

To illustrate how the scientist-practitioner model works, let's say the branch manager of a bank is frustrated by high turnover among tellers. Fortunately, this individual may draw on the findings of many scientific investigations of turnover to guide his or her efforts to reduce it (e.g., Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000). Conversely, scientific investigations of organizational phenomena are often motivated by the practical concerns of organizations. For example, the past decade has indicated a considerable rise in research on how organizations can assist employees in balancing the demands of both work and family domains (e.g., Adams, King, & King, 1996; Kossek & Ozer, 1998). Although certainly useful from a purely scientific standpoint, another important factor motivating this research is that organizations want to avoid losing valuable employees because of difficulties in balancing work and family demands.

Within the general field of I/O psychology, the scientist-practitioner model has become so important that it serves as the underlying philosophy for many if not most graduate training programs in the field. Graduate training guided by the scientist-practitioner model suggests that, first and foremost, students need the skills necessary to conduct scientific research. This explains why virtually all graduate programs in I/O psychology require training in statistics, research methodology, and psychological measurement. The other important implication of the scientist-practitioner model in graduate training is that students are typically provided with some opportunity, the scientist-practitioner model is also quite relevant to the field of organizational psychology, and thus was chosen as the guiding theme for this book. As will become evident as readers proceed through the chapters, research by organizational psychologists has greatly enhanced our understanding of behavior in organizations. For example, research by organizational psychologists has provided valuable insights into things such as group effectiveness, socialization of new employees, and goal-setting processes. At the same time, findings generated from scientific research in these areas have been used to guide interventions designed to help organizations become more effective.

The impact of the scientist-practitioner model also can be seen in the work settings and activities of those trained in organizational psychology. Many hold academic positions—typically, in departments of psychology or management. The primary job duties of most academicians are teaching, scientific research, and service to one's academic department and university. However, many in academia also use their research skills to help organizations solve a variety of practical problems. The careers of both authors of this text have certainly contained this blend of science and practice (see Comment 1.3).

The training of organizational psychologists who pursue academic careers is not drastically different from the training of organizational psychologists who pursue nonacademic careers. Consistent with the scientist-practitioner model, students in graduate programs in I/O psychology and related fields typically receive coursework in research methodology, statistics, and on field projects are often surprised at how quickly organizations want things done, as well as the importance of building positive interpersonal relationships with "clients" in organizations. Many students are also surprised that their methodological and statistical training comes in quite handy as they work on these field projects.

Despite the many advantages of practical experience, there can be some disadvantages of incorporating it into graduate programs. The primary single experience by many doctoral programs is that, in some cases, students who take internships never finish their degree. Other problems that can occur are lack of competent supervision and, in some cases, the projects organizations assign to students are not meaningful. Despite these potential disadvantages, carefully monitored practical experience is usually a valuable component of graduate training. It is also an excellent way to teach the scientist-practitioner model to students.

career plans, to conduct research and obtain practical experience.

There are, however, some important components that future academicians typically need to incorporate into their graduate training. For example, it is important for those planning an academic career to become involved in research early in their graduate training. This increases the chances of gaining authorship on journal articles and conference presentations—something that definitely helps in a competitive job market. Research involvement

do research. Another essential component of the training of future academicians is teaching experience. Regardless of the type of institution in which one is employed, teaching is a major component of any academic position, and all universities are looking for good teachers. Thus, graduate students who obtain significant teaching experience are much better prepared for academic positions than those with little or no experience.

Typical nonacademic employment settings for organizational psychologists in-
SCIENCE AND PRACTICE IN OUR OWN CAREERS

Steve Jex-Whitney reflects on his own career, suggesting the science-practice theme is very evident. Since receiving his Ph.D. in industrial/organizational psychology in 1988, he has carried on an active program of research in the area of occupational stress. Thus he has a good deal of what I do centers around the science. However, in addition to scientific activity, he has conducted a number of projects in organizations that have been designed to solve practical problems. For example, not long after starting his first job out of graduate school, he was the assistant investigator on a project conducted for the U.S. Army Research Institute. This project involved conducting an organizational assessment of the recruiting operations branch of the U.S. Army. The Army was interested in ways that the recruiting branch could facilitate the training of field recruiters. Since that first project, Jex-Whitney has worked with a number of organizations conducting applied research projects and developing training programs.

What have I learned from working with organizations? Probably most important, I have developed a great deal of respect for those who do applied work on a full-time basis. Applying research findings in organizational settings is tough work that requires considerable skill. Another thing I have learned is that good science has practical value; that is, when projects in organizations are conducted in a scientifically rigorous manner, organizations typically obtain much more useful information than when they are not. Finally, working in organizations has really convinced me of the viability of the scientist-practitioner model. The opportunity to do scientifically meaningful work that has practical value makes the field of I/O psychology very unique and exciting.

Thomas Botts. This further into my career I immediately started active duty in the U.S. Army as a research psychologist. I quickly realized that the Army was not necessarily interested in the identity regulation of romantic partners (the topic of my doctoral dissertation), but was interested in how soldiers could be motivated to perform well during stressful military operations. Therefore, I tried to conduct applied research in the field that met the own (and journal reviewer's) standards for scientific rigor. I ended up having a lot of fun in the Army conducting research on how the identity images of soldiers as “warriors” and “peacemakers” influenced motivation and health in different types of operations, how being personally engaged in work could serve as a buffer against many deployment stressors, and how soldiers could possibly derive benefits such as increased self-confidence and appreciation for life in the Army. It was a satisfying and fruitful experience that I continue to enjoy today.

Historical Influences in Organizational Psychology

The year 1992 marked the hundredth anniversary of the field of psychology. To mark this centennial, much was written about the history of industrial/organizational psychology. As Katzell and Austin (1992) point out, interest in the behavior of individuals in organizational settings undoubtedly dates back to ancient times. "In the organizational field, perhaps the earliest recorded consultant was the Midianite priest, Jethro, who advised his son-in-law, Moses, on how to staff and organize the ancient Israelites (Exod. 18)" (p. 803). Formalized attempts to study and influence such behavior, however, have a much more recent history.

In order to understand the more recent historical roots of organizational psychology, we must first examine the beginnings of the broader field of industrial/organizational psychology. Based on most historical accounts of the development of the field of I/O psychology, the industrial side of the field was much quicker to develop than the organizational side. Chronologically, the beginnings of the field of I/O psychology can be traced to work, during the early part of the twentieth century, by pioneers such as Hugo Munsterberg, Walter Dill Scott, and
THE INSTITUTE FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH AND APPLICATION (IPRA)

One of the most important features of the graduate program in I/O psychology at the Bowling Green State University is the experience students receive working on projects through the Institute for Psychological Research and Application (IPRA). IPRA was created by the I/O faculty at Bowling Green in the late 1980s in order to provide graduate students with the opportunity to apply, in actual organizational settings and under the supervision of faculty, what they learn in the I/O program. A secondary purpose of IPRA is to provide graduate students with funding to attend professional conferences.

Typically, local organizations approach the IPRA director (or some other I/O faculty member) with some proposed organizational need that might match the expertise of the I/O faculty at Bowling Green. Examples of projects that have been done through IPRA include employee opinion surveys, training needs assessment, customer service satisfaction surveys, and performance appraisal system development. After an organization has expressed a need, a faculty member is sought to serve as a supervisor on the project. Once a faculty member agrees to supervise a project, a meeting is typically set up with a representative from that organization to obtain more concrete information about the projects. This is typically followed by the submission, to that organization, of a formal proposal that includes the nature of the work to be done, the time frame under which the work will be done, the deliverables that the organization will receive at the conclusion of the project, and an itemized budget.

The vast majority of students who graduate from the I/O program at Bowling Green State University feel that their work on IPRA projects was one of the most valuable components of their education; this is particularly true for students who end up working for corporations and consulting firms. Students find that work on these projects helps them to sharpen their technical skills, provides valuable opportunities to apply what they learn in their classes, and provides a realistic preview of the world of consulting.

In considering the underlying principles of scientific management described previously, the first principle is certainly contrary to much of the thinking in the field of organizational psychology today. Many organizational psychologists, in fact, have recommended that employees be involved in decisions impacting the design of their work (e.g., Hackman & Oldham, 1980). The second principle, namely that employees will respond to financial incentives, has actually received considerable support over the years (Jenkins, Mura, Gupta, & Shaw, 1998; Locke, 1982). Most organizational psychologists, however, do not believe that financial incentives will completely compensate for extremely dull and repetitive work—something that seems to be an assumption of scientific management. The third principle, empirical study, has been fully embraced by the field of organizational psychology and is clearly the one that establishes the link between the two fields. It is also worth noting that by employing scientific methodology to study production
COMMENT 1.5

ARTHUR KORNHAUSER: ADVOCATE FOR ORGANIZED LABOR

While the study of labor unions is generally not considered one of the core areas of industrial/organizational psychology, it has certainly increased dramatically in the past 25 years. Much of the credit for this interest in labor unions can be traced back to the pioneering work of Arthur Kornhauser. Kornhauser received his Ph.D. in psychology from the University of Chicago in 1926, and remained there as a faculty member until 1943. After a brief period in a research position at Columbia University, Kornhauser accepted a full professorship at Wayne State University in 1947 and remained there until his retirement in 1962. Kornhauser died in 1990 at the age of 94.

In a 2003 article published in the Journal of Applied Psychology, Mike Zickar provides a fascinating and quite detailed account of the life and work of Kornhauser, which was based on a number of interviews with Kornhauser's colleagues, family, and former students. According to Zickar, Kornhauser was unique in that he was one of the few early industrial/organizational psychologists who conducted research on behalf of labor unions and was an advocate for their interests. Most industrial/organizational psychologists, both early in the development of the field and in the present day, have been interested primarily in issues that are important to the management of organizations—turnover, productivity, and selection, to name a few issues.

Unfortunately, Kornhauser's work has not been given the attention of other early figures in the field of industrial/organizational psychology; this is one of the reasons Zickar wrote the article. It is probably a reasonable assumption that Kornhauser's connection to unions, not a mainstream topic in the field, was one reason for this neglect. Other reasons for this neglect, according to Zickar, were that Kornhauser's work was interdisciplinary (he held a joint appointment in the Institute for Labor and Industrial Relations at Wayne State) and that he had only three doctoral students throughout his career.


When one considers the time period in which the Hawthorne studies were initiated (early 1920s), it is not surprising that these topics were investigated because scientific management was the dominant school of managerial thought at the time.

What makes the Hawthorne studies so important to the field of organizational psychology were the unexpected findings that came out of this series of investigations. Perhaps the best known were the findings that came from the illumination experiments. Specifically, the Hawthorne researchers found that productivity increased regardless of the changes in level of illumination. This became the basis for what is termed the Hawthorne effect, or the idea that people will respond positively to any novel change in the work environment. In modern organizations, a Hawthorne effect might occur when a relatively trivial change is made in a person's job, and that person initially responds to this change very positively, but the effect does not last long.

The significance of the Hawthorne studies, however, goes well beyond simply demonstrating a methodological artifact. For example, in subsequent studies, Hawthorne researchers discovered that work groups established and strongly enforced production norms. The Hawthorne researchers also found that employees responded differently to different styles of leadership. The overall implication of the Hawthorne studies, which later formed the impetus for organizational psychology, was that social factors impact behavior in organizational settings. This may seem a rather obvious conclusion today, but when considered in the historical context, it was a very novel and important finding. Focusing only on the specific conclusions Carey, 1967), misses the much larger implications of this research effort.

During roughly the same time period in which the Hawthorne studies took place, another important historical influence on organizational psychology occurred: unionization. This is somewhat ironic, considering that I/O psychology is often viewed warily by unions (Zickar, 2001), despite the fact that there has been cooperation between the two. However, the union movement in the United States during the 1930s was important because it forced organizations to consider, for the first time, a number of issues that are largely taken for granted today. For example, organizational topics such as participative decision making, workplace democracy, quality of work life, and the psychological contract between employees and organizations are rooted, at least to some degree, in the union movement. Many of these issues were addressed in collective bargaining agreements in unionized organizations. Many nonunionized organizations were forced to address these issues due to the threat of unionization (see Comment 1.5).

During the period of union growth in the 1920s, another event occurred that would prove to be very significant for the development of the field of organizational psychology: Kurt Lewin fled Nazi Germany and ultimately took a post at the University of Iowa Child Welfare Research Station. By the time he immigrated to the United States, Lewin was already a prominent social psychologist who had a variety of research interests, many of which were relevant to the emerging field of organizational psychology. Lewin's ideas, for example, have had a major impact in the areas of group dynamics, motivation, and leadership. Perhaps Lewin's
A Period of Growth

World War II had a tremendous impact on the growth of organizational psychology. For example, one of the results of World War II was that women were needed to fill many of the positions in factories that were vacated by the men called into military service. Also, shortly after World War II in 1948, President Harry S. Truman made the decision to pursue racial integration of the military. Both events were extremely important because they represented initial attempts to understand the impact of diversity on the workplace, a topic that has become quite pertinent in recent years.

World War II also served as the impetus for major studies of morale and leadership styles. Although Hollywood has managed to portray a somewhat idealized version of WWII, the U.S. military experienced problems with low morale and even desertion. Thus, troop morale and the influence of leadership were issues of great practical importance during this time.

Another very important event in the development of organizational psychology was the publication of Morris Viteles’ book Motivation and Morale in Industry (1953). This was significant because Viteles’ 1932 book, Industrial Psychology, had contained very little on the organizational side of the field, largely because there simply wasn’t much subject matter at that time. Thus, the 1953 book signified that the organizational side of the field had finally arrived and had a significant role to play in the broader field of industrial psychology. It was also during the post-WWII period that the human relations perspective emerged within the field. Those who advocated this perspective (e.g., McGregor, 1960) argued that the way organizations had traditionally been managed kept employees from being creative and fulfilled on the job. During this time, for example, Herzberg conducted his studies of job design and job enrichment, and major research programs investigating leader behavior.

Another broader social factor impacted the development of organizational psychology during the 1960s and early 1970s: the United States’ involvement in the Vietnam War, which led to many cultural changes in America and in other countries. During this period, for example, many young people began to question conventional societal norms and the wisdom of traditional societal institutions such as education, government, and the legal system. Many, in fact, suspected that the federal government was not truthful about many important details of the war. Furthermore, subsequent accounts of the war by historians have proven that many of these suspicions were justified (e.g., Small, 1999). People at that time also began to feel as though they should have much more freedom to express themselves in a variety of ways (e.g., hairstyles, dress, speech).

For organizations, the cultural changes that arose out of the 1960s had major implications. In essence, it became less and less common for people to blindly follow authority. Therefore, organizations had to find methods of motivating employees, other than simply offering financial incentives or threatening punishment. It was also becoming more and more common for employees to seek fulfillment in areas of their lives other than work. Thus, it was becoming increasingly difficult to find employees who were willing to focus exclusively on work.

Maturity and Expansion

From the early 1970s into the 1980s, organizational psychology began to mature as a field of study. For example, during the early
psychologists began to break significant new ground in both theory and research. As just a few examples, Salancik and Pfeffer (1978) proposed Social Information Processing Theory (SIP) as an alternative to more traditional need-based theories of job satisfaction and job design. Also, roughly during this period, organizational psychology began to rediscover the impact of personality and dispositions on things such as job attitudes (Staw & Ross, 1985) and perceptions of job-related stress (Watson & Clark, 1984).

Another noteworthy development that took hold during this period, and continues today, was the recognition that behavior in organizations is impacted by forces at both the group and organizational levels (e.g., James & Jones, 1974; Rousseau, 1985). This multilevel perspective has had major implications for the field in guiding theory development as well as statistical methodology (e.g., Dansevitch, Alutto, & Yamin, 1984; James, Denner, & Wolf, 1984). During this same period, organizational psychologists began to devote increasing attention to what could be called nontraditional topics. For example, more literature began to appear on work/family issues (e.g., Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985), job-related stress and health (Bech & Newman, 1978), and retirement (Bech, 1986). This willingness to explore nontraditional topics was significant because it served as evidence that the interests of organizational psychologists had broadened beyond purely management concerns.

From roughly the late 1980s to the year 2000, a number of trends have impacted the field of organizational psychology. If one takes a global perspective, perhaps the most significant event of this period was the breakup of the Soviet Union and the eventual fall of communism in many nations that embraced democracy during this period have also attempted to establish free-market economies. As many of these new democracies found out, managing and motivating employees in state-owned businesses is quite different from doing so in a free-market economy (Fres, Krings, Moses, & Zemel, 1996a; Pfeffer, 1998b; Stroh & Dennis, 1994). The science and the practice of organizational psychology can potentially help these nations make this difficult economic transition.

Another important trend that is taking place, both in the United States and worldwide, is the change in the demographic composition of the workforce. The world population is aging rapidly and becoming more ethnically diverse. One of the implications of these demographic shifts is that organizational psychologists will likely devote much more time and attention to understanding the process of retirement (e.g., Adams & Bech, 1998). Organizational psychologists will likely help organizations as they assist employees in making the retirement transition. The increasing level of cultural diversity will also have wide-ranging implications. Organizational psychologists will increasingly be called upon to investigate the impact of cultural differences on organizational processes such as socialization, communication, and motivation.

A third trend that has become evident during this period is the move away from highly specific jobs, and toward more temporary, project-based work. Some have labeled this dejobbing (Bridge, 1990). This trend has a number of implications for organizational psychology. At the most fundamental level, this trend has impacted and will continue to impact the psycholog-
Some students (and maybe even some instructors) may find it unusual to have a chapter on research methodology. I've included it for three primary reasons. First, having at least a rudimentary understanding of research methodology is fundamental to understanding many of the concepts and research findings discussed throughout the text. Second, research methodology is a legitimate area of inquiry within organizational psychology. In fact, a great deal of important research within organizational psychology in recent years has been methodologically oriented. Finally, as a course instructor and supervisor of student research, I have found that students often forget (or perhaps repress) what they learn in research methods courses. Covering research methods in content courses often compensates for this forgetting.

The first seven chapters focus on the behavior of individuals in organizational settings. A close examination of these chapters reveals a sequential ordering. It is assumed that individuals are initially socialized into an organization (Chapter 3), become productive members of that organization (Chapter 4), and derive some level of satisfaction and commitment (Chapter 5). It is also recognized that individuals may engage in behaviors that are counterproductive to their employers (Chapter 6), and that work may have a negative effect on the health and well-being of employees (Chapter 7).

The next three chapters focus on the mechanisms that organizations use to influence employees' behaviors. To this end, Chapter 8 covers the major motivation theories in organizational psychology. In Chapter 9, we examine the various ways in which organizations utilize theories of motivation to behavior, namely leadership. Chapter 10 also examines power and influence processes that are at the core of leadership and yet influence many other behaviors in organizations.

In the next two chapters, the focus of the book shifts from the individual to the group level. This is very important, given the increased reliance on teams in many organizations. Chapter 11 introduces the basic concepts underlying group behavior. Chapter 12 describes the factors that have the greatest impact on group effectiveness, as well as the dynamics underlying intergroup behavior.

In the final three chapters, the focus shifts from the group to the organization—the macro level. Chapter 13 reviews several theoretical approaches used to define an organization and examine approaches to organizational design. Chapter 14 explores the concepts of organizational culture and climate. Chapter 15 describes the variety of ways in which organizations engage in planned change with the assistance of behavioral science knowledge.

One topic that readers will notice is not the focus of any one chapter is international or cross-cultural issues. This book examines cross-cultural issues in the context of the various topics covered in the chapters. This was done intentionally because we believe cross-cultural findings are best understood and assimilated in the context of specific topics.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

Organizational psychology is the scientific study of individual and group behavior in formal organizational settings. While it is a legitimate field of study in its own right, psychologists use scientific methods to study behavior in organizations. They also use this knowledge to solve practical problems in organizations; this is the essence of the scientist-practitioner model, the model on employees? Why do I-O psychologists, for the most part, focus on improving efficiency more so than improving worker well-being? These questions prompted me to look back in the history of our field.

Historical research relies much more on the right side of the brain compared to quantitative research. I find that balance very stimulating and useful in maintaining my intellectual curiosity. One of my favorite historical pieces is an article about my hero Arthur Kornhauser who was an early progressive I-O psychologist that worked actively with labor unions in the auto industry. When I contacted one of Kornhauser's former students, he seemed unfriendly and impatient until I told him that I wanted to discuss his former advisor. Instantly on hearing his former advisor's name, he warmed up and said in a mornful but pleasant tone, "I always told my wife that if we had had a son, I would have wanted to name him Arthur!"

I did not start off my career interested in historical research, though I now find it an important part of my intellectual identity. Regardless of what path your career takes you, I hope that you will remain open to change and that you stumble occasionally onto new directions and ideas.

Mike J. Zickar
Department of Psychology
Bowling Green State University
Introduction to Organizational Psychology

In the years and will continue to do so. A giant thread through the history of the is the dynamic interaction between science and practice—in most cases for the benefit of organizations and their employees.

SUGGESTED ADDITIONAL READINGS


Chapter Two

Organizational psychologists often design scientific investigations to answer a variety of research questions about behavior in organizational settings; in some cases research is designed to test theories. In order to conduct research, one must make use of research designs, as well as a variety of statistical analyses. As will be shown in this chapter, research methods may range from simple observation of behavior to more elaborate designs. Likewise, statistical methods may range from very simple descriptive measures, to very elaborate model testing.

Research methodology and statistical analysis are also crucial to the practice of organizational psychology. For example, organizational psychologists often use systematic research methods to provide organizational decision makers with information regarding employees' attitudes. In other cases, research methodology and statistical analysis may be used to evaluate some intervention designed to enhance organizational effectiveness. An organization may want to know, for example, whether a team development intervention will enhance the functioning of work groups. This question, and others like it, can also be answered with the aid of typical research methods and statistical analyses used in organizational psychology.

In addition to facilitating the science and practice of organizational psychology, research methodology and statistical analysis have both emerged as legitimate fields of study within organizational psychology.

devoted their attention to method and statistical issues. For example, organizational psychologists investigate the validity of self-report (e.g., Spector, 1994), as well as the of data from multiple organization (Bliese & Jex, 2002). Both topics discussed later in the chapter.

This chapter is designed to pro introduction to the methods organ psychologists use to collect data, as the statistical techniques used to that data. From the student's pers research methodology and statistics a