# Chapter 1

# Introduction to Organizational Psychology

The behavior of individuals acting as members of formal organizations has a tremendous impact on many aspects of our lives. Most things we need—the food we eat, the cars we drive, the houses we live in—depend on the coordinated effort of individuals in organizations. This impact, in fact, is so pervasive that we typically take it for granted. In most cases, we only take notice when the results are at the extremes. For example, we marvel at the coordinated effort of a surgical team that successfully performs a difficult procedure, and express disdain when corruption occurs in a government agency. In most instances, 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 their constituents, and are usually more financially successful than less effective organizations. For private organizations, financial success often translates into higher wages and 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.

Enhanced organizational effectiveness, and the success that often comes with it, often provides many indirect benefits as well. 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 roles such as parent and community member. Consumers also benefit from enhanced organizational effectiveness because well-managed, efficient organizations are often able to produce

COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

Trim size: 7in x 10in

Jex c01.tex V3 - 11/20/2014 4:31 P.M. Page 2



products and provide services at a much lower cost 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 provides students with a comprehensive treatment of the science and practice of organizational psychology. *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 primary defining characteristic of an organization is "patterned" human behavior. When behavior is patterned, this means that some structure is imposed on it. In organizations this structure typically comes from formal job descriptions and organizational policies. Most organizations also have a set of values that they want employees to abide by. Thus, an organization cannot exist when people just "do their own thing" without any consideration of the behavior of others.

Given Katz and Kahn's (1978) defining characteristic of organizations (e.g., patterned behavior), it is easy to see that there are many organizations in this world. A group of 12 people who regularly play softball together on Friday nights would fit this definition, as would a major multinational corporation. Therefore, to further define the field of organizational psychology, it is important to distinguish between *formal* and *informal* organizations. 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.

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

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 business 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 are described that have been conducted not only in businesses but also in government agencies, universities, and nonprofit social service agencies. In some cases, organizational psychologists even study "virtual" organizations where people never even interact face-to face (Shin, 2004), yet these are still considered formal organizations according to the definition provided above (see Comment 1.1).

Another point worth noting is that the focus on formal organizations does not preclude the study of informal organizational

Trim size: 7in x 10in

Jex c01.tex V3 - 11/20/2014 4:31 P.M. Page 3



**COMMENT 1.1**

VIRTUAL ORGANIZATIONS: ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES

Imagine if you needed to buy food, or needed to complete some banking transaction. What's the first thing you would do? Most likely you would look for a grocery store or a bank—or would you? With increasing advances in information and telecommunications technology, however, organizations can be (and often are) created by linking people in different physical locations. The term for this organizational configuration is a *virtual organization* and it has been defined as "a collection of geographically distributed and culturally diverse people who are linked by electronic forms of communication (De Sanctis & Monge, 1999, p. 693). Really any organization that does not need to meet face-to-face with its people could use this type of organizational arrangement.

So what are the advantages of creating a virtual organization? The primary one is cost. For most "nonvirtual" organizations a major cost is physical space. Leasing office space is costly, and this is particularly true in large cities (try leasing any space in Manhattan!). Having a virtual organization also saves employees from long commutes to work, and having to uproot their families due to transfers.

Despite these advantages, which are certainly considerable, there may also be disadvantages to this type of organization. Employees in this type of organization must obviously be comfortable with computer and telecommunications technology—this is something we often take for granted now, but may not necessarily be the case for everyone. Another potential disadvantage is that employees may miss the face-to-face social interaction that comes with working in a traditional organization—as much as a pain other people can be at times, they do also provide comfort. Finally, all customers are not necessarily comfortable dealing with virtual environments. When some people invest they feel more comfortable meeting face-to-face with their investment broker as opposed to talking with them on the phone or communicating via e-mail.

Despite these potential disadvantages, virtual organizations are here to stay and will likely increase in number in the future. As with any form of organization, the key is to make sure that people are comfortable working in it and that it is appropriate given the nature of the business.

*Sources:* DeSanctis, G., & Monge, P. (1999). Introduction to the special issue: Communication processes for virtual organizations. *Organizational Science*, *10*, 693–703; Shin, Y. (2004). A person-environment fit model for virtual organizations. *Journal of Management, 30*, 725–743.

*processes*, or even occasionally informal groups and organizations themselves. It has been shown, for example, that informal friendship ties exist in formal organizations, and they have important implications for employees (Nielson, Jex, & Adams, 2000). 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 on an intramural basketball team may help researchers better understand the emergence of leadership in formal organizations. Put differently, the laws of human behavior apply regardless of the context in which they occur.

Another point of clarification in the definition of organizational psychology has to do with the term psychology itself, since organizational psychology is part of this

Trim size: 7in x 10in

Jex c01.tex V3 - 11/20/2014 4:31 P.M. Page 4



larger field. Psychology is the scientific study of individual human behavior and mental processes (Comer & Gould, 2013) Two things are important to note about this definition. First, like any other psychologist, organizational psychologists use methods of scientific inquiry. 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, given that significant portions of this text are devoted to group and organizational-level processes. What it means is that regardless of the level at which some process may occur, psychologists view individual behavior as central to that process (Porras & Robertson, 1992). Thus, to understand the impact of 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, and political science) that attempt to explain organizational processes but are less focused on individual behavior. It is also one, though certainly not the only, way that organizational psychology differs from the closely related field of organizational behavior (see Comment 1.2).

## 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, 2012). 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.

FIGURE 1.1
**A Breakdown of Topics Associated With the Industrial and Organizational Sides of the Field of I/O Psychology**


Given this distinction between the industrial and organizational sides of the field, it is tempting to polarize into different "camps" based on one's professional interests. Unfortunately, this "I" and "O" distinction underestimates the considerable interdependence among the topics that constitute each of these subfields.

To illustrate this point, let's say a large retail organization wants to take steps to reduce the amount of theft among its hourly

Trim size: 7in x 10in

Jex c01.tex V3 - 11/20/2014 4:31 P.M. Page 5



**COMMENT 1.2**

## 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 appreciable 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.

The field of 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 behavior and organizational psychology is seen by those who are on the job market. Faculty in business schools who teach organizational behavior are typically paid significantly more than faculty who teach organizational psychology within psychology departments. In fact, in a salary survey conducted in 2012 by the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP), the average annual salary for SIOP members teaching in business schools was found to be approximately $142,000 compared to $91,000 for those in 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 shows that many have been trained in psychology either at the doctor or subdoctoral level. In recent years, however, the hiring of psychologists in business schools seems to have waned a bit. This is due in part to an overall stagnant job market, and the fact that business schools now produce more PhDs than they did 25 to 30 years ago.

*Sources:* Khanna, C., Medsker, G., & Ginter, R. (2013, July). *SIOP 2012 income survey*. Retrieved from http://www.siop.org/2012SIOPIncomeSurvey.pdf; Moorhead, G., & Griffin, R. W. (1995). *Organizational behavior: Managing people and organizations* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

employees. To do so, this organization might well give applicants some form of integrity test to screen out those who are most likely to steal (Van Iddekinge, Roth, Raymark, & Odle-Dusseau, 2012). This organization might also develop some type of training program designed to educate employees on the negative effects that employee theft may have on the organization (Greenberg, 2002). Because selection and training are both "I" activities, what relevance does the "O" side of the field have for the retail organization in this example? On first glance, it would appear to be very little. However, if you think about it, organizational topics are highly relevant. For example, even if "honest" people are hired, there may still be conditions on the job that could lead to theft. Specifically, social norms within work groups or departments may reinforce stealing, as they do other forms of negative behaviors (Flaherty & Moss, 2007). It is also possible that even if people are honest, they may steal as a way to get back at this retail organization if they feel they are treated unfairly (Greenberg, 1990). Thus, in addition to selecting honest employees and training them on the effects of stealing, this organization needs to understand the social norms associated with theft, and pay attention to the level of fairness with which they treat their employees. As we see, the impact of social norms and fairness are both 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 the mental health and well-being among its enlisted soldiers. Fortunately, in organizational psychology, there is a considerable amount of research on employee health and well-being and the Army could draw on these sources to help guide its efforts (e.g., Jex, Swanson, & Grubb, 2013). Can issues that are relevant to the "I" side of the field be ignored? Absolutely not. Although it is true that the health and well-being of employees is impacted by the conditions under which they work, some people are better able to tolerate adverse conditions than others (Jex, Kain, & Park, 2013). Thus, regardless of steps the Army might take to decrease soldiers' exposure to adverse conditions, it is also important to select resilient individuals, or alternatively provide training in order to enhance resilience (Reivich, Seligman, & McBride, 2011). Selection and training, of course, are two of the major topics on the "I" side of the field.

## THE SCIENTIST-PRACTITIONER APPROACH

Organizational psychology is 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 individual employees, work groups, and entire organizations. The *scientist-practitioner model* captures this dynamic interaction between generating scientific knowledge and the application of that knowledge for some practical purpose. At a general level, the scientist-practitioner 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 wants to improve the level of customer service provided to the bank's customers. Fortunately, this individual may draw on the findings of many scientific investigations of customer service to guide his or her efforts to reduce it (e.g., Schneider,

Trim size: 7in x 10in Jex c01.tex V3 - 11/20/2014 4:31 P.M. Page 7



White, & Paul, 1998). Conversely, scientific investigations of organizational phenomena are often motivated by the practical concerns of organizations. For example, in the past decade there has been a considerable rise in research on the process older employees go through when they decide to retire (e.g., Jex & Grosch, 2013; Wang & Shultz, 2010). Although such research may certainly be useful from a purely scientific perspective, another important factor motivating this research is that organizations often want to influence the retirement decisions of older employees; in some cases to retire earlier, and other cases to put off retirement.

Within the broader 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. Graduate training guided by the scientist-practitioner model suggests that, first and foremost, students need to learn 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, through internships, practica, or other field experiences, to apply what they have learned in "real world" settings (see Comment 1.3).

**COMMENT 1.3**

TRAINING SCIENTIST-PRACTITIONERS: THE ROLE OF PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE

Most graduate programs in I/O psychology, as well as other fields, incorporate some form of practical experience into their curriculum. This can be accomplished in a variety of ways. Most programs, for example, encourage students to participate in formal internship programs in corporations and consulting firms. Typically, internships span between 6 months and 1 year, and require that students work under the supervision of an experienced I/O psychologist. Other less formal ways that students obtain practical experience include class projects, working with faculty on research and consulting projects, and field-based practicum courses.

The major benefit of students participating in field experiences is that they gain a chance to put what they've learned in their courses into practice in a real organization. Students also benefit in a more subtle way: They develop a greater understanding of how the "real world" actually works. For example, students working 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 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 assigned 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.

The scientist-practitioner model is also relevant to the field of organizational psychology, and thus was chosen as the guiding theme for this book. As becomes evident through the chapters, research by organizational psychologists has greatly enhanced the understanding of behavior in organizations. For example, research by organizational psychologists has provided valuable insights into a variety of topics—group effectiveness, socialization of new employees, employee health and well-being, deviant employee behavior, and organizational culture are but a few examples. At the same time, findings generated from scientific research in these and many other topics have been used to guide interventions designed to make organizations more effective and make the lives of employees healthier and more fulfilling.

The impact of the scientist-practitioner model can also 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 1.4).

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 measurement, as well as in specific content areas (e.g., motivation, leadership). It is also common for all students, regardless of their career plans, to conduct research and to obtain practical experience in some form.

There are, however, some important components that future academicians typically need to incorporate into their graduate training that are not as crucial for those planning to pursue applied careers. For example, students planning to pursue an academic career need to become involved in research early in their graduate training. This increases the chances of gaining authorship on journal articles, book chapters, and conference presentations—all of which definitely help in a competitive job market. Research involvement also facilitates the development of close working relationships with faculty. These relationships are crucial in learning how to do research.

Another essential component of the training of future academicians is teaching experience. Although the emphasis placed on teaching varies considerably according to the type of academic institution, teaching is still an important component of any academic position and all colleges and 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. Also, given recent trends in the academic job market (Weir, 2011) it is becoming more common for new PhDs to become employed in smaller colleges and universities that traditionally have placed a higher value on teaching effectiveness compared to large research-intensive universities.

Typical nonacademic employment settings for organizational psychologists include business organizations, consulting firms, nonprofit research institutes, government

Trim size: 7in x 10in

Jex c01.tex V3 - 11/20/2014 4:31 P.M. Page 9



**COMMENT 1.4**

SCIENCE AND PRACTICE IN OUR OWN CAREERS

Steve Jex: When I reflect on my own career, the science-practice theme is very evident. Since receiving my PhD in industrial/organizational psychology in 1988, I have carried on an active program of research and scholarship in the area of occupational stress. Thus, a good deal of what I do centers around scientific research and scholarship. However, in addition to my scholarly pursuits, I have conducted a number of projects in organizations that have been designed to solve practical problems. For example, not long after starting my first job out of graduate school, I 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. Another major project, which I directed, involved the development of an internal customer service satisfaction survey for a large medical center in Ohio. Administrators at this facility were concerned with the level of service departments within the hospital (e.g., radiology, nursing) provided to each other—something that is crucial to effective patient care. In addition to these large projects, over the past 25 years I have worked with a number of organizations on a number of smaller applied research projects and occasionally the development training programs.

What have I learned from working on projects involving the application of organizational psychology in real organizations? Probably most important, I have developed a great deal of respect for those who do applied work on a full-time basis. As I stated earlier, I am primarily a researcher/author, but the few applied projects I have done over the years has convinced me that applying research findings in organizational settings is tough work that often requires a very broad skill set. 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 Britt: The further into my career I get, the more I realize the importance of the scientist-practitioner model. I received my PhD in social psychology in 1994, and then 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 my own (and journal reviewer's) standards for scientific rigor. I ended up having a great experience in the Army conducting research on how the identity images of soldiers as "warriors" and "peacekeepers" 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 as a result of successfully handling the rigors of military operations.

Somewhat to my surprise, I also enjoyed communicating the importance of research findings to military leaders, and thinking

(*continued*)

Trim size: 7in x 10in

Jex c01.tex V3 - 11/20/2014 4:31 P.M. Page 10



(*continued*)

about the applied relevance of the research I conducted. I found that leaders were much more likely to take recommendations to heart when they were backed by data collected using a sound research design. I also found that leaders in applied settings appreciated the utility of a well-supported theory in making sense of the findings. Like Steve, I was impressed with how leaders were really willing to devote the time and attention necessary to understand the implications of scientific research for the well-being and performance of their personnel. I find myself being guided by the scientist-practitioner even more as I have begun new programs of research on understanding the determinants of whether employees in high stress environments seek treatment for mental health problems and the factors that promote resilience to high-intensity work stressors.

agencies and research institutes, and even market research firms. Although actual job duties vary widely by setting, many organizational psychologists employed in nonacademic settings are involved in organizational change and development activities. This might involve assisting an organization in the development and implementation of an employee opinion survey program, designing and facilitating the implementation of team development activities, or perhaps even assisting top management with the strategic planning process.

The other major activity of organizational psychologists employed in nonacademic settings is *research*. This is particularly true of those employed in nonprofit research institutes, government research institutes, and market research firms. Given the diversity of these settings, it is difficult to pin down the exact nature of the research that is conducted. However, in the most general sense, these individuals conduct scientific research that is designed to have some practical benefit to the organization or even to society in general. Both authors, for example, have conducted research to help the Army better understand how soldiers cope with stressors (e.g., Britt, Adler, Bliese, & Moore, 2013; Jex, Bliese, Buzzell, & Primeau, 2003).

To prepare for a nonacademic career, graduate students need training in most of the same areas as those pursuing academic careers. These include courses in research methodology, statistics, measurement, and several substantive topical areas. There is one important difference, however: Compared to those seeking academic employment, it is more essential for students planning nonacademic careers to obtain practical experience during their graduate training. This experience can often be gained by assisting faculty with consulting projects, or, in some cases, through formal internship programs (see Comment 1.5). Obtaining practical experience is crucial not only because it enhances a student's credentials, but because it provides valuable opportunities to apply what has been learned in graduate courses.

So how does a student decide on which career path they want to pursue? Given that PhD students are generally capable, most typically have the option of pursuing academic or nonacademic employment so this decision ultimately hinges on what students enjoy and value. In our experience, academic employment is typically favored by students who enjoy teaching and have developed a well-defined set of research interests. Academia is also well-suited for those who enjoy a great deal of autonomy and control

Trim size: 7in x 10in

Jex c01.tex V3 - 11/20/2014 4:31 P.M. Page 11



**COMMENT 1.5**

THE INSTITUTE FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH AND APPLICATION (IPRA)

One of the most important features of the graduate program in I/O psychology at 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 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 feel that work on these projects helped them to sharpen their technical skills, provided valuable opportunities to apply what they learn in their classes, and provided a realistic preview of the world of consulting.

over their time as opposed to a great deal of structure.

In contrast, nonacademic careers are typically favored by students who really enjoy working in organizational settings and seeing organizational psychology applied in a meaningful way. Applied careers are also well-suited to those who desire a little more structure, because those in applied settings typically have less freedom to decide what they work on; those decisions are usually determined by external factors such as client needs, government funding, and top management preference. Another factor that often determines the choice of one's career path, and one that we don't talk about a lot, is the reality of the job market (see Comment 1.6).

## HISTORICAL INFLUENCES IN ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

Compared to many other scientific disciplines, psychology is very young. In fact, the field as a whole is just a little more than 100 years old. Because much has been written about the history of the broader field of I/O psychology (Koppes, 1997; Koppes, 2007; Vinchur & Koppes, 2011, for a recent example) we do not attempt to provide a

Trim size: 7in x 10in Jex c01.tex V3 - 11/20/2014 4:31 P.M. Page 12



**COMMENT 1.6**

REALITY OF THE JOB MARKET

As many readers know all too well, a stagnant economy in recent years has led to high levels of unemployment in the United States and many other countries (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2011) and these trends certainly impact those in the field of organizational psychology. This has depressed the job market for organizational psychologists in both academic and nonacademic settings. On balance, though, academia has been hit harder because universities are under pressure not only to cut costs in general but also to keep the cost of tuition at moderate levels in order to make higher education affordable.

So how does the reality of the job market impact graduate students' choice of careers? What we *don't* see, and to a certain extent don't expect to see, is graduate students rejecting a particular career path altogether based solely on the job market. Graduate students who are highly motivated to seek out a particular career path will continue to do so regardless of short-term trends in the job market. What we have seen, however, is that many graduate students are "hedging their bets" a bit when it comes to preparing for their career. For example, a graduate student who is pursuing an academic career may also pursue an internship or gain other applied experiences to make themselves competitive in case they decide to pursue nonacademic employment. Conversely, students pursuing nonacademic career paths may still try to publish and obtain teaching experience in case they decide to pursue an academic position. In our opinion, having a more flexible approach to career planning makes a great deal of sense, and in fact is a necessity given the current job market.

*Source:* Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2011). *Regional and state unemployment (annual) news release* (USDL-12–0371).

comprehensive treatment here. Rather, our intent is to provide a relatively concise summary of people and historical events that have shaped the field of organizational psychology.

## Historical Beginnings

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.

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 in the United States, during the early part of the 20th century, by pioneers such as Hugo Munsterberg, Walter Dill Scott, and Walter Bingham (Vinchur & Koppes, 2011). The application of psychology to the workplace at that time was also beginning to occur simultaneously in Europe.

In the United States most of the work at that time dealt with topics such as skill

Trim size: 7in x 10in

Jex c01.tex V3 - 11/20/2014 4:31 P.M. Page 13



## PEOPLE BEHIND THE RESEARCH

LAURA KOPPES BRYAN

While teaching my first introductory to industrial and organizational (I-O) psychology course, I would spend the first two classes reviewing the history of the discipline. I believe that knowing our history deepens our understanding and broadens our perspectives when teaching, practicing, or researching I-O psychology. One day, while using a typical textbook, I presented the "fathers" of I-O psychology. There are different opinions about the original founders, but frequently cited individuals include Hugo Munsterberg and Walter Dill Scott. While writing the word "fathers" on the chalkboard, it occurred to me that I had not read any historical accounts of I-O psychology that included women who may have been involved early in the discipline. This observation led to over a decade of research, looking for women psychologists who contributed to I-O psychology during its inception.

It was unusual for a tenure-track faculty member early in her career to study history. In fact, one tenured professor told me to quit the research because it would jeopardize my tenure decision. He wanted me to conduct traditional empirical research. He said that only senior level professionals later in their careers are interested in history. Because I highly valued knowing our historical roots and desired to provide a more complete historical account, I ignored the advice and continued my research. I immediately contacted Frank Landy, who was known for his historiography of I-O psychology during the early years of the discipline. I asked him if he came across women psychologists in his research. These women were not his focus so he was not sure, but encouraged me to continue the research. He then mentored me on how to study archival material. We visited the Northwestern University archives while researching Walter Dill Scott and the Scott Company. During this trip, I found Mary Holmes Stevens Hayes, who was the only consulting psychologist working for the Scott Company. I traced her to the National Archives because she had a very successful career of applying psychology to solve problems while working for the federal government.

I continued my search in which I actually felt like a detective, looking for clues that would provide connections between women and men psychologists. I reviewed letters written by famous psychologists of the time (e.g., Cattell, Munsterberg), examined newspapers and conference programs, analyzed company materials, and studied other primary and secondary material. The research was very gratifying when I made connections. I remember the feeling of success when I first saw a photo of Mary Holmes Stevens Hayes, a psychologist I researched for 5 years. I remember thinking "that's what she looks like!" I also interviewed living psychologists (e.g., Pat Smith), who were retired and could recall the early years of the discipline.

I became fascinated with these women's lives. I was enthralled with their capacities to earn doctorates, pursue professional careers, and in some cases, have children, all during

(*continued*)

(*continued*)

a time period where these efforts were not common for women. I was especially pleased that I discovered Marion Bills, Elsie Bregman, and Millicent Pond, all who worked in industry and made significant contributions to the field. I also spent a considerable amount of time in understanding the work of Lillian Gilbreth who conducted time and motion studies with her husband while also seeking employees' perspectives. Lillian Gilbreth was one of the first full-time consulting psychologists; she carried on her husband's consulting business after he died. She then proceeded to support her 12 children through college, and has been the only psychologist honored with a U.S. postage stamp. A book and movie *Cheaper by the Dozen* were made to recognize their prolific work.

After conducting this research, I realized that a text that pulled together various aspects of the discipline did not exist. I then embarked on a project, which results in an edited volume on historical perspectives of I-O psychology. This project took over 5 years, working with discipline experts and historians. To date, it's the only text that captures individual contributors as well as specific topics, such as selection, training and development, consumer psychology, and so forth. I believe this work enhances our understanding of questions asked and problems solved. As noted by others "the past is the prologue of our future."

Dr. Laura Bryan is dean of the Yale Gordon College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Baltimore (UB).

acquisition and personnel selection, while there was very little attention given to the organizational side of the field. This was not, however, the case in other parts of the world at the beginning of the 20th century. In Great Britain, for example, H. M. Vernon, who is acknowledged as one of that country's first industrial psychologists, investigated such topics as industrial fatigue, accidents, the impact of long work hours, and worker efficiency. Fatigue of employees was also of interest to psychologists in Australia, most notably Bernard Muscion. Most of these topics are today considered part of the organizational side of the field, and in fact part of the recently emerging field of Occupational Health Psychology (see Chapter 7).

Table 1.1 provides a chronological summary of some of the major events that shaped the development of the field of organizational psychology in the 20th century.

Somewhat surprisingly, the beginnings of the organizational side of the field were heavily influenced by the work of several nonpsychologists. Perhaps the best known of these was Frederick Winslow Taylor, who developed the principles of *scientific management* (Taylor, 1911). Although for many the term *scientific management* typically conjures up images of time-and-motion study, as well as piece-rate compensation, it was actually much more than that. Scientific management was, to a large extent, a philosophy of management, and efficiency and piece-rate compensation were the most visible manifestations of that philosophy. When one looks past these more visible aspects of scientific management, three underlying principles emerge: (1) those that perform work tasks should be separate from those who design work tasks; (2) workers are rational beings, and they will work harder if provided with favorable economic incentives; and (3) problems in the workplace can and should be subjected to empirical study.

In considering the underlying principles of scientific management described earlier, the first principle is certainly contrary

Trim size: 7in x 10in

Jex c01.tex V3 - 11/20/2014 4:31 P.M. Page 15



**TABLE 1.1**

**A Chronological Summary of the Major Historical Influences on the Field of Organizational Psychology During the 20th Century**

| | |
|---|---|
| Early 1900 | Development and growth of scientific management (Taylor); beginning of the scientific study of organizational structure (Weber). |
| 1920–1930 | Hawthorne Studies; growth of unionization; immigration of Kurt Lewin to the United States. |
| 1940–1950 | WWII; publication of Vitele's book *Motivation and Morale in Industry*; development of the "Human Relations" perspective; Lewin conducts "action research" projects for the Commission on Community Relations and establishes the Research Center for Group Dynamics at MIT. |
| 1960–1970 | U.S. involvement in Vietnam; Division 14 of the APA is changed to "Industrial/Organizational Psychology"; "multilevel" perspective in organizational psychology; increasing attention to nontraditional topics such as stress, work-family conflict, and retirement. |
| 1980–1990 | Increasing globalization of the economy; changing workforce demographics; increasing reliance on temporary or contingent employees; redefining the concept of a "job." |
| 2000–2010 | Advances in communication technology, continued increases in globalization, greater flexibility in work arrangements, boundaries between "work" and "nonwork" less clear. |
| 2010–Present | Greater focus on the retirement process due to the rapid aging and ethnic diversification of the world population, new focus on emergency preparedness in post 9/11 world, increasing advances in communication technology, resurgence of research on unemployment and job insecurity after 2008 recession, evermore increasing globalization. |

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, Mitra, 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-related processes, Taylor was ahead of his time and is considered a pioneer by some. (Most of his studies dealt with cutting sheet metal.) Despite the widespread impact of scientific management, many of Taylor's ideas met with a great deal of controversy (see Comment 1.7).

Other early nonpsychologists who contributed greatly to the development of organizational psychology were Max Weber, Frederic Engels, and Karl Marx. Weber's academic training was in law and history, but his legacy is largely in the field of organizational design. Weber is best known for his development of the notion of "bureaucracy" as an organizing principle. The basic idea of a bureaucratic organization is that employees know exactly what they are supposed

**COMMENT 1.7**

FREDERICK WINSLOW TAYLOR: FATHER OF SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT

Frederick Winslow Taylor was born in 1856 in Germantown, Pennsylvania, a suburb of Philadelphia. Taylor was the son of affluent parents and spent a great deal of his childhood traveling in Europe. Perhaps the biggest turning point in Taylor's life came when, at the age of 18, he turned down the opportunity to study at Harvard, and instead accepted a position as an apprentice at the Enterprise Hydraulic Works in Philadelphia. Taylor worked there for 2 years before moving to Midvale Steel. He prospered at Midvale, working his way up to the supervisory ranks by the age of 24. It was during his time at Midvale that Taylor developed an interest in work methods and procedures—an interest that would lead to the famous pig iron experiments and ultimately to the development of scientific management.

The impact of scientific management during the early part of the 20th century cannot be overstated. Most manufacturing was designed according to scientific management principles; in some cases, even white-collar jobs had elements of this approach. For Taylor, the emergence of scientific management meant a great deal of professional success and notoriety. Taylor eventually left Midvale, worked for several other organizations, and ultimately went out on his own and became one of the first management consultants. Many organizations contracted with Taylor to help them implement scientific management principles.

Despite these successes, Taylor's later years were not happy. Taylor's wife, Louise, suffered from chronic ill health, and Taylor himself was ill a great deal. In addition, scientific management came under fire, primarily due to the charge that it was inhumane to workers. In fact, this controversy became so great that, in 1912, Taylor was forced to testify before a congressional committee investigating the human implications of scientific management. This controversy took a toll on Taylor, both mentally and physically. He died in 1915 at the age of 59.

Regardless of the controversy that surrounded Taylor's scientific management, there is no denying its impact. For organizational psychology, the impact of Taylor was not so much in the principles he espoused, but in the methods that he used to develop those principles. By using data to solve work-related problems, Taylor pioneered an approach that has become a major part of modern organizational psychology and many other related fields.

*Source:* Kanigel, R. (1997). *The one best way: Frederick Winslow Taylor and the enigma of efficiency*. New York, NY: Viking.

to be doing, and the lines of authority are clearly stated. Another major principle of bureaucracy is that advancement and rewards should be based on merit and not on things such as nepotism or social class.

Frederic Engels, who was from Germany, published the book *The Condition of the Working Class in England* in 1845. In this book Engels described in great detail the mental and physical health problems suffered by many workers in trade occupations. Engels believe that the causes of these problems could be traced to not only physical conditions within the workplace, but also the design of work and the social conditions present in the workplace. Many

Trim size: 7in x 10in Jex c01.tex V3 - 11/20/2014 4:31 P.M. Page 17



organizational psychologists today focus considerable effort on both topics (Barling & Griffiths, 2011).

Karl Marx, who is known to most readers, wrote *Das Kapital* in 1867 where he described the ways in which industrial capitalism exploited employees, and described how workers became alienated under this system. Although Marx is typically associated with the political ideology of *socialism*, he was influential in the development of organizational psychology because of his emphasis on the needs of employees as opposed to management. This is not to say that organizational psychology is "anti-capitalism" or "anti-management," by any means; rather, we mention Marx simply to make the point that much of organizational psychology is "worker-focused," and does not merely view employees as a means of production. In fact, in our opinion, the field or organizational psychology largely developed as a *reaction* to this point of view.

## The Field Takes Shape

Despite the early work of Taylor, and the influences of those such as Weber, Engels, Marx, and others, the vast majority of effort in "Industrial" psychology in the early 20th century was focused on what were described earlier as industrial topics. The event that changed that—an event many see as the beginning of organizational psychology—was the Hawthorne studies. The Hawthorne studies, a collaborative effort between the Western Electric Company and a group of researchers from Harvard University, took place between 1927 and 1932 (Mayo, 1933; Whitehead, 1935, 1938). The original purpose of the Hawthorne studies was to investigate the impact of environmental factors—such as illumination, wage incentives, and rest pauses—on employee productivity. 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 made 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. A lesser known outcome of the Hawthorne studies was that it represented one of the first attempts to provide an employee counseling program (Highhouse, 1999), which was the forerunner to current Employee Assistance Programs (EAP).

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

Trim size: 7in x 10in

Jex c01.tex V3 - 11/20/2014 4:31 P.M. Page 18



today, but when considered in the historical context, it was a very novel and important finding. Focusing only on the specific conclusions published by the Hawthorne researchers, as well as the methodological shortcomings of this research (e.g., Bramel & Friend, 1981; Carey, 1967), misses the much larger implications of this historical 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, 2004) despite the fact that there has been cooperation between the two. 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 also forced to address these issues due to the threat of unionization.

During the period of union growth in the 1930s, 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 greatest contribution was his willingness to use research to solve practical problems in both organizational and community settings. The term action research, which is typically associated with Lewin, refers to the idea that researchers and organizations can collaborate on research and use those findings to solve problems. The scientist-practitioner model can be traced to the action research model and thus stands as one of Lewin's most important contributions to the field (see Comment 1.8).

## 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 in 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 important event in the development of organizational psychology was the

Trim size: 7in x 10in

Jex c01.tex V3 - 11/20/2014 4:31 P.M. Page 19



**COMMENT 1.8**

KURT LEWIN: THE PRACTICAL THEORIST

Kurt Lewin was born in 1890 in the village of Mogilno, which was then part of the Prussian province of Posen (now part of Poland). Lewin's father owned a general store, as well as a small farm, so the family was prosperous although not wealthy. In 1905, Lewin's family moved to Berlin, largely to gain better educational opportunities than were available in Mogilno. Lewin entered the University of Frieberg in 1909, initially with the goal of studying medicine. His distaste for anatomy courses contributed to Lewin's abandoning the goal of becoming a physician. He switched his interest to biology. This led to a transfer first to the University of Munich and ultimately to the University of Berlin, where he eventually earned his doctorate in 1916. After returning from military service during World War I, he began his academic career.

The years at Berlin were very productive, and Lewin's work became quite influential. At this time, Lewin began to develop an interest in the application of psychology to applied problems such as agricultural labor, production efficiency, and the design of jobs. Lewin became quite interested in scientific management, particularly the impact of this system on workers. Lewin and his family left Germany in 1933 due to the rise of the Nazi party. He initially received a temporary appointment at Cornell University, and ultimately moved to the University of Iowa Child Welfare Research Station. While at Iowa, Lewin conducted influential studies on a variety of topics, including child development, the impact of social climates, and leadership. Following his years at Iowa, Lewin became deeply involved in the Commission on Community Relations, which was established by the American Jewish Congress. During his involvement, Lewin initiated a number of "action research" projects aimed at enhancing understanding of community problems such as racial prejudice, gang violence, and integrated housing. Remarkably, during this same time, Lewin also founded the Research Center for Group Dynamics at MIT. Lewin's work at the Center continued until his death in 1947, at the age of 56.

In retrospect, it is hard to imagine anyone having a greater impact on the field of organizational psychology than Kurt Lewin. His ideas continue to influence the study of a number of areas such as employee motivation, leadership, group dynamics, and organizational development. However, perhaps Lewin's most enduring legacy was his innovative blending of science and practice.

*Source:* Marrow, A. J. (1969). *The practical theorist: The life and work of Kurt Lewin*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

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

Trim size: 7in x 10in

Jex c01.tex V3 - 11/20/2014 4:31 P.M. Page 20



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 both leadership and job satisfaction were conducted. By the early 1960s, organizational psychology was clearly an equal partner with the industrial side of the field (Jeanneret, 1991).

At roughly this same point in time, there was considerable work being done on employee health and well-being in Nordic countries such as Sweden, Norway, Finland, and Denmark (Barling & Griffiths, 2011). Notable examples from this time period were Einar Thorsrud in Norway who was exploring empowerment in work groups, and Lennart Levi at the Karolinska Institute in Stockholm who was investigating the physiological effects of stress in the workplace. Contrary to the United States, the industrial side of the field never really flourished in Nordic countries, due largely to the strong influence of labor unions and perhaps cultural factors. This strong emphasis on employee health and well-being formed the foundation of what is now the field of Occupational Health Psychology (see Chapter 7), and continues today. It is also worth noting that many organizational psychologists today, even if they do not study employee health and well-being directly, examine topics (e.g., job design, organizational commitment, job satisfaction) that are indirectly related to occupational health.

Another broader social factor impacted the development of organizational psychology during the 1960s and early 1970s: the U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War, which led to many cultural changes in the United States 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, and speech).

For organizations, the cultural changes that arose out of the 1960s had major implications. In essence, it was becoming 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 common for employees to seek fulfillment in areas of their life 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 1970s, the name of Division 14 of the American Psychological Association (APA) was formally changed from "Industrial Psychology" to "Industrial/Organizational Psychology." Also during this period, organizational 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"

Trim size: 7in x 10in

Jex c01.tex V3 - 11/20/2014 4:31 P.M. Page 21



the impact of personality and dispositions on organizational constructs 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 individual behavior in organizations is impacted by forces at 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 the use of statistical methodology (e.g., Dansereau, Alutto, & Yammarino, 1984; James, Demaree, & 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 (Beehr & Newman, 1978), as well as retirement (Beehr, 1986), and customer service (Schneider & Bowen, 1985). This willingness to explore nontraditional topics was significant because it served as evidence that the interests of organizational psychologists had broadened considerably.

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 many Communist regimes. These extraordinary events have implications for organizational psychology because a number of the 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 (Frese, Kring, Soose, & Zempel, 1996; Puffer, 1999; Stroh & Dennis, 1994). The science and the practice of organizational psychology can potentially help organizations in these nations make this difficult economic transition.

Another important trend, 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 have devoted much more time and attention to understanding the process of retirement (e.g., Jex & Grosch, 2013; Wang & Shultz, 2010). Based on the knowledge generated from this research, 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 on to investigate the impact of cultural differences on organizational processes such as socialization, communication, and motivation (Erez, 2011).

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" (Bridges, 1994), but other terms used have included temporary work, contingent work, and in European countries the term "portfolio work" is often used (Gallagher, 2005). This trend has a number of implications for organizational psychology. At the most fundamental level, this trend impacts the "psychological contract" between organizations and employees. What does an organization owe its employees? What do employees owe the organization they work for? In the past, the answers

Trim size: 7in x 10in

Jex c01.tex V3 - 11/20/2014 4:31 P.M. Page 22



to these questions were rather straightforward; now, they have become increasingly complex.

Another implication of this trend is that many individuals are not "employees" in the way this word has typically been used in the past. This suggests a number of interesting and challenging issues for organizational psychologists. How does an organization maintain a consistent culture and philosophy with a relatively transient workforce? Is it possible to motivate temporary employees to perform beyond an average level of performance? Although some research has been done on the implications temporary, project-based work for organizations (Gallagher, 2005), more research clearly needs to be done before these questions can be answered with any degree of certainty.

## RECENT PAST AND BEYOND

On the morning of September 11, 2001 hijacked commercial aircraft crashed into the World Trade Center in New York City and the Pentagon outside of Washington, DC. In terms of casualties, the 9/11 terrorist attack represents one of the worst in history, and certainly the worst on U.S. soil. For many readers of this text, 9/11 represents one of the defining moments of their generation, much the same way that the Kennedy assassination, the first moon landing, or the attack on Pearl Harbor were for previous generations.

What are the implications of 9/11 for organizational psychology? This is a difficult question to answer with a high degree of certainty because of the magnitude of these events. Probably the most direct way that many organizations were impacted was in the area of *emergency preparedness*. That is, 9/11 made many organizations aware of the need for having plans in place in case of emergencies. Had it not been for the emergency plans of many of the organizations with offices in the World Trade Center the death toll of 9/11 could have been much higher.

Since the tragedy of 9/11, and the wars in both Iraq and Afghanistan that have followed, the United States and many other countries around the world have experienced a sustained period of economic recession that has led to high levels of unemployment (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2011). This has led to a resurgence of interest in the impact of unemployment (McKee-Ryan, Song, Wanberg, & Kinicki, 2005), and a growth in research on job insecurity (Cheng & Chan, 2008). At a more fundamental level, the economic recession has forced people once again to rethink the contract that exists between organizations and individuals employees.

Another historic event that certainly has impacted the United States, and the study of organizations indirectly, occurred in November of 2008 when Barack Obama became the first African American to be elected president. Obama was subsequently reelected by a wide margin in November of 2012. What are the implications of the Obama presidency? As of this writing there are nearly two years left in Obama's second term so it is clearly too soon to determine what his legacy will ultimately be.

One clear implication, however, is that it certainly signaled that the highest level positions in organizations can be achieved by anyone regardless of race. In some ways this is a natural progression of the trend to increased diversity that was mentioned in the previous section. Another implication of the Obama presidency, which is perhaps less obvious, is that it has come with an increased level of intervention on the part of the federal government in private sector

Trim size: 7in x 10in

Jex c01.tex V3 - 11/20/2014 4:31 P.M. Page 23



organizations (Walsh, 2009). Whether one views this as positive or negative obviously depends on one's political views; however, the reality is that organizations must be more accountable for what they do, and how they treat their employees. This has undoubtedly led to an increased awareness of equity and fairness within organizations, and perhaps a greater emphasis on employee well-being. Yet, at the same time, keeping up with more government regulations and mandates takes a great deal of time and organizational resources.

Another recent trend that has had a great impact on life within organizations, as well as the research within organizational psychology, is the rapid development of communications technology. Although technological change has certainly impacted organizations for many years, within the past 5 years this technology has developed at an even greater rate. It is now possible for people to access e-mail and the full resources of the Internet on a device as small as a cell phone. Although these technological advances have certainly had some positive effects on individuals' productivity (Park & Jex, 2011) and have allowed for much more flexible work arrangements, many view these gains as coming at a cost. More specifically, the lines of demarcation between work and other areas of people's lives are almost nonexistent, and therefore it is literally possible to work 24 hours a day. This has led to a great deal of research on how people are able to detach from work (Ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012), and the activities they can engage in to recover from work (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007).

A final recent trend that has greatly impacted organizations is increased globalization. In most industries the number of competitors has increased greatly, and those increased competitors span the globe. In addition, most large organizations have branch offices or subsidiaries around the world. This increased level of global competition has forced organizations to become more innovative in the products and services offered to consumers. Globalization has also increased the realization within the field of organizational psychology that many of our theories and research findings are "culture bound" and may not apply as widely as we hope. At a more practical level, organizations with global operations have recognized the challenges associated with employees working in cultures that are vastly different than their own, and this has led to considerable research on expatriation (e.g., Takeuchi, Wang, & Marinova, 2005).

Considering all of these recent historical events and trends, it is clear that the work world of the recent past and not too distant future will be highly complex and fast-paced. This may seem rather intimidating, but it is also an exciting prospect for the field of organizational psychology because it will allow for truly groundbreaking research and practical applications. In fact, we believe that this is one of the most exciting times in history to be involved in the science and practice of organizational psychology.

## THE CHAPTER SEQUENCE

A textbook should function as a tour guide for the student. In our experience, both as students and course instructors, the best way to guide is in a logical sequential fashion. The sequence of chapters in this book was developed with this consideration in mind. The chapters in the first part provide introductory material on the field of organizational psychology as well as its methodological foundations. Some students (and maybe even some instructors) may find it unusual to have a chapter on research methodology. We've included it for three primary reasons. First,

Trim size: 7in x 10in

Jex c01.tex V3 - 11/20/2014 4:31 P.M. Page 24



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, some very interesting research within organizational psychology in recent years has been methodologically oriented (e.g., Carter, Dalal, Lake, Lin, & Zickar, 2011). 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 next section, which contains the next eight chapters, focuses on the behavior of individuals in organizational settings. Given the definition of organizational psychology provided earlier in this chapter, this is obviously a key section of the book. A close examination of these chapters reveals somewhat of a sequential ordering. It is assumed that individuals are initially socialized into an organization (Chapter 3), are forced to balance the demands of their role as employees with other aspects of their lives (Chapter 4), and eventually become productive members of that organization (Chapter 5). It is also recognized, however, that employees may engage in number of behaviors that run counter to the goals of their employers (Chapter 6), and that work may have both positive and negative effects on employee health and well-being (Chapter 7). Along these same lines, we recognize that work may evoke feelings of satisfaction and commitment within employees (Chapter 8). The last two chapters in this section focus on the mechanisms that organizations use to influence employees' behavior. Chapter 9 covers the major motivation theories in organizational psychology, while Chapter 10 examines the various ways in which organizations attempt to influence employees' behavior.

In the next section we focus on the study of groups within organizational settings. Since most organizations consist of series of interdependent work groups, this has become a very important level of analysis. In Chapter 11 we examine one of the most important processes that occurs within work groups; namely leadership. Chapter 11 also examines power and influence processes that are at the core of leadership within groups, yet influence many other behaviors in organizations. In Chapter 12 we go beyond leadership and delve into the myriad of other factors that may influence the effectiveness of teams within organizations.

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 examines approaches to organizational design. Chapter 14 probes the concepts of organizational climate and culture. 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. Although it is a legitimate field of study in its own right, organizational psychology is part of

Trim size: 7in x 10in

Jex c01.tex V3 - 11/20/2014 4:31 P.M. Page 25



the broader field of industrial/organizational (I/O) psychology. Organizational 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 which most graduate training in I/O psychology is based. Thus, those with training in organizational psychology are employed in both academic and nonacademic settings. Historically, in most countries (the Nordic countries being the exception) organizational psychology was slower to develop than the industrial side of the field. The event that is usually considered the historical beginning of organizational psychology was the Hawthorne studies, although many other events and individuals throughout the world have helped to shape the field over the years and will continue to do so. A constant thread through the history of the field is the dynamic interaction between science and practice; in most cases for the betterment of organizations and their employees.

## SUGGESTED ADDITIONAL READINGS

Cascio, W. F., & Aguinis, H. (2008). Research in industrial and organizational psychology from 1963 to 2007: Changes, choices, and trends. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*, 1062–1081.

Highhouse, S., & Schmitt, N. W. (2013). A snapshot in time: Industrial-organizational psychology today. In N. W. Schmitt & S. E. Highhouse (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology* (2nd ed., Vol. 12, pp. 3–13). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Ryan, A. M., & Ford, J. K. (2010). Organizational psychology and the tipping point of identity. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, *3*, 241–258.

Zickar, M., & Gibby, R. E. (2007). Four persistent themes throughout the history of I-O psychology in the United States. In L. Koppes (Ed.), *Historical perspectives in industrial and organizational psychology*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.