PSYCHOLOGY 462:

TOPICS IN ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY:
THEORIES AND RESEARCH

Department of Psychology
Fall 2004-05

Instructor: Dr. Ramona Bobocel
Office: Room 4031, PAS
Telephone: 888-4567 (ext. 3622)
Office Hours: Tuesdays 2:30-3:30 p.m. and Thursdays 3:00-4:00 p.m.

Optional Background Text (on reserve in Dana Porter Library): Bowditch, J.L., & Buono, A.F. (1990). A primer on organizational behavior. (2nd ed.) New York: John Wiley & Sons. .

Content of the Course

    This course considers psychological theories and research that focus on understanding the behavior of people at work. There will be an emphasis on the psychology of the individual (vs. groups or organizations). Accordingly, we will examine research and theory on such topics as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, citizenship behavior, personality, and justice.

Objectives of the Course

    Students should leave the course with (a) a comprehensive understanding of the theoretical and methodological issues in each topic area, and (b) an increased ability to critically evaluate research in organizational psychology. The primary objective of the course, then, is to refine your ability to think analytically and originally about questions pertaining to organizational psychology.

Format of the Course

    The course is structured as a series of discussions of prescribed readings (on reserve at Dana Porter). The readings are organized around a particular topic area and are intended to provide a common knowledge base from which relevant theoretical, methodological, and practical issues can be addressed.

    The textbook is intended as a supplement to the readings; it is intended for the student who does not have the appropriate background in organizational psychology or who requires a brief "refresher." Students are not required to purchase the text; a copy is on reserve in the Dana Porter Library.

    In addition to the prescribed weekly readings, I have attached an "extended reading list." These readings might be a useful starting place as additional background for your research proposal, depending on your question of interest. All of the articles are available from the library.

Evaluation:

1.   Weekly "Thought Papers:" 10% of your grade. All students (including those wishing to audit or to be evaluated on a credit basis) will be required to bring to class two copies of a short "commentary" based on the week's readings. One copy is for me to take away, and the other is to aid your in-class discussion (see below). This commentary should be brief (1-2 pages, 12 pt font), and it should contain your critical (positive as well as negative) reactions to, and evaluation of, the week's readings. The readings should also raise research questions in your mind, which you can pose in your notes. In other words, the paper should not merely summarize the readings, but rather it should present original thoughts about what you have read. You should aim to comment on each of the readings, even if you are developing a single theme in your notes. A good commentary is the basis for excellence in the course, as it will aid your in-class participation and your discussion leading, and it will set the stage for research proposals (points #2, 3, 4 below).

The style of the notes can be relatively informal as long as they are intelligible. It matters less to me that the notes follow a particular style; what matters more is that they illustrate your critical evaluation, thoughts, and observations about the readings.   I'd prefer the notes to be typed, but handwritten is fine, as long as the writing is legible.

Given the nature of the commentaries, they will not be formally "graded" as such, although I will read them; rather you will receive 1 point for every commentary that you submit, as we will cover 10 topics in the course.

2.   In-class participation: 10% of your grade.   This is an advanced undergraduate seminar, and therefore you have a rare opportunity to actively participate in weekly discussions of the material, regardless of whether or not you are a discussion leader (see below) in any particular week. The seminar has the potential to be a valuable and rewarding learning experience, but that is largely determined by you. I would suggest that in preparing for our weekly meetings (and for your thought papers) you do several things: First, read the articles carefully and summarize (in writing) the major ideas, issues, and conclusions. Second, spend some time giving serious thought to the issues raised and to the implications of the material for future research and/or for the practical management of problems in the workplace. You should then find it is quite easy to come to each class with questions, observations, criticisms, praise, and so on.

3.   Discussion Leader: 10% of your grade. Individually or in small groups (depending on class size), you will be responsible for leading discussion each week. Obviously, your written thoughts (from point 1 above) can serve as the basis for how you will lead the discussion.   In leading discussion, you should assume that all of us have read the readings--in other words, your role is not merely to summarize the readings. Rather, you should have questions, comments, observations, critical evaluations, and so forth, to put to the class. Note that, even when you are not the discussion leader, you are expected to contribute in a meaningful way. Thus being discussion leader does not mean that you should dominate the discussion. Everyone is expected to

bring forth his or her observations every week.

4.   Two Research Proposals: Each worth 35% of your grade. In this course, you will also develop two research proposals. One proposal will be due Tues., Oct. 26 (covering the first half of the topics); the other will be due on Tues., Dec. 7 (covering the second half of the topics). The **maximum length of each proposal is 5 standard pages (12 point font, double spaced, 1 inch margins)**, excluding references and tables, etc. Note that anything beyond 5 pages will not be considered, and the penalty for late submissions is 5% per day.

In brief, the goal of each research proposal is to develop a research question that you consider interesting and worthy of study, and to design a study to investigate it.   You should develop an idea that you had as a <u>direct result</u> of discussions/readings.   You may need to locate, read, and report on additional relevant research that pertains to the rationale for your research question.

The basic components of a research proposal are: Develop a specific research question, review the background research that leads to your question, design a study to test the question, discuss the predicted results and implications of the findings for theory and practice.

You will develop the research proposal individually or in small groups (depending on class size), but ultimately you will each write up the proposal individually.   If working in groups, you will meet with your group members throughout the term.

Some of the major relevant scientific journals to which you may wish to refer (all available in the Dana Porter Library or (some) via Psych Info:

Journal of Applied Psychology
Personnel Psychology
Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes
Journal of Organizational Behavior
Academy of Management Journal
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology
Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin
Psychological Bulletin

A Few Other Notes from the Psychology Department:

All students should activate their UW computer accounts each term. The accounts give students access to applications such as word processing, statistical and graphics packages, and electronic email as well as access to the Internet. For those who are not planning to use their UW email addresses, please do one of the following things:

- change your email address on QUEST to the one that you want posted on the University Directory, or
- on the UW account, arrange for the email from your UW account to be forwarded to your alternate email address.

Psychology majors should check the Psychology Undergraduate Web Site (http://www.psychology.uwaterloo.ca/ugradprog/) regularly for updates (e.g., psychology course offerings for F/W/S, volunteer and/or part-time paid research positions, application deadlines for scholarships, etc.)

Plagiarism. The Associate Dean of Arts has requested that all course outlines in the Faculty of Arts quote the definition of plagiarism and emphasize the gravity of this academic offense. A summary is provided on page 1:10 of the Undergraduate Calendar.

> "Plagiarism… is the act of presenting the ideas, words or other intellectual property of another as one's own. The use of other people's work must be properly acknowledged and referenced in all written material… The properly acknowledged use of sources is an accepted and important part of scholarship. Use of such material without complete and unambiguous acknowledgement, however, is an offense under this policy."

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask.

Note on avoidance of academic offenses: All students registered in the courses of the Faculty of Arts are expected to know what constitutes an academic offense, to avoid committing academic offenses, and to take responsibility for their academic actions. When the commission of an offense is established, disciplinary penalties will be imposed in accord with Policy #71 (Student Academic Discipline). For information on categories of offenses and types of penalties, students are directed to consult the summary of Policy #71 which is supplied in the Undergraduate Calendar (section 1; on the Web at http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infoucal/UW/policy_71.html). If you need help in learning how to avoid offenses such as plagiarism, cheating, and double submission, or if you need clarification of aspects of the discipline policy, ask your course instructor for guidance. Other resources regarding the discipline policy are your academic advisor and the Undergraduate Associate Dean.

Psychology 462: Organizational Psychology

Suggestions for Effective Use of Readings in a Seminar

Here are some questions that you might find useful to consider when reading articles. Of course, depending on the nature/purpose of the article, some of these questions may apply more or less readily.   These questions will not only help you prepare for class discussions, but also they underlie an effective research proposal.

1.   Statement of the theory or key assumptions and tenets underlying the research (in empirical articles) or the conceptual framework provided (in review articles):

To understand the basic ideas, or principles, underlying the research, identify:

a) What are the major variables involved in explaining the phenomenon under investigation (e.g., commitment to the organization)? Note that some of the variables may be presumed to be antecedents, others may be moderators, and still others may be mediators. (If you are not clear on these terms, this is something to bring up in class!) You should thus not only identify the variables, but also indicate their presumed role.

b) Once you identify the major variables, indicate how they act to influence the phenomenon under investigation. That is, outline the process explaining why the effects are expected, according to the particular perspective.

Your answers for a) and b) may be brief, but what you should end up with is an outline of the particular theory or assumptions underlying the phenomenon of interest.

2.   Also, you should indicate what the fundamental assumptions underlying the approach are. For example, what must we assume about the nature of humans to buy a particular theoretical framework? (You might indicate assumptions first, then follow with the tenets of the theory.)

3.   Briefly, what is the research status of some explanation? What aspects of the explanation seem to be borne out in research? Which do not?

<u>More on preparation for class</u>:

As stated above, you should all have a few questions/observations to bring to class each week. Below are some additional general points that might aid you in this regard. These questions should NOT limit or constraint your thinking. You will, undoubtedly, have other insights that you are encouraged to share with the class.

1. Are there any observations you make as you read the articles? For example, do you see inconsistencies/parallels to readings from a previous week? Are there aspects of the various theories that are competing, or can they be reconciled? Are there any consistencies/discrepancies to what you have observed in the organization?

2. Are you skeptical about the basis of any of ideas or the conclusions? Why? Any methodological concerns?

3. In what way did you feel heartened and/or disheartened by the readings, with respect to your understanding about theory and research on behavior in the workplace.

4. What did you learn that seemed counterintuitive to you? What seemed to be something "your grandmother could have told you"?

5. What did you want to most want to know--both as a scientist and a practitioner--after reading the work?

6. What applications did you take away from what you read? Or, alternatively, are there any problems (or limits) that you see to as far as application?

7. What's the next study you see as necessary?

READING LIST

Sept.   14   Introduction

Sept.   21   Organizational Theory/History

Bowditch, J.L., & Buono, A.F. (1990). Chp.1, especially pp. 6-33. (This is a good summary.)

Scott, W.R. (1981). Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. Read Chps. 3, 4 (can skip pp. 90-98), and 5 (only pp. 109-120).

Sept. 28   Job Satisfaction 1

Spector, P. E. (1997).   Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences. Advanced topics in organizational behavior. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Chapters 1, 4, 5: Meaning, Antecedents, Potential effects.

Oct. 5   Job Satisfaction 2

Arvey, R.D., Bouchard, T.J., Segal, N.L. & Abraham, L.M. (1989). Job satisfaction: Environmental and genetic components. JAP, 74, 187-192.

Judge et al. (1997). The dispostional causes of job satisfaction: A core evaluative approach. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior, 19, 151-188. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Oct. 12   Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organ, D.W. (1988). Organizational citizenship: The good soldier syndrome. Toronto: Lexington Books, Chpt. 1.

Allen, T.D., & Rush, M.C. (1998). The effects of organizational citizenship behavior on performance judgments: A field study and a laboratory experiment. JAP, 83, 247-260.

Oct. 19   **Organizational Commitment**

Meyer, J.M. & Allen, N.J. (1997). <u>Commitment in the workplace: Theory, Research, and Application</u>, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Chapters 2 & 4. Meaning, Consequences, Development.

Meyer, J.P., Paunonen, S.V., Gellatly, I.R., Goffin, R.D. & Jackson, D.N. (1989). Organizational commitment and job performance: It's that nature of the commitment that counts. <u>JAP</u>, <u>74</u>, 152-156.

Oct. 26   **Research Proposal I Due (by 2:30 p.m.)   No class**

Nov. 2   **Perceptions of Organizational Support**

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R. Hutchinson, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. <u>JAP, 71,</u> 500-507.

Shore, L. M., & Wayne, S. J. (1993). Commitment and employee behavior: Comparison of affective commitment and continuance commitment with perceived organizational support. <u>JAP, 78</u>, 774-780.

Eisenberger, R., Cummings, J., Armeli, S., and Lynch, P. (1997). Perceived organizational support, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction. <u>JAP, 82</u>, 812-820.

Nov. 9   **Justice in the Workplace I: Distributive Justice**

Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. <u>JAP, 5</u>, 561-568.

Mowday, R.T. (1991). Equity theory predictions of behavior in organizations. In R.M. Steers & L.W. Porter (Eds.), <u>Motivation and work behavior</u>, (5th edition, pp. 111-131). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nov. 16   **Justice in the Workplace II: Procedural Justice**

Folger, R.,& Greenberg, J. (1985). Procedural justice: An interpretive analysis of personnel systems. In K. Rowland & G. Ferris (Eds.), <u>Research in personnel and human resources management</u> (Vol. 3, pp. 141-183). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Lind, E. A., Kanfer, R., & Earley, P. C. (1990). Voice, control, and procedural justice: Insturmental and noninstrumental concerns in fairness judgements. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</u>, <u>59</u>, 952-959.

Nov. 23   **The Psychological Contract**

Morrison, E.W., Robinson, S.L. (1997). When employees feel betrayed: A model of how psychological contract violation develops. <u>AMR, 22</u>, 226-256.

Raja, U., Johns, G., & Ntalianis (2004). The impact of personality on psychological contracts, <u>AMJ, 47</u>, 350-367.

Nov. 30   **Employee Withdrawal: Absenteeism, Turnover**

Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W., & Steers, R.M. (1982). <u>Employee-organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover</u>. New York, NY: Academic Press. Read Chapter 4: Determinants of employee absenteeism and Chapter 5: Determinants of employee turnover

Hollenbeck, J.R. & Williams, C.R. (1986). Turnover functionality versus turnover frequency: A note on work attitudes and organizational effectiveness. <u>JAP</u>, <u>71</u>, 606-611.

Dec. 7   **Research Proposal II Due**

Topics & Discussion Leaders -

Sept.   14   Introduction

           21   Organizational Theory: Background   RB

           28   Job Satisfaction 1

            5   Job Satisfaction 2

Oct.   12   Organizational Citizenship

           19   Organizational Commitment

           26   Research Proposal I Due

Nov.   2   Perceptions of Organizational Support

            9   Distributive Justice

           16   Procedural Justice

           23   Psychological Contract

           30   Absenteeism, Turnover

Dec.   7   Research Proposal II Due

EXTENDED READING LIST FOR YOUR INTEREST!

Organizational Theory

Landy, F.J. (1997). Early influences on the development of Industrial and Organizational
Psychology, <u>JAP</u>, <u>82</u>, 467-477.

Citizenship Behavior and Related Constructs

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Paine, J.B., & Bachrach, D.G. (2000). Organizational
citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and
suggestions for future research. <u>Journal of Management, 3</u>, 513-563.

Bateman, T.S., & Organ D.W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship
between affect and employee "citizenship." <u>AMJ</u>, <u>26</u>, 587-595.contains OCB scale
items:

McNeely, B.L. (1994). The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial
organizational behavior: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial
behavior, <u>JAP, 79,</u> 836-844.

Podsakoff, P.M., Ahearne, M. & MacKenzie, S.B. (1997). Organizational citizenship and the
quality and quantity of work group performance. <u>JAP, 82</u>, 262-270.

Job Satisfaction

Judge et al. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relation: A qualitative and
quantitative review, <u>Psychological Bulletin, 127</u>, 376-407.

Iaffaldano, M.T. & Muchinsky, P.M. (1985). Job satisfaction and job performance: A
meta-analysis. <u>Psychological Bulletin</u>, <u>97</u>, 251-273.

Olson, J.M., & Zanna, M.P. (1993). Attitudes and attitude change. <u>Annual Review of
Psychology, 44</u>, 117-154 (**you may omit pp. 135-on).

Ostroff, C. (1992). The relationship between satisfaction, attitudes, and performance: An
organizational level analysis. <u>JAP</u>, <u>77</u>, 963-974.

Staw B.M., & Ross, J. (1985). Stability in the midst of change: A dispositional approach to job
attitudes, <u>JAP</u>, <u>70</u>, 469-480.

Organizational Commitment

Allen, N.J. & Meyer, J.P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. JOP, 63, 1-18. (original scale items).

Meyer, J.P., Bobocel, D.R., & Allen, N.J. (1991). Development of organizational commitment during the first year of employment: A longitudinal study of pre- and post-entry Influences. Journal of Management, 17, 717-733.

Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J. (1997). Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application. Sage.

Irving, G.R., Coleman, D.F., & Cooper, C.L. (1997). Further assessments of a three-component model of occupational commitment: Generalizability and differences across occupations. JAP, 82, 444-452.

Personality

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M.K. (1993). Autonomy as a moderator of the relationships between the Big Five personality dimensions and job performance, JAP, 1, 111-118.

Ones, D.S., Viswesvaran, C., & Reiss, A.D. (1996). The role of social desirability in personality testing for personnel selection: The red herring. JAP, 81, 660-679.

Cellar, D.R., Miller, M.L., Doverspike, D.D., & Klawsky, J.D. (1996). Comparison of factor structures and criterion-related validity coefficients for two measures of personality based on the five factor model. JAP, 81, 694-704.

Goffin, R.D., Rothstein, M.G., & Johnston, N.G. (1996). Personality testing and the assessment center: Incremental validity for managerial selection. JAP, 81,746-756.

Justice in the Workplace

Taylor, D. M. , & Moghaddam, F. M. (1987). Relative deprivation theory. [chapter 6 of] Theories of intergroup relations. New York: Praeger.

Lind, E. A., Kanfer, R., & Earley, P. C. (1990). Voice, control, and procedural justice: Insturmental and noninstrumental concerns in fairness judgements. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 952-959.

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviours: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? Journal of Applied Psychology, 76, 845 - 855.

Konovsky, M. A. & Cropanzano, R. (1991). Perceived fairness of employee drug testing as a
   predictor of employee attitudes and job performance. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, <u>76</u>,
   698-707.

Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of
   pay cuts. <u>JAP, 5</u>, 561-568.

Absenteeism & Turnover

Johns, G. (1994). How often were you absent? A review of the use of self-reported absence
   data, <u>JAP</u>, <u>79</u>, 574-591.

Johns, G. (1994). Absenteeism estimates by employees and managers: Divergent perspectives
   and self-serving perceptions. <u>JAP</u>, <u>79</u>, 229-239.

Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover
   intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. <u>Personnel
   Psychology</u>, <u>46</u>, 259-293.

Judge, T. A. (1993). Does affective disposition moderate the relationship between job
   satisfaction and voluntary turnover? <u>JAP</u>, <u>78</u>, 395-401.

Johns, G. (1987). Understanding and managing absence from work. In S.L. Dolan & R.S.
   Schuler (Eds.), <u>Canadian Readings in Personnel and Human Resource Management</u>, pp.
   324-335. St. Paul, MN: West.

PSYCH 462: SHORT BIO & STARTER

PRINT NAME:

YEAR AND PROGRAM:

Describe briefly any previous (or current) work experience you had which was particularly good or bad. What experience most comes to mind?

What made the experience good or bad? Identify what you believe was (were) the primary cause(s).

If you described a bad experience, what if anything, do you believe could have been done to improve it?

 ** On the other side of the page, tell me a bit about your goals/objectives in taking this course.