

SYLLABUS

Psychology 639-001
SURVEY OF ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY
George Mason University

Fall 2011

Instructor: Reeshad S. Dalal, Ph.D.

Email: rdalal@gmu.edu

Office: David King 3077

Office Hour: Thursday, 3 PM – 4 PM

Class Day, Time, and Location: Thursday, 4:30 PM – 7:10 PM, Science and Technology I 127

COURSE OVERVIEW:

This is a graduate-level survey of research in organizational psychology. One of the major, and most obvious, objectives of this course is to introduce students to the primary areas of research in the field. The focus is on basic scientific research, and an attempt has been made to include some highly cited papers as well as some papers that are models of good research design or broad interdisciplinary interest. However, an attempt has also been made to discuss how the research might inform practice in organizations—thereby furthering the nascent “evidence-based management” movement. In addition, an attempt has been made to introduce students to topics they are not likely to encounter in subsequent courses (e.g., decision-making and negotiation/conflict) as well as unique aspects of topics that are typically covered in subsequent courses. Finally, an attempt has been made to choose readings that will provoke the reader and provide ample fodder for discussion. Overall, the course aims to help students become good consumers, developers, and appliers of research.

ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION:

It is important for every student to read all the assigned articles, attend all class sessions, and contribute to the class discussion because the quality of this course will be influenced significantly ($p < 0.01$) by the quality of the discussion.

One absence is permitted without any penalty *as long as* the student summarizes his/her reactions to the week's readings in some depth on the Blackboard discussion board. A second or third absence will automatically result in a one-grade penalty (e.g., an "A" becomes a "B") to the participation/attendance portion of the course grade *unless* the student not only provides reactions to the readings (see previous sentence) but also performs an additional in-class presentation (please see me to discuss this). Barring truly exceptional circumstances (as adjudged by *me*), a fourth absence will automatically result in a failing grade in the overall course.

Frequent instances of late arrival to and/or early departure from class will also result in grade penalties to the participation/attendance portion of the course grade.

Every student is expected to contribute to the class discussion during each course session. Students who do not voluntarily contribute will be "encouraged" to contribute by the professor. In other words, I may deliberately put you on the spot. Contributions via the online (Blackboard) discussion board are encouraged, but cannot completely substitute for in-class participation. Repeated failure to participate will result in grade penalties to the participation/attendance portion of the course grade.

COURSE READINGS:

Note: "" indicates a reading that is not required, but that is warmly recommended for your personal development.*

September 1

FIRST CLASS MEETING

No readings.

September 8

INTRODUCTION

Bem, D. J. (2004). Writing the empirical journal article. In J. M. Darley, M. P. Zanna, & H. L. Roediger (Eds.), *The compleat academic: A career guide* (2nd ed., pp. 185-220). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. **[Only the following sections are required reading: *The Shape of an Article* (p. 189-190), *The Introduction* (p. 190-195), and *Rewriting and Polishing Your Article* (p. 205-217).]**

Hulin, C. L. (2002). Lessons from industrial and organizational psychology. In J. M. Brett & F. Drasgow (Eds.), *The psychology of work: Theoretically based empirical research* (pp. 3-22). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kendall, P.C., Silk, J. S., & Chu, B. C. (2000). Introducing your research report: Writing the introduction. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Writing articles for publication in psychology journals: A handbook* (pp. 41-57). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Pfeffer, J., & Sutton, R. I. (2006). Demanding proof. *Industrial Engineer*, 38, 43-47.

*Hulin, C. L. (2001). Applied psychology and science: Differences between research and practice. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 225-234.

*Paul, K. I., & Moser, K. (2009). Unemployment impairs mental health: Meta-analyses. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74, 264-282.

*Pfeffer, J. (1993). Barriers to the advance of organization science: Paradigm development as a dependent variable. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 599-620.

*Pfeffer, J. (1998). Understanding organizations: Concepts and controversies. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (4th ed., Vol. II, pp. 733-777). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

*Pfeffer, J., & Sutton, R. I. (2007). Evidence-based management. *Public Management*, 89, 14-25.

September 15

MOTIVATION - I (GOAL-SETTING, CONTROL/SELF-REGULATION, EXPECTANCY AND COMPENSATION)

Locke, E. A. (1982). Relation of goal level to performance with a short work period and multiple goal levels. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 512-514.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist*, 57, 705-717.

Rynes, S. L., Gerhart, B., & Minette, K. A. (2004). The importance of pay in employee motivation: Discrepancies between what people say and what they do. *Human Resource Management*, 43, 381-394.

- Werther, W. B. (1992). Workshops aid in goal setting. In R. R. Sims, D. D. White, & D. A. Bednar (Eds.), *Readings in organizational behavior* (pp. 95-100). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- *Camerer, C. F., & Hogarth, R. M. (1999). The effects of financial incentives in experiments: A review and capital-labor-production framework. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, *19*, 7–42.
- *Elliot, A. J. & Church, M. A. (1997). A hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72*, 218-232.
- *Jenkins, G. D., Mitra, A., Gupta, N., & Shaw, J. D. (1998). Are financial incentives related to performance? A meta-analytic review of empirical research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*, 777-787.
- *Pinder, C. C. (2007). Expectancy theory of work motivation. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of industrial/organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 235-238). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- *Vancouver, J. B. (2007). Control theory. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of industrial/organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 107-110). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

September 22

MOTIVATION - II (EQUITY AND JUSTICE)

- Cascio, W. F. & Wynn, P. (2004). Managing a downsizing process. *Human Resource Management*, *43*, 425-436.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*, 386-400.
- Kahneman, D., Knetsch, J. L., & Thaler, R. H. (1986). Fairness and the assumptions of economics. *Journal of Business*, *59*, 8285-8300.
- *Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*, 425-445.
- *Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *75*, 561-568.

- *Greenberg, J. (2007). Equity theory. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of industrial/organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 212-215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- *Latham, G. P., Erez, M., & Locke, E. A. (1988). Resolving scientific disputes by the joint design of crucial experiments by the antagonists: Application to the Erez-Latham dispute regarding participation in goal setting. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73*, 753-772.
- *Shaw, J. C., Wild, E., & Colquitt, J. A. (2003). To justify or excuse? A meta-analytic review of the effects of explanations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 444-458.

September 29

JOB ATTITUDES – I (JOB EVALUATIONS AND AFFECT)

- Arvey, R. D., Bouchard, T. J., Segal, N. L., & Abraham, L. M. (1989). Job satisfaction: Environmental and genetic components. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 187-192.
- Dalal, R. S., & Credé, M. (in press). Job satisfaction. In K. F. Geisinger (Ed.), *American Psychological Association handbook of testing and assessment in psychology*.
- Glomb, T. M. & Tews, M. J. (2004). Emotional labor: A conceptualization and scale development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64*, 1-23.
- Saari, L. M. & Judge, T. A. (2004). Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management, 43*, 395-407.
- *Ajzen, I. (2002). Attitudes. In R. Fernandez Ballesteros (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Psychological Assessment* (Vol. 1, pp. 110-115). London, UK: Sage Publications.
- *Judge, T. A., Hulin, C. L., & Dalal, R. S. (in press). Job satisfaction and job affect. In S. W. J. Kozlowski (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- *Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 538-551.
- *Smith, F. J. (2003). Influence of surveys in initiating top management action. In *Organizational surveys: The diagnosis and betterment of organizations through their members* (pp. 152-160). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- *Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 19, 1-74.

October 6

JOB ATTITUDES – II (OUTCOMES)

- Johns, G. (2001). The psychology of lateness, absenteeism, and turnover. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. P. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 232-252). London, U.K.: Sage Publications.
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 376-407.
- Keller, R. T. (1997). Job involvement and organizational commitment as longitudinal predictors of job performance: A study of scientists and engineers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 539-545.
- Smith, F. J. (1977). Work attitudes as predictors of attendance on a specific day. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62, 16-19.
- *Hom, P. (2002). The legacy of Charles Hulin's work on turnover thinking and research. In J. M. Brett & F. Drasgow (Eds.), *The psychology of work: Theoretically based empirical research* (pp. 169-187). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- *Ryan, A. M., Schmit, M. J., & Johnson, R. (1996). Attitudes and effectiveness: Examining relations at an organizational level. *Personnel Psychology*, 49, 853-882.

October 13

STRESS, HARASSMENT/DISCRIMINATION, AND DIVERSITY

- Fitzgerald, L. F. (2000). Sexual harassment. In A. E. Kazdin (Ed). *Encyclopedia of psychology* (Vol. 7, pp. 251-254). Washington, DC, USA: American Psychological Association.
- Jackson, S. E., Joshi, A., & Erhardt, N. L. (2003). Recent research on team and

organizational diversity: SWOT analysis and implications. *Journal of Management*, 29, 801-830.

Judge, T. A. & Colquitt, J. A. (2004). Organizational justice and stress: The mediating role of work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 395-404.

Sonnentag, S. & Frese, M. (2003). Stress in organizations. In I. B. Weiner (Series Ed.) & W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Vol. Eds.) *Handbook of Psychology: Vol. 12. Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 453-491). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

*Bell, S. T., Villado, A. J., Lukasik, M. A., Belau, L., & Briggs, A. L. (2011). Getting specific about demographic diversity variable and team performance relationships: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, 37, 709-743.

*Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6, 64-80.

*Horwitz, S. J., & Horwitz, I. B. (2007). The effects of team diversity on team outcomes: A meta-analytic review of team demography. *Journal of Management*, 33, 987-1015.

*Kanner, A. D., Coyne, J. C., Schaefer, C., & Lazarus, R. S. (1981). Comparison of two modes of stress measurement: Daily hassles and uplifts versus major life events. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 4, 1-39.

*Kochan, T., Bezrukova, K., Ely, R., Jackson, S., Joshi, A., Jehn, K., Leonard, J., Devine, D., & Thomas, D. (2003). The effects of diversity on business performance: Report of the diversity research network. *Human Resource Management*, 42, 3-21.

*Reed, J., & Buck, S. (2009). The effect of regular aerobic exercise on positive-activated affect: A meta-analysis. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 10, 581-594.

*Richardson, K. M., & Rothstein, H. R. (2008). Effects of occupational stress management intervention programs: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 13, 69-93.

October 20

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE, ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE, AND SOCIETAL CULTURE

Note: Applied Projects are due in class today.

Cohen, D., Nisbett, R. E., Bowdle, B. F., & Schwarz, N. (1996). Insult, aggression, and the Southern culture of honor: An "experimental ethnography." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 945-960.

Gelfand, M., Leslie, L., & Shteynberg, G. (2007). Cross-cultural research methods and theory. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of industrial/organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 136-143). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schneider, B., Salvaggio, A. N., & Subirats, M. (2002). Climate strength: A new direction for climate research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 220-229.

Zohar, D. (1980). Safety climate in industrial organizations: Theoretical and applied implications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 96-102.

*Chan, D. (1998). Functional relations among constructs in the same content domain at different levels of analysis: A typology of composition models. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 234-246.

*Dickson, M. & Mitchelson, J. K. (2007a). Organizational climate. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of industrial/organizational psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 545-548). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

*Dickson, M. & Mitchelson, J. K. (2007b). Organizational culture. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of industrial/organizational psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 558-562). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

*Ostroff, C., Kinicki, A. J., & Tamkins, M. M. (2003). Organizational culture and climate. In I. B. Weiner (Series Ed.) & W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Vol. Eds.) *Handbook of Psychology: Vol. 12. Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 565-594). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

October 27

LEADERSHIP

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). Women and the labyrinth of leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(9), 62-71.

Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., & Ilies, R. (2004). The forgotten ones? The validity of consideration and initiating structure in leadership research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 36-51.

Sosik, J. J. (2007). Transformational and transactional leadership. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of industrial/organizational psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 834-837). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Vroom, V. H. (2000). Leadership and the decision-making process. *Organizational Dynamics*, 28, 82-94.

*Den Hartog, D. N. & Koopman, P. L. (2001). Leadership in organizations. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. P. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 166-187). London, U.K.: Sage Publications.

*Fleenor, J. W. (2007). Trait approach to leadership. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of industrial/organizational psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 830-832). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

*Sin, H-P., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2009). Understanding why they don't see eye to eye: An examination of leader-member exchange (LMX) agreement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 1048-1057.

November 3

WORK GROUPS/TEAMS

- Hollenbeck, J. R., DeRue, D. S., & Guzzo, R. (2004). Bridging the gap between I/O research and HR practice: Improving team composition, team training, and team task design. *Human Resource Management, 43*, 353-366.
- Rowe, G., & Wright, G. (1999). The Delphi technique as a forecasting tool: Issues and analysis. *International Journal of Forecasting, 15*, 353-375.
- Schwall, A. & Mohammed, S. (2007). Group decision-making quality and performance. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of industrial/organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 286-289). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Thompson, L. F. (2007). Group decision-making techniques. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of industrial/organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 289-292). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- *Bell, S. T. (2007). Deep-level composition variables as predictors of team performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 595-615.
- *Diehl, M., & Stroebe, W. (1987). Productivity loss in brainstorming groups: Toward the solution of a riddle. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 497-509.
- *Hinsz, V. B, Tindale, R. S., & Vollrath, D. A. (1997). The emerging conceptualization of groups as information processes. *Psychological Bulletin, 121*, 43-64.
- *Hollenbeck, J. R., Ilgen, D. R., Sego, D. J., Hedlund, J., Major, D. A., & Phillips, J. (1995). Multilevel theory of team decision making: Decision performance in teams incorporating distributed expertise. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*, 292-316.
- *Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Bell, B. S. (2003). Work groups and teams in organizations. In I. B. Weiner (Series Ed.) & W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Vol. Eds.) *Handbook of Psychology: Vol. 12. Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 333-376). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- *McGrath, J. E. (1997). Small group research, that once and future field: An interpretation of the past with an eye to the future. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 1*, 7-27.
- *McGrath, J. E. (1984). A typology of tasks. In *Groups: Interaction and performance* (pp. 51-66). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

November 10

DECISION-MAKING AND NEGOTIATION/CONFLICT

Note: Bulleted Outlines are due via email by class time today.

Please watch Laurie Weingart's videos on Negotiating a Job Offer (total time is approximately 25 minutes):

<http://www.tepper.cmu.edu/alumni/lifelong-learning/expert-commentary/laurie-weingart-video-on-negotiating-a-job-offer/index.aspx>

Brodt, S. E. (2007). Negotiation, mediation, and arbitration. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of industrial/organizational psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 511-514). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

De Dreu, C. K. W. & Weingart, L. R. (2003). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance and team member satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 741-749.

Lambdin, C., & Shaffer, V. A. (2009). Are within-subjects designs transparent? *Judgment and Decision-Making, 4*, 554-566.

Milkman, K. L., Chugh, D., & Bazerman, M. H. (2009). How can decision making be improved? *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 4*, 379-383.

O'Connor, K. M., & Carnevale, P. J. (1997). A nasty but effective negotiation strategy: Misrepresentation of a common-value issue. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*, 504-515.

*Arkes, H. R. (1991). Costs and benefits of judgment errors: Implications for debiasing. *Psychological Bulletin, 110*, 468-498.

*Bazerman, M. H. & Moore, D. A. (2009). Improving decision making. In *Judgment in managerial decision-making* (7th edn.; pp. 179-199). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

*Carnevale, P. J., & Isen, A. M. (1986). The influence of positive affect and visual access on the discovery of integrative solutions in bilateral negotiation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 37*, 1-13.

*Carnevale, P. J. & Pruitt, D. G. (1992). Negotiation and conflict. *Annual Review of Psychology, 43*, 531-582.

*Heath, C., Larrick, R. P., & Klayman, J. (1998). Cognitive repairs: How organizational

practices can compensate for individual shortcomings. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 20, 1-37.

*Stuhlmacher, A. F., & Walters, A. E. (1999). Gender differences in negotiation outcome: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 52, 653-677.

*Wickens, C. D., Lee, J., & Liu, Y. (2004). Decision making. In *An Introduction to Human Factors Engineering* (2nd ed.; pp. 156-183). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

*Yaniv, I. (2004). The benefit of additional opinions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 13, 75-78.

*Yaniv, I., & Schul, Y. (1997). Elimination and inclusion procedures in judgment. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 10, 211-220.

November 17

STUDENT-SELECTED READINGS – I

No assigned readings.

November 24

THANKSGIVING BREAK

No class.

December 1

CLASS PRESENTATIONS

No readings.

December 8

STUDENT-SELECTED READINGS – II

No assigned readings.

December 14 (Wednesday)

TERM PAPERS DUE VIA EMAIL BY 10 A.M.

No class.

APPLIED PROJECT: WIKIPEDIA ENTRY[†]:

This is a group project. You will be working in pairs.

Your task is to create a Wikipedia entry. The entry should, in effect, be a brief (equivalent to 5-8 double-spaced pages using 12-point font in MS Word—*excluding* the table of contents, references, and any tables or figures) introduction to a particular topic, written at a level accessible to an educated *layperson* (i.e., you should keep jargon to a minimum, avoid acronyms, etc.).

Choose a topic that is explicitly related to organizational psychology, and on which no Wikipedia entry (or at best a “stub”) currently exists. Also, your topic should be “notable”: avoid choosing an overly specific topic, or one on which research has been conducted primarily by a single individual or research team. Keep in mind that your topic need not be a psychological construct (e.g., “Sexual Harassment”); it could instead be a theory (e.g., “Illinois Model of Sexual Harassment”) or a real-world application (e.g., the “Reasonable Woman” legal standard) or a topic that melds two areas (e.g., “Sexual Harassment Prevention Training”). It may be a good idea to run your proposed topic by me before you begin work on it. You may also want to share your proposed topic with the rest of the class: despite the odds of this being miniscule, in a previous semester it just so happened that two groups wanted to do the same topic!

Your Wikipedia entry should include relevant readings from the syllabus plus other sources obtained by you. *Cite at least 15 sources in total.*

As an example, an entry on a particular psychological construct should include sections like: table of contents (quite important to the “Wikipedia police,” apparently), definition(s), operationalization(s), antecedents, consequences, implications for practice, methodological problems with existing research (if any), and brief descriptions of closely-related constructs (if any). With regard to the last of these topics: If the closely-related constructs have their own existing Wikipedia entries, your article should link to these other entries, and *you should also edit those other entries in order to link them to your own entry.* Of course, depending on the specific topic chosen, not all the aforementioned sections will be relevant; moreover, additional sections (unmentioned above) may be relevant.

For further information, please refer to the following Wikipedia pages:

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Tutorial>

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Your_first_article#How_to_create_a_page

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:What_Wikipedia_is_not

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:The_perfect_article

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Featured_article_criteria

The objectives of requiring students to create Wikipedia entries are threefold. First, in the process of creating such articles, students will gain in-depth knowledge about a particular topic. Second, the creation of such articles is intended to contribute to the dissemination and popularization of industrial/organizational psychology research to a broader audience--one that is interested in the topics we study, but that does not necessarily view the *Journal of Applied Psychology* as appropriate bedtime reading. The creation of such articles is therefore consistent with the Association for Psychological Science (APS) Wikipedia Initiative:

<http://www.psychologicalscience.org/index.php/members/aps-wikipedia-initiative> (Note: You do *not* need to formally join this initiative). Third, regardless of whether a student intends to go into academia or the applied world, he or she will need to be able to communicate with laypersons. The current assignment will hopefully aid in the development of such skills.

Note that Wikipedia changes rapidly: it is conceivable that, within a matter of hours, your entry may be amended by the "Wikipedia police"--or even recommended for deletion! (Fortunately, in previous semesters, none of the Wikipedia articles created by students was ultimately deleted outright, but this remains a possibility.) Thus, please print out your entry (or save a pdf version of it) as soon as you have submitted it. Although I will look at the version on the web, and although I will ask you to make an attempt to save an entry that has been recommended for deletion by the "Wikipedia police," I will not hold you accountable if your entry is ultimately deleted. In other words, my primary focus will be the content of the material you submitted.

Please note that, after you have submitted your Wikipedia entry to me, I may ask you to make some improvements. Students who submit entries that are near-perfect the first time around, or who make a good-faith effort to incorporate the improvements suggested by me (or explain cogently why my suggestions are not actually "improvements"), will receive an "A" on the project.

[†]I am potentially open to receiving some other form of applied project. Students who wish to do something different should prepare a brief (e.g., 1-page) proposal regarding the type of alternative they desire, and should discuss their proposal with me *at least two weeks prior to the due date for the applied project*.

Applied Projects are due in class on Thursday, October 20.

RESEARCH PROPOSAL (BULLETED OUTLINE + IN-CLASS PRESENTATION + TERM PAPER):

This is a group project. You will be working in pairs.

Your task is to propose an original research project *explicitly related to the topic of organizational psychology*. In practical terms, the end product will essentially be the "introduction" section of an empirical journal article. That is, you will first review the literature

on a particular topic and then propose your own hypotheses. Each hypothesis should be preceded by a sound rationale.

Note that this is a proposal for *basic* research. It should focus on psychological constructs and their inter-relationships. Hypotheses should ideally be derived from psychological (or other social science) theories. A paper discussing an applied research problem (e.g., a consulting project--“Here is a description of a project I conducted for ‘Elegantly Wasted Winery,’ Inc., comparing levels of employee engagement across the winery’s Production and Sales departments”) is completely inappropriate and will receive a failing grade. If you are unsure about whether your proposal meets the basic research criterion, please talk to me ahead of time.

The topic should be *specific*. For example, whereas “leadership” or even “leader-member exchange” are too broad, something like “ecological momentary assessment of the temporal development of leader-member exchange” would be more appropriate. You should propose *original* research: though our discipline should have a place for replications, the current paper is designed in part to assess your creativity—therefore, replications are not suitable here. It is incumbent upon you to demonstrate, even at the outline stage (see below), that your paper topic is novel.

The idea is for students to use this opportunity to develop research proposals in areas relevant and interesting to them. In the past, some students have gone on to conduct the studies they proposed for this course--and I would urge you to try to do the same.

Papers should be formatted in American Psychological Association style, as exemplified by the latest edition of the APA Publication Manual. Alternately, Academy of Management style is acceptable.

For both your sanity and mine, the term paper will be fairly short: **8-10⁺⁺** pages of text. This page limit does *not* include the title page, references, and any tables or figures you may have. The paper must make use of what you learned in class regarding how to write an introduction section, what constitutes good paragraph structure, how to use transitions, and so forth. You do not need an abstract, and you do not need a method, results, or discussion section. Note, however, that a good introduction section will foreshadow the method and results sections. Thus, although the method and results sections are not included in the paper, they *do* need to be given some thought. You will need *at least 18 references* in the final paper.

The short length of the paper does not obviate the necessity of thoroughness.

To facilitate viable research proposals, the submission of the paper will be preceded by:

- A **bulleted outline**. The text portion of the outline should be **3-5** double-spaced pages in length, *plus* a references section (you should have *at least 12 references at this stage*). The outline, like the ultimate paper as a whole, must make use of what you learned in

class regarding how to write an introduction section, what constitutes good paragraph structure, how to use transitions, and so forth. The outline should include a descriptive title. An example of a good title is “Ecological Momentary Assessment of the Temporal Development of Leader-Member Exchange” and an example of a bad title is “Jane and John’s Excellent Organizational Psychology Term Paper.” It is important to provide enough detail regarding the extant literature to demonstrate that your paper topic is unique/novel (and interesting!). Make sure to include formal hypothesis statements in your outline, and to carefully justify each hypothesis with a rationale that *precedes* the hypothesis. Please write in complete sentences, and please make sure every bullet of text is comprehensible!

- An ***in-class PowerPoint presentation***. You should have *at least 16 references at this stage*. This will be a group presentation: both members of the pair should play an approximately equal role. In addition to the requirements for the outline (descriptive title, formal hypotheses, References section, etc.--yes, you need a References section here too!), please make sure that all slides are numbered. Each presentation should be **10-12** minutes long, and will be followed by a brief (no more than **4** minutes) question-and-answer session. Please do not put a lot of text on each slide: instead, use more slides with less text per slide. Additional details regarding the presentation will be provided at a later date.

I will, of course, provide feedback on outlines and class presentations. The other class members will also provide feedback on the presentations. Additionally, I will provide feedback on the term papers within 7 days of receiving them. The purpose of providing such feedback is to assist students with their writing/framing skills in general, and to suggest areas for improvement as well as “next steps” in the event that they wish to pursue their projects further (beyond the end of the semester).

^{††}For certain paper topics, a paper that is slightly shorter or (more often) longer may be warranted. Students should request the instructor’s permission *ahead of time* if they feel that the length guidelines would unduly interfere with the quality of their research proposal.

Bulleted Outlines are due via email by class time on Thursday, November 10.

Class presentations will be on Thursday, December 1.

Term Papers are due via email by 10 A.M. on Wednesday, December 14.

STUDENT-SELECTED READINGS:

Each student will individually present a reading of his or her choice. *The chosen reading must be closely related to organizational psychology*, but there are no other restrictions. For example, the chosen reading could be: quantitative or qualitative or theoretical in orientation, an article or a book chapter or a video, something intended for researchers or practitioners or both,

something from any academic discipline or no particular academic discipline, and so forth. This is *your* reading: choose something that *you* believe to be interesting and important—and feel free to be creative in your choice!

It is the responsibility of the student presenting a particular reading to edify the rest of us because, in all likelihood, neither the other students nor I will have read the reading you are presenting. Thus, each student should prepare a **10-12** minute long *PowerPoint* presentation that includes: his or her name, a full citation for the reading selected (in American Psychological Association or Academy of Management style) on the very first slide, information regarding why that particular reading was chosen and *how it fits in with the topics covered in class and the readings in the syllabus*, and a summary of the chosen reading (e.g., for an empirical journal article: theoretical framework, hypotheses, methods used, analyses conducted, and conclusions drawn). Please make sure that all slides are numbered. Each presentation will be followed by a brief (no more than **4** minutes) question-and-answer session.

Student-Selected Readings will be presented in class on Thursday, November 17, and Thursday, December 8. The order of presentations will be decided in the week or two preceding November 17, on the basis of students' preferences.

GRADING SCHEME:

Attendance and Participation (in class and on Blackboard)	30%
Student-selected reading	10%
Applied project	20%
Research proposal: Bulleted outline	7%
Research proposal: In-class presentation	13%
Research proposal: Term paper	20%
TOTAL	100%

Note that this is not a “guaranteed A” course. Poor work will receive poor grades.

I reserve the right to make changes to the syllabus with reasonable advance notice.