Industrial/Organizational Psychology

10 CE Hours

By:Wade T. Lijewski, Ph.D.

Learning objectives

This course is designed to help you:

- Describe the history and foundations of I/O psychology.
- Discuss various types of research methods and data collection techniques.
- Apply the concepts of leadership theories.
- Critique theories of motivation as appropriate in the workplace.
- Create employee selection tools and procedures.
- Compare organizations' use of power and influence.
- Describe the elements of training in the workplace.
- Assess and apply efforts to retain employees.

OVERVIEW

Psychology is typically described as the science of behavior and mental processes. The subfield of industrial and organizational (I/O) psychology is defined as the application of the methods and principles of psychology to the workplace (Spector, 1999).

In recent years, companies have increasingly begun to hire industrial or organizational psychologists to improve elements of their business. Industrial and organizational psychologists conduct scientific research on various people-oriented workplace topics, such as what personality traits predict good performance under stress and what social factors cause conflict in work groups.

I/O psychologists are also hands-on practitioners who help organizations apply research findings to problems, such as matching employees to jobs and maximizing cooperation in workplace teams. The link between scientific research and professional practice can be especially strong in I/O psychology because the workplace provides both a natural laboratory for studying psychological questions and a setting in which research-based answers can be applied and evaluated.

Industrial and organizational psychologists address two main goals in their research and practice. The first is promoting effective job performance by employees, which ultimately leads to enhanced performance by the organization as a whole. The second goal is to contribute to human welfare by improving the health, safety, and well-being of employees. In effective organizations, employees are not only capable of performing their jobs well but are also healthy and well adjusted in the workplace.

What are the differences between industrial and organizational psychology?

Now let's break the subfield down further:
Industrial psychology is the branch of applied psychology that is concerned with efficient management of an industrial labor force and especially with problems encountered by workers in a mechanized environment. Industrial psychology is more likely to use quantitative methods in studies more often than qualitative studies.

Organizational psychology is the scientific study of individual and group behavior in formal organizational settings. Katz and Kahn, in their well-known work, *The Social Psychology of Organizations* (1978), stated that the essence of an organization is "patterned" human behavior.

When behavior is patterned, some structure is imposed on individuals. This structure typically comes in the form of roles (normative standards governing behavior) as well as a guiding set of values. An organization cannot exist when people just "do their own thing" without any awareness of the behavior of others. Organizational psychology is more likely to use qualitative methods to obtain information.

Industrial psychology typically encompasses topics such as:

- Recruitment.
- Selection.
- Classification.
- Compensation.
- Performance appraisals.
- Training.

Organizational psychology typically involves:

- Socialization.
- Motivation.
- Occupational stress.
- Leadership.
- Group performance.
- Organizational development.

Knowledge in these categories can be applied in a variety of ways to help organizations function more effectively. This is important because effective organizations are typically more productive, often provide higher-quality services, and are typically more financially successful than less effective organizations.

For private organizations, success often results in increased shareholder wealth and greater job security for employees. For public organizations, such as police departments, municipal governments, and public universities, success means higher-quality services and cost savings to taxpayers.

There are also indirect results associated with enhanced organizational effectiveness and the success that often comes with it. Organizations success provides employment opportunities, which facilitate the economic well-being of members of society. 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 often produce 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.

Where is I/O psychology used?

According to a 2011 membership survey of the Society for Industrial-Organizational Psychology, approximately two-thirds of U.S. I/O psychologists are employed by academic institutions and consulting firms. Employment at consulting firms has been the growth category in the profession, while the percentage of I/O psychologists employed by academia and private organizations has declined somewhat. About 15 percent work for private companies, and the rest work at government agencies or other organizations. (SIOP, 2011)

HISTORY OF INDUSTRIAL/ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

I/O psychology began to develop in the 19th century from an idea to study and measure human capabilities and motives. Some early psychologists, noting the practical nature of psychological research, sought to apply the findings to business problems. In response to the urging of some advertising executives, one such early psychologist, Walter Dill Scot, wrote *The Theory of Advertising* (1903), generally considered to be the first book linking psychology and the business world. It was followed by The Psychology of Advertising (1908).

Another founder of the field was Hugo Munsterberg (1863-1916), a German-born psychologist who taught at Harvard University and in 1913 published *The Psychology of Industrial Efficiency.* Munsterberg's book was greatly influenced by the focus of human efficiency so well expressed in the work of Frank and Lillian Gilbreth and Frederick W. Taylor (1856-1915).

When the United States entered World War I in 1917, applied psychology really came into its own. Committees of psychologists investigated soldier morale, motivation, and the prevalence of psychological impairment. Psychologists developed a group-administered intelligence test called the Army Alpha. While 1,726,000 enlisted men and officers were tested, little use was made of the results at the time because the war ended a mere three months after the testing program was authorized. However, research studies did show that the test scores were related to soldier performance.

The first university-based center for studying the applications of psychology to business was established at the Carnegie Institute of Technology after the war in 1919. It was named the U.S. Bureau of Salesmanship Research, and was funded largely by the life insurance industry for the purpose of conducting research for the selection and development of clerical and executive personnel and sales people.

In 1924, a change in direction was brought forth by the Hawthorne experiments, named after Western Electric Company's Hawthorne plant in Chicago where the studies were conducted. Originally developed as a test of some aspects of Taylor's principles, the researchers sought the optimal level of illumination necessary for workers to produce telephone equipment. Instead of finding Taylor's assumed "one-best-way," the researchers found that productivity increased after each change in lighting no matter how bright or dim they made it. Eventually, they concluded that the workers were responding to the attention they were getting as part of the special research study, and this phenomenon came to be known as the Hawthorne effect.

During that time, thinking about work organizations had been dominated by classical (i.e., bureaucratic or machine) theory. Workers were viewed as extensions of the job, and the goal was to arrange human activity to achieve maximum efficiency. These classical views of organization assumed a top-down management point of view, emphasizing the authority structure of the organization. The object was to get top management's wishes translated into practice on the shop floor. So essentially, the task was to design the job according to scientific precepts and then provide some type of incentive to get workers to comply with the will of management and the industrial engineers.

The Hawthorne researchers believed in a different view of the business enterprise. They reported findings that indicated friendship patterns among the workers were the foundation of the organization, and also that people would work harder for an organization that they believed was interested in their lives. The Hawthorne researchers eschewed economic incentives as the driving force behind work and painted a rich picture of the informal relationships (i.e., those not specified in the organizational chart or job specifications) among workers themselves, in addition to those among workers and managers, which was the focus of the classical view. People, in other words, came to work not for money, but for the social rewards and satisfactions inherent in human organization.

Hawthorne researchers argued that management can govern only with consent of the workers and that workers actually influence management decisions by controlling the impression that management had of a proper day's work.

Additionally, the Hawthorne researchers became convinced that job performance could be influenced in ways that could not be achieved with either money or job design. They proposed motivating workers with a set of techniques called human relations, which involved providing considerate supervision and management as a means of persuading the workers to conform to management's expectations by convincing them that the company was indeed concerned about them.

With this belief, the goal was to change employee attitudes rather than job design or pay. In return, productivity and reliable job performance would presumably increase. Therefore, motivation was seen as a function of the satisfaction of social needs for acceptance and status within a person's group. They recognized that workers might not perform effectively, not because they are immoral but because they perceive that they are being treated indifferently or poorly by management. To motivate workers, therefore, one must attempt to change those perceptions.

Shortly after World War II, I/O psychology emerged as a specifically recognized specialty area within the broader discipline of psychology. Subspecialties materialized, such as personnel psychology, engineering psychology, and organizational psychology. In the late 1950s and into the 1960s, a renewed thrust toward studying organizations with psychological precepts arose as social psychologists and I/O psychologists gained the conceptual tools needed to model and understand large, task-oriented groups, including work organizations.

From this line of inquiry came the work of I/O psychologists in assessing the effects of organizational structure and functioning on employees. Related applications appeared under the rubric of organization development (i.e., participative management, socio-technical systems, self-managing work groups, team building, survey feedback, and related approaches).

Modern approaches

Contemporary I/O psychologists no longer feel they have to choose between classical bureaucratic theory or scientific management and neoclassical human relations. The common view today is that taken together, they provide a comprehensive picture of organizational functioning. Environmental forces such as management directives, human capabilities, the state of technology, and economic considerations are potent forces on worker performance and cannot be denied. Likewise, human motivation, perceptions, and job attitudes are influential and are ignored at management's peril.

I/O psychologists recognize that there is an inherent conflict between the needs of organizations and the needs of individuals. Organizations typically seek regularity and so attempt to reduce human behavior to predictable patterns. Humans, on the other hand, do not typically respond well to having their behavior reduced to the acts required by a job. This conflict will never be eliminated, only alleviated. However, it requires constant, ongoing effort and vigilance to contain the unnatural arrangement we call social organization.

The most recent major thrust in I/O psychology began in the 1970s following court decisions interpreting the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The courts placed a heavy burden on employers to defend the validity (i.e., job relevance) of their recruiting, selection, and promotional procedures. Many employers concluded that complying with this and subsequent anti-discrimination legislation required the skills of psychologists as their best defense against lawsuits brought by employees who claimed they were victims of illegal employment discrimination. Evidence of the validity of selection criteria provided by psychologists is often essential in defending against charges of civil rights violations brought by government or employees against employers.

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

Another development from this time that continues today was the recognition that behavior in organizations is impacted by forces at the group and organizational levels (James & Jones, 1974; Rousseau, 1985). This multi-level perspective has had major implications for the field in guiding theory development as well as statistical methodology (Dansereau, Alutto, & Yammarino, 1984; James, Demaree, & Wolf, 1985).

During this same period, organizational psychologists began to devote increasing attention to what could be called nontraditional topics, such as work/family issues (Greenhaus & Buetell, 1985), job-related stress and health (Beehr & Newman, 1978), and retirement (Beehr, 1986). Such willingness to explore nontraditional topics was significant because it served as evidence that the interests of organizational psychologists had broadened beyond purely management concerns.

RESEARCH METHODS AND STATISTICS

Research methodology and statistical analysis are extremely important. Organizational psychologists routinely design scientific investigations to answer theoretically based research questions about behavior in organizational settings. Methods may range from simple observation of behavior to elaborate, field-based quasi-experimentation. The data from such studies are then analyzed using a variety of statistical methods to test the validity of predictions.

Research methodology and statistical analysis are also crucial to the practice of organizational psychology. For example, organizational psychologists often use systematic research methods to provide organizational decision makers with information on employees' attitudes. In other cases, research methodology and statistical analysis are used to evaluate some interventions designed to enhance organizational effectiveness.

An organization may want to know, for example, whether a team development intervention will enhance the functioning of work groups. This question, and others like it, can be answered with the aid of typical research methods and statistical analyses used in organizational psychology.

In modern research studies, situational aspects are nearly always considered as either determining leadership behavior or strongly influencing it (Vroom & Jago, 2007).

There are several different kinds of situations that can affect leadership; the most frequently discussed are:

- Environment.
- Organization.
- Culture.
- Crisis.
- Change.

Though we will discuss leadership in more detail later in a later section, let's take a look at how these elements impact leadership:

Several aspects of an environment can determine how leadership occurs. Some examples of this are the stability of the environment; whether the environment centers on politics, society, or legal issues; or the types of relationships and social networks that exist in the environment. For example, when an environment is unstable, perhaps during an organizational change or merger, leaders must behave differently than when the organization is stable. To lead successfully, they must take into account the instability of the environment.

The nature of leadership may change, depending on the character of an organization. For instance, organizations may have different philosophies, outlooks, types, or structures.

Organizational culture can also affect leadership through its values, the views of those who founded the culture, and any emergent countercultures.

Crisis is another important example of a situation affecting leadership. Crisis situations are delicate because they require a different kind of leader than noncrisis situations. Crisis situations are situations that involve high levels of stress and usually an unclear problem or unclear outcomes that require a leader to create a new solution.

Hunt, Boal, & Dodge (1999) conducted a study that focused on varying types of leadership exhibited in crisis situations; they found that visionary leaders, or leaders who develop visions similar to their followers' values and goals, are most accepted by their followers in a crisis.

The last type of situation is change. Change is a broad concept that refers to any new efforts to alter an organization. Change can be carried out through mergers, divisions, or a revision of the way things are done within the organization. An organization can change for a number of reasons, including survival and competition. A continuing question within the study of change is what type of leader is best at accomplishing change.

Methods of data collection

I/O psychologists use three different types of research methods: quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods. The method they select depends greatly upon what information and data they are trying to obtain and what or how they want their findings to be expressed. It may also depend on the specific interests of managers and leadership who are working with the I/O psychologist.

Quantitative methods

Quantitative methods refer to the systematic empirical investigation of social phenomena via statistical, mathematical or computational techniques. The objective of quantitative research is to develop and employ mathematical models, theories and hypotheses on phenomena. The process of measurement is central to quantitative research because it provides the fundamental connection between empirical observation and mathematical expression of quantitative relationships. Quantitative data is any data that is in numerical form, such as statistics, percentages, etc. This means that the quantitative researcher asks a specific, narrow question and collects a sample of numerical data from participants to answer the question.

The researcher analyzes the data with the help of statistics. The researcher is hoping the numbers will yield an unbiased result that can be generalized to some larger population. Qualitative research, on the other hand, asks broad questions and collects word data from participants. The researcher looks for themes and describes the information in themes and patterns exclusive to that set of participants.

Qualitative methods

Qualitative research is a method of inquiry employed in many different academic disciplines, traditionally in the social sciences, but also in market research and further contexts. Qualitative researchers aim to gather an in-depth understanding of human behavior and the reasons that govern such behavior. The qualitative method investigates the why and how of decision-making, not just what, where, when. Hence, smaller but focused samples are more often needed than large samples.

In the conventional view, qualitative methods produce information only on the particular cases studied, and any more general conclusions are only propositions (informed assertions). Quantitative methods can then be used to seek empirical support for such research hypotheses.

Qualitative researchers face many choices for data collection, ranging from grounded theory practice, narratology, storytelling, classical ethnography, or shadowing. Qualitative methods are also loosely present in other methodological approaches, such as action research or actor-network theory. Forms of the data collected can include interviews and group discussions, observation and reflection field notes, various texts, pictures, and other materials.

Qualitative research often categorizes data into patterns as the primary basis for organizing and reporting results. Qualitative researchers typically rely on the following methods for gathering information: participant observation, focus groups, non-participant observation, field notes, reflexive journals, structured interview, semi-structured interview, unstructured interview, and analysis of documents and materials.

Special note: One way to remember the difference between quantitative and qualitative is:
Quantitative = quantity (in numbers).
Qualitative = quality (narrative).

Mixed methods

Mixed methods is an approach to professional research that combines the collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data. Many researchers believe a mixed methods approach is desirable and feasible because it gives a more complete view, and because the requirement during the different phases of the intervention (or research project) make very specific demands on a general methodology. While it is demanding, it is more effective to choose the right tool for the job at hand.

It can be used when you want to build from one phase of research to another. You may first want to explore the data qualitatively to develop an instrument or to identify variables to test in a later quantitative study. You engage in a mixed methods study when you want to follow up a quantitative study with a qualitative one to obtain more detailed specific information.

Most empirical mixed methods studies in recent years have employed two or more different types of data or data collection techniques. The most notable characteristic of the literature is its diversity: Whereas mixed methods may have once referred primarily to a survey with a few follow-up interviews for “added context,” today researchers have developed more complex designs, combined more diverse kinds of data, and integrated different kinds of data into their analyses more carefully than in the past.

The literature may be categorized according to three criteria: the purported motivations to combine different types of data, the extent of sequencing of the data collection, and the level of nesting of the multiple data sources (Morse 1991, Fine & Elsbach 2000, Creswell et al. 2003, Johnson & Turner 2003, Leech & Onwuegbuzie 2009, Creswell & Clark 2007).

There are literally thousands of research questions that have been and continue to be explored by organizational psychologists.

Some examples include:

- Are employees who perceive a high level of autonomy in their work likely to be highly satisfied with their jobs?
- Does a high level of conflict between work and family responsibilities lead to poor health?
- Does job performance remain consistent over time?

Regardless of the research question being asked, there is a need for relevant data to be collected if the questions are ever to be answered.

Let’s discuss four commonly used types of data collection methods. These include observational methods, survey research, experimentation, and quasi-experimentation.

Observational methods

Observational methods actually encompass a variety of strategies that may be used to study behavior in organizations (Bouchard, 1978). Simple observation, the most basic of these strategies, involves observing and recording behavior. If a researcher wants to investigate the decision-making processes used by corporate boards of directors, he or she might observe these individuals during quarterly meetings and record relevant observations. These observations may reveal that the chairperson has more input into decisions than other

board members, or that younger board members have less input into decisions than their more experienced counterparts.

Observational methods allow researchers to study things that cannot be manipulated in a lab because of ethical concerns. For example, while it would be unethical to study the effects of imprisonment by actually confining subjects, researchers can gather information by using naturalistic observation in real prison settings.

It can help support the external validity of research. It is one thing to say that the findings of a lab study will generalize to a larger population, but quite another to actually observe those findings actually occurring in a natural setting.

One of the disadvantages of naturalistic observation is that it can be difficult to determine the exact cause of a behavior, and the experimenter cannot control for outside variables.

Some other disadvantages of naturalistic observation include:

- People may behave differently when they know they are being watched.
- People may try to behave in a certain way to conform with what they think researchers expect to see.

Survey research

Survey and questionnaires are one of the most common methods used in psychological research. In this method, a random sample of participants complete a survey, test, or questionnaire that relates to the variables of interest. Random sampling is a vital part of ensuring the generalizability of the survey results.

Advantages of the survey method:

- It's fast, cheap, and easy. Researchers can collect a large amount of data in a relatively short amount of time.
- It's more flexible than some other methods.

Disadvantages of the survey method:

- It can be affected by an unrepresentative sample or poor survey questions.
- Participants can affect the outcome. Some participants try to please the researcher, lie to make themselves look better, or have mistaken memories.

Experimental

The simple experiment is one of the most basic methods of determining whether there is a cause-and-effect relationship between two variables. The experimental method involves manipulating one variable to determine whether changes in one variable cause changes in another variable. This method relies on controlled methods, random assignment and the manipulation of variables to test a hypothesis.

A simple experiment uses a control group of participants who receive no treatment and an experimental group of participants who receive the treatment. Experimenters then compare the results of the two groups to determine whether the treatment had an effect.

Psychologists, like other scientists, use the scientific method when conducting an experiment. The scientific method is a set of procedures and principles that guide how scientists develop research questions, collect data, and come to conclusions.

The four basic steps of the process are:

1. Forming a hypothesis.
2. Designing a study and collecting data.
3. Analyzing the data and reaching conclusions.
4. Sharing the findings.

Quasi-experimentation

A quasi-experiment is an empirical study used to estimate the causal impact of an intervention on its target population. These types of designs share many similarities with the traditional experimental design or randomized controlled trial, but they lack the element of random assignment to treatment or control. Instead, quasi-experimental designs typically allow the researcher to control the assignment to the treatment condition, but using some criterion other than random assignment. In some cases, the researcher may have no control over assignment to treatment condition.

Quasi-experiments are subject to concerns about internal validity because the treatment and control groups may not be comparable at baseline. With random assignment, study participants have the same chance of being assigned to the intervention group or the comparison group. As a result, the treatment group will be statistically identical to the control group, on both observed and unobserved characteristics, at baseline (provided that the study has adequate sample size). Any change in characteristics post-intervention is due, therefore, to the intervention alone.

With quasi-experimental studies, it may not be possible to convincingly demonstrate a causal link between the treatment condition and observed outcomes. This is particularly true if there are confounding variables that cannot be controlled or accounted for.

LEADERSHIP

The study of leadership is not just a popular subject, but is a very important one because it also has quite serious implications. In recent years, it has become clear that errors in leadership have dramatic repercussions. Examples of this include the unethical behaviors of the leaders of Enron and the response efforts following Hurricane Katrina.

Leaders' actions often carry more weight than the actions of others within an organization, not only because they have greater responsibility but also because they are in more visible positions. Leaders are the ones who can set the tone, create the plan, and demonstrate to their followers the appropriate (or inappropriate) way to behave. They are the ones held accountable, and the critical decisions fall onto their laps.

Understanding the characteristics and behaviors of leaders and the elements and theories linked to leadership can provide the foundation for identifying and promoting good leadership. At a more basic level, we can take the findings of leadership researchers and apply them in our own lives, regardless of whether we are leaders or followers.

Leadership as an area of research did not really take off until the 20th century, but it made particularly great strides in the second half of the century. Although this might seem like a relatively short period, significant progress was made in this short time. The questions of leadership are quite compelling, and interest in the field continues to grow at a rapid pace. The first and most frequently asked – yet rarely agreed upon – question remains: What is leadership?

What is leadership?

Leadership has been defined in many ways. It is very likely that you believe you have a clear idea of what leadership is, given that you have likely been exposed to many leaders in your lifetime. The main question that seems to emerge when formulating a definition of leadership is whether we are defining a person, a role, or a process. If you were asked to define leadership, do you first think of a person who epitomizes certain characteristics?

I/O psychology has taken a variety of approaches to studying leadership. Two major types of leadership are transactional leadership and transformational leadership.

Transactional leadership

Sometimes a leader is simply "the person in charge." That is, as a leader she sees herself as responsible for running things but not changing things. A transactional leader is an individual who emphasizes the exchange relationship between the worker and the leader (Bass, 1985), applying the principle "You do a good job and I will reward you." A transactional leader believes that people are motivated by the rewards (or punishment) they receive for their work.

A transactional leader provides clarity and structure to followers. Such a leader works within the goals of the existing organizational system ("that's how we do it around here") and may exhibit management by exception, stepping in only when a problem arises.

Transformational leadership

While a transactional leader concentrates most on keeping the ship sailing, a different type of leader focuses on defining the direction of the ship. An individual with this leadership style dedicates thought to the meaning of leadership itself and to the impact she might have in improving an organization. Such a transformational leader is concerned not with enforcing the rules but with changing them. A transformational leader is a dynamic individual who brings charisma, passion, and, perhaps most important, vision to the position (Mumford, Scott, & Hunter, 2006).

There are four elements of transformational leadership that have been described (Sivanathan & et al., 2004). First, transformational leaders exert what has been referred to as idealized influence. This quality means that transformational leaders act as they do because they believe it is the right thing to do. A good example of this is the leaders of Google, who have a motto – "Don't be evil!" – that has guided them in creatively implementing their idea of what a great place to work ought to be. This commitment to integrity is likely to instill trust in followers.

Second, transformational leaders motivate by inspiring others to do their very best. Niro Sivanathan and his colleagues stress that transformational leaders need not have natural charm or charisma but rather a talent for bolstering employees' self-efficacy (their confidence in their abilities) and for persuading them to do their best.

Third, transformational leaders are devoted to intellectually stimulating their employees. They make it clear that they need input from employees because they themselves do not have all the answers.

Fourth, transformational leaders provide individualized consideration to their employees, showing a concern for each person's well-being.

A great deal of research supports the idea that transformational leadership is associated with positive organizational outcomes in a wide variety of settings, from sports teams (Charbonneau, Barling, & Kelloway, 2001) to profit-oriented businesses (Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996) to the military (Bass, 1998). The positive impact of transformational leaders (relative to transactional leaders) is based on the capacity of the leader to foster trust in the organization, to persuade employees that their work is meaningful, and finally, to strengthen employees' organizational identity, which is their feeling of "oneness" with the organization and its goals (Sivanathan & et al., 2004).

A person-focused definition of leadership would specify a given set of traits or skills that would identify a person as a leader. A role-focused definition of leadership would focus on a set of behaviors or actions that leaders must engage in to do their job. The person focus and the role focus may seem similar, but by defining leadership as a role, it is possible that a person may occupy more than one role. Finally, a process-focused definition of leadership focuses on how leaders interact with followers, regardless of role.

The questions that researchers seek to answer about leadership are often about the person-focused concept of leadership. For the purpose of this discussion, we will define leadership generally as encompassing all three concepts: leadership is the influence of others toward a collective goal.

In addition to defining leadership, it is critical to also identify some of the terms that we use as we discuss leadership, and leadership research in particular. The persons subject to a leader's influence are often referred to in different terms, such as followers, subordinates, and constituencies, among others. For the purpose of our efforts, we will use the most general of these terms: followers. Thus, followers are the individuals a leader influences for the purpose of achieving a collective goal.

As Yukl (2006) pointed out, it is possible for a leader to not be a manager, and for a manager to not be a leader, but there is a great deal more overlap possible between the two than some may think. According to Kotter (1990), the distinctions between the two can be drawn from their outcomes. He asserts that management is intended to produce organization, structure, clear problem-solving, and action, whereas leadership is about coping with change.

For Kotter, the leadership process involves:

- Developing a vision for the organization.
- Aligning people with that vision through communication.
- Motivating people to action through empowerment and through basic need fulfillment.

In contrast, the management process involves:

- Planning and budgeting.
- Organizing and staffing.
- Controlling and problem-solving.

Another important aspect to consider is that of followers. After all, without followers, there are no leaders. Follower-focused approaches look at the processes by which leaders motivate followers and lead teams to achieve shared goals. Understandably, the area of leadership motivation draws heavily from the abundant research literature in the domain of motivation in industrial and organizational psychology. Because leaders are held responsible for their followers' ability to achieve the organization's goals, their ability to motivate their followers is a critical factor of leadership effectiveness. Similarly, the area of team leadership draws heavily from the research in teams and team effectiveness in I/O psychology.

Because organizational employees are frequently structured in the form of teams, leaders need to be aware of the potential benefits and pitfalls of working in teams, how teams develop, how to satisfy team

members' needs, and ultimately how to bring about team effectiveness and performance.

An emerging area of research in the area of team leadership is in leading virtual teams, where people in the team are geographically distributed across various distances and sometimes even countries. While technological advances have enabled the leadership process to take place in such virtual contexts, they present new challenges for leaders as well, such as the need to use technology to build relationships with followers, and influencing followers when faced with limited (or no) face-to-face interaction.

Approaches to research on leadership

The study of leadership has been ongoing for hundreds of years. The initial work, however, focused more on general observations and discussing one's own experiences. Authors have documented the lives of leaders for centuries not only for the benefit of posterity, but also so that future leaders can learn from leaders in the past. Even religious documents are sources of observation and guidance on effective leadership.

Over the last 50 years, there have been several broad changes in the way in which researchers have approached the topic. In the beginning of the century, leadership scholars were interested in finding specific traits or characteristics that differentiated leaders from others. A lack of conclusive findings, however, led to a shift in which researchers began to focus more on the behaviors that managers and leaders exhibited and under what conditions they engaged in certain actions.

It eventually became apparent that there was more to leadership than just leader behavior, and scholars sought to understand the relational and situational dynamics involved, particularly the relationship between leaders and their followers. More recently, the field of leadership has focused more on the decision-making patterns of leaders, and what differentiates outstanding leadership from general leadership. Let's take a closer look at a few approaches to leadership research:

The trait approach

Before the 1950s, leaders were viewed as extraordinary individuals exhibiting exceptional qualities that set them apart from others. More specifically, it was believed that there was a set of characteristics, or traits, that made someone a leader. Imbedded in this approach was an overall positive spin on the characteristics of leaders. Thus, early leadership researchers sought to identify these exceptional characteristics. The theories applied have often been referred to as "great man" theories as a result of the positive approach taken to leadership.

Studies that took this approach to research used what is called the trait approach, which means researchers focused on identifying the personal attributes leaders possessed that set them apart. It was believed that the presence of these particular traits could cause individuals to emerge as leaders or make them more effective as leaders than others who did not possess these traits. For instance, in an early review of research using the trait approach, Stogdill (1948) found that group leaders were different from group members in characteristics such as intelligence, alertness, sociability, and self-confidence.

Other studies over the years have identified different traits and situational factors that may influence whether these traits truly impact leadership. However, the traditional trait approach focuses solely on the leader, which is a characteristic of this approach that some view as a weakness. This perceived weakness and the generally inconclusive findings of early trait studies resulted in a gradual shift by leadership researchers away from the trait approach.

The behavioral approach

Following the frustration of the inconclusive findings that emerged from these early trait studies, leadership researchers turned to evaluating what leaders do rather than their personal characteristics. For instance, rather than study whether a leader's personality characteristics could predict whether they would succeed as a leader, a researcher taking the behavioral approach may be interested in what goal-setting behaviors the leader engaged in with his or her followers and whether those behaviors led to the desired outcomes. Two universities, Ohio State University and the University of Michigan, engaged in significant behavioral research efforts during this time that are considered the foundation of the behavioral approach.

The researchers involved in the Ohio State studies administered questionnaires to individuals about the behaviors of their supervisors. They found that the behavior of the leaders fell into two broad categories:

1. Behaviors related to initiating structure (e.g., "My supervisor assigns people under him to particular tasks").
2. Behaviors related to consideration (e.g., "My supervisor treats all of his subordinates equally.") (Fleishman, 1953).

The researchers involved in the University of Michigan studies used interviews and questionnaires given to real-world leaders to evaluate leader behaviors, and they examined the relationship of these behaviors to group-level indicators of effective leadership (e.g., group productivity). They found that leaders could be classified as effective or ineffective based on three types of behaviors:

1. Task-oriented behaviors.
2. Relations-oriented behaviors.
3. Participative leadership behaviors (Katz, Maccoby, Gurin, & Floor, 1951; Likert, 1967).

Although their findings have been subject to criticism over the years, the general categories of "task focused" or "initiating structure" and "relationship focused" or "consideration" are still used in leadership studies to this day.

Following these two initial efforts, the behavioral approach increased in popularity, which led to one of the major criticisms of this approach: There were far too many categorizations of leader behaviors. In addition, many of the studies relied on the observations of followers who responded to surveys about their leaders' behaviors. This approach is limiting because it assumes that those reporting on the leaders' behaviors are witnessing everything the leader does, which is unlikely.

Further, much of the behavioral approach work made generalized predictions about the effects of leader behaviors on desired outcomes. Similarly to researchers using the trait approach, those using the behavioral approach did not often consider the impact of other variables, such as follower motivation.

Thus, leadership scholars began to question whether the success of leaders with certain traits or who engaged in certain types of behaviors was contingent on these other variables. This led to a shift toward research that considered more situational variables in the leadership equation, the first of which was the contingency approach.

The contingency approach

The first concerted effort to consider situational variables in leadership studies was initiated by a model of leadership called the LPC contingency model (Fiedler, 1967). Fielder, using the LPC contingency model, sought to explore the interaction between a leader's motivational tendencies and the characteristics of a situation in predicting a group's ultimate performance.

Leaders' motivational tendency was determined by asking them questions about the co-worker they had the most difficult time working with or their least preferred co-worker (LPC). Based on their LPC score, they were categorized as either task-motivated or relationship-motivated. Fiedler and his colleagues then classified the leader's situation based on leader-member relations, the leader's position of power, and the level of structure of the group's task.

They found that either a high LPC leader or a low LPC would be better suited under different types of situations (e.g., good leader-member relations, structured task, and strong position of power). They reported findings that support that a situation could, in fact, have an impact on whether different leader traits or behaviors were more appropriate.

The path-goal approach

The path-goal theory of leadership expands on the contingency theory by explaining how a leader responds to certain situations and influences his or her subordinates' paths toward the collective goal, specifically, influencing their job satisfaction and performance. (House, 1971).

A few years later, House and Mitchell (1974), outlined four leader behaviors:

1. Supportive leadership.
2. Directive leadership.
3. Participative leadership.
4. Achievement-oriented leadership.

They stated that a leader could use these four leader behaviors, depending on the situation and the subordinates' motivational needs, to maximize performance and satisfaction. An important contribution of this approach was that if it was found that certain leader behaviors operated effectively to maintain or improve subordinate satisfaction and performance in various types of situations, leaders could be trained to respond appropriately in similar situations.

Follow-up studies, however, have often resulted in inconclusive findings, which some researchers attribute to the fact that leader behaviors are considered separately, such that each leader would be classified into a behavioral type. It is more likely, however, that leaders engage in different mixtures of behaviors, and this interaction between different kinds of behaviors at any given time may cause effects that are harder to interpret.

The situational approach

Hersey and Blanchard (1993) proposed the situational leadership theory, which evaluated the interaction of two types of leadership behaviors in different situations. The premise of Hersey and Blanchard's (1993) situational leadership theory is that different situations call for different combinations of leader behaviors.

Specifically, they proposed that different combinations of supportive and directive leadership behaviors would be appropriate, depending on the development level of the followers involved. Where the path-goal theory looked at supportive and directive behaviors separately, the situational theory evaluated combinations of different levels of each type of behavior.

For example, leaders who were engaging in low levels of supportive behavior and low levels of directive behavior were considered to be delegating, whereas leaders who were engaging in low levels of supportive behavior but high levels of directive behavior were considered to be directing.

Delegating and directing, along with coaching and supporting, were four leadership styles proposed to be differentially appropriate, depending on the level of development of the followers.

This theory supports the idea that the levels of development are not static, and as a result, a leader must know which combination of behaviors to engage in for different situations. As with the contingency and path-goal theories, the situational theory can be used for leader training programs because leaders could be instructed on how and when to engage in these different leadership styles.

Although practical, the contingency, path-goal, and situational theories all suffer from a similar criticism in that they seem to address how the leader should respond to group situations, however, individual members of the group may have very different needs or present different situational variables.

The relational approach

The relational approach to leadership research focuses on the one-on-one, or dyadic, relationships between leaders and followers. While the prior approaches to the study of leadership typically assumed that leaders treat all followers the same, the dyadic approach examines the differences in the relationships a leader has with each of his or her followers.

Consider a situation in which you were in a work group.

- Did the leader provide an equal amount of attention to all members?
- Did the leader seem to trust some members more than others, giving them more responsibility or more challenging tasks?
- Did some members interact with the leader beyond what was required of the task?

The predominant theory on these exchange relationships, originally referred to as the vertical dyad theory, is the leader-member exchange (LMX) theory. The basic premise of the LMX theory of leadership is that over time, a relationship develops between a leader and each follower based on the history of each individual's contributions and gains from the exchange. Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) outlined several stages an exchange relationship may go through. In the beginning of the relationship, both the leader and follower make assessments of one another's potential contributions to the exchange, perhaps including skills or resources.

As expectations are met or exceeded, the exchange relationship may develop further. Relationships that are based solely on the exchange of formal job requirements are considered low-exchange or out-group relationships. Relationships that develop beyond these formal requirements, in which there is a sense of trust or loyalty between the two parties, are considered high-exchange or in-group relationships.

Some relationships may develop to a third stage, referred to as a mature relationship, in which there is an equal commitment to each other and to the ultimate goal of the effort. Hundreds of studies have been conducted examining how different variables may be related to the different exchange relationships established between leaders and followers. For instance, leadership scholars have evaluated how a follower's type of relationship with a leader may affect the follower's motivation, job satisfaction, or job performance.

The findings of LMX research, however, are often plagued by criticisms about the measurement of the exchange relationship. It is difficult to discern what constitutes whether a relationship between a leader and follower is high or low, and whether two followers who are in the in-group are there for the same reasons. For example, one follower may have a high-exchange relationship because he puts extra time into the group task, while another individual has a high-exchange relationship because she has a strong interpersonal relationship with the leader.

The cognitive approach

From the 1990s to today, a commonly used approach to understanding leadership is the cognitive approach. This approach refers to research that seeks to understand leadership by examining how leaders think, how others think about leaders, or how their thought processes change in specific situations (e.g., crisis, creative problems).

This may include research on the cognitive resources of leaders or followers, such as intelligence or problem-solving skills (which overlap somewhat with the trait approach); research on the cognitive steps involved in actions associated with leadership, such as planning, evaluating problem situations, monitoring social interactions, or developing a mission or vision; or research on perceptions about leaders and leadership.

Cognitive traits, particularly general cognitive ability, or intelligence, have been studied in the area of leadership for decades. However, a specific focus on developing a theory on the cognitive abilities of leaders was not undertaken until the late 1980s and early 1990s with the development of the cognitive resources theory (Fiedler, 1986). This theory proposed that the stress leaders experience affects how they use their cognitive resources (intelligence and experience) when making decisions.

A second body of research on cognition and leadership is that of implicit leadership theories. Implicit leadership theories make propositions about how a person's implicit beliefs or assumptions of what a leader is and how an effective leader performs relate to the leadership process (Lord & Maher, 1991).

For example, followers' reactions to a leader's behavior may be more a factor of their perception of what a successful leader is than whether that leader is actually performing effectively.

More recently, leadership scholars have made attempts to understand the cognitive steps that occur as leaders work through typical leadership activities. For instance, both theoretical and experimental efforts have been made to gain insight into the cognitive processes that leaders undergo to solve creative problems (Mumford, Connelly, & Gaddis, 2003), develop visions (Strange & Mumford, 2002), react to crises (Mumford, Friedrich, Caughron, & Byrne, 2007), and engage in planning (Marta, Lertiz, & Mumford, 2005), among other actions.

Outstanding leadership approach

Another approach to studying leadership that has been quite prominent in recent years is the focus on instances of outstanding or exceptional leadership. Please note that this approach is different from the "great man" theories of leadership developed in the first half of the century.

Prior research may have shied away from evaluating outstanding leadership because it is more rare than standard instances of leadership, and it is quite difficult to contact and study outstanding leaders. It is important, however, to evaluate these most exemplary instances of leadership if we are to gain a complete understanding of the leadership phenomenon. Additionally, it is important to understand these particular leaders given the outstanding impact these individuals have on people, groups, and organizations.

Most research on outstanding leadership has revolved around theories of charismatic or transformational leadership (Burns, 1978), picking up particular steam following Bass and Avolio's (1990) development of a measure of transformational leadership. Both charismatic and transformational leadership are held to be based on the vision-defining behaviors of a leader, a rather powerful behavior that leaders use to motivate followers toward a change.

Vision-defining behaviors refers to behaviors that a leader engages in to define a vision or desired outcome for his or her followers. The imagery of an impassioned leader conveying a vision can be quite powerful, and theories that sought to evaluate the effects of transformational and charismatic leadership easily found popularity among both leadership scholars and the general public.

Studies evaluating the differences in development, emergence, and performance of transformational leaders (leaders that engage in more vision definition, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration of their followers) compared to transactional leaders (leaders that exchange rewards for performance and that respond to specific critical instances or mistakes) have dominated leadership literature in the last 10-15 years.

This trend, however, may be shifting as it becomes clear that these two categorizations of leadership may be somewhat limiting. As Mumford (2006) notes, there are other leaders who have had a significant impact on the world but are not necessarily transformational or charismatic.

Mumford (2006) proposes three types of outstanding leadership: charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic. The differences in these three types of outstanding leaders lie in their developmental patterns, the way in which they view the world, and how they interact with their followers and seek to accomplish their goals.

For instance, both charismatic and ideological leadership are considered vision-based; however, charismatic leaders have visions oriented toward an idealized future, whereas ideological leaders have visions oriented toward an idealized past. The leadership behavior of pragmatic leaders, on the other hand, is based more on problem solving than vision.

Cognitive traits: Are they important to leadership?

Researchers have looked at many different traits to see how they relate to successful leadership. Several traits seem to be important for leadership across a number of studies.

Intelligence is very important for leaders. Leaders must perform extremely complicated tasks and understand the complexities of organizations and the processes and products of those organizations. They must be able to retain large amounts of information, and

they must be able to use and retrieve that information quickly and efficiently. You will see that a high level of intelligence is also necessary for many of the other important traits, skills, and behaviors that leaders must have to be successful (Mumford, Marks, Connelly, Zaccaro, & Reiter-Palmon, 2000).

Wisdom is another important trait. Sternberg (2007) has studied wisdom and leadership extensively. He proposed that wisdom involves the successful use of intelligence, creativity, and experience.

There are four components to wisdom:
1. Seeking to reach a common good.
2. Balancing the goals of oneself, others, and an organization.
3. Considering both the short- and long-term elements of a situation.
4. Adapting to and shaping one's environment.

Additionally, expertise is a deep understanding and knowledge of a specific area or situation. Expertise comes from experience; the more experience a person has with a certain area or situation, the more likely that person is to become an expert in that area.

Leaders must have expertise in the specific organizational area where they serve as leaders. Researchers have found that expertise (technical expertise, specific to the task at hand) is highly associated with the performance of a leader's team (Mumford, Hunter, Eubanks, Bedell, & Murphy, 2007).

Theory X and Theory Y

In his book *The Human Side of Enterprise,* Douglas McGregor (1960) suggested that there are two general approaches to management, which he termed Theory X and Theory Y. Theory X managers assume that work is innately unpleasant and that people have a strong desire to avoid it. Such managers believe that employees need direction, dislike responsibility, and must be "kept in line." Theory X managers motivate performance by exerting control and threatening punishment.

In contrast, Theory Y managers, those with the outlook that McGregor advocates, assume that engaging in effortful behavior is natural to human beings. According to the Theory Y view, control and punishment are not the only way to motivate workers. Rather, Theory Y managers recognize that people seek out responsibility and that motivation can come from allowing them to suggest creative and meaningful solutions to problems. These managers assume that people have untapped creative and intellectual potential that can benefit the organization.

Strength-based management

In keeping with the focus of Theory Y managers on the potential abilities of employees, in 2002, survey scientist Donald Clifton was the CEO of the Gallup polling organization and was recognized as the founder of strengths-based psychology in a citation by the American Psychological Association. He emphasized the importance for managers to uncover and exploit the strengths of their employees.

Strength-based management supports the idea that to develop worker strengths, a manager must recognize that each person has unique talents, and that the individual discovering these and putting them to use is crucial not only to an effective organization but also to a fulfilling life (Bateman & Snell, 2007).

Using one's strengths can be an important part of work fulfillment. In an analysis of a variety of past studies, researchers examined how responses to the item "I have the opportunity to do what I do best," related to work outcomes (Harter & Schmidt, 2002). Organizations in which employees answered "yes" to this item had a 38 percent increased probability of success in productivity and a 44 percent higher probability of success in customer loyalty and employee retention.

In another analysis, researchers evaluated the effectiveness of interventions intended to improve organizations (Clifton & Harter, 2003). Of the 65 organizations studied, four had taken a strengths-based approach. Compared to the other 61, those four showed an increase in productivity equal to $1,000 per employee.

What does that translate into in real terms? For the average company in the study, that would be $5.4 million.

Personality traits

The Big Five model is a popular way of categorizing personality traits into five broad traits that encompass most of what distinguishes one person's personality from another's. The five categories that the Big Five uses to describe personality are:
1. Openness.
2. Conscientiousness.
3. Extroversion.
4. Agreeableness.
5. Neuroticism.

(A good way to remember them is that they spell out OCEAN).

Openness describes how willing a person is to experience new things.

Conscientiousness is how dependable and hard-working a person is.

Extroversion is how outgoing a person is and how much he or she enjoys being around other people.

Agreeableness is being cheerful and optimistic.

Neuroticism is how controlled and emotionally stable a person is.

Most leadership research on the Big Five suggests that each of the personality traits is important for successful leadership. However, results have not been entirely consistent. This could be because different researchers use different tests to measure these personality traits. Another possible reason for inconsistency is that different researchers use different measures of leader success. While these personality traits do appear to be important in leadership, more research is needed to see how they specifically relate to successful leadership.

Self-confidence

For the most part, leader self-confidence seems related to leadership success. Self-confidence influences a leader's behavior primarily by giving him or her the assurance to attempt and accomplish difficult tasks and influence people. Clearly, self-confidence can be good for a leader, but too much self-confidence could actually be bad for a leader's performance. Too much confidence can cause leaders to take excessive risks and be arrogant and annoying to people around them, minimizing their success (Yukl, 2006).

Locus of control

The term locus of control describes how a person views the causes of his or her behavior. People with an internal locus of control believe that the events in their lives are determined and controlled by them personally. People with an external locus of control believe that the events in their lives are controlled by chance or some other external factor; they believe they have little control over their lives and thus, cannot do anything to change (Rotter, 1966).

Because people with an internal locus of control believe they can control and influence their lives, they are more future oriented and more likely to actively attempt to solve problems.

Emotional maturity

People who exhibit emotional maturity have a realistic view of their own strengths and weaknesses, and they work toward self-improvement instead of denying their weaknesses and focusing only on their strengths. They are typically less self-centered, have more self-control, and they are less prone to mood swings. Leaders who are emotionally mature have more cooperative relationships with other people in their work environment (Cantoni, 1955).

Interpersonal traits

Machiavellianism
Machiavellianism refers to a person's tendency to deceive and manipulate others for personal gain. People who are high in Machiavellianism resist the influence of other people, and they are more concerned with completing their own personal tasks instead of emotional and moral concerns. They are game players.

Researchers have studied specific Machiavellian manipulation tactics in organizational leaders. Some tactics they found include lying, acting like other people have a say when they really do not, changing information, exaggerating the importance of a task, and ignoring others.

Authoritarianism
Authoritarianism is a person's tendency to stress authority and power in relationships. People who are high in authoritarianism are said to be conservative, emotionally withdrawn, power-seeking, and resistant to change. Authoritarianism is related to several aspects of a leader's behavior.

For the most part, authoritarianism is associated with negative leadership behaviors. People high in authoritarianism are more likely to give punishments for bad behavior than rewards for good behavior. Also, authoritarianism is related to fewer successful leadership behaviors, such as displaying sensitivity toward other people and contributing to the accomplishment of group goals (Bass, 1990).

Integrity
Integrity means that a person's behavior is consistent with their personal values, and that the person is honest, ethical, and trustworthy. In fact, integrity is an important part of trust.

Several types of behavior are related to personal integrity. First, people with integrity are honest and truthful rather than deceptive. Leaders lose credibility when people discover they have lied or stretched the truth. Second, people with integrity keep their promises. People do not want to make agreements with leaders who cannot be trusted to keep promises. Third, people with integrity are loyal to their followers. The trust of followers will be lost if a leader does not demonstrate loyalty. Fourth, these people will not tell secrets. Finally, people with integrity are responsible for their own actions. Taking responsibility for their actions makes leaders look strong and dependable to others (Yukl, 2006).

WHAT SKILLS ARE IMPORTANT TO SUCCESSFUL LEADERSHIP?

Decision-making

Leaders must make high-stakes decisions rapidly, so they must be skilled at decision-making. They often do not have time to thoroughly think about each and every decision they make, and each decision often has multiple, complicated consequences. Because of this need to make quick decisions with little in-depth thought, leaders have been said to be intuitive thinkers, meaning that they do not spend valuable time analyzing complex situations.

While intuition is likely to play a large role in the decisions leaders make, there is also a strategic element to leaders' decisions. These decisions involve long time frames and broad organizational elements.

Because of the complexity and high stakes involved in strategic decisions, leaders cannot simply use intuition for these decisions; they must actively analyze the elements of the situation. When leaders are faced with major strategic decisions, they analyze the following:

- The goals to be accomplished.
- The actions or tactics that will be most effective in accomplishing these goals.
- The causes involved in the situation.

Problem solving
In their day-to-day work, leaders encounter several different types of social problems. These problems are extremely complex and poorly defined. Not only do leaders have to address complex problems, they also have to address these problems in very short time frames. Leaders typically do not have time to think extensively about every aspect of every problem they encounter.

Therefore, leaders must be able to solve problems quickly and efficiently, and it is best if their solutions can address multiple problems at one time. To come up with these solutions quickly, leaders must focus on the restrictions that come with potential solutions to determine the best action to take to solve a problem.

Planning

Planning is an ongoing process that leaders must do everyday in organizations. Leaders must think about their future actions and the consequences of these potential actions, and how their actions will help them and their followers achieve their goals. Planning is very important to organizations. It takes a lot of time and cognitive

resources to develop a good, thorough plan (Mumford, Schultz, & Van Doorn, 2001).

Leaders must plan their own day-to-day activities (when and how they are going to work on their own tasks), plan how to divide other work tasks among their subordinates (how to delegate effectively), and leaders must help their organizations plan responses to competitors and environmental change.

Planning is always based on the goal a leader is trying to accomplish. Planning begins with a leader recognizing an opportunity to take an action that will lead to goal achievement. Then, the leader thinks about the situation and the best way to accomplish the goal. Next, the leader comes up with an initial plan, and he or she revises the plan when changes need to be made to avoid potential problems. Finally, a good plan involves ways to mark progress toward goal accomplishment and backup plans in case something goes wrong (Mumford et al., 2001).

Emotional intelligence

Emotional intelligence is also important for leadership success. Emotional intelligence is the ability to recognize one's own feelings and the feelings of others. It also involves the ability to manage emotions such that they do not interfere with a person's thinking and behavior (Goleman, 1995).

Because emotions are strong feelings, they can distract people from their normal thinking and behavior. Even when a person stops immediately experiencing a particular emotion, the feeling often remains as a good or bad mood; and moods can also impact leaders' performance.

Emotional intelligence is important for leadership success. A leader who has emotional intelligence is better able to solve problems, make decisions, and manage time and crises.

Social intelligence

Social intelligence is the ability to recognize and choose the best way to address a situation. Social intelligence goes beyond what we commonly think of as social skills. The two elements of social intelligence are social perceptiveness and behavioral flexibility.

Social perceptiveness is the ability to recognize the needs, the potential problems, and the potential opportunities for an organization. It also involves understanding the characteristics of an organization and the relationships involved in that organization. Finally, a person who is socially perceptive understands how different actions will help or hurt the group. Basically, a leader with high social perceptiveness understands what needs to be done to make a group or organization more effective and how to do it.

Behavioral flexibility is the ability and the willingness to change one's behavior in response to a situation. It involves taking a variety of different actions and judging their effectiveness, changing one's behavior as needed (Zaccaro, Gilbert, Thor, & Mumford, 1991).

Behaviors linked to leadership

When researchers were unable to find a specific set of traits that would lead to successful leadership, they decided to look at specific leader behaviors that are important for success. Leadership researchers have looked at four broad categories of behaviors: (a) consideration, (b) initiating structure, (c) participation, and (d) change-oriented behaviors. Some researchers have also studied several more specific behaviors, like role modeling and feedback behaviors.

Consideration

Consideration involves a leader showing concern for the well-being of his or her employees. Considerate leaders show appreciation of their employees' work, help increase the self-esteem of their employees by treating them well, and work to make their employees feel comfortable in the organization. Considerate leaders are oriented toward relationships and trust. On the other hand, inconsiderate leaders criticize their employees publicly, do not consider their feelings, and make them feel uncomfortable.

Initiating structure

Initiating structure involves a leader planning and organizing a work group's activity. A leader who initiates structure sets and maintains standards for work, meeting deadlines, and deciding how the work will be done. A leader who initiates structure establishes clear standards and rules for communication and work organization. These leaders are oriented toward the work tasks, as opposed to establishing relationships with other employees.

Participation

With participative leadership, a leader involves his or her subordinates in making important decisions and doing supervisor-type tasks. Leadership studies conducted at The University of Michigan found that successful leaders engaged in participative leadership by having group meetings to encourage individuals to contribute to important decisions and to improve communication.

The leader's role in group meetings is to guide the discussion and make sure it is constructive and that the group is solving problems. It is important to remember, however, that the leader is still responsible for what the group decides, even though the group is more involved in decisions (Yukl, 2006).

Change-oriented behavior

Yukl (2006) argued that these types of behavior did not adequately cover the range of behaviors that successful leaders engage in. He and other researchers proposed an additional behavior they described as change-oriented behavior. Change-oriented behaviors involve behaviors that are directed at encouraging and facilitating change in organizations.

Organizations can no longer be competitive by maintaining their current processes, products, or services. They must continually create new products and processes to achieve long-term success. One of the most important factors in successful adaptation for organizations is effective leadership (Mumford, Scott, Gaddis, & Strange, 2002).

By now, you may be wondering why so much research has considered the personality qualities of leaders without examining the types of groups the persons are going to lead. The results of these studies seem to indicate that leadership is not the same as expertise or intelligence or even being the best at whatever the group does. If you think about the captain of your favorite sports team, it is rarely the case that the person is the best player on the team. Rather, leadership is a social process, and it likely emerges out of an individual's disposition to get noticed, to assert himself or herself, and to demonstrate responsibility.

A good leader may not be the person who knows the most but rather the person whose temperamental endowments predispose him or her to flourish in a leadership role.

Specific behaviors

There are a number of different, specific behaviors that have been researched to see how they relate to successful leadership. Most of these behaviors are important when working with teams of employees and developing and putting different projects into operation in organizations. This section will describe some of the specific behaviors found to be important for successful leadership.

Role modeling

Role modeling can be a useful tool for leaders. Some people may think the purpose of role modeling is for a leader to show the other employees what types of behaviors are appropriate for a work environment. Actually, role modeling helps leaders because it helps them set the climate of a work group. Work performance is enhanced when employees perceive that the work environment, or climate, is supportive (Amabile, Schatzer, Moneta, & Kramer, 2004). In general, when people work in a climate in which they feel safe and supported, they will be better workers (Mumford, Eubanks, & Murphy, 2007).

Leaders may influence these aspects primarily by role modeling behaviors that indicate acceptance of these values (Jaussi & Dionne, 2003). Think about what a leader would do if that leader wanted to make sure his or her employees made the organization of their work materials a priority. Would the leader be organized or disorganized?

Support

Organizational tasks and projects can be costly; therefore, these projects will not succeed if support and resources are not available (Amabile et al., 2004; Ekvall & Ryhammer, 1999). It is important that leaders make sure the necessary time and resources are available to complete projects. When employees feel pressure to complete their tasks in a short amount of time, their performance will deteriorate.

To make sure that their employees have enough time and resources to complete their tasks, leaders must often persuade upper-level management of the importance of their projects (Jelinek & Schoonhoven, 1990). This can be done by involving these senior executives in the project early on, and then working to keep them interested in the project until it is complete (Mumford, Eubanks, & Murphy, 2007).

Championing

Another part of getting different projects accomplished involves making sure that an organization as a whole is prepared to accept and adopt these new projects. For new projects to be adopted, it is important that leaders take part showing enthusiasm for or "championing" a project to gain support from the rest of an organization (Howell & Boies, 2004), in effect serving as representatives for their team within the organization (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992). To gain support, leaders must show the other organization members how these new projects will help and support their goals.

Feedback

Another very important behavior of leaders when working with project teams is directing the work. Leaders help guide the work of their employees in the right direction. One important way leaders direct project work is by evaluating the work of employees and providing feedback. Leaders should try to provide constructive feedback when evaluating their employees' work.

In addition, leaders must make sure they are evaluating the work based on appropriate standards; depending on the stage and goals of the project, different evaluation standards will be more or less relevant (Mumford, Eubanks, et al., 2007).

Ethical leadership

Leaders have an important role in influencing the process of decision-making to ensure outcomes that will be beneficial to the organization as a whole; to customers, including vendors and suppliers; and to individual employees within the organization. There are times when it is important to allow individuals to voice an opinion that may be in conflict with others'. However, the effective leader is able to encourage authentic dissent rather than dissent simply meant to disrupt (Greitemeyer et al., 2009).

It is also useful to apply the group needs model as proposed by Bellman and Ryan (2009) because individuals relate self-knowledge to the group's purpose and the bigger picture of the overall goals and impact of the organization. Open discussion in group meetings allows individuals to not only hear others' opinions and ideas but to revise their own opinions as well (Bellman & Ryan; Soll & Larrick, 2009).

The decision-making process can be aided by ensuring that all members of the group or team understand the process to the degree necessary and are clear about what each member can expect from the group and what is expected of each group member.

Ethical leaders must communicate accurate and concise information on the values of the organization (Standsbury, 2009). A focus on

organizational success will foster a climate of open discussion of ethical standards and expectations. Ethical leaders set the standard of truth for every employee they lead (Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009). The moment people take leadership positions, they have an opportunity to place the highest emphasis on truthfulness (Kaptein et al., 2005).

Ethical leaders can also make effective use of a group of advisors (Standsbury, 2009). They might select the sharpest employees within their organizations or hire some from other companies, but they must be surrounded by people with answers and information (Sama & Shoaf, 2008).

When change is necessary because of circumstances beyond the leader's control, the reputation the leader has for ethical behavior will partially determine how this change will be received (Griggs, 2009). In other words, change will be received in a more positive light when the leader has previously exhibited ethical leadership than when the leader's ethics have been questionable (Marcy et al., 2008).

Personal integrity plays a significant role in leadership effectiveness and has been found to be an important attribute of leadership across cultures (Yukl, 2006). Leaders may be involved in various activities requiring personal integrity, including influencing others, framing problems, facilitating issues, and motivating others to accomplish important tasks (Yuki, 2006).

Common definitions of personal integrity include honesty and consistency (people do the right thing when no one is looking). There is controversy surrounding this definition, though, because it does not address moral values and ethical behavior (Yukl, 2006).

When understanding the topic of personal integrity, it is important to understand the difference between behavior and impact. Often, because every individual has different experiences and values, the behavior of a leader may be misinterpreted as having a negative impact on another person. A false assumption in this case could be made that the leader lacks personal integrity, which may in fact not be the case.

When there is a conflict between what the leader personally believes and what his or her personal responsibilities require, a leader may tend to serve his or her own best interest, thus compromising personal integrity (Martin, 2009). It is possible for leaders to rationalize their behavior when it is not aligned with the organization's ethical codes and values. Leaders may justify their behavior even though it breaks ethical codes. It is clear that ethics is a significant factor leading to effectiveness for those in leadership positions (McCann & Holt, 2009).

According to Drucker (1999), organizations must have values that align with employees, and that these individuals' values must be compatible with the organization to be most effective. Organizational leadership and employee values may not necessarily need to be the same, but they need to coexist.

There are significant things that leaders can do to help uphold high levels of personal integrity. First, it is critical that leaders partner with their human resources departments to recruit and bring onboard people who share similar values as the organization. This will help to ensure a successful fit.

Secondly, leaders can recognize employees who exemplify those values that represent high levels of personal integrity, for example, in a group meeting setting. Aligning reward systems with personal behavior is one way that leaders can ensure that people in the organization are motivated to do the right thing (Yukl, 2006).

Leaders are responsible for explaining and describing the potential risks of failure as well as potential benefits of success (Yukl, 2006). Effective leaders have the ability to focus on the positive aspects and benefits of a situation while not concealing the risks and obstacles the group will face.

Leaders also can influence followers' attitudes and beliefs, which many believe is unethical in any circumstances (Toor & Ofori, 2009; Yukl, 2006).

When leaders attempt to make changes in the organizational culture, changes in employee beliefs may be required. The effective leader discusses the need for these changes with individual employees, which is most likely to help bring about organizational change. However, there are still many ethical questions about the extent to which leaders should influence follower beliefs even when the focus is on positive or necessary change within the organization (Yukl, 2006).

Leaders do not operate in a vacuum and thus influence and are influenced by many other entities or stakeholders. The stakeholders for most organizations include owners, shareholders, managers, employees, customers, vendors, and the local community (Yukl, 2006). The challenge for ethical leadership is to balance the interests of any applicable stakeholders to produce the best outcome for those involved. Often a decision made to benefit one stakeholder, for example, the owners, may result in a less than favorable impact on others. It is in these situations that the ethical decision may not be apparent (Yukl, 2006).

In an economic climate such as exists today, leaders in organizations are required to make difficult decisions, and the consequences may significantly affect a broad scope of participants. Ethical leadership involves assessing the situation, evaluating the impact of any decisions, both long-term and short-term, and maintaining ethical values throughout the process (Puffer, & McCarthy, 2008). Making the best decision for the short term even though it is considered to be ethical may lead to negative effects in the future (Yukl, 2006).

In an ever-changing environment, leaders are called upon to evaluate the situation, make critical decisions, support and encourage followers, and otherwise perform at a level acceptable to higher-level management, owners, shareholders, and other involved parties. There are often conflicts of interest between these groups, and it is the responsibility of the leader to make decisions that balance these self-interests as much as possible (Yukl, 2006).

The effective, ethical leader who has a clear moral compass may still be faced with conflict in the face of situations requiring decisions that will have broad or long-term impact (Puffer & McCarthy, 2008). Leaders must be prepared to make not only decisions that may be unpopular with followers, but also decisions that may be unpopular with management or other stakeholders (Yukl, 2006).

Ethical leadership can take on two forms: endorsing ethical climate and resisting unethical activities (Yukl, 2006). The most successful leader knows how to use both forms simultaneously to maintain a culture of integrity in the workplace (Sama & Shoaf, 2008). It is imperative that leaders make their employees aware of the ethical paradigm while also being clear about those behaviors and practices that do not fit into the desired norm (Dickson, Smith, Grojean, & Ehrhart, 2001).

There are many factors that determine ethical leadership behavior and will contribute to which form or combination of the two forms of leadership a leader chooses to enforce (Yukl, 2006).

First, Kohlberg (as cited in Yukl, 2006) argues that leaders advance through six stages to develop moral behavior. Kohlberg's theory holds that moral reasoning, the basis for ethical behavior, has six identifiable developmental stages, each more adequate at responding to moral dilemmas than its predecessor.

Kohlberg followed the development of moral judgment far beyond the ages studied earlier by Piaget, who also claimed that logic and morality develop through constructive stages. Expanding on Piaget's work, Kohlberg determined that the process of moral development was principally concerned with justice, and that it continued throughout the individual's lifetime, a notion that spawned dialogue on the philosophical implications of such research.

Kohlberg's six stages of moral development

Pre-conventional (Stages 1 and 2)
The pre-conventional level of moral reasoning is especially common in children, although adults can also exhibit this level of reasoning. Reasoners at this level judge the morality of an action by its direct consequences. The pre-conventional level consists of the first and second stages of moral development, and is solely concerned with the self in an egocentric manner.

A child with pre-conventional morality has not yet adopted or internalized society's conventions on what is right or wrong, but instead focuses largely on external consequences that certain actions may bring.

- In **stage one** (obedience and punishment-driven), individuals focus on the direct consequences of their actions on themselves. For example, an action is perceived as morally wrong because the perpetrator is punished. "The last time I did that I got spanked, so I will not do it again." The worse the punishment for the act is, the more "bad" the act is perceived to be. This can give rise to an inference that even innocent victims are guilty in proportion to their suffering. It is "egocentric," lacking recognition that others' points of view are different from one's own. There is "deference to superior power or prestige."
- **Stage two** (self-interest-driven) espouses the "what's in it for me" position, in which right behavior is defined by whatever individuals believe to be in their best interest but understood in a narrow way that does not consider their reputation or relationships to groups of people. Stage two reasoning shows a limited interest in the needs of others, but only to a point where it might further the individual's own interests. As a result, concern for others is not based on loyalty or intrinsic respect, but rather a "You scratch my back, and I'll scratch yours" mentality. The lack of a societal perspective in the pre-conventional level is quite different from the social contract (stage five), as all actions have the purpose of serving the individual's own needs or interests. For the stage two theorist, the world's perspective is often seen as morally relative.

Conventional (Stages 3 and 4)
The conventional level of moral reasoning is typical of adolescents and adults. Those who reason in a conventional way judge the morality of actions by comparing them to society's views and expectations. The conventional level consists of the third and fourth stages of moral development.

Conventional morality is characterized by an acceptance of society's conventions on right and wrong. At this level, individuals obey rules and follow society's norms even when there are no consequences for obedience or disobedience. Adherence to rules and conventions is somewhat rigid, however, and a rule's appropriateness or fairness is seldom questioned.

- In **stage three** (interpersonal accord and conformity-driven), the person enters society by filling social roles. Individuals are receptive to approval or disapproval from others as it reflects society's accordance with the perceived role. They try to be a "good boy" or "good girl" to live up to these expectations, having learned that there is inherent value in doing so.
- Stage three reasoning may judge the morality of an action by evaluating its consequences in terms of a person's relationships, which now begin to include things like respect, gratitude and the Golden Rule. "I want to be liked and thought well of; apparently, not being naughty makes people like me." Desire to maintain rules and authority exists only to further support these social roles. The intentions of actors play a more significant role in reasoning at this stage: "They mean well. ..."
- In **stage four** (authority and social order obedience-driven), it is important to obey laws, dictums and social conventions because of their importance in maintaining a functioning society. Moral reasoning in stage four is thus beyond the need for individual approval exhibited in stage three. A central ideal or ideals often prescribe what is right and wrong, such as in the case of fundamentalism. If one person violates a law, perhaps everyone would. Therefore, there is an obligation and a duty to uphold laws and rules. When someone does violate a law, it is morally wrong; culpability is thus a significant factor in this stage as it separates the bad domains from the good ones. Most active members of society remain at stage four, where morality is still predominantly dictated by an outside force.

Post-conventional (Stages 5 and 6)
The post-conventional level, also known as the principled level, is marked by a growing realization that individuals are separate entities from society, and that the individual's own perspective may take precedence over society's view; individuals may disobey rules inconsistent with their own principles. Post-conventional moralists live by their own ethical principles.

These principles typically include such basic human rights as life, liberty, and justice. People who exhibit post-conventional morality view rules as useful but changeable mechanisms; ideally rules can maintain the general social order and protect human rights. Rules are not absolute dictates that must be obeyed without question. Because post-conventional individuals elevate their own moral evaluation of a situation over social conventions, their behavior, especially at stage six, can be confused with that of those at the pre-conventional level. Some theorists have speculated that many people may never reach this level of abstract moral reasoning.

- In **stage five** (social contract-driven), the world is viewed as holding different opinions, rights and values. Such perspectives should be mutually respected as unique to each person or community. Laws are regarded as social contracts rather than rigid edicts. Those that do not promote the general welfare should be changed when necessary to meet "the greatest good for the greatest number of people." This is achieved through majority decision and inevitable compromise. Democratic government is ostensibly based on stage five reasoning.
- In **stage six** (universal ethical principles-driven), moral reasoning is based on abstract reasoning using universal ethical principles. Laws are valid only insofar as they are grounded in justice, and a commitment to justice carries with it an obligation to disobey unjust laws. Legal rights are unnecessary, as social contracts are not essential for deontic moral action. Decisions are not reached hypothetically in a conditional way but rather categorically in an absolute way, as in the philosophy of Immanuel Kant.
- This involves individuals imagining what they would do in another's shoes if they believed what that other person imagines to be true. The resulting consensus is the action taken. In this way, action is never a means but always an end in itself; the individual acts because it is right, and not because it avoids punishment, is in their best interest, expected, legal, or previously agreed upon. Although Kohlberg insisted that stage six exists, he found it difficult to identify individuals who consistently operated at that level.

Ultimately, a leader may deviate from social norms to formulate what he or she sees as morally sound (Yukl, 2006). Second, choices in ethical leadership can also emerge from the personal attributes of the leader (Yukl, 2006; Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009).

Constructive, group-oriented behavior is more likely for leaders with personal attributes such as high emotional maturity, trustworthiness, and the ability to inspire motivation (Yukl, 2006; Brown & Trevino, 2006).

Last, choices in ethical behavior can be determined by varied situational factors (Yukl, 2006). It is important that a manager always understand the context of the professional climate and all its organizational, communal, and individual contributors in making ethical decisions (Kaptein, Huberts, Avelino, & Lasthuizen, 2005).

Although it is a relatively new area, research is ongoing to discover the best way for a leader to influence the ethical climate of an organization (Yukl, 2006). Researchers are attempting to resolve the disparity between endorsing ethical climate and resisting unethical activities (Yukl, 2006; Sama & Shoaf, 2008). It is important to continue the study of ethical conduct in order to better equip leaders to shape organizational ethical culture (Dickson et al., 2001).

Ethical behavior is one of the most important aspects of effective leadership and change management (Kaptein et al., 2005). While most leaders choose to either promote ethical behavior or oppose unethical behavior, the best leaders must understand that it is a combination of both that will be most successful (Sama & Shoaf, 2008).

Organizational leaders must make decisions that will not only benefit them, but they also must think about how the people in the organization will be affected (Dickson, et al., 2001). The best leaders must make their ethical values known by communicating them verbally and in action (Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009). Ethical leaders exemplify the vision and goals of the organization.

Ethical leaders collaborate to incorporate best practices, solve problems, address the issues, and enlighten employees about all of the associated information affecting the individual and the organization (Kaptein et al., 2005). From this group of advisors, other leaders may emerge. Ethical leaders offer training to potential successors, allowing them the opportunity to be mentored and to build leadership skills (Standsbury, 2009). Ethical leaders know how to put personal egos aside and work for the greater good of the organization (Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009).

Change in organizations is an unavoidable phenomenon. When leaders are forced to implement change, they must see their employees as stakeholders striving to achieve the same purpose, vision, and goals (Sama & Shoaf, 2008). Employees must be able to trust that a leader is ethically sound and that the decision made will benefit the employee as well as the organization (Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009). When a leader is ethical, he or she gains the respect and admiration of employees and upper management as well as the satisfaction gained from doing the right thing (Kaptein et al., 2005).

Ethical leadership and diversity

While we will discuss organizational culture with more detail later in this course, let's discuss how ethical behavior, leadership, and diversity are connected.

Leadership in organizations is multifaceted and offers many challenges. These challenges in the climate of constant business change are even more diverse and consuming. This requires leaders to be at their best and well equipped to provide the appropriate leadership for every situation that occurs. To do this, today's leader must have knowledge and options for fully leveraging the capability of their organizations, including its climate and diverse human resources.

Two challenging areas in today's business climate are leadership ethics and organization diversity. Recent well publicized failures in business ethics and the ever changing diversity of the human resource pool make these areas critical to understand for any leader who plans to lead his or her organization to business success.

Exploring the area of ethical leadership leads us to the values and integrity of individual leaders and the role their behavior has in shaping an organizational culture where doing what is right is the norm. It emphasizes the need for clear, ethical expectations that eliminate misalignment between the leader, followers, and the entire organization so the overall business is not at risk.

The same exploration in the area of diversity identifies three subjects that are at the forefront of concern as leaders seek to leverage their work force to its fullest potential. These three areas are the differences in leadership due to gender, the differences in leadership in different cultures, and the importance of managing organization diversity.

There is a growing interest in ethical leadership, however there is conflict on exactly how to define and measure the concept objectively for scientific research. An important aspect of ethical leadership is to lead by example, and set and encourage others to follow high standards (Jackson, Clements, Averill, & Zimbro, 2009). The terms integrity, moral values, and character are used to describe the concept of ethics (Griggs, 2009).

In evaluating ethics in leadership, a distinction can be made between the ethics of a specific leader as compared to the ethics associated with a specific leadership style. Because of the subjectivity in evaluating ethics, the results may reflect not only the ethics of the leader but also those of the evaluator.

There are many examples of what constitutes unethical behavior and how it affects employees and followers, including falsifying information, taking credit for other's contributions, and accepting bribes for preferential treatment.

The views of three scholars describe ethical behavior for leaders in fields such as government, religion, social movement, community services, and nonprofit organizations. Burns (as cited in Yukl, 2006) proposes that transformational leadership is a process in which the leader as well as others within the organization move to bring each other to a higher level of motivation and performance, leading to social change both inside and outside of the organization.

Heifetz (as cited in Yukl, 2006) proposes that leaders play a significant role in addressing and solving conflict by using both formal and informal authority by first acknowledging there is a problem and then taking action to resolve it. This can best be accomplished through cooperation among participants who set realistic goals balanced with optimism about their ability to achieve those goals.

Greenleaf (as cited in Yukl, 2006) introduced the concept of servant leadership in which the primary focus of the leader is to provide the follower with support and understanding through listening, assessing their needs, and helping with any negative aspects of the environment. These leaders hold themselves and others to a high standard of social justice and equality in the workplace and have a high sense of social responsibility. By being straightforward, honest, and open with employees, the result is inspired individuals who take steps to bring about social change.

In a world that is constantly changing, the issue of ethical leadership becomes even more important (Cohen, 2009). It is difficult to address the issue of ethics without discussing values (Fu, & Liu, 2009) and behaviors of employees when there is a high level of respect and trust between management and employees (Zigarmi, 2008).

When there is not a match between behaviors and the vision statement, then the ethics of the leadership team come into question (Fu, & Liu, 2009; Griggs, 2009; Zigarmi, 2008). In these situations, it is imperative that the leaders refer back to a code of ethics that will influence the choices made rather than simply react to a stressful situation (Fu, & Liu, 2009).

Ethical behavior on the part of the leader combined with the use of a transformational leadership style tend to lead to high levels of trust in and respect for the leader (van Eeden, Cilliers, & van Deventer, 2008).

Developing women as leaders creates a diverse team that more accurately reflects society and also broadens the perspective of the team (Kearney & Gebert, 2009). How women prepare for and fill their leadership roles is linked to their gender. Organizations need to recognize this and create an environment that is accepting of and committed to working with women leaders (Yoder, 2001).

Strategic development of leadership development programs that integrate unique opportunities for women and a mentoring program that provides guidance are also needed changes in the arena of gender and leadership (Hopkins, O'Neil, Passarelli, & Bilimoria, 2008). In general, many organizations should be assessing the changing face of leadership, which may require leaders to alter their selection and promotion practices to be more inclusive; recognize the opportunities and perspectives brought to the executive table by women; and engage them in preparatory programs that can only benefit the organization (Gilgoff, 2009).

Leading individuals vs. leading groups

It has already been stated that leadership can be geared toward a single person or many people. And the leader may be leading multiple, independent individuals, but more often than not, the leader is leading a group of individuals.

Dealing with an individual is much different than dealing with a group. When a single follower is involved, a leader has only one person's concerns, preferences, and activities to consider. If a leader must oversee an entire group, then he or she must consider not only the group as a whole but also each member individually.

When leading groups, it is important that the group members get along with each other and that they work together effectively. In doing so, each member creates an identity within the group, causing him or her to feel associated with the other members of the group as a whole.

When group members stick together, they become cohesive. However, sometimes members become too close and fall into a process called "deindividuation," which happens when members become too entrenched in the group and lose their own identities. This is a bad thing because individual members might act differently than they normally would and might participate in uncharacteristic behaviors. Group members do this because they feel they are exempt from the consequences of their actions as individuals, and that the group will likely take the blame for negative consequences.

This tends to happen when leaders motivate their followers with punishment for bad behavior. When leaders offer rewards for good behavior, group members tend to maintain their own identities yet are still cohesive. Because of this, it is essential that leaders avoid punishments and instead offer rewards to groups for their accomplishments.

Looking at leadership

You may have noticed that some of these traits and skills overlap. For instance, intelligence is highly related to planning and problem-solving skills. Intelligence is also necessary for wisdom. This highlights the complexity of the nature of leadership and what is necessary for successful leadership.

Some traits, skills, or behaviors may be more important in some situations than others. The traits, skills, and behaviors we've discussed appear to have a wide range of usefulness across many different job situations. Organizations can also use this type of traits and skills research to develop and hire their employees, and you can use this research to develop your own skills as a leader.

POWER AND INFLUENCE

Power is another important element to consider when discussing topics in the field of industrial and organizational psychology. Power is commonly referred to as the capacity of one person to influence the behavior or attitudes of others and focuses more on initiating change by communicating a vision or goals and seeking to inspire others into action.

Power can be exercised over groups as well as individuals. Power is derived from authority, which includes a right or claim of legitimacy that serves as a justification to exercise power.

Attempts to understand power have identified many different types, and further efforts distinguished among those types. Some of the most influential work in this field was done by French and Raven (1959), who developed a classification system describing five kinds of power. Although their work had a great effect on power research, it did not include all sources of power involved in leadership.

The five types of power in this taxonomy include:

1. Legitimate power, which comes from a follower's internalization of values or norms and the belief that the person in power has a right to his or her power, often as a result of his or her position.
2. Expert power, which comes from a follower's beliefs that the person in power is knowledgeable and competent.
3. Referent power, which comes from a follower liking or admiring the person in power.
4. Reward power, which comes from a follower seeking rewards provided by the person in power.
5. Coercive power, which comes from a follower avoiding punishment from the person in power.

Another approach to power sources is Bass's (1960) theory of position versus personal power. This model describes the two major sources of power. Position power occurs when one is given a certain position that has influence over a person's subordinates, such as a manager of a restaurant. Personal power is attributed to an individual in power, and can include expertise or a another's friendship with the person in power.

Research has found support for Bass's view and has revealed types of power subsumed within each factor. The types of power within position power include legitimate, reward, coercive, information (control over access to information), and ecological (control over the situation) power.

The different types of personal power include referent and expert power (Yukl & Falbe, 1991). Because of the complexity of position and personal power, it can be difficult at times to distinguish between the two; however, Bass's approach is still widely accepted among researchers.

Because a leader's amount of power can change over time and in different situations, two theories have been proposed to explain how power is acquired and lost. First, social exchange theory defines changes in power in terms of the relationship between leaders and

followers over time. In this way, social interactions between members of a small group determine how power is gained or lost.

These social interactions tend to involve the exchange of material or psychological benefits (i.e., approval, respect, affection). As leaders show involvement in a group and propose successful goals and actions, they will accumulate what are called idiosyncrasy credits and gain power.

Idiosyncrasy credits are credits that a leader builds up with successful ideas over time. If a leader appears selfish or uninvolved and his or her actions fail, then he or she loses power. In evaluating this theory, problems arise with the theory's application of the different types of power. Social exchange theory focuses only on expert power and authority and fails to consider how reward and referent power are involved in interpersonal exchanges.

The second theory proposed to explain how power is gained or lost is called strategic contingencies theory. This theory attempts to describe how power is distributed among various subunits, or departments, in an organization.

Strategic contingencies theory contends that in each group, power depends on:

- Expertise in handling major problems.
- The importance of the subunit to the overall work of the organization.
- How easily the subunit's expertise can be replaced.

As a subunit exhibits unique expertise at solving problems critical to the organization, it gains power. Gained power will first come in the form of expert power, and over time can evolve into legitimate power. This theory has generally been supported by research; however, it fails to consider the organizational politics that might be involved.

Influence

Yukl (2006) uses the word essence to describe influence and leadership. In other words, without influence, there is no leadership. The more power the leader possesses, the greater the degree of influence that leader can have on others, both positive and negative. There are leaders who have used this power and influence to promote themselves, at times to the detriment of others. Often in the news today there are reports of misuse of this power to the degree that many individuals no longer trust leaders and businesses to make wise and ethical decisions (Fu, & Liu, 2009).

According to Yukl (2006), influencing others involves altering the motives or perceptions of another to accomplish a given goal. Related to power, influence also plays an important role in successful leadership. In fact, influence lies at the core of leadership, and without influence, it would be impossible to gain follower support, implement decisions, or get anything done.

Influence attempts are actions geared toward bringing about a desired outcome. A proactive influence attempt refers to a single request from one person to another. While influence attempts are actions, the psychological view considers influence to be a process. This view of influence processes maintains that one person's influence on another depends upon the follower's perceptions of the leader about the actions within the context of the situation.

Another way of understanding influence is the behavioral approach. This approach views influence in terms of behavioral tactics. Influence tactics are behaviors intended to sway the attitudes and behaviors of others. Impression management tactics are behaviors used by a leader to make followers like him or her. Political tactics are behaviors intended to affect broad organizational decisions, or how such decisions are made, to benefit an individual or his or her group. Proactive influence tactics include behaviors geared toward achieving a particular outcome. These differ from proactive influence attempts in that they do not necessarily have to be a single request from one person to another.

These influence tactics can generalize across situations, but also must be considered in the context of specific situations, where one tactic may be more appropriate than another. For example, impression management tactics may be useful at work meetings or social events; however, when working on a specific project with followers, proactive influence tactics would be more beneficial.

Behavior of power and influence

Although distinct concepts, power and influence in the leadership context maintain a complex relationship that causes leaders to behave in different ways to try to enhance their effectiveness.

One important factor in understanding how power and influence are exhibited is the direction of the interaction. To understand the directions of influence tactics, Yukl and Tracey (1992) developed a model to help identify which influence tactics would be most useful. This model consists of the following interrelated factors:

- Adherence to existing social norms and role expectations about using the tactic in a given situation.
- The appropriateness of a leader's power being used as a base for the tactic in a given situation.
- The extent to which the tactic will lead to a goal of an influence attempt.
- The amount of follower resistance expected.
- The expected cost compared to the benefits of using the tactic.

For any given situation, a leader will typically assess the relevance of these five concerns and decide which influence tactics will be most useful. The main idea from this model is that leaders should use influence tactics that are accepted socially and by their followers, appropriate for the goal and situation, and not overly costly to accomplish their goals.

Support for this model has been somewhat inconsistent because of the complex relationships between the factors in the model, the behaviors of those involved, and potential influence tactics used in different contexts. In general, however, the model has been supported (Yukl, 2006).

Q: How can a person know which influence tactics will be successful?

To answer this question, researchers proposed a second model that contained the following five factors to predict influence tactic effectiveness:

- The extent to which followers resist because they disagree with a request.
- The likelihood that the tactic will affect follower attitudes on the attractiveness of a request.
- The appropriateness of a leader's power being used as a base for the tactic in a given situation.
- A leader's proficiency in using the tactic.
- Existing social norms and role expectations about using the tactic in a given situation.

Application of this model suggests that an effective influence tactic will be one that is socially acceptable, appealing and supported by followers, and appropriate for use by the leader in that context.

EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION

Motivation can be defined as an employee's internal enthusiasm about and drive to accomplish activities at work. Motivation causes an individual to decide to take action. An individual's motivation is influenced by biological, intellectual, social and emotional factors, but can also be easily influenced by external factors.

In the workplace, employee motivation can be the foundational factor in an organization's level of success in obtaining goals. Increased motivation in the workplace typically means improved performance, increased productivity and revenue and profits, improved morale and organizational stability. An organization's employees are its greatest assets. No matter how efficient technology and equipment may be, it is no match for the effectiveness and efficiency of an organization's staff.

Organizations with highly motivated employees are more likely to enjoy the following advantages:

- Higher productivity levels in the workplace.
- Better quality of work with less wastage.
- Development of a greater sense of urgency.
- A work environment that encourages more employee feedback and suggestions (motivated workers take more ownership of their work).
- A work environment that facilitates greater and more frequent feedback from supervisors and management.

Employee motivation has always been a central problem for leaders and managers. Unmotivated employees are likely to spend little or no effort on their jobs, avoid the workplace as much as possible, exit the organization if given the opportunity, and produce low quality work.

On the other hand, employees who feel motivated to work are likely to be persistent, creative and productive, turning out high quality work that they willingly undertake

There has been a lot of research done on motivation by many scholars, but the behavior of groups of people to try to find out why it is that all employees of a company do not perform at their best has received limited attention from the research world. Many things can be said to answer this question; the reality is that employees are motivated by different things.

Every employee has activities, events, people, and goals in his or her life that he or she finds motivating. Therefore, motivation about some aspect of life exists in everyone's consciousness and actions. The challenge for employers is to figure out how to inspire employee motivation at work. To create a work environment in which an employee is motivated about work involves both intrinsically satisfying and extrinsically encouraging factors.

Employee motivation is the combination of fulfilling the employee's needs and expectations from work and the workplace factors that enable employee motivation. These variables make motivating employees challenging.

Employers often understand that they need to provide a work environment that creates motivation in people. However, many employers fail to understand the significance of motivation in accomplishing their mission and vision. Even when they understand the importance of motivation, they lack the skill and knowledge to provide a work environment that fosters employee motivation.

Types of human motivation

Intrinsic motivation refers to motivation that is driven by an interest or enjoyment in the task itself, and exists within the individual rather than any external pressure. Intrinsic motivation is based on taking pleasure in an activity instead of working towards an external reward. Intrinsic motivation has been studied by social and educational psychologists since the early 1970s. Students who are intrinsically motivated are more likely to engage in the task willingly as well as work to improve their skills, which will increase their capabilities.

Individuals are likely to be intrinsically motivated if they:

- Attribute their educational results to factors under their own control, also known as autonomy.
- Believe they have the skill that will allow them to be effective agents in reaching desired goals (i.e., the results are not determined by luck).
- Have a genuine interest in mastering a topic or task.

Extrinsic motivation refers to the performance of an activity to attain an outcome, which then contradicts intrinsic motivation. Extrinsic motivation comes from outside of the individual. Common extrinsic motivations are rewards like money and grades, coercion and threat of punishment. Competition is in general extrinsic because it encourages the performer to win and beat others, not to enjoy the intrinsic rewards of the activity. A crowd cheering on the individual and trophies are also extrinsic incentives.

Goal internalization motivation is described as an individual's motive to perform because the content of the behavior is congruent with his or her personal value system. For example, an individual may believe in a particular cause or hold certain beliefs and values that motivate them to work toward a collective goal.

Instrumental motivation is described as an individual's motivation to perform a task or engage in behaviors because the person perceives that his or her efforts will result in tangible outcomes and rewards. Such outcomes may be pay, promotion, stock options, bonuses, and so forth.

Leonard et al. (1999) explored a range of research on self-based theories, including social identity theory (Stryker, 1987; Tajfel & Turner, 1985), self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1986), and self-presentation theory (Beach & Mitchell, 1990). Through their review of the literature and a process of inductive reasoning, Leonard et al. proposed a meta-theory of motivation, containing five motivational sources. They include (a) intrinsic process motivation; (b) instrumental motivation; (c) external self-concept motivation; (d) internal self-concept motivation; and (e) goal internalization motivation.

External self-concept motivation is described as an individual's motivation to engage in certain behaviors for the approval of others. The self-concept is inferred from the role expectations of reference groups, with the individual seeking affirmation of competencies and traits from others.

Internal self-concept motivation is described as an individual's motivation to perform to reinforce his or her internal standards of traits, competencies, and values. This concept of the ideal self serves to motivate the individual to perform in ways that reinforce this concept.

Motivational theories

The field of psychology has provided us with a variety of theories on motivation. While some incorporate the learning process, needs, and personal values, all of them refer to the psychological forces that determine the direction of a person's behavior in an organization, a person's level of effort, and a person's level of persistence.

Herzberg motivation theory

Frederick Herzberg (1923-2000), an American psychologist, put forward an employee motivation theory on motivation in the workplace. His motivation-hygiene theory emerged originally from interviews in Pittsburgh with 203 American accountants and engineers.

Herzberg described hygiene factors as elements that do not motivate employees but are essential to maintain satisfaction. These include a satisfactory salary and related employee benefits, considerate human relations skills, and satisfactory working conditions. The absence of any of these hygiene factors will cause employee dissatisfaction. These are also sometimes referred to as maintenance factors.

The accountants and engineers were asked to think of a time when they felt very satisfied at work and to describe the circumstances that caused them to feel that way. They were then asked to think of a time when they felt very dissatisfied at work and to describe what caused these feelings.

When their answers were analyzed and interpreted, the following five key elements that people reported as causing satisfaction were:

1. A sense of achievement.
2. Recognition for their achievements.
3. Intrinsically interesting work.
4. Responsibility (e.g., making decisions).
5. Advancement (e.g., promotion or psychological growth, such as learning new skills).

The five key things people reported as causes of their dissatisfaction were:

1. Perceived poor company policy and administration.
2. Salary.
3. Supervision (e.g., treated badly by the boss).
4. Interpersonal relationships with colleagues (poor teamwork).
5. Poor working conditions.

As a result, Herzberg proposed the following key findings:

- A bad environment (poor hygiene factors) will lead to dissatisfied people, but a good environment (good hygiene factors) will rarely lead to satisfied people.
- Both the prevention of dissatisfaction and the encouragement of satisfaction are necessary (through inspiring leadership).
- The motivators and hygiene factors are independent.
    - For example, an individual can be highly motivated in his or her work and be dissatisfied with his or her work environment.
- Improvements in hygiene factors have only short-term effects in the removal or prevention of dissatisfaction.

Hygiene needs are cyclical in nature and come back to a starting point that leads to the "What have you done for me lately?" syndrome (much to the frustration of many leaders). For example, employees may experience this about their pay. At times, they may become dissatisfied with their income as they see others earning more or getting bigger pay raises. When they receive a raise, this removes their dissatisfaction for awhile, but then they begin to feel dissatisfied again, and the cycle is repeated.

Hygiene factors are also often referred to as "dissatisfiers." They are concerned with factors associated with the job itself but are not directly a part of it. Typically, this is salary, although other factors that will often act as dissatisfiers include:

- Perceived differences with others.
- Job security.
- Working conditions and work environment.
- The quality of management.
- Organizational policy.
- Administration.
- Interpersonal relations.

Motivators (sometimes called "satisfiers") are factors directly concerned with the satisfaction gained from a job, such as:

- The sense of achievement and the intrinsic value obtained from the job itself.
- The level of recognition by both colleagues and management.
- The level of responsibility.
- Opportunities for advancement.
- The status provided.

Applying Herzberg's two-factor theory

This motivation theory is referred to as a two-factor theory because of the belief that motivators can be categorized as either hygiene factors or motivating factors.

The most important part of this theory of motivation is that the main motivating factors are not in the environment but in the intrinsic value and satisfaction gained from the job itself. It follows, therefore, that to motivate an individual, a job itself must be challenging, have scope for enrichment and be of interest to the jobholder. From this concept, Herzberg shaped his ideas about job enrichment, job enlargement, and job rotation.

Often, workers expect higher payment to compensate for learning these other jobs and for agreeing to changes in working practices. The new jobs are often only a marginal improvement in the degree of repetition, the skill demands and the level of responsibility; as a result, workers have not always responded positively to such change. Job enlargement schemes may not be entirely feasible in some circumstances.

The concepts of both job rotation and enlargement do not have their basis in any psychological theory. However, the next generation of attempts to redesign jobs developed from the research of Herzberg.

From his theory, Herzberg itemized a set of principles for the enrichment of jobs:

- Eliminating some controls while retaining accountability.
- Increasing personal accountability for work.
- Assigning each worker a complete unit of work with a clear start and end point.
- Granting additional authority and freedom to workers.
- Providing periodic reports directly available to workers rather than to supervisors only.
- Introducing new and more difficult tasks into the job.
- Encouraging the development of expertise by assigning individuals to specialized tasks.

Herzberg's other major contribution to the development of ideas in the area of job design was his checklist for implementation. He provided the following tips for those seeking success in the enrichment of jobs:

- Select jobs where technical changes are possible without major expense.
- Job satisfaction is low.
- Performance improvement is likely with increases in motivation.
- Hygiene is expensive.
- Examine the jobs selected with the conviction that changes can be introduced.
- "Green light" or brainstorm a list of possible changes.
- Screen the list ("red lighting") for hygiene suggestions and retain only ideas classed as motivators.
- Remove the generalities from the list, retaining only specific motivators.
- Avoid employee involvement in the design process.

- Set up a controlled experiment to measure the effects of the changes.
- Anticipate an early decline in performance as workers get used to their new jobs.

Job enrichment aims to create greater opportunities for individual achievement and recognition by expanding the task to increase not only variety but also responsibility and accountability. This can also include greater worker autonomy, increased task identity and greater direct contact with workers performing servicing tasks.

Maslow

Abraham Maslow is often referred to as the father of humanist psychology. He based his needs hierarchy theory of motivation on the idea that individuals work to satisfy human needs, such as food, and complex psychological needs, such as self-esteem. He coined the term "hierarchy of needs" to account for the roots of human motivation.

According to Maslow, a fulfilled need did little to motivate an employee. For example, a person who has sufficient food to eat cannot be enticed to do something for a reward of food. In contrast, a person with an unfulfilled need can be persuaded to work to satisfy that need. Thus, a hungry person might work hard for food. Maslow called this the deficit principle.

Deficit principle

- It is a person's unsatisfied needs that influence his behavior.
- The unsatisfied need becomes a focal motivator.
- The satisfied need no longer influences an individual's behavior.
- Managers should be alert for unmet needs and then create rewards to satisfy them.

Progression principle

- Higher order needs are not active motivators until lower order needs are fulfilled.
- Unfulfilled lower order needs take precedence over higher level needs. For example, for a person who is hungry, his need for food will far outweigh his need for self respect.

The needs described within Maslow's theory include:

- **Physiological needs** – Needs required to sustain life, such as, air, water, food, and sleep. According to this theory, if these needs are not satisfied, then an individual will surely be motivated to satisfy them. Higher-order needs will not be recognized unless one satisfies the needs that are basic to existence.
- **Safety and security** – Once physiological needs are met, one's attention turns to safety and security and to be free from the threat of physical and emotional harm. Such needs maybe fulfilled by living in a safe area, medical insurance, job security, and financial reserves.
- **Social needs** – Once lower-level needs are met, higher-level motivators awaken, the first of which are social needs. Social needs are about interaction with others and may include friendship, belonging to a group, and giving and receiving love.
- **Esteem needs** – After a person feels that he or she belongs, the urge to attain a degree of importance emerges. Esteem needs can be categorized as external motivators and internal motivators. Internally motivating esteem needs are those such as self-esteem, accomplishment, and self-respect. External esteem needs are those such as reputation, social status, and recognition.
- **Self-actualization** – This is the summit of Maslow's motivation theory. It is about the quest for reaching one's full potential as a person. Self-actualized people tend to have motivators such as truth, justice, wisdom, and meaning. They are said to have frequent occurrences of peak experiences, which are energized moments of profound happiness and harmony. According to Maslow, only a small percentage of the population reaches the level of self-actualization.

Applying Maslow's needs hierarchy in the workplace

If Maslow's theory holds true, there are some important implications for management. Managers have varied opportunities to motivate employees through management style, job designs, company events, and compensation packages.

To follow Maslow's theory, managers are encouraged to do the following:

- **Physiological motivation:** Provide ample breaks for lunch and recuperation. Devise a salary scheme that would allow your workers to buy life's essentials.
- **Safety needs:** Employees cannot reach maximum effectiveness or efficiency when they feel the need to constantly check their backs and scan their surroundings for fear of potential threats. Physical threats in the work environment can be alleviated by security guards, cameras, and responsive management personnel. Managers should also provide relative job security, retirement benefits, and the like.
- **Social needs:** Generate a feeling of acceptance, belonging, and community by reinforcing team dynamics, planning team-based projects and social events.
- **Esteem motivators:** Recognize achievements, assign important projects, and provide status to make employees feel valued and appreciated.
- **Self-actualization:** Offer challenging and meaningful work assignments that enable innovation, creativity, and progress to long-term goals. Provide opportunities that would allow your employees to reach their full career potential.

It is important for us to remember that everyone is not motivated by the same needs. At various points in their lives and careers, employees will be motivated by completely different needs. It is imperative to recognize the needs employees are currently pursuing.

Alderfer

In 1969, Clayton Alderfer developed a revision of Abraham Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, called the ERG (existence, relatedness and growth) theory of motivation. Alderfer's contribution to organizational behavior was dubbed the ERG theory, and was created to align Maslow's motivation theory more closely with empirical research.

Alderfer distinguishes three categories of human needs that influence worker's behavior. These are existence, relatedness and growth.

1. **Existence needs:** physiological and safety needs, such as hunger, thirst and sex.
2. **Relatedness needs:** social and external esteem involvement with family, friends, co-workers and employers.
3. **Growth needs:** internal esteem and self-actualization, the desire to be creative, productive and to complete meaningful tasks.

The ERG theory does not believe in levels of needs. A lower-level need does not have to be gratified. This theory accounts for a variety

of individual differences, which would cause workers to satisfy their needs at hand, regardless of whether a previous need has been satisfied. Hence, needs in the different ERG areas can be felt simultaneously.

According to Alderfer, the frustration-regression principle has an impact on workplace motivation. For example, if growth opportunities are not offered to the employees, they may regress towards relatedness needs, and socialize more with co-workers. If management can recognize these conditions early, steps can be taken to satisfy the frustrated needs until the employees are able to pursue growth again.

Kolb's theory of adult learning

Considering that all learners are not the same, David Kolb introduced an experiential learning theory in 1984. Of the various existing approaches to learning, David Kolb's theory of adult learning seems to actually take cultural differences into consideration. His theory centered around two ideas: 1) people learn in a two-step process (information is obtained and information is processed); and 2) individuals differ in the methods they prefer to do the two-step process (Little, 2004).

Kolb developed four styles of learning for his theory and considers each group to represent four different methods of inputting and processing information. Therefore, if cultural differences account for variations in the manner in which people learn and are motivated, Kolb's approach offers an understanding and various approaches to motivating a diverse group of employees.

Additionally, organizations have successfully relied upon Kolb's Learning Style Inventory, as defined by (Kolb et al. 1979), which includes four learning styles:

1. **Converger:** Someone who wants to solve a problem and who relies heavily upon hypothetical-deductive reasoning ... to focus on specific problems (Kolb et al., 1979).
2. **Diverger:** Someone who solves problems by viewing situations from many perspectives and who relies heavily upon brainstorming and generation of ideas (Kolb et al., 1979).
3. **Assimilator:** Someone who solves problems by inductive reasoning and ability to create theoretical models (Kolb et al., 1979).
4. **Accommodator:** Someone who solves problems by carrying out plans and experiments ... and adapting to specific immediate circumstances (Kolb et al., 1979).

To determine a person's learning style, the person completes an instrument called Learning-Style Inventory by answering questions contained in the Self-Scoring Inventory and Interpretation Booklet (Kolb, 1985).

Additionally, Kolb defined four learning cycles:

1. **Concrete experience:** Where learning from feelings (Kolb, 1995) or reactions to experience influence your learning.
2. **Reflective observation:** Where learning from watching and listening (Kolb, 1985) influence your learning.
3. **Active conceptualization:** Where learning from thinking (Kolb, 1985) or analyzing problems in a systematic method influence your learning.
4. **Active experimentation:** Where learning by doing (Kolb, 1985) or results influence your learning.

These four cycles are tied into learning styles. For instance, a converger favors a learning cycle of abstract conceptualization and active experimentation, which fits because these two learning cycles are characterized by learning by doing and thinking. And because convergers focus on reasoning and solving problems, the cycles and learning styles are closely tied together.

But, it should be noted, that while students prefer one learning style to another, students will move between learning cycles; Kolb says actual process of growth in any single individual ... probably proceeds through successive oscillations form one stage to another (Kolb, et al., 1979).

Applying Kolb's theory and inventory in the workplace

These four styles are based upon established learning theories, such as Kolb's own adult learning theory. Organizations often use the inventory as a way to understand the dynamics within a team. This then helps the organization to implement efforts to increase motivation, based on the known learning styles of team members.

Management theory

W. Edwards Deming was a statistician and mathematical physicist by trade. He believed that performance did not come from the individual, but rather that performance came from the system or the lack of a system. He also stated that one effective solution is to engage employees in the process of improving the system. People are born with intrinsic motivation, self-esteem, and dignity. One inherits joy in work and joy in learning.

Deming's management theory is centered on thinking of an organization and the vendors and customers of the organization as a system. With what he called "profound knowledge," this system may be managed to yield maximum value to all involved. Profound knowledge itself is a system.

Deming identified four interacting parts to this system of knowledge:

1. Appreciation for a system.
2. Knowledge about variation.
3. Theory of knowledge.
4. Psychology.

The first part, which is appreciation for a system, has already been mentioned: Recognition of relationships within and between organizations and the potential for these relationships to maximize value is crucial to realizing value. Smart systems allow for synergy – wholes greater than the sum of their parts. Appreciation for a system means that parts of an organization are always considered in relationship to other parts, and the aim of the system.

The second part of Deming's system of profound knowledge, knowledge about variation, is crucial for understanding various phenomena that occur in a system and making smart decisions in designing and managing a system. Deming emphasized the importance of discerning (through proper statistical methods) what variation is built into a repeating process and will predictably occur within certain limits, and what variation represents extraneous phenomena, or the existence of chaos. Knowledge about variation also allows managers to make better decisions about what variation should be reduced and what variation should be left alone or even increased.

The third part of Deming's system of profound knowledge was theory of knowledge, which is about understanding how knowledge is created, and how there is no substitute for knowledge in managing a system. Deming defined knowledge as rational predictions (or

theories) about relationships between phenomena that are separate in time. A rational prediction is a prediction that conforms faithfully to observations that have been made through the present. A theory must change when new observations refute previous theory.

Knowledge is built through cycles of theory, experience, and then corroboration or revisions of theory. Good theory or knowledge is essential for creating value in a system. Knowledge must be extracted from experience, and sought from outside the system, to manage well. The alternatives to management by knowledge – such as superstition, luck, hoping and wishing, copying examples without understanding, following tradition for its own sake – tend to take away value.

The last part of Deming's system of profound knowledge, psychology, comprises knowledge about what humans do and why they do it.

Psychology is extremely relevant to organizations in that "human beings doing things" is what organizations are. Even the non-human pieces of an organization (e.g., machines, buildings, physical raw materials, procedures) were ultimately the result of human beings doing things.

He was especially concerned with effective uses of motivation and emphasized the motivating power of the joy, satisfaction, and pride that occurs when one contributes to an effective system. He noted how many typical employee reward programs are contrary to appreciation for a system, and hurt, rather than help, morale. He also was concerned about organizational cultures based on fear, which is destructive to both the system and to individuals.

Goal-setting theory

In 1960s, Edwin Locke put forward the goal-setting theory of motivation. This theory states that goal setting is essentially linked to task performance. It states that specific and challenging goals along with appropriate feedback contribute to higher and better task performance. In simple words, goals indicate and give direction to an employee about what needs to be done and how much effort is required to be put in.

Goal-setting theory places a large focus on the following elements:

- **Self-efficiency:** The individual's self-confidence and faith that he or she has the potential to perform the task. The higher the level of self-efficiency, the greater the efforts put forth by the individual when he or she is faced with various challenges. Meanwhile, the lower the level of self-efficiency, the fewer efforts the individual makes and the higher the likelihood the person may quit when met with challenges.
- **Goal commitment:** Goal-setting theory assumes that the individual is committed to the goal and will not leave the goal. Goal commitment is highly dependent on the following factors:
    - Goals are made open, known, and broadcasted.
    - Goals should be self-developed by the individual rather than designated.
    - Individuals' goals should be consistent with the organizational goals and vision.

Goal-setting theory is based on the notion that individuals sometimes have a drive to reach a clearly defined end state. Often, this end state is a reward in itself. A goal's efficiency is affected by three features: proximity, difficulty and specificity.

An ideal goal should present a situation where the time between the initiation of behavior and the end state is close. This explains why some children are more motivated to learn how to ride a bike than to master algebra.

A goal should be moderate, not too hard or too easy to complete. In both cases, most people are not optimally motivated, because many want a challenge (which assumes some kind of insecurity of success). At the same time people want to feel that there is a substantial probability that they will succeed.

Specificity is important in the description of the goal. The goal should be objectively defined and intelligible for individuasl. A classic example of a poorly specified goal is to get the highest possible grade. Most children have no idea how much effort they need to reach that goal.

Self-determination theory

Self-determination theory (SDT) was developed by Edward Deci and Richard Ryan. It focuses on the importance of intrinsic motivation in driving human behavior. Like Maslow's hierarchical theory and others that built on it, SDT posits a natural tendency toward growth and development.

Unlike these other theories, however, SDT does not include any sort of "autopilot" for achievement, but instead requires active encouragement from the environment. The primary factors that encourage motivation and development are autonomy, competence feedback, and relatedness.

How it impacts the workplace

Employers need to get to know their employees very well and use different tactics to motivate each of them based on their personal wants and needs. Happy, motivated employees are indeed better workers and will help to generate a positive work environment that both customers and employees will better appreciate. Seeking ways to motivate and build worker morale pays dividends to any business or organization. The motivated worker is more committed to the job and to the customer.

Organizations motivate employees by investing in them. Motivating people is not just about a financial investment, though, but also an emotional one. A motivated workforce has more productive employees and this translates into bottom line cost savings. On the other hand, motivated employees positively impact corporate culture, resulting in many intangible but equally important returns.

The end result when an organization invests in employees both emotionally and financially is plain to see: happy customers and increased revenues. A motivated workforce can truly have bottom line impact and make the workplace somewhere employees look forward to interacting with others instead of just a place to pick up a paycheck.

Motivation varies in different people. We can also say that motivation is the willingness to work at a certain level of effort. Motivation emerges, in current theories, out of needs, values, goals, intentions, and expectation. Because motivation comes from within, managers need to cultivate and direct the motivation that their employees already have.

Motivation comes from within us, such as thoughts, beliefs, ambitions, and goals. The people who are most interested in motivation studies are managers of people because they may provide insights into why people perform at work as they do, and as a result, provide managers with techniques to improve worker productivity.

One of the traditional components of management along with planning, organizing, and controlling is motivating. Many managers do different things, for example, contests; ranking of people, plants,

shifts, teams and departments; performance appraisals; performance; production; sales quotas; and commission pay. All these systems are implemented in the belief that they drive performance.

But some researchers think it does the opposite. Instead of trying to use extrinsic motivators (something outside of the work itself such as promised rewards or incentives) to get higher levels of performance from people, management will be better served by studying the organization as a system. Employers demand results. Without results, the organization will not survive. Managing motivation is a requirement for productivity.

Theorists studying intrinsic motivation have provided the clearest demonstration of the link between the provision of choice and human motivation. By far the most prominent analysis of this concept (e.g., Deci, 1981; Deci & Ryan, 1985), which draws in part on earlier work by deCharms (1968), virtually equates intrinsic motivation with individual choice and personal self-determination. In this analysis, people are viewed as actors seeking to exercise and validate a sense of control over their external environments. As a result, they are theorized to enjoy, to prefer, and to persist at activities that provide them with the opportunity to make choices, to control their own outcomes, and to determine their own fate (Condry, 1977; Deci, 1975, 1981; Lepper & Malone, 1987; Malone & Lepper, 1987; Nuttin, 1973; Zuckerman, Porac, Lathin, Smith, & Deci, 1978).

The absence of choice and control has been hypothesized and shown to produce a variety of detrimental effects on intrinsic motivation, life satisfaction, and health status (e.g., Deci, Speigel, Ryan, Koestner, & Kaufman, 1982; Schulz & Hanusa, 1978; Seligman, 1975).

The achievement of performance measures depends on both the collective efforts of agency employees as well as the individual efforts of employees in specific roles. Therefore, the motivation for collective achievement within an organization is a key element. According to Ruvolo et al (2004), leader development initiatives will fail miserably without a clear understanding of the existing organizational culture and the powerful impact it has on shaping and maintaining behavior in ways that are almost invisible.

Motivational elements are connected with humanistic aspects of management as well as immaterial organizational resources. (Krzemien & Wolniak, 2007). In the reality of the knowledge-based economy, only intellectual resources are considered to be unforgiveable, inimitable and can meet an organization success. Other assets, such as capital, machines, and devices, have recently become easy to acquire.

Motivation links managers with their workers in the most direct way. The efficiency managers who deal with the organization's quality management largely depend on their leadership skills as well as their ability to motivate employees. No proper leadership can be established without an appropriate motivational system in any organization, and without it, employees cannot perform their tasks precisely.

The problem with workers' motivation is particularly important in the management of the service sector, where there is a direct contact with a customer. Therefore, communication, politeness, kindness, and so on are extremely crucial. In the meantime, the importance of the service sector is growing. It is possible that the vast majority of newly created workplaces will occur in the service sector. The importance of services is rising even in production enterprises, where internal services are coming into a greater significance, such as, marketing, a delivery system, post-sale services, etc. (Krzemien & Wolniak, 2007).

There are numerous definitions of motivation, describing it as activities that are focused on a particular objective whose aim is to make others behave in the expected way. However, motivation can be defined in a subjective way, too. In this aspect, strongly motivated people undertake bigger efforts in comparison with the ones with no motivation. On this basis, it may be inferred that motivation can be characterized as a willingness to do something. The willingness depends on a possibility to fulfill individual needs.

Motivation deals with factors influencing people to behave in a specified way. In motivation, three elements may be distinguished: the direction (what a person tries to do), the effort (how hard a person tries), and the persistence (how long a person will try).

Motivation includes power (objectives and results). These factors initiate and control behavior. Motivation can also be understood in two aspects. In an attributive perspective, it denotes an internal process that regulates people's behavior at work. The internal process affects their decisions about taking a job and also about their involvement in this job.

By contrast, motivation in a functional way is often defined as a conscious and intentional influence on people's behavior with the use of knowledge about factors determining it in the work process. Problems with insufficient workers' motivation are much more difficult to overcome than difficulties with other resources. For example, when an organization has unsuitable machines, it is simple to replace them. When a company has raw materials of a poor quality, it is possible to find new suppliers. When workers' knowledge or performance is unsatisfactory, they can attend professional courses.

The continued need for individual and organizational development can be traced to numerous demands, including maintaining superiority in the marketplace, enhancing employee skills and knowledge, and increasing productivity. Training is one of the most pervasive methods for enhancing the productivity of individuals and communicating organizational goals to new personnel. In 2000, U.S. organizations with 100 or more employees budgeted to spend $54 billion on formal training (Industry Report, 2000).

Given the importance and potential impact of training on organizations and the costs associated with the development and implementation of training, it is important that both researchers and practitioners have a better understanding of the relationship between design and evaluation features and the effectiveness of training and development efforts.

Relationships within the workplace are significant to motivation as well. Employees who have a positive working relationship with their supervisor are more likely to be motivated to perform well. Those who lack this positive working relationship are less likely to be motivated. Others are motivated by their working relationships with co-workers or with their clients. Until recently, American social psychologists studying interpersonal processes have excluded from their studies participants in continuing relationships.

Predictably, the main recent exception involves research on romantic relationships, although even there the focus is often on initial attraction instead of the evolving or ongoing features of the relationship itself. Even when intergroup or intragroup dynamics are the focus of investigation, it is generally previously unacquainted individuals or arbitrarily defined groups that are studied.

When group dynamics of continuing relationships are not the focus of attention, researchers typically study the responses to actions by, communications from, or even written information about strangers rather than friends, family, coworkers, or others in long-term relationships. In a sense, relational and social contexts are treated as sources of noise, or even bias, to be eliminated in the search for "basic" underlying processes and functional relationships between variables.

Independent versus interdependent

Some employees are intrinsically motivated to perform quality work, and those individuals inject a strong work ethic into their roles and achievements. These people are often driven by the opportunity for choice and self-determination (Ivengar & Lepper, 1999).

Others require assistance in understanding their roles and what they are working toward besides a paycheck and benefits. According to Meglino et al (1989), individuals may at times work with a high level of efficiency and be committed to their organizations while at the same time perform behaviors that are inconsistent with the success of their organization.

Research has noted considerable differences between many Western European cultures and Asian cultures. Markus & Shinobu (1991) describe these differences as rooted in independent or interdependent approaches, which affect cognition, emotion, and motivation.

Asian culture has focused on the need to be part of the group and conform to values and beliefs of coworkers or group members. Western European culture has displayed the individual as self-contained, autonomous, and independent, which may place higher focus on individual achievements and the effect of those individual traits on motivation.

American and Western European cultural norms place higher emphasis on individual competition among team members, while British athletes have typically displayed levels of competitiveness on behalf of the team and its goals and behaviors (Sullivan & Callow, 2005).

FACTORS THAT AFFECT EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION

Stress

Just as stress can affect the physical well-being of an employee, it can just as easily have a negative effect on the individual's psychological well-being. We know that physically, stress can lead to headaches, grinding teeth, clenched jaws, chest pain, shortness of breath, pounding heart, high blood pressure, muscle aches, indigestion, constipation or diarrhea, increased perspiration, fatigue, insomnia, and frequent illness.

Stress can also result in psychological reactions, such as anxiety, irritability, sadness, defensiveness, anger, mood swings, hypersensitivity, apathy, depression, slowed thinking or racing thoughts; feelings of helplessness, hopelessness, or of being trapped.

Behavioral changes can occur as well, such as, overeating or loss of appetite, impatience, quickness to argue, procrastination, increased use of alcohol or drugs, increased smoking, withdrawal or isolation from others, neglect of responsibility, poor job performance, poor personal hygiene, change in religious practices, and change in close family relationships.

Each of these types of responses has a significant impact on people's ability to maintain their level of motivation.

Stress factors in the workplace can also lead employees to feel they might be happier elsewhere, either in a different organization that may have elements that appeal to them, or in a different field altogether, because they feel the current stress they experience does not exist in other fields or organizations (Shim, 2010).

Stress can come in many forms. Interpersonal communications and relationships alone can exist in several variations, depending on the roles of the individuals and the requirements that each one is focused on meeting.

Goals and barriers will vary across levels of employment. What exists as a primary goal for a manager may not be the primary goal of the administrative support staff, of the quality assurance staff, and the levels of operational staff. Even if the overall goal or agency mission is the same for everyone, there are different pieces of the bigger-picture goal that are more important to certain people than others within the work population. This alone can create significant stress levels for all individuals involved (Moseley, Jeffers, & Paterson, 2008).

Stress in the workplace can also be caused by a series of other elements. It can result from the access to, lack thereof, or the efficiency of existing technological devices or available resources. Stress can also arise from change in policies and procedures and a lack of clarification; changes in organizational structure or responsibilities; interactions with clients or the public; and increased workload because of exiting coworkers (Westbrook et al., 2006).

Overall, stress can lead to burnout, which in some fields can be linked to what is called compassion fatigue. According to Pfifferling & Gilley (2000), "compassion fatigue is a deep physical, emotional and spiritual exhaustion accompanied by acute emotional pain ... flourishing today, due in part to the demands of managed care" (p. 39). This form of stress, often caused by having a direct impact on a person's life as a result of career role, is often found in medical, health, and social services fields.

Lack of advancement opportunities

For employees who are motivated by external factors, a lack of advancement opportunities or increase in financial compensation may result in decreased levels of motivation. Lack of advancement opportunities is typically cited as one of the top five reasons people leave a place of employment. Therefore, we can assume that even if someone remains in his or her current role, the person's level of motivation to do quality work will decrease over time.

Workplace violence

Workplace violence is often described as threats, threatening statements, or threatening behaviors that give a reasonable cause to believe that the employee is at risk of physical injury, as well as attempted conduct of a person that endangers the physical health or physical safety of the employee. (Occupational Health and Safety Act, 1996).

Violence can occur in many forms. These include supervisor to worker, among co-workers, and client to worker. This violence can be manifested through physical, sexual, verbal, emotional and psychological actions, but violence can occur in other forms, such as excessive workloads, unsafe working conditions, and inadequate support. Most individuals may not associate workload with the term "violence," though it is easy to understand how it falls into this category; unrealistic workload assignments (especially in extreme conditions) may quickly turn into an element of a hostile work environment. Past research findings also suggest a direct link between aggression and increases in sick leave, burnout, and staff turnover.

Creativity

While you may not expect to see "creativity" appear next to stress, lack of advancement opportunities, and workplace violence, interestingly, Ambrose and Kulik (1999) found that the same variables that predict intrinsic motivation are associated with creativity. This is a helpful conclusion in that organizations can measure and influence both creativity and motivation simultaneously.

Further, allowing employees to choose creative and challenging jobs or tasks has been shown to improve motivation. To increase creativity, setting "creativity goals" can positively influence the process, along with allowing more autonomy (e.g., giving employees the freedom to feel and to be creative).

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Creating a positive organizational culture is clearly an important aspect of great leadership and as such, a large focus within the field of I/O psychology. Organizational culture refers to an organization's shared values, beliefs, norms, and customs.

- How do people dress?
- Do they socialize?
- Are decorated cubicles acceptable?
- Can the employees talk to the CEO?

These are the kinds of questions a new employee might ask, and the answers can reveal how formal, warm, and status-conscious the workplace culture is. Organizational culture describes the "flavor" of an organization, often referred to as the "way we get things done around here" (Deal & Kennedy, 1982).

Types of organizational culture

Researchers have proposed a variety of theoretical approaches to organizational culture (Schein, 2005). One approach describes four types of organizational culture (Handy, 1985):

Power culture: Power is centralized to only a few people. Control is enforced from the center of the organization outward. A power culture typically has few rules and little bureaucracy and is characterized by quick decision-making.

Role culture: Structure is clearly defined and authority is delegated. Typically such a culture is hierarchical in structure, with authority flowing from the top down.

Task culture: Teams are used to solve particular problems, with expertise driving the status of members. The person who knows the most about the problem at hand takes charge until some other problem comes along.

Person culture: Everyone believes that he or she is above the organization itself. An organization with this type of culture has difficulty surviving because the members have not "bought into" a shared mission.

Leadership among different cultures is essential in cross-cultural organizations (Manning, 2003). In a multi-cultural context, leaders are increasingly addressing the need to inspire and lead people from different cultures. Effective leadership calls for both an awareness and understanding of these cultures. Typically, global leaders were selected based on technical skills and organizational commitment; however, today, leading across cultural boundaries requires specific interpersonal behaviors and skills.

Leaders must also be able to appreciate how people from different cultures perceive them and understand actions (Yukl, 2006). Dickson, Den Hartog, and Mitchelson (2003) explained that different cultural contexts call for different leadership behaviors. One way to address the research of the relationship between leadership and cultural differences is through the recognition and measurement of cultural dimensions (Dickson et al.), which have been honed and developed by many researchers (Hofstede, 2001; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004).

Research has shown a strong correlation between leaders' awareness of cultural dimensions and successful performance in organizations in different societies (House et al., 2004; Javidan et al., 2006). This makes it extremely important for leaders to consider and perhaps modify their leadership style to fit the context and culture of the organization to successfully establish relationships with employees and management. Awareness and sensitivity to different operating cultures in the organization is imperative to achieving both contingent and strategic changes that may be needed in the pursuit of its mission (Dickson et al, 2003).

Leadership practices must be in tune with the complex milieu in which leaders perform. Leadership behavior is further influenced by other situational behavior, such as the climate, level and function of the manager, position, power and authority (Yukl, 2006).

As the culture of an organization changes, the relationship between members and their stakeholders change (Awal, Klingler, Rongione, & Stumpf, 2006). As the organization changes slowly over time, it is characterized by affiliated, communal, and approval values and beliefs, resulting in individuals getting along, avoiding conflict and following rules while demonstrating a supportive pleasant behavior (Awal et al., 2006).

Diversity and management techniques

Diversity in the workplace has increased in the United States and has contributed to individuals gaining a global perspective with an increase in opportunities for companies to grow. Yukl (2006) pointed out that although diversity has many benefits, it may also create an environment with less trust and conflict because of the various points of view on how to address various issues. Managing diversity is necessary to foster a climate that is conducive to overall success.

Individuals have an opportunity to learn from one another and gain knowledge that may lead to a better understanding or a better approach at resolving problems. Hosley, Gensheimer, & Yang (2003) indicated that successful collaborative efforts between individuals in a diverse work group must begin with trust and respect. Furthermore, the various cultural, gender and or other diverse styles should be incorporated into all areas of the work, including "meetings, decision-making, and communication patterns" (Hosley et al., 2003, p. 5).

According to Hartel, Panipucci, & Fujimoto (2003), individuals are more likely to be receptive to the decisions made within a diverse work group when they are open-minded and have social environments that value and encourage positive stereotypes rather than negative stereotypes. Hartel et al. (2003) also indicated that it is beneficial for

organizations to incorporate HR policies and practices that are focused on the diversity levels that exist.

Whereas workers may wonder if they have certain rights as employees to challenge or address concerns, an HR policy that supports diversity would allow for employees to participate in a grievance process that would address the concerns and provide support for the necessary changes to occur.

Yukl (2006) described various ways for leaders to encourage diversity and teach individuals the value of working through conflicting issues. A few of the methods that were outlined included offering diversity training, promoting structural mechanisms to reduce discrimination that would allow for individuals to address intolerance, effective recruitment strategies, and programs that provide equal opportunities to all employees when it comes to professional development and access to promotions within the organization. Leaders who are willing to address concerns made by individuals are more likely to gain the respect that they need so that they can offer insight into the development of their organization.

Doyle & George (2008) concluded that organizations must measure how well they are integrating diversity. That there is a plan in place to address the progress that individuals within a workplace are making when it comes to effective communication, work performance, effective decision-making and access to growth within an organization is an accomplishment and a move toward equity, social justice, and empowerment. Leaders are responsible for establishing an effective framework for their employees.

Broome (2003) explained that a leader should be aware of the unique needs within the group. He stated that embracing the unique qualities that each individual contributes to the work group as well as avoiding pointing out individuals by race, gender, ethnic group, or culture will increase the level of performance.

Individuals are likely to form subgroups within an organization if they feel that they do not belong to the group or the work team as a whole. It is important for managers to recognize that the inclusion of all team members, especially members who are of a minority group, is necessary to avoid motivating them to form their own subgroups and developing a distinct vision for themselves while dividing the team approach. It is also important to recognize the accomplishments of the team members as a team rather than as individuals (Panipucci & Hartel, 2003).

While leaders may find it difficult to build a strong organizational culture because of the various perspectives that each team member brings, it is necessary to use their skills as a listener and facilitator to gain the various perspectives and incorporate them into the organizational culture. Miller and Fields (2000) indicated that although individuals like to be surrounded by others who share the same interest, speak the same language, and have the same values, a leader in an organization is more likely to benefit from the various perspectives that diversity offers. Miller and Fields stated, “Managing diversity also enhances organizational flexibility” (p. 20).

Diversity training is an effective method for developing a safe environment to learn about others’ thoughts and beliefs. Karp and Sammour (2000) pointed out that although individuals may resist diversity training, it provides them with the opportunity to learn the legal ramifications involved in making fair decisions within the workplace. The approach that is taken with diversity training will affect how it is received.

Knowing the audience and choosing the appropriate individuals to conduct the training as well as the topics that pertain to the group that is being addressed will not only enhance the learning opportunities for the organization, but also provide a more satisfying approach to learning about managing diversity. Pendry, Driscoll, and Field (2007) stressed that it is important to be aware of how individuals may react to diversity training scenarios and not assume that what works in the laboratory will work with individuals confronted with issues that they are unfamiliar with or that they are not willing to accept.

A trainer may provide individuals with an assessment before beginning the training to find out where they stand on tolerance and their understanding of diversity issues before actually beginning the training (Hostager & Meuse, 2008). Once leaders are able to unite their teams, they can begin working toward positive change.

In cross-cultural leadership, there are many different styles, models, and theories used to develop leaders for an international environment. If leaders are going to be effective in meetings, planning, and leading their followers, they must develop strategic skills. Many of these skills can influence attitudes and behaviors of leaders in a number of ways (Yukl, 2006).

Different cultures affect leaders because their values influence their attitudes and behaviors. Through practice, intentionality, and openness to experiential learning, leaders can increase their awareness and even acceptance of the differences in cultural dimensions (Brislin, Worthley, & Macnab, 2006). This means that leaders will have to immerse themselves in the target culture so they can learn from the social experiences to assimilate cultural intelligence.

Thomas (2006) suggested paying attention to and appreciating critical differences in culture and background between oneself and others, recognizing how culture affects behavior and the importance of different behaviors. Intentions and inquisitiveness will go a long way in equipping leaders with the capacity to observe and adjust their behavior and leadership style to enhance their experience in new cultural situations, thus enabling effective cross-cultural leadership (Templer, Tay, & Chandrasekar, 2006).

Cultural leaders are often faced with the challenges of making group decisions. With many changes occurring in an organization, making decisions is important. Although cultures are different, strong leaders have adopted techniques that are used in building strong group units. According to McFadzean and O’Loughlin, (2000) some strategies for improving group effectiveness in organizations include developing and implementing innovative ways of decision-making.

Researchers additionally argue that building teams with the right individuals and using techniques that improve or create creativity are important. Coaching, training, and building communication skills are also important to improve behavior and thinking skills. Other techniques may involve planning events and supporting the meetings by using effective facilitation techniques, interventions and appropriate technology to improve communication, generate ideas and develop group memory (McFadzean & O’Loughlin).

Different individuals will have different preferences, and certainly the more choices available, the more these individuals will be able to find and select alternatives that best match their personal preferences. In addition, the mere exercise of choice itself may have psychological benefits. People offered a choice may feel a sense of autonomy, control, or empowerment.

But are these principles truly as self-evident and as universal as they might first appear to investigators raised and living in North America? The American assumption is that people will find choice intrinsically motivating, and psychologists have rarely paused to examine the more general applicability of these findings.

An influential cultural analysis presented by Markus and Kitayama (1991a, 1991b) attempts to explain and shed some light on the mechanisms that might underlie these differences. Their self-systems theory argues that whereas personal agency is an essential element of the self-constructs of American individualists, it may be much less relevant to the self-constructs of members of more collectivistic cultures characteristic of Asia and elsewhere. Markus and Kitayama’s

analysis suggests that the link between the provision of choice and intrinsic motivation may not be universally applicable.

For Americans, making a choice provides an opportunity to display their preferences and consequently, to express internal attributes, assert their autonomy, and fulfill the goal of being unique. For Americans, individual choice and personal autonomy may be deeply intertwined with a their sense of self-identity.

In contrast to American individualists, Markus and Kitayama (1991a, 1991b) theorize that members of more interdependent cultures (i.e., most non-Western, and particularly East Asian cultures) strive for interconnectedness and belongingness with their social in-groups, seek to maintain harmony and endeavor to fulfill the wishes of those groups (DeVos, 1985; Hsu, 1985; Miller, 1988; Shweder & Bourne, 1984).

For such individuals, the exercise of personal choice may have considerably less intrinsic value. Indeed, in some situations, the exercise of personal choice might even pose a threat to individuals whose personal preferences could prove to be at variance with those of their reference group. Interdependent people, therefore, might sometimes actually prefer to submit to choices expressed by others if the situation enables them to fulfill the cultural goal of belongingness.

For individuals possessing interdependent selves, we might hypothesize that the effects of having choices made by others might depend critically on the specific identity of the choosers. Depending on the degree of closeness between the chooser and the individual, a person making choices for another can be perceived either as a compassionate or as arrogant.

If availability of individual choice is indeed less relevant for people from more socially interdependent cultures, then social psychologists may be faced with the challenge of re-conceptualizing a number of traditional theories and paradigms.

Such cultural differences may prove important, for example, in many other classic social psychological theories in which choice or perceptions of choice have been shown to play a central role. Such well-known theories as cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957; Heine & Lehman, 1997), attribution theory (Morris & Peng, 1994), and psychological reactance (Brehm, 1966), to name just a few, may not apply to non-individualistic cultures without some modification.

In our society, for instance, it is typically presumed that when a person engages in some behavior merely to please or to conform to the ideals of others, that action is extrinsically motivated (deCharms, 1968; Deci, 1975; Harter, 1981). In deCharms's (1968) terms, "The crux of the distinction between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation lies in the knowledge or feeling of personal causation" (p. 328).

Although this assumption is clearly consistent with the American self-system, the boundaries between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation may need to be reconsidered when taking into account the interdependent self for whom conformity to one's in-group is an integral aspect of the self-system.

Gender

Gender and its tie with leadership has been and continues to be an area of interest. Selection and promoting leaders in large organizations tends to favor males, though some increases in female leader numbers are being seen (Laff, 2007; Yukl, 2006). However, the majority of high-profile, high-level positions in organizations are held by men (Gilgoff, 2009). Various theories attempt to explain why this gap exists, but the research tends to be weak, inconsistent and lacks suggested remedies (de Vries, 2008; Staley, 1984; Yukl, 2006).

The studies to date tend to focus on gender-based differences in displayed leadership behavior and effectiveness without thoroughly considering the variables that influence leadership. Additionally, the studies do not investigate the magnitude of differences or provide suggestions into why the differences exist (Yukl, 2006).

Laff (2007) provides four findings from the Women's Leader Study. Recognizing these findings, but also leveraging what women bring to the meeting in terms of leadership and organizational change can improve decision-making in group meetings. Those findings include: Women leaders are more persuasive than men; they are negatively impacted by rejection but they learn from the experience; women leaders display an inclusive, team-oriented style to solve problems and reach decisions; and women leaders are more likely to take risks. Fennell (1999) also suggests women leaders are less conservative than their male counterparts and tend to use relational power behaviors.

It is also important that men and women be sensitive to and aware of the possibility that the gendered nature of meetings could be a barrier for female-oriented leadership (Grisoni & Beeby, 2007). The key to breaking down this barrier – and improving group decisions – is the importance of an open and inclusive dialogue that allows all team members to exchange information, actively listen and understand the topic as well as participative discussions (Grisoni & Beeby).

Team meetings should have a purpose and an outline of what is to be discussed. Individuals who meet on a regular basis are more likely to have a system in place for accomplishing agenda items and the ability to move forward on action items. According to Lee (2008), assigning roles to help the meeting run smoother is beneficial.

Miller and Fields (2000) pointed out that diversity enhances the creative decision making process; therefore, incorporating individuals who are willing to offer suggestions and brainstorm solutions will positively contribute to the outcome of the meeting.

When individuals are open to learning, they allow for the possibilities that change may bring (Mannix & Neale, 2005). Leaders should provide a safe environment where individuals have the opportunity to brainstorm and offer constructive criticism. A leader may be receptive to ideas and be willing to provide feedback to those involved in the decision-making process when it comes to the end results. Acknowledgement of the team for its contributions and commitment to the decision-making will encourage continued support and a feeling of accomplishment.

Binns (2008) stresses that gender matters, both in the bodies described as male and female, but also in the behaviors and scripts leaders live by. Recognizing those scripts and incorporating the best each leader has to offer into the decision-making process will result in better decisions, and thus better outcomes.

Even with the inconsistencies that exist in the research, reflecting on the assertions and theories on why this gender leadership inequality exists is important. Implicit theories suggest the biases that exist about the abilities and behaviors of women are part of the discrimination that exists in the selection and promotion of women leaders (Yoder, 2001; Yukl, 2006).

Such biases arose from the notion that the personality traits necessary to be an effective leader were considered to be masculine in nature and supported by cultural beliefs (Gilgoff, 2009). Conversely, the strategies used in most organizations today require collaboration and relationship building, which are considered to be female-oriented traits and have created a female advantage contingent (Binns, 2008; Yukl, 2006). The caution here, however, is that this theory also feeds the biased-belief that a trait has a gender or is only displayed by a male or female (Yoder).

Sosik, Avolio, and Kahai (1997) assert that having leaders treat people as individuals with their own histories, experiences, and emotions ultimately creates better organizational commitment and productivity.

This approach employs the use of traditionally assigned female-oriented behaviors and traits (Binns, 2008).

Assigning gender to behaviors and traits, however, lends support to another approach used in gender and leadership studies, which is the application of stereotypes and role expectations (Yukl, 2006). Males are expected to be competitive and aggressive. Women displaying the same type of behavior are negatively viewed and tend to be evaluated and compensated less (Eagly, 2007; Kulich, Ryan, & Haslam, 2007).

Geddes (2009) found in her research that in times of war, people choose older, masculine faces as their leaders, while in times of stability and peace, feminine faces were chosen. This research suggests that in general, appearance and gender play a strong role in determining who leads in times of war and peace based on culturally influenced, assigned gender traits (Geddes).

Another explanation for the lack of women in leadership positions looks at whether and how women prepare themselves to take on these leadership roles. Wang (2009) cites the lack of leveraging social capital as a cause for the glass ceiling. By not actively networking or developing a mentoring relationship, females put themselves at a disadvantage (Eagly, 2007). Additionally, attributions of leadership and performance-based pay processes differ based on gender, with women needing to be charismatic to be seen as effective leaders, while men are assessed in terms of performance measures (Kulich et al., 2007).

Gender and leadership are tied together in research, stereotypes, role expectations, and personality traits. While research is being performed in this area, it tends to be inconsistent in terms of controls, methodologies, variables, and conclusions. Some research cites significant differences in gender-based leadership traits and effectiveness, while other studies find mixed or no gender-related differences (de Vries, 2008; Eagly, 2007; Staley, 1984). More research is indicated to determine what basis may exist for the gender/leadership gaps and what actions could be implemented to close the gap (Eagly, 2007; Wang, 2009).

JOB SATISFACTION

I/O psychologists are keenly interested in work attitudes, that is, how people feel about their jobs. Job satisfaction is the extent to which a person is content in his or her job. Job satisfaction is a relatively recent term, because in the past, the choice of occupation was not so much up to the individual. Instead, many people simply did whatever their parents did to earn a living.

As economic conditions and social changes have allowed more people access to education and employment, the question has become not only whether a job puts money in the bank and food on the table but also whether an individual feels fulfilled by his or her occupation. The happier that individuals are in their jobs, the more satisfied they are said to be.

The most common way to measure job satisfaction is to ask employees to report their reactions to their jobs using rating scales. Job satisfaction can be assessed globally, as with an item such as "How happy are you with your job, overall?" or in terms of more specific factors such as pay, work responsibilities, variety of tasks, promotional opportunities, the work itself, and co-workers.

Occupations define people in fundamental ways (Osipow, 2000). People identify with their work, and the work shapes many aspects of their lives. Work is an important influence on their financial standing, leisure activities, home location, friendships, and health.

One of the strongest predictors of job satisfaction is feeling that one is engaging in something meaningful or important. When asked about the meaning associated with their work, respondents nominated contributing to the economic maintenance of their family, having a job that allowed them to have a positive impact on the organization, and work as self-expression (Wrzesniewski, Dutton, & Debebe, 2003). Genentech declares the meaningfulness of its mission in straightforward terms on its website: "To cure cancer."

The way people think about their work and its place in their lives can have an impact on their work performance, their workplace, and their lives in general (Bartel, Blader, & Wrzesniewski, 2007; Jones & George, 2007). I/O psychologist Amy Wrzesniewski and her colleagues (1997) studied 300 workers and found that their perceptions of their occupation had a substantial impact on important aspects of their work and well-being.

Some described the occupation as a "job," one that involved no training and allowed no personal control and little freedom. These individuals tended to focus on the material benefits of work. Another group of participants identified their occupation as a "career." They saw their occupation as a stepping-stone to greater advancement and accordingly focused on the attainment of better pay, promotions, and moving up the organizational ladder.

A final group of participants viewed their occupation in terms of a "calling." They perceived the occupation as requiring a great deal of training and as involving personal control and freedom. For these individuals, work was not a means to financial ends but rather a valuable endeavor in and of itself. Indeed, some saw their occupation as their "mission in life."

Importantly, all of these individuals were describing the same job: that of a hospital maintenance worker. Other research has uncovered similar results for administrative assistants, with about equal numbers having each work orientation (Wrzesniewski, 2003).

Individuals who view their occupation as a calling are more likely to experience work as wholly meaningful and fulfilling. They show higher levels of life satisfaction and job satisfaction. These individuals are more likely to engage in citizenship behaviors, to devote more time to work, and to miss work less often (Bartel, Wrzesniewski, & Wiesenfeld, 2007; Wrzesniewski, 2003).

Those with a calling orientation also derive more satisfaction from the work domain than from hobbies or leisure activities. Perhaps not surprisingly, a predictor of taking a calling orientation to work is preexisting psychological well-being.

You might think that those who view their work as a calling must have just gotten lucky and found the right job for themselves. But Wrzesniewski (2003) argues that the ability to view one's occupation as a calling is a "portable" resource that a person can take from one context to another. She uses the term "job crafting" to refer to the physical and cognitive changes individuals can make within the constraints of a task to make the work "their own."

Here is an example:

> *A hospital maintenance worker takes it upon himself to start rotating the artwork on the walls of the hospital rooms as he cleans them. Doing so is not part of his written job description. It is his own idea for improving the quality of life for patients who face long hospital stays.*

Job crafting means taking advantage of the freedom one has to bring fulfillment to an occupation, whatever it may be. Job crafting opens up new avenues for meaning on the job by allowing the individual to reshape the task and relational boundaries of a job.

One cross-country comparative study examined job satisfaction in 24 different nations (Spector & et al., 2001). Workers in Canada were the most satisfied with their jobs; workers in England, the least satisfied. U.S. respondents fell in the upper third for job satisfaction.

Predictors of job satisfaction may vary for different jobs and different cultures. For example, in a study of 1,814 healthcare workers in

Norway, the job satisfaction of all of the respondents was related to their feelings about the local leadership of their organizations (Krogstad et al., 2006). But differences emerged for the various occupational groups in the study.

Researchers have determined that one factor that is not as strongly related to job satisfaction as might be expected is pay (Brasher & Chen, 1999). Among those who are making the minimum wage, some individuals are quite satisfied with their jobs. And among those who are earning a six-figure salary, some are dissatisfied. One study found that job satisfaction did not depend on the amount of money per se but rather on the person's perception that his or her pay was fair (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001).

It is possible then that it is the person, not the job, that matters most for job satisfaction. Certainly there is evidence that job satisfaction is relatively stable over time. A 50-year longitudinal study revealed that a worker's emotional disposition was linked to job satisfaction 50 years later (Staw, Bell, & Clausen, 1986). Some individuals may simply be predisposed to be satisfied. Of course, any group has its malcontents and complainers.

Even in the Hawthorne studies, researchers identified individuals called "chronic kickers" who complained no matter what the researchers did (Roethlisberger, 1941). There may not be one perfect job, but rather a very good but different job for each of us. Research that summarized the results of 21 studies indicated that the fit between the person and the job is the most important aspect of job satisfaction (Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003).

In a study that explored the worst things about their jobs, clerical employees in India and the United States described the most stressful aspects of their work (Narayanan, Menon, & Spector, 1999). Among the U.S. workers, lack of control was the second-greatest stressor, nominated by 25 percent of the participants. The Indian workers expressed the most stress about a lack of structure (again, about 25 percent described this issue). Interestingly, not a single American participant mentioned structure, and not a single Indian participant mentioned control.

When individuals are asked "What makes a job satisfying?" the answer may very well be "It depends," and the factors might include the person, the job, and the cultural context.

I/O psychologists also have been interested in the question of whether job satisfaction relates to other aspects of people's jobs, such as absenteeism, organizational citizenship, and performance. Job satisfaction is related to lower job turnover and absenteeism (Crampton & Wagner, 1994), an increase in organizational citizenship (Organ & Ryan, 1995), and performance (Judge et al., 2001). However, whether happy workers are more productive workers has been the source of some debate, as the critical controversy explores.

EMPLOYEE SELECTION

Industrial and organizational psychologists typically work with HR specialists to design recruitment processes and personnel selection systems. Personnel recruitment is the process of identifying qualified candidates in the workforce and getting them to apply for jobs within an organization. Personnel recruitment processes include developing job announcements, placing ads, defining key qualifications for applicants, and screening out unqualified applicants.

It is generally agreed that people are an organization's most valuable assets because it is people who are ultimately responsible for success in achieving an organization's goals. Accordingly, there is often intense competition among organizations to recruit the "best and brightest" employees. It is a disciplined competition, however. There is no point in hiring this year's top 10 accounting graduates if your organization only needs two new accountants. So the first step in effective recruiting is to determine what employees are needed and then to go after applicants to meet those needs.

Determining employment needs means more than just counting empty chairs. Analyses by I/O psychologists help organizations determine how many people in each position are needed at the moment and how many will be needed in the future.

Suppose that a computer company anticipates a 20 percent growth in business over the next five years. That growth will require a 20 percent increase in the number of customer service representatives, but how many new representatives should be hired each month?

An I/O psychologist's analysis would help answer this question. The analysis would take into account the growth projections as well as estimates of how many representatives quit each year and whether the existing ratio of customer service employees to customers is too high, too low, or about right for efficient operation.

In making recommendations about recruitment plans, I/O psychologists must also consider the intensity of demand for employees in various occupations. More active recruitment plans will be necessary to attract the best people in high-demand areas.

Another factor to consider is the initial presentation of the job to the applicant. Not only is the interviewer attempting to assess whether the candidate is the right fit for the position, but the candidate is considering whether the position is the right fit for him or her. If the position is presented in a manner that does not reflect the actual work experience, employees are more likely to leave sooner because of the undisclosed demands of the job or the perception that the organization did not share accurate information. Equally important is the accuracy of the physical job description, which is often reviewed and signed at the point of initial hire. (Faller et al., 2010)

Even before entering the workforce, individuals with high levels of well-being are more successful. They are more likely to graduate from college and to receive an interview for a job or a callback for a second interview than their counterparts with low levels of well-being (Burger & Caldwell, 2000; Frisch et al., 2004). Further, happy individuals appear to secure "better" jobs. In one study, employees with happier personalities had jobs that were rated by trained observers as having more autonomy, meaning, and variety (Staw, Sutton, & Pelled, 1994). Another study found that happiness at age 18 was related to financial independence, occupational attainment, and work autonomy at age 26 (Roberts, Caspi, & Moffitt, 2003).

Once happy individuals obtain a job, they are more likely to succeed than unhappy individuals. Happy employees receive relatively more favorable evaluations from supervisors and others (Wright & Staw, 1999). In one study, managers in three Midwestern organizations gave higher evaluations to happy employees than to unhappy employees, based on work quality, productivity, dependability, and creativity (Staw, Sutton, & Pelled, 1994).

Work performance is more strongly predicted by well-being than by job satisfaction. For example, in two studies, job performance (as judged by supervisors) was significantly related to well-being but not job satisfaction (Wright & Cropanzano, 2000).

A number of studies have found that happiness and positive affect are important aspects of the workplace. In one study, happy individuals performed objectively better on a task for their assessing managerial potential (including "leadership" and "mastery of information," as rated by objective observers) (Staw & Barsade, 1993). In other research, dormitory resident advisors were described by residents as being more effective if they were also rated as high on positive affect (DeLuga & Mason, 2000).

In another study, service departments with happy leaders were more likely to receive high ratings from customers, and the positive affective tone of the sales force was an independent predictor of customer satisfaction (George, 1995). Optimistic life insurance agents appear to sell more insurance (Seligman & Schulman, 1986). And optimistic CEOs receive higher performance ratings from the chairpersons of their boards and lead companies with greater returns on investment (Pritzker, 2002).

One reason that happy workers are more likely to be high performers is that they are less likely to show "job withdrawal." Job withdrawal often includes absenteeism, turnover, job burnout, and retaliatory behaviors (Donovan, 2000; Thoresen et al., 2003). Indeed, positive moods at work are linked to lower withdrawal and organizational retaliation and higher organizational citizenship behavior (Thoresen et al., 2003), as well as lower job burnout (Wright & Cropanzano, 1998).

In addition, individuals who experience calmer types of positive emotions on the job, such as serenity and contentment, are less likely to want to quit and to be in conflict with other workers (Van Katwyk et al., 2000).

TRAINING

Every year, organizations in the industrialized world spend billions to train their employees (Thompson et al., 2002); the figure is more than $126 billion each year in the United States alone (Paradise, 2007). I/O psychologists are often directly involved in identifying the need for training, in designing training methods and content, and in evaluating the outcome of training efforts. Some I/O psychologists actually conduct training programs, but in most cases, professional trainers deliver these programs.

Assessing training needs

To help organizations identify which employees need what kind of training, I/O psychologists typically carry out a training needs assessment that takes into account the organization's job categories, workforce, and goals (Goldstein, 1993). One aspect of this assessment is to look at job analysis reports. As mentioned earlier, the need for training is indicated when job analyses reveal that certain jobs require KSAOs that employees do not have or that could be strengthened.

A second aspect of a training needs assessment is to give employees a chance to describe the training they would like to have. This information often emerges from personal development plans that employees and their supervisors create. These plans usually include an evaluation of the person's strengths and weaknesses. The weaknesses suggest where training might be useful, especially for employees who are motivated to improve their skills (Klein, Noe, & Wang, 2006). For example, if the supervisor notes that an individual is awkward when making presentations, a course in public speaking might be worthwhile.

Finally, the I/O psychologist will look at the goals of the organization. If those goals include reducing workplace accidents or improving communication with international customers, training in safety procedures or foreign language skills would be in order.

Designing training programs

In designing training programs for use by organizations, I/O psychologists are always mindful of the basic principles that govern the learning and remembering of new information and skills. These principles guide efforts to promote transfer of training, feedback, training in general principles, overlearning, and sequencing.

Transfer of training – The most valuable training programs are those that teach knowledge and skills that will generalize, or transfer, to the workplace. If employees don't see how to apply what they have learned to improve their job performance, the training effort will have been wasted. Because promoting transfer of training is not always easy, I/O psychologists develop written materials and active-learning exercises that not only clarify the link between training and application but also give employees a chance to apply new knowledge and skills in simulated work situations.

So trainees might first complete reading assignments, attend lectures, and watch videos illustrating effective approaches to dealing with customer complaints or defusing an office conflict. Then they might form groups to role-play using these approaches in a variety of typical workplace scenarios. These experiences enhance transfer of training, especially when the trainees' newly learned skills are supported and rewarded by their coworkers and supervisors (Kontoghiorghes, 2004).

Training in general principles – People tend to learn better and remember more of what they learn when they can put new information into a broader context. In other words, they learn better when they get some insight into how the information or skill they are learning fits into a bigger picture (Linou & Kontogiannis, 2004). In organizational settings, the "big picture" approach takes the form of training in general principles, which teaches not only how to do things in particular ways but also why it is important to do so.

In a study conducted by Strolin-Goltzman, Auerbach, McGowan, & McCarthy (2008), significant findings were noted on a correlation between the type of educational degree and location as well as the existence of local incentives for employees. Findings indicate that there were higher numbers of caseworkers with social work degrees in urban and suburban settings than in rural settings. Additionally, the study indicates a higher degree of intention to leave within the rural and urban groups than those employed in suburban areas.

Other significant factors in retention relate to whether or not employees feel they are appropriately compensated for the amount of work they perform. Inadequate salaries and high workloads are common issues that often result in high turnover in the human service field (Westbrook et al., 2006).

Training for not only employees but also those in leadership roles is another method of ensuring that workers on all levels feel confident in their job duties. Leadership is the consistent factor as a prerequisite to change in the workplace (Wolfson, Bernabeo, Leas, Sofaer, Pawlson, & Pillittere, 2009).

Further, the process of inductive reasoning may not only be beneficial for managers attempting to address issues in the workplace, but also important within the training process itself, potentially leading to increased fluid intelligence performance and better academic learning of the training material or curriculum (Klauer & Phye, 2008).

Another element of training that may lead to increased retention rates is the process of mentoring. In addition to quality supervision, peer mentoring by coworkers not only assists in new staff development and promotion of social networking within the agency, but also offers an opportunity for the mentor to feel an increased sense of self-worth and accomplishment, taking responsibility for another's learning process and sharing in their accomplishments (Hartje, Evans, Killian, &

Brown, 2008). This process fosters a sense of community within inner circle team or unit and can then impact the outer circle, encompassing the entire agency with a team-based approach (Moseley et al., 2008).

Feedback – People learn new skills quicker when they receive feedback on their performance (Smither, London, & Reilly, 2005). In organizational training, this feedback usually comes from the trainer or other trainees. It takes the form of positive reinforcement following progress, constructive suggestions following errors or failure, and constant encouragement to continue the effort to learn. For example, after one trainee has participated in a videotaped role-play of a new way to deal with an angry customer or a disgruntled employee, the trainer might play the video for the entire trainee group so that everyone can offer comments, compliments, and suggestions for improvement.

EMPLOYEE RETENTION

The workload of any given position is dependent upon the type of organization, field of business, and the roles and responsibilities assumed by the position. However, the constant is that increased workload and time management issues can affect the level of retention for the individual and the agency. In addition, whether adequate training has been provided for employees to successfully do their jobs affects their ability to maintain various workload levels.

A national survey conducted in 2010 by Express Employment Professionals found "staggering" results. Express surveyed more than 100 business owners, managers and other personnel, and of those surveyed, 79.4 percent said their workload had increased in the past year, 13.7 percent said their workload had stayed the same and 6 percent said it had decreased. Comparing stress levels to that of past years, 48 percent reported their stress level had increased, while 27.5 percent reported it to be the same and 24.5 said it had decreased (Lee, 2011).

Additionally, in 2010, a national survey of 9,400 business leaders showed overwhelming statistics. It showed 49 percent felt higher stress than they did the year before, and 68 percent said their workload had increased. Companies are trending toward moving to a more flexible workforce populated by temporary workers, contractors and freelancers (Lee, 2011). Temporary workers can help ease stress as employers attempt to cut labor without sacrificing productivity. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2010), the number of workers placed by temporary-staffing agencies has risen since September of 2010 by 404,000, making up 68 percent of the 593,000 jobs added by employers.

Stress

Stress factors in the workplace may lead employees to feel they might be happier elsewhere, either in a different organization that may have certain elements that are appealing to them or in a different field altogether, because workers may feel that the current stress they experience does not exist in other fields (Shim, 2010).

A key source of job-related stress is role conflict, which may occur when a person tries to meet the demands of more than one important life role, such as worker and mother. Workload can also be a source of stress.

According to Moos (1986), there are four characteristics of work settings linked to employee stress and health problems:

- High job demands, such as having a heavy workload and time pressure.
- Inadequate opportunities to participate in decision-making.
- A high level of supervisor control.
- A lack of clarity about the criteria for competent performance.

Nowhere is the importance of work in our lives more apparent than when individuals lose their jobs. Unemployment is related to physical problems (such as heart attack, stroke, obesity, and diabetes), mental problems (such as anxiety and depression), marital and family problems, homicide, and other crimes.

A 15-year longitudinal study of more than 24,000 adults revealed a significant drop in life satisfaction following unemployment and a substantial increase in life satisfaction following re-employment. However, in this study, re-employed persons did not experience life satisfaction at the level previous to being unemployed (Lucas et al., 2004).

For some individuals in the work world, it is not unemployment that creates stress but rather burnout, an extremely distressed psychological state in which a person experiences emotional exhaustion and little motivation for work. Burnout may include feelings of being overworked and underappreciated and can feature depersonalization, confusion, worry, and resentment (Ahola et al., 2006; Becker, Milad, & Klock, 2006).

Symptoms of burnout can be physical (exhaustion, headaches, gastrointestinal problems, suppressed immune function, sleep disturbance), behavioral (increased use of alcohol, drugs, caffeine; absenteeism, and social withdrawal), and emotional (increased cynicism and negativity, hopelessness, irritability, emotional distancing, depression, and anxiety). Burnout may result from chronic stress at work.

Managing job stress

Stress at work does not always lead to burnout, especially if individuals develop enjoyable leisure activities. Leisure refers to the pleasant times before or after work when individuals are free to pursue activities and interests of their own choosing, such as hobbies, sports, and reading.

Some existing research on what U.S. adults regret the most revealed that not engaging in more leisure activities was one of the top six regrets (Roese & Summerville, 2005). Could taking regular vacations also help individuals to combat work stress? A recent study found that in the days and weeks at work just after a vacation, individuals reported that they were less exhausted, had fewer health complaints, and were putting forth more efficient effort than in the week at work before the vacation (Fritz & Sonnentag, 2006).

In a longitudinal study, 12,338 men 35 to 57 years of age were assessed each year for five years on whether they took vacations (Gump & Matthews, 2000). Then the researchers examined the medical and death records over nine years for men who lived for at least a year after the last vacation survey.

Compared with those who never took vacations, men who went on annual vacations were 21 percent less likely to die over the nine years and 32 percent less likely to die of coronary heart disease. The same concerns that lead men to skip a vacation, such as not trusting anyone to fill in for them and fearing that they will get behind in their work and someone will replace them, tend to promote heart disease.

In addition to developing enjoyable leisure activities and taking regular vacations, what else can you do to cope with work stress? Dealing

with job stress in a healthy way involves taking care of your body as well as your mind (Marine et al., 2006). Physical needs must be met by eating right, exercising, and getting enough sleep (Fahey, Insel, & Roth, 2007; Robbins, Powers, & Burgess, 2008). Because work stress, like all stress, is about our perception of experience, it makes sense to hone your coping skills and monitor your patterns of behavior and well-being periodically (Blonna, 2007; Greenberg, 2008).

Some things to consider when experiencing work stress:

- Have you set realistic goals at work?
- Are you taking work-related issues too personally?
- What are your strengths, and how can you use them to do what you do best?

It is important to keep in mind that work is an essential part of living a fulfilling life. Indeed, Mihalyi Csikszentmihalyi (1990) found that while working, we are 10 times more likely to experience "flow." Flow is considered to be the optimal experience of a match between our skills and the challenge of a task. Ironically, we are also six times more likely to wish we were somewhere else when on the job. Work provides us an unequaled opportunity to use our skills and abilities.

When we think of work as a calling, we might find ourselves listening for that call with an open mind and heart. However, a calling orientation to work is not just about hearing a call. It is about the active way we craft any job to our skills and abilities, finding a way to place a personal stamp on the workplace. Transforming a job into a calling is a decision that we make about our work situation.

Stress can come in many forms. Interpersonal communications and relationships alone can exist in several variations, depending on the roles of the individuals and the requirements that each person is focused on meeting. Goals and barriers will vary across levels of employment. What exists as a primary goal for a manager may not be the primary goal of the administrative support staff, of the quality assurance staff, and the levels of operational staff.

Even if the overall goal or agency mission is the same for everyone, there are different pieces of the bigger-picture goal that are more important to certain people than others within the work population. This alone can create significant stress levels for all individuals involved. (Moseley, Jeffers, & Paterson, 2008)

Stress in the workplace can also be caused by a series of other elements. It can result from the access to, the lack of, or the efficiency of existing technological devices or available resources. Stress can also arise from changes in policy and procedure and lack of clarification; changes in organizational structure or responsibilities; interactions with clients or the public; and increased workloads due to exiting coworkers (Westbrook et al., 2006).

Support and supervision

Quality supervision includes understanding the responsibilities and demands of the worker's job, fair distribution of workload among team members, flexibility, availability, active listening, respect for workers, providing a strong knowledge base of the job, setting high but attainable expectations, and providing instrumental and emotional support and praise (Westbrook et al., 2006).

Positive leadership has been linked to outcomes such as employees reporting high levels of positive interpersonal working relationships, teamwork and retention, as well as health and well-being (Schoo, 2008). Such information should be an eye opener for managers when considering the level of training they are providing to their supervisors.

Managers may convey agency mission and values, but it is the supervisors who are in daily contact with their team. Therefore, employee retention may increase as a result of supervisors supporting a motive to change, and sharing the vision or bigger picture of the organization (Schoo, 2008).

Quality supervision does not have to occur solely in a one-on-one supervision format. Group supervision or all staff meetings also allow an opportunity for support, communication, leadership, and teamwork. Some organizations have developed meetings that allow workers to share the good things that happen each month, with additional discussion of what resources may be lacking to adequately meet the needs of their job requirements (Fessele, 2008). Innovative meetings such as these offer an opportunity for workers to increase their sense of team and maintain a vested interest in their personal successes as well as the success of the organization.

Advancement opportunities

Workers also report that their own likelihood to remain with their current employer is a result of opportunities for advancement and ability to transfer into alternate areas or programs to learn and participate in other elements of their field (Westbrook et al., 2006).

Successful managers often employ a strategy that includes inquiring with their staff regularly about their career aspirations and plans to achieve them with the addition of challenging their staff by assigning specialized roles, special projects, and opportunities for advanced training to further develop their skills (Gillham & Ristevski, 2007).

However, it is then important for organizations to offer opportunities for official advancement into specific promotional positions. While this is a goal for many managers, budget and structure-related issues can create a barrier, which in turn works against them in efforts of retention.

Burnout

Many employees experience what is considered burnout, a term often used to refer to the experience of long-term exhaustion and diminished interest. A personal definition of burnout is the process of becoming less effective in your level of performance because of the level of workload responsibilities, work environment, or length of time conducting the same tasks.

Feelings of burnout may increase if sense of accomplishment is no longer part of people's work experience. Dr. Mary Byrne (2006) conducted a study that assessed the resilience of 467 publicly employed child protective social workers, comparing a group using a strengths-based service planning approach with those who used a traditional protective services approach. Within the study, levels of self-efficacy, compassion satisfaction, compassion fatigue, burnout, personal competence, and personal adaptability measured resilience.

What particularly stands out from this research is the data and analysis on burnout, which finds:

- Burnout was significantly related to being in a direct service role, having a higher caseload and recent trauma.
- Lower caseloads appeared to moderate the effects of burnout.
- Burnout was significantly and inversely related to age (younger), to years employed in DSS (fewer years employment), and to lacking a graduate level degree.
- Trauma was a highly significant moderator directly on burnout; those reporting recent personal trauma revealed higher indicators of burnout. (Byrne, 2006).

A variation of burnout is commonly referred to as compassion fatigue. Individuals working in the human services field, such as a nurse, social worker, or case manager, can feel emotionally exhausted by contact with others and the level of empathy involved; negative feelings toward the recipients of their services; or reduced personal accomplishment with a tendency to minimize the self-evaluation of their own work (Westbrook et al., 2006). In the human service field of child welfare, where the intrinsic value of wanting to make a difference plays an important role in employee retention (Goodwin, 2009), compassion fatigue is often linked to these professionals being required to participate in complex tasks combined with existing policy and procedures (Warman & Jackson, 2007).

Work-life balance is an important element to combat burnout. Employees often have to juggle numerous elements of their personal and professional lives to meet the needs and requirements of both, while retaining their own efforts toward personal goals (Fessele, 2008).

Family issues, such as day care schedules not meeting their needs; day cares that are closed while the employee's office remains open; and the unpredictable element of children becoming ill and needing to return home from school or day care or go to additional medical appointments from illness, are examples of situations that lead to worker stress and difficulty maintaining the responsibilities of family versus employment.

Recognizing the importance of work-life balance, an innovative approach was developed by Swedish American Health System in Rockford, Ill., which implemented a concierge service for its nursing staff. This program offered assistance to workers in running errands, servicing their cars, or waiting for a repair person to arrive at their home. It also included travel planning, dry cleaning, and other services that provided freedom for workers from having to take time off of work or spend their day off to accomplish personal tasks (Fessele, 2008).

Employee commitment

By the time an employee has completed initial training, the organization has already dedicated a great deal of resources to the person. Clearly, it becomes important to keep the employee around. Especially during times of organizational change, understanding the factors that might maintain employee commitment has become important to industry and psychologists (Amiot et al., 2006).

I/O psychologists have examined work commitment as an important determinant of work-related outcomes (Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005). A highly influential framework emphasizes three types of commitment: affective, continuance, and normative. These are believed to be essential to understanding an employee's level of dedication.

Affective commitment refers to the person's emotional attachment to the workplace. A person with a strong affective commitment identifies closely with the goals of the organization and wants to be a part of it. Affective commitment is associated with feelings of "we-ness," of identifying with the group that is a person's workplace (Johnson & Chang, 2006). Individuals with strong affective commitment commit to the organization because they want to. Affective commitment is thought to result in more favorable job performance because those high in affective commitment are likely to work harder (Riketta, 2002).

Continuance commitment derives from employees' perception that leaving the organization would be too costly, both economically and socially. The person may dread the notion of relocation or the thought of the effort that a new job search would require. Such an individual might remain with an organization because of the feeling that he or she "has to." Continuance commitment has been shown to be either unrelated or negatively related to job performance or citizenship behaviors (Meyer et al., 2002). In contrast to affective commitment, continuance commitment is related to a more individualistic sense, rather than a group sense, of identity (Johnson & Chang, 2006).

Normative commitment is the sense of obligation an employee feels toward the organization because of the investment the organization has made in the person's personal and professional development. If an organization has subsidized a person's education, for example, the employee might feel that she owes it to her boss to stick around. Normative commitment means being committed because people feel they "ought to." Theoretically, individuals are thought to have a commitment profile that captures their level of commitment on all three of these dimensions at any given point in time (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001).

EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AND PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS

People who apply for a job with a large corporation or government agency are often asked to take one or more standardized tests of personality or mental ability and to participate in other assessments whose results will help determine whether the person will fit well into an organization and has the "right stuff" for the job he or she seeks.

Organizations commonly turn to industrial and organizational psychologists to design or conduct these assessment programs, so one of the main areas of scientific research in I/O psychology is the development and evaluation of new and better assessment devices.

Job performance represents behaviors employees engage in while at work that contribute to organizational goals. These behaviors are formally evaluated by an organization as part of an employee's responsibilities. To understand and ultimately predict job performance, it is important to be precise when defining the term.

Job performance is about behaviors that are within the control of the employee and not about results (effectiveness), the costs involved in achieving results (productivity), the results that can be achieved in a period of time (efficiency), or the value an organization places on a given level of performance, effectiveness, productivity or efficiency (utility).

To model job performance, researchers have attempted to define a set of dimensions that are common to all jobs. Using a common set of dimensions provides a consistent basis for assessing performance and enables the comparison of performance across jobs.

Performance is commonly broken into two major categories:
1. In-role (technical aspects of a job).
2. Extra-role (non-technical abilities, such as communication skills and being a good team member).

Knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics
Industrial and organizational assessments are often used to identify the human attributes necessary for doing jobs successfully. Those attributes are referred to collectively as KSAOs, which stands for knowledge, skill, ability, and other personal characteristics.

Knowledge refers to what the person already knows. Skill refers to how well a person does a particular task. Ability is defined as the person's relatively enduring capacities in areas such as thinking and physical coordination.

Skills and abilities are closely related. Some researchers consider skills to be the products of inherent abilities (Muchinsky, 2003). Other personal characteristics can be almost anything else about a person, including attitudes, personality traits, physical characteristics, preferences, and values.

Job analysis

How do organizations know which KSAOs are important for which jobs? The answer lies in job analysis, in which I/O psychologists collect information about particular jobs and job requirements. This job analysis information is then used to guide decisions about whom to hire and what kind of training is needed to succeed at a particular job (Brannick & Levine, 2002; Krause & Thornton, 2009).

There are three major approaches to job analysis:
1. Job-oriented approach.
2. Person-oriented approach.
3. Personality-oriented approach.

The **job-oriented approach** focuses on the tasks involved in doing a job, such as wiring circuit boards, creating a computer database, or driving a truck.

The **person-oriented approach** focuses on the KSAOs needed to do those job tasks.

The **personality-oriented approach** focuses on the specific personality characteristics associated with success in a job.

Most job analyses take either the job-oriented or person-oriented approach, but the personality-oriented approach is often used by organizations in which high-quality customer service is of great importance (Aguinis, Mazurkiewicz, & Heggestad, 2009).

A job analysis report can be a relatively superficial description, a microscopically detailed examination, or anything in between. The approach taken and the level of detail included in a job analysis depend mainly on how the report will be used.

When the analysis will guide the hiring of employees, it should contain enough detail to make it clear what a particular job requires and to show in a court of law, if necessary, how the selection process is related to the requirements established by the job analysis. The person-oriented approach is the most useful one for this purpose because it describes the KSAOs that the employer should be looking for in the new employee.

Job analysis can also help organizations recognize the need to train employees, and it can even outline the kind of training required. Suppose that you have five job openings, but when you test candidates for hiring or promotion, too few of them possess the KSAOs that a job analysis says are necessary for success in these positions. Obviously, some training will be needed, and because the job analysis lists specific KSAOs, you can use that analysis to determine exactly what the training should include.

Imagine that a job analysis reveals that people in a computer sales position must be familiar with the Linux operating system. As a result, you would provide Linux training for all individuals hired for that position unless they already knew that operating system.

The most common method of job analysis is to ask current employees to fill out questionnaires about what they do in the workplace. However, a somewhat more reliable picture may emerge when specially trained job analysts observe people as they do their jobs or even perform those jobs themselves (Dierdorff & Wilson, 2003).

If the goals of job analysis include comparing one job to another, I/O psychologists might use an instrument such as the Position Analysis Questionnaire, or PAQ (McCormick, Jeanneret, & Mecham, 1972). The 189 items on the PAQ can describe almost any job in terms of a particular set of characteristics, or dimensions, such as the degree to which a job involves communicating with people, lifting heavy objects, or doing mental arithmetic.

Measuring employee characteristics

I/O psychologists use a wide variety of instruments to measure a person's knowledge, skill, ability, and other characteristics. These instruments range from simple paper-and-pencil tests to several days of hands-on activities that simulate the tasks required of a midlevel manager. Some assessments are used to select new employees, others are designed to choose employees for promotion, and still others are meant to determine how well employees are doing their jobs at the moment.

The three main methods to measure employee characteristics are:
1. Psychological tests.
2. Job applicant interviews.
3. Assessment center exercises.

A psychological test is a systematic procedure for observing behavior in a standard situation and describing it on a number scale or a system of categories (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997). Some tests present a standardized series of problems or questions, each of which has one correct answer, much like the multiple-choice exams used in some college classrooms.

Others are more like essay exams in which the respondent is asked to, say, describe an ideal sales organization. These essay-type exams are not scored by a computer but by experts who use job analysis information and their own job experience to judge the correctness or quality of the responses.

Still other tests require the respondent to demonstrate skill by performing a task, such as typing a letter, debugging a computer program, repairing a car, or giving a sales talk.

These tests are relatively inexpensive and easy to administer, and they do a reasonably good job of predicting how well people will do on a wide variety of occupational tasks (Bertau, Anderson, & Salgado, 2005; Jansen & Vinkenburg, 2006; Rooy et al., 2006).

In addition, job applicants might be asked to participate in situational judgment tests (SJTs) in which they read about or view videos of various workplace situations, such as a conflict between coworkers. The applicants are then asked to rate which of several responses to that situation would be best or to describe what they would do if confronted with that same situation (Sackett & Lievens, 2008).

The information provided by SJTs supplements cognitive and personality tests and provides an additional perspective from which to predict an applicant's eventual job performance (Lievens, Peeters, & Schollaert, 2008; Salter & Highhouse, 2009). Tests of job-relevant knowledge, such as basic accounting principles or stock trading rules and regulations, may also be used to confirm that an individual has the information necessary to succeed at a particular job.

Finally, personality tests are used to assess a wide variety of other employee characteristics. Some of these tests provide information about personality dimensions that may be relevant to hiring decisions. For example, a person's score on conscientiousness (i.e., reliability and industriousness) has been linked to job performance in many occupations (Dudley et al., 2006; Meyer, Dalal, & Bonaccio, 2009; Thoresen et al., 2003).

Personality-related integrity tests are sometimes used to identify people who have tendencies that might lead them to steal or engage in dangerous or disruptive acts (Berry, Sackett, & Wiemann, 2007; Casillas et al., 2009; Ones & Viswesvaran, 2001). These are usually paper-and-pencil tests that ask respondents about their thoughts or temptations on theft, their perceptions of norms on dishonesty,

their own social conformity, and their history of associating with delinquents (Wanek, Sackett, & Ones, 2003).

Job applicant interviews are designed to determine an applicant's suitability for a job. Interviews usually take place in person, though some are conducted by telephone, videoconferencing, or even e-mail. Interviews can be structured or unstructured (open-ended).

In a structured interview, the interviewer has prepared a list of specific topics or even specifically worded questions to be covered in a particular order (Chapman & Zweig, 2005). In unstructured interviews, the course of the conversation is more spontaneous and variable.

Following some interviews, especially structured interviews, the candidate's responses will be rated on a set of dimensions such as product knowledge, clarity of expression, and poise. After other interviews, the interviewer's subjective impression of the candidate is used to make a yes-or-no judgment about the candidate's suitability for the job.

Research consistently shows that structured interviews are far more effective than unstructured interviews in leading to good hiring decisions (e.g., Huffcutt & Arthur, 1994). The difference is due largely to the fact that structured interviews focus specifically on job-related knowledge and skills, especially interpersonal skills, whereas unstructured interviews do not (Huffcutt et al., 2001). Further, lack of structure makes it easier for personal bias to enter the hiring picture.

Ratings from an unstructured interview might have more to do with the interviewer's personal bias about the candidates' appearance and presentation style than with the candidates' objective qualifications (Barrick, Shaffer, & DeGrassi, 2009).

There is some evidence that job candidates tend to prefer interview-based assessments over test-based assessments. This preference is of interest, especially when competing for top candidates, because those who have positive views of the selection process are more likely to like the organization and to accept a job offer (Hausknecht, Day, & Thomas, 2004).

Assessment centers are an extensive set of exercises designed to determine an individual's suitability for a particular job. Assessment centers are often used to hire or promote managers, but they can be employed for other positions as well.

A typical assessment center consists of two to three days of exercises that simulate various aspects of a job and that are rated by a team of judges, usually psychologists or specially trained managers (Gibbons & Rupp, 2009; Spychalski et al., 1997). Because assessment centers allow live observation of applicants' reactions in a variety of realistic work situations, they provide information about specific aspects of behavior that might not emerge from a test or an interview (Gibbons & Rupp, 2009).

The "in-basket" is a typical assessment center exercise for managers. Candidates are seated at a desk and asked to imagine that they have just taken over a new management job. On the desk is the previous manager's overflowing in-basket, containing correspondence, memos, phone messages, and other items.

Measuring job performance

Almost all employees of medium to large organizations receive an annual job performance appraisal, which, much like a student's report card, provides an evaluation of how well they are doing in various aspects of their work. Organizations use job performance appraisals to guide decisions about employee salary raises and bonuses and about retention, promotion, and firing.

The appraisals are also used to give employees feedback on the quality and quantity of their work (Rynes, Gerhart, & Parks, 2005). The feedback function of job performance appraisals is important because it helps employees recognize what they are doing right and what they need to do differently to reach their own goals and to promote the goals of the organization.

Establishing performance criteria

One of the most important roles for I/O psychologists in designing job performance appraisal systems is to establish criteria, or benchmarks, that define what the organization means by "good" or "poor" performance. These criteria can be theoretical or actual. A theoretical criterion is a statement of what we mean by good or poor performance in theory. A theoretical criterion for good teaching, for example, might be "promotes student learning."

This criterion certainly sounds reasonable, but notice that it does not specify how we would measure it to decide whether a particular teacher is actually promoting student learning. Therefore, there is a need for an actual criterion, which specifies what we should measure to determine whether the theoretical criterion has been met. An actual criterion for good teaching might be defined in terms of students' performance on a standardized test of what their teacher has taught them. If, on average, the students reach or exceed a particular score, the teacher will have satisfied one of the school district's criteria for good teaching.

When do employment tests make the most sense?

Employees affect an organization's performance and profitability. Hiring or promoting people who are unsuitable costs time, money, and potential new business. Carefully developed and administered employment tests can provide organizations with a way to decide systematically and accurately which people have the ability to perform well on the job, will not turn over, won't engage in counterproductive behaviors, or will be able to learn from training programs. Tests can also benefit individuals who are better matched to positions for which they are suited and in which they will wish to remain.

Some of the more commonly cited reasons for testing are:

- **Testing leads to savings in the decision-making process.** Employment tests can be a cost-effective way to pare down the applicant pool. Tests can make the decision process more efficient because less time is spent with individuals whose characteristics, skills, and abilities do not match what is needed. However, some tests do require more time up-front with individuals to determine who is and who isn't qualified. In these cases, tests can still result in savings from not training and compensating individuals whose productivity would be low or who would not remain on the job.
- **The costs of making a wrong decision are high.** For certain employment decisions, a wrong decision can be very costly in terms of training costs, errors made by a poor performer, costs of replacement and so on. For these types of decisions, investing in testing may be seen as a particularly worthwhile endeavor if testing reduces the number of wrong decisions.
- **The job requires attributes that are hard to develop or change.** Tests are often used for assessing characteristics that cannot be developed through training but are acquired over long periods of time or even a lifetime (personality traits, in-depth knowledge of a profession).

- **Hard-to-get information can be obtained more easily and efficiently.** One important advantage of using employment tests is that they can often provide information about an individual that is not easily obtained using other methods, or that would be much more costly to obtain by other means.
- **Individuals are treated consistently.** Using standardized tools in employment decision-making ensures that the same information is gathered on each individual and used in a similar way in decisions. Employers often turn to testing because of the unfairness of less standardized processes in which individuals are not all treated in a similar way, and similar information is not gathered on all individuals. Subjective biases can easily creep into decisions if the process for making decisions is unstandardized.
- **There are a lot of applicants.** Sometimes the sheer number of individuals to consider for an employment decision leads an employer to choose testing as the most efficient and fair means of making a decision in a timely manner.

Reasons for not testing

Some of the most commonly cited reasons for not testing are:

- **Costs.** While tests vary in their costs (i.e., developing customized tools costs more than purchasing off-the-shelf products, extensive assessments typically cost more), the cost of testing may be easily offset when considering costs of low productivity, errors, retraining times, and turnover. For example, conservative estimates of the cost of turnover range from one-third to one-half of the annual salary of the employee that is being replaced. The costs of replacing management, executive and highly skilled talent can easily be 1-2 times the annual incumbent's salary. Further, the costs associated with hiring a wrong employee who makes mistakes can be quite high. Testing can be a valuable investment for organizations to make in hiring and retaining talent.
- **Fear of legal action.** Sometimes concerns are raised about the legality of using tests in hiring. As with any other method of making employment decisions, tests can be scrutinized if there is a belief that discrimination in employment decisions has occurred. Adverse impact exists when the selection rate of a given demographic group (e.g., females vs. males, whites vs. blacks) is substantially lower than the selection rate of the majority group.

  While any selection procedure may show score differences that result in exclusionary effects upon a group, some types of tests (e.g., physical ability, cognitive ability) are more likely to show such score differences.

  Despite these differences, these tests are often accurate predictors of job performance and other outcomes of interest. Before using a test, it is important to anticipate whether adverse impact might occur and to consider ways that minimize any exclusionary effects while preserving the ability to make valid inferences based on test scores. If adverse impact does occur, it is important to demonstrate that the inferences made based on test scores are appropriate. By doing this, a company has the data to support the use of the test. U.S. case law and guidelines have clearly established that well-developed and validated tests can withstand legal scrutiny. Employers should have clear documentation on any tools they use in employment decision-making.
- **Practical constraints.** Tests may not be the best choice if not many individuals are being considered in a particular employment decision, if the resources to properly administer the test are not available, or if the timing and logistics of the decision-making process preclude the use of an appropriate test.
- **The current decision-making process would not be improved upon by the addition of a test.** Employers may believe they already have a quality decision-making process in place and a test would simply add costs and time with no gain in decision accuracy. Often, however, this belief has not been well-assessed, because organizations do not always track the information necessary to actually evaluate how well their employment decision-making processes are working. A proper evaluation of a decision-making process may reveal room for improvement, and often a test is a cost-effective and efficient way to improve the process.

Tests are useful decision-making tools in employment contexts. Deciding whether a test is the right solution in a given situation may require professional advice from someone with knowledge of both testing and employment situations. Industrial-organizational psychologists may be helpful in such a situation.

CONCLUSION

Industrial and organizational psychology studies behavior in business to find solutions to problems and discover important information about an organization. It has been developing over many years, and the use of it is invaluable to an organization.

Determining solutions to common workplace problems can be made easier using organizational psychology. Changes and transitions benefit from this type of research because information and knowledge gained through organizational psychology can ease transition and make changes occur smoothly. It also helps companies save money and increase stakeholder value because the information provided through these studies can help an organization run effectively and efficiently.

This is beneficial because it increases employee morale and security, which, in turn, increases efficiency of employees and the organization. And that increased efficiency will allow an organization to also provide better customer service and increase the organization's success financially (Britt & Jex, 2008).

Understanding how individuals and groups behave in an organizational setting can help predict outcomes of situations as well as provide valuable information about influencing the workforce.

Industrial psychology is more likely to use quantitative methods in studies more often than qualitative studies, while organizational psychology is more likely to use qualitative methods, such as interviews and focus groups.

Two topics often addressed by I/O psychologists are leadership and motivation. Leaders' actions often carry more weight than the actions of others within an organization because they have greater responsibility and also are in more visible positions. Leaders are the ones who can set the tone, create the plan, and demonstrate to their followers the appropriate (or inappropriate) way to behave. They are the ones held accountable, and the critical decisions fall into their laps. Therefore, leaders' approach to motivating workers or their team is a critical element in the effectiveness of an organization.

In the workplace, employee motivation can be the foundational factor in an organization's level of success in obtaining goals. Increased motivation in the workplace typically means improved performance, increased productivity and revenue and profits, improved morale, and organizational stability. No matter how efficient technology and equipment may be, it is no match for the effectiveness and efficiency of an organization's staff.

Processes such as employee recruitment, selection, retention, training, and performance appraisals are also key elements in the success of an organization. Industrial and organizational psychologists are often brought in to organizations to assess such processes, identify strengths and needs, and facilitate the process of change to try to improve such elements with leaders and managers.

I/O psychologists use a wide variety of instruments to measure a person's knowledge, skill, ability, and other characteristics. These

instruments range from simple paper-and-pencil tests to several days of hands-on activities that simulate the tasks required of a midlevel manager. Some assessments are used to select new employees, others are designed to choose employees for promotion, and still others are meant to determine how well employees are doing their jobs at the moment.

The three main methods to measure employee characteristics are:

1. Psychological tests.
2. Job applicant interviews.
3. Assessment center exercises.

The scientific study of organizational psychology helps an organization understand the behavior of individuals and groups in an organization. An organization can use organizational psychology to increase efficiency and effectiveness, and this will increase its success.

From research, motivation, and leadership to employee selection, retention, and training, I/O psychology covers a vast realm of workforce issues. As this field of psychology continues to grow and develop, its approaches and beliefs may have to change to meet the needs of the ever-changing economy and job market, though additional research and findings can only lead to potential for improved outcomes for organizations and individuals.

References

- Ambrose, M. & Kulik, C. (1999). Old friends, new faces: Motivation research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management*, 25(3), 231–92.
- Barbuto, J. E. (2000). Influence triggers: A framework for understanding follower compliance. *Leadership Quarterly*, *11*, 365–387.
- Barbuto, J. E., Fritz, S. M., & Marx, D. (2000). A field study of two measures of work motivation for predicting leaders' transformational behaviors. *Psychological Reports*, *86*, 295–300.
- Barbuto, J. E., & Gifford, G. T. (2007). Sources of work motivation of business leaders in the U.S.A. and South Africa: A cross-cultural comparison using the Motivational Sources Inventory. *Psychological Reports*, *101*, 636–640.
- Barbuto, J. E., & Scholl, R. W. (1998). Motivation Source Inventory: Development and validation of new scales to measure an integrative taxonomy of motivation. *Psychological Reports*, *82*, 1011–1022.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications. New York: Free Press.
- Bellman, G., & Ryan, K. (2009). The Group Needs Model. OD Practitioner, 41(4), 45-50.
- Binns, J. (2008). The ethics of relational leading: Gender matters. Gender, Work & Organization, 15(6), 600-620. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2008.00418.x.
- Brehm, J. W. (1966). *A theory of psychological reactance*. New York: Academic Press.
- Brislin, R., Worthley, R., & Macnab, B. (2006). Cultural intelligence: Understanding behaviors that serve people's goals. Group & Organization Management, 31(1), 40.
- Britt, T. W., & Jex, S. M. (2008). *Organizational Psychology: A Scientist-Practitioner Approach* (2 ed.). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Broome, B. (2003). Meeting Diverse Needs. Journal of Cultural Diversity, 10(3), 75. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.
- Brown, M . E., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Socialized charismatic leadership, values congruence, and deviance in work groups. Journal of Applied Psychology, 91(4), 954-962. Retrieved from PsycINFO database.
- Burke, M. J., & Day, R. R. (1986). A cumulative study of the effectiveness of managerial training. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 232–245.
- Condry, J. (1977). Enemies of exploration: Self-initiated versus other-initiated learning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *35*, 459–477.
- Conger, J. A., & Riggio, R. E. (2007). The practice of leadership: Developing the next generation of leaders. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cordova, D. I. (1993). *The effects of personalization and choice on students' intrinsic motivation and learning*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.
- Cordova, D. I., & Lepper, M. R. (1996). Intrinsic motivation and the process of learning: Beneficial effects of contextualization, personalization, and choice. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *88*, 715–730.
- deCharms, R. (1968). *Personal causation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Creswell JW, Plano Clark VL, Gutmann ML, Hanson WE. 2003. See Tashakkori & Teddlie 2003, pp. 209–40
- Deci, E. L. (1975). *Intrinsic motivation*. New York: Plenum.
- Deci, E. L. (1981). *The psychology of self-determination*. Lexington, MA: Health.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Deci, E. L., Speigel, N. H., Ryan, R. M., Koestner, R., & Kaufman, M. (1982). The effects of performance standards on teaching styles: The behavior of controlling teachers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *74*, 852–859.
- Dickson, M. W., Smith, D. B., Grojean, M., & Ehrhart, M. G. (2001). An organizational climate regarding ethics: The outcome of leader values and the practices that reflect them. Leadership Quarterly, 12(2), 197-217. Retrieved from Google Scholar.
- Dickson, M., Den Hartog, D., & Mitchelson, J. (2003). Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: Making progress, and raising new questions. The Leadership Quarterly, 14, 729–768.
- Doyle, R., & George, U. (2008). Achieving and measuring diversity: An organizational change approach. Social Work Education, 27(1), 97-110. doi:101080/02615470601141235.
- Drucker, P. (1999). Management challenges for the 21st century. New York: HarperCollins.
- Eagly, A. (2007). Female leadership advantage and disadvantage: Resolving the contradictions. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31(1), 1-12. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00326.x.
- Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Earley, P. C., & Peterson, R. S. (2004). The elusive cultural chameleon: Cultural intelligence as a new approach to intercultural training for the global manager. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 3(1), 100-115.
- Farina, A. J., Jr., & Wheaton, G. R. (1973). Development of a taxonomy of human performance: The task-characteristics approach to performance prediction. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 3, 26–27.
- Fennell, H. A. (1999). Power in the principalship: Four women's experiences. Journal of Educational Administration, 37(1), 23-49. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Fine GA, Elsbach KD. 2000. Ethnography and experiment in social psychological theory building: tactics for integrating qualitative field data with quantitative lab data. J. Exp. Soc. Psychol. 36:51–76
- Fleishman, E. A., & Quaintance, M. K. (1984). Taxonomies of human performance: The description of human tasks. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Ford, J. K., Quiñones, M., Sego, D. J., & Speer Sorra, J. S. (1992). Factors affecting the opportunity to perform trained tasks on the job. Personnel Psychology, 45, 511–527.
- Fu, P., & Liu, J. (2009). In focus/leader values: It's time to reexamine values. Leadership in Action, 28(6), 18-19.
- Garic, D. (2006). Are leaders born or made? Supervision, 67(12), 19-20.
- Gagne, R. M., Briggs, L. J., & Wagner, W. W. (1992). Principles of instructional design. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Geddes, L. (2009). How we choose leaders in times of war and peace. New Scientist, 202(2705), 10. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.
- Gilgoff, D. (2009). Investing in diversity. U.S. News & World Report, 146(10), 72-72. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.
- Greitemeyer, T., Schulz-Hardt, S., & Frey, D. (2009). The effects of authentic and contrived dissent on escalation of commitment in group decision making. European Journal of Social Psychology, 39(4), 639-647. doi:10.1002/ejsp.578.
- Griggs, F. (2009). New look at the code of ethics. Journal of Professional Issues in Engineering Education & Practice, 135(1), 40-46. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)1052-3928(2009)135:1(40).
- Grisoni, L., & Beeby, M. (2007). Leadership, gender and sense-making. Gender, Work & Organization, 14(3), 191-209. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2007.00339.x.
- Goldstein, I. L. (1980). Training in work organizations. Annual Review of Psychology, 31, 229–272.
- Goldstein, I. L., & Ford, J. K. (2002). Training in organizations: Needs assessment, development, and evaluation (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Hackman, J. R., & Wagerman, R. (2007). Asking the right questions about leadership: Discussion and conclusions. American Psychologist, 62(1), 43-47.
- Hartel, C., Panipucci, P., & Fujimoto, Y. (2003). Fostering diverse workgroups who excel in decision making. Australian Journal of Psychology, 55, 127-128. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.
- Heine, S. J., & Lehman, D. R. (1997). Culture, dissonance, and self-affirmation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *23*, 389–400.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hopkins, M. M., O'Neil, D. A., Passarelli, A., & Bilimoria, D. (2008). Women's leadership development strategic practices for women and organizations. Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 60(4), 348-365. doi: 10.1037/a0014093.
- Hostager, T., & Meuse, K. (2008). The effects of diversity learning experience on positive and Negative diversity perceptions. Journal of Business and Psychology, 23(3/4), 127-139. doi:10.1007/s10869-008-9085-x.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Industry Report 2000. (2000). Training, 37(10), 45–48.
- Iyengar, S. & Lepper, M. (1999). Rethinking the value of choice: A cultural perspective on intrinsic motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76 (3), 349-366.
- Joplin, J. R. W., & Daus, C. S. (1997). Challenges of leading a diverse workforce. Academy of Management Executive, 11(3), 32-47.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Johnson RB, Turner LA. 2003. Data collection strategies in mixed methods research. See Tashakkori & Teddlie 2003, pp. 297–320
- Kaptein, M., Huberts, L., Avelino, S., & Lasthuizen, K. (2005). Demonstrating ethical leadership by measuring ethics. Public Integrity, 7(4), 299-311. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.
- Karp, H., & Sammour, H. (2000). Workforce diversity: Choices in diversity training programs & dealing with resistance to diversity. College Student Journal, 34(3), 451. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.
- Kearney, E., & Gebert, D. (2009). Managing diversity and enhancing team outcomes: The promise of transformational leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, 94(1), 77-89. doi: 10.1037/a0013077.
- Kets De Vries, M., & Florent-Treacy, E. (2002). Global leadership from A to Z: Creating high commitment organizations. Organizational Dynamics, 30(4), 295–309.
- Kiely, R., Sandmann, L., and Truluck, J. (2004). Adult **learning theory** and the pursuit of **adult** degrees. New Directions for **Adult** & Continuing Education, 103, 17-30.
- Kouzes, J. & Posner, B. (2003). Encouraging The Heart: A Leader's Guide to Rewarding and Recognizing Others. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Krzemień, E. & Wolniak, R. (2007). Problems of incentives for employees in the quality management of the service sector. *Quality & Quantity*, Vol. 41 Issue 5, p749-756, 8p, DOI: 10.1007/s11135-006-9012-z
- Latham, G. P. (1988). Human resource training and development. Annual Review of Psychology, 39, 545–582.
- Lepper, M. R., & Malone, T. W. (1987). Intrinsic motivation and instructional effectiveness in computer-based education. In R. E. Snow & M. J. Farr (Eds.), Aptitude, learning, and instruction: *Vol. 3. Conative and affective process analysis* (pp. 255–286). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- Leonard, N. H., Beauvais, L. L., & Scholl, R. W. (1999). Work motivation: The incorporation of self-concept-based processes. *Human Relations*, *52*, 969–997.
- Lewin, K. (1938). *The conceptual representation and measurement of psychological forces*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Little, L. (2004). **Kolb's learning** styles for leaders. Administrator, 23 (8), 8-8.
- Locke, E. A., & Henne, D. (1986). Work motivation theories. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1–35). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Locke, E. A., & Lantham, G. (1984). *Goal setting: A motivational technique that works*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Malone, T. W., & Lepper, M. R. (1987). Making learning fun: A taxonomy of intrinsic motivations for learning. In R. E. Snow & M. J. Farr (Eds.), Aptitude, learning, and instruction: *Vol. 3. Conative and affective process analysis* (pp. 223–253). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Markus, H. & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. Psychological Review, 98 (2), 224-253.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991a). Cultural variation in the self concept. In J. Strauss & G. R. Goethals (Eds.), *The self: Interdisciplinary approaches* (pp. 18–24). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- McCall, M., & Lombardo, M. (1983). Off the track: Why and how successful executives get derailed (Tech. Rep. No. 21). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership
- McGehee, W., & Thayer, P. W. (1961). Training in business and industry. New York: Wiley.
- Morris, M., & Peng, K. (1994). Culture and cause: American and Chinese attributions for social and physical events. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*, 949–971.
- Morse JM. 1991. Approaches to qualitative-quantitative methodological triangulation. Nurs. Res. 40:120–23
- Mumford, M. D., Friedrich, T. L., Caughron, J. J., & Byrne, C. L. (2007). Leader cognition in real-world settings: How do leaders think about crises? The Leadership Quarterly, 18, 515–543.
- Mumford, M. D., Hunter, S. T., Eubanks, D. L., Bedell, K. T., & Murphy, S. T. (2007). Developing leaders for creative efforts: A domain-based approach to leadership development. Human Resource Management Review, 17, 402–417.
- Mumford, M. D., Schultz, R. A., & Osburn, H. K. (2002). Planning in organizations: Performance as a multi-level phenomenon. In F. J. Yammarino & F. Dansereau (Eds.), Research in multi-level issues: The many faces of multi-level issues (pp. 3–35). Oxford, England: Elsevier Science.
- Naus, F., van Iterson, A., & Roe, R. (2007). Organizational cynicism: Extending the exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect model of employees 'responses to adverse conditions in the workplace. *Human Relations*, *60*, 683–718.
- Nuttin, J. R. (1973). Pleasure and reward in human motivation and learning. In D. E. Berlyne & K. B. Madsen (Eds.), *Pleasure, reward, preference* (pp. 243–274). New York: Academic Press.
- Olson, D. A. (2009). Are great leaders born, or are they made? Frontiers of Health Services Management, 26(2), 27-30.
- Ott, J. S., Parks, S. J., & Simpson, R. B. (2003). *Classic readings in organizational behavior* (3rd ed.). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Wadsworth.
- Piaget, J. (1972). Intellectual evolution from adolescence to adulthood. *Human Development*, *15*, 1–12.
- Pfifferling, J. & Gilley, K. (2000). Overcoming compassion fatigue. Family Practice Management. 7, (4) 39.
- Ruvolo, C., Peterson, S., & LeBoeuf, J. (2004). Leaders Are Made, Not Born: The Critical Role of a Developmental Framework to Facilitate an Organizational Culture of Development. Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 56 (1), 10-19.
- Ryan, R. M., Koestner, R., & Deci, E. L. (1991). Ego-involved persistence: When free-choice behavior is not intrinsically motivated. *Motivation and Emotion*, *15*, 185–205.
- Schulz, R., & Hanusa, B. H. (1978). Long-term effects of control and predictability-enhancing interventions: Findings and ethical issues. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *36*, 1194–1201.
- Shweder, R. A., & Bourne, E. J. (1984). *Does the concept of the person vary cross-culturally? In R.* A. Shweder & R. A. LeVine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion* (pp. 158–199). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Steel, P., & Konig, C. J. (2006). Integrating theories of motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, *31*, 889–913.
- Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2006). Motivational cultural intelligence, realistic job preview, realistic living conditions preview, and cross-cultural adjustment. Group & Organization Management, 31(1), 154.
- Thomas, R., Jr. (2006). Diversity management: An essential craft for leaders. *Leader to Leader, 2006*(41), 45-49. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.
- Thomas, D. C. (2006). Domain and development of cultural intelligence: The importance of mindfulness. *Group & Organization Management, 31*(1), 78.
- Toor, S., & Ofori, G. (2009). Ethical leadership: Examining the relationships with full range leadership model, employee outcomes, and organizational culture. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *90*(4), 533-547. doi:10.1007/s10551-009-0059-3.
- Tucker, B. A., & Russell, R. F. (2004). The influence of the transformational leader. Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 10(4), 103–111.
- Yukl, G. (2006). Leadership in organizations (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Zigarmi, D. (2008). Just leadership: Creating a values-driven community. *Leader to Leader*, *(*47) 33-38.
- Zuckerman, M., Porac, J., Lathin, D., Smith, R., & Deci, E. L. (1978). On the importance of self-determination for intrinsically motivated behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *4*, 443–446.

INDUSTRIAL/ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

Final Examination Questions

Select the best answer for each question and proceed to ***Psychology.EliteCME.com*** to complete your final examination.

1. Industrial and organizational psychologists primarily address which two main goals in their research and practice?
   a. Managerial motives and employee incentives.
   b. Promoting effective job performance and contributing to human welfare.
   c. Motivation and retention.
   d. Selecting job tests and contributing to employee professionalism.

2. I/O psychology began to develop in the 19th century from an idea to study and measure:
   a. Human capabilities and motives.
   b. Business performance measures.
   c. Conscious and subconscious memory.
   d. Human development and health outcomes.

3. The idea that workers were responding to the attention they get as part of a special research study was a phenomenon that came to be known as the_____.
   a. Taylor principle.
   b. Response theory.
   c. Hawthorne effect.
   d. Employee attention theory.

4. A _____ is an empirical study used to estimate the causal impact of an intervention on its target population.
   a. Observational study.
   b. Survey study.
   c. Quasi-experiment.
   d. Literary research study.

5. A _____ believes that people are motivated by the rewards (or punishment) they receive for their work.
   a. Transactional leader.
   b. Transformational leader.
   c. Strength-based leader.
   d. Authoritarian leader.

6. Which approach refers to research that seeks to understand leadership by examining how leaders think, how others think about leaders, or how their thought processes change in specific situations?
   a. Outstanding leadership approach.
   b. Relational approach.
   c. Cognitive approach.
   d. Situational approach.

7. _____ managers motivate performance by exerting control and threatening punishment.
   a. Theory X.
   b. Theory Y.
   c. Situational.
   d. Charismatic.

8. _____ is how controlled and emotionally stable a person is.
   a. Extroversion.
   b. Openness.
   c. Agreeableness.
   d. Neuroticism.

9. _____ defines changes in power in terms of the relationship between leaders and followers over time.
   a. Social exchange theory.
   b. Follow the leader theory.
   c. Corporation change theory.
   d. Social change theory.

10. Which theory attempts to describe how power is distributed among various subunits, or departments, in an organization?
    a. Social exchange theory
    b. Strategic contingencies theory.
    c. Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory.
    d. Adult learning theory.

11. _____ theory focuses on the importance of intrinsic motivation and posits a natural tendency toward growth and development.
    a. Management.
    b. Adult learning.
    c. Self-determination.
    d. Participative leadership.

12. Individuals who view their occupation as a _____ are more likely to experience work as wholly meaningful and fulfilling. They show higher levels of life satisfaction and job satisfaction.
    a. Job.
    b. Paycheck.
    c. Challenge.
    d. Calling.

13. The term _____ refers to the physical and cognitive changes individuals can make within the constraints of a task to make the work "their own."
    a. Job crafting.
    b. Specialization.
    c. Creative adjustment.
    d. Intrinsic shaping.

14. One reason that happy workers are more likely to be high performers is that they are less likely to show _____.
    a. Emotion.
    b. Job withdrawal.
    c. Their discontent.
    d. Retaliation.

15. _____ may occur when a person tries to meet the demands of more than one important life role, such as worker and mother.
    a. Responsibility clash.
    b. Turnover.
    c. Role conflict.
    d. Disengagement.

16. The optimal experience of a match between our skills and the challenge of a task is known as:
    a. Flow.
    b. Synergy.
    c. Knowledge.
    d. Wisdom.

17. _____ refers to a person's emotional attachment to the workplace.
    a. Employee commitment.
    b. Emotional commitment.
    c. Affective commitment.
    d. Emotional leadership.

18. The _____ approach to job analysis focuses on the tasks involved in doing a job, such as wiring circuit boards, creating a computer database, or driving a truck.
    a. Job-oriented.
    b. Person-oriented.
    c. Personality-oriented.
    d. Satisfaction-oriented.

19. A _____ is a systematic procedure for observing behavior in a standard situation and describing it on a number scale or a system of categories.
    a. Qualitative research study.
    b. Quantitative research study.
    c. Psychological test.
    d. Personality test.

20. Using _____ in employment decision-making ensures that the same information is gathered on each individual and used in a similar way in decisions.
    a. Standardized tools.
    b. Outcome measures.
    c. Focal points.
    d. Power points.