

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF WORK

Theoretically Based Empirical Research



EDITED BY
JEANNE M. BRETT • FRITZ DRASGOW

The Psychology of Work

Theoretically Based Empirical Research

This page intentionally left blank

The Psychology of Work

Theoretically Based Empirical Research

Edited by

Jeanne M. Brett
Northwestern University

Fritz Drasgow
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign



Psychology Press
Taylor & Francis Group

New York London

The picture reproduced on the cover of this book is a formal portrait of a cooper, or barrel maker, taken about 1850. Having a portrait taken then was a formal occasion, and a series of daguerreotypes on the Library of Congress' Web site depicts many occupational photographs in which individuals included the tools of their trade in their portraits. The pictorial historical record suggests that people have long presented themselves to the world identified with their work. The cooper in the photograph represents himself as working on the barrel he is making. Not much has changed in a century and a half. People are still known by what they do. Work is an integral part of self-identity. It is about this vital aspect of individuals' lives—work—that this book is written. We dedicate this volume to the workers of the world whose work still defines them.

Library of Congress, Prints & Photographic Division,
Daguerreotype Pictures and Views 1839-1864, reproduction number 23.

Copyright © 2002 by Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by photostat, microform, retrieval system, or any other means, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

First published by

Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers
10 Industrial Avenue
Mahwah, NJ 07430

This edition published 2012 by Psychology Press

Psychology Press
Taylor & Francis Group
711 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10017

Psychology Press
Taylor & Francis Group
27 Church Road, Hove
East Sussex BN3 2FA

*Psycho log Press is an imprint of the **Taylor & Francis** Group, an informa business*

First issued in paperback 2013

ISBN 13: 978-0-415-65268-1 (Paperback)

ISBN 13: 978-0-8058-3815-2 (Hardback)

Cover design by Kathryn Houghtaling Lacey

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The psychology of work : theoretically based empirical research / edited by Jeanne M. Brett, Fritz Drasgow.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

ISBN 0-8058-3815-5 (alk. paper)

1. Work—Psychological aspects—Congresses. I. Brett, Jeanne M. II. Drasgow, Fritz.

BF481 .P84 2002
158.7—dc21

2001045112
CIP

In honor of Charles L. Hulin

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

Foreword	xi
<i>Arthur P. Brief and James P. Walsh</i>	
Introduction	xiii
<i>Jeanne M. Brett and Fritz Drasgow</i>	
PART I: THE HULIN LEGACY	1
1 Lessons From Industrial and Organizational Psychology	3
<i>Charles L. Hulin</i>	
2 Back to the Same Place, for the First Time?	
The Hulin Family Tree	23
<i>Timothy A. Judge</i>	
PART II: RESEARCH ON THE PSYCHOLOGY OF WORK	51
Section A: Conceptualization of Psychological Constructs	53
3 The Scientific Merit of Valid Measures of General Concepts: Personality Research and Core Self-Evaluations	55
<i>Timothy A. Judge, Joyce E. Bono, Amir Erez, Edwin A. Locke, and Carl J. Thoresen</i>	
	vii

4	The Ubiquity of Evaluation: A Hulinesque Essay <i>Howard M. Weiss and Daniel R. Ilgen</i>	79
5	Motivation to Work in Cross-Cultural Perspective <i>Harry C. Triandis</i>	101
Section B: Antecedents and Outcomes of Satisfaction		119
6	Are Men Affected by the Sexual Harassment of Women? Effects of Ambient Sexual Harassment on Men <i>Wendy L. Richman-Hirsch and Theresa M. Glomb</i>	121
7	The Impact of Job Insecurity on Employee Work Attitudes, Job Adaptation, and Organizational Withdrawal Behaviors <i>Tahira M. Probst</i>	141
8	The Legacy of Charles Hulin's Work on Turnover Thinking and Research <i>Peter Hom</i>	169
9	Turnover: An Integration of Lee and Mitchell's Unfolding Model and Job Embeddedness Construct With Hulin's Withdrawal Construct <i>Chris J. Sablinski, Thomas W. Lee, Terence R. Mitchell, James P. Burton, and Brooks C. Holtom</i>	189
10	Emotional Reserve and Adaptation to Job Dissatisfaction <i>Howard E. Miller and Joseph G. Rosse</i>	205
Section C: Modeling Organizational Behavior		233
11	Exploring Patterns of Aggressive Behaviors in Organizations: Assessing Model–Data Fit <i>Theresa M. Glomb and Andrew G. Miner</i>	235
12	Investigating Self-Presentation, Lies, and Bullshit: Understanding Faking and Its Effects on Selection Decisions Using Theory, Field Research, and Simulation <i>Robert A. Levin and Michael J. Zickar</i>	253

13	Models of Organizational Withdrawal: Information and Complexity	277
	<i>Steven T. Seitz and Andrew G. Miner</i>	
	Author Index	315
	Subject Index	323

This page intentionally left blank

Foreword

Arthur P. Brief

Tulane University

James P. Walsh

University of Michigan

Jeanne Brett and Fritz Drasgow's collection of essays in honor of Chuck Hulin is a testimony to the breadth and depth of what the organizational sciences, in this case Industrial and Organizational Psychology and organizational behavior, have become. Breadth-wise, several essays address a traditional concern of the field—turnover and other forms of organizational withdrawal—but others focus on such topics as cross-cultural perspectives on the motivation to work, patterns of aggressive behavior in organizations, and the effects of ambient sexual harassment of women on men. Depth-wise, one finds, for example, a detailed and provocative analysis of the supposed ubiquity of evaluation. Moreover, the list of contributors is punctuated by some of the field's leading scholars (e.g., Dan Ilgen, Ed Locke, Terry Mitchell, Harry Triandis, and Howard Weiss), so, readers, justifiably, should expect a tantalizing read. We are pleased to feature Brett and Drasgow's collection in our LEA Series.

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

Jeanne M. Brett
Northwestern University

Fritz Drasgow
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

On May 19–20, 2000, colleagues and former students of Charles L. Hulin gathered in Champaign, Illinois, for a conference to honor his contributions to the psychology of work and to celebrate his retirement. This book is the product of that conference, but it is more than simply a series of research papers on the psychology of work or the musings of scholars about the psychology of work. The book can be read to understand the current state of the research on the psychology of work. It can also be read to understand Hulin's unique theoretical-empirical perspective on research about the psychology of work. Doctoral seminars taught by the very best professors provide insight not only into a content area, but also into the professor's way of thinking about and inquiring into that content area. This book was designed to provide insight into the Hulin legacy—a paradigm for thinking about and doing research on the psychology of work.

Part I of the book, *The Hulin Legacy*, provides direct insight into this paradigm. Hulin's own chapter, *Lessons From Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, discusses the centrality of work in modern life. Judge's chapter, *Back to the Same Place, for the First Time? The Hulin Family Tree*, reveals Hulin's intellectual influences passed down from Wilhelm Wundt and Edward Titchener, E. G. Boring, and J. P. Guilford through his mentor, Patricia Cain Smith, and from Thomas Art Ryan, also a professor of psychology at Cornell during Hulin's graduate school days. Hulin's vita is an appendix to the book. Hulin is the son of an autoworker and a union member, who knew the days of organizing the UAW–CIO in the Michigan

auto plants. He passed along many of these events and an appreciation of the role of the blue-collar work to Chuck.

Chuck was a scholarship student at Northwestern University where he worked in D. T. Campbell's social psychology laboratory and wrote a BA Thesis with Brendan Maher. He went to graduate school at Cornell, and subsequently spent his entire career at the University of Illinois in psychology. The Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology recognized Hulin's influence on the field by conferring its Career Contributions award in 1998, noting his direct impact on knowledge about job satisfaction and withdrawal from work and indirect impact through training and collaborating with students and colleagues. What better way to understand that influence than engaging with him as he considers the lessons he has learned about the psychology of work, understanding his intellectual heritage, and becoming familiar with that which has been influenced by his thinking?

Part II, Research on the Psychology of Work, is organized into sections that reflect three recurring themes in Hulin's own research. Each section consists of chapters by authors who have worked with Hulin during their careers. The sections survey the state of knowledge with respect to the conceptualization of psychological constructs, the antecedents and outcomes of satisfaction, and modeling organizational behavior. First and foremost, the chapters in these sections provide content. They review past research, but they also suggest new insights into the psychology of work. Read these chapters for their content and read them to see how the Hulin paradigm is applied in systematic empirical research.

The chapters in Section A emphasize the theme of broad, theoretical constructs. The virtue of viewing constructs broadly is that a wide range of behavioral patterns can be explained by a small number of variables. Research by Hulin and his students has carefully developed and tested theories related to job satisfaction, withdrawal from work, and sexual harassment that demonstrate the conceptual and empirical utility of broad theoretical constructs. The chapters in this section illustrate the use of general constructs with respect to disposition or personality, performance evaluation, and cultural values.

The chapters in Section B illustrate the linkages between job satisfaction and its antecedents and outcomes. Hulin's own research propelled job satisfaction into a central role in theories of organizational behavior, first by demonstrating relationships between job satisfaction and a variety of outcome variables, and then by developing the general constructs of job and work withdrawal and demonstrating relationships between job satisfaction and withdrawal constructs. Two chapters in this section illustrating the precursors and consequences theme focus on "ripple effects" in organizations where sexual harassment of women affects the job satisfaction of

men in the same work groups, and where layoffs in a period of growth and economic prosperity transform psychological contracts based on job security to ones based on job insecurity. Two other chapters in this section illustrate one extreme reaction to job dissatisfaction—turnover—and how that decision unfolds. The final chapter describes a different reaction to job dissatisfaction—adaptation.

The chapters in Section C illustrate the theme of modeling behavior in organizational settings. Much of Hulin's recent research has focused on how to use formal models to characterize behavior in organizations. These contributions include applying models derived from item response theory to measures and translations of measures of job satisfaction, using structural equation modeling to test hypotheses about sexual harassment, and, most recently, using computational modeling to account for work withdrawal. Three chapters illustrate this theme using formal modeling procedures to explore patterns of aggressive behavior, faking and self-presentation behavior, and withdrawal behavior.

Colleagues and former students of Chuck Hulin produced this book to share the unique legacy of Chuck's insights into research and theory with a broader audience of scholars in work and psychology. Our enthusiasm for this project stemmed from another unique legacy of Chuck Hulin. Working with him, we learned to respect the people whose work lives we were studying; we learned the importance of our field of research; we learned to do research of the highest quality; we learned to be professionals. We also learned that none of us stands alone at the beginning of a research journey. All of us reached that place following the guidance of those who went before us and whose research has provided roadmaps of where we have been and where we seem to be headed. Without his encouragement, confidence, and behind-the-scenes aid, many of us would not be Industrial and Organizational psychologists. Hulin is not only a fine scholar, but an extraordinary teacher and mentor as well. The contributors to this book and the participants in the conference on the Psychology of Work celebrate Chuck Hulin's career. Thank you, Chuck, for the knowledge, the skills, and the values you gave us.

This page intentionally left blank

THE HULIN LEGACY

This page intentionally left blank

Lessons From Industrial and Organizational Psychology

Charles L. Hulin

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

CENTRALITY OF WORK IN LIVES IN MODERN SOCIETY

Industrial and Organizational (I-O) Psychology, to a greater extent than any other field of behavioral science, is concerned with one of the few fundamental elements of the life of an individual in our world. In the United States and other nations in the industrialized world, our work defines us. You are what you do. To do nothing is to be nothing. Just as doing nothing negates our humanity, we are defined privately and socially by our work.

Work, whether pleasant or painful, helps define individual identity. Strangers ask, “What do you do?” We reply to casual or ideological queries by naming skills or places of employment. We relate occupation to race, ethnicity, gender, region, and religion in struggling to comprehend the essential reality of self or community. Our daily tasks give lives coherence; by contrast, the lack of work denies our basic humanity. Workers uncomfortable with abstract discourse assert, “I am a workaholic” or “Hard work’s my middle name.” Philosophers may translate such vernacular lines into “I work, therefore I am.” (Green, 1993)

There are changes (but fewer than we think) from the days when we wore our occupation as our name. Our Anglo-Saxon ancestors named Ar-

cher, Baker, Bowman, Butcher, Brewer, Carpenter, Cartwright, Clark, Cooper, Cook, Farrier, Fletcher, Hunter, Judge, Miller, Miner, Porter, Sawyer, Sheppard, Scribner, Shoemaker, Smith, Squire, Tailor, Tanner, Teacher, Tinker, Wagner, Weaver, and Wright, among others, were identified by their occupation. Other examples from other languages and cultures are easily found. We did not have to guess about others' jobs nor did they have to announce their job in the first few sentences of a conversation for their place in the world to be known. We truly were what we did. We still are in less obvious but equally defining ways.

What Work Provides

Work is a source of identity. We no longer wear our occupation as our name so "What do you do?" is among the first questions we ask of a new acquaintance (perhaps the most generally exchanged bit of information about ourselves).

Work is a source of relationships outside the family. Our relationships with our work colleagues and supervisors define us and shape our views of the world as surely as do social roles.

Work is a source of obligatory activity. The obligatory activities and time constraints of work provide a structure to our everyday lives. Absent these structuring forces, quotidian activities may resemble all too much time fillers without purpose.

Work is a source of autonomy. In individualist cultures, autonomy is among the most strongly held values. Our autonomy, valued so highly in U.S. culture, rests on the foundation of a job, the money it provides, the goods that can be purchased with that money, and the intangible values of "standing on one's own two feet."

Work provides opportunities to develop skills and creativity. Aside from genetically influenced general cognitive abilities, the important skills and abilities we have are either developed or honed in the performance of a succession of jobs. We establish the base for these skills in the classroom but we develop them on the job.

Work is a source of purpose in life. The importance of family notwithstanding, work provides most of us with a sense of purpose. Among women, changes in the relative priority of marriage and family on one hand and work and a career on the other in industrialized societies suggest the overall importance of work may be increasing, at least among this segment of the population.

Work is a source of feelings of self-worth and self-esteem. Just as work provides a sense of purpose in life, accomplishments related to this purpose provide us with a sense of our self-worth and self-esteem. We gain self-esteem when we accomplish something worthwhile—and work is worthwhile.

Work is a source of income and security. Money is the universal fungible. Work, whatever the nature of the job, provides income that can be spent to acquire goods and services needed or desired. No other value received for work can be exchanged for the range of things that money can. Other values received from work may be more valued but none is as fungible. Money is a nearly universal metric used to measure accomplishments.

Work gives other activities, for example, leisure time, meaning. Absent work and work routines, our other activities would have no defining base. Not everything we do is measured against our work; work is, however, the source of activities that provides the ambient structure against which other activities are compared and defined.

Job Loss

Just as a job still defines today, the loss of a job has fundamental consequences for our lives. For example, when Gary Romans was fired by Caterpillar in Peoria, what troubled him more than the silence of the union was losing the company badge he had carried from the age of 18, as his father did before him for 31 years. Getting fired from the largest employer in a company town like Peoria is “. . . like an industrial death sentence. When you are fired, you have lost your identity, your sanctuary, and security” (Franklin, 1996).

Clifford Mills, executive vice president of Tazwood, a mental health center based in Pekin and serving the Peoria area, said after a prolonged Caterpillar strike that resulted in many employees being fired, “Trying to get these guys to respect themselves again is going to be the hard part for us clinically” (Franklin, 1996).

Clifford McCree returned to his former workplace 14 months after being fired from his maintenance job with the city of Miami. He killed five former coworkers, wounded one, and then killed himself. His suicide note read, “The economic lynching without regard or recourse was—is—something very evil. Since I couldn’t continue to support my family, life became nothing. . . . I also wanted to punish some . . . that helped bring this about” (“In Suicide Note,” 1996).

“Going postal” is now a part of our everyday language. It almost always refers to somebody killing former co-workers or supervisors because of real or imagined problems at work or the removal of work or a job from one’s life. But, just as suicide is the final culmination in a long series of self-destructive behaviors, “going postal” is but the tip of the iceberg of interpersonal aggressiveness and abuse individuals experience and dispense in organizations (Glomb, 1998, in press). The consequences for individuals and organizations of anger and aggression in the workplace are significant and long-term. Patterns of such incidents, both aggressing and being

aggrieved against, are predictable by a combination of individual differences and organizational characteristics (Glomb, 1998). These relations highlight the need for research into an aspect of work in organizations that may erupt into violence when individuals are denied a job and the dignity that goes with it.

In the United States, when the size of the population is controlled, the number of employed persons and the number of suicides are correlated $-.59$ ($p < .01$) across years (Cook, Dintzer, & Mark, 1980). The direction of this correlation no surprise; the size of the relationship, describing an effect size of $\sim .6$ in the relationship between suicide and lack of work across years, may be somewhat surprising. The results of a lack of a job are not phenomena restricted to the United States or Western societies. In Japan, they are experiencing the highest unemployment levels in post-war history and the highest number and largest percentage of people committing suicide, nearly 33,000 in 1998 (Strom, 1999). These trends in suicide began in 1990 when the bubble of Japan's economy burst. There was a 44.6% increase in suicide in 1998 over 1997 among men ages 40 to 59. Forty percent more men in their 20s committed suicide in 1998. These trends have not changed in the past 2 years. These are noteworthy figures because this is the period of time when young men traditionally counted on becoming *shaiin*, members of society by means of entering the work force. This portal to society is opened only a crack today compared to previous years. The shame of not having a job is almost unbearable among Japanese men. Men without a job—even employed men fearful of losing their job—are killing themselves. The effects of job loss or a lack of a job may be magnified in Japan because the threshold for suicide is reduced; suicide has little of the stigma it has in the United States or other Western societies.

But in other nations, functionally related responses that reflect indirect self-destruction (Baumeister & Scher, 1988; Faberow, 1980) will be enacted as surely as people are deprived of a job and their pride is eroded. Few modern societies or cultures have true “coming of age and independence” ceremonies. Jobs and work are the defining elements of adulthood. Acquiring full-time work is often the only obvious event marking the transition from childhood. The loss of a job, either through layoff, firing, or retirement is a major life event; it may mark a return to dependency on one's family, spouse, or the government. In an individualist culture such as the United States (Triandis, 1994; chap. 5, this volume), dependency is functionally equivalent to being shunned in a collectivist culture; they are both threats to one's identity.

When we deny a person's work, we deny many things other than income—things that represent the difference between existence and a life seen as valuable. We gain self-esteem when we do something worthwhile, not when we mouth psychobabble slogans about our importance in the

cosmos; our jobs provide the most frequent source of accomplishments. When a job is lost, low self-esteem and its consequences follow. We rarely have to retreat to our own private Walden Pond to learn if we have lived; we do that by examining our accomplishments.

Work, Population Demographics, and Public Policy

Work and jobs and expectations about jobs influence ages, and the changes in these ages, at which we marry (22.5 years for males and 20.6 years for females in 1970, and 26 years for males and 24 years for females in 1990) when we have our first children (21.8 years in 1960 to 24 years in 1990), and even *if* we get married (72% in the 1970s; 61% in 1990). These are *very* large changes in population demographics across approximately 20 years. The birth rate in the United States has dropped to near the replacement rate of ~ 2.1 . Fertility rates are substantially below population replacement rates in many Western, industrialized nations, for example, Sweden, Ireland, and Italy in the European Union. Their birth rates are sufficiently below population replacement rates that they have significant (negative) implications for the nation.

The most frequent reason given for delayed beginnings of families, for limitations on family size, increasing ages of marriage, or even marriage at all, is interference with working careers of potential mothers. When work or a career are seen as limited by marriage and a family, the latter are frequently giving way to the former. Some countries, for example, Sweden, have instituted public policies to increase birth rates and family sizes by making parenthood compatible with working careers. A similar but weaker Family Friendly Leave Act addresses the same issues in the United States.

Changes in women's priorities, balancing or even reversing the relative importance of marriage and family on one hand, and work and career on the other, would have seemed unthinkable a generation ago. Legislation allowing women to pursue marriage and families within the context of jobs and careers speaks eloquently to the importance of work and its role in contemporary lives of both men and women. Changes in thinking about work and careers is needed but these changes must be based on solid empirical data.

Tinkering with work so it is compatible with a family or addressing peripheral issues of work responsibilities is not going to do the job. When work and careers take precedence over marriage and children, changes in social policies to protect the social institutions of marriage and the family within the context of a working family are needed. But we must know what elements of work constitute the core of its meaning in contemporary lives. The study of work is vital to understanding changes in individuals and so-

ciety. Work may be the impetus for more changes in family life and contemporary society than any other single force.

Work and Development

Work influences us throughout our lives as few activities do. No other choice we make—with the possible exception of our spouse—influences each of us, our families, our children, our values, or our status as much as our choice of a job or an occupation. Throughout our lives, but especially from our late teens and early 20s to our 60s, we spend more time engaged in work activities than any other single pursuit (except sleep, which does not seem to be a pursuit or even an activity). Social roles and social behaviors are developed and grow out of our work roles and work organizations but they are studied devoid of their context within populations of college sophomores who appear as research participants in most experimental research.

Wiggins (1965) argued that personalities are forged by social roles and social interactions. Work roles and work role interactions occur later in our lives than do social roles and social role interactions, but many enter the world of work via part-time and temporary work in their early teens. In 2000, nearly 65% of the teenagers work by the time they are 15 according to a report released by the U.S. Department of Labor. By the time U.S. teenagers are graduated from high school, 80% of them have been employed at least on a part-time basis (Barling & Kelloway, 1999); many occupy full-time work roles by then. The age at which personalities become fixed is unknown and probably varies from individual to individual. If social roles influence our personalities, then the influence of work roles on personalities must be explored because work roles are a large and important part of social roles and because the overwhelming majority of U.S. teenagers have jobs during high school. The influences of social and work roles, early and later in life, are largely unaddressed empirical questions. It will take a major change in how developmental and personality questions are studied; a life-span approach that addresses questions about the continuing importance of work and careers in the lives of individuals and families.

These psychological processes and their impact on nonwork spheres of life are rarely studied *in situ*, in organizational contexts, by social psychologists or personality researchers. Organizations are the settings for most of our nontrivial behaviors. These nontrivial behaviors take place in contexts that directly influence the behaviors. This is not to reopen the personality/situationism debate that was waged by Mischel (1977), Mischel and Peake (1982), and others (Bowers, 1973) but persistent, general, questions remain unaddressed about the role of situations and roles not often represented in traditional studies of personality or social psychology.

There is evidence that events at work create emotions and emotional reactions that spill over onto nonwork behaviors, health conditions, and health satisfactions (Fitzgerald, Drasgow, Hulin, Gelfand, & Magley, 1997; Fitzgerald, Hulin, & Drasgow, 1994; Glomb, Munson, Hulin, Bergman, & Drasgow, 1999; Glomb et al., 1997; Hulin, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 1996; Munson, Hulin, & Drasgow, 2000); there is little evidence that the spillover goes in the opposite direction.

Work, Society, and General Perceptions

Federal courts recognize the importance of work and jobs in our society, but they limit freedom of expression when expressions take place within the context of work organizations. Expressions and behaviors constituting gender and sexual harassment, expressions rarely challenged otherwise, are proscribed if they take place within work organizations. Such statements are judged to create hostile and threatening work environments that interfere with an individual's pursuit of a job or career. Harassers and their employing organizations are punished civilly by multimillion dollar fines. The Supreme Court of the United States has effectively ruled that when our fundamental right of freedom of expression conflicts with others' fundamental rights to a job and career, our freedom of speech must give way to these other, fundamental, rights. This recognition by the Supreme Court highlights their contention articulated in the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* that the constitution of the United States must be interpreted within the prevailing values of society. Our society values work and the freedom to pursue a job and a career as much as other freedoms. When they are in conflict, limits may be placed on the conflicting freedoms.

There are numerous other nonscientific testaments about the importance of work other than the decisions of the Supreme Court. Miller's *Death of a Salesman*, the American *Hamlet*, examines the disintegration of Willy Loman's life when he loses his job and his identity. Willy was a salesman. And for a salesman

... there is no rock bottom to the life. He don't put a bolt to a nut, he don't tell you the law or give you medicine. He's a man way out there in the blue, riding on a smile and a shoeshine ... and when they start not smiling back—that's an earthquake. And then you get yourself a couple of spots on your hat, and you're finished. Nobody dast blame this man. A salesman is got to dream, boy. It comes with the territory. (Miller, 1981)

But without a job, Willy no longer had a dream.

O'Neill's (1937) *The Hairy Ape* traces the collapse of an individual whose job as a coal tender on a ship identified him as a lout, incapable of sensitivity or intellect. His descent followed his realization of how he was seen by society. John Henry, perhaps our most recognized mythic hero, is celebrated in song and story for his fatal victory over a machine designed to take away his job. We have erected a bronze and granite statue of him at the site of the Big Bend Tunnel on the C&O Road. There is no statue honoring the man who designed the steam drill that killed John Henry and took his job. But John Henry, a mythic tunnel stiff, is so honored.

From a different point on the heroic spectrum, we have a song written nearly 200 years ago celebrating being a shoemaker, making shoes.

*In the days of eighteen and one,
peg and awl.
In the days of eighteen and one,
peg and awl.
In the days of eighteen and one,
pegging shoes was all I done,
Hand me down my pegs, my pegs, my pegs, my awl.*

.
.
.

*In the days of eighteen and four, peg and awl. (2)
In the days of eighteen and four,
I said I'd peg them shoes no more,
Throw away my pegs, my pegs, my pegs, my awl.*

*They've invented a new machine, peg and awl. (2)
They've invented a new machine,
The prettiest little thing you ever seen.
I'll throw away my pegs, my pegs, my pegs, my awl.*

*Makes a hundred pair to my one, peg and awl (2)
Makes a hundred pair to my one,
Peggin' shoes, it ain't no fun.
Throw away my pegs, my pegs, my pegs, my awl.*

Songs addressing basic human needs survive 200 years in oral tradition. Those that do not are unlikely to be found in oral tradition beyond the lifetime of the social writhing that produced them.

Community psychologists performed an important function when they adopted the ideas and approaches advocated and used effectively by Alinsky in his Back of the Yards Movement (1989, 1991) and focused attention on the importance of communities as influences on mental health, psychological development, empowerment, and other aspects of our lives.

However, what may be the most important parts of communities—work organizations, talking circles, and networks of co-workers—and the most important sources of self-esteem—accomplishments on a job or simply having a job—seem excluded from their inquiry. A recognition of the role of jobs and work as important influences on the lives and health of individuals may have developed a healthy cross-fertilization between community and I-O Psychology that would have strengthened both fields.

Contributions, Religion, and Society

Certainly on a normative basis, and perhaps even on an ipsative basis, jobs and careers are rated as more important to professionals than to blue collar workers (Hanisch & Hulin, 1990, 1991). This in no way overshadows the general importance of work, jobs, and the intangible benefits provided by such jobs, as compared to other elements in their lives, to all varieties of blue- and pink-collar workers. The effects of work on individuals is general. Work is work no matter who does it or what they do. It is as important to who we are whether one is a archeologist cataloging old garbage or a garbage collector picking up new garbage. Today, we rarely imbue work with elements of religion; previously, for some, work was painful but gained dignity because of its worthy end, purification for the pride of flesh. For instance, for John Calvin, work was valuable for what it signified in terms of a person's presence among the chosen few.

Contemporary man has replaced God and king with himself at the center of his life. For most people, the self is now defined by work more than any other element of their lives, including God and country. The meanings of work to individuals' lives have been stripped of most religious significance for most of us, but work's importance is not limited by socioeconomic status; its role may vary across groups but it is irrelevant to few. The usefulness of many standard external cues by which others know us—ancestry, religion, land ownership, school, accent, job—have been eroded in the United States by relentless application of democratic political philosophy, dynamic economic conditions, effective academic scholarship programs, and social, labor, and geographic mobility that have homogenized our population. One's job, however, remains as an obvious personal characteristic used by others and by ourselves to identify us.

Nothing links school, work, careers, family life, retirement, and post-retirement activities as do work, work attitudes, work values, and work behaviors. Other influences and processes wax and wane in importance across developmental stages. For some isolated populations, work plays a minor role at best in their lives. But for most, work provides an essential continuity across stages of our lives.

Few researchers now pursue a life-span approach to individuals' lives. Among the important themes such a life-span view of human development would discover are the things work brings to lives—autonomy, self-esteem, self-respect, a sense of purpose in life. These values and attitudes are related to behaviors in all of spheres of life, not just to work behaviors. Work attitudes and work values tie the components of our lives together. Nobody outside of I-O psychologists studies this aspect of the lives of individuals.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF I-O PSYCHOLOGY TO THE LIVES OF EMPLOYEES

Selection and Training

Much empirical and theoretical work by I-O psychologists contributes directly to the welfare of formal work organizations. In the extreme, this has been expressed as I-O psychologists being “handmaidens” of management, serving the goals of greater organizational profits at the expense and exploitation of employees. One need not encounter a Marxist or a member of the counterculture to hear this description of I-O psychologists and their activities. Zickar (in press) reviewed a part of the history of I-O Psychology that details evidence supporting this belief. This is a somewhat myopic view today of the generality and importance of research and application efforts of I-O psychologists. It accurately describes some I-O applied research. It does not describe the field as a whole.

Ideological controversies about the role of general cognitive ability in job and school performance (Andrews, 1990; Brodnick & Ree, 1993; Gould, 1981; Herrnstein & Murray, 1994) may never be resolved but empirically established relations between general intelligence and performance in a variety of complex settings (schools, work organizations) are well established (Hunter, 1980; J. E. Hunter & R. F. Hunter, 1984). Selection research benefits individuals selected into work organizations and, paradoxically, those not selected. Not getting a desirable job is painful at the time for all that having a job provides. The costs of getting a job for which one is not qualified have a deferred payment schedule in the coin of dissatisfaction, work, and job withdrawal (Hulin, 1992). The costs are no less expensive for that delay. The benefits from having a job that one can do well are inestimable. Basic research on selection into work organizations or academic institutions is necessary and valuable; exploiting the database benefits all parties involved.

The value of selection programs, both to society and to an organization, covaries with labor market conditions. During times of very low unemployment, selection blends over into placement programs. The question is not who should be hired but how can those hired be placed to maximize their

contributions to an organization. Selection also influences training more when unemployment is very low. How can those hired be trained to enable them to be productive members of an organization? When unemployment is higher, there are more applicants for a job and selection become possible without the necessity of investing in training for those hired.

Selection and training are two sides of a single coin. Depending on the labor market, and within wide limits, selection and training are alternate paths for reaching an organization's goals. They have different costs that are borne by different parties to the selection-hiring-placement-training process. Selection removes skilled and trained individuals from local environments through the hiring process, relying on high schools, community colleges, and training done by other organizations to provide employees with necessary knowledge and skills. Individuals can also be hired randomly from the applicant pool and then trained to perform the jobs in question. In this case, the costs of training are borne by the organization; individuals with newly acquired skills and knowledge are returned, stochastically, to the environment.

Selection and training are elements of an organization's interface with its environment that exploit or enrich environments depending on the relative balance of selection or training. Both processes benefit employees as well as work organizations in different degrees and coins over different time spans. Selection and training are intimately connected to the local labor market; they depend on theory and empirical data developed from basic research by I-O psychologists. If appropriately done, they provide better job/person fits than the ones provided by a random system of selection and unstructured on-the-job training.

On its own merits, organizational training represents an area of direct contributions by I-O psychologists to the worklife of employees. Teaching complex skills and procedures is relatively easily accomplished. The problems with organizational training, and perhaps most training and teaching, seem to be designing the training so it will transfer to work situations and will generalize broadly from the specific skills taught to other, related, skills (Richman, 1998). Individual employees in training courses and work organizations that sponsor the training are direct beneficiaries of research on training that will transfer and generalize. I-O psychologists are pursuing these latter questions, using models of motivated behavior based on goal setting (Ryan, 1970) and models of relapse prevention by Kanfer (1980).

Motivated Behaviors

Research in the area of human motivation by I-O psychologists makes significant contributions to employees as well as to the employing organizations. I-O researchers have borrowed from general psychology for their

theories in the past. This nonrecursive borrowing has slowed considerably in the last 10 years or so. Appeals to physiological needs, need hierarchies, psychoanalytic motives, and even self-observations of one's own behaviors (as if these behaviors were the only needed source of information about why we behave as we do), are being discarded in favor of somewhat different starting points. These different starting points are cognitive in nature but the emphasis may be shifting to a recognition of the role of work and work tasks in our lives. The time may have come when there is a reversal of the assumed "appropriate" direction of generalization and influence that has gone from theories of behavior in general to work behaviors. Theories of work behavior should be a foundation for "basic" areas of research; the ecological importance of work behaviors and the lack of clear distinctions between work and nonwork activities are compelling reasons:

- Activity is the normal state of an individual (Naylor, Pritchard, & Ilgen, 1980; Ryan, 1970).
- Work and nonwork constitute fuzzy rather than crisp sets; distinctions among work and nonwork activities are probabilistic. Even if we try to separate the activities from their contexts, the distinctions may be trivial.
- Models and theories of motivation need to account for variance in direction and duration of this ongoing stream of behavior; variance in amplitude will contribute trivially to understanding normal behaviors (Terborg & Miller, 1978).
- Behaviors in work settings account for most of the important activity to be explained. When time for eating, sleeping, and routine commuting is subtracted from a day, work activities constitute the bulk of the remaining activities whose variance we want to explain.

These assumptions should lead to a changed direction in motivation research. They suggest that we need not concern ourselves with impetus to action when studying normal adults. Generalizations of a theory of behavior at work to account for variance in less generally distributed tasks and activities have the advantage of being based on data from individuals enacting salient and widely distributed tasks and activities.

The assumption that activity is the normal state and researchers need be concerned only with direction and duration of a stream of activity rather than activity versus nonactivity seems a truism. It could be verified by observations of individuals but hardly seems worth the effort.

We can test empirically the assumption that work and nonwork are fuzzy sets with activities having degrees of belongingness rather than crisp memberships by generating a list of activities and asking observers to classify them, divorced from their contexts, if possible, into work versus non-

work tasks. One person's hobby is very likely to be another person's work and livelihood:

- Some individuals tie trout flies for fun. Other people, some working part-time in small towns in Montana, some from third-world and emerging countries, tie them for money.
- I wrote for a living . . . or, perhaps more accurately, I spent many hours writing and editing manuscripts while "working." Others write for fun and "publish" their products in vanity presses or chapbooks.
- There are more amateur musicians than there are professionals; their musical activities, including performing before an audience who may or may not have paid to hear them, differ but little. Amateurs are unlikely to regard making music as work; professionals regard what they do as work.
- There are more amateur actors in local playhouses than there are professionals on Broadway. They perform before paying audiences. Everything about their task but the pay is the same. The degree to which the task of acting contributes to the self-identity of professional and amateur actors may differ but little. Their "day-jobs" allow them to eat; their "real" jobs allow them to be.

Tasks can be classified into work and nonwork even though the tasks may migrate between work and nonwork depending on the context, who is doing them, and why. We can extract signals about the worklike nature of some tasks and the nonworklike characteristics of others even when tasks have degrees of belongingness of .55/.45 to the two sets. These signals may be informative and important. But, there may be few reliable differences between work and nonwork activities except for contextual factors. Generalizations from theories of work and patterns of organizational behaviors to patterns of behaviors in nonwork settings may help us understand planful and reasoned behaviors in all settings, not just behaviors in work organizations.

Assumptions about the overlap between work and nonwork tasks can be addressed empirically. A relatively small number of unidimensional ratings of task characteristics in a multidimensional scaling study of tasks might contribute significantly to both our understanding of the differences between work and nonwork and the similarities and overlap in the constituent activities of the two sets. These unidimensional ratings might include:

- Paid versus unpaid;
- Supervised versus unsupervised;

- Product or goal determined by someone else versus self-determined product or goal;
- Ownership of the work product versus ownership by someone else;
- Done at hours set by someone else versus done at the pleasure of the person.

Such unidimensional ratings may help us identify the dimensions needed to account for perceived similarities of work and nonwork tasks. The specifications of the dimensions are important evidence about tasks that constitute the nontrivial behaviors individuals enact. Clusters or families of tasks are likely to include both “work” and “nonwork” activities. The distinctness of work and nonwork tasks and the content of the unidimensional ratings accounting for dimensions among tasks will inform us of the likelihood that a general theory of task performance will generalize across the nontrivial tasks individuals do, whatever the setting.

Work may also consist of those things we do well enough so others pay us to do them, and that we can do fast enough to make a living. This elevates pay and others’ evaluations of what we do to central roles. *Pro bono* activities, ranging from carpenters building a house for a homeless family to lawyers or professors contributing their time to a legal case or project requiring their talents, cause problems for this definition. If we do the same tasks for a living are they work when we do them *pro bono*? The tasks are identical but the role of pay has changed. The background against which *pro bono* activities are judged, work-for-pay activities, provides the ground that differentiates work from the figure of *pro bono* activities. But we need a definition of work that includes those tasks that are work but excludes those that are not to form the background. The complexity of the construct suggests a multidimensional, “fuzzy” set approach may provide initial understanding that can be supplemented by a more inclusive definition that builds on the insights provided by characteristics of tasks that are related to degrees of belongingness of tasks to work and nonwork sets.

Organizations are excellent laboratories: They control many environmental characteristics that influence means, variances, and the structure of behaviors and constructs of our theories. Research done in these controlled settings provides an excellent empirical basis for generalizations.

This reversal of the assumed “appropriate” direction of generalization from behavior in general to work behaviors will strike many non-I-O psychologists as blasphemy. I-O Psychology, an “applied” area, should be taking its lead from the “basic” areas of psychology. The arguments just outlined suggest a theory of motivation based on individuals enacting behaviors related to work tasks and leading to a different conclusion. We should proceed in an orderly fashion to explore the limits of generality of theories of work behaviors.

Theories of behavior that have emerged from I-O research are intended to account for variance in reasoned activities that humans perform. In addition to accounting for variance in work behaviors in organizations, goal setting theory (Ryan, 1970) and technology (Locke, Shaw, Sari, & Latham, 1981) account for variance in performance across a wide variety of settings. Kluger and DiNisi's (1996) theory of feedback interventions provides a statement about the characteristics of feedback. Naylor et al. (1980) developed a general theory of behavior based on an expansion of subjective utility theory derived from Tolman (1932, 1959) and Peak (1955). Their theory assumed that behaviors are a result of judgments and decisions by individuals influenced by individual differences, situational constraints, and characteristics of tasks that constitute the antecedents of these judgments and decisions. Weiss and Cropanzano's (1996) theory of affect and evaluations—emotions and attitudes—in organizations specifies relations between these different reactions to work and other tasks and salient behaviors that should be observed (Donovan, 1999; Miner, 1999). Differences in relations involving emotions and evaluations about the same object can contribute significantly to our understanding of how individuals react and how they behave in response to their cognitive and emotional reactions to their jobs and other tasks.

These developments have come from I-O psychologists attempting to account for variance in characteristics of human behavior. Organizational behavior was the focus of their efforts; the generality of their formulations may reach well beyond this focus. The general usefulness of these theories rests on the degree of generality of the theories that specifically account for variance in behaviors in organizations to other settings.

Satisfactions and emotions are important parts of theories of motivation and behaviors. The role of satisfactions, viewed as instantiations of attitudes, in theories of job motivation is well known. The role of affect and emotions in theories of job behaviors and general behaviors is less studied. Interest in many aspects of motivation in psychology wax and wane as a function of the currently dominant paradigm dictating what is important—cognitions, emotions, or behaviors. Attitudes have components of each of these; the study of attitudes has remained important whereas the winds of research fashion have brought behaviors, emotions, and cognitions to the fore at different times. However, the demonstrated relevance of job attitudes as consistent correlates of important job behaviors suggests that they would be important to a general theory of motivation. Research on job behaviors has produced evidence (Hanisch & Hulin, 1990, 1991; Hulin, 1992) that predicting patterns of behaviors rather than individual behaviors, as suggested by Thurstone (1931) and Doob (1947), will pay dividends in the study of reasoned behaviors in general. Knowing the antecedents of attitudes and of emotions and the degree of overlap or

separation in these sets of antecedents would provide important information regarding why individuals enact their behavioral patterns.

Generalizing theories of work behaviors to behaviors in general, and including attitudes and affect as core constructs in the theories, adds to the mix of empirical findings, generalizations from these findings, and attitude/behavior theories. The consistently significant attitude/behavior relations found between job satisfactions and several job behaviors pose an unacknowledged theoretical problem for attitude researchers. Organizational attitudes predict many organizational behaviors; social attitudes towards objects do not, in general, predict individuals' behaviors toward those objects. This discrepancy may reflect a fundamental difference between social and work attitudes and between social and work behaviors. It should be addressed.

A perspective that stresses the general importance of work tasks and behaviors reverses signal and noise. The normal significant relations between job attitudes and job behaviors become the baseline against which nonsignificant relations between social attitudes and social behaviors are contrasted. Treating the lack of significant relations between attitudes and behaviors as the baserate and ignoring the ecologically more valid findings from I-O Psychology seems counterproductive. Research on attitudes that do predict behaviors may tell us much about social attitudes that do not predict behaviors.

The salience of the tasks that generate attitudes and the attitudes themselves that are used to predict different classes of behaviors, social versus organizational, vary considerably. Salience of attitudes is likely to be related to the ease of access to the attitudes; the omnipresence of job attitudes might be more important than accessibility. It is not just that job attitudes are easily accessible, it is that we cannot escape them for most of our waking days. This is in distinction to attitudes toward general social objects—religion, blood donations, contraceptive usage. How many times a day are these important? The importance of the ubiquity of job attitudes in influencing behaviors that are consistent with cognitive and emotional reactions to jobs may be a potentially important hypothesis to be studied. Working 8 hours a day, 50 weeks a year on a job that one hates is inescapable. A job that provides few of the outcomes an individual desires, or needs, to provide positive motivations to go to work every day or contains many stressors is dissatisfying, stressful, and potentially unhealthy (Fitzgerald et al., 1997; Glomb et al., 1999; Hanisch & Hulin, 1990, 1991; Munson et al., 2000). Opportunity costs involved in holding a dissatisfying job when one might have a satisfying job make the situation even worse. The affect and emotions generated by negative evaluations of a job and the inputs required to maintain the job are unavoidable. Working on a job that provide an individual with most or all of one's desired outcomes may

also be obvious. Individuals, while not evaluating their jobs every waking moment, are very much aware of a job's deficits and its advantages. These evaluations form the basis for job satisfactions/attitudes. These also are likely to be among the important antecedents of affect and emotions.

SUMMARY

I-O researchers, alone among psychologists, study work and its roles in the lives of individuals. Without I-O Psychology, the work processes and events that define our personae would remain unexplored or, worse, assumed to be known and turned over to practitioners for implementation. It is critical that the research is done well and that it is grounded in sound theory. Well done I-O research is likely to have immediate implications for public and organizational policies that distribute scarce resources such as jobs, careers, pay, and promotions; so, however, will poorly done research or research done in highly restrictive settings with problematic ecological validity. Bad research, like bad money, will drive out good research; it is almost always full of catchy slogans, simpler, easier to understand, and easier to sell to policy makers. If bad research dominates our field, it will be relied on by those needing guidance in policy decisions.

The research and theory that informs organizational policy, as opposed to public policy, has implications that are nearly as far-reaching. The impact may be on fewer individuals at a time but when this is multiplied across the number of work organizations in the United States, the cumulative impact is nearly as great as research that informs public policy. The quality and rigor are equally demanded.

This is not a plea for sound research on important issues. That may not be a no brainer but it is rather obvious. Few have ever made an argument for sloppy, atheoretical research. But the stakes here seem much different. I-O Psychology is being assaulted on two sides. One group is our colleagues from the practitioner side of the Boulder scientist/practitioner model that held sway in I-O Psychology for many years and did nobody, scientist or practitioner, any favors. See Latham (2001) and Hulin (2001) for two point-counterpoint articles on the role of basic versus applied research in I-O Psychology. On the other side are our colleagues from the so-called basic areas of behavioral science. I-O psychologists are seen as too theoretical by our application oriented colleagues; we are too applied for the rest of our colleagues. The former raise issues that are relatively easy to respond to. The rejection of the fundamental importance of I-O Psychology is less easily handled and these criticism are potentially more lethal, not for their validity but because of the standard, knee-jerk labeling, perception, and treatment of different subdisciplines within behav-