

New General Examination Format

May 24, 2013

Purpose: The Industrial-Organizational (I-O) Psychology Division at the University of Connecticut voted to adopt a standardized general exam format at its May 10, 2013 meeting. Given the numerous variations to the present general exam process, as well as its time-consuming nature for both faculty and students, a standardized approach has been adopted to better prepare students for working in the field of I-O Psychology and also to expedite the examination process for everyone involved. This document presents the working draft of this new exam format.

Goals of the General Examination: The degree students receive is in I-O Psychology; in line with this, students should be well versed in all elements of the I-O field. To that end, one purpose of the General Examination is to determine if a student can demonstrate a well-rounded knowledge base and the ability to critically evaluate and discuss all aspects of the field of I-O Psychology as outlined by the I-O Graduate Training Program at the University of Connecticut. Therefore, students are expected to study – and be tested on – the entirety of the I-O field. Successful completion of the General Examination should reflect that a student has achieved a working knowledge of all aspects of I-O Psychology and the ability to engage in informed, well-reasoned discussion of I-O Psychology topics as is often expected of a doctoral candidate in this field; for example, when responding to challenging questions following a conference presentation, in exchanges with other I/O psychologists about their research, when interviewing for jobs, and when it becomes necessary to explain the field of I/O psychology to other psychologists or non-psychologists.

Although a broad knowledge base is important, it is also important to develop a specialty area within the I-O field in preparation for doctoral research. Thus, a second purpose of the General Examination is to examine students in their area of research specialization. To compare these two exam goals, then, the first part of the General Examination is intended to demonstrate a thorough understanding of the broad field of I-O Psychology, and the second part is intended to demonstrate a deep understanding of a specific area of the field.

Method: The general exam will be offered once a year—during the week before fall classes. The exam will consist of three phases across three days. Days 1 and 2 will be written examinations, and Day 3 consists of an oral defense of the written answers and the student's ability to "think on their feet."

Exam Day 1, called the General Day, will ask students to write responses to four out of five questions that are written by the I-O Division Faculty and which are administered to all students taking the exam on this day. These questions can cover any topic in the field of I-O psychology. Some questions may be required.

Exam Day 2, called the Specialty Day, will again ask students to write responses to four out of five questions which for this day are written by the student's advisory committee. These questions will cover the student's own selected specialty area in the field of I-O psychology. That is, the student determines his/her specialty area in the field of I-O psychology (with the guidance of the major advisor); the student's committee then writes five items tailored to topics in this specialty area. Some questions may be required. Example specialty areas include (but are not limited to): Employee Selection¹, Human-machine Systems, Judgment and Decision Making¹, Incivility, Leadership, Macroergonomics, Team Processes¹, Work-Family Issues, Work Motivation, and Work Stress¹. Cross-area specialization is also possible; for example, topics could require application of specialized knowledge and deep understanding of incivility in regard to Occupational Health Psychology.

Finally, Exam Day 3 is an oral exam. The purpose of this portion of the exam is two-fold: (1) to allow the student an opportunity to defend, clarify or correct aspects of their written answers to the committee, and (2) to allow the committee to assess the student's ability to critically reason "on their feet." The oral defense will occur no sooner than two weeks after the completion of the written exam, and no later than four weeks after the completion of the written exam, at which time the student defends his/her answers to his/her committee. Additional questions may be asked during this oral defense including (but not limited to): questions about skipped items or partially answered items, clarification questions, or requests to integrate two answers into one new answer.

Student responses will be evaluated for completeness; demonstrated mastery of the content areas questioned; and the ability to integrate multiple topics and lines of research into a coherent interpretation or argument. Oral defense performance will be evaluated based on how well the student reasons through questions and arguments, and how the student defends his/her positions.

In the event a student does not successfully meet the standards for passing any portion of the exam, the committee may elect one of two courses of action:

- (1) The student may be asked to prepare further, and then repeats the entire exam process the following year, or
- (2) The student may be asked to write short essays covering the topics or approaches the student's committee feels he/she has not adequately prepared. These essays will be between 4-5 pages in length (double spaced), and will be expected to demonstrate that the student understands the topics or approaches identified by the committee. This would need to be completed within two weeks of the oral defense and will be evaluated by the student's major advisor.

¹ Note, individual major advisors may find this specialty too broad. Specialty topics should be agreed upon by student and major advisor.

Preparation for the Examination: Students are expected to begin preparing for the general examination from the time they begin their graduate studies. This preparation includes coursework, research, and regularly reading professional journals in the field on an ongoing basis. In addition, many students will choose to devote a concentrated block of time during the spring and/or summer before the examination to focused review and preparation for the exam. Students should expect to utilize course reading lists, Handbook chapters, and recent years of top-tier journals to guide their studying. Additionally, they should feel free to consult with the I/O Faculty to ascertain other general and/or specific directions for studying. Students are responsible for ensuring that they will be well prepared to answer any questions, in particular in their area of specialization. It is appropriate and encouraged for students to work together when preparing for the exam.

Examination Process: Exam Day 1 and Exam Day 2 will each involve a four-hour block of time (e.g., 9 a.m. to 1 p.m.) on separate days during the week that both occur before classes begin for the fall semester. Exam Day 1 and Exam Day 2 will both take place on campus, and all answers will be completed on a personal computer or laptop. Students are NOT allowed to use notes, readings, or the internet while taking the examination. The only material allowed to the student during the exam is a hard copy of the reading list that has guided their preparation (see the attached example). Day 3 of the exam will be a one-hour oral examination, scheduled to take place 2 – 4 weeks after the written examination is completed. Examiners for Day 1 include all I/O Faculty. Examiners for Day 2 and Day 3 are the faculty members of the student's committee, but may include additional members of the I-O Faculty as they desire to participate.

Petition for Alternative Exam: In extraordinary cases, a student and his/her major advisor may formally petition the I-O Faculty for the alternative, Project-based General Exam. The student first prepares a written petition in which he/she outlines why the Project-based General Exam is more beneficial than the standard examination to him/her and his/her future career plans. The I-O Faculty will then vote on whether or not to grant the use of the alternative format; a majority must approve the proposal. If approved, the student and major advisor will craft a formal project-based proposal for the student's committee to approve.

Advocacy for Method: Below are a few quotes from individuals who have taken General/Preliminary Exams based on a similar three-phase approach stating the benefits of such a method.

“I thought [the exam process] was a great experience! It gave me the opportunity to reflect on everything that I have learned much deeper and integrate topics in ways I didn't know fit together before. Although the process is daunting at times, post comps I can sincerely say that it's a much needed and useful skill.” **Lawrence Houston, Doctoral Candidate, The Pennsylvania State University.**

“The preliminary exam format encourages a deep understanding of all content areas and requires one to draw connections between disparate research streams typically labeled with a silo

approach as "I" or "O." As a practitioner, I am confident that I can answer any client's presented challenges because I understand the associations between the client's primary concerns and the I-O psychology literature and topics in which I am more experienced. The breadth of knowledge I gained while studying for the preliminary exam is always the foundation on which I build my applied research and consulting recommendations." **Erin Gerbec, Post-Doctoral Research Fellow, Air Force Research Laboratory Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH.**

"I have never known more about the field of Industrial-Organizational Psychology than I did during the semester of my preliminary exam." **Kevin Nolan, Assistant Professor Hofstra University.**

"The flexible question format allowed tests to be tailored appropriately to student interest, while still hitting the important points of the field in general. Further, the opportunity for defense left little room for inaccuracies in understanding if a student was well-versed in both the general aspects of the field, as well as their own area of specialization." **Nathan Carter, Assistant Professor University of Georgia.**

"The preliminary exam was effective because it not only required us to learn a large portion of the most influential I-O literature to date, but it required us to draw connections between the different content areas, resulting in a far more well-rounded perspective than when we started. Though I took the exam a few years ago, I still find myself drawing on that knowledge base which is useful when attempting to frame my work within the broader I-O literature." **Michael Daniels, Visiting Scholar Singapore Management University.**

Begin *Example* General Day Reading List

Example General Reading List

History of I-O Psychology

- Koppes, L. L., & Pickren, W. (2007). Industrial and organizational psychology: An evolving science and practice. In L. L. Koppes (Ed.), *Historical perspectives in industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 3-35). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Landy, F. J. (1997). Early influences on the development of industrial and organizational psychology. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82*, 467-477.
- Vinchur, A. J. & Koppes, L. L. (2007). Early contributors to the science and practice of industrial psychology. In L. L. Koppes (Ed.), *Historical perspectives in industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 37-58). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Zickar, M. J. & Gibby, R. E. (2007). Four persistent themes throughout the history of I-O psychology in the United States. In L. L. Koppes (Ed.), *Historical perspectives in industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 61-80). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Job/Task Analysis & Competency Modeling

- Arvey, R. D., Salas, E., & Gialluca, K. A. (1992). Using task inventories to forecast skills and abilities. *Human Performance*, *5*, 171-190.
- Levine, E. L., Maye, D. M., Ulm, R. A., & Gordon, T. R. (1997). A methodology for developing and validating minimum qualifications (MQs). *Personnel Psychology*, *50*, 1009-1023.
- McCormick, E. J., Jeanneret, P. R., & Mecham, R. C. (1972). A study of job characteristics and job dimensions as based on the Position Analysis Questionnaire (PAQ). *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *56*, 347-368.
- Morgeson, F. P. & Campion, M. A. (1997). Social and cognitive sources of potential inaccuracy in job analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82*, 627-656.
- Raymark, P. H., Schmit, M. J., & Guion, R. M. (1997). Identifying potentially useful personality constructs for employee selection. *Personnel Psychology*, *50*, 723-736.
- Sanchez, J. I. (1994). From documentation to innovation: Reshaping job analysis to meet emerging business needs. *Human Resource Management Review*, *4*, 51-74.
- Sanchez, J. I. & Levine, E. L. (2009). What is (or should be) the difference between competency modeling and traditional job analysis? *Human Resource Management Review*, *19*, 53-63.
- Sanchez, J. I. & Levine, E. L. (2000). Accuracy or consequential validity: Which is the better standard for job analysis data? *Journal of Organizational Behaviors*, *21*, 809-818.
- Sanchez, J. I. & Levine, E. L. (2001). The analysis of work in the 20th and 21st centuries. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 1: Organizational Psychology* (pp. 71-89). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Example General Reading List

Schneider, B. & Konz, A. M. (1989). Strategic job analysis. *Human Resources Management*, 28, 51-63.

Thompson, D. E. & Thompson, T. A. (1982). Court standards for job analysis in test validation. *Personnel Psychology*, 35, 865-874.

Criterion Theory and Development

Austin, J. T. & Villanova, P. (1992). The criterion problem: 1917-1992. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 836-874.

Bommer, W. H., Johnson, J. L., Rich, G. A., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1995). On the interchangeability of objective and subjective measures of employee performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 587-603.

Borman, W. C. (1991). Job behavior, performance, and effectiveness. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 1* (p. 271-326).

Campbell, J. P. (1990) Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 1* (p. 687-732). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press, Inc.

Dubois, C. L. Z., Sackett, P. R., Zedeck, S., & Fogli, L. (1993). Further exploration of typical and maximum performance criteria: Definitional issues, prediction, and White-Black differences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 205-211.

Hoffman, C. C., Nathan, B. R., & Holden, L. M. (1991). A comparison of validation criteria: Objective measures versus subjective performance measures and self versus supervisor ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 601-619.

Sackett, P.R., Laczko, R.M., & Arvey, R.D. (2002). The effects of range restriction on estimates of criterion interrater reliability: Implications for validation research. *Personnel Psychology*, 55, 807-825.

Sackett, P.R., Zedeck, S., & Fogli, L. (1988). Relations between measures of typical and maximal job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 482-486.

Sonntag, S. & Frese, M. (2002). Performance concepts and performance theory. In S. Sonntag (Ed.), *Psychological Management of Individual Performance* (pp. 3-25). West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Steele-Johnson, D., Osburn, H. G., & Pieper, K. F. (2000). A review and extension of current models of dynamic criteria. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 8, 110-136.

Judgment and Decision Making

Hastie, R. (2001). Problems for judgment and decision making. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 653-683.

Example General Reading List

Highhouse, S. (2002). Judgment and decision-making research: Relevance to industrial and organizational psychology. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 2: Organizational Psychology* (pp. 314-331). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Job Evaluation and Compensation

Bartol, K. M. & Durham, C. C. (2000). Incentives: Theory and practice. In C. L. Cooper and E. A. Locke (Eds.), *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Linking Theory with Practice* (1-33). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.

Morgeson, F. P., Campion, M. A., & Maertz, C. P. (2001). Understanding pay satisfaction: The limits of a compensation system implementation. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 16*(1), 133-149.

van Sliedregt, T., Voskuil, O. F., & Thierry, H. (2001). Job evaluation systems and pay grade structures: Do they match? *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 12*(8), 1313-1324.

Individual Differences

Ackerman, P. L., & Heggestad, E. D. (1997). Intelligence, personality, and interests: Evidence for overlapping traits. *Psychological Bulletin, 121*(2), 219-245.

Murphy, K. R. (1996). Individual differences and behavior in organizations: Much more than g. In K. Murphy (Ed.), *Individual differences and behavior in organizations* (pp. 3-30). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Intelligence

Behling, O. (1998). Employee selection: Will intelligence and conscientiousness do the job? *Academy of Management Executive, 12*, 77-86.

Hunter, J. E., Schmidt, F. L., Rauschenberger, J. M., & Jayne, M. E. A. (2000). Intelligence, motivation, and job performance. In C. L. Cooper and E. A. Locke (Eds.), *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Linking Theory with Practice* (278-303). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.

Reeve, C. L., & Hakel, M. D. (2002). Asking the right questions about g. *Human Performance, 15*, 47-74.

Personality

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big-five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 1-26.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1996). Effects of impression management and self-deception on the predictive validity of personality constructs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 261-272.

Example General Reading List

- Burch, G. St. J. & Anderson, N. (2008). Personality as a predictor of work-related behavior and performance: Recent advances and directions for future research. In G. P. Hodgkins & J. K. Ford (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 23, pp. 261-306). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Cortina, J. M. & Ingerick, M. J. (2005). Personality in industrial/organizational psychology: Not much more than cheese. In G. P. Hodgkins & J. K. Ford (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 20, pp. 119-148). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Hough, L. M. & Ones, D. S. (2001). The structure, measurement, validity, and use of personality variables in industrial, work, and organizational psychology. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 1: Organizational Psychology* (pp. 233-277). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Roberts, B. W., Chernyshenko, O. S., Stark, S., & Goldberg, L. R. (2005). The structure of conscientiousness: An empirical investigation based on seven major personality questionnaires. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 103-109.
- Tett, R. P., Jackson, D. N., & Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality measures as predictors of job performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 703-742.
- Winter, D. G., John, O. P., Stewart, A. J., Klohnen, E. C., & Duncan, L. E. (1998). Traits and motives: Toward an integration of two traditions in personality research. *Psychological Review*, 105, 230-250.

Development over Time

- Kanfer, R., & Ackerman, P. L. (2004). Aging, adult development, and work motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 29, 440-458.
- Reeve, C. L., & Hakel, M. D. (2000). Toward an understanding of adult intellectual development: Investigating within-individual convergence of interest and knowledge profiles. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 897-908.

Individual Assessment

- Highhouse, S. (2002). Assessing the candidate as a whole: A historical and critical analysis of individual psychological assessment for personnel decision making. *Personnel Psychology*, 55, 363-396.
- Jeanneret, R. & Silzer, R. (1998). An overview of individual psychological assessment. In R. Jeanneret & R. Silzer (Eds.), *Individual Psychological Assessment: Predicting Behavior in Organizational Setting* (p. 3-26). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ryan, A. M. & Sackett, P. R. (1998). Individual assessment: The research base. In R. Jeanneret & R. Silzer (Eds.), *Individual Psychological Assessment: Predicting Behavior in Organizational Setting* (p. 54-87). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Example General Reading List

Recruitment/Selection

- Anderson, N., Born, M. & Cunningham-Snell, N. (2001). Recruitment and selection: Applicant perspectives and outcomes. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 1: Organizational Psychology* (pp. 200-218). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Breaugh, J. A., Macan, T. H., & Grambow, D. M. (2008). Employee recruitment: Current knowledge and directions for future research. In G. P. Hodgkinson & J. K. Ford (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (Vol. 23, pp. 45-82)*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Newman, D. A. & Lyon, J. S. (2009). Recruitment efforts to reduce adverse impact: Targeted recruiting for personality, cognitive ability, and diversity. *Journal Applied Psychology, 92*, 298-317.
- Sackett, P.R., & Lievens, F. (2008). Personnel selection. *Annual Review of Psychology, 59*, 419-450.
- Salgado, J. F., Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2001). Predictors used for personnel selection: An overview of constructs, methods, and techniques. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 1: Organizational Psychology* (pp. 165-199). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Taylor, M. S. & Collins, C. J. (2000). Organizational recruitment: Enhancing the intersection of research and practice. In C. L. Cooper and E. A. Locke (Eds.), *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Linking Theory with Practice* (304-334). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.

Legal Issues and Scoring

- Bobko, P., Roth, P.L., & Buster, M.A. (2007). The usefulness of unit weights in creating composite scores: A literature review, application to content validity, and meta-analysis. *Organizational Research Methods, 10*, 689-709.
- Cascio, W. F., Alexander, R. A., & Barrett, G. V. (1988). Setting cutoff scores: Legal, psychometric, and professional issues and guidelines. *Personnel Psychology, 41*, 1-24.
- Gutman, A. (2003). Adverse impact: Why is it so difficult to understand? *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist, 40*, 42-50.
- Sackett, P. R., Schmitt, N., Ellingson, J. E., & Kabin, M. B. (2001). High-stakes testing in employment, credentialing, and higher education: Prospects in a post-affirmative-action world. *American Psychologist, 56*, 302-318.
- Sackett, P. R., & Wilk, S. L. (1994). Within-group norming and other forms of score adjustment in preemployment testing. *American Psychologist, 49*, 122-158.
- Truxillo, D. M., Donahue, L. M., & Sulzer, J. L. (1996). Setting cutoff scores for personnel selection tests: Issues, illustrations, and recommendations. *Human Performance, 9*(3), 275-295.

Example General Reading List

Varca, P. E., & Pattison, P. (1993). Evidentiary standards in employment discrimination: A view toward the future. *Personnel Psychology*, *46*, 239-258.

Selection Methods

Ployhart, R. E., Weekley, J. A., Holtz, B. C., & Kemp, C. (2003). Web-based and paper-and-pencil testing of applicants in a proctored setting: Are personality, biodata, and situational judgment tests comparable? *Personnel Psychology*, *56*(3), 733-752.

Salgado, J. F. (1999). Personnel selection methods. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 14, pp. 1-54). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Schmidt, F. L. & Hunter, J. E. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, *124*(2), 262-274.

Biodata

Dean, M. A., & Russell, C. J. (2005). An examination of biodata theory-based constructs in a field context. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *13*(2), 139-149.

Interviews

Cortina, J. M., Goldstein, N. B., Payne, S. C., Davison, H. K., & Gilliland, S. W. (2000). The incremental validity of interview scores over and above cognitive ability and conscientiousness scores. *Personnel Psychology*, *53*, 325-350.

Huffcutt, A. I., Conway, J. M., Roth, P. L., & Stone, N. J. (2001). Identification and meta-analytic assessment of psychological constructs measured in employment interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*, 897-913.

Rynes, S. L., Barber, A. E., & Varma, G. H. (2000). Research on the employment interview: Usefulness for practice and recommendations for future research. In C. L. Cooper and E. A. Locke (Eds.), *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Linking Theory with Practice* (250-277). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.

Cognitive Ability Tests

Ottz, J. L. (2002). The role of cognitive ability tests in employment selection. *Human Performance*, *15*, 161-171.

Ree, M. J., Carretta, T. R., & Steindl, J. R. (2001). Cognitive ability. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 1: Organizational Psychology* (pp. 219-232). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Example General Reading List

Sackett, P. R., Borneman, M. J., & Connelly (2008). High-stakes testing in higher education and employment: Appraising the evidence for validity and fairness. *American Psychologist*, *63*, 215-227.

Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2002). Agreements and disagreements on the role of general mental ability (GMA) in industrial, work, and organizational psychology. *Human Performance*, *15*, 212-231.

Personality & Integrity Tests

Berry, C. M., Sackett, P. R., & Wiemann, S. (2007). A review of recent developments in integrity test research. *Personnel Psychology*, *60*(2), 271-301.

Hogan, J., & Holland, B. (2003). Using theory to evaluate personality and job-performance relations: A socioanalytic perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*, 100-112.

Hough, L. M. & Oswald, F. L. (2008). Personality testing and industrial-organizational psychology: Reflections, progress, and prospects. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, *1*, 272-291.

Situational Judgment Tasks

Brooks, M. E., & Highhouse, S. (2006). Can good judgment be measured? In J. A. Weekley & R. E. Ployhart (Eds.), *Situational judgment tests: Theory, measurement, and application* (pp. 39-55). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McDaniel, M. A., Hartman, N. S., Whetzel, D. L., & Grubb, W. L. (2007). Situational judgment tests, response instructions, and validity: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, *60*(1), 63-91.

McDaniel, M. A., & Nguyen, N. T. (2001). Situational judgment tests: A review of practice constructs assessed. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *9*, 103-113.

Assessment Centers

Arthur, W. J., Day, E. A., McNelly, T. L., & Edens, P. S. (2003). A meta-analysis of the criterion-related validity of assessment center dimensions. *Personnel Psychology*, *56*, 125-153.

Bowler, M. C., & Woehr, D. J. (2006). A meta-analytic evaluation of the impact of dimension and exercise factors on assessment center ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*, 1114-1124.

Lievens, F. (2001). Assessors and use of assessment center dimensions: A fresh look at a troubling issue. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *22*(3), 203-221.

Example General Reading List

Banding

- Bobko, P., Roth, P. L., & Nicewander, A. (2005). Banding selection scores in human resource management decisions: Current inaccuracies and the effect of conditional standard errors. *Organizational Research Methods, 8*, 259-273.
- Campion, M. A., Outtz, J. L., Zedeck, S., Schmidt, F. L., Kehoe, J. F., Murphy, K. R., & Guion, R. M. (2001). The controversy over score banding in personnel selection: Answers to 10 key questions. *Personnel Psychology, 54*, 149-185.
- Sackett, P. R., & Roth, L. (1991). A monte carlo examination of banding and rank order methods of test score use in personnel selection. *Human Performance, 4*, 279-295.
- Schmidt, F. L. (1995). Why all banding procedures in personnel selection are logically flawed. *Human Performance, 8*, 165-177.

Utility Analysis

- Cabrera, E. F., & Raju, N. S. (2001). Utility analysis: Current trends and future directions. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9*, 92-102.
- Hazer, J. T., & Highhouse, S. (1997). Factors influencing managers' reactions to utility analysis: Effects of SDy method, information frame, and focal intervention. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(1), 104-112.
- Roth, P. L., Bobko, P., & Mabon, H. (2001). Utility Analysis: A review and analysis at the turn of the century. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 1: Organizational Psychology* (pp. 363-384). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Selection Decision Making

- Highhouse, S. (1996). Context-dependent selection: The effects of decoy and phantom job candidates. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 65*(1), 68-76.
- Highhouse, S. (1997). Understanding and improving job-finalist choice: The relevance of behavioral decision research. *Human Resource Management Review, 7*, 449-470.
- Highhouse, S., Luong, A., & Sarkar-Barney, S. (1999). Research design, measurement, and effects of attribute range on job choice: More than meets the eye. *Organizational Research Methods, 2*, 37-48.
- Slaughter, J. E., Sinar, E. F., & Highhouse, S. (1999). Decoy effects and attribute level inferences. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*, 823-828.

Validation

- Barrett, G. V., Phillips, J. S., & Alexander, R. A. (1981). Concurrent and predictive validity design: A critical reanalysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*, 1-6.

Example General Reading List

Scherbaum, C. A. (2005). Synthetic validity: Past, present, and future. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 481-515.

Sussman, M., & Robertson, D. U. (1986). The validity of validity: An analysis of validation study designs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 461-468.

Performance Appraisal and Feedback

Brett, J. F., & Atwater, L. E. (2001). 360 feedback: Accuracy, reactions, and perceptions of usefulness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 930-942.

Fletcher, C. & Perry, E. L. (2001). Performance appraisal and feedback: A consideration of national culture and a review of contemporary research and future trends. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 1: Organizational Psychology* (pp. 127-144). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Kluger, A. N. & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119, 254-284.

Latham, G. & Latham, S. (2000). Overlooking theory and research in performance appraisal at one's peril: Much done, more to do. In C. L. Cooper and E. A. Locke (Eds.), *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Linking Theory with Practice* (199-215). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.

Smither, J. W., London, M., & Reilly, R. R. (2005). Does performance improve following multisource feedback? A theoretical model, meta-analysis, and review of empirical findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 33-66.

Viswesvaran, C. (2001). Assessment of individual job performance: A review of the past century and a look ahead. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 1: Organizational Psychology* (pp. 110-126). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Werner, J.M., & Bolino, M.C. (1997). Explaining U.S. courts of appeals decisions involving performance appraisal: Accuracy, fairness, and validation. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 1-24.

Yun, G.J., Donahue, L.M., Dudley, N.M., & McFarland, L.A. (2005). Rater personality, rating format, and social context: Implications for performance appraisal ratings. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 13, 97-107.

Training and Socialization

Alliger, G. M., Tannenbaum, S. I., Bennett, W., Traver, H., & Shotland, A. (1997). A meta-analysis of the relations among training criteria. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 341-358.

Example General Reading List

- Aquinis, H. & Kraiger, K. (2009). Benefits of training and development for individuals and teams, organizations and society. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 451-474.
- Arthur, W., Bennett, W., Edens, P. S., & Bell, S. T. (2003). Effectiveness of training in organizations: A meta-analysis of design and evaluation features. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 234-245.
- Ashforth, B. E., Sluss, D. M., & Harrison, S. H. (2007). Socialization in organizational context. In G. P. Hodgkinson & J. K. Ford (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 22, pp. 1-70). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Jex, S. M. & Britt, T. W. (2008). Attraction and socialization (Chapter 3). *Organizational psychology: A scientist-practitioner approach* (Vol 2). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Kraiger, K. (2003). Perspectives on training and development. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology*, Vol. 12 (pp. 171-192). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Saks, A. M., Uggerslev, K. L., & Fassina, N. E. (2007). Socialization tactics and newcomer adjustment: A meta-analytic review and test of a model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70(3), 413-446.

Attitude Theory, Measurement, and Change

- Ajzen, I. (2001). Nature and operation of attitudes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 27-58.
- Hulin, C., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Job attitudes. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology*, Vol. 12 (pp. 255-276). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Judge, T. A. (2009). Core Self-Evaluation and work success. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 18, 58-62.
- Koys, D. J. (2001). The effects of employee satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover on organizational effectiveness: A unit-level, longitudinal study. *Personnel Psychology*, 54, 101-114.
- Ricketta, M. (2008). The causal relation between job attitudes and performance: A meta-analysis of panel studies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 472-481.
- Venkataramani, V., & Dalal, R. S. (2007). Who helps and harms whom? Relational antecedents of interpersonal helping and harming in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 952-966.

Job Satisfaction

- Arvey, R. D., Bouchard, T. J., Segal, N. L., & Abraham, L. M. (1989). Job satisfaction: Environmental and genetic components. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 187-192.
- Iaffaldano, M. T. & Muchinsky, P. M. (1985). Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97, 251-273.

Example General Reading List

- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluation traits--self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability--with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(1), 80-92.
- Judge, T. A. & Church, A. H. (2000). Job satisfaction: Research and practice. In C. L. Cooper and E. A. Locke (Eds.), *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Linking Theory with Practice* (166-198). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.
- Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 530-541.
- Judge, T. A., Parker, S. K., Colbert, A. E., Heller, D., & Ilies, R. (2002). Job satisfaction: A cross-cultural review. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 2: Organizational Psychology* (pp. 25-52). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Judge, T. A., Thoreson, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin, 127*(3), 376-407.
- Schleicher, D. J., Watt, J. D., & Greguras, G. J. (2004). Reexamining the job satisfaction-performance relationship: The complexity of attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 165-177.

Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement

- Allen, N. J., Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment in organizations. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*, 1-18.
- Brown, S. P. (1996). A meta-analysis and review of organizational research on job involvement. *Psychological Bulletin, 120*(2), 235-255.
- Keller, R. T. (1997). Job involvement and organizational commitment as longitudinal predictors of job performance: A study of scientists and engineers. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(4), 539-545.
- Meyer, J. P., Paunonen, S. V., Gellatly, I. R., Goffin, R. D., & Jackson, D. N. (1989) Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of commitment that counts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 152-156.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*, 20-52.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Example General Reading List

- Allen, T. D., & Rush, M. C. (1998). The effects of organizational citizenship behavior on performance judgments: A field study and a laboratory experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(2), 247-260.
- LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 52-65.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 775-802.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management, 26*, 513-563.

Counterproductive Work Behaviors

- Dilchert, S., Ones, D. S., Davis, R.D., & Rostow, C. D. (2007). Cognitive ability predicts objectively measured counterproductive work behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(3), 616-627.
- Mitchell, M. S., & Ambrose, M. L. (2007). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(4), 1159-1168.
- Sackett, P. R. & DeVore, C. J. (2001). Counterproductive behaviors at work. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 1: Organizational Psychology* (pp. 145-164). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Spector, P. E., Fox, S., Penney, L. M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviors created equal? *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*(3), 446-460.

Justice/Trust/Cynicism

- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., & Porter, C. O. H. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 425-445.
- Fichman, M. (2003). Straining towards trust: Some constraints on studying trust in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*(2), 133-157.
- Gilliland, S. W. & Chan, D. (2002). Justice in organizations: Theory, methods, and applications. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 2: Organizational Psychology* (pp. 143-165). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Example General Reading List

Greenberg, J. & Lind, E. A. (2000). The pursuit of organizational justice: From conceptualization to implication to application. In C. L. Cooper and E. A. Locke (Eds.), *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Linking Theory with Practice* (72-108). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.

Schalk, R. & Rousseau, D. M. (2002). Psychological contracts in employment. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 2: Organizational Psychology* (pp. 133-142). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Stanley, D. J., Meyer, J. P., & Topolnytsky, L. (2005). Employee cynicism and resistance to organizational change. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 19*(4), 429-459.

Health and Stress in Organizations

Ganster, D. C. & Murphy, L. (2002). Workplace interventions to prevent stress-related illness: Lessons from research and practice. In C. L. Cooper and E. A. Locke (Eds.), *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Linking Theory with Practice* (34-51). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.

Hart, P. M. & Cooper, C. L. (2002). Occupational stress: Toward a more integrated framework. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 2: Organizational Psychology* (pp. 93-114). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Jex, S. M. & Britt, T. W. (2008). Occupational stress (Chapter 7). *Organizational psychology: A scientist-practitioner approach (Vol 2)*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 397-422.

Podsakoff, N. P., LePine, J. A., & LePine, M. A. (2007). Differential challenge stressor-hindrance stressor relationships with job attitudes, turnover intentions, turnover, and withdrawal behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(2), 438-454.

Tubre, T. C., & Collins, J. M. (2000). Jackson and Schuler (1985) revisited: A meta-analysis of the relationships between role ambiguity, role conflict, and job performance. *Journal of Management, 26*(1), 155-169.

Motivation, Self-Regulation, and Goal Orientation

DeShon, R. P., & Gillespie, J. Z. (2005). A motivated action theory account of goal orientation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 1096-1127.

Donovan, J. J. (2002). Work motivation. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 2: Organizational Psychology* (pp. 53-76). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Example General Reading List

- Jenkins, G. D. Jr., Mitra, A., Gupta, N., & Shaw, J. D. (1998). Are financial incentives related to performance? A meta-analytic review of empirical research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 777-787.
- Judge, T. A. & Ilies, R. (2002). Relationship of Personality to performance motivation: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 797-807.
- Kanfer, R. (1990). Motivation theory and industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 1; p. 75-170). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist, 57*(9), 705-717.
- Mitchell, T. R., Thompson, K. R., & George-Falvy, J. (2000). Goal setting: Theory and practice. In C. L. Cooper and E. A. Locke (Eds.), *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Linking Theory with Practice* (216-249). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.
- Porath, C. L., & Bateman, T. S. (2006). Self regulation: From goal orientation to job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 185 – 192.
- Tubbs, M. E. (1986). Goal setting: A meta-analytic examination of the empirical evidence. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 474-483.

Leadership

- Aditya, R. M., House, R. J., & Kerr, S. (2000). Theory and practice of leadership: Into the new millennium. In C. L. Cooper and E. A. Locke (Eds.), *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Linking Theory with Practice* (130-165). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.
- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60*, 421-449.
- Den Hartog, D. N. & Koopman, P. L. (2002). Leadership in Organizations. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 2: Organizational Psychology* (pp. 166-187). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing men and women. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 569-591.
- Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership. *American Psychologist, 49*, 493-504.
- Judge, T. A., Colbert, A. E., & Ilies, R. (2004). Intelligence and leadership: A quantitative review and test of theoretical propositions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 542-552.

Example General Reading List

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

Kark, R., Shamir, B., & Chen, G. (2003). The two faces of transformational leadership: Empowerment and dependency. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 246-255.

Small Group Theory and Team Processes

Cannon-Bowers, J. A. & Salas, E. (1998). Team performance and training in complex environments: Recent findings for applied research. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 7*, 83-87.

Hackman, J. R., Wageman, R., Ruddy, T. M., & Ray, C. L. (2000). Team effectiveness in theory and in practice. In C. L. Cooper and E. A. Locke (Eds.), *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Linking Theory with Practice* (109-129). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.

Mesmer-Magnus, J. R. & DeChurch, L. A. (2009). Information sharing and team performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 535-546.

McGrath, J. E. & Argote, L. (2001). Group processes in organizational context. In M. A. Hogg & R. S. Tindale (Eds.), *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Group Processes* (603-627). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Stevens, M. J. & Campion, M. A. (1999). Staffing work team: Development and validation of a selection test for teamwork settings. *Journal of Management, 25*, 207-228.

West, M. A. (2002). The human team: Basic motivations and innovations. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 2: Organizational Psychology* (pp. 270-288). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Organizational Theories, Culture, Change, and Development

Ashkanasy, N. M. & Jackson, C.R.A. (2002). Organizational culture and climate. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 2: Organizational Psychology* (pp. 25-52). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Detert, J. R., Schroeder, R. G., & Mauriel, J. J. (2000). A framework for linking culture and improvement initiatives in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(4), 850-863.

Neuman, G. A., Edwards, J. E., & Raju, N. S. (1989). Organization development interventions: A meta-analysis of their effects on satisfaction and other attitudes. *Personnel Psychology, 42*, 461-489.

Staw, B. M. (1991). Dressing up like an organization: When psychological theories can explain organizational action. *Journal of Management, 17*, 805-819.

Usdiken, B. & Leblebici, H. (2002). Organizational theory. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 2: Organizational Psychology* (pp. 377-397). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Example General Reading List

Diversity, Emotions, and Negotiation

- Ashkanasy, N. M. & Ashton-James, C. E. (2005). Emotion in organizations: A neglected topic in I/O psychology, but with a bright future. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 14, pp. 221-268). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 279-307.
- Harrison, D.A., Price, K.H., & Bell, M.P. (1998). Beyond relational demography: Time and the effects of surface- and deep-level diversity on work group cohesion. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 96-107.
- Jackson, S. E. & Joshi, A. (2002). Research on domestic and international diversity in organizations: A merger that works? In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 2: Organizational Psychology* (pp. 206-231). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kravitz, D. A. (2008). The diversity-validity dilemma: Beyond Selection—the role of affirmative action. *Personnel Psychology*, 61, 173-193.
- Ployhart, R. E. & Holtz, B. C. (2008). The diversity-validity dilemma: Strategies for reducing racioethnic and sex subgroup differences and adverse impact in selection. *Personnel Psychology*, 61, 153-172.
- Pyburn Jr., K. M. (2008). The diversity-validity dilemma: Overview and Legal Context. *Personnel Psychology*, 61, 143-151.
- Rupp, D. E., Spencer, S. (2006). When customers lash out: The effects of customer interactional injustice on emotional labor and the mediating role of discrete emotions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 971-978.
- Van Rooy, D. L., & Viswesvaran, C. (2004). Emotional intelligence: A meta-analytic investigation of predictive validity and nomological net. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65, 71-95.

Ethical Issues in I-O Psychology

- Lefkowitz, J. (2003). *Ethics and values in industrial-organizational psychology*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Mirvis, P. H., & Seashore, S. E. (1979). Being ethical in organizational research. *American Psychologist*, 34(9), 766-780.

Cross-Cultural I-O Psychology

- Aycan, Z. & Kanungo, R. N. (2001). Cross-cultural industrial and organizational psychology: A critical appraisal of the field and future directions. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C.

Example General Reading List

Viswesaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 1: Organizational Psychology* (pp. 385-408). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Gelfand, M. J., Erez, M., & Aycan, Z. (2007). Cross-cultural organizational behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 479-514.

Human Factors

Handbook of human factors, 2nd edition (HHF2)

G. Salvendy (Ed.) 1997. ISBN 0-471-11690-4. Wiley.

Chapters 1, 2, 15, 18, 49, 51, 57

Handbook of human factors, 3rd edition (HHF3)

G. Salvendy (Ed.) 2006. ISBN 13-978-0-471-44917-1. Wiley.

Human Factors in Systems Engineering (HFSE)

Alphonse Chapanis, 1996. New York: Wiley (ISBN:0-471-13782-0)

Macroergonomics (ME)

H.W. Hendrick and B.M. Kleiner, 2002. ISBN 0-8058-3191-6

Begin Example Specialty Day Reading List
(Specialty: Quantitative and Research Methods)

Example Specialty Reading List

Research Methods

- Bagozzi, R. P. & Edwards, J. R. (1998). A general approach for representing constructs in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods, 1*, 45-87.
- Cook, T. D. & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-Experimentation: Design & Analysis Issues for Field Settings*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Cortina, J. M. (2002). Big things have small beginnings: An assortment of “minor” methodological misunderstandings. *Journal of Management, 28*, 339-362.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1957) The two disciplines of scientific psychology. *American Psychologist, 12*, 671-684.
- McClelland, G. H. (1997). Optimal design in psychological research. *Psychological Methods, 2*, 3-19.
- Tochim, W. M. K. (2001). *The Research Methods Knowledge Base (2nd Ed.)*. Cincinnati, OH: Atomic Dog Publishing.
- Schwab, D. P. (2005). *Research Methods for Organizational Studies*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Vogt, P. W. (2007). *Quantitative Research Methods for Professionals*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Theory

- Bacharach, S. B. (1989). Organizational theories: Some criteria for evaluation. *Academy of Management Review, 14*, 496-515.
- Feldman, D. C. (2004). What are we talking about when we talk about theory? *Journal of Management, 30*, 565-567.
- Klein, K. J. & Zedeck, S. (2004). Theory in applied psychology: Lessons (re)learned. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 931-933.
- Schwab, D. P. (2005). Chapter 2—A model of empirical research; pp. 11-22.
- Sutton, R. I. & Staw, B. M. (1995). What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 40*, 371-384.

Lab v. Field Research

- Dipboye, R. L. & Flanagan, M. F. (1979). Research settings in industrial and organizational psychology: Are finds in the field more generalizable than in the laboratory? *American Psychologist, 34*, 141-150.

Example Specialty Reading List

- Dipboye, R. L. (1990). Laboratory vs. field research in industrial and organizational psychology. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*, Vol. 5 (pp. 1-34).
- Dobbins, G. H. (1988). A note on the role of laboratory methodologies in applied behavioural research: Don't throw out the baby with the bath water." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 9, 281-286.
- Griffin, R., & Kacmar, K. M. (1991). Laboratory research in management: Misconceptions and misused opportunities. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12, 301-311.
- Highhouse, S. (2007). Designing experiments that generalize. *Organizational Research Methods*.
- Schwab, D. P. (2005). Chapter 5—Research design foundations; pp. 53-68.
- Schwab, D. P. (2005). Chapter 7—Design applications: Field studies and surveys; pp. 84-94).
- Shadish, W. R. (2002). Revisiting field experiments: Field notes for the future. *Psychological Methods*, 7, 3-18.
- Stanton, J. M. & Rogelberg, S. G. (2001). Using internet/intranet web pages to collect organizational research data. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4, 200-217.
- Stone-Romero, E. F. (2002). The relative validity and usefulness of various empirical research design. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 77-98). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Qualitative Research in Organizations

- Bitektine, A. (2008). Prospective case study design: Qualitative method for deductive theory testing. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11, 160-180.
- Eby, L. T., Hurst, C. S., & Butts, M. M. (2009). Qualitative research: The redheaded stepchild in organizational and social science research? In C. E. Lance & R. J. Vandenberg (Eds.), *Statistical and Methodological Myths and Urban Legends: Doctrine, Verity, and Fable in the Organizational and Social Sciences* (p. 219-246). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lissack, M. R. (1998). Concept sampling: A new twist for content analysis. *Organizational Research Methods*, 1, 484-504.
- Locke, K. & Golden-Biddle, K. (2002). An introduction to qualitative research: Its potential for industrial and organizational psychology. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 99-118). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Madill, A. & Gough, B. (2008). Qualitative research and its place in psychological science. *Psychological Methods*, 13, 254-271.

Experimental/Quasi-experimental Designs

Example Specialty Reading List

- Cook, T. D., Campbell, D. T., & Perrachio, L. (1990). Quasi experimentation. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, Vol. 1* (2nd ed., pp. 491-576). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Cook, T. D. & Campbell, D. T. (1979). Chapter 3—Quasi-Experiments: Nonequivalent Control Group Designs; pp. 95-146.
- Cook, T. D. & Campbell, D. T. (1979). Chapter 5—Quasi-Experiments: Interrupted Time-Series Designs; pp. 207-232.
- Cook, T. D. & Campbell, D. T. (1979). Chapter 8—The Conduct of Randomized Experiments; pp. 341-386.
- Heinsma, D. T. & Shadish, W. R. (1996). Assignment methods in experimentations: When do nonrandomized experiments approximate answers from randomized experiments? *Psychological Methods, 1*, 154-169.
- Schwab, D. P. (2005). Chapter 6—Design applications: Experiments and quasi-experiments; pp. 69-83.
- Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). Chapter 1—Experiments and generalized causal inference; p. 1-32.
- Vogt, P. W. (2007). Chapter 6—Experiments and Random Assignment; pg. 95-112.

Self-report

- Chan, D. (2009). So why ask me? Are self-report data really that bad? In C. E. Lance & R. J. Vandenberg (Eds.), *Statistical and Methodological Myths and Urban Legends: Doctrine, Verity, and Fable in the Organizational and Social Sciences* (p. 309-226). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Clark, S. J. & Desharnais, R. A. (1998). Honest answers to embarrassing questions: Detecting cheating in the randomized response model. *Psychological Methods, 3*, 160-168.
- Crampton, S.M. (1994). Percept-percept inflation microorganizational research: An investigation of prevalence and effect. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 67-76.
- Podsakoff, P. M. & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management, 12*, 531-544.
- Spector, P. E. (1994). Using self-report questionnaires in OB research: A comment on the use of a controversial method. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15*, 385-392.

Surveys

- Clark, L. A. & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment, 7*, 309-319.

Example Specialty Reading List

- Hinkin, T. R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaire. *Organizational Research Methods, 1*, 104-121.
- Rogelberg, S. G., Church, A. H., Waclawski, J., & Stanton, J. M. (2002). Organizational survey research. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pg. 141-160). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Rogelberg, S. G., Fisher, G. G., Maynard, D. C., Hakel, M. D., & Horvath, M. (2001). Attitudes towards surveys: Development of a measure and its relationship to respondent behavior. *Organizational Research Methods, 4*, 3-25.
- Rogelberg, S. G. & Stanton, J. M. (2007). Introduction: Understanding and dealing with organizational survey nonresponse. *Organizational Research Methods, 10*, 195-209.
- Rose, D. S., Sidle, S. D., & Griffith, K. H. (2007). A penny for your thoughts: Monetary incentives improve response rates for company-sponsored employee surveys. *Organizational Research Methods, 10*, 225-240.
- Simsek, Z. & Veiga, J. F. (2001). A primer on internet organizational surveys. *Organizational Research Methods, 4*, 218-235.
- Tourangeau, R. (2004). Survey research and societal change. *Annual Review of Psychology, 55*, 775-801.
- Vogt, P. W. (2007). Chapter 5—Surveys and Sampling; pg. 76-94.

Sampling

- Aguinis, H. & Harden, E. E. (2009). Sample size rules of thumb: Evaluating three common practices. In C. E. Lance & R. J. Vandenberg (Eds.), *Statistical and Methodological Myths and Urban Legends: Doctrine, Verity, and Fable in the Organizational and Social Sciences* (p. 267-286). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Henry, G. T. (1990). *Practical Sampling*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Highhouse, S. & Gillespie, J. Z. (2009). Do samples really matter that much? In C. E. Lance & R. J. Vandenberg (Eds.), *Statistical and Methodological Myths and Urban Legends: Doctrine, Verity, and Fable in the Organizational and Social Sciences* (p. 247-266). New York, NY: Routledge.

Types of Errors

- Betz, M. A. & Gabriel, K. R. (1978). Type IV errors and analysis of simple effects. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics, 3*, 121-143.
- Games, P.R. (1973). Type IV errors revisited. *Psychological Bulletin, 80*, 304-307.

Example Specialty Reading List

- Kaiser, H. F. (1960). Directional statistical decisions. *Psychological Review*, 67, 160-167.
- Kimball A.W. (1957). Errors of the third kind in statistical consulting. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 52, 133-142.
- Leventhal, L., Huynh, C-L. (1996). Directional decisions for two-tailed tests: Power, errors rates, and sample size. *Psychological Methods*, 1, 278-292.
- Levin, J. R., & Marascuilo, L. A. (1972). Type IV errors and interaction. *Psychological Bulletin*, 78, 368-374.
- Marascuilo, L.A. & Levin, J.R. (1970). Appropriate post hoc comparisons for interaction and nested hypotheses in analysis of variance designs: The elimination of type-IV errors. *American Educational Research Journal*, 7, 397-421.
- Mitroff, I. I. & Featheringham, T. R. (1974). On systematic problem solving and the error of the third kind. *Behavioral Science*, 19, 383-393.
- Umesh, U. N., Peterson, R. A., McCann-Nelson, M., Vaidyanathan, R. (1996). Type IV error in marketing research: The investigation of ANOVA interactions. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 24, 17-26.
- (Fallacy of) Null Hypothesis Significance Testing**
- Berger, J. O. & Selke, T. (1987). Testing a point null hypothesis: The irreconcilability of P values and evidence. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 82, 112-122.
- Cortina, J.M., & Dunlap, W.P. (1997). On the logic and purpose of significance testing. *Psychological Methods*, 2, 161-172.
- Cortina, J.M. & Folger R. (1998). When is it acceptable to accept the null hypothesis: No way Jose? *Organizational Research Methods*, 1, 334-350.
- Cohen, J. (1994). The earth is round ($p < .05$). *American Psychologist*, 49, 997-1003.
- Cumming, G. & Maillardet, R. (2006). Confidence intervals and replication: Where will the next mean fall? *Psychological Methods*, 11, 217-227.
- Frick, R. W. (1996). The appropriate use of null hypothesis testing. *Psychological Methods*, 1, 379-390.
- Greenwald, A. G., Gonzalez, R., Guthrie, D. G., & Harris, R. J. (1996). Effect sizes and p values: What should be reported and what should be replicated? *Psychophysiology*, 33, 175-183.
- Jones, L. V. & Tukey, J. W. (2000). A sensible formulation of the significance test. *Psychological Methods*, 5, 411-414.
- Killeen, P. R. (2005). An alternative to null-hypothesis significance tests. *Psychological Science*, 16, 345-353.

Example Specialty Reading List

- Krantz, D. H. (1999). The null hypothesis testing controversy in psychology. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 44, 1372-1381.
- Krueger, J. (2001). Null hypothesis significance testing: On the survival of a flawed method. *American Psychologist*, 56, 16-26.
- Loftus, G. R. (1996). Psychology will be a much better science when we change the way we analyze data. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 5, 161-171.
- Nickerson, R. S. (2000). Null hypothesis significance testing: A review of an old and continuing controversy. *Psychological Methods*, 5, 241-301.
- Schmidt, F. L. (1996). Statistical significance testing and cumulative knowledge in psychology: Implications for training of researchers. *Psychological Methods*, 1, 115-129.
- Shaffer, J. P. (2002). Multiplicity, directional (type III) errors, and the null hypothesis. *Psychological Methods*, 7, 356-369.
- Trafimow, D. (2003). Hypothesis testing and theory evaluation at the boundaries: Surprising insights from Bayes's theorem. *Psychological Review*, 110, 526-535.
- Wainer, H. (1999). One cheer for null hypothesis significance testing. *Psychological Methods*, 4, 221-213.

Validity/Reliability

- Guion, R. M. (2002). Validity and reliability. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Handbook of research methods in industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 57-76). Malden, MA: Blackwell
- Vogt, P. W. (2007). Chapter 7—Reliability and Validity; pg. 113-127.

Reliability

- Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 98-104.
- Wanous, J. P. & Reichers, A. E. (1996). Estimating the reliability of a single-item measure. *Psychological Reports*, 78, 631-634.
- Wanous, J. P. & Hudy, M. J. (2001). Single-item reliability: A replication and extension. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4, 361-375.
- Li, H., Rosenthal, R., & Rubin, D. B. (1996). Reliability of measurement in psychology. From Spearman-Brown to maximal reliability. *Psychological Methods*, 1, 98-107.
- Drewes, D. W. (2000). Beyond the Spearman-Brown: A structural approach to maximal reliability. *Psychological Methods*, 5, 214-227.

Example Specialty Reading List

Osburn, H. G. (2000). Coefficient alpha and related internal consistency reliability coefficients. *Psychological Methods*, 5, 343-355.

Rodriguez, M. C. & Maeda, Y. (2006). Meta-analysis of coefficient alpha. *Psychological Methods*, 11, 306-322.

Schwab, D. P. (2005). Chapter 17—On reliability; pp. 240-251.

Validity

Austin, J. T., Boyle, K. A., & Lualhati, J. C. (1998). Statistical conclusion validity for organizational science researchers: A review. *Organizational Research Methods*, 1, 164-208.

Binning, J. & Barrett, G. (1989). Validity of personnel decisions: A conceptual analysis of the inferential and evidential bases. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 478-494.

Borsboom, D., Mellenbergh, G. J., & van Heerden, J. (2005). The concept of validity. *Psychological Review*, 11, 1061-1071.

Cronbach, L. J. & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52, 281-301.

Kane, M. T. (1992). An argument-based approach to validity. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 527-535.

Mitchell, T. R. (1985). An evaluation of the validity of correlational research conducted in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 192-205.

Schwab, D. P. (2005). Chapter 3—Measurement foundations: Validity and validation; pp. 23-37.

Schwab, D. P. (2005). Chapter 14—External validity; pp. 203-216.

Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). Chapter 2—Statistical conclusion validity and internal validity; p. 33-63.

Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). Chapter 3—Construct validity and external validity; p. 64-102.

Common Method Bias

Conway, J. M. (2002). Method variance and method bias in industrial and organizational psychology. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Handbook of research methods in industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 344-365). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Doty, D. H. & Glick, W. H. (1998). Common method bias: Does common method variance really bias results? *Organizational Research Methods*, 1, 374-406.

Example Specialty Reading List

- Lance, C.E., Baranik, L. E., Lau, A. R., & Scharlau, E. A. (2009). If it ain't trait it must be method: (Mis)application of the multitrait-multimethod design in organizational research. In C. E. Lance & R. J. Vandenberg (Eds.), *Statistical and Methodological Myths and Urban Legends: Doctrine, Verity, and Fable in the Organizational and Social Sciences* (p. 337-360). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 879-903.
- Scullen, S. E. (1999). Using confirmatory factor analysis of correlated uniquenesses to estimate method variance in multitrait-multimethod matrices. *Organizational Research Methods, 2*, 275-292.
- Spector, P. E. (1987). Method variance as an artifact in self-reported affect and perceptions at work: Myth or significant problem? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*, 438-443.
- Spector, P. E. (2006). Method variance in organizational research: Truth or urban legend? *Organizational Research Methods, 9*, 221-232.
- Spector, P. E. & Brannick, M. T. (1995). The nature and effects of method variance in organizational research. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology 1995 Volume 10* (pp. 249-274). Chichester, UK: John Wiley.
- Williams, L. J. & Brown, B. K. (1994). Method variance in organizational behavior and human resources research: Effects on correlations, path coefficients, and hypothesis testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 57*, 185-209.

Multi-level research

- Beal, D. J. & Dawson, J. F. (2007). On the use of Likert-type scales in multilevel data: Influence on aggregate variables. *Organizational Research Methods, 10*, 657-672.
- Bliese, P. D. (1998). Group size, ICC values, and group level correlations: A simulation. *Organizational Research Methods, 1*, 355-373.
- Bliese, P. D., Chan, D., & Ployhart, R. E. (2007). Multilevel methods: Future directions in measurement, longitudinal analyses, and nonnormal outcomes. *Organizational Research Methods, 10*, 551-563.
- Croon, M. A., van Veldhoven, M. J. P. M. (2007). Predicting group-level outcome variables from variables measured at the individual level: A latent variable multilevel model. *Psychological Methods, 12*, 45-57.
- Enders, C. K. & Tofighi, D. (2007). Center predictor variables in cross-sectional multilevel models: A new look at an old issue. *Psychological Methods, 12*, 121-138.

Example Specialty Reading List

- Hofmann, D. A. (2002). Issues in multilevel research: Theory development, measurement, and analysis. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Handbook of research methods in industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 247-274). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Klein, K. J. & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (2000). From micro to meso: Critical steps in conceptualizing and conducting multilevel research. *Organizational Research Methods, 3*, 211-236.
- Ludtke, O., Marsh, H. W., Robitzsch, A., Trautwein, U., Asparouhov, T., & Muthen, B. (2008). The multilevel latent covariate model: A new, more reliable approach to group-level effects in contextual studies. *Psychological Methods, 13*, 203-229.
- Sadler, M. S. & Judd, C. M. (2001). Overcoming dependent data: A guide to analysis of group data. In M. A. Hogg & R. S. Tindale (Eds.), *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Group Processes* (pp. 497-524). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Vogt, P. W. (2007). Chapter 12—Multilevel Modeling; pg. 214-229.

Statistical Methods/Data Analysis

- Cohen, J. (1968). Multiple regression as a general data-analytic system. *Psychological Bulletin, 70*, 426-443.
- Lance, C. E., Butts, M. M., Michels, L. C. (2006). The sources of four commonly reported cutoff criteria: What did they really say? *Organizational Research Methods, 9*, 202-220.
- Wilkinson, L. & The task Force on Statistical Inference (1999). Statistical methods in psychology: Guidelines and explanations. *American Psychologist, 54*, 594-604.

Power Analysis

- Cashen, L. H. & Geiger, S. W. (2004). Statistical power and the testing of null hypotheses: A review of contemporary management research and recommendations for future studies. *Organizational Research Methods, 7*, 151-167.
- Cohen, J. (1969). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Cohen, J. (1992). Statistical power analysis. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 1*, 98-101.
- Maxwell, S. E. (2004). The persistence of underpowered studies in psychological research: Causes, consequences, and remedies. *Psychological Methods, 9*, 147-163.
- Murphy, K. (2002). Using power analysis to evaluate and improve research. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Industrial-Organizational Psychology* (pp. 119-138). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Effect Size

Example Specialty Reading List

Cortina, J. M. & Landis, R. S. (2009). When small effect sizes tell a big story, and when large effect sizes don't. In C. E. Lance & R. J. Vandenberg (Eds.), *Statistical and Methodological Myths and Urban Legends: Doctrine, Verity, and Fable in the Organizational and Social Sciences* (p. 287-336). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cortina, J. M. & Nouri, H. (2000). *Effect size for ANOVA designs*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Grissom, R. J. & Kim, J. J. (2001). Review of assumptions and problems in the appropriate conceptualization of effect size. *Psychological Methods*, 6, 135-146.

McGrath, R. E. & Meyer, G. J. (2006). When effect sizes disagree: The case of r and d. *Psychological Methods*, 11, 386-401.

Thompson, B. (2002). What future quantitative social science research could look like: Confidence intervals for effect sizes. *Educational Researcher*, 31, 25-32.

van den Noortgate, W. & Onghena, P. (2003). Estimating the mean effect size in meta-analysis: Bias, precision, and mean squared error of different weighting methods. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 35, 504-511.

Measures

Bobko, P., Roth, P. L., & Bobko, C. (2001). Correcting the effect size of d for range restriction and unreliability. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4, 46-61.

Howell, D. C. (2002). *Statistical Methods for Psychology (5th Ed.)*. Pacific Grove, CA: Duxbury.

Rosenthal, R. (1994). Parametric measures of effect size. In H. Cooper & L. V. Hedges (Eds.), *The handbook of research synthesis* (pp. 231-244). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Rosenthal, R. & Rubin, D. B. (2003). $r_{\text{equivalent}}$: A simple effect size indicator. *Psychological Methods*, 8, 492-496.

Zou, G. Y. (2007). Toward using confidence intervals to compare correlations. *Psychological Methods*, 12, 399-413.

Missing data techniques

Fichman, M. & Cummings, J. N. (2003). Multiple imputation for missing data: Making the most of what you know. *Organizational Research Methods*, 6, 279-281.

Graham, J. W. (2009). Missing data analysis: Making it work in the real world. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 549-576.

Newman, D. A. (2009). Missing data techniques and low response rates: The role of systematic nonresponse parameters. In C. E. Lance & R. J. Vandenberg (Eds.), *Statistical and*

Example Specialty Reading List

Methodological Myths and Urban Legends: Doctrine, Verity, and Fable in the Organizational and Social Sciences (p. 7-36). New York, NY: Routledge.

Roth, P. L., Switzer III, F. S., & Switzer, D. M. (1999). Missing data in multiple item scales: A Monte Carlo analysis of missing data techniques. *Organizational Research Methods*, 2, 211-232.

Schafer, J. L. & Graham, J. W. (2002). Missing data: Our view of the state of the art. *Psychological Methods*, 7, 147-177.

Switzer III, F. S. & Roth, P. L. (2002). Coping with missing data. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Handbook of research methods in industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 310-323). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

CTT and IRT

Allen, M. J., & Yen, W. M. (1979). *Introduction to Measurement Theory*. [Reprinted in 2001]. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Ellis, B. B. & Mead, A. D. (2002). Item analysis: Theory and practice using classical and modern test theory. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Handbook of research methods in industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 324-343). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Embretson, S. E. & Reise, S. P. (2000). *Item Response Theory for Psychologists*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.

Vogt, P. W. (2007). Chapter 16—Test item analysis, individual assessment, and accountability; pg. 276-293.

Zickar, M. J. (1998). Modeling item-level data with item response theory. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 7, 104-109.

Zickar, M. J. & Broadfoot, A. A. (2009). The partial revival of a dead horse? Comparing classical test theory and item response theory. In C. E. Lance & R. J. Vandenberg (Eds.), *Statistical and Methodological Myths and Urban Legends: Doctrine, Verity, and Fable in the Organizational and Social Sciences* (p. 37-60). New York, NY: Routledge.

Generalizability Theory

Brennan, R. L. (2001). *Generalizability Theory*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Cronbach, L. J., Gleser, G. C., Nanda, H., & Rajaranam, N. (1972). *The Dependability of Behavioral Measurement: Theory of Generalizability for Scores and Profiles*. New York, NY: Wiley.

DeShon, R. P. (2002). Generalizability theory. In F. Drasgow & N. Schmitt (Eds.), *Measuring and Analyzing Behavior in Organizations: Advances in Measurement and Data Analysis* (pp. 189-220). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Example Specialty Reading List

Kraiger, K. & Teachout, M. S. (1990). Generalizability theory as construct-related evidence of the validity of job performance ratings. *Human Performance*, 3, 19-35.

Shavelson, R. J. & Webb, N. M. (1991). *Generalizability Theory: A Primer*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Shavelson, R. J., Webb, N. M., Rowley, G. L. (1989). Generalizability theory. *American Psychologist*, 44, 922-932.

Meta-analysis

Cortina, J. M. (2003). Apples and oranges (and pears, oh my!): The search for moderators in meta-analysis. *Organizational Research Methods*, 6, 415-439.

Dalton, D. R. & Dalton, C. M. (2008). Meta-analysis: Some very good steps toward a bit longer journey. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11, 127-147.

Dunlap, W.P., Cortina, J.M., Vaslow, J., & Burke, M. (1996). Meta-analysis of experiments with correlated observations. *Psychological Methods*, 1, 170-177.

Hedges, L. V. & Olkin, I. (1985). *Statistical methods for meta-analysis*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Hedges, L. V. & Vevea, J. L. (1998). Fixed- and random-effects models in meta-analysis. *Psychological Methods*, 3, 486-504.

Huffcutt, A. I. (2002). Research perspectives on meta-analysis. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Handbook of research methods in industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 198-215). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Mosteller, F. & Colditz, G. A. (1996). Understanding research synthesis (meta-analysis). *Annual Review of Public Health*, 17, 1-23.

Rosenthal, R., & DiMatteo, M. R. (2001). Meta-analysis: Recent developments in quantitative methods for literature reviews. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 59-82.

Schmidt, F. L. (2008). Meta-analysis: A constantly evolving research integration tool. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11, 96-113.

Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (2001). Meta-analysis. In N. Anderson, D. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran. (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work, and organizational psychology, Vol 1: Personnel psychology* (pp. 51-70). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schmidt, F. L., Pearlman, K., Hunter, J. E., & Hirsch, H. R. (1985). Forty questions about validity generalization and meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 38(4), 697-798.

Shadish, W. R. (1996). Meta-Analysis and the exploration of causal mediation processes: A primer of examples, methods, and issues. *Psychological Methods*, 1, 47-65.

Example Specialty Reading List

Exploratory Factor Analysis

- Bandalos, D. L. & Boehm-Kaufman, M. R. (2009). Four common misconceptions in exploratory factor analysis. In C. E. Lance & R. J. Vandenberg (Eds.), *Statistical and Methodological Myths and Urban Legends: Doctrine, Verity, and Fable in the Organizational and Social Sciences* (p. 61-88). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Browne, M. W., (2001). An overview of analytic rotation in exploratory factor analysis. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 36, 111–150.
- Conway, J. M., & Huffcutt, A. I. (2003). A review and evaluation of exploratory factor analysis practices in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 6(2), 147-168.
- Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, 4, 272-299.
- Hayton, J. C., Allen, D. G., & Scarpello, V. (2004). Factor retention decisions in exploratory factor analysis: A tutorial on parallel analysis. *Organizational Research Methods*, 7, 191-205.
- Vogt, P. W. (2007). Chapter 13—Factor Analysis; pg. 230-246.
- Wood, J. M., Tataryn, D. J., & Gorsuch, R. L. (1996). Effect of under- and overextraction on principal axis factor analysis with varimax rotation. *Psychological Methods*, 1, 354-365.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

- Flora, D. B. & Curran, P. J. (2004). An empirical evaluation of alternative methods of estimation for confirmatory factor analysis with ordinal data. *Psychological Methods*, 9, 466-491.
- Hojtink, H., Rooks, G., & Wilmink, F. W. (1999). Confirmatory factor analysis of items with a dichotomous response format using the multidimensional Rasch model. *Psychological Methods*, 4, 300-314.
- Lance, C. E., Noble, C. L., & Scullen, S. E. (2002). A critique of the correlated trait-correlated method and correlated uniqueness models for multitrait-multimethod data. *Psychological Methods*, 7, 228-244.
- Williams, L. J., Ford, L. R., Nguyen, N. (2002). Basic and advanced measurement models for confirmatory factor analysis. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Handbook of research methods in industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 366-389). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Mediation/Moderation

- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.

Example Specialty Reading List

- Cheung, G. W. & Lau, R. S. (2008). Testing mediation and suppression effects of latent variables: Bootstrapping with structural equation models. *Organizational Research Methods, 11*, 296-325.
- Edwards, J. R. (2009). Seven deadly myths of testing moderation in organizational research. In C. E. Lance & R. J. Vandenberg (Eds.), *Statistical and Methodological Myths and Urban Legends: Doctrine, Verity, and Fable in the Organizational and Social Sciences* (p. 143-164). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Edwards, J. R. & Lambert, L. S. (2007). Methods for integrating moderation and mediation: A general analytical framework using moderated path analysis. *Psychological Methods, 12*, 1-22.
- Fritz, M. S. & MacKinnon, D. P. (2007). Required sample size to detect the mediated effect. *Psychological Science, 18*, 233-239.
- James, L. R. (2008). On the path to mediation. *Organizational Research Methods, 11*, 359-363.
- James, L. R., Mulaik, S. A., & Brett, J. M. (2006). A tale of two methods. *Organizational Research Methods, 9*, 233-244.
- Kenny, D. A. (2008). Reflections on mediation. *Organizational Research Methods, 11*, 353-358.
- Landis, R. S. & Dunlap, W. P. (2000). Moderated multiple regression tests are criterion specific. *Organizational Research Methods, 3*, 254-266.
- LeBreton, J. M., Wu, J., & Bing, M. N. (2009). The truth(s) on testing for mediation in the social and organizational sciences. In C. E. Lance & R. J. Vandenberg (Eds.), *Statistical and Methodological Myths and Urban Legends: Doctrine, Verity, and Fable in the Organizational and Social Sciences* (p. 107-142). New York, NY: Routledge.
- MacKinnon, D. P. & Fairchild, A. J. (2009). Current directions in mediation analysis. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 18*, 16-20.
- MacKinnon, D. P., Fairchild, A. J., & Fritz, M. S. (2007). Mediation analysis. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*, 593-614.
- MacKinnon, D. P., Lockwood, C. M., Hoffman, J. M., West, S. G., & Sheets, V. (2002). A comparison of methods to test mediation and other intervening variable effects. *Psychological Methods, 7*, 83-104.
- Mathieu, J. E., DeShon, R. P., & Bergh, D. D. (2008). Mediational inferences in organizational research: Then, now, and beyond. *Organizational Research Methods, 11*, 203-223.
- Stone-Romero, E. & Rosopa, P. J. (2008). The relative validity of inferences about mediation as a function of research design characteristics. *Organizational Research Methods, 11*, 326-352.

Example Specialty Reading List

Taylor, A. B., MacKinnon, D. P., & Tein, J-Y. (2008). Tests of the three-path mediated effect. *Organizational Research Methods, 11*, 241-269.

Wood, R. E., Goodman, J. S., Beckmann, N., & Cook, A. (2008). Mediation testing in management research: A review and proposals.

Structural Equation Modeling

Bentler, P. M. (2007). On tests and indices for evaluating structural models. *Personality and Individual Difference, 42*, 825-829.

Cheung, G. W. & Rensvold, R. B. (2001). The effects of model parsimony and sampling error on the fit of structural equation models. *Organizational Research Methods, 4*, 236-264.

Cortina, J. M., Chen, G. & Dunlap, W. P. (2001). Testing interaction effects in LISREL: examination and illustration of available procedures. *Organizational Research Methods, 4*, 324-360.

DeShon, R. P. (1998). A cautionary note on measurement error corrections in structural equation models. *Psychological Methods, 3*, 412-423.

Eid, M., Nussbeck, F. W., Geiser, C., Cole, D. A., Gollwitzer, M., & Lischetzke, T. (2008). Structural equation modeling of multitrait-multimethod data: Different models for different types of methods. *Psychological Methods, 13*, 230-253.

Hall, R. J., Snell, A. F., & Foust, M. S. (1999). Item parceling strategies in SEM: Investigating the subtle effects of unmodeled secondary constructs. *Organizational Research Methods, 2*, 233-256.

Hu, L-T. & Bentler, P. M. (1998). Fit indices in covariance structure modeling: Sensitivity to underparameterized model misspecification. *Psychological Methods, 3*, 424-453.

Landis, R. S., Beal, D. J., & Tesluk, P. E. (2000). A comparison of approaches to forming composite measures in structural equation models. *Organizational Research Methods, 3*, 186-207.

Landis, R. S., Edwards, B. D., & Cortina, J. M. (2009). On the practice of allowing correlated residuals among indicators in structural equation models. In C. E. Lance & R. J. Vandenberg (Eds.), *Statistical and Methodological Myths and Urban Legends: Doctrine, Verity, and Fable in the Organizational and Social Sciences* (p. 193-218). New York, NY: Routledge.

MacCallum, R. C., & Austin, J. T. (2000). Applications of structural equation modeling in psychological research. *Annual Review of Psychology, 51*, 201-226.

MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W., & Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods, 1*, 130-149.

Example Specialty Reading List

- MacCallum, R. C., Widaman, K. F., Zhang, S., & Hong, S. (1999). Sample size in factor analysis. *Psychological Methods, 4*, 84-99.
- Meade, A. W., Behrend, T. S., & Lance, C. E. (2009). Dr. StrangeLOVE, or: How I learned to stop worrying and love omitted variables. In C. E. Lance & R. J. Vandenberg (Eds.), *Statistical and Methodological Myths and Urban Legends: Doctrine, Verity, and Fable in the Organizational and Social Sciences* (p. 89-106). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Rensvold, R. B. & Cheung, G. W. (1999). Identification of influential cases in structural equation models using the jackknife method. *Organizational Research Methods, 2*, 293-308.
- Vandenberg, R. J. & Grelle, D. M. (2009). Alternative model specification in structural equation modeling: Facts, fictions, and truth. In C. E. Lance & R. J. Vandenberg (Eds.), *Statistical and Methodological Myths and Urban Legends: Doctrine, Verity, and Fable in the Organizational and Social Sciences* (p. 165-192). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Vogt, P. W. (2007). Chapter 14—Structural Equation Modeling; pg. 247-260.

Scientist-Practitioner Model, Cross Cultural Research, Research Ethics

- Anderson, N., Herriot, P., & Hodgkinson, G. (2001). The practitioner-researcher divide in industrial, work and organizational (IWO) psychology: Where are we now, and where do we go from here? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 74*, 391-411.
- Aquinis, H. & Henle, C. A. (2002). Ethics in research. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 34-56). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- American Psychological Association (APA) (1992). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. *American Psychologist, 48*, 811-820.
- Dalziel, J. R. (1996). Students as research subjects: Ethical and educational issues. *Australian Psychologist, 31*, 119-123.
- London, M. & Bray, D. W. (1980). Ethical issues in testing and evaluation for personnel decisions. *American Psychologist, 35*, 890-891.
- Schaffer, B. S. & Riordan, C. M. (2003). A review of cross-cultural methodologies for organizational research: A best-practices approach. *Organizational Research Methods, 6*, 169-215.