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At the end of this course you should have gained a broad understanding of the many areas of I/O Psychology. The goals of the course are as follows:

- To gain some general knowledge regarding the history of I/O Psychology.
- To learn about the training requirements and career opportunities available for I/O Psychologists.
- To gain an understanding of the theories and research on which I/O Psychology is based.
- To learn how the science of I/O Psychology is applied to meet real-world organizational needs.

Exams:

There will be three exams, each worth 20% of your grade. No exams will be given before the scheduled time, and no make-up exams will be given, unless your absence from the exam is due to a documented and university excused absence. If you have a university excused absence you must contact me prior to the time of the exam and schedule a make-up. If it is impossible to contact me prior to the exam, you must contact me within 24 hours of the scheduled exam time to schedule a make-up. Failure to do so will result in a score of zero for that exam -- no exceptions. Exams will consist of multiple choice and short answer questions.

Case Study Paper:

Another 20% of your grade will be based on a writing project consisting of several case study exercises. You must provide answers for each case. Each individual will write a final report outlining your responses to the case questions due on December 7th (last day of class). The cases and questions are attached to this syllabus. The goals of this assignment are for you to: (a) practice developing creative, yet practical solutions to organizational problems, (b) integrate and apply the knowledge learned in class to real-world issues, and (c) gain experience communicating your ideas in writing—an important skill for any I/O Psychologist.

Grades on the case study paper will be based on: (1) the thoroughness and accuracy of the responses, (2) the use of scientific knowledge and research findings to support your answers, (3) the practicality and conceptual clarity of responses, (4) the creativity and novelty of responses, and (5) the overall professionalism of the report.
The final report should be structured so it has separate sections for each case. The answers to the questions should be numbered but presented **in paragraph format**. (Do not simply list your answers in incomplete sentences. Develop your ideas in paragraphs like a normal paper). A complete reference list of any cited material **(in APA format)** must also be included. Additionally, any citations you use should be including in the text **in APA format**. The final report must be typed, double-spaced, have 1" margins and use font no larger than 12-point Times New Roman. The total report must be at least **3000 words** (approximately evenly divided between the different case studies). **Rewriting the questions does not count toward the 3000 word limit.** Be warned that a report that is vague or skimpy on details will lose points. The thoroughness and thoughtfulness of your responses are a priority.

**Turnitin.com:**

Florida Tech has contracted with a private company, TurnItIn.com, to help identify plagiarized papers. The paper written for this course must be submitted electronically to the TurnItIn.com web site for screening.

**To sign up for turnitin.com:**
The course name is: Psychology of the workplace
The course ID is: TBA
The enrollment password is: organization

Papers that are not submitted to TurnItIn.com will not be graded.

Students must print out the report generated by TurnItIn.com and keep it as proof of their submission. In the event that I do not receive your paper from TurnItin.com, you must present me with this document as proof that you submitted it. Otherwise, you will receive a zero on the paper. You must also bring a hard copy of your paper to class.

**In-class Participation:**
You are expected to participate in the discussions that we have in class. 10% of your grade will be based on the extent to which you participate. (Just showing up doesn’t count!)

**In-class Assignments:**
Occasionally I will be assigning short in-class assignments designed to get you to apply the material discussed in class lecture. These assignments will consist of group discussions, class discussion, short journal-type entries, etc. Your participation in these assignments will make up 10% of your grade in the class. Most of these assignments will be unannounced; therefore, it is important that you don’t miss class!

**Grading Weights:**
The relative weights given to each component of the course are as follows:

- Exam 1: 20%
- Exam 2: 20%
- Exam 3: 20%
- Case Study Paper: 20%
- In-class Participation: 10%
- In-class Assignments: 10%
Grading Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90 % to 100%</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 % to less than 90 %</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 % to less than 80%</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 % to less than 70%</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 60%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendance:
Attendance is mandatory. I will often lecture on material not covered in the assigned readings. I will not officially take attendance, but you are still responsible for information presented in class. Additionally, I will be assigning several in-class assignments, and these assignments likely will not be announced ahead of time. You will receive a zero on any in-class assignments that you miss as a result of not being in class. (Exceptions will be given for documented university excused absences only.)

College of Psychology and Liberal Arts Statement on Academic Dishonesty:

Academic dishonesty is the willful misrepresentation of all or any part of another's work as one's own. The use of one's own papers and materials prepared for another class without express permission of instructor is considered plagiarism. Copying another's answers or giving or receiving proscribed assistance during classroom or take-home examinations, assignments, papers, research reports, and projects is cheating. Plagiarism in all its forms is cheating; it is the student's responsibility to understand academic expectations for attribution and citation. A student who aids another in cheating shares the guilt of the offense. Additional details concerning academic dishonesty and university policies can be found on the Psychology web site and at http://www.fit.edu/current/plagiarism.pdf. The College of Psychology and Liberal Arts pursues all cases of academic dishonesty vigorously, according to University guidelines.

In this course, the penalty for any kind of academic dishonesty will consist of a final course grade of "F".
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Meeting Day</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, August 22</td>
<td>Course expectations/syllabus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, August 24</td>
<td>History of I/O</td>
<td>Chapter 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, August 29</td>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, August 31</td>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, September 5</td>
<td>No Class (Holiday)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, September 7</td>
<td>Job Analysis</td>
<td>Chapter 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, September 12</td>
<td>Criterion Measurement</td>
<td>Chapter 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, September 14</td>
<td>Performance Appraisal</td>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, September 19</td>
<td>Performance Appraisal</td>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, September 21</td>
<td>Predictors</td>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, September 26</td>
<td>Predictors</td>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, September 28</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Exam 1</em> (on Chapters 1-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, October 3</td>
<td>Guest Lecture—Cross-Cultural Issues</td>
<td>Readings TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 5</td>
<td>Selection and Personnel Law</td>
<td>Chapter 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, October 10</td>
<td>No Class (Fall Break)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 12</td>
<td>Selection and Personnel Law</td>
<td>Chapter 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, October 17</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Chapter 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 19</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Chapter 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, October 24</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Chapter 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 26</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Chapter 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, October 31</td>
<td>Job Attitudes</td>
<td>Chapter 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, November 2</td>
<td>Job Attitudes</td>
<td>Chapter 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, November 7</td>
<td><em>Exam 2</em> (on Chapters 7-10 and Cross-Cultural Issues)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, November 9</td>
<td>Stress &amp; Worker Well-being</td>
<td>Chapter 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, November 14</td>
<td>Stress &amp; Worker Well-being</td>
<td>Chapter 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, November 16</td>
<td>Groups &amp; Teams</td>
<td>Chapter 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, November 21</td>
<td>Groups &amp; Teams</td>
<td>Chapter 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, November 23</td>
<td>No Class (Thanksgiving Holiday)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, November 28</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Chapter 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, November 30</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Chapter 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, December 5</td>
<td>Emotions in the Workplace</td>
<td>Barsade &amp; Gibson (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, December 7</td>
<td>Case Study Papers Due. Reserve this as a “make-up day” (in case hurricanes, tropical storms, etc. cause us to miss a class). Do not plan to go out of town on this day! Plan to be in class until I announce otherwise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam Week--TBA</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Exam 3</em> (on Chapters 11-13 and Emotions in the Workplace)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All dates and items listed on this syllabus are tentative!*
Case Study Paper
Instructions

1. Read the case studies that follow. Read them carefully, and read them several times to become familiar with them.

2. Answer the questions that follow each of the four cases. Support your answers with what you’ve learned in class. Include at least 10 citations. You can get these from research cited in the textbook, but you must cite the original source in your paper, not Levy. In instances where Levy does not cite any other work, you can cite Levy (2010).

3. Use APA formatting whenever possible. For example, use APA formatting to do your in-text citations, and to do your references page. Also, use 1-inch margins, double spacing and font no larger than 12-point Times New Roman.

4. Number your cases and answers, so that I can tell what case and question you’re answering. However, you should still write in paragraph form. (Complete sentences, etc.)

5. Your paper must be 3000 words. You can divide these words among the four cases in any manner that you wish. However, you must be thorough in your answers to all cases. A case study that lacks detail or is not supported by what you’ve learned in class (with citations from the text or other citations) will lose points.

6. Note that there is not only one correct answer to these cases. Rather, I am looking for you to back up your answers with class material, and show that you can apply what you’ve learned in class. See your syllabus for more details on the criteria I will use to grade the paper.

7. Rewriting the questions and excessive titles and subtitles in your paper will not count toward the 3000-word minimum.

8. Submit your paper to turnitin.com by class time (2:00 PM) on December 7th. Before you can do that, you will need to sign up for this course on their website. Do this early, in case you have any problems with the process!

   The course name is: Psychology in the Workplace
   The course ID is: TBA
   The enrollment password is: organization

9. Bring a hard copy of your paper to class on December 7th.

   Warning: This paper will require a lot of time and thought. It is not something that can be written the night before the due date. I suggest you start each case study right after we go over the chapter on it. (Start the selection case right after we go over the selection chapter, etc.)
Case Study #1 – Selection and Legal Issues

Selection of Firefighters in Cleveland

In 1983 a group of women applied for firefighter positions in the City of Cleveland but were rejected. They filed a lawsuit against the city claiming that in rejecting them for employment, the city had violated Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. At the time they were rejected, the city had never hired a woman as a firefighter. The selection process consisted of two tests, with applicants required to first pass a written test before taking a physical abilities test. These exams had been developed by a psychologist who had conducted job analyses to determine the tasks required of entry-level firefighters. From an examination of the frequency and importance of the tasks, a determination was made of the knowledge, skills, and abilities required for entry-level firefighters. Based on the research, a written test was developed to assess reading comprehension, the ability to follow directions, mathematical skills, and other forms of cognitive reasoning. The physical test consisted of three parts:

1. Event 1: Overhead Lift. Using a 33-pound barbell, candidates must lift the barbell overhead repeatedly for one minute or up to a maximum of 35 lifts.

2. Event 2: Fire Scene Set-up and Tower Climb. While wearing a custom-tailored self-contained breathing apparatus, candidates must drag two lengths of standard 2 1/2-inch hose 180 feet (90 feet one way, drop coupling, run to the other end of the hose, pick up and return 90 feet, drop coupling in designated area), run 75 feet to pumper, remove a one-person ladder (approximately 35 pounds) from the side of the pumper, carry the ladder into the fire tower, place it against the back rail of the first landing, and continue up the inside stairwell to the fifth floor where a monitor observes the candidates’ arrival. Then, candidates return to the first landing, retrieve the ladder, and place it on the pumper.

3. Event 3: Dummy Drag. Still wearing their self-contained breathing apparatus, candidates must drag a 100-pound bag 70 feet (40 of which includes low headroom), turn and, still dragging the bag, return to the starting point.

The written test was worth a maximum of 100 points. An adjustment was made by awarding five extra points if the applicant was a qualified veteran, ten extra points if the applicant was a city resident, and six points if the applicant was a minority. The minority adjustment was made as the result of a previous court case involving racial discrimination. Those applicants who received an adjusted score of 35 points or higher were allowed to take the physical abilities test.

Of 285 women who took the written test, 122 passed and took the physical exam. Only 29 women scored high enough on both tests to be placed on an eligibility list. A total of 1,927 men took the written exam, with 1,206 passing. Of these, 1,069 scored high enough on both tests to be placed on the eligibility list. Those on the eligibility list were rank ordered on their test totals. The woman with the highest score ranked 334 on the eligibility list.

Previous Supreme Court decisions in cases involving the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Griggs v. Duke Power, 401 U.S. 424, 429-431; Albemarle Paper Co. v. Moody, 422 U.S. 405) had established that those filing a suit must first show that one group was hired at a significantly
lower rate than other groups as the result of the hiring procedures. In this case, the large
differences in the rate at which men and women had been hired enabled the plaintiffs (the
women) to make what is known as a prima facie case of discrimination. Once shown to have an
adverse impact, the employer must then produce evidence that the procedures have “a manifest
relationship to the employment in question.” EEOC guidelines dictate that showing a manifest
relationship involves providing evidence of the criterion, construct, and content validity of the
hiring procedures.

The plaintiffs claimed that the tests lacked in all three respects. The physical tests lacked
content validity because the three events only superficially replicated the actual sequence of
tasks in the firefighter job. They also argued that the city had failed to show a substantial
relationship between the test scores and criteria of success in the jobs. The physical tests lacked
construct validity because they tested only anaerobic performance. In other words, the physical
tests reflected traits such as strength and speed, and ignored stamina.

The lawyer representing the City of Cleveland submitted research findings that they
claimed supported the validity of the selection procedures. The city claimed that the fact that the
tests were constructed on the basis of a thorough job analysis was evidence of their content
validity. Criterion-related validity was supported in a technical study showing a positive
correlation between test scores and supervisor ratings of performance in the firefighter job.
Although the aerobic capacity of applicants was not tested, the city argued that “speed and
strength were most critical at the initial stages of a fire where matters of life and death are most
acute.”

The plaintiffs also argued that women were placed at a disadvantage by the scoring
system that gave minority and veterans extra points. Although the elimination of these bonus
points would raise the rank of women applicants, the city argued that the elimination of these
adjustments would do little to improve the chances of the women applicants, given that the
highest ranked woman was still only 334 on the eligibility list.

Questions:

1. If you were the judge in this case, would you find the City of Cleveland guilty or
innocent of discrimination against women? Why?

2. If you were a consultant for the city in this case, how would you go about evaluating the
content, construct, and criterion validity of the selection tests? Explain in detail your
answer for each “type” of validity.

3. What would you do to provide more opportunity for women wishing to become
firefighters? Would these procedures be fair to male applicants?

4. One argument has been that requiring an employer to prove the validity of selection
procedures when adverse impact has been shown is equivalent to requiring a person
accused of murder to prove that he or she is innocent. Do you believe that the burden of
proof should be on the employer to show that what they are using in selection is valid?
Why?
Developing Leaders and Teamwork Through Outdoor Adventure Training

In today's business world, many of the largest American corporations are attempting to change their organization cultures and the leadership styles of their managers and executives. These organizations are replacing bureaucratic methods with teamwork, collaboration, and risk taking. An increasingly popular but controversial type of program used in implementing these changes is outdoor adventure training.

There are many varieties of outdoor adventure training, but all typically involve presenting a group with physical barriers that they must overcome either as a group or individually. After attempting to overcome these challenges, trainees discuss what they learned about themselves, others, and working together, and how they can apply what they have learned back at work.

In wilderness training, the group undergoes training in a secluded and rugged setting. Challenges can include climbing vertical mountain walls, rappelling down cliffs, rafting in whitewater rapids, hiking over rugged terrain, and crossing deep ravines on ropes. In an example of such a program, the University of Michigan business school brought together 21 senior executives from Japanese, American, and Indian companies for five weeks (Main, 1989). Part of their time together was spent on an island off the coast of Maine where the participants were presented with "physical tests that sane middle-aged men normally avoid." (Main, p. 74). For instance, participants were faced with squeezing blindfolded at night through the Crack, "a passage narrower than a normal human body, between two enormous boulders." In the raft race, teams had to construct a raft from a collection of barrels, rope, and other materials, navigate to a buoy offshore, and dismantle the buoy. In working together to overcome these barriers, the various executives supposedly broke through language and cultural barriers to understand something about themselves and others.

In another version of adventure training, the trainees stay at a permanent site. A common type of challenge involves climbing a ladder and leaping to another location. In the "leap of faith," trainees are attached to a harness, climb to the top of a tall pole, stand on a small wobbly plate at the top of the pole, and then leap to catch a trapeze. In the "trust fall," trainees fall backward from a ledge and other trainees catch them. In the "spiderweb," all trainees except for one are blindfolded and must pass other members through without touching a web of ropes hung between two posts. The group is instructed by the one trainee who can see. Other exercises are foot races, rope climbing, and wall climbing.

According to one observer, "Most individuals going through the program move through predictable mental opening-up stages. They start off looking around and are nervous about how they're going to do. Then after they've completed a task, their energy starts to shift—and by the end of the day, they're often in a more spontaneous, hugging, high-fiveing, cheering mode—and are excited, hoarse and thrilled about the future....Often, participants begin to question: Where else in my life have I been performing less than is really possible? Where have I been settling for less?...By examining what happens to oneself under duress in a controlled situation, employees can learn and build on that self-knowledge so they're much more grounded in the relationship between what they think and what they do, when they return to work" (Laabs, 1991, pp.59-60).
Anecdotal evidence provides mixed support for the effectiveness of outdoor adventure training. A director of marketing who participated in a wilderness program stated that “Every time I climbed over a rock, I needed someone’s help....There’s a valuable lesson to be learned in being able to ask for help and graciously accept it, but the reality is I don’t have a 40-pound pack on my back in the office....Do I think that everything we did translates to the office environment as well as other activities would? Probably not” (Laabs, 1991, p.56). In another example, a 16-member staff participated in a one-day team building program in the attempt to increase the harmony with which they worked together. A member of this team felt that the lack of harmony reflected deeper problems that the training would not correct. “I’ve seen no improvement whatsoever. In fact, things are worse....The people who went were outdoorsy-types anyway. So to them, it was just an activity....Many of my co-workers are somewhat intimidated by our boss. They feel that in order to keep their jobs, they had to do this” (Laabs, 1991, pp. 56-57). Others are more positive. One participant described her experience in the leap of faith challenge as restoring her self-esteem and as leaving her with a concrete reminder that at some point in any project she must take risks and act on faith (Conlin, 1988, pp. 31-32).

The typical evaluation is anecdotal. A representative of a company that sent 400 of its 12,000 employees on wilderness training claimed that “The response has been quite favorable. People comeback enthused and say they’ve got increased confidence” (Laabs, 1991, p. 62). Occasionally questionnaires or interviews are used to determine how trainees reacted to their experience. One human resources manager of a company that sent employees to an outdoor adventure says that he “is planning to send a questionnaire to all the participants and then assemble a one- to two-day follow-up session this month to get feedback about the seminar’s overall results” (Laabs, 1991, p. 63).

Questions:

1. If you were in charge of deciding what type of training to use to improve employee leadership skills and to improve teamwork, would you seriously consider outdoor adventure training? Why?

2. How would you evaluate the effectiveness of an outdoor adventure training program in improving leadership skills and teamwork? Specifically, what type of design would you use and what measures would you collect? Explain your answer in detail.

3. What do you think might be some of the legal considerations in this type of training?

4. Outdoor adventure training and other types of experiential training are often aimed at changing trainee values. For instance, organizations may attempt to instill in trainees the need to be risk takers and to be team oriented in their working relationships. Do you believe that an organization has the right to require employees to participate in training that is directed at changing their values? Should training be restricted to changing knowledge, skills, and abilities directly related to the job? Justify your answer.

5. What other training approach might you consider using to develop these skills? Identify one other approach you could use and describe in detail how you would develop the program, how you would implement it, and how you would evaluate it.
Case Study # 3 – Performance Appraisal

The Hackney Paper Box Company is having trouble deciding what should be done about its employee evaluation program. Hackney operates forty-seven corrugated box factories located from Maine to California and has a highly centralized corporate personnel department in New York City. Each plant employs about 125 persons.

The union contracts in some Hackney plants allow a junior employee to be promoted over a senior employee if the junior employee has “noticeably” better qualifications for the job. In the South Bend plant a junior employee was promoted to a combiner operator job over an employee with more experience as a combiner first helper and two more years of union seniority. The case went to arbitration. The company correctly contended that the senior employee was not responsible, was lazy, not cooperative, not even bright, and had a horrible attendance record. During the arbitration hearing the union produced copies of all the past employee evaluation forms for Bob Peller, the senior employee. These forms were prepared by his immediate supervisors over the past ten years, the time Peller had been an employee. On a scale of one to five he was rated (4) above average or (5) excellent in all categories on every evaluation instrument. Bob Peller won the arbitration case, was promoted, and now the company has to have a qualified operator stay with Peller at all times in order to get the job done.

The above-mentioned situation caused Mr. Green, Corporate Vice-President of Personnel, to call a meeting of selected plant personnel managers, the Corporate Compensation Manager, and the Corporate Training and Development Manager. The purpose of the meeting was to decide what was to be done about the existing employee evaluation program.

This meeting produced four suggestions that Mr. Green is considering:

1. Get rid of the employee evaluation program altogether.
2. Substitute MBO (Management by Objectives) for the present evaluation program.
3. Have the personnel manager at each plant do the evaluation and conduct the evaluation interview that follows the evaluation.
4. Leave the program as it is but give every supervisor adequate training in employee evaluation and evaluation interviewing.

The idea to get rid of the program was advanced by the personnel manager at the South Bend Plant. He contended that supervisory personnel were not qualified to evaluate or counsel. He also contended that they would only rate a subordinate high as it was much easier to discuss this kind of rating with the subordinate. In addition to this, if an employee was rated low, the supervisor had to determine and explain to the employee how he or she could improve. This took effort.

The MBO suggestion was made by a new plant personnel manager who had been transferred to the position from outside the personnel field. He admitted that he didn’t know much about MBO but he had heard lots of good things about it.

The suggestion to have the personnel manager at each plant do the evaluation and counseling came from a plant personnel manager who had a master’s degree in psychology as well as considerable plant experience both as a production supervisor and hourly paid employee.
He thought this would work at Hackney as all the plants were small, having approximately 125 employees each.

The suggestion to keep the present evaluation system and train the supervisors in evaluation and evaluation counseling was made by the corporate training and development manager.

Mr. Green is currently trying to decide which suggestion is best or if there is still a better solution.

Questions:

1. Evaluate each of the four suggestions, based on what you have learned about performance appraisal.

2. Make a recommendation to Mr. Green—either suggest one of the four options or come up with your own plan for improving the performance appraisal system.
Case Study #4—Motivation Problems at Electro Logic

Electro Logic (EL)

Electro Logic (EL) is a small R&D firm located in a midwestern college town adjacent to a major university. Its primary mission is to perform basic research on, and development of, a new technology called “Very Fast Very Accurate” (VFVA). Founded four years ago by Steve Morgan, an electrical engineering professor and inventor of the technology, EL is primarily funded by government contracts, although it plans to market VFVA technology and devices to non-governmental organizations within the year.

The government is very interested in VFVA, as it will enhance radar technology, robotics, and a number of other important defense applications. EL recently received the largest small business contract ever awarded by the government to research and develop this or any other technology. Phase I of the contract has just been completed, and the government has agreed to Phase II contracting as well.

The organizational chart of EL is shown in Figure 6. Current membership is 75, with roughly 88 percent in engineering. The hierarchy of engineering titles and requirements for each are listed in the Table. Heads of staff are supposedly appointed based on their knowledge of VFVA technology and their ability to manage people. In practice, the president of EL hand-picks these people based on what some might call arbitrary guidelines: Most of the staff leaders were or are the president’s graduate students. There is no predetermined time frame for advancement up the hierarchy. Raises are, however, directly related to performance appraisal evaluations.

Working directly with the engineers are the technicians. These people generally have a high-school degree, although some also have college degrees. They are trained on the job, although some have gone through a local community college’s program on microtechnology fabrication. The technicians perform the mundane tasks of the engineering department: running tests, building circuit boards, manufacturing VFVA chips, and so on. Most are full-time hourly employees.

The administrative staff is composed of the staff head (with an MBA from a major university), accountants, personnel director, graphic artists, purchasing agent, project controller, technical writers/editors, and secretaries. Most of the people in the administrative staff are women. All are hourly employees except the staff head, personnel director, and project controller. The graphic artist and technical writer/editor are part-time employees.

The facilities staff is composed of the staff head and maintenance personnel. EL is housed in three different buildings, and the primary responsibility of the facilities staff is to ensure that the facilities of each building are in good working order. Additionally, the facilities staff is often called upon to remodel parts of the buildings as the staff continues to grow.

EL anticipates a major recruiting campaign to enhance the overall staff. In particular, it is looking for more technicians and engineers. Prior to this recruiting campaign, however, the president of EL hired an outside consultant to assess employee needs as well as the morale and overall effectiveness of the firm. The consultant has been observing EL for about three weeks and has written up some notes regarding impressions and observations of the company.
Consultant’s Notes from Observations of Electro Logic (EL)

Facilities: EL is housed in three different buildings. Two are converted houses, and one is an old school building. Senior managers and engineers are in the school, and others are scattered between the houses.

Meeting: Weekly staff meetings in the main building are held to discuss objectives and to formulate and review milestone charts.

Social interaction: A core group of employees interact frequently on a social basis, for example, sports teams, parties. The administration staff celebrates birthdays at work. The president occasionally attends.

Work allocation: Engineers request various tasks from the support staff, which consists of technicians and administrative unit personnel. There is obviously some discretion used by the staff in assigning priorities to the work requests, based on rapport and desirability of the work.

Turnover: The highest turnover is among administration personnel and technicians. Exit interviews with engineers indicate they leave because of the company’s crisis-management style, better opportunities for career advancement and security in larger organizations, and overall frustration with EL’s “pecking order”. Engineers with the most responsibility and authority tend to leave.

Salary and benefits: In general, wages at EL are marginal by national and local standards. A small group of scientists and engineers do make substantial salaries and have a very attractive benefits package, including stock options. Salaries and benefits for new engineers tend to be linked to the perceived level of their expertise.

Offices and facilities: Only EL’s president, vice-president, and chief financial officer have their own offices. Engineers are grouped together in “pods” by project assignment. There is very little privacy in these work areas, and the noise from the shared printer is distracting. The head of administration shares a pod with the personnel director, facilities head, and the project controller. One to three secretaries per building are located in or near the reception areas. The large building has an employee lounge with three vending machines. There is also a coffee and tea station. The smaller buildings have only a pop machine in the reception area.

Consultant’s Interviews with Employees

After making these observations, the consultant requested interviews with a cross-section of the staff for the purpose of developing a survey to be taken of all employees. Presented below are excerpts from those interviews.
Pat Klausen, Senior Member of the Technical Staff

CONSULTANT: What is it about EL that gives you the most satisfaction?

PAT: I really enjoy the work. I mean, I’ve always liked to do research, and working on VFVA is an incredible opportunity. Just getting to work with Steve (EL’s president and VFVA’s inventor) again is exciting. I was his graduate student about six years ago, you know. He really likes to work closely with his people—perhaps sometimes too closely. There have been times when I could have done with a little less supervision.

CONSULTANT: What’s the least satisfying aspect of your work?

PAT: Probably the fact that I’m never quite sure that we’ll be funded next month, given the defense budget problems and the tentativeness of our research. I’ve got a family to consider, and this place isn’t the most stable in terms of its financial situation. Maybe it’ll change once we get more into commercial production. Who knows?

CONSULTANT: You’ve offered some general positives and negatives about EL. Can you be more specific about day-to-day dealings? What’s good and bad about working here on a daily basis?

PAT: You’re sure this isn’t going to get back to anyone? OK, well, in general I’m not satisfied with the fact that too often we end up changing horses in the middle of the stream, if you know what I mean. In the past seven months, three of my engineers and four of my techs have been pulled off my project onto projects whose deadlines were nearer than mine. Now I’m faced with a deadline, and I’m supposed to be getting more staff. But I’ll have to spend so much time briefing them that it might make more sense for me to just finish the project myself. On the other hand, Steve keeps telling me that we have to be concerned with EL’s overall goals, not just our individual concerns—you know, we have to be “team players,” “good members of the family.” It’s kind of hard to deal with that, though, when deadlines are bearing down and you know your butt’s on the line, team player or not. But if you go along with this kind of stuff and don’t complain, the higher-ups treat you well. Still, it seems to me there’s got to be a better way to manage these projects.

CONSULTANT: What are the positive aspects of your daily work?

PAT: Well, the people here are great to work with. They know their stuff or can learn quickly. I tend to be a social person and I really like socializing with these people. We play softball and basketball together and do happy hours and stuff. I like that. I’ve got some good friends here, which helps get my work orders filled quickly, if you know what I mean.
**Bob Christensen, Member of the Technical Staff**

CONSULTANT: You said that Steve was your advisor for your MS. So you’ve known him a long time.

BOB: Yes, that’s right. I’ve known Professor Morgan—Steve—for about eight years. I had him for a few undergraduate classes; then, of course, he was my advisor for my two-year Master’s program, and now I’ve worked at EL for two years.

CONSULTANT: It seems as if you enjoy working with Steve.

BOB: Oh, yeah. But I really don’t get to work directly with him anymore. I’ll see him at meetings and such, but that’s about it.

CONSULTANT: So he’s not your immediate supervisor?

BOB: No, but for the amount of time I spend with my supervisor, Steve might as well be. My boss and I meet maybe once every three weeks for about an hour to see if all is well. And that’s it. The rest of the time, I’m on my own. I used to talk to Steve when I had questions, but he’s gotten so busy now it’s hard to see him—you need to make an appointment a few days in advance.

CONSULTANT: Do you think your supervisor treats all his staff this way?

BOB: To be honest, I have heard some complaints. In fact, about six months ago, the situation was so bad, some other people and I had a meeting with him. He promised that he would be more available to us and was, for about a month. Then we got involved in a new proposal, so he made himself scarce again. So nothing’s really changed. We’re coming up on finalizing the proposal now, and it’s important that I see him, ask him questions. The last few drafts I’ve submitted to him, he’s returned, rewritten in his own way, and with no explanation of the changes. Sometimes I think he treats me like somebody who doesn’t know anything, as if I had no training whatsoever. I realize his neck is on the line with this project, but sometimes it seems that he uses being busy to avoid talking to me.

**Chris Chen, Research Scientist**

CONSULTANT: What kind of characteristics should a person have if he/she wants to work as a research scientists at EL?

CHRIS: Well, certainly knowledge is important. When I’ve interviewed recent college grads for entry-level positions, I am always concerned with their GPA. I like to see straight-A averages, if possible. But for experienced research scientists, technical knowledge shows up in their publication records, mostly. So I’ll read their papers. I also think a research scientist has to be highly self-motivated, not look to others for praise and such. Particularly here. If you want someone to tell you you’ve done a good job, you’ll be waiting a long time. It’s not clear to me that research scientists really get the support we need from the rest of the staff here. Work orders
are often lost or put off for one reason or another. Senior members seem to get more techs than scientists do, and they certainly get more attention from Steve. The rumor is that these guys also get higher raises than the scientists; allegedly, this is to keep pay at an equitable rate—you know, they’re supposedly more valuable to the company. Of course, everybody knows that most of the senior members are Steve’s old graduate students, and so he takes care of them really well. One of the things that really galls me is that I need to keep up my publication record to maintain my career options. But publishing if frowned on because it takes time away from your work. I’ve even been told that my work can’t be published because of proprietary rights or that the defense department considers the information classified. However, if somebody important is working with me and needs the publication, then it’s full steam ahead.

CONSULTANT: You sound pretty disgruntled with your work.

CHRIS: It’s not my work so much. I’m really very happy doing this work—it’s cutting edge, after all. The problem is that I’m never quite sure where the work is going. I do my part of a project, and unless I go out of my way to talk to other people, I never find out the final results of the total project. That’s just something you learn to live with around here—being part of a system that’s not particularly open.

Meg Conroy, Assistant to the Head of Administration

CONSULTANT: You’ve only been here a short time, is that correct?

MEG: That’s right—just a little over a year.

CONSULTANT: Why did you take the job?

MEG: Well, I was in my last semester of college and was looking for a job, like most college seniors. My fiancé at the time—now he’s my husband—was already working for EL and found out that there was an opening. So I applied.

CONSULTANT: So you were a business major in school?

MEG: Oh, no. I was a history major.

CONSULTANT: Do you like your job?

MEG: It has a lot to offer. I get paid pretty well for what I’m doing. And I’m learning a lot. I just wish the company would let me take some classes in administration, like accounting. The auditors ask some pretty tough questions. Steve says we should hire that expertise, but I’d still be responsible for supervising the people.

CONSULTANT: Is there any particular aspect of your job that you really find satisfying?

MEG: Well, let me think. I guess I like the fact that I get to do a lot of different tasks so that things don’t get so boring. I would hate to have to do the same thing, day in and day out. A lot
of times, I go to the library to do research on different things, and that’s nice because it gets me out of the office.

CONSULTANT: What don’t you like about your job?

MEG: Well, I often get the feeling that administration isn’t taken seriously. You know, the engineers could get along without us quite nicely, or so they seem to think. The whole structure of the department shows that we’re the catch-all department: If you don’t fit anywhere else, they put you in here. Perhaps some of that is because our department is primarily women—in fact, I’ve been told that 95 percent of all the female employees are in administration. Sometimes it’s hard to work with the engineers because they treat you like you don’t know anything, and they always want things to be done their way. Clearly, the engineers get the money and consideration and yet, well, we do contribute quite a lot to the whole team, as Steve would say. But words of praise just aren’t as impressive as actions. Sure, we get our birthday parties, but that still seems to be a little patronizing. We rarely get to see what’s going on in the research area. I’ve asked a number of engineers specific questions, and they just kind of look at me with a blank stare and give me some really simplified answer. It seems to me if you want to build a family, like the president says, you can’t treat administration like a bad relation.

P. J. Ginelli, Technician

CONSULTANT: I gather you’ve just been through your semiannual performance appraisal. How did it go?

P.J.: Like I expected. No surprises.

CONSULTANT: Do you find these appraisals useful?

P.J.: Sure. I get to find out what he thinks of my work.

CONSULTANT: Is that all?

P.J.: Well, I suppose it’s a nice opportunity to understand what my supervisor wants. Sometimes he’s not so clear during the rest of the year. I suppose he’s been given specific goals from higher-ups before he talks with me, so he’s clear and then I’m clear.

CONSULTANT: Do you like what you’re doing?

P.J.: Oh yeah. The best part is that I’m not at the main building and so I don’t have to put with the “important” people, you know? I’ve heard from other techs that those guys can be a real pain—trying to be nice and all, but really just being a bother. I mean, how can you get your stuff done with the president looking over your shoulder all the time? On the other hand, if the president knows your name, I suppose that’s a good thing. When it comes to raises and promotions. But my boss sticks up for his techs; we get a fair deal from him.

CONSULTANT: Do you think you’ll be able to get ahead at EL?
P.J.: Get ahead? You mean become an engineer or something? No, and I really don’t want to do that. Everyone around here keeps pushing me to move up. I’m afraid to tell people how I really feel for fear they’ll decide I don’t fit into this high-tech environment. I don’t want to be the “black sheep of the family.” I like where I am, and if the raises keep coming, I’ll keep liking it. One of my kids is starting college next year, and I need the money to help her out. I get a lot of overtime, particularly when contract deadlines are near. I suppose the rush toward the end of the contracts gives some people big headaches, but for me, I don’t mind. The work is pretty slow otherwise, and so at least I’m working all the time and then some. But my family wishes my schedule was more predictable.

CONSULTANT: Do you think you’ll continue working for EL?

P.J.: I’m not sure I want to answer that. Let’s just say that my ratings on the performance appraisal were good, and I expect to see an improvement in my pay. I’ll stay for that.

Chalida Montgomery, Technician

CONSULTANT: In general, what are your feelings about the work you do for EL?

CHALIDA: Well, I feel my work is quite good, but I also feel that I perform rather boring, tedious tasks. From what my supervisor says, the kinds of things I do are what electrical engineering students do in their last year of classes. I gather their final project is to make a circuit board, and that’s what I do, day in and day out.

CONSULTANT: What is it that you would like to do?

CHALIDA: Well, it would be nice to be able to offer some input into some of the designs of these boards. I know I don’t have a Ph.D. or anything, but I do have lots of experience. But because I’m a tech, the engineers don’t really feel I’ve got much to offer—even though I build the boards and can tell from the design which one will do what the designer wants it to do. I also would like to maybe supervise other technicians in my department. You know, some kind of advancement would be nice. As it is, lots of techs ask me how to do things, and of course I help, but then they get the credit. Around here, you have to have a piece of paper that says you’re educated before they let you officially help other people.
Engineering Titles and Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>REQUIREMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member of Technical Staff</td>
<td>BSEE; MSEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Member of Technical Staff</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSEE with 2 years of industrial experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BSEE with 5 years of industrial experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Engineer</td>
<td>PhD with 2 years of industrial experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BSEE or MSEE with 7 years of industrial experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Scientist</td>
<td>PhD with appropriate experience in research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Research Scientist</td>
<td>PhD with appropriate industrial and research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6  Electro Logic Organization Chart
Questions:

1. Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of Electro Logic (EL) from a motivational perspective.

2. What suggestions would you make in a consulting report to Steve Morgan, president of EL? Focus on specific actions that he could take that would better use the abilities of the staff and foster a more motivating work environment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thoroughness and accuracy of the responses (You will lose points here if you fail to address parts of the question, or if your answer is inaccurate—For example, you explain a piece of legislation inaccurately; give an incorrect definition, etc.)</th>
<th>/50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of scientific knowledge and research findings to support your answers (You will lose points here if answers are merely “opinion” and not cited from the book/notes/other sources. Always give citations for your answers. For example, most of the time you are going to cite the Levy text (Levy, 2010); you may even cite the Levy text if something comes from your notes/slides. Alternatively, you could say something like “according to Adam’s Equity Theory....” in order to back up your answers. Basically you need to show that you aren’t simply “making things up”.) Using other sources (other than the book or notes) is fine but not required.</td>
<td>/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicability and conceptual clarity of responses (You will lose points here if your answers are unclear---in other words, if the reader cannot tell what you are trying to say. You will also lose points if you don’t give a practical solution to the case. For example, if you simply describe a theory but don’t talk about how to apply it, you will lose points on practicality.)</td>
<td>/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall professionalism of the report (You will lose points here for grammatical errors, misspelling, failing to use professional language, not writing in paragraph form, failing to follow instructions for formatting listed on your syllabus.)</td>
<td>/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and novelty of responses (This is not necessary, but you will get bonus points for it.)</td>
<td>Up to 10 bonus points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire paper must be 3000 or more words—divided (not necessarily equally) among the different case studies. Rewriting the question does not count toward the 3000-word minimum.</td>
<td>Minus 10 points if 2500-2999 words Minus 20 points if 2000-2499 words Minus 30 points if 1500-1999 words Minus 40 points if 1000-1499 words Minus 50 points if 500-999 words Minus 60 points if under 500 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
