

A Quantitative Examination of Trends in I-O Psychology 2001–2005

Richard N. Landers
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

In I-O psychology, as would be expected in any self-aware area of study, we sometimes wonder what direction our field is taking and who is leading it there. Which work appears most often in the I-O literature? What topics receive the most attention? Which papers have made the most impact on our field? Originally, seeking the answer to these questions represented a difficult and time-consuming task considering the quickly changing nature of our field and the vast amounts of ever-growing data to sift through. Using traditional data-gathering techniques, counting the number of times a paper or author was cited in prior empirical research required much more in-depth data collection and processing than even the largest-*k* meta-analysis published today. As newer tools became available, such as the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI—a part of Web of Science), this became substantially easier. The SSCI allowed researchers to quickly determine a count of the number of times they or any one of their works had been cited in the social sciences. It did not, however, allow much precision; because SSCI summarized works cited by the social science literature as a whole, it was difficult to determine, for example, the works and authors most cited by I-O psychology in particular. Determining the key citations for a particular field of study, as reflected by that field's top journals, could provide more accurate information on the direction that field is taking. This paper describes and utilizes a new, more accessible quantitative investigative technique for analyzing past scholarly literature that makes this kind of targeted investigation much faster and simpler.

For determining influence and impact in I-O, using SSCI alone is flawed for two specific reasons. First, because this tool surveys the social science literature as a whole, it is impossible to distinguish whether a citation is stated in I-O psychology or a different social scientific field. For example, Barrick and Mount's (1991) widely cited study on the relationship between the Big Five personality constructs and job performance is commonly cited outside of I-O as early evidence of the renewed interest in and "practical application" of the Big Five personality constructs. Although we can anecdotally discuss the great impact Barrick, Mount, and their work have had within I-O, quantitative evidence is surprisingly lacking. Although SSCI offers some degree of search refinement by area of study, direct precise control is difficult to exert, as it is never made explicit upon what the area of study specifications are based.

The second and larger issue is the validity of equating influence and impact with the number of publications that an author has produced. Quantity does not necessarily indicate quality. Authors choosing to publish a great number of articles in less selective journals would appear more influential by this method.

The reality might be just the opposite. In this context, this could be considered a sort of criterion contamination, which should clearly be avoided if possible.

Because of both of these issues, replacing a paper's "number of citations appearing within the social science literature" with a paper's "number of citations within the I-O literature" would be substantially more construct valid in representing influence and impact within I-O. Instead of examining the number of times anyone has cited a work by an I-O author, determining the number of times specific works have been cited by authors within the I-O literature would produce a much more informative list. Past efforts in this vein have been extremely limited. Although I imagine most I-O psychologists asked could come up with an impromptu list of the most "influential" papers in our field, there have been no substantial quantitative examinations seeking an answer to this question. This is an unfortunate gap in the self-awareness that I-O needs to continue to grow. Although individual authors might make an indirect impact, the papers themselves contain the theories that actually influence future research, and understanding which papers are most influential is central to understanding how our field is developing.

Method

To determine rankings of the most cited articles in I-O, a PsycINFO search was conducted for every article contained within the top 10 most prestigious I-O journals as determined by Zickar and Highhouse (2001) between 2001 and 2005, inclusive. This includes *Academy of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Journal of Management*, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *Organizational Research Methods*, and *Personnel Psychology*. This journal list was chosen as a balance; collecting every journal with any I-O content would provide too many citations irrelevant to I-O whereas collecting only the top two or three journals would exclude too many. The years 2001 to 2005 were chosen for three reasons. First, as of the time of this writing, PsycINFO has not yet fully indexed all journals published in 2006 or 2007, leaving gaps in the data from those years. Second, full citation information is not recorded in PsycINFO for most of these journals before 2000, creating large systematic gaps if reference data was harvested from before that time. Third, a 5-year metric creates an easily referenced time period; new 5-year segments can continue to be determined, allowing for future longitudinal examination of research trends. It is also important to note here that "what papers published between 2001 and 2005 are most cited?" is not being tracked. Instead, this addresses "what do papers published between 2001 and 2005 cite?" by examining the reference lists from these articles.

All citations from all articles in these journals from 2001 to 2005 indexed by PsycINFO were extracted from PsycINFO and entered into a new freely available computer program (The Research Explicator for oNline Databases [TREND]) designed to parse this kind of data for entry into a database (Lan-

ders, 2007). From 2,636 articles, this produced a final dataset containing 128,425 citations, 72,675 of which were unique. To combat incorrect spelling and formation of citations by authors, the “moderate assumptions” option in the TREND software was used, which matches citations by ignoring the case of the citations, eliminating words less than three characters in length, eliminating subtitles starting with a colon, eliminating embedded Web addresses, and eliminating all numbers. The remaining letters are then compared to previously extracted and cut-down citations to determine which should be counted together, even if the authors did not format the citations correctly (see Landers, 2008, for a discussion of these issues). This does not catch all incidents, and a visual check of the dataset was required to match any remaining malformed cites. This was done by sorting the list alphabetically and comparing citations close by in alphanumeric order. This is not exact, however; final numbers should be interpreted as only an approximate rank ordering.

From initial extractions of data, it became quite apparent that lumping all citations into a single list would mask the relative importance of many of the articles within their respective subfields. For example, because topics in organizational psychology are more popular than topics in industrial psychology (and more commonly published), a top 20 list of all citations in the list would contain only three entries in industrial psychology. Thus for added clarity, five categories in which citations might fall were defined: industrial psychology, organizational psychology, equally contributing to industrial and organizational psychologies, methodology and statistics, and other topics/unknown. Three volunteers from the SIOP graduate student discussion list were then recruited to categorize the top 250 entries in the overall list, with the goal of extracting top 20 lists for each category. Because this was categorical data with more than two raters, to measure interrater agreement, a Fleiss' κ of 0.49 was computed, indicating a moderate level of agreement. All three raters agreed for 127 of the 250 citations (50.8%), and at least two raters agreed in 225 (90.0%). Final categorical assignments were made based on majority opinion. In the 25 cases where all three raters disagreed, the final categorical assignment for those citations was made by the author.

Results

The top 20 entries per major category were extracted from these lists and placed in Tables 1 (industrial), 2 (organizational), 3 (equally industrial-organizational), and 4 (methodological and statistics). Among the top 250, 38 (15.2%) citations were industrial, 135 (54.0%) were organizational, 22 (8.8%) were equally I-O, 39 (15.6%) were methodological and statistics, and 16 (6.4%) were other/unknown. For a more complete list of the top 500 citations contained in the I-O literature between 2001 and 2005, see <http://rlanders.filedrawer.org/iotrends.html>. Among the top 20 lists (96 citations), all three raters agreed for 44 of the 96 citations (45.8%), and at least two raters agreed on 86 (89.6%).

Table 1

Top 20 Most Highly Cited Industrial Psychological Articles From 2001 to 2005

Citation	# Cites
1 Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. <i>Personnel Psychology</i> , 44, 1–26.	294
2 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. <i>Psychological Bulletin</i> , 124, 262–274.	149
2 Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. <i>Personnel Psychology</i> , 40, 437–453.	149
4 Hunter, J. E., & Hunter, R. F. (1984). Validity and utility of alternate predictors of job performance. <i>Psychological Bulletin</i> , 96, 72–98.	132
5 Tett, R. P., Jackson, D. N., & Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality measures as predictors of job performance: A meta-analytic review. <i>Personnel Psychology</i> , 44, 703–742.	108
6 Salgado, J. F. (1997). The five factor model of personality and job performance in the European Community. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> , 82, 30–43.	91
7 Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: Historical review, a meta-analysis and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. <i>Psychological Bulletin</i> , 119, 254–284.	90
8 Borman, W. C., Hanson, M., & Hedge, J. W. (1997). Personnel selection. <i>Annual Review of Psychology</i> , 48, 299–337.	82
9 Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big Five factor structure. <i>Psychological Assessment</i> , 4, 26–42.	80
10 Gilliland, S. W. (1993). The perceived fairness of selection systems: An organizational justice perspective. <i>Academy of Management Review</i> , 18, 694–734.	79
10 Smither, J. W., Reilly, R. R., Millsap, R. E., Pearlman, K., & Stoffey, R. W. (1993). Applicant reactions to selection procedures. <i>Personnel Psychology</i> , 46, 49–76.	79
12 Viswesvaran, C., Ones, D. S., & Schmidt, F. L. (1996). Comparative analysis of the reliability of job performance ratings. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> , 81, 557–560.	76
13 Barrick, M. R., Stewart, G. L., & Piotrowski, M. (2002). Personality and job performance: Test of the mediating effects of motivation among sales representatives. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> , 87, 43–51.	68
13 Gilliland, S. W. (1994). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to a selection system. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> , 79, 691–701.	68
13 Huselid, M. A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> , 38, 635–672.	68
16 Hough, L. M. (1992). The “Big Five” personality variables-construct confusion: Description versus prediction. <i>Human Performance</i> , 5, 139–155.	66
16 Hough, L. M., Dunnette, M. D., Eaton, N. K., & Kamp, J. D. (1990). Criterion-related validities of personality constructs and the effect of response distortions on those validities. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> , 75, 581–595.	66
18 McDaniel, M. A., Whetzel, D. L., Schmidt, F. L., & Maurer, S. (1994). The validity of employment interviews: A comprehensive review and meta-analysis. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> , 79, 599–616.	63
19 Harris, M. M., & Schaubroeck, J. (1988). A meta-analysis of self-supervisor, self-peer, and peer-supervisor ratings. <i>Personnel Psychology</i> , 41, 43–62.	57
19 McHenry, J. J., Hough, L. M., Toquam, J. L., Hanson, M. A., & Ashworth, S. (1990). Project A validity results: The relationship between predictor and criterion domains. <i>Personnel Psychology</i> , 43, 335–354.	57

Note. Ties indicated with identical ranks. Order within ranks is alphabetical.

Table 2

Top 20 Most Highly Cited Organizational Psychological Articles From 2001 to 2005

Citation	# Cites
1 Bandura, A. (1986). <i>Social foundations of thought and action: A social-cognitive view</i> . Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.	203
2 Bandura, A. (1997). <i>Self-efficacy: The exercise of control</i> . New York: Freeman.	159
2 Blau, P. (1964). <i>Exchange and power in social life</i> . New York: Wiley.	159
4 Bass, B. M. (1985). <i>Leadership and performance beyond expectations</i> . New York: Free Press.	155
5 Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). <i>A theory of goal setting and task performance</i> . Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.	150
6 Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> , <i>71</i> , 500–507.	138
7 Hofstede, G. (1980). <i>Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values</i> . Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.	126
8 Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). <i>Work redesign</i> . Readings, MA: Addison-Wesley.	124
9 Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). <i>The social psychology of procedural justice</i> . New York: Plenum.	123
10 Organ, D. W. (1988). <i>Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome</i> . Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.	122
11 Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: the PANAS scales. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i> , <i>54</i> , 1063–1070.	120
12 March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). <i>Organizations</i> . New York: Wiley.	119
13 Van Vianen, A. E. M. (2000). Person–organization fit: The match between newcomers' and recruiters' preferences for organizational cultures. <i>Personnel Psychology</i> , <i>53</i> , 113–149.	118
14 Vroom, V. H. (1964). <i>Work and motivation</i> . New York: Wiley.	116
15 Gist, M. E., & Mitchell, T. N. (1992). Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. <i>Academy of Management Review</i> , <i>17</i> , 183–211.	112
15 Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). <i>The social psychology of organizations</i> (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.	112
17 Mowday, R., Steers, R., & Porter, L. (1979). The measurement of organization commitment. <i>Journal of Vocational Behavior</i> , <i>14</i> , 224–247.	111
18 Smith, C. A., Organ, D. P., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> , <i>68</i> , 653–663.	110
19 Thompson, J. D. (1967). <i>Organizations in action</i> . New York: McGraw-Hill.	106
20 Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> , <i>76</i> , 845–855.	105

Note. Ties indicated with identical ranks. Order within ranks is alphabetical.

Table 3

Top 20 Most Highly Cited Equally Industrial-Organizational Articles From 2001 to 2005

Citation	# Cites
1 George, J. M. (1990). Personality, affect, and behavior in groups. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> , 75, 107–116.	87
2 Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. <i>Annual Review of Psychology</i> , 41, 417–440.	84
3 Kanfer, R., & Ackerman, P. L. (1989). Motivation and cognitive abilities: An integrative/aptitude-treatment interaction approach to skill acquisition. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> , 74, 657–690.	78
4 Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> , 79, 475–480.	75
5 Campion, M. A., Medsker, G. J., & Higgs, A. C. (1993). Relations between work group characteristics and effectiveness: Implications for designing effective workgroups. <i>Personnel Psychology</i> , 46, 823–850.	58
5 Cohen, S. G., & Bailey, D. E. (1997). What makes teams work: Group effectiveness research from the shop floor to the executive suite. <i>Journal of Management</i> , 23, 239–290.	58
7 Pelled, L. H., Eisenhardt, K. M., & Xin, K. R. (1999). Exploring the black box: An analysis of work group diversity, conflict, and performance. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i> , 44, 1–28.	57
8 McGrath, J. E. (1984). <i>Groups: Interaction and performance</i> . Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.	53
9 Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative “description of personality”: The Big Five factor structure. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i> , 59, 121–1229.	52
10 Sajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. <i>Psychological Bulletin</i> , 124, 240–261.	51
11 Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> , 38, 555–572.	50
12 Schneider, B., Goldstein, H. W., & Smith, D. B. (1995). The ASA framework: An update. <i>Personnel Psychology</i> , 48, 747–773.	50
12 Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. <i>Personnel Psychology</i> , 46, 259–293.	50
14 Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> , 33, 64–86.	49
15 Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1996). Person–organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. <i>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes</i> , 67, 294–311.	48
16 Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1993). Autonomy as a moderator of the relationships between the Big Five personality dimensions and job performance. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> , 78, 111–118.	47
17 Ilgen, D., Fisher, C., & Taylor, M. (1979). Consequences of individual feedback on behavior in organizations. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> , 64, 349–371.	46

Table 3 (continued)

Citation	# Cites
18 Jackson, S. E., Brett, J. F., Sessa, V. I., Cooper, D. M., Julin, J. A., & Peyronnin. (1991). Some differences make a difference: Individual dissimilarity and group heterogeneity as correlates of recruitment, promotions, and turnover. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology, 76</i> , 675–689.	46
19 Arvey, R. D., Strickland, W., Drauden, G., & Martin, C. (1990). Motivational components of test taking. <i>Personnel Psychology, 43</i> , 695–716.	45
19 Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1997). Interviewers' perceptions of person–organization fit and organizational selection decisions. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology, 82</i> , 546–561.	45

Note. Ties indicated with identical ranks. Order within ranks is alphabetical.

Table 4

Top 20 Most Highly Cited Methodological and Statistics Articles From 2001 to 2005

Citation	# Cites
1 Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6</i> , 1173–1182.	404
2 Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). <i>Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences</i> (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.	301
3 Joreskog, K. G., & Sorbom, D. (2001). <i>LISREL 8 user's reference guide</i> . Chicago: Scientific Software.	296
4 Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). <i>Psychometric theory</i> (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.	291
5 Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). <i>Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions</i> . Newbury Park, CA: Sage.	258
6 Cohen, J. (1988). <i>Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences</i> (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.	216
7 Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (1990). <i>Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings</i> . Newbury Park, CA: Sage.	182
8 James, L. R., Demaree, R. G., & Wolf, G. (1984). Estimating within-group interrater reliability with and without response bias. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology, 69</i> , 85–98.	175
9 Bollen, K. A. (1989). <i>Structural equations with latent variables</i> . New York: Wiley.	167
10 Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indices in structural models. <i>Psychological Bulletin, 88</i> , 588–606.	154
11 Podsakoff, P., & Organ, D. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. <i>Journal of Management, 12</i> , 531–544.	152
12 Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. <i>Psychological Bulletin, 103</i> , 411–423.	140
13 Bentler, P. M., & Bonett, D. G. (1980). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. <i>Psychological Bulletin, 88</i> , 588–606.	138

Table 4 (continued)

Citation	# Cites
14 Hu, L.-T., & Bentler, P. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. <i>Structural Equation Modeling</i> , 6, 1–55.	96
15 Bryk, A. S., & Raudenbush, S. W. (1992). <i>Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods</i> . Newbury Park, CA: Sage.	95
16 James, L. R. (1982). Aggregation bias in estimates of perceptual agreement. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> , 67, 219–229.	91
17 Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. A. Bollen & J. S. Long (Eds.), <i>Testing structural equation models</i> (pp. 136–162). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.	89
18 Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). <i>Quasi-experimentation</i> . Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.	87
19 Shrout, P. E., & Fleiss, J. L. (1979). Intraclass correlations: Uses in assessing rater reliability. <i>Psychological Bulletin</i> , 86, 420–428.	83
20 James, L. R., Demaree, R. G., & Wolf, G. (1984). r_{wg} : An assessment of within-group interrater agreement. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> , 78, 306–309.	82

Note. Ties indicated with identical ranks. Order within ranks is alphabetical.

Discussion

A peculiar finding emerged from this process, and although peripheral to my main purpose here, it is interesting enough to mention: The most miscited article by the I-O literature is Baron and Kenny's (1986) work on the moderator–mediator variable distinction, which is quite often cited as the “mediator–moderator” distinction or any of a hundred slight deviations. Of 404 citations extracted, only 261 were formed correctly. It is suspected that this variation in citation formatting exists in the psychological literature as a whole (for a full discussion of the development of TREND in relation to the difficulties realized through mis-citations of Baron and Kenny, see Landers [2008]). These sorts of minor errors likely occur with every entry in the list, and add error to the rankings at an unknown degree (it would require a by-hand check of all 128,425 citations against all other citations in each list to be more sure) and draws some question to the accuracy of the ranks, especially in cases where they differ only by a count of one or two citations. Because of this error, absolute position in the rankings should be considered with some caution. While it may be safe to say that Baron and Kenny's (1986) work is the most cited article by the I-O literature (see Table 4), the relative importance of the top two equally I-O articles (see Table 3) is a more difficult call to make.

Several interesting trends arise in the tables. Methodological articles would dominate an overall top 20 list, as would be expected; research methods and statistics are common to both I and O. Individual differences pervade the I, O, and I-O lists, which reflects the current high degree of attention our field pays as a whole to such topics. This is perhaps best reflected

in that Barrick and Mount's (1991) work represents the article most cited by the I-O literature that is also within the I-O literature. Interestingly, I and I-O (Table 1 and 3) citations are predominantly journal articles while O and methods (Tables 2 and 4) citations are predominately books. Hypothesizing as to the cause of this difference is outside the scope of this paper, but several humorous anecdotes about "I people" and "O people" can be imagined.

The primary contributions of this paper, of course, are the lists themselves. Not only do they give a convenient reading list for newcomers to modern-day I-O research, but they reveal the utility of the TREND tool. A similar procedure could be used for any particular research area, and the most highly cited (and theoretically influential) papers could be extracted quickly and easily, providing the I-O scientist an extremely useful starting point for future investigation. Say, for example, the rapidly growing field of e-learning drew a researcher's interest. This researcher could run a PsycINFO search for "e-learning" and run TREND on the results, thus quickly extracting all of the most highly cited articles and books within the e-learning literature, as well as several other summaries, including author prevalence, years of publication, source, and keywords used. What journal is the most common carrier of this topic? What is the trend in publication frequency over time for this topic? Is this area on the rise, or are publication rates slowing down? These questions and many more can be quickly and easily answered. Thus, this further holds great potential for the practitioner, as I-O psychologists in the field often need to extend themselves into areas of I-O that they have not studied for some time. The software could be used to search for any particular topic, quickly and easily extracting the most potentially relevant articles to the practitioner's immediate problem. The TREND software further supports the scientist-practitioner, breaking down barriers to interdisciplinary work, by allowing easy early investigation into topics in sister fields, such as human resource management or social psychology. It is the hope of the author that not only do readers find the extracted lists themselves useful but also take advantage of this new software for their own use, discovering applications even beyond what was done here. And of course, deciding on advanced course reading lists has never been easier.

References

- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 51*, 1173-1182.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 1-26.
- Landers, R. N. (2007). The Research Explicator for oNline Databases (TREND) v1.21 [Computer software]. Retrieved September 1, 2007, from <http://rlanders.filedrawer.org/explicator.html>.
- Landers, R. N. (2008). TREND: A tool for rapid online research literature analysis and quantification. *Behavior Research Methods, 40*, 665-672.
- Zickar, M. J., & Highhouse, S. (2001). Measuring prestige of journals in industrial-organizational psychology. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist, 38*(4), 29-36.