

## SYLLABUS

*Psychology 892/592*  
BEHAVIOR AND PERFORMANCE AT WORK  
Fall 2014  
George Mason University

Instructor: Reeshad S. Dalal, Ph.D.  
Email Address: rdalal@gmu.edu  
Class Day and Time: Thursday, 1:30 - 4:15 PM  
Class Location: Robinson B, Room 205  
Office Hours: Monday, 4:15 - 5:15 PM or by appointment  
Office Location: David King Hall, Room 2006 (entry through Room 2005)

“The criterion, if properly understood, could give us further insights into the effect of the independent variable, and perhaps even help identify some of the intervening variables.”

— J. Weitz (*American Psychologist*, 1961, p. 231)

### PREREQUISITES:

- Graduate survey-level statistics courses (PSYC 611 and 754, or equivalent)
- Graduate survey-level courses in industrial/organizational psychology (PSYC 636 and 639, or equivalent)

### COURSE OVERVIEW:

This is a graduate-level survey of research related to work behavior/performance (loosely defined). The focus is on basic scientific research, and the readings are therefore primarily peer-reviewed journal articles and handbook chapters (including some very highly cited papers as well as some papers that are models of good research design and/or interdisciplinary breadth). However, an attempt has also been made to discuss how this research might inform practice in organizations—thereby furthering the nascent “evidence-based management” movement. Finally, an attempt has been made to choose readings that will provoke the reader and provide ample fodder for discussion.

Overall, the course aims to help students become good developers, consumers, and appliers of research. Students will additionally have the opportunity to: (1) hone their analytical and information presentation skills, and (2) gain practice in generating research proposals. Finally, one of the objectives of the course is to keep the amount of reading in any given week to a manageable length. The sincere hope is that this will encourage students to actually complete all the assigned readings. ☺

## ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION POLICY:

It is important for every student to read all the assigned articles, attend all class sessions, and contribute to the class discussion because the quality of this course will be influenced significantly ( $p < 0.01$ ) by the quality of the discussion.

One absence is permitted without any penalty as long as the student summarizes his or her reactions to the week's readings in some depth on the Blackboard discussion board. A second or third absence will automatically result in a one-grade penalty (e.g., an "A" becomes a "B") to the participation/attendance portion of the course grade unless the student not only provides reactions to the readings but also performs an additional in-class presentation (please see me to discuss this). Barring truly exceptional circumstances (as determined by *me*), a fourth absence will automatically result in a failing grade in the course as a whole.

Frequent instances of late arrival to and/or early departure from class will also result in grade penalties to the participation/attendance portion of the course grade. This is also the case for frequent instances of temporary departures from the classroom while class is in session.

Every student is expected to contribute to the class discussion during each course session. Students who do not voluntarily contribute will be "encouraged" to contribute by the professor. In other words, I may have to put you on the spot. Contributions via the online (Blackboard) discussion board are encouraged, but cannot completely substitute for in-class participation. Repeated failure to participate will result in grade penalties to the participation/attendance portion of the course grade.

## COURSE READINGS:

The course readings are listed below. Every student is expected to contribute to the class discussion. Students who do not voluntarily contribute will be "encouraged" to contribute by the professor. In other words, I may deliberately put you on the spot. It is important for every student to read all the assigned articles and to contribute to the class discussion because the quality of this course will be influenced significantly by the quality of the discussion ( $p < 0.01$ ). Participation in the electronic discussion board (on *Blackboard*) can partially, but not fully, substitute for in-class discussion: *some amount of in-class discussion will be required if the student is to obtain the highest possible grade in the attendance/ participation category.*

When reading an empirical article, here are some questions to keep in mind:

- Primarily *descriptive* questions:
  - What are the main points in this article? A few examples:
    - Which theoretical frameworks are used? If you were asked to summarize each framework in 4-5 sentences, what would you say?
    - What are the major hypotheses?

- How are the relevant constructs defined?
- What is the research design?
- How are the relevant constructs operationalized and measured?
- How do the author(s) analyze the data? Even in cases where the data-analytic techniques are complex, try to emerge with at least a surface-level understanding of what is being done, and why.
- What are the major findings?
- What are the implications for future research and for practice?
  - Are there any implications for you personally?
- In what ways does this article relate to other articles that we have read this week or in previous weeks?
- Primarily *evaluative* questions:
  - What are the strengths of this article? For example, if the article has been cited heavily, why might this be the case?
  - What are the weaknesses of this article?
  - Was there anything in this article that you found surprising or particularly interesting?

Some of the above questions will also apply to a theoretical/review article.

The article list follows:

*Note: “\*” indicates a reading that is not required, but is warmly recommended for personal development.*

#### AUGUST 28: FIRST CLASS MEETING

No readings.

#### SEPTEMBER 4: OVERVIEW - I

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* (pp. 687-732). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Motowidlo, S. J. & Kell, H. J. (2013). Job performance. In I. B. Weiner (Series Ed.) and N. Schmitt & S. Highhouse (Vol. Eds.) *Handbook of psychology: Vol. 12. Industrial and organizational psychology* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn., pp. 82-103). Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons.

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

\*Murphy, K. R., & Deckert, P. J. (2013). Performance appraisal. In K. F. Geisinger (Ed.

in Chief), *APA handbook of testing and assessment in psychology: Vol. I. Test theory and testing and assessment in industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 611-627). Washington, DC, USA: American Psychological Association.

## SEPTEMBER 11: OVERVIEW - II

Cascio, W. F., & Aguinis, H. (2011). *Applied psychology in human resource management* (7<sup>th</sup> edn.). Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA: Prentice Hall. [**Chapter 4: Criteria: Concepts, measurement, and evaluation**]

Cascio, W. F., & Aguinis, H. (2011). *Applied psychology in human resource management* (7<sup>th</sup> edn.). Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA: Prentice Hall. [**Chapter 5: Performance management**]

Kaplan, R. S. & Norton, D. P. (1992). The balanced scorecard—measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review*, 70, 71-79.

\*Cascio, W. F. (2007). Utility analysis. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of industrial/organizational psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 854-858). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

\*Richard, P. J., Devinny, T. M., Yip, G. S., & Johnson, G. (2009). Measuring organizational performance: Toward methodological best practice. *Journal of Management*, 35, 718-804.

## SEPTEMBER 18: OVERVIEW – III (DYNAMIC CRITERIA)

Beus, J. M., & Whitman, D. S. (2012). The relationship between typical and maximum performance: A meta-analytic examination. *Human Performance*, 25, 355-376.

Dalal, R. S., Bhawe, D. P., & Fiset, J. (2014). Within-person variability in job performance: A theoretical review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 40, 1396-1436.

Lee, H., & Dalal, R. S. (2011). The effects of performance extremities on ratings of dynamic performance. *Human Performance*, 24, 99-118.

\*Beal, D. J., Weiss, H. M., Barros, E., & MacDermid, S. M. (2005). An episodic process model of affective influences on performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1054-1068.

- \*Dalal, R. S. & Hulin, C. L. (2008). Motivation for what? A multivariate dynamic perspective of the criterion. In R. Kanfer, G. Chen, & R. D. Pritchard (Eds.), *Work motivation: Past, present, and future* (pp. 63-100). New York: Routledge.
- \*Ghiselli, E. E. (1956). Dimensional problems of criteria. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 40, 1-4.
- \*Hofmann, D. A., Jacobs, R., & Baratta, J. E. (1993). Dynamic criteria and the measurement of change. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 194-204.
- \*Hulin, C. L., Henry, R. A., & Noon, S. L. (1990). Adding a dimension: Time as a factor in the generalizability of predictive relationships. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 328-340.
- \*Inn, A., Hulin, C. L., & Tucker, L. (1972). Three sources of criterion variance: Static dimensionality, dynamic dimensionality, and individual dimensionality. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 8, 58-83.
- \*Kane, J. S. (1996). The conceptualization and representation of total performance effectiveness. *Human Resource Management Review*, 6, 123-145.
- \*Sackett, P. R., Zedeck, S., & Fogli, L. (1988). Relations between measures of typical and maximum job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 482-486.
- \*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.

#### SEPTEMBER 25: MEASUREMENT/APPRaisal - I

- Landy, F. J. (2010). Performance ratings: Then and now. In J. L. Outtz (Ed.), *Adverse impact: Implications for organizational staffing and high stakes selection* (pp. 227-248). New York, NY, USA: Routledge. **[Read this after reading Landy and Farr (1980).]**
- Landy, F. J., & Farr, J. L. (1980). Performance rating. *Psychological Bulletin*, 87, 72-107.
- Oppler, S. H., Campbell, J. P., Pulakos, E. D., & Borman, W. C. (1992). Three approaches to the investigation of subgroup bias in performance measurement: Review, results, and conclusions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 201-217.
- \*DeNisi, A., & Williams, K. J. (1988). Cognitive approaches to performance appraisal. In G. R. Ferris & K. M. Rowland (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resources management* (Vol. 6, pp. 109-155). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- \*Ferris, G. R., Munyon, T. P., Basik, K., & Buckley, M. R. (2008). The performance evaluation context: Social, emotional, cognitive, political, and relationship components. *Human Resource Management Review*, 18, 146-163.

## OCTOBER 2: MEASUREMENT/APPRAISAL - II

- DeNisi, A. S., & Kluger, A. N. (2000). Feedback effectiveness: Can 360-degree appraisals be improved? *The Academy of Management Executive*, 14, 129-139.
- Roch, S. G., Woehr, D. J., Mishra, V., & Kieszczynska, U. (2012). Rater training revisited: An updated meta-analytic review of frame-of-reference training. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 85, 370-395.
- Rothstein, H. R. (1990). Interrater reliability of job performance ratings: Growth to asymptote level with increasing opportunity to observe. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 322-327.
- Schwab, D. P., Heneman, H. G., & DeCotiis, T. A. (1975). Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales: A review of the literature. *Personnel Psychology*, 28, 549-562.
- Smith, P. C., & Kendall, L. M. (1963). Retranslation of expectations: An approach to the construction of unambiguous anchors for rating scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 47, 149-155.
- \*Bommer, W. H., Johnson, J., 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, 587-605.
- \*Borman, W. C., Buck, D. E., Hanson, M. A., Motowidlo, S. J., Stark, S. J., & Drasgow, F. (2001). An examination of the comparative reliability, validity, and accuracy of performance ratings made using computerized adaptive rating scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 965-973.

## OCTOBER 9: STAR PERFORMERS (IS PERFORMANCE REALLY DISTRIBUTED NORMALLY?)

- Beck, J. W., Beatty, A. S., & Sackett, P. R. (in press). On the distribution of job performance: The role of measurement characteristics in observed departures from normality. In press at *Personnel Psychology*.
- Muchinsky, P. M. (1994). What is the shape of the distribution of job performance (and what difference does it make)? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 2, 255-258.
- O'Boyle, E., & Aguinis, H. (2012). The best and the rest: Revisiting the norm of

normality of individual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 65, 79-119.

\*Aguinis, H., & O'Boyle, E. (2014). Star performers in twenty-first century organizations. *Personnel Psychology*, 67, 313-350.

#### OCTOBER 16: ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR, CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE, AND RELATED TOPICS

Carpenter, N. C., Berry, C. M., & Houston, L. (2014). A meta-analytic comparison of self-reported and other-reported organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35, 547-574.

Coleman, V. I., & Borman, W. C. (2000). Investigating the underlying structure of the citizenship performance domain. *Human Resource Management Review*, 10, 25-44.

Snyder, M., & Dwyer, P. C. (2013). Altruism and prosocial behavior. In I. B. Weiner (Series Ed.) and H. A. Tennen & J. M. Suls (Vol. Eds.) *Handbook of psychology: Vol. 5. Personality and social psychology* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn., pp. 467-486). Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons.

\*Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Niehoff, B. P. (2004). The other side of the story: Reexamining prevailing assumptions about organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 14, 229-246.

\*Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10, 99-109.

\*Lee, F. (2002). The social costs of seeking help. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 38, 17-35.

\*Pearce, P. L., & Amato, P. R. (1980). A taxonomy of helping: A multidimensional scaling analysis. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 4, 363-371.

#### OCTOBER 23: CLASS PRESENTATIONS (APPLIED PROJECT: BARS CONSTRUCTION OR OTHER PROJECT)

No readings.

#### OCTOBER 30: COUNTERPRODUCTIVE/DEVIANT WORK BEHAVIOR, AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR, AND

## RELATED TOPICS

- DeWall, C. N., Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2013). Aggression. In I. B. Weiner (Series Ed.) and H. A. Tennen & J. M. Suls (Vol. Eds.) *Handbook of psychology: Vol. 5. Personality and social psychology* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn., pp. 449-466). Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ones, D. S., & Dilchert, S. (2013). Counterproductive work behaviors: Concepts, measurement, and nomological network. In K. F. Geisinger (Ed. in Chief), *APA handbook of testing and assessment in psychology: Vol. I. Test theory and testing and assessment in industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 643-659). Washington, DC, USA: American Psychological Association.
- Ritter, D. & Eslea, M. (2005). Hot sauce, toy guns, and graffiti: A critical account of current laboratory aggression paradigms. *Aggressive Behavior*, 31, 407-419.
- \*Bushman, B. J., Baumeister, R. F., & Phillips, C. M. (2001). Do people aggress to improve their mood? Catharsis beliefs, affect regulation opportunity, and aggressive responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 17-32.
- \*Everton, W. J., Mastrangelo, P. M., & Jolton, J. A. (2005). Personality correlates of employees' personal use of work computers. *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 8, 143-153.
- \*Greco, L. M., O'Boyle, E. H., & Walter, S. L. (in press). Absence of malice: A meta-analysis of nonresponse bias in counterproductive work behavior research. In press at *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
- \*Gruys, M. L. & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11, 30-42.
- \*Hindelang, M. J., Hirschi, T., & Weis, J. G. (1979). Correlates of delinquency: The illusion of discrepancy between self-report and official measures. *American Sociological Review*, 44, 995-1014.
- \*Hirschi, T. & Gottfredson, M. (1983). Age and the explanation of crime. *American Journal of Sociology*, 89, 552-584.
- \*Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). Concluding thoughts: Where do we go from here? In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 297-305). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. [Read only Table 12.1, page 303]
- \*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, 446-460.

#### NOVEMBER 6: WITHDRAWAL (TURNOVER, ABSENTEEISM, LATENESS, ETC.)

Bozeman, D. P., & Perrewé, P. L. (2001). The effect of item content overlap on Organizational Commitment Questionnaire-turnover cognitions relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 161-173.

Harrison, D. A. (2002). Meaning and measurement of work role withdrawal: Current controversies and future fallout from changing information technology. In M. Koslowsky & M. Krausz (Eds.), *Voluntary Employee Withdrawal and Inattendance: A Current Perspective* (pp. 95-131). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic / Plenum Publishers.

Hom, P. W., & Griffeth, R. W. (1995). *Employee turnover*. Cincinnati, OH: South-western College Publishing. **[Read only pp. 4-12]**

Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R., Holtom, B. C., McDaniel, L. S., & Hill, J. W. (1999). The unfolding model of voluntary turnover: A replication and extension. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42, 450-462.

\*Hanisch, K. A., & Hulin, C. L. (1990). Job attitudes and organizational withdrawal: An examination of retirement and other voluntary withdrawal behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 37, 60-78.

\*Harrison, D. A. & Hulin, C. L. (1989). Investigations of absenteeism: Using event history models to study the absence-taking process. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 300-316.

\*Holtom, B. C., Mitchell, T. R., Lee, T. W., & Eberly, M. B. (2008). Turnover and retention research: A glance at the past, a closer review of the present, and a venture into the future. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 2, 231-274.

\*Hom, P. W., & Griffeth, R. W. (1995). *Employee turnover*. Cincinnati, OH: South-western College Publishing. **[Read only pp. 184-192]**

\*Hulin, C. L. (1991). Adaptation, persistence, and commitment in organizations. In M.D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 445-506). Palo Alto, CA, USA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

\*Johns, G. (2001). The psychology of lateness, absenteeism, and turnover. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. P. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 232-252). London,

U.K.: Sage Publications.

#### NOVEMBER 13: RELATIONSHIPS AMONG CRITERIA: STATIC AND DYNAMIC DIMENSIONALITY

*Bulleted outline due in class today.*

- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 1241-1255.
- Dalal, R. S., Lam, H., Weiss, H. M., Welch, E., & Hulin, C. L. (2009). A within-person approach to work behavior and performance: Concurrent and lagged citizenship-counterproductivity associations, and dynamic relationships with affect and overall job performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 52*, 1051-1066.
- Rosse, J. G., & Miller, H. E. (1984). Relationship between absenteeism and other employee behaviors. In P. S. Goodman, R. S. Atkin, and associates (Eds.), *Absenteeism: New approaches to understanding, measuring, and managing employee absence* (pp. 194-228). San Francisco, CA, USA: Jossey Bass.
- Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 66-80.
- \*Harrison, D. A. & Shaffer, M. A. (2005). Mapping the criterion space for expatriate success: Task- and relationship-based performance, effort, and adaptation. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 16*, 1454-1474.
- \*Viswesvaran, C. (2002). Absenteeism and measures of job performance: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10*, 12-17.
- \*Viswesvaran, C., Schmidt, F. L., & Ones, D. S. (2005). Is there a general factor in ratings of job performance? A meta-analytic framework for disentangling substantive and error influences. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 108-131.

#### NOVEMBER 20: CALIBRATION AND (OVER)CONFIDENCE

- Alba, J. W., & Hutchinson, J. W. (2000). Knowledge calibration: What consumers know and what they think they know. *Journal of Consumer Research, 27*, 123-156.
- Klayman, J., Soll, J. B., González-Vallejo, C., & Barlas, S. (1999). Overconfidence: It depends on how, what, and whom you ask. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 79*, 216-247.

Sitzmann, T., & Yeo, G. (2013). A meta-analytic investigation of the within-person self-efficacy domain: Is self-efficacy a product of past performance or a driver of future performance? *Personnel Psychology*, 66, 531-568.

\*Arkes, H. R., Christensen, C., Lai, C., & Blumer, C. (1987). Two methods of reducing overconfidence. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 39, 133-144.

\*Billings, B. M., & Odean, T. (2001). Boys will be boys: Gender, overconfidence, and common stock investment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 141, 261-292.

\*Tenney, E. R., MacCoun, R. J., Spellman, B. A., & Hastie, R. (2007). Calibration trumps confidence as a basis for witness credibility. *Psychological Science*, 18, 46-50.

#### NOVEMBER 25: THANKSGIVING BREAK

No class (and no readings).

#### DECEMBER 4: DAY SET ASIDE FOR MEETINGS ABOUT RESEARCH PROPOSAL

No class (and no readings). Meetings can be scheduled during class time or at other mutually convenient times.

#### DECEMBER 11: RESEARCH PROPOSALS DUE THIS MORNING

No class (and no readings). Term papers for research proposals are due at 9 AM via email.

---

### APPLIED PROJECT (BARS CONSTRUCTION)<sup>†</sup>:

This is a *group* project. You will be working in groups of size three.

On *October 23*, students will present an approximately **12-15** minute long *PowerPoint* presentation describing the construction of BARS for *two* dimensions of “success” associated with a particular “type” of I/O graduate student at Mason (e.g., 2nd year M.A. student, 2nd year Ph.D. student, or 4th year Ph.D. student).

In constructing the BARS, students should use seminal sources including, *but not limited to*, Schwab et al. (1975) and Smith and Kendall (1963), both of which are included in the required reading list. One permissible departure from standard procedure is that although students should use as many subject-matter experts (other current Mason I/O graduate students, recent alumni of the program, etc.) during the construction of the BARS as possible, under the circumstances they will almost certainly need to use many fewer subject-matter experts than would be typical. Students should let me know if they believe that any additional departures from standard procedure are necessary; these must be approved by me on a case-by-case basis *prior to* the due date.

Each presentation will be followed by a brief (no more than 5 minutes) question-and-answer session.

Students should practice their presentations ahead of time and should time themselves when doing so. Grade penalties will apply for presentations that greatly exceed (or fall short of) the allotted time.

<sup>†</sup>I am potentially open to students creating BARS for another “job” or even to students doing some other form of applied project entirely. Students who wish to do something different should prepare a brief (e.g., 1-page) proposal regarding the type of alternative they desire, and should discuss their proposal with me *at least two weeks prior to* the due date.

## STUDENT-SELECTED READINGS:

Each student will choose **two** of the recommended readings—those marked with an asterisk (\*)—from the list above. The student will then briefly present that reading to the rest of the class. To that end, each student should prepare an approximately **12-15** minute long *PowerPoint* presentation that includes the following information:

- The student’s (i.e., presenter’s) name on the first slide
- A full citation for the reading selected, in American Psychological Association (APA) style on the first slide
- Some information regarding why this particular reading was selected
- A summary of the reading (e.g., for an empirical journal article, see the list of questions mentioned at the beginning of the syllabus)
- A clear indication of how this reading fits in with the assigned readings for the same week and previous weeks.

Each presentation will be followed by a brief (no more than 5 minutes) question-and-answer session.

Students should practice their presentations ahead of time and should time themselves when doing so. Grade penalties will apply for presentations that greatly exceed (or fall short of) the allotted time.

Note: A student cannot choose two readings from the same week. Moreover, across students, no more than 3 readings can be selected for a given week.

## **RESEARCH PROPOSAL (BULLETED OUTLINE + TERM PAPER):**

This is a *group* project. You will be working in groups of size three.

Each group of students is required to propose an original research project *explicitly focused on the topic of work behavior or performance*. In other words, behavior/performance cannot simply be treated as the dependent/outcome variable: it must be the focus of the paper. I would strongly recommend discussing your project idea with me before moving forward with it.

In practical terms, the end product will essentially consist of the *introduction, method, and “anticipated analyses” sections of an empirical journal article*.<sup>††</sup>

- For the introduction section, you should first review the literature on a particular topic and then propose your own hypotheses. Each hypothesis should be preceded by a sound rationale.
- For the method section, you should describe your sample and procedures. As part of describing the sample, you should indicate not only who the participants will be (e.g., demographic information, job types, etc.) and why, but also *how many* participants you will need. An estimation of the number of participants needed can be done either via a formal power analysis (which you should describe *in detail*, along with appropriate citations) or, failing that, via rules of thumb that have been articulated for the analyses you plan to conduct (which you should describe *in detail*, along with appropriate citations).
- The “anticipated analyses” section should be as close to a results section as you can get without actually having any data. Basically, you should describe the data-analytic techniques you plan to conduct, along with a brief justification for the use of these techniques. This justification becomes critical if, as is often the case, there are multiple techniques that could be used to analyze your data.

Note that this is a proposal for *basic* research. It should focus on psychological constructs and their inter-relationships. Hypotheses should ideally be derived from psychological (or other social science) theories. A paper discussing an applied research problem (e.g., “Here is a description of a consulting project I conducted for *Elegantly Wasted Winery, Inc.*, comparing the levels of employee performance across the winery’s Production and Sales departments”) is completely inappropriate and will receive a failing grade.

The topic should be *specific*. For example, whereas “organizational citizenship behavior” or even “organizational citizenship behavior as an antecedent rather than an outcome” are too broad, something like “the within-person relationship between organizational citizenship

behavior and employee burnout” would be more appropriate. You should propose *original* research: though our discipline should have a place for replications, the current paper is designed in part to assess your creativity—therefore, replications are not suitable here. *The idea is for students to use this opportunity to develop research proposals in areas relevant and interesting to them.* In the past, some students have gone on to conduct the studies they proposed for this course--and I would urge you to try to do the same.

Papers should be formatted in American Psychological Association style, as exemplified by the latest edition of the APA Publication Manual. Another good resource is:

Bem, D. J. (2004). Writing the empirical journal article. In J. M. Darley, M. P. Zanna, & H. L. Roediger (Eds.), *The compleat academic: A career guide* (2nd ed., pp. 185-220). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

For both your sanity and mine, the term paper will be fairly short: **12-15<sup>††</sup>** double-spaced pages of text—that is, *excluding* title page, references, and any tables or figures you may have. You do not need an abstract, and you do not need a discussion section. You will need *at least 20 references* in the final paper. The short length of the paper does not obviate the necessity of thoroughness.

To facilitate viable research proposals, the submission of the paper will be preceded by a *bulleted outline*. This should be **4-5** double-spaced pages in length, plus a references section (you should have at least *15 references* at this stage). The outline should include sections associated with the introduction, method and anticipated analyses. By this stage, you should also have an estimate for (and explanation of) the number of participants you will require.

I will, of course, provide extensive feedback on the outlines. I will also provide extensive feedback on the term papers. The purpose of providing feedback on the term paper is (in addition to justifying the grade) to assist students with their writing/framing skills in general, and to suggest areas for improvement as well as “next steps” in the event that they wish to pursue their projects further (beyond the end of the semester).

*Please proof-read your outlines and term papers carefully!*

<sup>††</sup>I am potentially open to a theory or review paper instead of an empirical paper. If students are interested in writing a theory or review paper, they should come and talk to me about it *at least two weeks prior to the due date for the outline*.

<sup>†††</sup>For certain paper topics, a paper that is slightly shorter or longer may be warranted. Students should request the instructor’s permission *ahead of time* if they feel that the length guidelines would unduly interfere with the quality of their research proposal.

*Outlines are due in class on November 13.*

*Term Papers are due via email by 9 AM on December 11.*

**GRADING SCHEME:**

Attendance and participation	30%
Applied Project (BARS construction or other)	15%
Student-selected readings (7.5% each)	15%
Research proposal: Bulleted outline	15%
Research proposal: Term paper	25%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>

Note that this is not a “guaranteed A” course. Poor work will receive a poor grade.

*The instructor reserves the right to make changes to the syllabus with reasonable advance notice.*