

SYLLABUS

Psychology 892-002
BEHAVIOR AND PERFORMANCE AT WORK
Fall 2016
George Mason University

Instructor: Reeshad S. Dalal, Ph.D.
Email Address: rdalal@gmu.edu

Class Day and Time: Friday, 1:30 - 4:10 PM
Class Location: Research Hall, Room 202

Office Hours: Wednesday, 10:30 - 11:30 AM, 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 courses in statistics (PSYC 611 and 754, or equivalent)
- Graduate survey-level courses in industrial and organizational psychology (PSYC 636 and 639, or equivalent)

COURSE OVERVIEW AND OBJECTIVES:

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). In addition, we will emphasize how to go about actually doing this research (tips and tricks, obstacles, etc.). So, yes, this will be a heavily research-based course. Having said that, we will also discuss how this research might inform practice in organizations—thereby furthering the nascent “evidence-based management” movement. Finally, the readings have been chosen with an eye to provoking the reader and providing ample fodder for informed discussion.

Overall, the course aims to help students become good developers, consumers, and appliers of research. A major portion of the course involves students generating and executing research

projects. I have always placed a heavy emphasis on research generation and execution, but this course will attempt to go even further than its previous iterations in those regards. Students will have the opportunity to carefully consider various options for research projects. Moreover, students will have the opportunity to make considerable progress during the semester in actually executing those projects. The sincere hope is that this course will provide the basis for several high-quality student-led publications.

To facilitate this, I have done my best to keep the number of assigned readings manageable. I have, moreover, attempted to order the readings so that students obtain a basic foundation in the field before they finalize their research projects--and so that the readings later in the semester provide additional detail that can help students flesh out their research projects.

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 during the semester is permitted without any penalty and for any reason, 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 for any reason will automatically result in a letter-grade penalty (e.g., an "A" becomes an "A-") to the participation/attendance portion of the overall course grade unless the student not only provides reactions to the readings but also performs an additional assignment for each absence (please see me to discuss this). Barring truly exceptional circumstances (as determined by *me*), a fourth absence for any reason will automatically result in a failing grade (i.e., "F") in the participation/attendance portion of the overall course grade.

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. 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.

CLASS CANCELTION POLICY:

In the hopefully unlikely event that I myself need to miss class, I will do my very best to inform you via email as soon as possible. Depending on the specific content to be covered in the missed week, the make-up may differ. For instance, I may request that you post brief reactions to the readings to the Blackboard discussion board (and I may use that medium myself to communicate

critical information about the readings and/or to respond to your reactions) or we may defer the discussion of the readings until the following week.

COURSE READINGS:

All readings will be provided on Blackboard.

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 a few sentences, what would you say?
 - What are the major hypotheses?
 - How are the relevant constructs defined and operationalized?
 - What is the research design?
 - How do the authors 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? A frequent tendency among junior graduate students is to focus on the weaknesses of articles while overlooking the strengths. Recall that articles are published (and chosen as readings for this course) *due* to their strengths and *despite* their weaknesses.
 - 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.

Note: In the list below, an asterisk (i.e., “”) indicates a reading that is not required, but that is warmly recommended for personal development.*

SEPTEMBER 2: PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT - I

In-class discussion of syllabus.

YouTube video on performance metrics (5:16)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R4HPYR5iLw>

Campbell, J. P., & Wiernik, B. M. (2015). The modeling and assessment of work performance. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2, 47-74.

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

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

*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* (2nd edn., pp. 82-103). Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons.

SEPTEMBER 9: PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT - II

In-class BARS construction exercise.

YouTube videos on organization-level performance using the balanced scorecard (3:59 and 3:23, respectively):

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M_IIOlywryw

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QM9SLX4icu0>

YouTube video on appraisal rating errors (9:34):

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jCPaQuY-ejg&list=PLKdtyrtJuuLeJnTOesMDM8KKO6RZEAcsR>

Cascio, W. F., & Aguinis, H. (2011). *Applied psychology in human resource management* (7th edn.). Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA: Prentice Hall. [**Chapter 5: Performance management, pp. 73-109.**]

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.

*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.

*Kaplan, R. S. & Norton, D. P. (1992). The balanced scorecard—measures that drive performance.

Harvard Business Review, 70, 71-79.

*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.

*Schwab, D. P., Heneman, H. G., & DeCotiis, T. A. (1975). Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales: A review of the literature. *Personnel Psychology*, 28, 549-562.

SEPTEMBER 16: WITHIN-PERSON PERFORMANCE VARIABILITY

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.

Dalal, Bhawe, and Fiset: Prospectus for *Journal of Management* review issue

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

*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.

*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.

*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 23: COUNTERPRODUCTIVE/DEVIANT WORK BEHAVIOR, AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR, AND RELATED TOPICS

Dalal, R. S., & Gorab, A. K. (in press). Insider threat in cyber security: What the organizational psychology literature on counterproductive work behavior can and cannot (yet) tell us. In S. J. Zaccaro, R. S. Dalal, L. E. Tetrick, & J. A. Steinke (Eds.), *Psychosocial dynamics of cyber security*. Routledge (Taylor & Francis).

Holland, S. J., Simpson, K. M., Dalal, R. S., & Vega, R. P. (in press). I can't steal from a coworker if I work from home: Conceptual and measurement-related issues associated with studying counterproductive work behavior in a telework setting. In press at *Human Performance*.

- 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.
- *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. (2015). Absence of malice: A meta-analysis of nonresponse bias in counterproductive work behavior research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 75-97.
- *Gruys, M. L. & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11, 30-42.
- *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.

SEPTEMBER 30: WITHDRAWAL (TURNOVER, ABSENTEEISM, LATENESS, ETC.) + ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR, CONTEXTUAL PERFORMANCE, AND RELATED TOPICS

Formation of groups for research project.

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

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

*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.

OCTOBER 7: RELATIONSHIPS AMONG CRITERIA: STATIC AND DYNAMIC DIMENSIONALITY

Groups exchange feedback on their research project ideas.

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.

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.

*Borman, W. C., & Brush, D. H. (1993). More progress toward a taxonomy of managerial performance requirements. *Human Performance*, 6, 1-21.

*Viswesvaran, C. (2002). Absenteeism and measures of job performance: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 12-17.

OCTOBER 14: STAR PERFORMERS (IS PERFORMANCE REALLY DISTRIBUTED NORMALLY?)

Short outline for research project due.

YouTube video on the “long tail” in marketing (2:49):
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RoeEmJWVU8c>

YouTube video on the power law (5:48):
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vIp1kY0H0yw>

Beck, J. W., Beatty, A. S., & Sackett, P. R. (2014). On the distribution of job performance: The role of measurement characteristics in observed departures from normality. *Personnel Psychology*, 67, 531-566. **[Please read O’Boyle & Aguinis (2012) first.]**

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. (2013). Star performers in twenty-first century organizations. *Personnel Psychology*, 67, 313-350.

*Call, M. L., Nyberg, A. J., & Thatcher, S. (2015). Stargazing: An integrative conceptual review, theoretical reconciliation, and extension for star employee research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 623-640.

OCTOBER 21: MORE ON PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT

DeNisi, A. S., & Kluger, A. N. (2000). Feedback effectiveness: Can 360-degree appraisals be improved? *The Academy of Management Executive*, 14, 129-139.

Pulakos, E. D., Hanson, R. M., Arad, S., & Moye, N. (2015). Performance management can be fixed: An on-the-job experiential learning approach for complex behavior change. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 51-76.

Uggerslev, K. L., & Sulsky, L. M. (2008). Using frame-of-reference training to understand the implications of rater idiosyncrasy for rating accuracy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 711-719.

The Economist (2016, February 20). The measure of a man: Reports of the death of performance reviews are exaggerated. Retrieved from: <http://www.economist.com/news/21693151-employers-are-modifying-not-abolishing-them-performance-reviews-not-dead-yet>

Woehr, D. J., & Huffcutt, A. I. (1994). Rater training for performance appraisal: A quantitative review. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67, 189-205.

*Anseel, F., Beatty, A. S., Shen, W., Lievens, F., & Sackett, P. R. (2015). How are we doing after 30 years? A meta-analytic review of the antecedents and outcomes of feedback-seeking behavior. *Journal of Management*, 41, 318-348.

*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.

OCTOBER 28: GROUP MEETINGS WITH ME REGARDING RESEARCH PROJECTS

No class (and no readings). Meetings need not be precisely on this date.

NOVEMBER 4: MORE ON WITHIN-PERSON PERFORMANCE VARIABILITY

Courtright, S., Gardner, R., Smith, T., McCormick, B., & Colbert, A. (in press). My family made me do it: A cross-domain, self-regulatory perspective on antecedents to abusive supervision. In press at *Academy of Management Journal*.

Gibbons, A. M., & Rupp, D. E. (2009). Dimension consistency as an individual difference: A new (old) perspective on the assessment center construct validity debate. *Journal of Management*, 35, 1154-1180.

Minbashian, A., Earl, J., & Bright, J. E. (2013). Openness to experience as a predictor of job performance trajectories. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 62, 1-12.

*Alessandri, G., & Borgogni, L. (2015). Stability and change of job performance across the career span. *Human Performance*, 28, 381-404.

*Alessandri, G., Borgogni, L., & Truxillo, D. M. (2015). Tracking job performance trajectories over time: A six-year longitudinal study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 24, 560-577.

NOVEMBER 11: **FULL OUTLINE DUE**

No class (and no readings).

NOVEMBER 18: YET MORE (!) ON WITHIN-PERSON PERFORMANCE VARIABILITY

YouTube video on experience sampling methods / ecological momentary assessment (57:04):
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nQBBVp9vBIQ>

Baard, S. K., Rench, T. A., & Kozlowski, S. W. (2014). Performance adaptation: A theoretical integration and review. *Journal of Management*, 40, 48-99.

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.

*Huang, J. L., Ryan, A. M., Zabel, K. L., & Palmer, A. (2014). Personality and adaptive performance at work: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99, 162-179.

NOVEMBER 25: THANKSGIVING BREAK

No class (and no readings).

DECEMBER 2: WHAT OTHER DISCIPLINES CAN CONTRIBUTE TO OUR UNDERSTANDING OF CITIZENSHIP AND COUNTERPRODUCTIVE BEHAVIOR - I

YouTube video on Bandura's Bobo Doll experiment--interview and original footage (5:03):
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eqNaLerMNOE>

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* (2nd edn., pp. 449-466). Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons.

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* (2nd edn., pp. 467-486). Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons.

*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.

*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.

DECEMBER 9: WHAT OTHER DISCIPLINES CAN CONTRIBUTE TO OUR UNDERSTANDING OF CITIZENSHIP AND COUNTERPRODUCTIVE BEHAVIOR - II

In-class exercise on CWB interventions.

Ayal, S., Gino, F., Barkan, R., & Ariely, D. (2015). Three principles to REVISE people's unethical behavior. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 10, 738-741.

Bartlett, M. Y., & DeSteno, D. (2006). Gratitude and prosocial behavior helping when it costs you. *Psychological Science*, 17, 319-325.

Ritter, D., & Eslea, M. (2005). Hot sauce, toy guns, and graffiti: A critical account of current laboratory aggression paradigms. *Aggressive Behavior*, 31, 407-419.

Zhou, L. (2016, June 2). Can you cure chronic lateness? *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <http://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2016/06/can-you-cure-lateness/485108/>

*Ferguson, C. J., & Savage, J. (2012). Have recent studies addressed methodological issues raised by five decades of television violence research? A critical review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17, 129-139.

*Gino, F., Schweitzer, M. E., Mead, N. L., & Ariely, D. (2011). Unable to resist temptation: How self-control depletion promotes unethical behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 115, 191-203.

DECEMBER 14: RESEARCH PROJECTS DUE THIS MORNING

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

RESEARCH PROJECT:

This is a group project. You will be working in groups of size three (3). However, if you wish to work alone instead of in a group, you may do so.

The research project must *explicitly focus 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.

The research project may take any of the following forms:

1. A prospectus for a *Journal of Applied Psychology* Integrative Conceptual Review
 - <http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/apl/integrative-conceptual-reviews.aspx>
 - Ideally, the final version submitted to me at the end of the semester would be at most 1-2 drafts short of being ready to submit to the journal
 - At the end of the semester, at least 1 student in the group must be at least 1 year away from graduating
2. A commentary to a focal article in the journal *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*
 - <http://my.siop.org/journal>
 - This option requires a commitment to submit the commentary to the journal by December 31 or by the submission deadline, whichever is *earlier*.
3. An entry to the Practice Forum in the journal *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*
 - <http://www.siop.org/journal/PFGuidelines.aspx>
 - This option requires a commitment to submit the Practice Forum entry to the journal by December 31 or by the submission deadline, whichever is *earlier*.
 - For this particular option, we will need to contact the journal editor to determine if the project is viable in the journal's eyes. The potential process (open to discussion) would be as follows: Submit short outline to me → Receive feedback from me → Make edits and submit short outline to *IOP* Editor for feedback → Receive feedback from Editor → Submit full outline to me → Receive feedback from me → Make edits and submit full paper draft to me → Receive feedback from me → Make edits and submit to *IOP*!
4. A focal article to the journal *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*
 - <http://my.siop.org/journal>
 - Ideally, the final version submitted to me at the end of the semester would be at most 1-2 drafts short of being ready to submit to the journal.
 - For this particular option, we will need to contact the journal editor to determine if the project is viable in the journal's eyes. The potential process (open to discussion) would be as follows: Submit short outline to me → Receive feedback from me → Make edits and submit short outline to *IOP* Editor for feedback → Receive feedback from Editor → Submit full outline to me → Receive feedback from me → Make edits and submit full paper draft to me → Receive feedback from me [*semester ends here*] → ... → Make edits and submit to *IOP*!
5. A meta-analysis
 - The version submitted to me by the end of the semester will contain the Introduction section + Method section + Anticipated Analyses section + Codebook
 - This option requires a group of 3 students
 - That is, a student cannot choose this option if s/he wishes to work alone
 - I will expect prior knowledge of the technical aspects of a meta-analysis;

therefore at least 2 of the 3 students in the group must already have taken the meta-analysis course or must already have completed a previous meta-analysis

- At the end of the semester, at least 1 of the 3 students in the group must be at least 1 year away from graduating

6. An empirical paper from scratch

- The version submitted to me by the end of the semester will contain the Introduction section + Method section (including power analysis) + Anticipated Analyses section + Draft IRB submission
- At the end of the semester, at least 1 student in the group must be at least 1 year away from graduating

7. An empirical paper involving reanalysis of an existing dataset

- The version submitted to me by the end of the semester will contain the Introduction section + Method section (including power analysis) + Results section + Discussion section (in other words, the whole paper!)
- The paper must focus on work behavior and performance.
- The paper must have a focus that is quite different from that of any other papers that have been or may in the future be submitted to a journal using the same dataset. If other papers have been or may be submitted using the same dataset, please also submit, along with the initial short outline: (1) a paragraph (akin to a short abstract) describing each additional paper that has been or may be submitted, and (2) a table in which the rows are the lists of constructs measured and the columns are each paper (including the one for this course) that has been or may be submitted, with an “X” to indicate a particular construct that is measured in a particular paper.
- The existing dataset--that is, the list of constructs measured, the research design (including adequate statistical power), etc.--must be suitable (as determined by *me*) for a good paper.

8. A graduate fellowship (e.g., NSF GRFP)

- <http://gradfellows.gmu.edu>
- Students who are considering this option must meet with the Director of Graduate Fellowships at least *two weeks before* submitting the short outline to me.
- Ideally, the final version submitted to me at the end of the semester would be at most 1-2 drafts short of being the final version.
- Students considering this option must be far enough away from graduating that they will be at Mason for the duration of the fellowship (if the application is successful). Therefore, this option is open only to Ph.D. students.

9. A white paper for the SHRM-SIOP series

- <http://www.siop.org/SIOP-SHRM%5Cdefault.aspx>
- Ideally, the final version submitted to me at the end of the semester would be at most 1-2 drafts short of being ready to submit to SHRM/SIOP
- For this particular option, we will need to contact SHRM/SIOP to determine if the project is viable in their eyes. The potential process (open to discussion) would be as follows: Submit short outline to me → Receive feedback from me → Make edits and submit short

outline to SHRM/SIOP for feedback → Receive feedback from SHRM/SIOP → Submit full outline to me → Receive feedback from me → Make edits and submit full paper draft to me → Receive feedback from me [*semester ends here*] → ... → Make edits and submit to SHRM/SIOP!

10. I am potentially open to discussing yet more options with you!

WARNING: Please do NOT submit anything to a journal or contact a journal editor without first getting my approval! ☺

NOTE: We may very well need to be adaptable. For example, if the initial 2-page outline for a particular research project option doesn't turn out to be promising, we can meet to discuss other options. As another example, we may need to move due dates forward or back, depending on the specific research option chosen and various contingencies (e.g., feedback from a journal Editor).

Due Dates:

- *September 30:* Formation of groups for research project
 - Note that, to facilitate group formation, each student should already have “researched” several options (i.e., learn more about what the options entail, done preliminary literature searches on specific topics, and so forth) and should be ready with a couple of ideas. You should start thinking about research project options from the very beginning of the semester!
- *October 7:* Groups exchange feedback on their research project ideas
 - Two groups pair up
 - Each group describes its research project idea to, and gets feedback from, the other group
 - Note that, in the previous week, each group should have developed its project idea a bit further
- *October 14:* Short outline due (via email)
 - Include the following:
 - Title page, with your names and an indication of which research project option you're choosing
 - Short outline of project: at least 4 double-spaced pages
 - A “pre-mortem” (see <http://www.drillscience.com/DPS/Project%20Pre-Mortem%20HBR.pdf>) and thoughts on how to avoid these problems: 1 double-spaced page
 - A very brief summary of the contributions of each group member to the outline. All members must agree regarding every member's contribution. Total length should be at most 2 paragraphs.
 - References section (should contain at least 12 references by this stage)
- *October 28-ish:* Group Meetings With Me

- Each group meets separately with me about its research project
- Groups should come prepared with questions/comments/concerns
- Groups should come prepared with descriptions of what they have done since receiving my feedback as well as known “next steps”
 - Regarding known “next steps,” groups should come prepared with suggestions regarding which of these next steps should be completed before the full outline is due and which ones should wait for the final version of the paper (and why).
- *November 11:* Full Outline Due (via email)
 - Content will differ as a function of the specific research option chosen, among other things, and should have been negotiated with me in advance
 - Include a brief description of any known “next steps” that remain prior to submitting the full paper
 - Include a very brief summary of the contributions of each group member since the previous “deliverable.” All members must agree regarding every member’s contribution. Total length should be at most 2 paragraphs.
- *December 14:* Final version (for this course) of the research project due at 9 AM via email.
 - Include a very brief summary of the contributions of each group member since the previous “deliverable.” All members must agree regarding every member’s contribution. Total length should be at most 2 paragraphs.

GRADING SCHEME AND SCALE:

GRADED COMPONENT OF COURSE	% OF OVERALL COURSE GRADE
Attendance, participation, homework, and pop quizzes	45%
Research project: Brief outline	10%
Research project: Group meetings with me	5%
Research project: Full outline	20%
Research project: Final version	20%
TOTAL	100%

GRADE	% RANGE	QUALITY POINTS	SATISFACTORY/PASSING?
A+	100.00% - 96.67%	4.00	Satisfactory/Passing
A	96.66% - 93.34%	4.00	Satisfactory/Passing
A-	93.33% - 90.00%	3.67	Satisfactory/Passing
B+	89.99% - 86.67%	3.33	Satisfactory/Passing
B	86.66% - 83.34%	3.00	Satisfactory/Passing
B-	83.33% - 80.00%	2.67	Satisfactory*/Passing
C	79.99% - 70.00%	2.00	Unsatisfactory/Passing
F	69.99% - 0.00%	0.00	Unsatisfactory/Failing

*Although a B- is a satisfactory grade for a course, students must maintain a 3.00 average in

their degree program and present a 3.00 GPA on the courses listed on the graduation application.

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

UNIVERSITY HONOR CODE:

Please familiarize yourself with the university’s honor code (available at <http://oai.gmu.edu/the-mason-honor-code-2/>) and conduct yourself accordingly. I may use iThenticate plagiarism detection software (<http://oria.gmu.edu/ethical-conduct-of-research/>) on your research projects. I reserve the right to enter a failing grade for any student found guilty of an honor code violation.

DISABILITY STATEMENT:

If you are a student with a disability and need academic accommodations, please see me at the beginning of the semester and please also contact Disability Resource Services (DRS) at 703-993-2474.

OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS VIA MASON E-MAIL:

Mason uses electronic mail to provide official information to students. Examples include communications from course instructors, notices from the library, notices about academic standing, financial aid information, class materials, assignments, questions, and instructor feedback. Students are responsible for the content of university communication sent to their Mason e-mail account and are required to activate that account and check it regularly.

ADD/DROP DEADLINES:

Last date to add a course or to drop a course with no tuition penalty: September 6

Last date to drop a course with a 33% tuition penalty: September 20

Last date to drop a course with a 67% tuition penalty: September 30

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