PSYC 631
INDUSTRIAL AND PERSONNEL TESTING AND EVALUATION
(AKA "SELECTION")
George Mason University
Spring 2019

Class Day and Time: **Thursday, 4:30 - 7:10 PM**
Class Location: **Hanover Hall L002**

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

Office Hour: Tuesday, 1 – 2 PM, or by appointment
Office Location: David King Hall, Room 3063

PREREQUISITES:

Graduate survey-level statistics courses (PSYC 611 and 754, or equivalent)
Graduate survey-level industrial psychology course (PSYC 636, or equivalent)

COURSE OVERVIEW (AND GOALS/OBJECTIVES):

This is a graduate-level survey of research related to employee selection. Essentially, students in this course get a more advanced look at the selection-related topics we covered in the Survey of Industrial Psychology (PSYC 636).

A major focus of the course is on basic scientific research, and the readings are therefore primarily peer-reviewed journal articles and book chapters. Overall, the course aims to help students become good consumers, appliers, and developers of research. Students will additionally have the opportunity to: (1) hone their critical thinking and information presentation skills, and (2) gain practice in generating research proposals.

A second focus, however, is practical. Some of the readings, as well as one of the major assignments, focus on how to actually do things in the real world—for instance, how to actually go about doing a job analysis.

Finally, believe it or not, a third focus 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. ☺

I should add that employee selection is a broad topic. I've tried to cover a lot of ground in this syllabus, but there's a lot of good stuff I just couldn't include. To that end, I'd encourage students to take the standalone courses on Job Performance (after all, we must understand the purposes for which we're selecting employees!) and Personality. I'm also happy to recommend additional areas for students to "fill in the gaps" with supplementary reading at their leisure.

ATTENDANCE/PARTICIPATION AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY:

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* (at least 1,500 words) on the Blackboard discussion board within one week of the absence. A second or third absence for any reason will each 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 temporary departures from the classroom while class is in session. Barring emergencies, students are <u>not</u> permitted to leave and return mid-class.*

It is important for every student to complete all the assigned readings 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. Every student is expected to contribute to the class discussion during every course session. I do empathize with students who are introverted, and so I encourage contributions via the online (Blackboard) discussion board; however, such contributions cannot substitute completely for in-class participation. If I notice that some students are not participating in class, I will encourage them to do so, either via generalized in-class requests for everyone to participate or via emails to individual students requesting that they participate. Repeated failure or inability to participate will result in grade penalties to the participation/attendance portion of the course grade.

To facilitate participation, the use of phones is not allowed in class barring emergencies or other situations that are discussed with me ahead of time. I do allow laptop/tablet use, although non-work use (messaging, emailing, watching cat videos, retweeting memes, reading "listicles," etc.) is not permitted. I will, moreover, cold-call students who visibly do not appear to be paying attention. Students who are frequently disruptive will receive grade penalties. Moreover, if laptop/tablet use proves disruptive, I reserve the right to disallow further laptop/tablet use for the remainder of the semester.

CLASS CANCELLATION POLICY:

In the hopefully very 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 nature of the make-up may differ. For instance, we may have a guest instructor or I may request that you post 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:

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:
        - What theoretical framework is used? If you were asked to summarize the theoretical framework in 4-5 sentences, what would you say?
        - What are the major hypotheses? How do these hypotheses flow from the theoretical framework used?
        - How are the relevant constructs defined?
        - What is the research design?
        - How are the relevant constructs measured?
        - How do the author(s) analyze the data? You are in an advanced graduate-level seminar, and so it's important to sink your teeth into the results sections of empirical papers. Even in cases where the data-analytic techniques are extremely complex, try to emerge with at least a surface-level understanding of the techniques and why they are used (note that this may occasionally require you to read additional sources).
        - What are the major findings?
        - What are the implications for future research and for practice?
    - 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? How serious are they, and why do you suppose the article was published despite them?
    - Was there anything in this article that you personally found surprising or particularly interesting? Did you obtain any insights that you will apply to your own life (your work, your relationships, etc.)?

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

Notes:

1. Students are expected to be familiar with basic material from their Survey of Industrial Psychology (PSYC 636) course or elsewhere. In-class discussion will therefore focus on more in-depth and/or advanced aspects of the readings. *Students who need a refresher on basic material should provide themselves with one* ***before*** *coming to class.*
    a. For instance, students who need a refresher on the three major approaches to utility analysis should re-read the relevant section of the Cascio and Aguinis (2019) textbook or an equivalent resource before coming to class on February 14.
2. For a given week, unless otherwise stated, I generally recommend going through the assigned readings in chronological order (based on publication date).
3. An asterisk ("*") indicates a reading that is not required, and that may or may not be discussed in class, but that is warmly recommended for personal development. ☺

JANUARY 24
First Class Meeting

Introductions, discussion of syllabus, assignment of dates for student-selected readings, assignment of groups for applied project, assignment of dyads for feedback on the research proposal outline, etc. No assigned readings.

JANUARY 31
Overview, History, and Current Concerns

Chambers, R. & Winter, J. (2017). Social media and selection: A brief history and practical recommendations. *SIOP white paper series.* Retrieved from http://www.siop.org/WhitePapers/Visibility/Social_Media_and_Selection_FINAL.pdf

Lawrence, A. D. & Kinney, T. B. (2017). Mobile devices and selection. *SIOP white paper series.* Retrieved from http://www.siop.org/WhitePapers/Visibility/Mobile%20Devices%20and%20Selection.pdf

Ployhart, R. E., Schmitt, N., & Tippins, N. T. (2017). Solving the supreme problem: 100 years of selection and recruitment at the Journal of Applied Psychology. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*, 291-304.

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

Schmidt, F. L., Oh, I-S., & Shaffer, J. A. (2016, October 17). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 100 years of research findings. Manuscript under review.

*United States Office of Personnel Management. (2008). *Assessment decision guide.* Retrieved from https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/assessment-and-selection/reference-materials/assessmentdecisionguide.pdf

FEBRUARY 7
Validity

Johnson, J. W., Steel, P., Scherbaum, C. A., Hoffman, C. C., Jeanneret, P. R., & Foster, J. (2010). Validation is like motor oil: Synthetic is better. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *3*, 305-328.

LeBreton, J. M., Schoen, J. L., & James, L. R. (2017). Situational specificity, validity generalization, and the future of psychometric meta-analysis. In J. L. Farr & N. T. Tippins (Eds.), *Handbook of employee selection* (pp. 93-114). New York, NY: Routledge.

Schmidt, N. W., Arnold, J. D., & Nieminen, L. (2017). Validation strategies for primary studies. In J. L. Farr & N. T. Tippins (Eds.), *Handbook of employee selection* (pp. 34-55). New York, NY: Routledge.

FEBRUARY 14
Utility Analysis (Valentine's Day Special!)

Bornmann, L., & Daniel, H. D. (2010). The usefulness of peer review for selecting manuscripts for publication: A utility analysis taking as an example a high-impact journal. *PLOS One*, *5*, e11344.

Thornton III, G. C., & Potemra, M. J. (2010). Utility of assessment center for promotion of police sergeants. *Public Personnel Management*, *39*, 59-69.

Whyte, G., & Latham, G. (1997). The futility of utility analysis revisited: When even an expert fails. *Personnel Psychology*, *50*, 601-610.

*Ock, J., & Oswald, F. L. (2018). The Utility of Personnel Selection Decisions. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 17,* 172-182.

FEBRUARY 21
Job Analysis

Brannick, M. T., Pearlman, K., & Sanchez, J. I. (2017). Work analysis. In J. L. Farr & N. T. Tippins (Eds.), *Handbook of employee selection* (pp. 168-198). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kubisiak, C. & Katz, L. (2006). U.S. Army Aviator job analysis (Report No. 1189). Arlington, VA: United States Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Rivkin, D., Gregory, C. M., Norton, J. J., Craven, D. E., & Lewis, P. M. (2017). Advancing O*NET data, application, and uses. In J. L. Farr & N. T. Tippins (Eds.), *Handbook of employee selection* (pp. 874-912). New York, NY: Routledge.

United States Office of Personnel Management. (n.d.). *Job analysis.* Retrieved from https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/assessment-and-selection/job-analysis/job_analysis_presentation.pdf

Vanguard Research. (2018). *Megatrends: The future of work.* Retrieved from https://pressroom.vanguard.com/nonindexed/Vanguard-Research-Megatrends-Series-Future-of-Work-101018.pdf
[See also: Bui, Q. (2015). *Will your job be done by a machine?* Retrieved from https://www.npr.org/sections/money/2015/05/21/408234543/will-your-job-be-done-by-a-machine]

*Sanchez, J. I., & Levine, E. L. (1989). Determining important tasks within jobs: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 336-342.

FEBRUARY 28
Employment Interview

Chapman, D. S., & Zweig, D. I. (2005). Developing a nomological network for interview structure: Antecedents and consequences of the structured selection interview. *Personnel Psychology*, *58*, 673-702.

Oh, I-S., Postlethwaite, B. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (2013). Rethinking the validity of interviews for employment decision-making: Implications of recent developments in meta-analysis. In D. J. Svyantek & K. Mahoney (Eds.), *Received wisdom, kernels of truth, and boundary conditions in organizational studies* (pp. 297-329). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

United States Office of Personnel Management. (2008). *Structured interviews: A practical guide.* Retrieved from https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/assessment-and-selection/structured-interviews/guide.pdf

*Campion, M. A., Palmer, D. K., & Campion, J. E. (1997). A review of structure in the selection interview. *Personnel Psychology*, *50*, 655-702.

MARCH 7
Work Simulations

Boyce, A. S., Corbet, C. E., & Adler, S. (2013). Simulations in the selection context: Considerations, challenges, and opportunities. In M. Fetzer & K. Tuzinski (Eds.), *Simulations for personnel selection* (pp. 17-41). New York, NY: Springer.

Gutierrez, S. L. & Meyer, J. M. (2013). Managerial simulations. In M. Fetzer & K. Tuzinski (Eds.), *Simulations for personnel selection* (pp. 215-230). New York, NY: Springer.

Sydell, E., Ferrell, J., Carpenter, J., Frost, C., & Brodbeck, C. C. (2013). Simulation scoring. In M. Fetzer & K. Tuzinski (Eds.), *Simulations for personnel selection* (pp. 83-107). New York, NY: Springer.

United States Office of Personnel Management. (2008). *Writing samples.* Retrieved from https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/assessment-and-selection/other-assessment-methods/writing-samples-summary.pdf

MARCH 14
Spring Break

No assigned readings.

MARCH 21
Assessment Centers and Situational Judgment Tests

Dilchert, S., & Ones, D. S. (2009). Assessment center dimensions: Individual differences correlates and meta-analytic incremental validity. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *17*, 254-270.

Guidry, B. W., Rupp, D. E., & Lanik, M. (2013). Tracing cognition with assessment center simulations: Using technology to see in the dark. In M. Fetzer & K. Tuzinski (Eds.), *Simulations for personnel selection* (pp. 231-257). New York, NY: Springer.

Lievens, F., & De Soete, B. (2015). Situational judgment test. In J. D. Wright (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences* (2nd edn., Vol. 22; pp. 13-19). Oxford, U.K.: Elsevier.

Pollard, S., & Cooper-Thomas, H. D. (2015). Best practice recommendations for situational judgment tests. *The Australasian Journal of Organisational Psychology*, *8,* 1-10.

MARCH 28
Intelligence: Controversies

Deadline for submitting Applied Project. Submit via Blackboard (as an assignment).

Gottfredson, L. S., et al. (1994, December 13). Mainstream science on intelligence. *Wall Street Journal* (p. A18). Retrieved from https://www1.udel.edu/educ/gottfredson/reprints/1994WSJmainstream.pdf

Mainstream science on intelligence. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mainstream_Science_on_Intelligence

Nisbett, R. E., Aronson, J., Blair, C., Dickens, W., Flynn, J., Halpern, D. F., & Turkheimer, E. (2012). Intelligence: New findings and theoretical developments. *American Psychologist*, *67*, 130-159.

Neisser, U., Boodoo, G., Bouchard Jr, T. J., Boykin, A. W., Brody, N., Ceci, S. J., ... & Urbina, S. (1996). Intelligence: Knowns and unknowns. *American Psychologist*, *51*, 77-101.

APRIL 4
SIOP Conference

No assigned readings.

APRIL 8: Deadline for submitting SIOP Poster Reaction. Submit via Blackboard (as an assignment).

APRIL 11
Intelligence: Use in Employee Selection

Lievens, F., & Chan, D. (2017). Practical intelligence, emotional intelligence, and social intelligence. In J. L. Farr & N. T. Tippins (Eds.), *Handbook of employee selection* (pp. 404-430). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lyons, B. D., Hoffman, B. J., & Michel, J. W. (2009). Not much more than *g*? An examination of the impact of intelligence on NFL performance. *Human Performance*, *22*, 225-245.

Ones, D. Z., Dilchert, S., Viswesvaran, C., & Salgado, J. F. (2017). Cognitive ability: Measurement and validity for employee selection. In J. L. Farr & N. T. Tippins (Eds.), *Handbook of employee selection* (pp. 297-327). New York, NY: Routledge.

Wonderlic Personnel Test Sample Test Report. (2018). Retrieved from https://www.wonderlic.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/WPT-RSampleReport.pdf

*Schneider, W. J., & Newman, D. A. (2015). Intelligence is multidimensional: Theoretical review and implications of specific cognitive abilities. *Human Resource Management Review*, *25*, 12-27.

APRIL 18
Adverse Impact and Differential Validity/Prediction
plus
Work Experience and Expertise

Aguinis, H., Culpepper, S. A., & Pierce, C. A. (2016). Differential prediction generalization in college admissions testing. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *108*, 1045-1059.

Bobko, P. & Roth, P. L. (2010). An analysis of two methods for assessing and indexing adverse impact: A disconnect between the academic literature and some practice. In J. L. Outtz (Ed.), *Adverse impact: Implications for organizational staffing and high stakes selection* (pp. 29-49). New York, NY: Routledge.

Klein, G., Shneiderman, B., Hoffman, R. R., & Ford, K. M. (2017). Why expertise matters: A response to the challenges. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, *32*, 67-73.

Quiñones, M. A., Ford, J. K., & Teachout, M. S. (1995). The relationship between work experience and job performance: A conceptual and meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, *48*, 887-910.

*Cohen, D. B., Aamodt, M. G., & Dunleavy, E. M. (2010). Technical advisory committee report on best practices in adverse impact analyses. Retrieved from https://content.dciconsult.com/whitepapers/technical-advisory-committee-report-best-practices-adverse-impact-analyses/

*Van Iddekinge, C., Arnold, J. D., Frieder, R. E., & Roth, P. L. (2018). It's required, but is it job-related? A meta-analysis of the validity of prior work experience. *Academy of Management Proceedings*. Retrieved from https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/AMBPP.2018.278

APRIL 25

Ethics, Professional Guidelines, and Applicant Reactions

Anderson, N., Salgado, J. F., & Hülsheger, U. R. (2010). Applicant reactions in selection: Comprehensive meta-analysis into reaction generalization versus situational specificity. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *18*, 291-304.

Bauer, T. N., McCarthy, J., Anderson, N., Truxillo, D. M., & Salgado, J. F. (2012). What we know about applicant reactions to selection: Research summary and best practices. *SIOP white paper series.* Retrieved from http://www.siop.org/WhitePapers/White%20Paper%20Series%2020112012ApplicantReactions.pdf

Jeanneret, P. R. & Zedeck, S. (2017). Professional guidelines/standards. In J. L. Farr & N. T. Tippins (Eds.), *Handbook of employee selection* (pp. 599-630). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lefkowitz, J. & Lowman, J. (2017). Ethics of employee selection. In J. L. Farr & N. T. Tippins (Eds.), *Handbook of employee selection* (pp. 658-683). New York, NY: Routledge.

APRIL 27: Deadline for sending (by email) a draft outline of your research proposal outline to another student who will provide feedback.

MAY 2
Integrity Tests
plus
The Situation/Context in Employee Selection

Deadline for providing feedback on another student's research proposal outline. Send feedback to the other student by email. Send a copy of the feedback to me via Blackboard (as an assignment).

Judge, T. A., & Bretz, R. D. (1992). Effects of work values on job choice decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *77*, 261-271.

Meyer, R. D., Dalal, R. S., & Bonaccio, S. (2009). A meta-analytic investigation into the moderating effects of situational strength on the conscientiousness-performance relationship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *30*, 1077-1102.

Slaughter, J. E., Bagger, J., & Li, A. (2006). Context effects on group-based employee selection decisions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *100*, 47-59.

Van Iddekinge, C. H., Roth, P. L., Raymark, P. H., & Odle-Dusseau, H. N. (2012). The criterion-related validity of integrity tests: An updated meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *97*, 499-530.

MAY 9: Deadline for submitting the final version of the research proposal outline to me. Submit via Blackboard (as an assignment).

The following sections provide additional details regarding various aspects of the course.

STUDENT-SELECTED READING (ARTICLE PRESENTATION):

This is a solo project.

A Google Doc sign-up sheet will be provided to students. In order for us to have time to discuss the assigned readings, no more than 3 presentations will occur per week.

Each student will individually present one (1) reading of his or her choice over the course of the semester. Each chosen reading *must be relevant to employee selection* (duh!)*, must be at least eight (8) pages long in its original form, and must have been published in a peer-reviewed journal article*.

In terms of choosing a reading, there are two options:

1. Option #1: A student may opt to present one of the **recommended readings** for a particular week. Word to the wise: Before choosing this option, it would be a good idea

to actually take a look at the reading in question rather than relying solely on its APA-style reference in the syllabus.

2. Option #2: A student may opt to present an **empirical** article, published **in the last decade** in a respectable peer-reviewed journal. I encourage students (i.e., this is not required) to seek out articles that focus on current or anticipated "hot topics": artificial intelligence, gamification, machine learning, video interviews, computer-based screening of résumés, unproctored internet-based tests, computer-adaptive tests, forced-choice measures, and so forth. Help your fellow students (and me) to be at the "bleeding edge" of employee selection, but also help us to see through the newest "fads, fashions, and folderol" in employee selection.

These criteria still provide considerable flexibility. This is *your* reading: choose something that *you* believe will be interesting and important!

It is the responsibility of the student presenting a particular reading to "educate" the rest of us because, in all likelihood, neither the other students nor I will have read what you are presenting. Thus, each student should prepare a PowerPoint presentation that includes:

- First slide:
    1. The student's name
    2. A full reference for the reading selected (in APA style)
- Second slide (or, if needed, second and third slides):
    1. Information regarding why that particular reading was chosen
    2. Information regarding how the chosen reading fits in with the topics covered in class and the required readings in the syllabus
- Remaining slides:
    1. A summary of the chosen reading. For instance, for an empirical journal article, this should include things like: theoretical framework, hypotheses, methods used, analyses conducted, and conclusions drawn. You will have to be judicious here: for instance, although I obviously don't expect you to discuss every statistical test in the results section, you'll need to think about how to represent the main findings very efficiently but yet in sufficient depth to reveal your understanding of the nuances of the data analysis.

Please make sure that all slides are **numbered**! Please also post your slides to the Blackboard discussion board prior to your presentation. Please **practice your presentation** before class, and please **time it** to ensure that it does not exceed **15-16** minutes. To allow sufficient time for all presentations, I may have to stop the presentations at 16 minutes. To prevent needless delays, please download your slides to the computer **before** the beginning of class on the day on which you are presenting (Yes, this does mean that you will need to show up to class several minutes early on that day! ☺).

Each presentation will be followed by a brief (**4-5** minutes) question-and-answer session involving the other students and me.

APPLIED PROJECT:

Students will work in teams of three.

Deadline: March 28. Submit via Blackboard (as an assignment).

The goal of this assignment is to give you some exposure (albeit abbreviated) to the process by which a job analysis is conducted as well as the process by which a structured interview and a situational judgment test (SJT) are developed.

The requirements of the assignment are as follows:

1. Find and peruse resources regarding how to conduct a job analysis. You should certainly use the assigned readings from class, but you should also use (and cite) at least one additional resource. The additional resource should be evidence-based, in the sense that it should draw heavily from existing research on job analysis.
2. Select a job with which you have some familiarity or in which you have some interest (IO professor, management consultant, barista, film critic, human cannonball, etc.).
3. Select a subject-matter expert (SME). This should be a person (cannot be yourself) who currently holds that job.
4. Conduct an initial interview with, and a direct observation of, your SME. The interview should be at least 20-30 minutes in length, and the observation should be at least 20 minutes in length. Augment your direct observation of the SME by watching online videos and perusing online job ads (please include citations to these sources). But do not use, or even look at, O*NET at this stage.
    i. Note that the SME interview questions should be based on the job analysis readings assigned for class as well as the other evidence-based "how to" resources you located.
    ii. Note that you will subsequently be developing structured interview questions and situational judgment test (SJT) items to evaluate applicants for the job in question. Therefore, before interviewing and observing your SME, you should think about (and read up on) the types of job analytic information that might be most important to assist you in the subsequent development of the structured interview and SJT. Additionally, think about the types of tasks that would be most useful for you to directly observe.
5. Based on the information obtained from the SME, online videos, job ads, etc., create a list of task statements and categorize them in an organized fashion. You should have at least

20-30 task statements (though of course a "real" job analysis would have many more task statements: often up to 300-500).

6. Evaluate each task on frequency and importance using standardized scales (e.g., 1-5 Likert-type scales with appropriate anchors). Ideally you would be able to go back to the SME and ask him or her to do the ratings for you. Failing that, you should do the ratings yourselves based on the information obtained from the SME and other sources (online videos, job ads, etc.—but not O*NET).
7. Create a list of relevant KSAOs. Feel free to use or modify existing KSAO taxonomies from the literature (but not from O*NET). If you do so, be sure to cite the sources, explain why you are using those taxonomies, and explain how and why you are modifying the taxonomies (or why you are not modifying them).
8. Conduct a linkage analysis of tasks to KSAOs. The deliverable here could take the form of a table (or a set of tables) with tasks as rows and KSAOs as columns.
9. Summarize any additional job analytic information you collected (e.g., critical incidents).
10. Write a one-paragraph narrative job description.
11. Write a formal job title.
12. Provide a description—at least 3-4 double-spaced pages, and longer if needed—of how you conducted the job analysis. Be very specific as to what you did, and why.
13. Up to this point, you should not have used (or even looked at) O*NET. But now you should briefly (e.g., 1-2 double-spaced pages) compare your job-analytic results to those from the corresponding parts of the O*NET profile for the job in question. Briefly mention a couple of major similarities and differences (if any).
14. Find and peruse resources regarding how to develop structured interview questions and SJT items. You should certainly use the assigned readings from class, but you should also use (and cite) at least one additional resource <u>each</u> for the structured interview and the SJT. The additional resources should be evidence-based, in the sense that they should draw heavily from existing research on structured interviews and SJTs, respectively.
15. Develop at least 4 structured interview questions (though of course a "real" structured interview would have many more questions) along with rules for scoring them.
16. Provide a description—at least 2 double-spaced pages, and longer if needed—of how you developed the structured interview questions and the scoring rubrics. Be very specific as to what you did, and why. For instance, explain which type of structured interview you used (and why), and explain very clearly how the structured interview questions and scoring rubrics were based on the job analysis results.

17. Develop at least 2 SJT items (though of course a “real” SJT would have many more items) along with rules for scoring them.
18. Provide a description—at least 1½ -2 double-spaced pages, and longer if needed—of how you developed the SJT items and the scoring rules. Be very specific as to what you did, and why. For instance, explain which type of SJT you used (and why), and explain very clearly how the SJT items and scoring rules were based on the job analysis results.
19. Turn in a document containing the following products:
    i. Snazzy cover page listing your names as well as the name and logo (!) of your fictionalized consulting firm
    ii. Job analysis results: (a) job title, (b) job description (narrative paragraph), (c) list of task statements with importance and frequency ratings (and with particularly important and/or frequent tasks highlighted), (d) list of KSAOs, (e) linkage analysis connecting tasks to KSAOs, and, optionally, (f) summary of any other job analytic information you collected (e.g., critical incidents)
    iii. Description of job analysis procedure
    iv. Comparison of your job analysis results with those from O*NET (for the same job)
    v. Structured interview questions and scoring rubrics
    vi. Description of procedure by which you developed the structured interview
    vii. SJT items and scoring rules
    viii. Description of procedure by which you developed the SJT
    ix. Any additional comments you wish to make (optional section)
    x. References section (APA style)
    xi. A paragraph indicating how each student on the team contributed to the final product (be specific!) and a one-sentence statement affirming that, overall, each student on the team performed approximately the same amount of work.

Again, for the “description” portions (i.e., how you conducted the job analysis and developed the interview questions and SJT items), you must be very specific, justify each step based on the literature, and cite your sources!

Please proof-read carefully before submitting. Poor quality writing will be penalized.

It is imperative that the interview with and observation of the SME be conducted in an ethical manner, consistent with basic Institutional Review Board (IRB) guidelines for human subjects research. In other words, although this is a class project and not a research endeavor, your SME

should be informed of the basic procedures, guaranteed complete confidentiality, given the opportunity to withdraw from the interview and/or observation at any time without consequence, and be debriefed regarding the purpose of the interview and observation.

Finally, I am potentially amenable to modifying the requirements and/or structure of this applied project. If you desire modifications, please discuss them with me at least two weeks ahead of the due date.

SIOP POSTER REACTION:

This is a solo project.

Deadline: April 8. Submit via Blackboard (as an assignment).

Each student will provide a brief reaction to a SIOP poster on a topic related to employee selection.

Please submit the following:

1. A picture of the poster
    i. The entire poster should be clearly visible in the picture. In other words, after enlarging the picture, I should be able to read all the text on the poster. (*Note:* Prior to taking the picture at SIOP, you should probably inform the presenter about what you are doing and why. This will make for a good "icebreaker.")
2. Your reaction to the poster. This should include:
    i. 500-750 words in total.
    ii. The connection(s) between the poster and the broad topics and specific ideas we have discussed in class.
    iii. The poster's contribution beyond the existing research literature.
    iv. One aspect of the poster you thought was particularly well done—and why. This could be a conceptual, methodological, or data-analytic aspect of the poster.
    v. One suggestion for improvement (conceptual, methodological, or data-analytic)—along with your rationale.

Not attending SIOP? No problem. Two options:

1. Instead of a poster, choose a brief empirical journal article published in the last two years. Answer the above questions with regard to the article, and attach a PDF version of the article.
2. If one of your friends from the class is attending SIOP, ask him or her to take—and immediately send you copies of—pictures of a couple of selection-related posters (other than the one he or she will be using). Then choose from among those posters.

Please proof-read carefully before submitting. Poor quality writing will be penalized.

RESEARCH PROPOSAL OUTLINE:

This is a solo project.

Deadlines are as follows:

- *Send (by email) draft outline to another student for feedback by April 27*
- *The other student should provide feedback (to you by email; a copy to me via Blackboard—as an assignment) by May 2*
- *Submit the final version of the outline via Blackboard (as an assignment) by May 9.*

Students are required to propose—in outline form—an original research project explicitly focused on a topic that falls under the category of *employee selection*. In practical terms, the end product will essentially consist of an outline of the *introduction, method, and "anticipated analyses" sections of an empirical journal article*.

- For the introduction section, you should first review the literature on a particular topic and then propose your own hypotheses. The introduction (from opening "hook" to hypotheses) should be structured as per Kendall et al. (2000) or similar sources. Each hypothesis should be preceded by a sound theoretical rationale. Ideally, the hypotheses would be derived logically from a single theory; certainly, a mishmash of disparate theories, each discussed only in a few sentences, should be avoided. The contribution of your paper beyond the existing literature should be stated clearly rather than left to my imagination.

Kendall, P.C., Silk, J. S., & Chu, B. C. (2000). Introducing your research report: Writing the introduction. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Writing articles for publication in psychology journals: A handbook* (pp. 41-57). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- 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. The number of participants needed can be estimated either via a formal power analysis (which you should describe *in some detail*, along with appropriate citations, and which should be targeted at the most sample-size-intensive of your anticipated analyses) or, failing that, via a rule of thumb that has been articulated for the analyses you plan to conduct (which you should describe, 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. The justification becomes critical if, as is often the case, there are multiple techniques that could be used to analyze your data.

I'd also recommend consulting the American Psychological Association's "Journal Article Reporting Standards": http://www.apastyle.org/manual/related/JARS-MARS.pdf
(You don't need to cover every topic suggested in the "JARS"—indeed, space constraints won't permit you to do so—but they're a good resource.)

Note that this term paper 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.") is inappropriate for this course and will receive a failing grade.

The paper topic should be *specific*. For example, whereas "conscientiousness" or even "Conscientiousness as an outcome rather than an antecedent" are much too broad, something like "Reciprocal relationships between conscientiousness and counterproductive work behavior: A cross-lagged panel study and implications for employee selection" would be more appropriate.

You should propose *original* research. Though our discipline should (and increasingly does) have a place for replications, this is not that place: the current outline is designed in part to assess your creativity and your knowledge of a subject area.

For both your sanity and mine, the outline will be fairly short: **4-5½** double-spaced pages of size 12 Times New Roman or Calibri font. In addition, you will need a title page, abstract (limit 125 words) and keywords (limit of 5 words/phrases), references, and, if needed, tables and figures. You do not need a discussion section. You will need *at least 12 references*. The short length of the outline does not preclude the necessity of being thorough.

Please use APA-style section titles to demarcate the introduction, method, and anticipated analyses sections as well as sub-sections within each section (e.g., the method section should have a "participants" sub-section and one or more additional sub-sections describing the procedure). For text within a section, you are welcome to use bullets rather than conventional paragraphs; however, please ensure that every bullet of text is clearly understandable.

Please proof-read carefully before submitting. Poor quality writing will be penalized.

Students should provide each other with feedback regarding their draft outlines. Feedback should pertain to whether the outlines follow instructions (Does the introduction section follow the structure suggested by Kendall et al., 2000? Is the contribution of the paper clear? Are the hypotheses properly justified? Is an adequate justification provided for the number of participants? Are important details suggested in the "JARS" missing? Do the proposed analyses make sense? Etc.) as well as whether the outline appears to be missing important citations, whether the arguments in the outline are understandable (vs., say, in need of more explanation), whether the outline has been properly proof-read, and so forth. Students should

probably plan to spend at least 45 minutes reading and providing feedback on each other's outlines.

The feedback should be emailed to the author. Moreover, to help me ascertain the quality and quantity of the feedback, students providing feedback should submit the document containing feedback via Blackboard as an assignment.

GRADING SCHEME AND SCALE:

Class Participation (including Attendance)	25.0%
Student-Selected Reading (Article Presentation)	12.5%
Applied Project	25.0%
SIOP Poster Reaction	7.5%
Feedback on Other Student's Research Proposal Outline	7.5%
Research Proposal Outline	22.5%
TOTAL	**100.0%**

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 must present a 3.00 GPA on the courses listed on the graduation application.

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

UNIVERSITY HONOR CODE:

George Mason University has an Honor Code, which requires all members of this community to maintain the highest standards of academic honesty and integrity. Cheating, plagiarism, lying, and stealing are all prohibited, as is tolerating such behavior from other students. Please familiarize yourself with the university's honor code (available at https://oai.gmu.edu/mason-honor-code/full-honor-code-document/) and conduct yourself accordingly. I may use *SafeAssign* or some other plagiarism detection software on your writing. All violations of the Honor Code will be reported to the Honor Committee. Ignorance of the Honor Code does not constitute an acceptable excuse for violating it.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES:

If you have a disability and may need academic accommodations, please contact Disability Services at ods@gmu.edu or 703-993-2474 at the beginning of the semester. Please also come and talk to me at the beginning of the semester.

TECHNOLOGY USED IN THE COURSE:

All readings (other than the textbook) will be provided via Blackboard. Blackboard will be used to post grades, augment in-class discussion and, occasionally, to make announcements. All other electronic communication will be via email.

OFFICIAL COMMUNICATION 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 email account, and are required to activate that account and check it regularly.

ADD/DROP DEADLINES:

Last date to add a course: January 29
Last date to drop a course with no tuition penalty: February 5
Final drop deadline: February 12
Student self-withdrawal: February 13-25

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