

SYLLABUS

Psychology 741-001
PSYCHOLOGY OF WORK MOTIVATION
Fall 2022
George Mason University

Instructor: Reeshad S. Dalal, Ph.D. (Please feel free to call me by my first name!)
Email Address: rdalal@gmu.edu
Instructor Website: <https://psychology.gmu.edu/people/rdalal>

Class Day and Time: Wednesdays, 4:30 - 7:10 PM
Class Location: [Music & Theater Building](#), Room 1004

Office Hour: Tuesdays, 12:30 – 1:30 PM, or by appointment
Office Hour Location: [Zoom](#)

PREREQUISITES:

- Prior or concurrent graduate survey-level statistics courses (PSYC 611 and 754, or equivalent), or instructor permission
- A graduate survey-level course in industrial and organizational psychology (PSYC 636 or equivalent), or instructor permission

COURSE OVERVIEW (AND LEARNING OBJECTIVES):

This is a graduate-level survey of research related to work motivation. Note, however, that I interpret the “psychology of work motivation” very broadly, along the lines of: the “psychology of motivation as potentially applicable to the world of work.” Thus, we will read several articles that do not directly focus on work or working, but we will discuss their application to workplace settings.

The focus in this course is on basic scientific research, and the readings are therefore primarily from peer-reviewed journal articles and “handbook” chapters. 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 are timely/topical, will provoke the reader, and provide ample fodder for discussion.

Overall, the course aims to help students become good consumers, producers, explainers, and

appliers of research. Finally, one of the objectives of the course is to keep the amount of reading in a given week to a manageable length. The sincere hope is that this will encourage students to actually complete all the assigned readings. 😊

COVID-19/FLU/COLD POLICY:

Students are required to be aware of and adhere to the university's policy—which may shift back and forth over time—regarding vaccination, masking, the daily health check, in-person attendance, and so forth. However, as far as possible I will actively support students in their decisions to be more careful than the university's minimum requirements.

I also invite all students to physically distance within the classroom to the extent possible and to open classroom windows if possible. Students should feel free to request that we meet outdoors—but, before doing so, should have checked the weather forecast and identified outdoor locations that are near the regular classroom, accessible to people with mobility challenges, low in ambient noise, and not already occupied by other people.

On any given day, if you are exhibiting symptoms commensurate with COVID/flu/cold and/or if you have recently been exposed to COVID, you are required to do *both* of the following if you wish to attend class: (1) take a rapid COVID test and ensure that you test negative prior to coming to class, *and* (2) wear a mask in class. Alternately, you may choose not to attend class on such a day (in this regard, please refer to the attendance policy).

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 to the participation/attendance portion of the overall course grade (e.g., an "A" becomes an "A-") *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 not permitted to leave and return mid-class except during official breaks.*

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. A sustained level of low participation will be reflected in poor grades on the participation/attendance portion of the overall 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 (social media, instant messaging, emailing, watching cat videos, retweeting memes, etc.) is not permitted. I will, moreover, direct questions toward 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.

Note: *If you are ill, I have a “no questions” (and certainly “no documentation required!”) policy that will allow you to attend class via Zoom. The Zoom option is available only in the case of illness (or injury or concerns about physical safety); it is not applicable to work/internship events, family/friend visits, and so forth. Zooming in will not count as an absence and therefore no make-up assignment will be necessary. Ideally, you could inform me about this ahead of time and arrange the logistics with another student who will be attending class that day—and you and that other student could ensure that you can hear me and the other students clearly—but, if advance notice is not possible, I will certainly understand. Additionally, if you are ill and prefer to skip class altogether, that is completely understandable! This will count as an official absence, but I will give you as much time as I can to do the make-up assignment(s). In general, if you are ill, I commit to making things work for you as best I can!*

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 switch to a virtual class (over Zoom) or 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 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, beyond the required readings).
 - What are the major findings?
 - What are the implications for future research?
 - What are the implications for practice in organizations?
- In what ways does this article relate to other articles 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?
 - Remember that a common graduate student “disease” (or bias) involves overemphasizing the weaknesses and underemphasizing—and, really, underappreciating—the strengths of published work.
 - 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.

The article list follows:

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

AUGUST 24: INTRODUCTION

Introductions.

Overview of syllabus.

Students schedule themselves for student-selected readings, form groups, etc.

AUGUST 31: OVERVIEW

Note: Read Van den Broek et al. (2019) before watching Milkman (2020).

Dalal, R. S. (2013). Job attitudes: Cognition and affect. 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. 341-366). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Milkman, K. (2020, November 9). *A mega-study approach to applied behavioral science* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1HdqozO3mLs> (41:08)

Van den Broek, A., Carpini, J. A., & Dieffendorff, J. (2019). Work motivation: Where do the different perspectives lead us? In R. M. Ryan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of human motivation* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
<https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190666453.01.0001/oxfordhb-9780190666453-e-27>

*Dalal, R. S., & Hulin, C. L. (2008). Motivation for what? The criterion question. In R. Kanfer, G. Chen, & R. Pritchard (Eds.), *Work motivation: Past, present and future* (pp. 63-100). New York, NY: Routledge.

*Ployhart, R. E. (2008). The measurement and analysis of motivation. In R. Kanfer, G. Chen, & R. D. Pritchard (Eds.), *Work motivation: Past, present, and future* (pp. 17-62). New York, NY: Routledge.

SEPTEMBER 7: OLD HABITS DIE HARD!

Carden, L., & Wood, W. (2018). Habit formation and change. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 20, 117-122.

Hamilton, K., Fraser, E., & Hannan, T. (2019). Habit-based workplace physical activity intervention: a pilot study. *Occupational Medicine*, 69(7), 471-474. **Note: The supplementary materials are included at the end of the article. Don't forget to read them too!**

- Stawarz, K., Cox, A. L., & Blandford, A. (2015, April). Beyond self-tracking and reminders: designing smartphone apps that support habit formation. In *Proceedings of the 33rd annual ACM conference on human factors in computing systems* (pp. 2653-2662). ACM.
- Wood, W. (2015). Five myths about our habits. *The Washington Post*.
https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/five-myths-about-our-habits/2015/12/31/1f3ab244-ad93-11e5-9ab0-884d1cc4b33e_story.html
- *Camerer, C. (2021, March 15). *New perspectives on habit formation from machine learning and neuroscience* [Video]. YouTube.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3kHZS6xyKfo> (43:30)
- *Harvey, A. G., Armstrong, C. C., Callaway, C. A., Gumpert, N. B., & Gasperetti, C. E. (2021). COVID-19 prevention via the science of habit formation. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 30(2), 174-180.
- *Verplanken, B., & Orbell, S. (2003). Reflections on past behavior: A self-report index of habit strength. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33(6), 1313-1330.
- *Wood, W., & Rünger, D. (2016). Psychology of habit. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 67, 289-314.

SEPTEMBER 14: WORK (RE-)DESIGN + GAMIFICATION + “NUDGES”

Note: Read DuVernet (2017) before Callan et al. (2015). Read Fried et al. (2017) before Morgeson and Humphrey (2006). Read Mertens et al. (2022) before Maier et al. (2022).

- Callan, R. C., Bauer, K. N., & Landers, R. N. (2015). How to avoid the dark side of gamification: Ten business scenarios and their unintended consequences. In T. Reiners & L. C. Wood (Eds.), *Gamification in education and business* (pp. 553-568). Springer. **Note: Read the preliminary material. Then read at least three (3) scenarios of your choice, with the constraint that the scenarios you read should collectively span multiple topics.**
- DuVernet, A. M. (2017). Gamification at work. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd edn.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fried, Y., Levi, A., & Hadani, M. (2017). Job design. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd edn.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Maier, M., Bartoš, F., Stanley, T. D., Shanks, D. R., Harris, A. J., & Wagenmakers, E. J. (2022). No evidence for nudging after adjusting for publication bias. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *119*(31), e2200300119.
- Mertens, S., Herberz, M., Hahnel, U. J., & Brosch, T. (2022). The effectiveness of nudging: A meta-analysis of choice architecture interventions across behavioral domains. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *119*(1), e2107346118.
- Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ): Developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*, 1321-1339.
- *Grant, A. M., & Parker, S. K. (2009). Redesigning work design theories: The rise of relational and proactive perspectives. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *3*, 317-375.
- *Pinder, C., Vermeulen, J., Beale, R., & Hendley, R. (2015, August). Exploring nonconscious behaviour change interventions on mobile devices. In Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction with Mobile Devices and Services Adjunct (pp. 1010-1017). ACM.
- *Weiser, P., Bucher, D., Cellina, F., & De Luca, V. (2015). A taxonomy of motivational affordances for meaningful gamified and persuasive technologies. In Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on ICT for Sustainability (ICT4S) (pp. 271-280). Bedford Park, IL: Atlantic Press.
- *Wu, S. J., & Paluck, E. L. (2021). Designing nudges for the context: Golden coin decals nudge workplace behavior in China. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *163*, 43-50.

SEPTEMBER 21: GOALS - I (MOSTLY CONCEPTUAL/REVIEW)

Note: Read Locke and Latham (2015) first.

- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2015). Breaking the rules: A historical overview of goal-setting theory. In A. J. Elliot (Ed.), *Advances in motivation science* (Vol. 2, pp. 99-126). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press (Elsevier).
- Magni, F., Gong, Y., & Chao, M. M. (in press). A longitudinal examination of the reciprocal relationship between goal orientation and performance: The mediating role of self-efficacy. *Personality and Individual Differences*.

Ordóñez, L. D., & Welsh, D. T. (2015). Immoral goals: How goal setting may lead to unethical behavior. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 6*, 93-96.

Werther, W. B. (1992). Workshops aid in goal setting. In R. R. Sims, D. D. White, & D. A. Bednar (Eds.), *Readings in organizational behavior* (pp. 95-100). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

*Austin, J. T., & Vancouver, J. B. (1996). Goal constructs in psychology: Structure, process, and content. *Psychological Bulletin, 120*, 338-375.

*Fried, Y., & Slowik, L. H. (2004). Enriching goal-setting theory with time: An integrated approach. *Academy of Management Review, 29*, 404-422.

*Golden, S. J., Ali, A. A., & Johnson, R. E. (2017). Goal orientation. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

*Latham, G. P. (2016). Goal setting: A possible theoretical framework for examining the effect of priming goals on organizational behavior. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 12*, 85-88.

*Payne, S. C., Youngcourt, S. S., & Beaubien, J. M. (2007). A meta-analytic examination of the goal orientation nomological net. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 128-150.

SEPTEMBER 28: GOALS - II (MOSTLY FINDINGS)

Landers, R. N., Bauer, K. N., & Callan, R. C. (2017). Gamification of task performance with leaderboards: A goal setting experiment. *Computers in Human Behavior, 71*, 508-515.

Latham, G. P., & Baldes, J. J. (1975). The "practical significance" of Locke's theory of goal setting. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*, 122-124.

Locke, E. A. (1982). Relation of goal level to performance with a short work period and multiple goal levels. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67*, 512-514.

Park, Y., Kim, T. S., & Park, S. W. (2016). Change in goal orientation of Korean high school athletes: A cross-temporal meta-analysis, 1999–2014. *Personality and Individual Differences, 94*, 342-347.

Welsh, D. T., & Ordóñez, L. D. (2014). The dark side of consecutive high performance goals: Linking goal setting, depletion, and unethical behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *123*, 79-89.

*Baretta, D., Bondaronek, P., Direito, A., & Steca, P. (2019). Implementation of the goal-setting components in popular physical activity apps: Review and content analysis. *Digital Health*, *5*, 1-10.

*Ilies, R. & Judge, T. A. (2005). Goal regulation across time: The effects of feedback and affect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*, 453-467.

*Klein, H. J., Wesson, M. J., Hollenbeck, J. R., & Alge, B. J. (1999). Goal commitment and the goal-setting process: Conceptual clarification and empirical synthesis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *84*, 885-896.

OCTOBER 5: INCENTIVES - I (MOSTLY CONCEPTUAL/REVIEW)

Bartol, K. M., & Locke, E. A. (2000). Incentives and motivation. In S. L. Rynes & B. Gerhart (Eds.), *Compensation in organizations* (pp. 104-147). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., Podsakoff, N. P., Shaw, J. C., & Rich, B. L. (2010). The relationship between pay and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis of the literature. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *77*, 157-167.

Pink, D. (2010, April 1). *Drive: The surprising truth about what motivates us* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u6XAPnuFjJc> (10:47)

Rynes, S. L., Gerhart, B., & Minette, K. A. (2004). The importance of pay in employee motivation: Discrepancies between what people say and what they do. *Human Resource Management*, *43*, 381-394.

*Ariely, D. (2013, September 26). *The psychology of money* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NhrGf73Ftwo> (53:47)

*Gagné, M., & Forest, J. (2008). The study of compensation systems through the lens of Self-Determination Theory: Reconciling 35 years of debate. *Canadian Psychology*, *49*, 225-232.

*Kerr, S. (1995). On the folly of rewarding A, while hoping for B. *Academy of Management Executive*, *9*, 7-14.

*Pfeffer, J. (1998). Six dangerous myths about pay. *Harvard Business Review*, 76(3), 109-119.

OCTOBER 12: INCENTIVES - II (MOSTLY FINDINGS)

Buttenheim, A., Duckworth, A., Gandhi, L., Milkman, K., Thirumurthy, H., & Volpp, K. (2021, November 5). *BCFG x CHIBE virtual briefing on tactics tested for encouraging COVID-19 vaccination* [Video]. YouTube.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uz9zOqXtfcA> (55:08)

Kahneman, D., Krueger, A. B., Schkade, D., Schwarz, N., & Stone, A. A. (2006). Would you be happier if you were richer? A focusing illusion. *Science*, 312, 1908-1910.

Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1997). A meta-analysis of the effects of organizational behavior modification on task performance, 1975-1995. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 1122-1149.

*Camerer, C. F., & Hogarth, R. M. (1999). The effects of financial incentives in experiments: A review and capital-labor-production framework. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 19, 7-42.

*Cerasoli, C. P., Nicklin, J. M., & Ford, M. T. (2014). Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic incentives jointly predict performance: A 40-year meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140, 980-1008.

*Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 627-668.

*Kahneman, D., & Deaton, A. (2010). High income improves evaluation of life but not emotional well-being. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 107(38), 16489-16493.

*Robinson, C. D., Gallus, J., Lee, M. G., & Rogers, T. (2021). The demotivating effect (and unintended message) of awards. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 163, 51-64.

*Wright, P. M., George, J. M., Farnsworth, S. R., & McMahan, G. C. (1993). Productivity and extra-role behavior: The effects of goals and incentives on spontaneous helping. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 374-381.

OCTOBER 19: SELF-EFFICACY AND RELATED CONSTRUCTS

Due date for CHRO briefing.

- Bandura A. (2005). The evolution of social cognitive theory. In K. G. Smith & M. A. Hitt (Eds.), *Great Minds in Management* (pp. 9-35). Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- Baumeister, R., Campbell, J., Krueger, J., & Vohs, K. (2005). Exploding the self-esteem myth. *Scientific American Mind*, *16*(4), 50-57.
- Lee, C., & Bobko, P. (1994). Self-efficacy beliefs: Comparison of five measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *79*, 364-369.
- Vancouver, J. B. (2018). Self-efficacy's role in unifying self-regulation theories. In A. J. Elliot (Ed.), *Advances in motivation science* (Vol. 5, pp. 203-230). Academic Press (Elsevier).
- *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.
- *Bandura, A. (2014, January 14). *Inside the psychologist's studio: Albert Bandura* [Video]. Association for Psychological Science.
https://www.psychologicalscience.org/observer/albert-bandura-itps#.WF_b9lMrLDc (46:02)
- *Bandura, A. (2017). Social cognitive theory. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- *Neal, A., Ballard, T., & Vancouver, J. B. (2017). Dynamic self-regulation and multiple-goal pursuit. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *4*(1), 401-423.
- *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.
- *Vancouver, J. B. (in press). Control theory. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd edn.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

OCTOBER 26: SELF-REGULATION AND RELATED THEORIES - I

Note: Read Baumeister and Tierney (2011) after Baumeister et al. (2007) and Ent et al. (2015).

Baumeister, R. F., & Tierney, J. (2011). *Willpower: Rediscovering the greatest human strength*. New York, NY: Penguin. **Note: Read only the chapter entitled *Conclusion: The future of willpower--more gain, less strain (as long as you don't procrastinate)*, pp. 238-260.**

Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., & Tice, D. M. (2007). The strength model of self-control. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *16*, 351-355.

Ent, M. R., Baumeister, R. F., & Tice, D. M. (2015). Trait self-control and the avoidance of temptation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *74*, 12-15.

Keller, L., Kabengele, M. C., & Gollwitzer, P. M. (in press). The self-regulation of face touching: A preregistered experiment testing if-then plans as a means to promote COVID-19 prevention. In press at *Psychology & Health*.

*Baumeister, R. F. (2012, November 7). *Willpower: Self-control, decision fatigue, and energy depletion* [Video]. YouTube.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KfnUicHDNM8> (59:22)

*Gollwitzer, P. M. & Sheeran, P. (2006). Implementation intentions and goal achievement: A meta-analysis of effects and processes. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *38*, 69-119.

*Lyngs, U., Lukoff, K., Slovak, P., Binns, R., Slack, A., Inzlicht, M., Van Kleek, M., & Shadbolt, N. (2019, May). Self-control in cyberspace: Applying dual systems theory to a review of digital self-control tools. In *proceedings of the 2019 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems* (pp. 1-18).

*Mischel, W. (2017, December 18). *Inside the psychologist's studio with Walter Mischel* [Video]. Association for Psychological Science.

<https://www.psychologicalscience.org/publications/observer/obonline/inside-the-psychologists-studio-with-walter-mischel.html> (1:06:59)

*Oettingen, G. (2022). WOOP my life. <https://woopmylife.org/en/home>

*Troll, E. S., Venz, L., Weitzenecker, F., & Loschelder, D. D. (in press). Working from home during the COVID-19 crisis: How self-control strategies elucidate employees' job performance. *Applied Psychology*.

NOVEMBER 2: SELF-REGULATION AND RELATED THEORIES - II (REPLICATION AND...RESOLUTION?)

Optional (but highly recommended!): Exchange outline for term paper (see subsequent instructions) with another team, so that each team can provide the other with feedback.

Note: Read Inzlicht and Friese (2019) last.

Carter, E. C., Kofler, L. M., Forster, D. E., & McCullough, M. E. (2015). A series of meta-analytic tests of the depletion effect: Self-control does not seem to rely on a limited resource. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *144*, 796-815.

Inzlicht, M., & Friese, M. (2019). The past, present, and future of ego depletion. *Social Psychology*, *50*(5-6), 370-378.

Vadillo Nistal, M. A., Gold, N. K., & Osman, M. (2016). The bitter truth about sugar and willpower: The limited evidential value of the glucose model of ego depletion. *Psychological Science*, *27*, 1207-1214.

Vohs, K. D., Schmeichel, B. J., Lohmann, S., Gronau, Q. F., Finley, A. J., Ainsworth, S. E., ... & Albarracín, D. (2021). A multisite preregistered paradigmatic test of the ego-depletion effect. *Psychological Science*, *32*(10), 1566-1581.

*Hagger, M. S., Chatzisarantis, N. L., Alberts, H., Anggono, C. O., Batailler, C., Birt, A., & Zwienerberg, M. (2016). A multi-lab pre-registered replication of the ego-depletion effect. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *11*, 546–573.

*Inzlicht, M., Schmeichel, B. J., & Macrae, C. N. (2014). Why self-control seems (but may not be) limited. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *18*, 127-133.

NOVEMBER 9: AFFECT (MOOD AND EMOTIONS)

Flynn, E., Hovasapian, A., & Levine, L. J. (2021). Affective forecasting. In K. Sweeny & M. L. Robbins (Eds.), *The Wiley encyclopedia of health psychology: The social bases of health behavior (Vol. II)*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Johnson, R. E., Tolentino, A. L., Rodopman, O. B., & Cho, E. (2010). We (sometimes) know not how we feel: Predicting job performance with an implicit measure of trait affectivity. *Personnel Psychology*, *63*, 197-219.

Slaughter, J. E., Gabriel, A. S., Ganster, M. L., Vaziri, H., & MacGowan, R. L. (2021). Getting worse or getting better? Understanding the antecedents and

consequences of emotion profile transitions during COVID-19-induced organizational crisis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 106(8), 1118-1136.

Weiss, H. M., & Merlo, K. L. (2020). Affect, attention, and episodic performance. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 29(5), 453-459.

*Erez, A., & Isen, A. M. (2002). The influence of positive affect on the components of expectancy motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 1055-1067.

*Seo, M-G., Barrett, L. F., & Bartunek, J. M. (2004). The role of affective experience in work motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 29, 423-439.

*van den Bosch, G. J., Roos, R. A. N., Otten, R., Bockting, C., & Smulders, Y. M. (2021). Are patients accurate forecasters of their emotional response to medical conditions? A scoping review on affective forecasting. *BMJ open*, 11(12), e053370.

*Wang, K., Goldenberg, A., Dorison, C. A., Miller, J. K., Uusberg, A., Lerner, J. S., ... & Isager, P. M. (2021). A multi-country test of brief reappraisal interventions on emotions during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 5(8), 1089-1110.

*Westermann, R., Spies, K., Stahl, G., & Hesse, F. W. (1996). Relative effectiveness and validity of mood induction procedures: A meta-analysis. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 557-580.

NOVEMBER 16: STUDENT-SELECTED READINGS—WEEK I

Due date for ego depletion assignment **OR** replication assignment (do either, not both).

Student-selected readings (see subsequent instructions).

NOVEMBER 23: THANKSGIVING BREAK

No class today. No assigned readings.

NOVEMBER 30: STUDENT-SELECTED READINGS—WEEK II

Student-selected readings (see subsequent instructions).

DECEMBER 7: TERM PAPERS DUE

Term papers due to me via email by 4:30 PM.

Note: A Google Doc sign-up sheet will be provided to so that you can: (1) sign up for a week during which to facilitate class and present a student-selected reading, and (2) form a group for other assignments. For group assignments, I recommend that you start by creating a [group/team charter](#). Also, for every group assignment, please be sure to submit an Author Contribution statement. An example can be seen here:

Author Contributions

RD developed the broad rationale for the paper and some of the research questions. BA, RD, AT, and SH fleshed out the theoretical foundation, improved, and added to the research questions, designed the study, and selected the instruments. All authors contributed to data collection. BA, ZS, AM, and SH contributed to data analysis. All authors contributed to the interpretation of the results. BA, RD, and ZS contributed to manuscript writing. AM, AT, and SH provided critical reviews for, and helped with the editing of, the manuscript prior to submission. BA, RD, ZS, AM, and SH contributed to manuscript revisions subsequent to reviewer feedback.

CLASS FACILITATION (KAHOOT QUIZ CREATION):

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

The Kahoot quizzes are designed for students to assess their own understanding of the class material in a confidential, non-graded manner. Consequently, when answering Kahoot quizzes, students should use nicknames (albeit ones they'll remember!), not their real names. Grades are assigned for students who create the quizzes, not students who complete them.

Each group of students should sign up for one week during which they will facilitate (a small portion of the) class.

Here, class facilitation involves assessing students' understanding of each assigned reading or video. For this purpose, we will use a gamified learning platform such as Kahoot (or Mentimeter, etc.) to pose multiple-choice questions to the class. There should be *no fewer than* 2, 4, and 6 questions per reading or video for short, medium-length, and long readings or videos, respectively. Questions should be chosen from all major sections of the reading or video. For instance, for an empirical journal article, ideally the questions should be spread across the Introduction, Method, Results, and Discussion sections. Do not include extremely easy questions, but do not include ridiculously picky questions either!

So, essentially, each group of students will be responsible for preparing the Kahoot quizzes for a given week. We will complete the quiz for each reading or video just before we discuss that reading or video in class.

Include an Author Contribution statement (see above for example). For this assignment only, your Author Contribution statement can be provided *verbally* if you wish.

STUDENT-SELECTED READING (ARTICLE PRESENTATION):

This is a solo project.

At most nine (9) students can sign up to present in a given week.

Each student will individually present one (1) reading of his or her choice. Each chosen reading *must be relevant to motivation* (obviously!), *must be at least eight (8) pages long in its original form, and must have been published in a peer-reviewed journal article within the last five (5) years*. Additionally, you must choose an *empirical journal article*: for instance, a paper involving a quantitative or qualitative data collection or else a meta-analysis. Narrative theory/review papers, case studies, etc., are not allowed.

Note that *motivation should be a main focus of the study. The study, in other words, should be primarily about motivation*. Failure to choose a proper reading will lead to heavy penalties.

These criteria still provide considerable flexibility. This is *your* reading: choose something that *you* believe is 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 (or Google Slides, Prezi, etc.) presentation that includes:

- First slide:
 - The student's name

- A full reference for the reading selected (in American Psychological Association Style)
- Next slide or two:
 - Information regarding why that particular reading was chosen
 - Information regarding how the chosen reading fits in with the topics covered in class and the required readings in the syllabus. Please cite specific required readings to which the chosen reading is similar—and indicate why
- Remaining slides:
 - 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'll need to think about how to represent the major findings very efficiently (I obviously don't expect you to discuss every statistical test in the results section, but you should present the major findings) yet in sufficient depth to reveal your understanding of the nuances of the data analysis. And, yes, in some cases, you might need to do additional reading (beyond the chosen article) so as to be able to understand and communicate at least the gist of the research design and/or statistical techniques used.

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, while doing so, please **time it** to ensure that it is **11-13** minutes long. Please do not compel me to stop you while you are still mid-presentation! To prevent needless delays, please download your slides to the desktop computer in the classroom **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 (**2-4** minutes) question-and-answer session involving the other students and me.

CHRO BRIEFING:

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

Imagine that your group is a (very small) consulting firm. You have been approached by Ms. Zeynep Erdogan, the Chief Human Resources Officer (CHRO) at a large multinational corporation. Ms. Erdogan wants you to deliver a **9-12** minute long briefing to her and her direct reports on the topic of **financial incentives**. Essentially, the company's CEO has asked Ms. Erdogan to consider whether the company should modify the way it compensates employees—and, before she makes any decisions in this regard, Ms. Erdogan has hired you to brief her and her direct reports on the research involving financial incentives.

Your task is to provide Ms. Erdogan and her team with **three (3)** very specific and very

evidence-based recommendations regarding how employees should (or should not) be compensated in order to maximize their motivation. For each recommendation, be very specific regarding what you are recommending and why (i.e., on the basis of what research evidence). Be very precise, but do not use technical terms (e.g., rather than saying “meta-analysis,” explain what a meta-analysis is in layperson terms). Try to convey an estimate of how helpful each recommendation would be (i.e., how much of an improvement it would yield); however, rather than referring to effect sizes like Cohen’s d or Pearson’s r (or for that matter R^2), convert the effect sizes to non-technical metrics, for example the “common-language effect size,” “binomial effect size display,” odds ratio, or risk ratio. In sum, you should aim your briefing at an intelligent layperson audience.

Additional guidelines:

- Use PowerPoint
- Number your slides
- Include your names on the first slide
- Include as many graphics as possible (albeit relevant ones)
- Don’t include too much text on a single slide
 - Use more slides with less text per slide rather than fewer slides with more text per slide
- Cite relevant research, but make the citations unobtrusive (e.g., include citations in footnotes); additionally, please *do* include a References section at the end of the presentation
- Record the presentation with a voiceover narrative
 - Each team member should do the voiceover for one of the three recommendations
 - I would highly recommend practicing the voiceover once or twice before doing the actual recording
- Include an Author Contribution statement (see above for example)

Feel free to base your presentation on only the required readings for the two weeks during which we discussed financial incentives. If needed, however, feel free to use 1-2 more readings (which could come from the recommended readings for those weeks or from readings you find through other means, such as a literature source).

You may find the following helpful:

- Table S5 in the online supplementary materials for Voss and Lake (2020, *Personnel Assessment and Decisions*). You can find the supplementary materials here: <https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?filename=1&article=1090&context=pad&type=additional>
- A way to convert effect sizes to non-technical metrics. For instance: <http://stat-help.com/spreadsheets/Converting%20effect%20sizes%202012-06-19.xls>

Deadlines:

- *Link (URL) to recorded video with voiceover narration sent to me (via email, before class): **October 19**. Please copy all other team members on the email, and please use a relevant subject line for the email.*

EGO DEPLETION ASSIGNMENT:

You would do either this assignment or the replication assignment, but not both!

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

Your task for this assignment is to compare how ego depletion research in I-O psychology—or rather one specific I-O psychology journal article—compares to ego depletion research in social-cognitive psychology, and the extent to which the former has taken and should take account of the replication crisis in the latter.

The end product should be a **2-3 page** long double-spaced Word document (plus a References section + an Author Contribution statement) containing the following information:

- The full American Psychological Association (APA) Style reference for the published I-O ego-depletion-focused journal article your group has chosen. Note that the term “ego depletion” should be in the journal article’s title, abstract, or keywords, and that the study should have been published in an I-O peer-reviewed journal in the last decade.
- Whether, and if so how, the I-O study alludes to replication concerns involving ego depletion. Note that, if you choose a study that is 5-10 years old (vs. more recent), it may not be as surprising if the study does not mention replication concerns.
- How the I-O study measures ego depletion—and how similar or different this is from the ways in which ego depletion is measured in social-cognitive psychology research (e.g., Vohs et al., 2021, from the required reading list or Hagger et al., 2016, from the recommended reading list).
- In light of the replication concerns involving social-cognitive psychology ego depletion research, what changes, if any, you might suggest to the I-O study’s: (a) theorizing, and (b) research design. For each change you suggest, provide a brief rationale.
- Include a References section (does not count toward the page limit).
- Include an Author Contribution statement (see above for example; does not count toward the page limit).

As you can see from the above, although the deliverable is short in terms of number of pages, the assignment will take some time to complete because you will need to do additional reading, etc. Prepare accordingly!

Deadlines:

- **Word document sent to me (via email, before class): November 16. Please copy all other team members on the email, and please use a relevant subject line for the email.**

REPLICATION ASSIGNMENT:

You would do either this assignment or the ego depletion assignment, but not both!

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

As you may know, psychology is in the throes of a “replication crisis.” Your task for this assignment is to choose a motivation-related study (published in a peer-reviewed journal article) to replicate—and to briefly indicate why and how you would do it.

Note that this should be a direct (exact) replication, not a conceptual replication.

The end product should be a **2-3 page** long double-spaced Word document (plus a References section + an Author Contribution statement) containing the following information:

- The full American Psychological Association (APA) Style reference for the published motivation-focused journal article your group proposes to replicate. Note that motivation should be a main focus of, rather than merely one construct among many in, the study being replicated.
- A rationale for why it is necessary or desirable to replicate that study in particular. For instance, you could contend that the study is worth replicating because its findings are noteworthy, its findings are unexpected, its design was novel, its design had unusually low statistical power for the hypotheses it aimed to test, etc.—though you should also provide specifics (e.g., *in what way* are its findings noteworthy?).
- The *a priori* standards that will be used to determine whether the replication is “successful.” Provide citations for these standards.
- The sample size that will be used for the replication study. If possible, please also summarize the details of a power analysis and/or other information (e.g., commonly used rules of thumb) relevant to sample size. Generally, the sample size in the replication study should be appreciably larger than the sample size in the original study.
- The additional best practices associated with replication you will incorporate. Provide citations for these best practices.
- Include a References section (does not count toward the page limit).
- Include an Author Contribution statement (see above for example; does not count toward the page limit).

As you can see from the above, although the deliverable is short in terms of number of pages, the assignment will take some time to complete because you will need to do additional reading, etc. Prepare accordingly!

Deadlines:

- **Word document sent to me (via email, before class): November 16. Please copy all other team members on the email, and please use a relevant subject line for the email.**

RESEARCH PROPOSAL (BULLETED OUTLINE + TERM PAPER):

This is a group project. You will be working in groups of three people. However, I am open to requests from Ph.D. students in or beyond their second year in the program who have already identified a paper topic and who wish to work on the paper alone because they want to actually conduct the study they are proposing. A Google Doc sign-up sheet will be provided to students so that they can indicate their group membership.

Each group of students is required to propose an original research project *explicitly focused on the topic of motivation*. In other words, motivation cannot simply be treated as one variable in the paper: it must be the focus, or at least *one of the major foci*, of the paper. Papers that do not adhere to this requirement will automatically receive a failing grade.

In practical terms, the end product will essentially consist of the *introduction, method, and “planned 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. Be sure to answer the “So What?” or “Who Cares?” question: in other words, be sure to indicate not only that your paper topic fills a gap in the existing research but also why that particular gap is worth filling! The introduction section (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, all the hypotheses would be derived logically from a single theory; certainly, a mishmash of theories should be avoided (see Sparrowe & Mayer, 2011). You should plan for *2-3 hypotheses in total*.

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.

Sparrowe, R. T., & Mayer, K. J. (2011). Publishing in *AMJ*--Part 4: Grounding hypotheses. *Academy of Management Journal*, *54*, 1098-1102.

- 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 detail*, along with appropriate citations, and which should be targeted at the most sample-size-intensive of your planned analyses) or, failing that, via a rule of thumb that has been articulated for the analyses you plan to conduct (which you should describe *in detail*, along with appropriate citations).

- The “planned 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. For every technique you propose to use, please list the outcome variables, the predictor variables, any mediators and/or moderators, and so forth.
- Include a References section (does not count toward the page limit).
- Include an Author Contribution statement (see above for example; does not count toward the page limit).

In addition to the above, please take a look at the American Psychological Association’s Journal Article Reporting Standards (JARS): <https://psycnet.apa.org/fulltext/2018-00750-002.pdf> (Hint: Table 1 in the JARS will be most important for you).

Note that this is a proposal for *basic* (i.e., academic) 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 employee motivation before and after achieving a blood alcohol concentration of 0.20”) is completely inappropriate and will receive a failing grade.

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 have submitted them to well-regarded journals.

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

For both your sanity and mine, the term paper will be fairly short: **10-12⁺⁺** double-spaced pages of text—that is, *excluding* the title page, abstract (limit 200 words) and keywords (limit of 5 words/phrases), references, and any tables or figures you may have. You do not need a discussion section. You will need *at least 15 references* in the term paper. The short length of the paper does not preclude the need for thoroughness.

To facilitate viable research proposals, I would *highly recommend* that each team exchange a brief **bulleted outline** (e.g., 3-4 double-spaced pages in length, plus a title page and a references section) with another team, so that each team can provide the other with feedback. I will not check on this, though, so it’s up to you as to whether you do this. If you do want to do this and

can't find another group with whom to exchange outlines, please let me know.

I will, of course, provide feedback on the final term paper. The purpose of doing so—even though at that point the semester will be over—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 term papers carefully! Also, please be aware that I have high standards: I believe that you are talented students who will submit high-quality work, and I will be disappointed if you don't. 😊

[†]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 *well in advance of the due date*. However, students should be aware that it is—at least in my opinion—harder to write a good theory or review paper than a good empirical paper.

^{**}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. Papers that depart from length guidelines without prior permission will be penalized.

Deadlines:

- **Optional (but highly recommended!):** Outline for term paper exchanged with another team on **November 2**, so that each team can provide the other with feedback.
- **Term paper sent to me (via email, by 4:30 PM): December 7.** Please copy all other team members on the email, and please use a relevant subject line for the email.

GRADING SCHEME AND SCALE:

Graded Component of Course	% of Overall Course Grade
Attendance and participation (in class and on Blackboard)	27.5%
Class facilitation (Kahoot quiz creation)	5.0%
Student-selected reading (presentation)	15.0%
CHRO briefing	15.0%
Ego depletion OR Replication assignment	15.0%
Research proposal: Final version (term paper)	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: August 29

Last date to drop a course with 100% tuition refund: September 6

Last date to drop a course with 50% tuition refund: September 13

Unrestricted withdrawal period (with 100% tuition penalty): September 14-27

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