

Psychology 592-001/892-003
BEHAVIOR AND PERFORMANCE AT WORK
Fall 2008
George Mason University

Instructor: Reeshad S. Dalal, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Industrial/Organizational Psychology

Email Address: rdalal@gmu.edu
Office Location: David King Hall, Room 3077
Office Hours: By appointment

Class Day and Time: Thursday, 1:30 PM – 4:10 PM
Class Location: Innovation Hall, Room 139

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

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

PREREQUISITES:

1. Graduate survey-level statistics courses (PSYC 611 and 612, or equivalent)
2. Graduate survey-level industrial/organizational psychology courses (PSYC 636 and 639, or equivalent).

COURSE OVERVIEW:

This major objective of this seminar is to provide “seminarians” (i.e., students) with in-depth exposure to theoretical and empirical research on employee job performance and closely-related behavior such as organizational citizenship behavior, counterproductive/deviant work behavior, and turnover/attrition. The emphasis is on both content and measurement/appraisal. The readings are drawn primarily from industrial/organizational psychology and micro-OBHR (organizational behavior and human resources), with occasional readings from related disciplines such as social psychology. The readings include reviews (both narrative and meta-analytic) and empirical studies. Along the way, students will encounter a wide variety of methodological and statistical approaches. Students will additionally have the opportunity to: (1) hone their analytical and information presentation skills, and (2) gain practice in generating research proposals. Finally, one of the objectives of the course is to keep the amount of reading in any given week to a manageable length. The sincere hope is that this will encourage students to actually complete all the assigned readings. ☺

ATTENDANCE:

Attendance is expected, barring exceptional events, and constitutes a part of the participation grade. Internship-related activities will generally not be considered sufficient grounds for absence.

COURSE READINGS:

Every student is expected to contribute to the class discussion. Students who do not voluntarily contribute will be “encouraged” to contribute. In other words, if necessary, I will deliberately put you on the spot. It is important for every student to read all the assigned articles/chapters and to contribute to the class discussion, because the quality of this course will be influenced significantly ($p < 0.01$) by the quality of the discussion.

The article list follows:

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

First Class Meeting (August 28)

No readings.

Overview - I (September 4)

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

Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 687-732). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

*Fleishman, E. A. (1975). Toward a taxonomy of human performance. *American Psychologist*, 30, 1127-1149.

Overview - II (September 11)

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

Cascio, W. F. (1998). *Applied psychology in human resource management*. Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA: Prentice Hall. [Read only pp. 41-79 (Chapters 4 & 5)]

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

Dalal, R. S. & Hulin, C. L. (2008). Motivation for what? A multivariate dynamic perspective of the criterion. In R. Kanfer, G. Chen, & R. D. Pritchard (Eds.), *Work motivation: Past, present, and future* (pp. 63-100). New York: Routledge.

Measurement/Appraisal - I (September 18)

Landy, F. J., & Farr, J. L. (1980). Performance rating. *Psychological Bulletin*, *87*, 72-107.

Kluger, A. N. & DeNisi, A. (1998). Feedback interventions: Toward the understanding of a double-edged sword. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *7*, 67-72.

Oppler, S. H., Campbell, J. P., Pulakos, E. D., & Borman, W. C. (1992). Three approaches to the investigation of subgroup bias in performance measurement: Review, results, and conclusions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *77*, 201-217.

Measurement/Appraisal - II (September 25)

Borman, W. C. (1997). 360° ratings: Assumptions and a research agenda for evaluating their validity. *Human Resource Management Review*, *7*, 299-315.

Borman, W. C., Buck, D. E., Hanson, M. A., Motowidlo, S. J., Stark, S. J., & Drasgow, F. (2001). An examination of the comparative reliability, validity, and accuracy of performance ratings made using computerized adaptive rating scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*, 965-973.

Rothstein, H. R. (1990). Interrater reliability of job performance ratings: Growth to asymptote level with increasing opportunity to observe. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *75*, 322-327.

Stanton, J. M. (2000). Reactions to employee performance monitoring: Framework, review, and research directions. *Human Performance*, *13*, 85-113.

*Bates, R. A. & Holton, E. F. (1995). Computerized performance monitoring: A review of human resource issues. *Human Resource Management Review*, *5*, 267-288.

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

Measurement/Appraisal - III (October 2)

- Bommer, W. H., Johnson, J., Rich, G. A., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1995). On the interchangeability of objective and subjective measures of employee performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, *48*, 587-605.
- Kane, J. S. (1996). The conceptualization and representation of total performance effectiveness. *Human Resource Management Review*, *6*, 123-145.
- Kaplan, R. S. & Norton, D. P. (1992). The balanced scorecard—measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review*, *70*, 71-79.
- Sackett, P. R., Zedeck, S., & Fogli, L. (1988). Relations between measures of typical and maximum job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *73*, 482-486.
- *Shim, J. K. & Siegel, J. G. (1999). *Schaum's outline of theory and problems of managerial accounting* (2nd ed.). New York, NY, USA: McGraw-Hill. [Read only pp. 274-280]
- *Tangen, S. (2003). An overview of frequently used performance measures. *Work Study*, *52*, 347-354.
- *Weigmann, D. A. & Shappell, S. A. (1997). Human factors analysis of postaccident data: Applying theoretical taxonomies of human error. *International Journal of Aviation Psychology*, *7*, 67-81.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Contextual Performance, and Related Topics (October 9)

- Batson, C. D., & Powell, A. A. (2003). Altruism and prosocial behavior. In I. B. Weiner (Series Ed.), T. Millon, & M. J. Lerner (Vol. Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Vol. 5. Personality and social psychology* (pp. 463-484). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, *10*, 99-109.
- Coleman, V. I., & Borman, W. C. (2000). Investigating the underlying structure of the citizenship performance domain. *Human Resource Management Review*, *10*, 25-44.
- Dalal, R. S. (2007). Contextual performance / prosocial behavior / organizational citizenship behavior. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of industrial/organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 103-106). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- *Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Bloodgood, J. M. (2002). Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *27*, 505-522.

- *Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Niehoff, B. P. (2004). The other side of the story: Reexamining prevailing assumptions about organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review, 14*, 229-246.
- *LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 52-65.
- *Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management, 26*, 513-563.

Counterproductive Work Behavior and Related Topics (October 16)

- Anderson, C. A. & Bushman, B. J. (2002). Human aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*, 27-51.
- Everton, W. J., Mastrangelo, P. M., & Jolton, J. A. (2005). Personality correlates of employees' personal use of work computers. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 8*, 143-153.
- Ritter, D. & Eslea, M. (2005). Hot sauce, toy guns, and graffiti: A critical account of current laboratory aggression paradigms. *Aggressive Behavior, 31*, 407-419.
- Sackett, P. R., & DeVore, C. J. (2001). Counterproductive behaviors at work. In N. Anderson, D. Ones, H. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work, and organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 145-164). London, UK: Sage.
- *Bushman, B. J., Baumeister, R. F., & Phillips, C. M. (2001). Do people aggress to improve their mood? Catharsis beliefs, affect regulation opportunity, and aggressive responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 17-32.
- *Gruys, M. L. & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 11*, 30-42.
- *Hindelang, M. J., Hirschi, T., & Weis, J. G. (1979). Correlates of delinquency: The illusion of discrepancy between self-report and official measures. *American Sociological Review, 44*, 995-1014.
- *Hirschi, T. & Gottfredson, M. (1983). Age and the explanation of crime. *American Journal of Sociology, 89*, 552-584.
- *LeBlanc, M. M., & Barling, J. (2004). Workplace aggression. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 13*, 9-12.

*Sackett, P. R. (1994). Integrity testing for personnel selection. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 3, 73-76.

Withdrawal (Turnover, Absenteeism, Lateness, etc.) (October 23)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Static Relationships Among Criteria (October 30)

Note: Wikipedia articles are due by class-time today.

Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1241-1255.

Harrison, D. A. & Shaffer, M. A. (2005). Mapping the criterion space for expatriate success: task- and relationship-based performance, effort, and adaptation. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16, 1454-1474.

Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 66-80.

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

*Viswesvaran, C., Schmidt, F. L., & Ones, D. S. (2005). Is there a general factor in ratings of job performance? A meta-analytic framework for disentangling substantive and error influences. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 108-131.

Dynamic Criteria, Dynamic Relationships Among Criteria, and Related Topics (November 6)

Note: Bulleted outlines (for the term paper) are due by class-time today.

Dalal, R. S., Lam, H., Weiss, H. M., Welch, E. R., & Hulin, C. L. (in press). A within-person approach to work behavior and performance: Concurrent and lagged citizenship-counterproductivity associations, and dynamic relationships with affect and overall job performance. In press at *Academy of Management Journal*.

Hofmann, D. A., Jacobs, R., & Baratta, J. E. (1993). Dynamic criteria and the measurement of change. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 194-204.

Reb, J. & Cropanzano, R. (2007). Evaluating dynamic performance: The influence of salient gestalt characteristics on performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 490-499.

Steele-Johnson, D., Osburn, H. G., & Pieper, K. F. (2000). A review and extension of current models of dynamic criteria. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 8*, 110-136.

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

*Inn, A., Hulin, C. L., & Tucker, L. (1972). Three sources of criterion variance: Static dimensionality, dynamic dimensionality, and individual dimensionality. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 8*, 58-83.

Class Presentations - I (November 13)

Class Presentations - II (November 20)

Thanksgiving Break (No Class!) (November 27)

Student-Selected Readings (December 4)

Term Papers are due by 4:30 PM on December 9 (Tuesday), via email.

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

I. CLASS DISCUSSION:

Discussion leaders:

Note: *Work in groups of size 2-3.*

Each group will lead discussion twice during the semester. Members of the group that will be leading discussion in a given week should meet prior to class in order to coordinate activities. Discussion leaders should plan for discussion to last approximately 2 hours per week.

Examples of questions that discussion leaders may choose to ask are as follows:

- What are the strengths of this article?
- What are the weaknesses of this article?
- Was there anything in this article that you found surprising or particularly interesting?
- How does this article relate to other articles that we have read this week or in previous weeks?
- Why do you think Reeshad chose this article?

Discussion leaders will be aided by the fact that, as discussed in the following sub-section, other students will have prepared brief “reactions” to readings: it is hoped that these reactions will facilitate additional discussion.

Everyone else:

Note: *Work alone/independently.*

Every week, each student who is *not* leading discussion should come to class with a piece of paper on which is printed his/her name as well as *at least one* brief “reaction” to *each* reading. A “reaction” involves a question or comment (maximum 3 sentences) about any aspect of the reading in question (literature review, method, analyses, discussion, purpose, contribution, etc.). Reactions may be either positive or negative in tone, but should also include a brief explanation (e.g., a comment such as “I loved this paper” will certainly not, in and of itself, suffice as a reaction). Essentially, a reaction should stimulate class discussion (thereby assisting discussion leaders in their task), and should also clearly indicate that the student has read the article. Reactions should be handed to the instructor at the end of each class period.

II. STUDENT-SELECTED READINGS (Week of December 4):

Note: Work in groups of size 2-3.

Students, working in small groups, will present a reading of their choice. The chosen reading must be related to behavior/performance at work, but students will otherwise have wide latitude in terms of selecting the reading. For example, the chosen reading could be: quantitative or qualitative or theoretical in orientation, an article or a book chapter, intended for researchers or practitioners or both, from any discipline (e.g., HR or sociology or economics), and so forth. You should feel free to choose a reading from the list of recommended readings (unless I have already discussed that reading in class), but, equally, you should feel free not to choose from among the recommended readings. This is *your* week: choose a reading that *you* believe to be interesting and important—and feel free to be creative.

It is the responsibility of the group presenting a particular reading to edify the rest of us regarding that reading (in other words, not everybody will be reading everything during this week!). Thus, each group should prepare a handout that includes: group-members' names, a full citation (in American Psychological Association or Academy of Management style) for the reading selected, some information regarding why that particular reading was selected, and a summary of the reading. The handout should be accompanied by a 10-15 minute description of the reading (ideally, this would not *solely* include a repetition of material provided on the handout!), as well as answers to questions that the rest of us may have about the reading.

III. WIKIPEDIA ARTICLE:

Note: Work in groups of size 2-3.

Students, working in small groups, will create a Wikipedia article. The Wikipedia article should, in effect, be a brief (3-5 single-spaced pages in MS Word) introduction to a particular topic, written at a level accessible to an educated layperson. Choose a topic that is explicitly related to behavior/performance at work, and on which no Wikipedia article currently exists. It may be a good idea to run your proposed topic by me before you begin work on it.

Your Wikipedia article should include, but definitely not be limited to, the relevant readings from the syllabus. Cite at least 10 sources in total.

As an example, an article on “organizational citizenship behavior” (please do not use this as your actual topic) should include sections like: definition(s), operationalization(s) (i.e., dimensionality), putative antecedents, putative consequences, implications for practice, and brief mentions and definitions of closely-related constructs (e.g., contextual performance, prosocial behavior, helping behavior, altruism, and volunteering). With regard to the last of these topics: If the closely-related constructs have their own Wikipedia articles, your article should link to these other articles; moreover, ideally, you would briefly edit those other articles in order to link to your article.

Of course, depending on the specific topic chosen, not all the aforementioned sections will be relevant; moreover, additional sections (unmentioned above) may be relevant.

For further information, please refer to the following Wikipedia pages:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:What_Wikipedia_is_not

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:The_perfect_article

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Featured_article_criteria

The objectives of requiring students to create Wikipedia articles are twofold. First, in the process of creating such articles, students will (hopefully) gain in-depth knowledge about a particular topic. Second, the creation of such articles is intended to contribute to the dissemination and popularization of industrial/organizational psychology research to a broader audience (one that is interested in the topics we study, but that does not necessarily view the *Journal of Applied Psychology* as appropriate bedtime reading).

Wikipedia articles are due by class-time on October 30 (Thursday).

IV. RESEARCH PROPOSAL: BULLETED OUTLINE + IN-CLASS PRESENTATION + TERM PAPER

Note: Work alone/independently.

In practical terms, the end product will essentially be the introduction and method sections of an empirical journal article. For the introduction section, you will first review the literature on a particular topic (related to behavior/performance at work, obviously!) and then propose your own hypotheses. Each hypothesis should be preceded by a sound rationale. For the method section, you will describe your participants and procedure (including survey measures, if any).

This is a proposal for basic (scientific) research, and should focus on psychological constructs and their inter-relationships. A technical report, such as that attached to an applied (e.g., consulting) project, is inappropriate and will receive a failing grade.

The topic should be *specific*. For example, whereas “behavior at work” or even “organizational citizenship behavior” is too broad, something like “ecological momentary assessment of the temporal development of organizational citizenship behavior” would be more appropriate. You should propose *original* research: replications of existing studies are not suitable here. Nonetheless, you are encouraged to propose research that is of interest to *you*, and that builds on your existing research projects. For example, if your research interest is Leader-Member eXchange (LMX), you could consider a research proposal that fleshes out the criterion side vis-à-vis LMX as a predictor variable. *Ideally, you would choose a topic that you can carry forward beyond the end of the semester and to eventual publication in a peer-reviewed journal.*

Papers should be formatted in American Psychological Association (APA) or Academy of Management (AOM) style. Another good resource, which I strongly encourage you to read before beginning your paper (and an electronic copy of which will be provided to you), is:

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

Also, you may want to check out our department's Guide to Writing in Psychology:
<http://www.gmu.edu/departments/psychology/writing/index.htm>

The paper should use double-spaced 12-point Times New Roman font, and should be 10-13 pages in length—excluding the title page, references, and any tables or figures you may have. You do not need an abstract, and you do not need a results or discussion section. Note, however, that good introduction and method sections will foreshadow the results section. Thus, although the results and discussion sections will not be included in the paper, they do need to be given some thought.

The short length of the paper does not preclude the necessity for thoroughness or precision.

To facilitate viable research proposals, the submission of the paper will be preceded by the following steps:

1. A bulleted outline that is at least two double-spaced pages long, with one or more additional pages containing references (you should have at least 7 references at this stage)
2. An in-class presentation (approximately 15 minutes in length, with an additional 5 minutes for audience questions/feedback)

Ideally, the in-class presentation will represent substantial progress beyond the bulleted outline, and the term paper will in turn represent substantial progress beyond the in-class presentation.

I will, of course, provide feedback on outlines and class presentations (and the other class members will also provide feedback on the presentations), but I will additionally provide feedback on the term papers. I hope to be able to do this within one week of receiving the term papers, but, at the very latest, will do so within three weeks of receiving the papers. The purpose of providing such feedback is 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).

Bulleted outlines are due by class-time on November 6 (Thursday).
Term Papers are due by 4:30 PM on December 9 (Tuesday), via email.

Further details will be provided at a later date.

GRADING SCHEME:

Leading in-class discussion	20%
Article reactions (when not leading discussion)	10%
Class participation (when not leading discussion), including attendance	10%
Student-selected reading	8%
Wikipedia article	15%
Bulleted outline	7%
In-class presentation	10%
Term paper	20%
TOTAL	100%

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

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