

SYLLABUS

Psychology 741-001
PSYCHOLOGY OF WORK MOTIVATION
Spring 2012
George Mason University

Class Day and Time: Thursday, 1:30 PM – 4:10 PM
Class Location: Innovation Hall, Room 215G

Instructor: Reeshad S. Dalal, Ph.D.
Email Address: rdalal@gmu.edu
Office Location: David King Hall, Room 3077
Office Hour: Thursday, 4:15 PM - 5:15 PM
Office Phone: 703-993-9487

PREREQUISITES:

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

COURSE OVERVIEW:

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

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

ATTENDANCE POLICY:

This is a graduate-level course that operates primarily through discussion. Consequently, attendance--barring unforeseeable personal/family emergencies--is compulsory. Internship-related activities will generally *not* be considered sufficient grounds for absence. Recall that attendance is factored into the participation grade.

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

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

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.

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

COURSE READINGS:

We will be reading the articles listed below. When reading an empirical article, here are some questions to keep in mind:

- Primarily *descriptive* questions:
 - What are the main points in this article? A few examples:
 - Which theoretical frameworks are used? If you were asked to summarize each framework in 1-2 sentences, what would you say?
 - What are the major hypotheses?
 - How are the relevant constructs defined?
 - What is the research design?

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

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

The article list follows:

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

JANUARY 26: INTRODUCTION

No readings.

FEBRUARY 2: OVERVIEW

Fiske, S. T. (2008). Core social motivations: Views from the couch, consciousness, classroom, computers, and collectives. In J. Y. Shah & W. L. Gardner (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation science* (pp. 3-22). New York, NY: Guilford.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2004). What should we do about motivation theory? Six recommendations for the 21st century. *Academy of Management Review*, *29*, 388-403.

Mitchell, T. R., & Daniels, D. (2003). Motivation. In I. B. Weiner (Series Ed.) & W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Vol. Eds.), *Handbook of Psychology: Vol. 12. Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 225-254). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

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.

*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.

*Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Shapiro, D. L. (2004). The future of work motivation theory. *Academy of Management Review, 29*, 379-387.

FEBRUARY 9: GOALS - I (MOSTLY THEORY)

Custers, R., & Aarts, H. (2010). The unconscious will: How the pursuit of goals operates outside of conscious awareness. *Science, 329*, 47-50.

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

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2006). New directions in goal-setting theory. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 15*, 265-268.

Ordóñez, L. D., Schweitzer, M. E., Galinsky, A. D., & Bazerman, M. H. (2009). Goals gone wild: The systematic side effects of overprescribing goal setting. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 23*, 6-16.

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

*Latham, G. P., & Locke, E. A. (2005). Enhancing the benefits and overcoming the pitfalls of goal setting. *Organizational Dynamics, 35*, 332-340.

*Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2009). Has goal setting gone wild, or have its attackers abandoned good scholarship? *The Academy of Management Perspectives, 23*, 17-23.

FEBRUARY 16: GOALS - II (MOSTLY FINDINGS)

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.
- Latham, G. P., & Baldes, J. J. (1975). The “practical significance” of Locke’s theory of goal setting. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*, 122-124.
- 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.
- *Pekrun, R., Elliot, A. J., & Maier, M. A. (2006). Achievement goals and discrete achievement emotions: A theoretical model and prospective test. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 98*, 583-597.

FEBRUARY 23: INCENTIVES - I (MOSTLY THEORY)

- 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.
- Kaufman, B. E. (2008). Work motivation: Insights from economics. In R. Kanfer, G. Chen, & R. D. Pritchard (Eds.), *Work motivation: Past, present, and future* (pp. 588-600). New York, NY: Routledge.
- 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.
- *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.
- *Kamenica, E. (2011). Behavioral economics and psychology of incentives. Unpublished manuscript.

MARCH 1: INCENTIVES - II (MOSTLY FINDINGS)

- 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.

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.

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.

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.

*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.

MARCH 8: EXPECTANCY, SELF-EFFICACY, AND SIMILAR CONSTRUCTS

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.

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

Lee, C., & Bobko, P. (1994). Self-efficacy beliefs: Comparison of five measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *79*, 364-369.

Schmidt, A. M., & DeShon, R. P. (2009). Prior performance and goal progress as moderators of the relationship between self-efficacy and performance. *Human Performance*, *22*, 191-203.

*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.

*Hiller, N. J., & Hambrick, D. C. (2005). Conceptualizing executive hubris: The role of (hyper-)core self-evaluations in strategic decision-making. *Strategic Management Journal*, *26*, 297-319.

- *Plous, S. (1995). A comparison of strategies for reducing interval overconfidence in group judgments. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*, 443-454.
- *Sanchez, R. J., Truxillo, D. M., & Bauer, T. N. (2000). Development and examination of an expectancy-based measure of test-taking motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 739-750.
- *Vancouver, J. B., & Kendall, L. N. (2006). When self-efficacy negatively relates to motivation and performance in a learning context. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 1146-1153.

MARCH 15: NO CLASS TODAY

No class today--Spring Break.

MARCH 22: SELF-REGULATION AND RELATED THEORIES
Applied Project due via email by class time today.

- 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.
- Kaplan, S., & Berman, M. G. (2010). Directed attention as a common resource for executive functioning and self-regulation. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5*, 43-57.
- Vancouver, J. B., & Day, D. V. (2005). Industrial and organisation research on self-regulation: From constructs to applications. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 54*, 155-185.
- *Bandura, A., & Locke, E. A. (2003). Negative self-efficacy and goal effects revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 87-99.
- *Brockner, J., & Higgins, E. T. (2001). Regulatory focus theory: Implications for the study of emotions at work. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86*, 35-66.
- * Gollwitzer, P. M. (1999). Implementation intentions: Strong effects of simple plans. *American Psychologist, 54*, 493-503.

*Vancouver, J. B. (2005). The depth of history and explanation as benefit and bane for psychological control theories. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 38-52.

MARCH 29: WORK DESIGN AND WORK CONTEXT

Hewlett, S., & Luce, C. (2006). Extreme jobs: The dangerous allure of the 70-hour workweek. *Harvard Business Review, 84*(12), 49-59.

Johns, G. (2006). The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review, 31*, 386-408.

Meyer, R. D., Dalal, R. S., Jose, I., Hermida, R., Chen, T. R., Vega, R. P., Brooks, C. K., & Khare, V. (in press). Measuring job-related situational strength and assessing its interactive effects with personality on voluntary work behavior. In press, *Journal of Management*.

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.

*Humphrey, S. E., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Integrating motivational, social, and contextual work design features: A meta-analytic summary and theoretical extension of the work design literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 1332-1356.

*Meyer, R. D., Dalal, R. S., & Hermida, R. (2010). A review and synthesis of situational strength in the organizational sciences. *Journal of Management, 36*, 121-140.

*Simons, R. (2005). Designing high-performance jobs. *Harvard Business Review, 83* (7-8), 54-62.

APRIL 5: WELL-BEING

Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*, 276-302.

Kahneman, D., Wakker, P. P., & Sarin, R. (1997). Back to Bentham? Explorations of experienced utility. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 112*, 375-405.

Kashdan, T. B., Biswas-Diener, R., & King, L. A. (2008). Reconsidering happiness: The costs of distinguishing between hedonics and eudaimonia. *Journal of Positive Psychology, 3*, 219-233.

Stevenson, B. (2009, Fall). What are the economics of happiness? *Qn*. Downloaded from http://qn.som.yale.edu/article.php?issue_id=12&article_id=275

*Waterman, A. S. (2008). Reconsidering happiness: A eudaimonist's perspective. *Journal of Positive Psychology, 3*, 234-252.

APRIL 12: JOB SATISFACTION

Bulleted outline due in class today.

Dalal, R. S. (in press). 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.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

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.

Song, Z., Li, W., & Arvey, R. D. (2011). Associations between dopamine and serotonin genes and job satisfaction: Preliminary evidence from the Add Health study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*, 1223-1233.

Stanton, J. M., Sinar, E. F., Balzer, W. K., Julian, A. L., Thoresen, P., Aziz, S., Fisher, G. G., & Smith, P. C. (2001). Development of a compact measure of job satisfaction: The Abridged Job Descriptive Index. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 61*, 1104-1122.

*Dalal, R. S., & Credé, M. (in press). Job satisfaction. In K. F. Geisinger (Ed.), *American Psychological Association handbook of testing and assessment in psychology*. In press.

*Smith, P. C., & Stanton, J. M. (1998). Perspectives on the measurement of job attitudes: The long view. *Human Resource Management Review, 8*, 367-386.

APRIL 19: AFFECT (MOOD AND EMOTIONS)

Eid, M., & Diener, E. (1999). Intraindividual variability in affect: Reliability, validity, and personality correlates. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 662-676.

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.

Menon, T., & Thompson, L. (2010). Envy at work. *Harvard Business Review*, 88 (4), 74-79.

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.

*Gross, J. J., & Thompson, R. A. (2007). Emotion regulation: Conceptual foundations. In J. J. Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of emotion regulation* (pp. 3-24). New York: Guilford Press.

*Kaplan, S., Dalal, R. S., & Luchman, J. (in press). Measurement of emotions. In R. Sinclair, M. Wang, & L. Tetrick (Eds.), *Research methods in occupational health psychology: State of the art in measurement, design, and data analysis*. Routledge.

*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.

APRIL 26: NO CLASS TODAY

No class today--SIOP conference.

MAY 3: CLASS PRESENTATIONS

No readings.

STUDENT-SELECTED READINGS:

Each student will individually present a reading of his or her choice. *The chosen reading must be*

closely related to the topic of the week, but there are no other restrictions. For example, the chosen reading could be: quantitative or qualitative or theoretical in orientation, an article or a book chapter or a video, something intended for researchers or practitioners or both, something from any academic discipline or no particular academic discipline, and so forth. You should feel free to choose a reading from the list of recommended readings (if you *do* want to choose one of the recommended readings, please let me know a day or two ahead of class so that I do not plan on discussing that reading in class). This is *your* reading: choose something that *you* believe to be interesting and important—and feel free to be creative in your choice!

It is the responsibility of the student presenting a particular reading to edify the rest of us because, in all likelihood, neither the other students nor I will have read the reading you are presenting. Thus, each student should prepare a **10-12** minute long *PowerPoint* presentation that includes: his or her name, a full citation for the reading selected (in American Psychological Association or Academy of Management style) on the very first slide, information regarding why that particular reading was chosen and *how it fits in with the topics covered in class and the readings in the syllabus*, and a summary of the chosen reading (e.g., for an empirical journal article: theoretical framework, hypotheses, methods used, analyses conducted, and conclusions drawn). Please make sure that all slides are numbered. Each presentation will be followed by a brief (no more than **5** minutes) question-and-answer session.

Student-Selected Readings will be presented in class during “regular” class weeks. 1-2 students will present per week. The order of presentations will be decided on the basis of students’ preferences.

APPLIED PROJECT:

This is a group project. You will be working in pairs.

OPTION #1: WIKIPEDIA ENTRY

Your task is to create a Wikipedia entry. The entry should, in effect, be a brief (equivalent to **5-8** double-spaced pages using 12-point font in MS Word—*excluding* the table of contents, references, and any tables or figures) introduction to a particular topic, written at a level accessible to an educated *layperson* (i.e., you should keep jargon to a minimum, avoid acronyms, etc.).

Choose a topic that is explicitly related to the current course, and on which no Wikipedia entry (or at best a “stub”) currently exists. Also, your topic should be “notable”: avoid choosing an overly specific topic, or one on which research has been conducted primarily by a single individual or research team. Keep in mind that your topic does not need to be a psychological construct (e.g., “Job Satisfaction”); it could instead be a theory (e.g., “Cornell Model of Job Satisfaction”) or a real-world application (e.g., “Interventions to Increase Job Satisfaction”) or a

topic that melds two areas (e.g., “Job Satisfaction Contagion”). It may be a good idea to run your proposed topic by me before you begin work on it. You may also want to share your proposed topic with the rest of the class: despite the odds of this being miniscule, in a previous semester it just so happened that two groups wanted to do exactly the same topic!

Your Wikipedia entry should include relevant readings from the syllabus plus other sources obtained by you. *You should have at least 15 references.*

As an example, an entry on a particular psychological construct should include sections like: table of contents (quite important to the “Wikipedia police,” apparently), definition(s), operationalization(s), antecedents, consequences, implications for practice, methodological problems with existing research (if any), and brief descriptions of closely-related constructs (if any). With regard to the last of these topics: If the closely-related constructs have their own existing Wikipedia entries, your article should link to these other entries, and *you should also edit those other entries in order to link them to your own entry.* 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:Tutorial>

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Your_first_article#How_to_create_a_page

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 entries are threefold. First, in the process of creating such articles, students will 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 care to be deluged with psychological jargon and does not view the *Journal of Applied Psychology* as appropriate bedtime reading. The creation of such articles is therefore consistent with the Association for Psychological Science (APS) Wikipedia Initiative:

<http://www.psychologicalscience.org/index.php/members/aps-wikipedia-initiative> (Note: You do *not* need to formally join this initiative). Third, regardless of whether a student intends to go into academia or the applied world, he or she will need to be able to communicate with laypersons. The current assignment will hopefully aid in the development of such skills.

Note that Wikipedia changes rapidly: it is conceivable that, within a matter of hours, your entry may be amended by the “Wikipedia police”--or even, in the very worst case scenario, recommended for deletion! (Fortunately, in previous semesters, none of the Wikipedia articles created by students was ultimately deleted outright, but this remains a possibility.) Thus, please save a pdf version of it as soon as you have submitted it to Wikipedia--and please email me not only the link to the version on Wikipedia but also the pdf version you have saved. Although I

will look at the version on Wikipedia, and although I will ask you to make an attempt to save an entry that has been recommended for deletion by the “Wikipedia police,” rest assured that I will not hold you accountable if your entry is ultimately deleted. In other words, my primary focus will be the content of the material you *submitted*.

Please note that, after you have submitted your Wikipedia entry to me, I may ask you to make some improvements. Students who submit entries that are near-perfect the first time around, as well as those who make a good-faith effort to incorporate my suggestions (or explain cogently why my suggestions are wrong-headed), will receive an “A” on the project.

OPTION #2: WHITE PAPER FOR CLIENT

Your task is to create a white paper on a potentially controversial topic for a client. The white paper should be in MS Word, should use 12-point font, and should be 5-8 double-spaced pages long—*excluding* the table of contents, references, and any tables or figures). Assume that the client is an educated *layperson* (i.e., you should keep jargon to a minimum, avoid acronyms, etc.). Feel free to be creative in terms of format (e.g., using bulleted lists, using pictures/graphics, using footnoted references rather than a separate references section).

Your white paper should include relevant readings from the syllabus (including the *recommended* readings) plus other sources obtained by you. When selecting references, you may need to be creative because the sources you cite may be basic research sources rather than sources that pertain to the specific applied topic you choose for your white paper. *You should have at least 15 references.*

You may pick your own topic, as long as it is *related to the current course*. For example, you could use what you’ve learned about financial incentives and motivation to write a white paper on a topic such as:

- the effect of financial incentives on teacher performance
- the effect of income tax cuts for the wealthy
- the effect of executive compensation on executive performance

Another possibility would be to pick a topic of relevance to the nascent field of Humanitarian Work Psychology (see <http://www.humworkpsy.org>).

It may be a good idea to run your proposed topic by me before you begin work on it. I do not mind if more than one group chooses the same topic, as long as there is no collaboration across groups.

Please note that your white paper, and especially your ultimate recommendations to the client, should be based on the available research evidence (theoretical, empirical, or ideally both), rather than your personal predilections or ideologies. Moreover, please do not over-simplify the topic. For example, if you choose the topic of executive compensation, you should keep in

mind that both the *amount* and the *form* (e.g., salary, gainsharing, stock options) of compensation might influence motivation and, consequently, performance.

Your topic may be one that is covered extensively in other disciplines, such as economics, but I am looking primarily for a psychological--and, in particular, motivation-based, approach to the topic. So, choose your references accordingly.

Please note that, after you have submitted your white paper to me, I may ask you to make some improvements. Students who submit white papers that are near-perfect the first time around, as well as those who make a good-faith effort to incorporate my suggestions (or explain cogently why my suggestions are wrong-headed), will receive an "A" on the project.

Applied Projects are due via email by class time on Thursday, March 22.

RESEARCH PROPOSAL

(BULLETED OUTLINE + IN-CLASS PRESENTATION + TERM PAPER):

This is a *group* project. You will be working in pairs.

Each group of students is required to propose an original research project *explicitly related to the topic of work motivation*. In practical terms, the end product will essentially consist of the **introduction, method, and "anticipated analyses"** sections of an empirical journal article (plus a title page, references section, and any tables and figures that may be required).[†]

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

techniques that could be used to analyze your data.

Note that this is a proposal for *basic* research. It should focus on psychological constructs and their inter-relationships. Hypotheses should ideally be derived from psychological (or other social science) theories. A paper discussing an applied research problem (e.g., a consulting project--“Here is a description of a project I conducted for ELEGANTLY WASTED WINERY, Inc., comparing the levels of employee engagement across the winery’s Production and Sales departments”) is completely inappropriate and will receive a failing grade. If you are unsure about whether your proposal meets the basic research criterion, please talk to me ahead of time.

The topic should be *specific*. For example, whereas “mood at work” or even “antecedents of mood at work” are too broad, something like “ecological momentary assessment of the impact of childcare-related events on mood at work” would be more appropriate. You should propose *original* research: though our discipline should have a place for replications, the current paper is designed in part to assess your creativity—therefore, replications are not suitable here.

The idea is for students to use this opportunity to develop research proposals in areas relevant and interesting to them (while also remaining relevant to the current course). In the past, some students have gone on to conduct the studies they proposed for this course--and I would urge you to try to do the same.

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

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

For both your sanity and mine, the term paper will be fairly short: **10-13**^{††} double-spaced pages of text—that is, *excluding* the title page, references section, and any tables or figures you may have. You do not need an abstract, and you do not need a discussion section. You will need *at least 20 references* in the final paper. The short length of the paper does not preclude the need for thoroughness.

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

- *A bulleted outline*. This should be **3-6** double-spaced pages in length, not counting the references section (you should have at least *13 references* at this stage). The outline should include sections associated with the introduction, method, anticipated analyses, and references. I would strongly urge students to also include a “boxes-and-arrows” figure that summarizes their set of hypotheses. By this stage, you should also have an estimate of (and explanation for) the number of participants you will require.

- *An in-class presentation.* You should have at least *16 references* at this stage. The presentation should include sections associated with the introduction, method, anticipated analyses, and references (and, ideally, a “boxes-and-arrows” figure). Please do not put a lot of text on each slide: instead, use more slides with less text per slide. Please also make sure that all slides are numbered! Each presentation should be **10-12** minutes long, and will be followed by a brief (no more than **4** minutes) question-and-answer session.

I will, of course, provide feedback on outlines and class presentations. The other class members will also provide feedback on the presentations. Additionally, I will provide feedback on the term papers within one week of receiving them. 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).

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

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

Bulleted outlines are due in class on Thursday, April 12.

Class presentations will be in class on Thursday, May 3.

Term Papers are due via email by 10 AM on Thursday, May 10.

GRADING SCHEME:

Class participation (including attendance)	35%
Student-selected reading	10%
Applied project	20%
Research proposal: Bulleted outline	5%
Research proposal: In-class presentation	10%
Research proposal: 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.