Course Syllabus – PSY 634: Personnel Selection
Spring Semester 2005, Thursday, 11 a.m. – 2 p.m., SH 429A

Instructor: Margaret Beier, Ph.D.
email: beier@rice.edu
Phone: 713-348-3920
Office: SH 429C
Office hours: by appointment

Texts: Guion, R. M. (1998). *Assessment, measurement, and prediction for personnel decisions*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (2003). *Principles for the validation and use of personnel selection procedures* (4th ed.) (This can be downloaded from the SIOP Website.)

Additional readings are provided in PDF format on the CD provided. Let me know if you have any difficulty printing off or retrieving the articles.

Objectives

This course is an advanced graduate seminar designed to provide an overview of personnel selection from the perspective of industrial/organizational psychology. The course will examine the theory, research, and practice perspectives of selection. It is designed not only to give you an overview of the field, but to get you involved in discussion and to assist you in formulating your own ideas about the area. Thus, the major objective of this course is for you to develop your own perspective about personnel selection.

Grading

Class participation (10%)
Daily discussion questions (10%)
Job analysis project (15%)
Legal case project (15%)
Research Proposal (50%)
- Outline, 5%
- Paper, 30%
- Presentation, 15%

Grades will be calculated on the following scale:

100 - 98% = A+	89 - 88% = B+	79 - 78% = C+	69 - 68% = D+	59 - 0% = F
97 - 93 % = A	87 - 83 % = B	77 - 73 % = C	67 - 63 % = D	
92 - 90 % = A-	82 - 80 % = B-	72 - 70 % = C-	62 - 60 % = D-	

Class Participation & Daily Discussion Questions

It is essential that you be present and participative in the class discussion. To facilitate class discussion please have at least 2 discussion questions for *each* article/chapter assigned, and bring notes regarding terms/topics that you want to discuss. Your daily discussion questions grade is based on the thoughtfulness and thoroughness of the questions and notes you write for each chapter. Please bring two copies of your discussion questions each week (one to hand in to me).

Your class participation grade will be based on (a) voicing your reflections on the readings (e.g., by noting positive contributions and constructive criticisms), (b) getting others in the class involved (e.g., by asking questions, having stimulating discussion/debate), (c) contributing information and experiences that supplement the readings, and obviously (d) attending class and being on time.

Job Analysis Project

The goal of this assignment is to give you some exposure (albeit abbreviated) to the process and outcomes of job analysis. In this exercise, you will practice conducting an interview and direct observation for a job. The job can be one that you are interested in or one that you have easy access to (e.g., TA, coffee shop worker, etc.).

The requirements of the assignment are:

- Select a job that you have some interest in/or familiarity with.
- Select a person who holds that position (cannot be yourself).
- Conduct an initial interview and a direct observation. (Your interview should be 15-30 minutes in length, and your observation should be at least 30 minutes in length.)
- Create a list of task statements; categorize them in an organized fashion. (Should have ~50 task statements - real job analyses have 300-500.)
- Create corresponding KSAOs for each task.
- Rate the tasks and KSAOs on frequency and importance.
- Write a one-page description of how you conducted the job analysis, and how the results could be used to make personnel decisions.
- Turn in the one-page description, task statements, KSAOs, and KSAO ratings.

Legal Case Study

We will be examining two cases; Malabarba vs. Chicago Tribune Company (1998) and Watson vs. Fort Worth Bank and Trust (1988). Half of you will present the Malabarba case and the other half the Watson case. The briefings for these cases are available on the CD that contains the course readings. The assignment is to write up a summary of the case including the general issues in the case, the key findings relevant to employment, and your interpretation of what it means for selection practices. Your group will turn your summary in to me and present it to the class (informally). Everyone in your group will receive the same grade. If there are problems with group participation, please see me BEFORE the project is due.

Research Proposal (Outline/Paper/Presentation)

One of the goals of this seminar is to get you to focus on research in personnel selection. As such, you will develop a research proposal as part of your participation in this seminar. The proposal counts for a large portion of your grade (i.e., 50%), and will include three distinct parts; an outline that you will turn in to me (5%); a presentation given to the class on the last day of class (15%) and a written proposal (30%). The topic of the proposal is your choice, but it must be relevant to course content, written in APA style, and it should be around 15-20 pages in length. You must turn in a statement of your topic idea for instructor approval on 2/17 (send me an email).

Grading criteria for the proposal are:
Adequacy of literature review
Rationale for hypotheses
Meaningfulness of research question
Feasibility of the study (it should be something that can actually be done)
Soundness of proposed methodology and analysis
Clarity of presentation (including APA style)
Please note that you may NOT turn in a proposal that you have written for another course or graduate school requirement (e.g., your MS proposal) to meet this course requirement.

You will be deducted 5 points for every day (i.e., 24 hr period) your paper is late.

Presentations should outline the research question, briefly review the literature, and present the proposed study (e.g., methods). Grading criteria for the presentation are clarity of presentation and ability to answer questions from the audience. Class members are expected to provide feedback and to ask questions during the presentations. The maximum amount of time for the presentations will be determined by the number of people in the class (180 min/N). You should plan on a minimum of 30 mins.

Disabilities and special needs

If a student has a documented disability and needs academic assistance in this or any other course, he or she should so inform the instructor within the first two weeks of classes. All discussions will remain confidential. Students should contact the instructor after class, during office hours, or by e-mail. The student may also need to register with the Disability Support Services, especially if unusual accommodations are needed. Before providing accommodations, instructors must have accommodations letters from the Disability Support Services office.

Academic Integrity

You are expected to follow the Rice University Honor Code. Any form of scholastic dishonesty (e.g., plagiarism, cheating) can result in a variety of negative consequences (not the least of which is failing this course).

Course Schedule

Topics, readings, and assignments tentatively follow the schedule below. Due dates for class assignments will not change, but dates for seminar topics might. *All assignments are due at the beginning of class on the due date*. Extensions will not be granted. 5 points will be deducted for every day an assignment is late.

Date	Topic	Readings	Assignments
1/13 Week 1	Syllabus Measurement overview	Syllabus Guion, Ch. 5, 6	**Assign legal cases**
1/20 Week 2	Overview and history of personnel selection	Guion, Ch. 1 Schmitt, Cortina, Ingerick, & Wiechmann, 2003 Katzell & Austin, 1992 Salgado, 2001	
1/27 Week 3	Job Analysis	Guion, Ch. 2 Morgeson & Campion, 1997 Dye & Silver, 1999 Brannick & Levine, 2002 Jeanneret & Strong, 2003	
2/3 Week 4	Job Performance	Guion, Ch. 3 Campbell et al., 1993 LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002 Campbell, 1999 Schmitt & Chan,1998, Ch. 8	**Job analysis project due**
2/10 Week 5	Performance Appraisal	Guion, Ch. 12 Murphy & Cleveland, 1995 (Ch. 1 & Ch. 5) Facteau & Craig, 2001 Borman, et al., 2001	
2/17 Week 6	Validity and Utility of Predictors of Job Performance	Guion, Ch. 7 Borsboom, Mellenbergh, & vanHeerden, 2004 Campbell, 1990 Binning & Barrett, 1989 Cabrera & Raju, 2001	**Research proposal topic to me for approval**

Date	Topic	Readings	Assignments
2/24 Week 7	Legal Issues	Guion, Ch. 4 Sackett & Ellingson, 1997 Campion et al., 2001 Gollub Williamson et al., 1997	**Legal case study project due**
3/3 Week 8	Bias and Group Differences	Guion, Ch. 10 Marlowe, Schneider, & Nelson, 1996 Schmitt & Mills, 2001 Sackett, Schmitt, Ellingson, & Kabin, 2001 Hough, Oswald, & Ployhart, 2001 Cullen, Hardison, & Sackett, 2004	
3/10	*Spring Break, No Class*		
3/17 Week 9	Testing and validity	Guion, Ch. 11, Ch. 13 pp. 591-606 SIOP Principles, 2003	
3/24 Week 10	Predictors	Barrick & Mount, 1991 Hunter & Hunter, 1984 Schmidt & Hunter, 1998 Sackett, Gruys, & Ellingson, 1998 Allworth & Hesketh, 2000 Kanfer, Ackerman, Murtha, & Goff, 1995 Kanfer & Kantrowitz, 2002	**Research proposal outline due**
3/31 Week 11	Issues in prediction	Guion, Ch. 8 Murphy & Shiarella, 1997 Ackerman, 1994 DuBois, Sackett, Zedeck, & Fogli, 1993 Hanges, Schneider, & Niles, 1990 Hoffman, Jacobs, & Baratta, 1993 Farrell & McDaniel, 2001	
4/7	*Spring Recess (no class)*		

Date	Topic	Readings	Assignments
4/14 Week 12	Interviews and Assessment Centers	Guion, Ch. 13, pp. 606-624; Guion Ch. 14, 638-668 Posthuma, Morgeson, & Campion, 2002 Cortina, Goldstein, Payne, Davison, & Gilliland, 2000 Bray, 1982 Lievens, 2002 Collins et al., 2003	
4/21 Week 13	Applicant Reactions and Recruiting	Rynes, 1993 Hausknecht, Day, & Thomas, 2004 Ryan & Ployhart, 2000 Ryan et al., 2000 Rynes & Cable, 2003	
4/28 Week 14	Student Presentations		**Research proposal due, beginning of class (11 a.m.)**

Readings

Ackerman, P. L. (1994). Intelligence, attention, and learning: Maximal and typical performance. In D. K. Detterman (Ed.) *Current topics in human intelligence; volume 4: Theories of intelligence (*pp. 1-27). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Allworth, E., & Hesketh, B. (2000). Job requirements biodata as a predictor of performance in customer service roles. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 8*, 137-147.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 1-26.

Binning, J. F., & Barrett, G. V. (1989). Validity of personnel decisions: A conceptual analysis of the inferential and evidential bases. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 478-494.

Borman, W. C., Buck, D. E., Hanson, M. A., Motowidlo, S. J., Stark, S., & 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.

Borsboom, D., Mellenbergh, G. J., & van Heerden, J. (2004). The concept of validity. *Psychological Review, 111*, 1061-1071.

Brannick, M. T., & Levine, E. L. (2002). Doing a job analysis study. In *Job analysis: Methods, research, and applications for human resource management in the new millennium* (Ch. 9, pp. 265-294). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bray, D. W. (1982). The assessment center and the study of lives. *American Psychologist, 37*, 180-189.

Cabrera, E. F., & Raju, J. S. (2001). Utility analysis: Current trends and future directions. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9*, 92-102.

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* (Vol. 1, pp. 687-732). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Campbell, J. P. (1999). The definition and measurement of performance in the new age. In D. R. Ilgen & E. D. Pulakos (Eds.), The changing nature of performance: Implications for staffing, motivation, and development (pp. 399-429). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H., & Sager, C. E. (1993). A theory of performance. In N. Schmitt & W. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 35-70). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Campion, J. A., Outtz, J. L., Zedeck, S., Schmidt, F. L., Kehoe, J. F., Murphy, K. R., & Guion, R. G. (2001). The controversy over score banding in personnel selection: Answers to 10 key questions. *Personnel Psychology, 54*, 149-185.

Collins, J. M., Schmidt, F. L., Sanchez-Ku, M., Thomas, L., McDaniel, M. A., & Le, H. (2003). Can basic individual differences shed light on the construct meaning of assessment center evaluations? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 11*, 17-29.

Cortina, J. M., Goldstein, N. B., Payne, S., Davison, H. K., & Gilliland, S. W. (2000). The incremental validity of interview scores over and above cognitive ability and conscientiousness scores. *Personnel Psychology, 53,* 325-351.

Cullen, M. J., Hardison, C. M., & Sackett, P. R. (2004). Using SAT-grade and ability-job performance relationships to test predictions derived from stereotype threat theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89,* 220-230.

DuBois, C. L. Z., Sackett, P. R., Zedeck, S., & Fogli, L. (1993). Further exploration of typical and maximum performance criteria: Definitional issues, prediction, and white-black differences. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78,* 205-211.

Dye, D. & Silver, M. (1999). The origins of O*NET. In N. G. Peterson, M. D. Mumford, W. C. Borman, P. R. Jeanneret, & E. A. Fleishman (Eds.). *An occupational information system for the 21st century: The development of O*NET.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Facteau, J. D. & Craig, S. B. (2001). Are performance appraisal ratings from different rating sources comparable? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 215-227.

Farrell, J. N., & McDaniel, M. A. (2001). The stability of validity coefficients over time: Ackerman's (1988) model and the General Aptitude Test Battery. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 60-79.

Gollub Williamson, L., Campion, J. E., Malos, S. B., Roehling, M. V., & Campion, M. A. (1997). Employment interview on trial: Linking interview structure with litigation outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82,* 900-912.

Hanges, P. J., Schneider, B., & Niles, K. (1990). Stability of performance: An interactionist perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75,* 658-667.

Hausknecht, J. P., Day, D. V., & Thomas, S. C. (2004). Applicant reactions to selection procedures: An updated model and meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 57,* 639-683.

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

Hough, L. M., Oswald, F. L., & Ployhart, R. E. (2001). Determinants, detection, and amelioration of adverse impact in personnel selection procedures: Issues, evidence, and lessons learned. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9,* 152-194.

Hunter, J. E., & Hunter, R. F. (1984). Validity and utility of alternative predictors of job performance. *Psychological Bulletin, 96,* 72-98.

Jeanneret, P. R., & Strong, M. H. (2003). Linking O*Net job analysis information to job requirement predictors: An O*Net application. *Personnel Psychology, 56,* 465-492.

Kanfer, R., Ackerman, P. L., Murtha, T., & Goff, M. (1995). Personality and intelligence in industrial and organizational psychology. In D. H. Saklofske & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *International handbook of personality and intelligence* (pp. 577-602). NY: Plenum Press.

Kanfer, R., & Kantrowitz, T. M. (2002). Ability and non-ability predictors of job

performance. In S. Sonnentag (Ed.), *Psychological management of individual performance* (pp. 27-50). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.

Katzell, R. A., & Austin, J. T. (1992). From then to now: The development of industrial-organizational psychology in the United States. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77,* 803-835.

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.

Lievens, F. (2002). Trying to understand the different pieces of the construct validity puzzle of assessment centers: An examination of assessor and assessee effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 675-686.

Marlowe, C. M., Schneider, S. L., & Nelson, C. E. (1996). Gender and attractiveness biases in hiring decisions: Are more experienced managers less biased? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81,* 11-21.

Morgeson, F. P., & Campion, M. A. (1997). Social and cognitive sources of potential inaccuracy in job analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82,* 627-655.

Murphy, K. R., & Cleveland, J. N. (1995). *Understanding performance appraisal: Social, organizational, and goal-based perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Murphy, K. R., & Shiarella, A. H. (1997). Implications of the multidimensional nature of job performance for the validity of selection tests: Multivariate frameworks for studying test validity. *Personnel Psychology, 50,* 823-854.

Posthuma, R. A., Morgeson, F. P., & Campion, M. A. (2002). Beyond employment interview validity: A comprehensive narrative review of recent research and trends over time. *Personnel Psychology, 55,* 1-81.

Ryan, A. M., Sacco, J. M., McFarland, L. A., & Kriska, S. D. (2000). Applicant self-selection: Correlates of withdrawal from a multiple hurdle process. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85,* 163-179.

Ryan, A. M., & Ployhart, R. E. (2000). Applicants' perceptions of selection procedures and decisions: A critical review and agenda for the future. *Journal of Management, 26,* 565-606.

Rynes, S. L. (1993). Who's selecting whom? Effects of selection practices on applicant attitudes and behavior. In N. Schmitt, W. C. Borman and associates (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 240 – 274). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rynes, S. L., & Cable, D. M. (2003). Recruitment research in the twenty-first century. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, R. J. Klimoski, & I. B. Weiner (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Vol. 12. Industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 55-76). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.

Sackett, P. R., & Ellingson, J. E. (1997). The effects of forming multi-predictor composites on group differences and adverse impact. *Personnel Psychology, 50,* 707-721.

Sackett, P. R., Gruys, M. L., & Ellingson, J. E. (1998). Ability-personality interactions when predicting job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83,* 545-556.

Sackett, P. R., Schmitt, N., Ellingson, J. E., & Kabin, M. B. (2001). High-stakes testing in employment, credentialing, and higher education: Prospects in a post-affirmative action world. *American Psychologist, 56,* 302-318.

Salgado, J. F. (2001). Some landmarks of 100 years of scientific personnel selection at the beginning of the new century. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9,* 3-8.

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

Schmitt, N. & Chan, D. (1998). The changing nature of work and implications for research on KSAO-performance relationships. In *Personnel selection: A theoretical approach* (Ch. 8, pp. 262-293).

Schmitt, N., Cortina, J. M., Ingerick, M. J., & Wiechmann, D. (2003). Personnel selectionp and employee performance. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, R. J. Klimoski, & I. B. Weiner (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Vol. 12. Industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 77-105). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.

Schmitt, N. & Mills, A. E. (2001). Traditional tests and job simulations: Minority and majority performance and test validities. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 451-458.

Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (2003). *Principles for the validation and use of personnel selection procedures* (4th ed.)