PSYC*7020, Course Outline: Winter 2025

General Information

Course Title: Employee Performance

Course Description: This course focuses on issues that related to employee performance. Individuals and organizations are interested in maximizing the contributions of employees at work. This course focuses on models of job performance, performance distributions, dynamic performance, performance appraisal, predictors and ways to improve performance, as well as other job performance related topics.

Credit Weight: 0.50

Academic Department (or campus): Psychology

Semester Offering: Winter 2025

Class Schedule and Location: 8:30-11:20AM Fridays MCKN 119A

Instructor Information

Instructor Name: Jeffrey Spence
Instructor Email: spencejr@uoguelph.ca
Office location and office hours: By appointment

GTA Information

No TA for this course.

Course Content

Specific Learning Outcomes:

1) Depth and Breadth of Understanding: Students should be able to: demonstrate mastery of a body of knowledge; gather, review, evaluate, and interpret information; compare the merits of alternate hypotheses in core areas of I/O psychology; and critically evaluate the limits of their own knowledge and how these limits influence analysis.

2) Reading Comprehension: The understanding of theoretical and empirical literature on job performance and related topics. Students should demonstrate a well-developed ability to extract theoretical and empirical information from complex psychological articles, and to generate ideas and questions from written text in the field of psychology.

3) Inquiry and Analysis: A systematic process of exploring issues, objects and works in psychology through the collection and analysis of evidence that result in informed conclusions or judgments. Students should be able to: ask and attempt to answer many questions from a critical perspective, develop novel hypotheses to explore further possibilities, and plan quality research.

4) Methodological Literacy: The ability to understand, evaluate, and design appropriate methodologies for rigorous psychological science. Students should be able to: design appropriate methodologies for novel psychological research situations, and tailor methodologies to particular populations and circumstances.

5) Written Communication: The ability to express one's ideas and summarize theory and research through a variety of writing styles. Students should: write in a sophisticated manner clearly conveying their message to a target audience, use a breadth of vocabulary appropriate to the discipline of psychology, effectively edit their own work; and avoid grammar, spelling, and structural errors.

6) Oral Communication: Includes interpersonal skills, oral speaking and active listening as they apply to the class topic. Students should be able to demonstrate the ability to present information in ways that the receiving party can easily understand, exhibit confidence as a public speaker, facilitate discussion of complex concepts effectively, actively listen, reflect upon, and respond effectively to questions while acknowledging limitations to one's psychological knowledge.

Lecture Content:

Block 1: Defining and understanding job performance

Week 1: Orientation, schedule presentation and discussion leading. Statistics/methods orientation and review.
Week 2: What is job performance? Models and definitions of job performance and a framework for the course
Week 3: Performance distributions I (presentations start)
Week 4: Cumulative Advantage
Week 5: Dynamic Performance

Block 2: Measuring job performance

Week 6: Performance appraisal and Performance Management
Week 7: Performance rating context
Week 8: Feedback
Week 9: Future of performance appraisals?

Block 3: Individual Difference Predictors

Week 10: General mental ability and job performance
Week 11: Personality, emotional intelligence, and job performance

Block 4: Improving Performance

Week 12: Ability x Motivation

Course Assignments and Tests:

Assignment or Test	Due Date	Contribution to Final Mark (%)	Learning Outcomes Assessed
In-class participation	**Graded each week.**	**25%**	**1-6**
Weekly discussion questions	**Graded each week.**	**20%**	**1-5**
Discussion leading	**Scheduled throughout term.**	**15%**	**1-6**
Presentation	**Scheduled throughout term.**	**20%**	**1-6**
Final paper	**April 4**	**20%**	**1-5**

Additional Notes (if required):

In-class participation (25%). Being present both physically (attendance) and psychologically (active listening, participating, and refraining from other activities during presentations, discussions, and practical exercises (e.g., off topic phone and laptop activity). Each class students will receive a grade between 0-5. Refraining from off topic activities = 2 points, 1 point for listening, 2 points for participating. Unaccounted for absence results in a grade of 0/5 for the week. 12 classes each worth 5 points = 60 points total.

Weekly discussion comments (20%). Every week that there are assigned discussion readings (weeks 3 through 12), students will be required to submit comments and critiques of the articles to facilitate the discussion period. For each of the assigned readings, students need to submit reflections and critiques based on their own opinions. Students will receive a grade out of 4 for turning in their questions: 2 points for completion and 2 points for demonstrating effort and thought in generating comments and critiques.

What to avoid: Your comments should not consist of a summary of what you have read. Your comment should not consist of things you do not understand in the readings.

Ideas for discussion comments: Is adequate support provided for the conclusions? Are there alternative explanations? Do the results conflict with other findings or theory? Are there

practical applications that the findings could inform? Is there a next experiment that you can propose that would extend the research?

Discussion Leading (15%). Each week 1-2 students will be responsible for assisting in leading two in-class discussions based on assigned readings. You need to come to class with a prepared list of questions, comments, observations, and critical evaluations that you wish to pose to the class as a result of the readings. At the beginning of class, you will need to hand in your list of questions, comments, observations, and critical evaluations.

Presentation (20%). Students will present on a chosen topic provided in course outline. Presentations should be 30-40 minutes and will be scored out of 100. Goal of presentation is to educate and instruct class on the selected topic/question and to practice presentation skills.

Final Paper (20%). Students will submit a final paper based on a topic covered in the course. The final paper will be formatted as a grant/scholarship proposal for a program of research. That is, the paper will propose several studies investigating a question.

Final examination date and time: No final exam.

Course Resources

Required Texts:

Weekly readings will be acquired independently by students. References for readings are provided in course outline.

Other Resources:

Courselink website will contain all other relevant information or materials.

Field Trips:

No field trips.

Additional Costs:

No additional costs.

Course Policies

Grading Policies

All assignments will be graded in accordance with standards established by the University of Guelph. Graduate Grade interpretation

Failure to present selected topic will result in grade of zero.

Discussion questions submitted after the start of class will receive a grade of zero.
Final papers submitted after April 4th will be penalized 10% each day.

Please note that these policies are binding unless academic consideration is given to an individual student.

Course Policy regarding use of electronic devices and recording of lectures:

Electronic recording of classes is expressly forbidden without consent of the instructor. When recordings are permitted they are solely for the use of the authorized student and may not be reproduced, or transmitted to others, without the express written consent of the instructor.

University Policies

Academic Consideration

When you find yourself unable to meet an in-course requirement because of illness or compassionate reasons, please advise the course instructor in writing, with your name, id#, and e-mail contact. See the academic calendar for information on regulations and procedures for

Academic Consideration:
Grounds for Academic Consideration

Medical notes will not normally be required for singular instances of academic consideration, although students may be required to provide supporting documentation for multiple missed assessments or when involving a large part of a course (e.g., final exam or major assignment).

Academic Misconduct

The University of Guelph is committed to upholding the highest standards of academic integrity and it is the responsibility of all members of the University community, faculty, staff, and students to be aware of what constitutes academic misconduct and to do as much as possible to prevent academic offences from occurring.

University of Guelph students have the responsibility of abiding by the University's policy on academic misconduct regardless of their location of study; faculty, staff and students have the responsibility of supporting an environment that discourages misconduct. Students need to remain aware that instructors have access to and the right to use electronic and other means of detection. Please note: Whether or not a student intended to commit academic misconduct is not relevant for a finding of guilt. Hurried or careless submission of assignments does not excuse students from responsibility for verifying the academic integrity of their work before submitting it. Students who are in any doubt as to whether an action on their part could be construed as an academic offence should consult with a faculty member or faculty advisor.

The Academic Misconduct Policy is detailed in the Graduate Calendar:

Accessibility

The University of Guelph is committed to creating a barrier-free environment. Providing services for students is a shared responsibility among students, faculty and administrators. This relationship is based on respect of individual rights, the dignity of the individual and the University community's shared commitment to an open and supportive learning environment. Students requiring service or accommodation, whether due to an identified, ongoing disability or a short-term disability should contact Student Accessibility Services as soon as possible.

For more information, contact SAS at 519-824-4120 ext. 54335 or email accessibility@uoguelph.ca or the Student Accessibility Services Website

Course Evaluation Information

Please refer to the Course and Instructor Evaluation Website **.**

Drop date

The last date to drop one-semester courses, without academic penalty, is April 4, 2025. For regulations and procedures for Dropping Courses, see Current Graduate Calendar

Course Schedule:
Readings, Topics, and Practical Exercises
(The content and schedule may be subject to change. Students will be notified of changes in lectures and on Courselink of any change)

Block 1: Defining and understanding job performance

Week 1 (Jan. 10): Introduction, orientation, schedule presentations and discussion leading.

Week 2 (Jan. 17): What is job performance? Models and definitions of job performance and a framework for the course.

Campbell, J. P., Gasser, M. B., & Oswald, F. L. (1996). The substantive nature of job performance variability. In K. R. Murphy (Ed.), Individual differences and behavior in organizations (pp. 258 –299). 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. C. Borman (Eds.), Personnel selection in organizations (pp. 35–70). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Viswevaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2000). Perspectives on models of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 8,* 216-226.

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 influence. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90,* 108-131.

Week 3 (Jan. 24): Performance distributions

Focal Readings:

O'Boyle, E., & Aguinis, H. (2012). The best and the rest: Revisiting the norm of normality of individual performance. *Personnel Psychology, 65,* 79-119.

Aguinis, H., O'Boyle, E., Gonzalez-Mule, E., & Joo, H. (2016). Cumulative advantage: Conductors and insulators of heavy-tailed productivity distributions and productivity stars. *Personnel Psychology, 69,* 3-66.

Joo, H., Aguinis, & Bradley, K. J. (2017). Not all nonnormal distributions are created equal: Improved Theoretical and Measurement Precision. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102,* 1022-1053.

Vancouver, J. B., Li, X., Weinhardt, J. M., Steel, P., & Purl, J. D. (2016). Using a computational

model to understand possible sources of skews in distributions of job performance. *Personnel Psychology, 69,* 931-974.

Presentation Topic: *Awards and Outcomes*

Awards and productivity:

Borjas, G. J., & Doran, K. B. (2015). Prizes and productivity: How winning fields medal affects scientific output. *Journal of Human Resources, 50,* 728-758.

Faria, J. R., & McAdam, P. (2015). Academic productivity before and after tenure: the case of the 'specialist'. *Oxford Economic Papers, 67,* 291-309.

Li, J., Yin, Y., Fortunato, S., & Wang, D. (2020). Scientific elite revisited: Patterns of productivity, collaboration, authorship and impact. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, *17*(165), 20200135.

Awards and longevity:

Chetty, R., Stepner, M., Abraham, S., Lin, S., Scuderi, B., Turner, N., ... & Cutler, D. (2016). The association between income and life expectancy in the United States, 2001-2014. *Jama*, *315*, 1750-1766.

Link, B. G., Carpiano, R. M., & Weden, M. M. (2013). Can honorific awards give us clues about the connection between socioeconomic status and mortality? *American Sociological Review, 78,* 192-212.

Rablen, M. D., & Oswald, A. J. (2008). Mortality and immortality: The Nobel Prize as an experiment into the effect of status upon longevity. *Journal of Health Economics, 27,* 1462-1471.

Week 4 (Jan. 31): Cumulative Advantage

Krauss, A., Danús, L., & Sales-Pardo, M. (2023). Early-career factors largely determine the future impact of prominent researchers: evidence across eight scientific fields. *Scientific Reports*, *13*(1), 18794.

Oldroyd, J. B., & Morris, S. S. (2012). Catching falling stars: A human resource response to social capital's detrimental effect of information overload on star employees. *Academy of Management Review*, *37*(3), 396-418.

Siler, K., Vincent-Lamarre, P., Sugimoto, C. R., & Larivière, V. (2022). Cumulative advantage and citation performance of repeat authors in scholarly journals. *Plos one*, *17*(4), e0265831.

Presentation Topics: *The Birth of and History of Management Consulting*

Kipping, M. (2003). The evolution of management consultancy: its origins and global development. In B. Curnow & J. Reuvid (Eds.), *The international guide to management consultancy: The evolution, practice and structure of management consultancy worldwide* (pp. 21-32). Kogan Page.

McKenna, C. D. (1995). The origins of modern management consulting. *Business and Economic History, 25,* 51-58.

Kipping, M. (2011). Hollow from the start? Image professionalism in management consulting. *Current Sociology, 59,* 530-550.

Suddaby, R., & Greenwood, R. (2001). Colonizing knowledge: Commodification as a dynamic of jurisdictional expansion in professional service firms. *Human Relations, 54,* 933-953.

Week 5 (Feb. 7): Dynamic Performance

Focal Readings:

Dalal, R. S., Bhave, D. P., & Fiset, J., (2014). Within-person variability in job performance: A theoretical review and research agenda. *Journal of Management, 40,* 1396-1436.

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,* 1054-1068.

Sturman, M. C. (2003). Searching for the inverted U-Shaped relationship between time and performance: Meta-analyses of the experience/performance, tenure/performance, and age/performance relationships. *Journal of Management, 29,* 609-640.

Bonus:

Huckman, R. S., & Pisano, G. P. (2006). The firm specificity of individual performance: Evidence from cardiac surgery. *Management science*, *52*, 473-488.

Groysberg, B., Lee, L. E., & Nanda, A. (2008). Can they take it with them? The portability of star knowledge workers' performance. *Management Science*, *54*, 1213-1230.

Presentation topics: Performance metrics in academia

Aguinis, H., Cummings, C., Ramani, R. S., & Cummings, T. G. (2020). "An A is an A": The new bottom line for valuing academic research. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *34*(1), 135-154.

Who is "Ike Antkare"?

Hirsch, J. E. (2005). An index to quantify an individual's scientific research output.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA, 102, 16569–16572. doi:10.1073/ pnas.0507655102

Cano-Fernandez, A. (2021). Publish, publish…cursed! *Scientometrics, 126,* 3673-3682.

Moreira, J. A. G, Zeng X. H. T., & Amaral L. A. N. (2015) The Distribution of the Asymptotic Number of Citations to Sets of Publications by a Researcher or from an Academic Department Are Consistent with a Discrete Lognormal Model. PLOS ONE 10(11): e0143108. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0143108

Uttl, B., White, C. A., & Wong Gonzalez, D. (2017). Meta-analysis of faculty's teaching effectiveness: Student evaluation of teaching ratings and student learning are not related. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 54,* 22-42.

Block 2: Measuring Job Performance

Week 6 (Feb. 14): Performance appraisal and Performance Management

Focal Readings:

DeNisi, A. S., & Murphy, K. R. (2017). Performance appraisal and performance management: 100 years of progress? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102,* 421-433.

Schleicher, D.J., Baumann, H. M., Sullivan, D. W., Levy, P. E., Hargrove, D. C., & Barros-Rivera, B. A. (2018). Putting the *system* into performance management systems: A review and agenda for performance management research. *Journal of Management, 44,* 2209-2245.

Scullen, S. E., & Mount, M. K. (2000). Understanding the latent structure of job performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85,* 956-970.

Presentation Topics: *Time management*

Claessens, B. J. C., van Eerde, W., & Rutte, C. G. (2007). A review of the time management literature. *Personnel Review, 36,* 255-276.

Aeon, B., & Aguinis, H. (2017). It's about time: New perspectives and insights on time management. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 31,* 1-20.

Rapp, A. A., Bachrach, D. G., & Rapp, T. L. (2013). The influence of time management skill on the curvilinear relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98,* 668-677.

---------- Reading Week (no class on Feb. 21) ----------

Week 7 (Feb. 28): Performance rating context

Focal Readings:

Erez, A., Schilpzand, P., Leavitt, K., Woolum, A. H., & Judge, T. A. (2015). Inherently relational: interactions between peers' and individuals' personalities impact reward giving and appraisal of individual performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 58,* 1761-1784.

Ellington, J. K. & Wilson, M. A. (2017). The performance appraisal milieu: A multilevel analysis of context effects in performance ratings. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 32,* 87-100.

Harari, M. B., & Rudolph, C. W. (2017). The effect of rater accountability on performance ratings: A meta-analytic review. *Human Resource Management Review, 27,* 121-133.

Presentations Topic: *Forced Distribution and Stacked Ranking Systems*

Moon, S. H., Scullen, S. E., & Latham, G. P. (2016). Precarious curve ahead: The effects of forced distribution rating systems on job performance. *Human Resource Management Review*, *26*, 166-179.

Schleicher, D. J., Bull, R. A., & Green, S. G. (2009). Rater reactions to forced distribution rating systems. *Journal of Management*, *35*, 899-927.

Scullen, S. E., Bergey, P. K., & Aiman-Smith, L. (2005). Forced distribution rating systems and the improvement of workforce potential: A baseline simulation. *Personnel Psychology*, *58*, 1-32.

Week 8: (March 7) Feedback

Focal Readings:

Anseel, F., & Sherf, E. N. (2025). A 25-Year Review of Research on Feedback in Organizations: From Simple Rules to Complex Realities. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior* (in press).

Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: a historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological bulletin*, *119*(2), 254.

Mertens, S., Schollaert, E., & Anseel, F. (2021). How much feedback do employees need? A field study of absolute feedback frequency reports and performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *29*, 326-335.

Tseng, S. T., Levy, P. E., Aw Young, S. H., Thibodeau, R. K., & Zhang, X. (2019). Frequent feedback in modern organizations: Panacea or fad? In L. A. Steelman, & J. R. Williams (Eds.), *Feedback at work (*pp. 53-73): Springer.

Presentations topic: Historical Perspectives**:** Scientific management (Taylorism, time motion), Relevance for today?

Baumgart, A., & Neuhauser, D. (2009). Frank and Lillian Gilbreth: scientific management in the operating room. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, *18*, 413-415.

Peaucelle, J. L. (2000). From Taylorism to post-Taylorism: Simultaneously pursuing several management objectives. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *13*, 452-467.

Price, B. (1989). Frank and Lillian Gilbreth and the manufacture and marketing of motion study, 1908-1924. *Business and economic history*, 88-98.

Littler, C. R. (1978). Understanding Taylorism. *British Journal of Sociology*, *29,* 185-202.

Week 9: (March 14) Future of Performance Appraisals?

Focal Readings:

Adler, S., Campion, M., Colquitt, A., Grubb, A., Murphy, K., Ollander-Krane, R., Pulakos, E. E. D. (2016). Getting rid of performance: Genius or folly? A debate. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 9,* 219-252.

Meyer, H. H., Kay, E., French, J. R. P. (1965). Split roles in performance appraisal. *Harvard Business Review, 43,* 123-129.

Pulakos, E. D., & O'Leary, R. S. (2011). Why is performance management broken? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 4,* 146-164.

Goler, L., Gale, J., & Grant, A. (2016). Let's not kill performance evaluations yet. *Harvard Business Review* https://hbr.org/2016/11/lets-not-kill-performance-evaluations-yet

Levy, P. E., Tseng, S. T., Rosen, C. C., & Lueke, S. B. (2017). Performance management: A marriage between practice and science–Just say "I do". In *Research in personnel and human resources management* (Vol. 35, pp. 155-213). Emerald Publishing Limited.

Presentations topic: *Talent Management*

Cappelli, P., & Keller, J. R. (2014). Talent management: Conceptual approaches and practical challenges. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *1*, 305-331.

Collings, D. G. (2014). The contribution of talent management to organization success. *The*

Wiley Blackwell handbook of the psychology of training, development, and performance improvement, 247-260.

Björkman, I., Ehrnrooth, M., Mäkelä, K., Smale, A., & Sumelius, J. (2013). Talent or not? Employee reactions to talent identification. *Human Resource Management*, *52*, 195-214.

Block 3: Individual Difference Predictors

Week 10 (March 21): General mental ability and job performance

Focal Readings:

Gonzalez-Mulé, E., Mount, M. K., & Oh, I. S. (2014). A meta-analysis of the relationship between general mental ability and nontask performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *99*, 1222-1243.

Harris-Watson, A. M., Miller, J. D., & Carter, N. T. (2024). Revisiting the Inhibitory Effect of General Mental Ability on Counterproductive Work Behavior: The Case for GMA-Personality Interaction. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 1-30.

Schmidt, F., & Hunter, J. (2004). General Mental Ability in the World of Work: Occupational Attainment and Job Performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86,* 162-173.

Salgado, J. F., Anderson, N., Moscoso, S., Bertua, C., de Fruyt, F., & Rolland, J. P. (2003). A Meta-Analytic Study of General Mental Ability Validity for Different Occupations in the European Community. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 1068-1081.

Judge, T. A., Klinger, R. L., Simon, L. S. (2010). Time is on my side: Time, general mental ability, human capital, and extrinsic career success. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95,* 92-107.

Presentation topics: *GMA and…*

Life expectancy:

Batty, D. G., Deary, I. J. & Gottfredson, L. S. (2007). Premorbid (early life) IQ and later mortality risk: Systematic review. *Annals of Epidemiology, 17,* 278-288.

Bijwaard, G. E., van Poppel, F., Ekamper, P., & Lumey, L. H. (2015). Gains in life expectancy associated with higher education in men. *PloS one*, *10*, e0141200.

Calvin, C. M., Deary, I. J., Fenton, C., Roberts, B. A., Der, G., Leckenby, N., & Batty, G. D. (2011).

Intelligence in youth and all-cause-mortality: systematic review with meta-analysis. *International journal of epidemiology*, *40*, 626-644.

Sanchez-Izquierdo, M., Fernandez-Ballesteros, R., Valeriano-Lorenzo, E. L., & Botella, J. (2023). Intelligence and life expectancy in late adulthood: A meta-analysis. *Intelligence*, *98*, 101738.

Academic achievement:

Meyer, J., Lüdtke, O., Schmidt, F. T., Fleckenstein, J., Trautwein, U., & Köller, O. (2024). Conscientiousness and cognitive ability as predictors of academic achievement: Evidence of synergistic effects from integrative data analysis. *European Journal of Personality*, *38,* 36-52.

Chess:

Bilalić, M., McLeod, P., & Gobet, F. (2007). Does chess need intelligence?—A study with young chess players. *Intelligence*, 35, 457-470.

Burgoyne, A. P., Sala, G., Gobet, F., Macnamara, B. N., Campitelli, G., & Hambrick, D. Z. (2016). The relationship between cognitive ability and chess skill: A comprehensive meta-analysis. *Intelligence, 59,* 72-83.

Grabner, R. H. (2014). The role of intelligence for performance in the prototypical expertise domain of chess. *Intelligence*, *45*, 26-33.

Week 11 (March 28): Personality and emotional intelligence predicting job performance

Focal Readings:

Le, H., Oh, I., Robbins, S. B., Ilies, R., Holland. E., & Westrick, P. (2011). Too much of a good thing: Curvilinear relationships between personality traits and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96,* 113-133.

Salgado, J. F. (2010). Predicting job performance using FFM and non-FFM personality measures. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 76,* 323-346.

O'Boyle, E. H., Humphrey, R. H., & Pollack, J. M. (2011). The relation between emotional intelligence and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 32,* 788-818.

Presentation topics: *Grit or (and?) Mindset Theory*

Grit

Duckworth, A. L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M. D., & Kelly, D. R. (2007) Grit: Perseverance and passion for long-term goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92,* 1087-1101.

Crédé, M., Tyan, M. C., & Harms, P. D. (2017). Much ado about grit: A meta-analytic synthesis of the grit literature. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 113,* 492-511.

Mindset Theory

Burnette, J. L., Billingsley, J., Banks, G. C., Knouse, L. E., Hoyt, C. L., Pollack, J. M., & Simon, S. (2023). A systematic review and meta-analysis of growth mindset interventions: For whom, how, and why might such interventions work? *Psychological bulletin*, *149*, 174-205.

Dweck, C. S., & Yeager, D. S. (2019). Mindsets: A view from two eras. *Perspectives on Psychological science*, *14*, 481-496.

Macnamara, B. N., & Burgoyne, A. P. (2023). Do growth mindset interventions impact students' academic achievement? A systematic review and meta-analysis with recommendations for best practices. *Psychological bulletin*, *149*, 133.

Yeager, D. S., & Dweck, C. S. (2020). What can be learned from growth mindset controversies? A*merican psychologist*, *75*, 1269-1284.

Block 4: Improving Performance

Week 12 (April 4): Ability X Motivation

Van Iddenkinge, C. H., Aguinis, H., Mackey, J. D., & DeOrtentiis, P. S. (2018). A meta-analysis of the interactive, additive, and relative effects of cognitive ability and motivation on performance. *Journal of Management, 44,* 249-279.

Vancouver, J. B., Carlson B. W., Dhanani, L. Y., Colton, C. E. (2021). Interpreting moderated multiple regression: A comment on Van Iddekinge, Aguinis, Mackey, and DeOrtentiis (2018). *Journal of Applied Psychology, 106,* 467-475.

Zhang, X. A., Liao, H., Li, N., & Colbert, A. E. (2020). Playing it safe for my family: Exploring the dual effects of family motivation on employee productivity and creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, *63*, 1923-1950.

Presentation Topics: Deliberate practice and expertise

Ackerman, P. L. (2014). Nonsense, common sense, and science of expert performance: Talent and individual differences. *Intelligence*, *45*, 6-17.

Ericsson, K. A. (2004). Deliberate practice and the acquisition and maintenance of expert performance in medicine and related domains. *Academic Medicine, 79,* S70-S81.

Hambrick, D. Z., Oswald, F. L., Altmann, E. M., Meinz, E. J., Gobet, F., & Campitelli, G. (2014). Deliberate practice: Is that all it takes to become an expert? *Intelligence*, *45*, 34-45.

Macnamara, B. N., Hambrick, D. Z., & Oswald, F. L. (2014). Deliberate practice and performance in music, games, sports, education, and professions: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Science, 25,* 1608–1618.