

SPRING 2004  
Performance Appraisal Seminar

INSTRUCTOR:	Sylvia Roch, Ph.D.	TA:	Laurel McNall
OFFICE:	Social Science 358	OFFICE:	Social Science 359
HOURS:	MW 3:30-5:00 or by appt.	HOURS:	M 11:15 - 12:15 W 12:45 - 2:45
PHONE:	442-5962	PHONE:	442-5550
EMAIL:	<a href="mailto:roch@albany.edu">roch@albany.edu</a>	EMAIL:	<a href="mailto:lm5865@albany.edu">lm5865@albany.edu</a>

TEXT:

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

SUPPLEMENTARY READINGS:

Additional required readings will consist of selected review papers and empirical journal articles. Optional readings will also be listed in most sections. These optional readings will not be discussed in class. They consist of relevant and often historically important articles and are listed only for additional information.

COURSE OBJECTIVE:

This seminar will review traditional areas of performance appraisal, along with some recent advances. The main objectives of the seminar are to: 1.) provide a solid foundation in the area of performance appraisal, 2.) review recent advances in performance appraisal, 3.) provide a working knowledge of how to design performance appraisal systems, and (4) promote self learning skills. It is important to learn how to gather information not only by listening to an instructor but also by critically reading both empirical and theoretical work and through discussion with peers.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

1. Attendance is mandatory. Active participation in the discussion of the readings is expected and essential for the success of the seminar. This is **NOT** a lecture course. Attendance and participation will count for 15% of your grade. Participation will be judged in terms of the quality of the participation.
2. Before Wednesday's class, you will need to email two discussion questions to Laurel by MONDAY NOON ([lm5865@albany.edu](mailto:lm5865@albany.edu)). Avoid questions of the yes/no variety. Please indicate which article generated the question and attach the questions in a Word document. We will use these questions to help stimulate discussion of the issues raised by the readings. These discussion questions will be worth 5% of your grade.
3. Choose one class session to provide the introduction to the week's readings. In this introduction, you should spend 10 to 15 minutes detailing the underlying theme(s) of the day's reading and the major points of the readings. This introduction should not be a summary of each article but should provide an integrative summary of the readings. For example, what were the themes and main points across all the readings. Also, you should pass out a ONE page summary detailing the major theme(s) of the readings. This introduction will be evaluated by your peers based on their reading of the material and by me. This evaluation will be worth 10% of your grade.
4. Four short papers will be assigned during the semester. Each paper should be 4 to 6 typed double spaced pages and will be worth 7.5% of your grade. These papers will not require outside research. The purpose of these papers is to give you an opportunity to integrate and/or apply the readings.
5. You will be asked to write a 13 to 15 page paper that will be worth 30% of your grade. This paper can either be a research proposal or a technical report. If you choose the technical report option, appendices do not count toward the 13 to 15 pages. I expect 13 to 15 pages of text, regardless of which option is chosen. The idea is due March 3 and the paper/proposal is due the last day of class.

Research Proposal Option: The research proposal should include an introduction, method, and results section. Specifically, the introduction should include a research question, explanation of the importance of the research question, relevant review of research and theory, and hypotheses. The method section should detail the sample to be used, measurement of the concepts, and experimental manipulations (if any). The results section should detail what type of statistical analyses you would use to test each hypothesis (do not provide imaginary results).

Technical Report Option: If you have an internship and/or access to individuals willing to fill out job analysis information regarding a specific position, you may write a technical report. In this technical report, you should create a performance appraisal system for a specific position. The technical report should include an overview (which should include references), job analysis, performance appraisal instrument (one that you created and not an existing instrument), and relevant information needed to implement and evaluate the system. You will also need to cite relevant references to support your decisions.

- During the last week of class (last two weeks if needed), you will be asked to formally present your research proposal. The presentation should be approximately 10 to 15 minutes with another 5 minutes for a question and answer session. This presentation should include handouts, overheads, or powerpoint slides. The presentation will be worth 10% of your grade, and both I and your peers will assess your presentation.

Summary of the course requirement:

Discussion Questions	5%
Introduction	10%
Attendance and Participation	15%
Short Papers	30%
Research Proposal	30%
Presentation	10%

Grades will be given as follows: 90% and above = A, 80%-89% = B, 70-79% = C.

It should be noted, however, that this class is officially a pass/fail class. I will assign grades according to the above schedule but as far as official purposes are concerned, a grade of B or above is passing.

Tentative Seminar Overview

Week of	
Jan. 21	Organizational meeting and general introduction PA.
Jan. 28	What do you appraise?
Feb. 4	Psychometric issues, rating errors and accuracy
Feb. 11	Psychometric issues, other accuracy concerns <b>PAPER 1 ASSIGNED</b>
Feb. 18	How do you measure it? (instruments)
Feb. 25	Training the rater
March 3	Rater cognitive processes <b>PAPER 2 ASSIGNED</b>
March 10	Rater motivation <b>IDEAS DUE FOR PAPER/PROPOSAL</b>
March 17	Moderators (accountability, interpersonal regard, etc.)
March 24	More Moderators (purpose & demographics) <b>PAPER 3 ASSIGNED</b>
March 31	360 degree performance feedback
April 7	Break
April 14	Issues from the ratee's perspective
April 21	More issues from the ratee's perspective and legal issues
April 18	Putting it all together (if needed – start presentations). <b>PAPER 4 ASSIGNED</b>
May 5	Presentations

↳ Proposals are due!

## WEEK 1

**Jan. 21 Organizational meeting and general introduction to PA**

### Required

- Cleveland, J. N., Murphy, K. R., & Williams, R. E. (1989). Multiple uses of performance appraisal: Prevalence and correlates. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(1), 130-135.
- Dipboye, R. L. (1990). Laboratory vs. field research in industrial and organizational psychology. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 5, 1-34 (1-18 required)
- Murphy & Cleveland, pp 1-17, 324-340

## WEEK 2

**Jan. 28 What do you appraise?**

### Required

- Bernardin, H. J., Hagan, C. M., Kane, J. S., & Villanova, P. (1998). Effective performance management: A focus on precision, customers, and situational constraints. In J. W. Smither (Ed.) *Performance appraisal: State of the art and practice* (pp. 3-20 required, 21 – 42 optional), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Heneman, R. L. (1986). The relationship between supervisory ratings and results-oriented measures of performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 39, 811-826
- Murphy & Cleveland, 110-132
- Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance on global ratings of job performance: A policy capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 66-80.

### Optional

- Austin, J.T., & Villanova, P. (1992). The criterion problem: 1917-1992. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(6), 836-874.
- Arvey, R. D., & Murphy, K. R. (1998). Performance evaluation in work settings. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 141-168.
- Borman, W. C, Brush, D. H. (1993). More progress toward a taxonomy of managerial performance requirements. *Human Performance*, 6(1), 1-21
- Bretz, Jr., R. D., Milkovich, G. T., & Read, W. (1992). The current state of performance appraisal research and practice: Concerns, directions, and implications. *Journal of Management*, 18(2), 321-352.
- Harvey, R. J. (1991). Job analysis. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., Vol 2, pp. 85-97, 104-107). Palo Alto, CA: CPP.
- Ilgen, D. R., & Favero, J. L. (1985). Limits in generalization from psychological research to performance appraisal processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(2), 311-321.
- Kane, J. S. (1997). Assessment of the situational and individual components of job performance. *Human Performance*, 10(3), 193-226.
- Murphy, K. R., & Herr, B. M., Lockhart, M. C., & Maguire, E. (1986). Evaluating the performance of paper people. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(4), 654-661.

## WEEK 3

**Feb. 4 Psychometric issues, rating error and accuracy**

### Required

- Balzer, W. K., & Sulsky, L. M. (1992). Halo and performance appraisal research: A critical examination. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(6), 975-985. ✓
- Murphy, K. R., & Balzer, W. K. (1989). Rater errors and rating accuracy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(4), 619-624. ✓
- Murphy & Cleveland pp. 267 – 295 → First half of Chapter 10
- Murphy, K. R., Jako, R. A., Anhalt, R. L. (1993). Nature and consequences of halo error: A critical analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(2), 218-225.
- Sulsky, L. M., & Balzer, W. K. (1988). Meaning and measurement of performance rating accuracy: Some methodological and theoretical concerns. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(3), 497-506.

## WEEK 4

### Feb. 11 Psychometric issues, other accuracy concerns

#### Required

- Dickinson, T. L. (1987). Designs for evaluating the validity and accuracy of performance ratings. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 40, 1-21.
- Kravitz, D. A., & Balzer, W. K. (1992). Context effects in performance appraisal: A methodological critique and empirical study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(1), 24-31.
- Murphy & Cleveland pp. 295-323. → Last half of Chapter 10
- Palmer, J. K., Mauerer, T. J., & Feldman, J. M. (2003). Context and prior impression effects on attention, judgment standards, and ratings: Contrast effects revisited. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(12), 2575-2597
- Sanchez, J. I., & De La Torre, P. (1996). A second look at the relationship between rating and behavioral accuracy in performance appraisal. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(1), 3-10.

#### Optional Readings for Weeks 3 & 4

- Becker, B. E., & Cardy, R. L. (1986). Influence of halo error on appraisal effectiveness: A conceptual and empirical reconsideration. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(4), 662-671.
- Borman, W. C. (1978). Exploring upper limits of reliability and validity in job performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(2), 135-144.
- Cooper, W. H. (1981). Ubiquitous Halo. *Psychological Bulletin*, 90(2), 218-244.
- Feldman, J. M. (1986). A note on the statistical correction of halo error. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(1), 173-176.
- James, W. R. (1973). Criterion models and construct validity for criteria. *Psychological Bulletin*, 80, 75-83.
- Kane, J. S., Bernardin, H. J., Villanova, P., & Peyrefitte, J. (1995). Stability of rater leniency: Three studies. *Academy of Management Journal* 38(4), 1036-1051
- Kane, J. S., & Lawler, E.E. (1979). Performance appraisal effectiveness: Its assessment and determinant. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 1, 425-478
- Roach, D. W., & Gupta, N. (1992). A realistic simulation for assessing the relationships among components of accuracy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(2), 196-200.
- Solomonson, A. L. & Lance, C. E. (1997). Examination of the relationship between true halo and halo error in performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(5), 665-674.
- Scullen, S. E., Mount, M.K., Goff, M. (2000). Understanding the latent structure of job performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(6), 956-970.

## WEEK 5

### Feb. 18 How do you measure it? (Instruments)

#### Required

- 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(5), 965-973.
- Jelley, R. B., & Goffin, R. D. (2001). Can Performance-Feedback Accuracy Be Improved? Effects of Rater Priming and Rating-Scale Format on Rating Accuracy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 134-144
- Latham, G. P., & Wexley, K. N. (1994). *Increasing productivity through performance appraisal* (2nd ed.). Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, pp. 76-105.
- Murphy & Cleveland, pp. 433-441. → Appendix
- Tziner, A., Kopelman, A. (2002). Is there a preferred performance rating format?: A non-psychometric. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 51(3): 479-503
- Woehr, D. J., & Miller, M. J. (1997). Distributional ratings of performance: More evidence for a new rating format. *Journal of Management*, 23(5), 705-720.

#### Optional

- Banks, C. G., & Roberson, L. (1985). Performance appraisers as test developers. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 128-142

- Bernardin, H. J., & Kane, J. S. (1980). A second look at behavioral observation scales. *Personnel Psychology*, 33, 509-813.
- Bernardin, H. J., & Smith, P. C. (1981). A clarification of some issues regarding the development and use of behaviorally anchored rating scales (BARS). *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66(4), 458-463.
- Hartel, C. E. J. (1993). Rating format research revisited: Format effectiveness and acceptability depend on rater characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(2), 212-219.
- Jabobs, R., Kafry, D., & Zedeck, S. (1980). Expectations of behaviorally anchored rating scales. *Personnel Psychology*, 33, 595-640.
- Landy, F. J., & Farr, J. L. (1980). Performance rating. *Psychological Bulletin*, 87(1), 72-107.
- Kane, J. S., & Lawler, E. E. (1979). Performance appraisal effectiveness: Its assessment and determinant. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 1, 425-478. (required p. 463-473)
- Kingstrom, P. O., & Bass, A. R. (1981). A critical analysis of studies comparing behaviorally anchored ratings scales (BARS) and other rating formats. *Personnel Psychology*, 34, 263-289.
- Latham G. P., Saari, L. M., & Fay, C. (1980). BOS, BES, and baloney: Raising Kane with Bernardin. *Personnel Psychology*, 33, 815-821.
- Steiner, D. D., & Rain, J. S., & Smalley, M. M. (1993). Distributional ratings of performance: Further examination of a new rating format. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(3), 438-442.
- Wagner, S. H., & Goffin, R. D. (1997). Differences in accuracy of absolute and comparative performance appraisal methods. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 70(2), 95-103.

## WEEK 6

### Feb. 25 Training the rater

#### Required

- Hauenstein, N. M. A. (1997). Training raters to increase the accuracy of appraisals and the usefulness of feedback. In J. W. Smither (Ed.) *Performance appraisal: State of the art and practice* (pp. 404 - 442), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers
- Keown-Garrard, J. L. & Sulsky, L. M. (2001). The effects of task information training and frame-of-reference training with situational constraints on rating accuracy. *Human Performance*, 14(4), 305-320.
- Woehr, D. J. (1994). Understanding frame-of-reference training: The impact of training on the recall of performance information. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(4), 525-534.
- Woehr, D. J., & Huffcutt, A. I. (1994). Rater training for performance appraisal: A quantitative review. *Journal of Organizational and Occupational Psychology*, 67, 189-205

#### Optional

- Bernardin, H. J. & Buckley, M. R. (1981). Strategies in rater training. *Academy of Management Review*, 6(2), 205-212.
- Bernardin, H. J., & Fence, E. C. (1980). Effects of rater training: Creating new response sets and decreasing accuracy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65(1), 60-66.
- Fay, C. H., & Latham, G. P. (1982). Effects of training and rating scales on rater errors. *Personnel Psychology*, 35, 105-116.
- Hauenstein, N. M. A. (1999). *Rater variability training: An alternative to rater error training and frame of reference training*. Poster presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychologists, Atlanta, GA
- Hedge, J. W., & Kavanagh, M. J. (1988). Improving the accuracy of performance evaluations: Comparison of three methods of performance appraiser training. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(1) 68-73.
- Lievens, F. (2001). Assessor training strategies and their effects on accuracy, interrater reliability, and discriminant validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(2), 255-264
- McIntyre, R. M., Smith, D. E., & Hassett, C. E. (1984). Accuracy of performance ratings as affected by rater training and perceived purpose of rating. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69(1), 147-156.
- Pulakos, E. D. (1984). A comparison of rater training programs: Error training and accuracy training. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69(4), 581-588.

- Roch, S. G., & O'Sullivan, B. J. (2003). An Empirical Investigation of Frame of Reference Rater Training Issues: Recall, Time, and Inclusion of Behavior Observation Training. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 7(2), 93-107.
- Stamououlis, D. T., & Hauenstein, N. M. A. (1993). Rater training and rating accuracy; Training for dimensional accuracy versus training for rater differentiation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 501-510.
- Schlecher, D. J., & Day, D. V. (1998). A cognitive evaluation of frame-of-reference rater training: Content and process issues. *OBHDP*, 73,(1), 76-101.
- Sulsky, L. M., & Day, D. V. (1992). Frame-Of-Reference training and cognitive categorization: An empirical investigation of rater memory issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 501-510
- Sulsky, L. M., & Day, D. V. (1994). Effects of frame-of-reference training on rater accuracy under alternative time delays. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(4), 535-543.

## WEEK 7

### March 3 Rater cognitive processes

#### Required

- DeNisi, A. S., & Williams, K. J. (1988). Cognitive approaches to performance appraisal. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 6, 109-155.
- Ganzach, Y. (1995). Negativity (and positivity) in performance evaluation: Three field studies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(4), 491-499.
- Illgen, D. R., Barnes-Farrell, J. L., & McKellin, D. B. (1993). Performance appraisal process research in the 1980s: What has it contributed to appraisals in use? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, 54, 321-368.
- Murphy & Cleveland, pp. 182-214. → Chapter 7

#### Optional

- Cardy, R. L., & Kehoe, J. F. (1984). Rater selective attention ability and appraisal effectiveness: The effect of cognitive style on the accuracy of differentiation among ratees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69(4), 589-594.
- Feldman, J. M. (1981). Beyond attribution theory: Cognitive processes in performance appraisal. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66(2), 127-148
- Feldman, J. M. (1994). On the synergy between theory and application: Social cognition and performance appraisal. In Wyer, R. S, Jr, & Scroll, T. K. (1994) *Handbook of Social Cognition* (vol. 2). pp 339 – 387.
- Kulik, C. T., & Ambrose, M. L. (1993). Category-based and feature-based processes in performance appraisal: Integrating visual and computerized sources of performance data. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(5), 821-830
- Kinicki, A. J., Hom, P. W., Trost, M. R., & Wade, K. J. (1995). Effects of category prototypes on performance-rating accuracy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(3), 354-370.
- Krzystofiak, F., Cardy, R., & Newman, J. (1988). Implicit personality and performance appraisal: The influence of trait inferences on evaluations of behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(3), 515-521

## WEEK 8

### March 10 Rater motivation

#### Required

- Harris, M. M. (1994). Rater motivation in the performance appraisal context: A theoretical framework. *Journal of Management*, 20(4), 737-756.
- Kozlowski, S. W. J., Chao, G. T., & Morrison, R. F. (1998). Games raters play: Politics, strategies, and impression management in performance appraisal. In J. W. Smither (Ed.), *Performance appraisal: State of the art in practice* (pp. 163-204), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Longenecker, C. O., Sims, H. P., & Gioia, D. A. (1987). Behind the mask: The politics of employee appraisal. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 1(3), 183-193.
- Murphy & Cleveland, pp. 241-266. → Chapter 9

### Optional

- Bartlett, C. J. (1983). Would you know a properly motivated performance appraisal if you saw one? In F. Landy, S. Zedeck, & J. Cleveland (Eds.) *Performance measurement and theory* (pp. 190-194). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers
- Mohrman, Jr., A. M. & Lawler III, E. E. (1983). Motivation and performance-appraisal behavior. In F. Landy, S. Zedeck, & J. Cleveland (Eds.) *Performance measurement and theory* (pp. 173-189). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Roch, S. G., & Woehr, D. J. (1997, August). *The effect of rater motivation on the accuracy of performance appraisal: An NPI approach*. Poster presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.
- Salvemini, N. J., Reilly, R. R. and Smither, J. W. (1993). The influence of rater motivation on assimilation effects and accuracy in performance ratings. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 55, 41-60

### WEEK 9

March 17 Moderators (accountability, interpersonal regard, etc.) ← copy articles

### Required

- ✓ Fried, Y., Levi, A. S., Haim, A. B., & Tieg, R. B. (1999). Inflation of subordinates' performance ratings: Main and interactive effects of rater negative affectivity, documentation of work behavior, and appraisal visibility. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 431-444.
- ✓ Mero, N. P. & Motowidlo, S. J. (1995). Effects of rater accountability on the accuracy and favorability of performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(4), 517-524.
- ✓ Murphy & Cleveland, pp 57-86 → Chapter 3
- ✓ Borman, W. C., White, L. A., & Dorsey, D. W. (1995). Effects of ratee task performance and interpersonal factors on supervisor and peer performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(1), 168-177.
- ✓ Lefkowitz, J. (2000). The role of interpersonal affective regard in supervisory performance ratings: A literature review and proposed causal model. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 73(1), 67-85.

### Optional

- Day, N. E. (1995). Can performance raters be more accurate? Investigating the benefits of prior knowledge of performance dimensions. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 7(3), 323-342.
- Fried, Y., & Tieg, R. B. (1995). Supervisors' role conflict and role ambiguity differential relations with performance ratings of subordinates and the moderating effect of screening ability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(2), 282-291.
- Harris, M. M., Smith, D. E., Champagne, D. (1995). A field study of performance appraisal purpose: Research versus administrative based ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 151-160.
- Klimoski, R. & Inks, L. (1990). Accountability forces in performance appraisal. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 45, 194-208
- Mauer, T. J., Palmer, J. K., & Ashe, D. K. (1993). Diaries, checklists, evaluations, and contrast effects in measurement of behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(2), 226-231.
- Smither, J. W., Reilly, R. R., & Buda, R. (1988). Effect of prior performance information on ratings of present performance: Contrast versus assimilation revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(3), 487-496.
- Woehr, D., & Feldman, J. (1993). Processing objective and question order effects on the causal relation between memory and judgment in performance appraisal. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 232-241.
- Woehr, D. J., & Roch, S. G. (1996). Context effects in performance evaluation: The impact of ratee sex and performance level on performance ratings and behavioral recall. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 66(1), 31-41.
- Williams, K. J., DeNisi, A. S., Meglino, B. M., & Cafferty, T. P. (1986). Initial decisions and subsequent performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(2), 189-195.
- Kiker, D. S., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1999). Main and interaction effects of task and contextual performance on supervisory reward decision. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(4), 602-609.

## WEEK 10

March 24

More Moderators (purpose & demographics)

← Copy articles

→ My introduction

### Required

- ✓ Jawahar, I. M., & Williams, C. R. (1997). Where all the children are above average: The performance appraisal purpose effect. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 905-925.
- ✓ Dobbins, G. H., Cardy, R. L., & Truxillo, D. M. (1988). The effects of purpose of appraisal and individual differences in stereotypes of women on sex differences in performance ratings: A laboratory and field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(3), 551-558.
- ✓ Murphy & Cleveland, pp 87 -109
- ✓ Saks & Waldman (1998). The relationship between age and job performance evaluations for entry-level professions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19, p. 409-419.
- ✓ Roth, P. L., Huffcutt, A. I., & Bobko, P. (2003). Ethnic group differences in measures of job performance: A new meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(4), 694-706.

### Optional

- Benedict, M. E., & Levine, E. L. (1988). Delay and distortion: Tacit influences on performance appraisal effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(3), 507-514.
- Dipboye, R. (1985). Some neglected variables in research on discrimination in appraisals. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 116-127.
- Kraiger, K., & Ford, J. K. (1985). A meta-analysis of rater race effects in performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70(1), 56-65.
- Lowery, C. M., & Krilowicz, T. J. (1994). Relationships among nontask behaviors, rated performance, and objective performance measures. *Psychological Reports*, 74, 571-578.
- Martell, R. F. (1991). Sex bias at work: The effects of attentional and memory demands on performance ratings of men and women. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 21, 1939-1960
- Mount, M. K., Sysma, M. R., Hazucha, J. F., & Holt, K. E. (1997). Rater-ratee race effects in developmental performance ratings of managers. *Personnel Psychology*, 50(1), 51-69.
- 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(2), 201-217.
- Robbins, T. L., & DeNisi, A. S. (1994). A closer look at interpersonal affect as a distinct influence on cognitive processing in performance evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(3), 341-353.
- Schmidt, F. L., Hunter, J. E., & Outerbridge, A. N. (1986). Impact of job experience and ability on job knowledge, work sample performance, and supervisory ratings of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 432-439.
- Villanova, P., Bernardin, H. J., Dahmus, S. A. & Sims, R. L. (1993). Rater leniency and performance appraisal discomfort. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53, 789-799.
- Waung, M., & Highhouse, S. (1997). Fear of conflict and empathic buffering: Two explanations for the inflation of performance feedback. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 71(1), 37-54.

## WEEK 11

April 7

360 Performance Feedback

### Required

- Atwater, L. E., Ostroff, C., Yammarino, F. J., & Fleenor, J. W. (1998). Self-other agreement: Does it really matter. *Personnel Psychology*, 51, 577-598.
- Conway, J., & Huffcutt, A. I. (1997). Psychometric properties of multisource ratings: A meta-analysis of subordinate, supervisor, peer, and self-ratings. *Human Performance*, 10(4), 331-360.
- Dalessio, A. T. (1998). Using multisource feedback for employee development and personnel decisions. In J. W. Smither (Ed.), *Performance appraisal: State of the art in practice* (pp. 278-330, pp 278-311 required), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers
- Murphy & Cleveland, 133-147.

Walker, A. G., & Smither, J. W. (1999). A five-year study of upward feedback: What managers do with their results matters. *Personnel Psychology*, 52, 393-423.

Viswesvaran, Schmidt, & Ones (2002). The moderating influence of job performance dimensions on convergence of supervisory and peer ratings of job performance: Unconfounding construct-level convergence and rating difficulty. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 345-354.

### Optional

Atwater, L.E.. (1998). The advantages and pitfalls of self-assessment in organizations. In J. W. Smither (Ed.), *Performance appraisal: State of the art in practice* (pp. 278-330), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers

Antonioni, D. (1994). The effects of feedback accountability on upward appraisal ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, 47, 349-356.

Ash, A. (1994). Participants' reactions to subordinate appraisal of managers: Results of a pilot. *Public Personnel Management*, 23(2), 237-256.

Facteau, J. D., & Craig, S. B. (2001). Are performance appraisal ratings from different rating sources comparable? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(2), 215-227.

✓ Harris, M. M., & Schaubroeck, J. (1988). A meta-analysis of self-supervisor, self-peer, and peer-supervisor ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, 41, 43-62. **IMPORTANT ARTICLE**

Johnson, J. W., & Ferstl, K. L. (1999). The effects of interrater and self-other agreement on performance improvement following upward feedback. *Personnel Psychology*, 52, 271-303.

Kane, J. S., & Lawler III, E. E. (1978). Methods of peer assessment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 85(3), 55 London, M., Smither, J.W., & Adsit, D. J. (1997). Accountability: The Achilles' heel of multisource feedback. *Group and Organizational Management*, 22(2), 162-179.5-586.

Makiney, J. D., & Levy, P. E. (1998). The influence of self-ratings versus peer ratings on supervisors' performance judgments. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 74(3), 212-228.

✓ McEvoy, G. M., & Buller, P. F. (1987). User acceptance of peer appraisal in an industrial setting. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 785-797.

✓ Mount, M. K., Judge, T. A., Scullen, S. E., Sytsma, M. R., Hezlett, S. A. (1998). Trait, rater, and level effects in 360-degree performance ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, 51, 557-577.

Ramsay, M. L., & Lehto, H. (1994). The power of peer review. *Training and Development*, 38-41.

Schrader, B. W., & Steiner, D. D. (1996). Common comparison standards: An approach to improving agreement between self and supervisory performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(6), 813-820.

Tornow, W. W. (1993). Perceptions or reality: Is multiperspective measurement a means or an end? *Human Resource Management*, 32(2&3), 221-229.

Viswesvaran, C., Ones, D. S., & Schmidt, F. L. (1996). Comparative analysis of the reliability of job performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 557-574

### **WEEK 12** HAVE THESE

#### **April 14 Issues from the ratee's perspective, fairness**

#### Required

Bartol, K. M., Durham, C. C., & Poon, J. M. L. (2001). Influence of performance evaluation rating segmentation on motivation and fairness perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6), 1106-1119.

Cobb, A. T., Vest, M., & Hills, F. (1997). Who delivers justice? Source perceptions of procedural fairness. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 27(12), 1021-1040.

Gilliland, S. W., & Langdon, J. C. (1998). Creating performance management systems that promote perceptions of fairness. In J. W. Smither (Ed.), *Performance appraisal: State of the art in practice* (pp. 278-330), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers

Greenberg, J. (1986). Determinants of perceived fairness of performance appraisal. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(2), 340-342.

Optional

Pearce, J. L., & Porter, W. P. (1986). Employee responses to formal performance appraisal feedback. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(2), 211-218.

Williams, J. R., & Levy, P. E. (2000). Investigating neglected criteria: The influence of organizational level and perceived system knowledge on appraisal reactions. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 14(3), 501-513.

Zuber, E. P., & Behson, S. J. (1998). *The relationship between performance appraisal session characteristics and rater reactions: A meta-analytic review*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA

**WEEK 13**

**April 21**

**More rater issues (acceptability) and legal issues**

Required

**Rater Reactions**

Hedge, J. W., & Teachout, M. S. (2000). Exploring the concept of acceptability as a criterion for evaluation performance measures. *Group and Organization Management*, 25(1), 22-44.

Keeping, L. M., & Levy, P. E. (2000). Performance appraisal reactions: Measurement, modeling, and method bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 708-723.

**Legal Issues**

Malos, S. B. (1998). Current legal issues in performance appraisal. In J. W. Smither (Ed.), *Performance appraisal: State of the art in practice* (pp. 49-94), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Werner, J. M., & Bolino, M. C. (1997). Explaining U.S. Courts of Appeals decisions involving performance appraisal: Accuracy, fairness, and validation. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 1-25

Optional

\* Feild, H. S., & Holley, W. H. (1982). The relationship of performance appraisal system characteristics to verdicts in selected employment discrimination cases. *Academy of Management Journal*, 25(2), 392-406.

\* Barrett G. V., & Kernan M. C. (1987). Performance appraisal and terminations: A review of court decisions since Brito V. Zia with implications for personnel practices. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 489-503

**WEEK 14**

**April 28**

**Putting it all together**

Required

Mohrman, A. M., Jr., Resnick-West, S. M., & Lawler III, E. E. (1989). *Designing performance appraisal systems: Aligning appraisals and organizational realities*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, pp. 1-47, 107-130.

Murphy & Cleveland, pp. 379-405.