

# **MGMT 8260 -- Seminar in Human Resource Management II**

Department of Management  
Fogelman College of Business & Economics  
University of Memphis

**Spring 2009**

Instructor: Charles A. Pierce, Ph.D.; Professor of HR Management  
Office: FCB 201  
Office Phone: (901) 678-3159  
E-mail: [capierce@memphis.edu](mailto:capierce@memphis.edu)  
Web: <http://profiles.memphis.edu/capierce>  
Office Hours: Mon & Wed 4:00-5:30pm or by appointment  
Class Time: Wed 1:00-4:00pm; FCB 361

## **Course Overview and Objectives**

This doctoral-level course addresses the scientific study of managing human resources in business organizations. The emphasis is on current and classic theory and research in human resource management. The course is offered in a research seminar format. You read and study very carefully an assigned list of readings in preparation for each class meeting. As a group, we discuss and critique the assigned set of readings for each topic. I do not lecture on any of the readings or course content. Instead, at least one student is responsible for leading/facilitating the class discussion on each topic. For each assigned reading, when applicable, it is important for you to understand and focus on the following: review of relevant literature, major research propositions, theoretical rationale, hypotheses, research methods and data-analysis strategies, empirical results, value-added contributions to theory, research, and practice in human resource management, study limitations, and directions for future research.

Because of time constraints, the research topics and assigned readings are not comprehensive. You are thus strongly encouraged to pursue supplemental readings to extend your knowledge of theory and research in human resource management. In this research seminar, we cover the following topics from a scientific perspective: legal issues in human resource management, ethical issues in human resource management, job analysis, reliability and validity of predictors in employee selection, validity generalization and meta-analysis, fairness in employee selection decisions, biases in performance appraisals, implementation of training and development programs, and evaluation of training and development programs.

The main objectives of this research seminar are as follows:

- read, discuss, and critique current and classic scientific literature in human resource management
- provide an understanding of legal, ethical, and effective human resource management practices in business organizations
- write a research proposal that addresses a timely, novel, and important question in human resource management from a scientific perspective
- provide doctoral students with knowledge that enables them to pursue answers to important research questions in human resource management
- prepare management doctoral students for their comprehensive examination in human resource management

## Required Course Readings

1. Cascio, W.F., & Aguinis, H. (2005). Applied psychology in human resource management (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
2. Scholarly journal articles from the human resource management literature (see list of required course readings below).

## Highly Recommended Supplemental Course Readings

### Books

1. Gatewood, R.D., Feild, H.S., & Barrick, M. (2008). Human resource selection (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Mason, OH: Thomson/South-Western.
2. Ployhart, R.E., Schneider, B., & Schmitt, N. (2006). Staffing organizations: Contemporary practice and theory (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
3. Noe, R.A. (2008). Employee training and development (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
4. Ghiselli, E.E., Campbell, J.P., & Zedeck, S. (1981). Measurement theory for the behavioral sciences. San Francisco: Freeman.
5. Hunter, J.E., & Schmidt, F.L. (2004). Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

### Journal Articles & Chapters

6. Lengnick-Hall, C.A., & Lengnick-Hall, M.L. (1988). Strategic human resource management: A review of the literature and a proposed typology. Academy of Management Review, 13, 454-470.
7. Wright, P.M., & McMahan, G.C. (1992). Theoretical perspectives for strategic human resource management. Journal of Management, 18, 295-320.
8. Huselid, M.A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. Academy of Management Journal, 38, 635-672.
9. Becker, B., & Gerhart, B. (1996). The impact of human resource management on organizational performance: Progress and prospects. Academy of Management Journal, 39, 779-801.
10. Delaney, J.T., & Huselid, M.A. (1996). The impact of human resource management practices on perceptions of organizational performance. Academy of Management Journal, 39, 949-969.
11. Arvey, R.D., & Murphy, K.R. (1998). Performance evaluation in work settings. Annual Review of Psychology, 49, 141-168.
12. Wright, P.M., & Snell, S.A. (1998). Toward a unifying framework for exploring fit and flexibility in strategic human resource management. Academy of Management Review, 23, 756-772.
13. Wright, P.M., Gardner, T.M., Moynihan, L.M., & Allen, M.R. (2005). The relationship between HR practices and firm performance: Examining causal order. Personnel Psychology, 58, 409-446.
14. Becker, B.E., & Huselid, M.A. (2006). Strategic human resources management: Where do we go from here? Journal of Management, 32, 898-925.

15. Ployhart, R.E. (2006). Staffing in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: New challenges and strategic opportunities. Journal of Management, 32, 868-897.
16. Potosky, D. (2008). A conceptual framework for the role of the administration medium in the personnel assessment process. Academy of Management Review, 33, 629-648.
17. Toh, S.M., Morgeson, F.P., & Campion, M.A. (2008). Human resource configurations: Investigating fit with the organizational context. Journal of Applied Psychology, 93, 864-882.
18. Birdi, K. et al. (2008). The impact of human resource and operational management practices on company productivity: A longitudinal study. Personnel Psychology, 61, 467-501.
19. Tenbrunsel, A.E., & Smith-Crowe, K. (2008). Ethical decision making: Where we've been and where we're going. Academy of Management Annals, 2, 545-607.
20. Hao-Chieh, L., & Chih-Ting, S. (2008). How executive SHRM system links to firm performance: The perspectives of upper echelon and competitive dynamics. Journal of Management, 34, 853-881.
21. Van Iddekinge, C.H., & Ployhart, R.E. (2008). Developments in the criterion-related validation of selection procedures: A critical review and recommendations for practice. Personnel Psychology, 61, 871-925.
22. Sackett, P.R., & Lievens, F. (2008). Personnel selection. Annual Review of Psychology, 59, 419-450.
23. Aguinis, H., & Kraiger, K. (2009). Benefits of training and development for individuals and teams, organizations, and society. Annual Review of Psychology, 60, 451-474.

## Course Requirements

1. Leading/Facilitating Group Discussions. Each student is required to lead/facilitate at least one in-class discussion of the assigned readings for a particular week's topic. During the first part of class, the facilitator must "teach" us about the theories, hypotheses, methods, results, and implications of each assigned reading. During the second part of class, the facilitator should "foster" discussions amongst us on issues such as strengths and weaknesses of the research, unresolved issues, directions for future research, etc. All students should be prepared to discuss the assigned readings during each class meeting. The presenter should prepare and furnish handouts for each of us that summarize the main points of each assigned reading. I realize that some students are more orally expressive than others. It is important in our profession that we be able to express our ideas with colleagues both orally and in writing. If you are not expressive, please motivate yourself to speak-up in class. If you are overly expressive, please include others in your discussions. Leading/facilitating group discussions and participation in class discussions is worth 100 points.
2. Research Proposal & In-class Presentation. Each student must write and submit a scientific research proposal. The topic of your research proposal must be within the domain of human resource management topics covered in this course. Exceptions may be approved by me on a case-by-case basis. Each student must have his or her proposal topic approved by me no later than the fourth week of class. Please choose a research topic that is of great interest to you, not one that you think may interest me. The research proposal must be no longer than 20 double-spaced, single-sided, typewritten pages including references. The style and format of the proposal must adhere to the guidelines set forth in **one** of the following sources: *APA Publication Manual* (2001, 5<sup>th</sup> ed.), *Academy of Management Journal*, or *Academy of Management Review*. The proposal must include the following sections: title page; abstract; introduction with a statement of the problem, review of relevant literature, hypothesis(es) development, and theoretical underpinnings/rationale for testing your hypothesis(es); method with a proposed research design, methodology, and data-analysis strategy; expected results that link to your hypothesis(es); discussion that addresses implications of your expected results for theory, research, and practice in human resource management along with potential study limitations. You should use the research articles assigned for this course as "models" for writing your proposal. At the end of the course (Wed April 22 & 29), each student must give an oral presentation of his or her research proposal to the class. The purpose of this oral presentation is for students to receive feedback from me and from other students. In addition, the presentation serves as practice for presentations you will make at professional meetings and job interviews. The use of PowerPoint overheads is strongly recommended. The written research proposal is worth 100 points. The in-class presentation of your research proposal is worth 50 points.
3. Exam. A three-hour cumulative exam is administered toward the end of the course (Wed April 15). The exam consists of essay questions based on all assigned readings. The purpose of the exam is to assess your knowledge and understanding of the assigned readings in human resource management. You should be able to integrate, compare and contrast, and critique constructively all of the assigned readings. The exam is worth 100 points.

## Course Grading

Final course grades are assigned based on the total number of points you accumulate as follows (total number of possible points is 350):

- A = 315 or above
- B = 280 - 314
- C = 245 - 279
- D = 210 - 244
- F = 209 or below

## Academic Integrity & Students with Disabilities

Each student is expected to recognize and to uphold standards of intellectual and academic integrity as stipulated in the University of Memphis General Catalog, Faculty Handbook, and Undergraduate Co-Curricular Affairs Handbook. Specifically, students should refrain from any and all forms of dishonorable or unethical conduct related to their academic coursework. This includes, but is not limited to, plagiarism, cheating on examinations, unauthorized collaboration, falsification, and multiple submissions of **identical** research papers or proposals (see me if you have questions about multiple submissions as exceptions may be made). Finally, reasonable and appropriate accommodations will be provided to students with disabilities who present a memo from Student Disability Services (SDS). Students who request disability accommodations without a memo must contact SDS. The SDS website is located at <http://saweb.memphis.edu/sds>.

## Course Calendar

<u>Class Date</u>	<u>Topic</u>
January 21	Course Introduction
January 28	Legal Issues in Human Resource Management
February 4	Ethical Issues in Human Resource Management
February 11	Job Analysis
February 18	Reliability & Validity of Predictors in Employee Selection
February 25	Validity Generalization & Meta-analysis
March 4	Fairness in Employee Selection Decisions
March 11	<b>Spring Break</b>
March 18	Fairness in Employee Selection Decisions
March 25	Biases in Performance Appraisals
April 1	Implementation of Training & Development Programs
April 8	Evaluation of Training & Development Programs
April 15	<b>Exam</b>
April 22	<b>Research Proposal Presentations</b>
April 29	<b>Research Proposal Presentations; Research Proposals Due</b>

## Required Course Readings

### Legal Issues in Human Resource Management

Cascio & Aguinis (2005). Chpts 1, 2, & 3

1. Terpstra, D.E., & Baker, D.D. (1992). Outcomes of federal court decisions on sexual harassment. Academy of Management Journal, *35*, 181-190.
2. Lengnick-Hall, M.L. (1995). Sexual harassment research: A methodological critique. Personnel Psychology, *48*, 841-864.
3. Pierce, C.A., Aguinis, H., & Adams, S.K.R. (2000). Effects of a dissolved workplace romance and rater characteristics on responses to a sexual harassment accusation. Academy of Management Journal, *43*, 869-880.
4. Wiener, R.L., & Hurt, L.E. (2000). How do people evaluate social sexual conduct at work?: A psycholegal model. Journal of Applied Psychology, *85*, 75-85.
5. Wiener, R.L., Hackney, A., Kadela, K., Rauch, S., Seib, H., Warren, L., & Hurt, L.E. (2002). The fit and implementation of sexual harassment law to workplace evaluations. Journal of Applied Psychology, *87*, 747-764.
6. Willness, C.R., Steel, P., & Lee, K. (2007). A meta-analysis of the antecedents and consequences of workplace sexual harassment. Personnel Psychology, *60*, 127-162.

### Ethical Issues in Human Resource Management

Cascio & Aguinis (2005). Chpt 18

1. Trevino, L.K. (1986). Ethical decision making in organizations: A person-situation interactionist model. Academy of Management Review, *11*, 601-617.
2. Jones, T.M. (1991). Ethical decision making by individuals in organizations: An issue contingent model. Academy of Management Review, *16*, 366-395.
3. Bowes-Sperry, L., & Powell, G.N. (1999). Observers' reactions to social-sexual behavior at work: An ethical decision making perspective. Journal of Management, *25*, 779-802.
4. O'Leary-Kelly, A.M., & Bowes-Sperry, L. (2001). Sexual harassment as unethical behavior: The role of moral intensity. Human Resource Management Review, *11*, 73-92.
5. Pierce, C.A., Broberg, B.J., McClure, J.R., & Aguinis, H. (2004). Responding to sexual harassment complaints: Effects of a dissolved workplace romance on decision-making standards. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, *95*, 66-82.
6. Pierce, C.A., & Aguinis, H. (in press). Moving beyond a legal-centric approach to managing workplace romances: Organizationally sensible recommendations for HR leaders. Human Resource Management.

## **Job Analysis**

Cascio & Aguinis (2005). Chpt 9

1. Levine, E.L., May, D.M., Ulm, R.A., & Gordon, T.R. (1997). A methodology for developing and validating minimum qualifications (MQs). Personnel Psychology, *50*, 1009-1023.
2. Morgeson, F.P., & Campion, M.A. (1997). Social and cognitive sources of potential inaccuracy in job analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, *82*, 627-655.
3. Peterson, N.G. et al. (2001). Understanding work using the Occupational Information Network (O\*Net): Implications for practice and research. Personnel Psychology, *54*, 451-492.
4. Dierdorff, E.C., & Wilson, M.A. (2003). A meta-analysis of job analysis reliability. Journal of Applied Psychology, *88*, 635-646.
5. 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.
6. Morgeson, F.P., Delaney-Klinger, K., Mayfield, M.S., Ferrara, P., & Campion, M.A. (2004). Self-presentation processes in job analysis: A field experiment investigating inflation in abilities, tasks, and competencies. Journal of Applied Psychology, *89*, 674-686.

## **Reliability & Validity of Predictors in Employee Selection**

Cascio & Aguinis (2005). Chpt 6 & 7

1. Mount, M.K., Muchinsky, P.M., & Hanser, L.M. (1977). The predictive validity of a work sample: A laboratory study. Personnel Psychology, *30*, 637-645.
2. Sackett, P.R., Burris, L.R., & Callahan, C. (1989). Integrity testing for personnel selection: An update. Personnel Psychology, *42*, 491-529.
3. Schippmann, J.S., Prien, E.P., & Katz, J.A. (1990). Reliability and validity of in-basket performance measures. Personnel Psychology, *43*, 837-859.
4. Conway, J.M., Jako, R.A., & Goodman, D.F. (1995). A meta-analysis of interrater and internal consistency reliability of selection interviews. Journal of Applied Psychology, *80*, 565-579.
5. Mount, M.K., Witt, L.A., & Barrick, M.R. (2000). Incremental validity of empirically keyed biodata scales over GMA and the five factor personality constructs. Personnel Psychology, *53*, 299-323.
6. Schmidt, F.L., & Zimmerman, R.D. (2004). A counterintuitive hypothesis about employment interview validity and some supporting evidence. Journal of Applied Psychology, *89*, 553-561.
7. Roth, P.L., Bobko, P., & McFarland, L.A. (2005). A meta-analysis of work sample test validity: Updating and integrating some classic literature. Personnel Psychology, *58*, 1009-1037.

## Validity Generalization & Meta-Analysis

Cascio & Aguinis (2005). Chpt 7 (pp. 176-180)

1. Schmidt, F.L., & Hunter, J.E. (1977). Development of a general solution to the problem of validity generalization. Journal of Applied Psychology, *62*, 529-540.
2. Schmidt, F.L., Pearlman, K., Hunter, J.E., & Hirsch, H.R. (1985). Forty questions about validity generalization and meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, *38*, 697-798.
3. James, L.R., Demaree, R.G., & Mulaik, S.A. (1986). A note on validity generalization procedures. Journal of Applied Psychology, *71*, 440-450.
4. Schmidt, F.L., Hunter, J.E., & Raju, N.S. (1988). Validity generalization and situational specificity: A second look at the 75% rule and Fisher's z transformation. Journal of Applied Psychology, *73*, 665-672.
5. James, L.R., Demaree, R.G., Mulaik, S.A., & Mumford, M.D. (1988). Validity generalization: Rejoinder to Schmidt, Hunter, and Raju (1988). Journal of Applied Psychology, *73*, 673-678.
6. Schmidt, F.L., Law, K., Hunter, J.E., Rothstein, H.R., et al. (1993). Refinements in validity generalization methods: Implications for the situational specificity hypothesis. Journal of Applied Psychology, *78*, 3-12.
7. Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D.S. (1995). Theory testing: Combining psychometric meta-analysis and structural equations modeling. Personnel Psychology, *48*, 865-885.
8. Erez, A., Bloom, M.C., & Wells, M.T. (1996). Using random rather than fixed effects models in meta-analysis: Implications for situational specificity and validity generalization. Personnel Psychology, *49*, 275-306.
9. Aguinis, H., Sturman, M.C., & Pierce, C.A. (2008). Comparison of three meta-analytic procedures for estimating moderating effects of categorical variables. Organizational Research Methods, *11*, 9-34.

## Fairness in Employee Selection Decisions

Cascio & Aguinis (2005). Chpt 8

1. Cleary, T.A. (1968). Test bias: Prediction of grades of negro and white students in integrated colleges. Journal of Educational Measurement, *5*, 115-124.
2. Bartlett, C.J., Bobko, P., Mosier, S.B., & Hannan, R. (1978). Testing for fairness with a moderated multiple regression strategy: An alternative to differential analysis. Personnel Psychology, *31*, 233-241.
3. Gilliland, S.W. (1993). The perceived fairness of selection systems: An organizational justice perspective. Academy of Management Review, *18*, 694-734.
4. Maxwell, S.E., & Arvey, R.D. (1993). The search for predictors with high validity and low adverse impact: Compatible or incompatible goals? Journal of Applied Psychology, *78*, 433-437.
5. Gilliland, S.W. (1994). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to a selection system. Journal of Applied Psychology, *79*, 691-701.
6. Steiner, D.D., & Gilliland, S.W. (1996). Fairness reactions to personnel selection techniques in France and the United States. Journal of Applied Psychology, *81*, 134-141.

7. Elkins, T.J., & Phillips, J.S. (2000). Job context, selection decision outcome, and the perceived fairness of selection tests: Biodata as an illustrative case. Journal of Applied Psychology, 85, 479-484.
8. Campion, M.A., Outtz, J.L., Zedeck, S., Schmidt, F.L., Kehoe, J.F., Murphy, K.R., & Guion, R.M. (2001). The controversy over score banding in personnel selection: Answers to 10 key questions. Personnel Psychology, 54, 149-185.
9. Sackett, P.R., Laczko, R.M., & Lippe, Z.P. (2003). Differential prediction and the use of multiple predictors: The omitted variables problem. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88, 1046-1056.
10. 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.
11. Aguinis, H., & Smith, M.A. (2007). Understanding the impact of test validity and bias on selection errors and adverse impact in human resource selection. Personnel Psychology, 60, 165-199.

## **Biases in Performance Appraisals**

Cascio & Aguinis (2005). Chpt 5

1. Schoorman, F.D. (1988). Escalation bias in performance appraisals: An unintended consequence of supervisor participation in hiring decisions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 73, 58-62.
2. Murphy, K.R., & Pardaffy, V.A. (1989). Bias in Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales: Global or scale-specific? Journal of Applied Psychology, 74, 343-346.
3. Murphy, K.R., Jako, R.A., & Anhalt, R.L. (1993). Nature and consequences of halo error: A critical analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 218-225.
4. Kane, J.S., Bernardin, H.J., Villanova, P., & Peyrfitte, J. (1995). Stability of rater leniency: Three studies. Academy of Management Journal, 38, 1036-1051.
5. Varma, A., Denisi, A.S., & Peters, L.H. (1996). Interpersonal affect and performance appraisal: A field study. Personnel Psychology, 49, 341-360.
6. Jawahar, I.M., & Williams, C.R. (1997). Where all the children are above average: The performance appraisal purpose effect. Personnel Psychology, 50, 905-925.
7. Stauffer, J.M., & Buckley, M.R. (2005). The existence and nature of racial bias in supervisory ratings. Journal of Applied Psychology, 90, 586-591.

## **Implementation of Training & Development Programs**

Cascio & Aguinis (2005). Chpt 15

1. Gist, M.E. (1989). The influence of training method on self-efficacy and idea generation among managers. Personnel Psychology, *42*, 787-805.
2. Bretz, R.D., & Thompson, R.E. (1992). Comparing traditional and integrative learning methods in organizational training programs. Journal of Applied Psychology, *77*, 941-951.
3. Brown, K.G. (2001). Using computers to deliver training: Which employees learn and why? Personnel Psychology, *54*, 271-296.
4. Towler, A.J., & Dipboye, R.L. (2001). Effects of trainer expressiveness, organization, and trainee goal orientation on training outcomes. Journal of Applied Psychology, *86*, 664-673.
5. Marks, M.A., Sabella, M.J., Burke, C.S., & Zaccaro, S.J. (2002). The impact of cross-training on team effectiveness. Journal of Applied Psychology, *87*, 3-13.
6. Callahan, J.S., Kiker, D.S., & Cross, T. (2003). Does method matter? A meta-analysis of the effects of training method on older learner training performance. Journal of Management, *29*, 663-680.

## **Evaluation of Training & Development Programs**

Cascio & Aguinis (2005). Chpt 16

1. Alliger, G.M., & Janak, E.A. (1989). Kirkpatrick's levels of training criteria: Thirty years later. Personnel Psychology, *42*, 331-342.
2. Arvey, R.D., Maxwell, S.E., & Salas, E. (1992). The relative power of training evaluation designs under different cost configurations. Journal of Applied Psychology, *77*, 155-160.
3. Sackett, P.R., & Mullen, E.J. (1993). Beyond formal experimental design: Towards an expanded view of the training evaluation process. Personnel Psychology, *46*, 613-627.
4. Yang, H., Sackett, P.R., & Arvey, R.D. (1996). Statistical power and cost in training evaluation: Some new considerations. Personnel Psychology, *49*, 651-668.
5. Alliger, G.M., Tannenbaum, S.I., Bennett, W., Jr., Traver, H., & Shotland, A. (1997). A meta-analysis of the relations among training criteria. Personnel Psychology, *50*, 341-358.
6. Arthur, W., Jr., Bennett, W., Jr., Edens, P.S., & Bell, S.T. (2003). Effectiveness of training in organizations: A meta-analysis of design and evaluation features. Journal of Applied Psychology, *88*, 234-245.

**Revised: 10 December 2008**