

Sample Journal Publications

Research Methods and Statistics

Note: Bolded Names Indicate a UCF I/O Graduate Student; Underlined Names Indicate a UCF I/O Faculty Member

Bowling, N. A., Sessa, V. I., Banks, G. C., & Shaffer, J. A. (in press). Read my lips: No new constructs! Construct proliferation as a threat to the future of I-O psychology. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*.

Abstract

Industrial and organizational (I-O) psychology recognizes dozens of different constructs, including several individual differences, environmental variables, job attitudes, and work-related behaviors. It is, of course, necessary to retain a variety of constructs in order to adequately capture the complexities, subtleties, and diversity of work-related phenomena. But do the many constructs recognized by I-O psychologists all serve a useful purpose? Or has our field been too eager to welcome redundant, unnecessary constructs into the fold? And if I-O psychology has embraced too many unnecessary constructs, then what—if anything—should we do about it? In the current focal article, we first discuss when and why construct proliferation occurs. We then advance a nuanced perspective—one that asserts that construct proliferation is occasionally “good,” usually “bad,” largely inevitable, and often incentivized. We conclude by calling for a temporary moratorium on the introduction of new constructs into the field of I-O psychology, and we offer suggestions for how the field can address construct proliferation. We hope that the current article leads to a fruitful discussion of how to most effectively solve the construct proliferation dilemma.

Bowling, N., Shoss, M. K., & Zhou, Z. (Eds). (2025). *How to Conduct and Publish High-Quality Research in Industrial-Organizational Psychology*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Abstract

This how to guide presents expert guidance on effectively conducting research in industrial-organizational (I-O) psychology. Distinguished authors address topics encompassing all stages of the research process, using practical examples and real-life experiences.

Kessler, S. R., & Shoss, M. K. (2022). Archival data sets should not be a secondary (or even last) choice in micro-organizational research. *Group & Organization Management*, 47(5), 907-919.

Abstract

Despite ample access to large, archival datasets, the micro-organizational sciences field seem to consistently cast these datasets aside in favor of primary datasets collected by independent researchers. In the current GoMusing, we argue that these archival datasets should not be a secondary (or even last) choice for the micro-organizational sciences. In fact, large archival datasets can enable researchers to (a) investigate phenomena of interest across generalizable samples, (b) incorporate multiple levels of context into research, and (c) take advantage of several additional methodological benefits. In the hopes of spurring a paradigm shift in the micro-organizational sciences, we begin our article by discussing problems with the standard approach to data collection (i.e., independent researchers collecting their own datasets). We then discuss how archival datasets can remedy many of these issues and advance the range of research questions the field is able to answer. We conclude by providing a step-by-step process for incorporating these archival datasets into our literature and provide insights into addressing common challenges. We hope this GoMusing will serve as a call to action for researchers and editorial teams alike to move our research forward through a greater usage of large archival datasets.

Lengnick-Hall, R., Williams, N. J., Ehrhart, M. G., Wilging, C. E., Bunger, A. C., Beidas, R. S., & Aarons, G. A. (2023). Eight characteristics of rigorous multilevel implementation research: A step-by-step guide. *Implementation Science*, 18, 52.

Abstract

Background: Although healthcare is delivered in inherently multilevel contexts, implementation science has no widely endorsed methodological standards defining the characteristics of rigorous, multilevel implementation research. We identify and describe eight characteristics of high-quality, multilevel implementation research to encourage discussion, spur debate, and guide decision-making around study design and methodological issues.

Recommendations: Implementation researchers who conduct rigorous multilevel implementation research demonstrate the following eight characteristics. First, they map and operationalize the specific multilevel context for defined populations and settings. Second, they define and state the level of each construct under study. Third, they describe how constructs relate to each other within and across levels. Fourth, they specify the temporal scope of each phenomenon at each relevant level. Fifth, they align measurement choices and construction of analytic variables with the levels of theories selected (and hypotheses generated, if applicable). Sixth, they use a sampling strategy consistent with the selected theories or research objectives and sufficiently large and variable to examine relationships at requisite levels. Seventh, they align analytic approaches with the chosen theories (and hypotheses, if applicable), ensuring that they account for measurement dependencies and nested data structures. Eighth, they ensure inferences are made at the appropriate level. To guide implementation researchers and encourage debate, we present the rationale for each characteristic, actionable recommendations for operationalizing the characteristics in implementation research, a range of examples, and references to make the characteristics more usable. Our recommendations apply to all types of multilevel implementation study designs and approaches, including randomized trials, quantitative and qualitative observational studies, and mixed methods.

Conclusion: These eight characteristics provide benchmarks for evaluating the quality and replicability of multi-level implementation research and promote a common language and reference points. This, in turn, facilitates knowledge generation across diverse multilevel settings and ensures that implementation research is consistent with (and appropriately leverages) what has already been learned in allied multilevel sciences. When a shared and integrated description of what constitutes rigor is defined and broadly communicated, implementation science is better positioned to innovate both methodologically and theoretically.

Ng, M. A., LeNoble, C. A., Shorey, A., Gregory, A., & Kateli, M. (2025). Rest easy, applied researcher: Latent profile analysis is for you. *Group & Organization Management*, 10596011251361583.

Summary

Organizational scholars often encounter barriers when attempting to partner with organizations, partly due to the perceived lack of relevance and accessibility of our research methods and findings. This article introduces latent profile analysis (LPA) as a practical and effective tool for applied researchers. LPA results are easily to interpret and yield the types of actionable insights that organizational stakeholders find appealing. The authors provide a tutorial for conducting an LPA by walking through an applied research project in which LPA was performed on a partner organization's membership survey data. Resulting profiles provide richer, more nuanced interpretations of organizational members' attitudes compared to aggregate-level analyses. Supplemental materials are provided to help applied researchers carry out this work, which the authors argue will help in addressing the gap between academic research and organizational practice.

Ramsey, M. C., & Bowling, N. A. (2025). Building a bigger toolbox: The construct validity of existing and proposed measures of careless responding to cognitive ability tests. *Organizational Research Methods*, 28(2), 245-268.

Abstract

Employers commonly use cognitive ability tests in the personnel selection process. Although ability tests are excellent predictors of job performance, their validity may be compromised when test takers engage in careless responding. It is thus important for researchers to have access to effective careless responding measures, which allow researchers to screen for careless responding and to evaluate efforts to prevent careless responding. Previous research has primarily used two types of measures to assess careless responding to ability tests—response time and self-reported carelessness. In the current paper, we expand the careless responding assessment toolbox by examining the construct validity of four additional measures: (1) infrequency, (2) instructed-response, (3) longstring, and (4) intra-individual response variability (IRV) indices. Expanding the available set of careless responding indices is important because the strengths of new indices may offset the weaknesses of existing indices and would allow researchers to better assess heterogeneous careless response behaviors. Across three datasets ($N = 1,193$), we found strong support for the validity of the response-time and infrequency indices, and moderate support for the validity of the instructed response and IRV indices.

Schlotzhauer, A., Ng, M., & Su, S. (2025). How to frame the frame of reference: A comparison of contextualization methods. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 1-19.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-024-09953-8>

Abstract

Personality measures are popular and useful in employment selection and academic contexts; however, concerns have been voiced regarding the strength of their association with desirable criteria. Contextualization (i.e., modifying measures to reflect the desired frame of reference, like work or school) has emerged as a promising option. Research has demonstrated that contextualizing personality measures increases predictive validity and enhances participants' perceptions of the assessments. However, few studies have compared contextualization methods to one another and, to date, only one study has compared the two most common forms of contextualization (i.e., instruction and tag contextualization), returning inconsistent findings. In a within-person, multi-wave study using a working sample ($N = 399$), we compared the relative efficacy of personality measures that are contextualized through manipulating the instructions and those contextualized through the addition of contextual item tags. We specifically contextualized the big five personality factors in order to predict work-related outcomes (i.e., job satisfaction, perpetrated incivility, job performance, creative job performance, and emotional exhaustion). Our study supports the use of tag-level contextualization and provides guidance on how to best implement contextual tags. Best practices, implications, and future research directions are discussed.