

RESEARCH PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

Peer-reviewed publications and peer-reviewed papers (or other equivalent value) occurring during my employment at Nicholls State University are summarized in the table below. All peer-reviewed articles are from journals that are listed in the Cabells research directory.

Scholarly Activity	'17	'18	'19	'20	'21	'22	Total
Peer-Reviewed Articles (outlet below)	1	2	2	1		1	8
<i>Journal of Business and Psychology</i>						1	1
<i>Personality and Individual Differences</i>	1			1			2
<i>Industrial & Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice</i>			2			1	3
<i>Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science</i>		1					1
<i>Journal of Business Ethics</i>		1					1
Peer-Reviewed Papers or other eq. value	4	4	4	6	6	5	29
Academy of Management Annual Conference [Conference proceeding/Paper]						1	1
Hawaii International Conference for Systems Sciences [Conference proceeding/Paper]		1					1
Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Inc., Conference Presentations [Paper, Symposium]	2	1	2	1	2	1	9
Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Inc., [Panel]	1	1	1	1		1	5
Scholars Expeaux [Poster]		1					1
Southern Management Association [Paper]	1						1
*Articles published in <i>The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist</i> (TIP)			1	4	4	2	11
Book Chapter in-press						1	1
R SCORE Perf. Rating	–	8.25	8.88	9.00	9.00	–	
Classification							Exemplary

Classification criteria for “Exemplary” as defined by Table 8a of the Faculty Development Plan requires four peer-reviewed articles and 4 peer-reviewed papers or other equivalent (eq.) value. *Technically TIP is in the Cabells approved journal list. However, I’ve chosen to classify TIP articles are under “Peer-Reviewed Papers or other eq. value” as these submissions are invited submissions. The editor reserves the right to accept or reject a submission made by anyone who contributes to the column.

RESEARCH STATEMENT

My research over the past five years makes three broad contributions to the literature: (i) further clarifying the role of personality and individual differences in the workplace, particularly in predicting unethical workplace behavior; (ii) refining our methods for addressing method variance in applied research; and (iii) promoting open science within industrial-organizational psychology and management. These contributions are explained further below.

Personality and Individual Differences in the Workplace

When I started my career as a publishing scholar, I had a relatively simple interest: I wanted to know what drove people to do bad things to other people and the organizations within which they work. By bad things, I am referring to behaviors such as the misuse of technology in the workplace (e.g., spending too much time text messaging rather than working; see Buckner, Castille, & Sheets., 2012), social undermining (e.g., “competing with coworkers for status and recognition”) (see Castille, Kuyumcu, & Bennett, 2017), production deviance (e.g., “purposely doing work incorrectly”) (see Castille, Kuyumcu, & Bennett, 2017), and unethical pro-organizational behavior (e.g., “if it would help my organization, I would misrepresent the truth to make my organization look good”) (Castille, Buckner, & Thoroughgood, 2018).

Much of my early work focuses on answering this question from a perspective grounded in personality and individual differences, which is an area that has long interested me (see Levy et al., 2011, which is my earliest publication in this area). I approached understanding personality at work from interactionist perspective termed trait activation theory, which posits that work settings can serve a lens into our personality by providing cues that trigger trait-relevant behaviors. My colleagues and I contributed to the broader discussion on personality and workplace ethics by highlighting a pathway by which individuals who score high on Machiavellianism measurements might get ahead in the workplace: (i) undermining their coworkers to make themselves look more favorable (see Castille et al., 2017) and (ii) violating broader social norms (e.g., honesty) to make their organizations look positive (see Castille et al., 2018). I would go on to make other contributions to the personality at work literature, such as examining how personality shapes meaningful work experiences (see Simonet & Castille, 2020) and the implications of using personality tests to identify ideal employees (see Castille, Castille, and Williamson-Smith, 2019). My work in this area is frequently cited (see by Google Scholar webpage: <https://tinyurl.com/bdd2hjn5>).

I have since evolved my interest beyond focusing on why people do bad things to how might we leverage rigorous research to spur more virtuous forms of organizational behavior.

Method Variance and Method Bias in Organizational Research

Assessing personality robustly is tricky – a quick story highlights how tricky it can be. In a faculty meeting in the Nicholls CBA, I once talked about narcissism in chief executive officers (CEO). A colleague from accounting quickly asked a question in surprise: “You can measure that?” Yes – so we think. A common indirect measure involves looking at company’s annual report, specifically the picture featuring the CEO. If the CEO is with a team of other executives,

that's considered a good sign that the CEO is considered more likely to be a team player (i.e., not a narcissist). However, suppose you have a picture with the CEO's face taking up a whole single page. What kind of signal does that send, particularly about how narcissistic they are (hint: "It's all about me!"). That could be a red flag. Other narcissistic behavior reported from close coworkers provide further evidence into one's narcissistic potential.

What if a CEO knows that narcissism is measured this way? Do you think that changes the way they present themselves publicly? What about other personality traits more broadly speaking? Indeed, any psychological phenomenon?

As you can imagine, measuring any psychological trait (be it socially undesirable in the case of narcissism or socially desirable in the case of conscientiousness) is never a pure measure of the things we care to study. This is especially true when those measurements are conducted in high stakes settings (e.g., if someone is applying to be a CEO) or using inexpensive protocols (e.g., short online surveys). In short, measuring any construct of interest (e.g., personality, attitudes, behavior) could be contaminated by what is broadly termed method variance (e.g., socially desirable responding, halo effects). If not addressed (e.g., using multi-source designs where all measurements are gathered from multiple informants), method variance could promote method bias, harming both science and practice.

What to do about method variance? My method variance research focuses on the viability of both procedural remedies (e.g., gathering measurements from independent or multiple sources across time) and statistical remedies (i.e., identifying the number of method factors that contaminate one's data post-hoc and controlling for them statistically). Implementing robust procedural remedies can be expensive, perhaps requiring scholars to pool limited resources to make robust contributions (a point I will speak to in the next section).

Although I have not produced a publication in the method variance literature as of this moment, my work on procedural remedies (which has been presented at peer-reviewed conferences) has won best conference paper and division paper awards from the *Southern Management Association* (SMA) (see Castille, Crawford, & Simmering, 2017). I have also presented work at both the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Inc. (SIOP) (Castille, Williams, Castille, & Cogswell, 2022) and the Academy of Management (Castille & Williams, 2022). I have been invited to give talks on method variance at SMA and will have a book chapter out in press in 2023. My colleague, Larry Williams, and I will be pursuing publication of a final product in our elite journal, the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, once we believe we are ready to undergo formal peer review.

Opening up IO Psychology and Business Research

As I alluded to previously, conducting methodologically rigorous research in any field is resource intensive. Long ago, the harder sciences were plagued by such resource problems. Now, pooling resources has become normative, helping scholars produce incredibly powerful measurement devices such as the James Webb telescope and the Large Hadron Collider.

Fortunately, changing norms in the social sciences brought about by what is termed the open science movement have spurred scholars to innovate and pool resources in order to make more robust contributions. Open science aims to make science more readily available and accessible to the public. My contributions to the broader discussion on open science concern translating innovation emerging from the open science movement for my discipline and, hopefully, promoting open science. Thus far, I've produced 1 scholarly article published in the *Journal of Business and Psychology* (see Castille et al., 2022), which is a leading journal in my field that also promotes open science, 10 popular press articles published in *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologists*, two panel presentations (e.g., Morrison & Castille., 2019), and a virtual conference (see [SIOP/CARMA Open Science Virtual Summer Series](#)). I will now briefly highlight one innovation I'm excited to share that I am actively working on promoting more broadly.

One innovation for pooling resources involves crowdsourcing science via multi-site collaboration initiative. Briefly, crowdsourcing involves leveraging the crowd (e.g., scientists, managers, employees) for all stages of the research process (e.g., sourcing novel ideas, pooling resources to robustly test an idea, building in replication, analyzing data, writing up results for publication, peer-reviewing manuscripts, and deciding future directions). Multi-site replication involves investigators across multiple sites collaborating, often in the form of pooling resources (e.g., materials, code, design choices, access to participants) to answer questions of mutual interest. Such initiative are needed in applied psychology to find out what theories and interventions are useful as well as to understand the boundary conditions that are at play.

Crowdsource multi-site collaboration initiatives are a pragmatic (if challenging) solution to key methodological challenges facing any scientific discipline: pooling limited resources to achieve sufficiently high statistical power for testing hypotheses, assessing the generalizability and replicability of effects, promoting the uptake of open science practices via collaboration, and promoting inclusion and diversity within the research community (Moshontz et al., 2018). An example vehicle for crowdsourcing is the *Psychological Science Accelerator* (PSA), a vehicle for crowdsourcing research needs and promoting multi-site replication research in psychology (of which I am a seminal co-author; see Moshontz et al., 2018). Thus far, the PSA has allowed psychologists across the globe to test claims collaboratively and comprehensively in the domains of ethical decision making, gendered prejudice, and stereotype threat (see <https://psysciacc.org>).

I believe all scholars can make robust contributions even if they have limited resources. The challenge we each face as practicing scientists is often finding the small thing that we can do to put our core values as scientists – objectivity, honesty, openness, accountability, fairness, and stewardship – into practice (Castille et al., 2022). One thing I love about crowdsourcing initiatives such as the PSA is that they make it easier to practice open science. There are a number of open science practices (i.e., tactics that increase the transparency and accessibility of our scientific research) that we can implement in any study that may align with our values. Crowdsourced multi-site collaborations may be valuable vehicle for promoting open science and furthering my discipline's positive impacts on society.

Future Plans

Crowdsourcing multi-site replication initiatives could be highly valuable for Nicholls State University. As a teaching institution, Nicholls has limited resources to offer both students and faculty for conducting robust research. What if our students and faculty could make small but meaningful contributions to broader efforts to understand organizational life more deeply? There are pedagogical benefits that such an initiative could bring about, such as effectively teaching students how to weigh and apply evidence in their day-to-day decision making; and teaching students how to make broader contributions to science.

My next five years will be heavily devoted toward spurring crowdsourced multi-site replication initiatives in my own discipline. At present, two come to mind. The first my colleagues (Tine Köhler and Ernest O'Boyle and I have termed ManyOrgs (Castille, Köhler, & O'Boyle, 2022, In Press). It is a crowdsourcing multi-site replication research initiative that services field settings (i.e., organizations). It promises to spur three outcomes: (i) encourage greater collaboration between academics and practitioners, (ii) spur the uptake of open science practices in our discipline, and (iii) facilitate multi-site replication research in applied settings. ManyOrgs could be highly valuable for local organizations served by Nicholls State University. Many organizations are small and do not have the resources to conduct rigorous field research. However, by contributing to broader efforts, such organizations can not only gain access to my field's knowledge about work works in regarding how to best manage human resources, but also a deeper understanding that can only be brought about by contributing data.

The second crowdsourced replication initiative I have in mind is one I am tentatively referring to as Collaborative Replications in Organizational Studies (CROS). It mirrors the Collaborative Replications and Education Project, or CREP (see <https://www.crep-psych.org>), which is an initiative that leverages open science to teach psychology students replication research. The same kind of vehicle, conducting replication research, could be highly valuable for teaching business students how to think more critically about data in organizational life. I experienced an early success training students in open science here at Nicholls in mentoring students. In mentoring students through my People Analytics Lab, several collaborated with me to create a reproducible product (see Avet, Daigle, Wezeman, & Castille, 2018), winning a small cash award in the process.

Concretely, I am deeply probing the viability crowdsourced multi-site replication initiatives in field settings and school settings. I want my proposals to rigorously address key concerns that they will no doubt raise (e.g., managing confidentiality, anonymity, ensuring fidelity to scientific methods). I plan and submitting proposals to my discipline's annual conference (SIOP¹) as well as the *Teaching and Learning Division* of the 2023 annual conference of the *Academy of Management* along with my colleague at Nicholls, Dr. Josh Cogswell, has agreed to help me continue this work. Peer review will refine my proposals further, hopefully giving way to more publications.

¹ After making more elite level contributions to my discipline, I plan on applying to become a SIOP Fellow. I have already met at least one requirement: being a contributing member of SIOP for over 10 years.