

Peer Feedback:

Four Day Work Week's Impact on Productivity: A study to determine the impact of a four day work week on employee productivity Research Proposal

<August 2, 2021>

Team 1: Blake Bormes, Kisha Kim, Sean Koval, Ben Ohno

- Is the title meaningful? Does it give the reader a sense of what the project is about? Any comments.
- <Vineeta K> The title is clear and to the point. However, it is repetitive. The team could have either removed the sub-title or used it in other ways such as, describe the audience / population such as "A study for the Amazon Customer Service Department" or more decorative such as "A study on a shortened work week" etc.
- <Don Irwin> The title could be shortened.
- <Russell Ude> The title is redundant. Catchy titles are always nice and can lead to early engagement in a presentation

Overview

- Does the group articulate the background/context, intended audience, and the justification for the project (ie. the so-what?) Could anything be more clear?
- <Vineeta K> I really liked the overview. Each section within the overview really addressed the context and did a good job of storytelling. The research is focussed on a specific group/company which also allows the team to share stats and immediately captures the attention of the intended audience.
- <Don Irwin> The overview section was very well organized and the intended audience background and goal of the analysis was well articulated.
- <Don Irwin> The "Expected Outcome" section could perhaps be done without. The expected outcome section suggested a bias at the onset. Saying what we expect to see in the study before the study even is conducted is signaling bias upfront.
- <Don Irwin> The inclusion of a "so what" section was especially good. It demonstrated that the project team had paid very close attention to the async material as well as the readings.

- <Russell Ude> the burnout statistic may not directly correlate with the number of days working per week
- <Russell Ude> I like the focus on Amazon's customer service team, but I'm not sure if that's the audience for this proposal. It would be nice if the audience was a bit clearer

Research Question

- Is the research question clear? Is the outcome of interest clear?
 - If necessary for the question: are their sub-questions or clarification bullet points?
- <Vineeta K> The research question is clear and very well articulated. However productivity can be defined more intentionally in the context of Amazon specially since this research is catered to one company only. The current definition used is "rate of output per unit of input" is ambiguous. I have questions such as what is input vs. output, is it applicable etc. There can be a quick reference to the metric in the research question with details to follow...
- <Don Irwin> Overall excellent study questions. I would perhaps separate satisfaction from productivity. While satisfaction was referenced inside of the research question satisfaction does not appear to be a variable measured in the variable section.
- <Russell Ude> The question typed out above the circles asks if a four day work week would improve productivity, but inside the circle labeled "productivity", the question reads "can the four day work week maintain a similar productivity level?". These questions slightly differ. I also think employee satisfaction is a different question so maybe would have been better to frame this slide as questions 1a and 1b. But I like the simplicity/direct nature of the questions

Data

- Does the group articulate the needed data and the justification?
 - Justification: why this data? What will this data allow us to do?
- <Vineeta K> If I am the intended audience, I am still not clear on how this study will be conducted and where this data is coming from given that Amazon doesn't have a four day work week currently. The key factor here is that the team wants to implement a four day work week for a group of employees in a specific location. This fact is not touched upon till the study design so as the audience I am not sure how the data will be collected. It would be good to hint at this design earlier in the research and go into details in the dedicated section. Apart from that, the data and usage of the data is very well defined.
- <Don Irwin> Overall very good. I may have simply tried to separate these two large paragraphs into smaller bullet points so that where the data is coming from is more clear.
- <Russell Ude> Good job, except it was a bit unclear how the group plans to juxtapose Amazon's current 5-day work week against a possible change to a four-day schedule

Study Design

- Is the study design clearly articulated? E.g. experimental or observational. Does the reader have a clear sense of how this design will provide the desired insight?
- <Vineeta K> I think the study design is very well laid out. The team addressed all the metrics and how they will use all the data they are collecting. Very informative.

- <Don Irwin> study design is excellent and well thought through. It was unclear to me what “perceived productivity” is and how would be useful as a measurement.
- <Russell Ude> Great job. I like how the survey is being used to derive both quantitative and qualitative data

Sample

- Are the sampling frame and approximate size of sample clearly articulated?
- <Vineeta K> The sampling frame and the sampling approach was well articulated. However some of the data risks identified in the risk section could be avoided through exclusions.
- <Don Irwin> While the population is assumed to be employees at Amazon. The population wasn’t clearly articulated. Making sure that the sample is inclusive of the entire pipeline. No inclusion or exclusion criteria was provided.
- <Russell Ude> I would have liked for “block sample” to be defined

Variables and/or Intervention

- High-level: Remind the reader what concepts the project is focused on which variables capture those concepts
- <Vineeta K> I think this section was articulated well. Provides succinct information on how the variables will be defined. I especially liked the attention to detail on the “ticket closure time”.
- - Observational:
<Don Irwin>
Their measure of productivity is useful. It’s a departure from the way that it’s been studied in other productivity studies. But it is consistent and likely a good measure.
 - <Don Irwin> The scaling on their quantitative survey instruments was very well thought through. Excellent design.
 - Experimental:
<Don Irwin>
While it wasn’t mentioned in this section, it was clear that there is going to be a control group of people within the company who were not on the five day work week. It’s possible that they’d be some benefit to referencing that within the variables and intervention section.
 - Qualitative:
<Don Irwin>
It’s unclear to me how the free form input on productivity will be used and how that is useful.
- <Russell Ude> Including the & explicitly defining the variables involved in the study in the slides would have made the presentation more powerful with the target audience in mind

Statistical Methods

- Is there a high level description of the statistical methods planned?
- <Vineeta K> I felt this section was lacking. The details included here belonged partly in the study design. There was no reference to the actual statistical techniques to be used apart from some

descriptive statistics. I would have liked to see how they will address the noise in the data, how they will ensure that the incremental change is significant etc.

- <Don Irwin> The statistical methods didn't go into detail on how qualitative data would be weighted against the quantitative data.
- <Russell Ude> I think a lot of this section could have been included in variables and study design. There were plenty of opportunities to define the methods and better link these methods to 4 vs 5 day work weeks

Potential Risks

- Do they clearly identify at least two risks?
- <Vineeta K> The team identified risks with the research design, but I felt that some of those risks could have been averted through careful sample selection as well handling nuances in the study design
- <Don Irwin> Excellent job in putting very specific scenarios within the potential risks. I was specifically impressed by the correct use of the "Spillover Effect". And how the example given was specific to their study.
- <Don Irwin> The specificity in each of these risks is outstanding. Rather than simply happening a generic risk label they were able to tie it into how that risk would manifest within their study. This was excellent work.
- <Russell Ude> Great section, and I like that concepts from async were brought in. Also, The group mentioned that certain employees may need to be in the office 5 days a week, which was great considering not every group of Amazon employees can effectively perform their duties in 4 vs 5 days

Deliverables

- Is there a clear timeline that outlines different stages of the research, and articulates a final deliverable and when that will be delivered?
- <Vineeta K> For the deliverables, they did a good job of identifying what work will occur when. However, the information could have been laid out differently so it's easy to process. In addition, in the slides, there was no reference to what will be delivered and the timeline. There was a lot of voiceover without anything concrete to look at. As the intended audience, I will have to weave out that information from the voice over.
- <Don Irwin> Good section.
- <Russell Ude> Great conclusion that definitely brings it all together