

MGMT953: RESEARCH METHODS IN MANAGEMENT
Course Syllabus (V5)
Spring 2016: Tuesdays, 1:30 – 4:30

Professor Katherine Klein
Office: 3115 SH-DH
202-491-7177 (Cell phone)
Email: kleink@wharton.upenn.edu

Course description

This is an introductory doctoral seminar on research methods in management. We will examine basic issues involved in conducting empirical research for publication in scholarly management journals. We will start by discussing the framing of research questions, theory development, the initial choices involved in research design, and basic concerns in empirical testing. We will then consider these issues in the context of different modes of empirical research (including experimental, survey, qualitative, archival, and simulation). We will discuss readings that address the underlying fundamentals of these modes as well studies that illustrate how management scholars have used them in their work, separately and in combination.

Please note that we will not address data analysis techniques in detail, as this material is covered in other courses, e.g., MGMT952. The course requirements are intended to provide you with opportunities to develop your own research ideas and abilities, as well as to engage with the current literature. My hope is that this seminar will be engaging, thought-provoking, and useful for you. Accordingly, I welcome your suggestions and feedback about class requirements, readings, and procedures at any time.

Course outline

Here is what we will cover and the schedule of classes:

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Introduction | Jan 19 |
| 2. Research Questions & Agendas | Jan 26 |
| 3. Theory Development | Feb 2 |
| 4. Research Design Choices | Feb 9 |
| 5. Empirical Concerns in Quantitative & Qualitative Research | Feb 16 |
| 6. NO CLASS | Feb 23 |
| 7. Writing, Publishing, & Ethics | Mar 1 |
| a. Professor Matthew Bidwell joins us | |
| SPRING BREAK | |
| 8. Varieties of Research Design I: Laboratory Experiments | Mar 15 |
| a. Professor Drew Carton joins us | |
| 9. Varieties of Research Design II: Field & Quasi Experiments | Mar 22 |
| a. Professor Sigal Barsade joins us | |
| 10. Varieties of Research Design IV: Qualitative Research | March 29 |
| 11. Varieties of Research Design VI: Archival Methods | Apr 5 |
| a. Professors Vit Hennisz and Ethan Mollick join us | |
| 12. Varieties of Research Design III: Surveys | April 12 |
| a. Professor Nancy Rothbard joins us | |
| 13. Varieties of Research Design VII: Simulation | Apr 19 |
| a. Professor Dan Levinthal joins us | |
| 14. Wrap-up discussion | Apr 26 |

Course requirements

Your grade in this class will be based on your performance on the following assignments: (explained more fully below and in the Appendix):

- | | |
|--|-----|
| • Participation in class discussions | 30% |
| • Research exercises (survey, interview) | 20% |
| • Research proposal | 40% |
| • Reviews of two research proposals | 10% |

Assignments are due by 11:59 pm on the date:

- | | |
|--|-------------------------|
| • Research topic description | Due: Jan 29 |
| • Annotated bibliography & commentary | Due: Feb 12 |
| • Draft research proposal – Part I | Due: Mar 4 |
| • Research exercise #1 – Survey | Due: Mar 25 |
| • Draft research proposal – Parts I & II | Due: Apr 3 |
| • Research exercise #2 – Interview | Due: Apr 8 |
| • Reviews of two research proposals | Due: Apr 15 |
| • Final research proposal – Parts I & II | Due: May 13 (tentative) |

Participation in class discussions (30%)

Please come to each class fully prepared to discuss the readings. To be well prepared, please carefully read and think about every assigned article or chapter. Some general questions to think about include:

- What are the central concerns, themes, and take-aways in each reading?
- How do the readings relate to each other?
- How do the readings relate to readings from prior classes?
- For empirical studies, what are the greatest strengths of this work?
- For empirical studies, what aspects of the work are less compelling to you?
- What are the implications of the readings for your own research?
- What questions do you have about the readings?

You will be expected to participate actively in every class session. High quality participation will demonstrate understanding of the readings, thoughtful engagement with the ideas presented, ability to develop new insights, ability to respond to others' inputs, role-modeling of candor and respect in class discussions. To ensure everyone's active participation in class discussions, I may "cold call" students – asking specific questions about specific articles – during each class.

Research exercises (20%)

Over the course of the semester, you will undertake two short research exercises, focused on collecting (1) survey data, and (2) interview data. Each research exercise is worth 10% of your grade. Each exercise is due on the Friday prior to the relevant class period, and we will share experiences from these exercises during that class period. Detailed guidelines for conducting and writing up each of the research exercises are provided in the Appendix.

Research proposal (40%)

- Your main writing assignment in this class is to prepare a 20-30 page research proposal (double-spaced, 1-inch margins, 12-point standard font, including references, tables, etc).
- It is permissible to work on a research topic that you began to develop in a prior class (but let me know).
- Your paper for this class must be your own independent work – not work you are preparing as a research assistant or 2nd or 3rd author. If you have questions about whether a project fits these standards, discuss this with me, please.
- To assist you in this process, there will be several stages:
 - Identify a research topic
 - Prepare an initial annotated bibliography
 - Prepare a brief literature review, develop your theoretic model, and generate hypotheses (Part I)
 - Propose a research design, incorporating two methodologies for your study (Part II)
 - Receive feedback from two students on your draft research proposal (i.e., Parts I & II)
 - Receive feedback from me on your draft research proposal
 - Incorporate feedback into a final research proposal.

I will review and comment upon, but not grade, Parts I & II of your research proposal. Your grade will be based on the final proposal you submit at the end of the semester.

Guidelines for preparing the annotated bibliography, Part I, Part II and the final research proposal are provided in the Appendix.

Research proposal feedback (10%)

You will review two fellow students' draft research proposals (Parts I & II) and provide constructive and detailed written feedback for each proposal. Part of the purpose of this assignment is to develop your ability to serve as a helpful reviewer for colleagues in the field. Accordingly, we will discuss your experiences as reviewers of each other's work in the class session when your reviews are due.

(1) Introduction – 1/19/16

Topics:

- What makes for compelling, convincing management research?
- What will we be doing in this course?

Required readings:

1. Gomez-Mejia, L. R., Haynes, K. T., Nunez-Nickel, M., Jacobson, K. J. K., & Moyano-Fuentes, J. (2007). Socioemotional wealth and business risks in family-controlled firms: Evidence from the Spanish olive oil mills. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52, 106-137.
2. Davis, J. P., Eisenhardt, K. M., & Bingham, C. B. (2009). Optimal structure, market dynamism, and the strategy of simple rules. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54: 413-452.
3. Hekman, D. R., Aquino, K., Owens, B. P., Mitchell, T. R., Schilpzand, P. & Leavitt, K. (2010). An examination of whether and how racial and gender biases influence customer satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53, 238-264.
4. Chatterji A. K. & Toffel, M. W. (2010). How firms respond to being rated. *Strategic Management Journal*, 31: 917-945.
5. Schüssler, E., Rüling, C. C., & Wittneben, B. B. F. (2014). On melting summits: The limitations of field-configuring events as catalysts of change in transnational climate policy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57: 140-171.

(2) Research Questions and Agendas - 1/26/16

Topics:

- What's interesting?
- Where do research ideas come from?
- Roles of theory, data, and practice
- Rigor and relevance

Required readings:

1. Colquitt, J. A. & George, G. (2011). Publishing in AMJ – Part 1: Topic choice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54, 432-435.
2. Davis, M. S. 1971. That's interesting! Toward a phenomenology of sociology and a sociology of phenomenology. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 1: 309-344.
3. Vermeulen, F. (2007). "I shall not remain insignificant": Adding a second loop to matter more. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 754-761.
4. Ashford, S. J. (2013). Having scholarly impact: The art of hitting academic home runs. *Academy of management Learning & Education*, 12, 623-633.
5. Pfeffer, J. 2007. A modest proposal: How we might change the process and product of managerial research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(6): 1334-1345.
6. Bedeian, A. 1996. Lessons learned along the way: Twelve suggestions for optimizing career success. In P. Frost & M. Taylor (Eds.), *Foundations for organizational science: Rhythms of academic life: Personal accounts of careers in academic*. (pp. 3 -11). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Some further readings:

Bennis, W. & J. O'Toole, J. 2005. How business schools lost their way. *Harvard Business Review*, 83(5) 96-124.

Oxley, J., Rivkin, J., Ryall, M. et al. 2010. The Strategy Research Initiative: Recognizing and encouraging high quality research in strategy. *Strategic Organization*, 8(4): 377-386.

Van de Ven, A. 2007. *Engaged Scholarship: A Guide for Organizational and Social Research*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Daft, R. L., & A. Y. Lewin, A. Y. 2008. Rigor and relevance in organization studies: Idea migration and academic journal evolution. *Organization Science*, 19: 177-183.

Palmer, D., Dick, B., & N. Freiburger, N. 2009. Rigor and relevance in organization studies. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 18: 265-272.

(3) Theory Development - 2/2/16

Topics:

- What is a theory? What is not a theory?
- What are the components of a theory?
- What are the attributes of a good theory?

Required readings:

1. Sutton, R. I. & Staw, B. M. 1995. What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 371-384.
2. Mitchell, T. R. & James, L. R. 2001. Building better theory: Time and the specification of when things happen. *Academy of Management Review*, 26: 530-548.
3. Klein, K. J. & Zedeck, S. (2004). Introduction to the special section on theoretical models and conceptual analyses – Theory in applied psychology: Lessons (re)learned. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 931-933.
4. Davis, G. 2010. Do theories of organizations progress? *Organizational Research Methods*, 13(4): 690-709.
5. Hambrick, D. C. 2007. The field of management's devotion to theory: Too much of a good thing? *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 1346-1352.
6. Afuah, A. & Tucci, C. L. (2012). Crowdsourcing as a solution to distant search. *Academy of Management Review*, 37, 355-375.

Some further readings:

Colquitt, J. A. & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. 2007. Trends in theory building and theory testing: A five-decade study of the Academy of Management Journal. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50: 1281-1303.

Ghoshal, S. 2005. Bad management theories are destroying good management practices. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 4(10): 76-91.

Mohr, L. 1982. *Explaining Organizational Behavior*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Chapter 2: "Approaches to explanation: Variance theory and process theory".

McGuire, W. J. 1997. Creative hypothesis generating in psychology: Some useful heuristics. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 48: 1-30.

Van Maanen, J. 1995. Style as theory. *Organization Science*, 6: 133-143.

(4) Research Design Choices – 2/9/16

Topics:

- How do we test our theories?
- How do we match our questions, theories, and methods?
- Units and levels of analysis

Required readings:

1. McGrath, J. E. 1981. Dilemmatics: The study of research choices and dilemmas. In J. E. McGrath, J. Martin, & R. A. Kulka (Eds.), *Judgment Calls in Research*: 69-102. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
2. Edmondson, A. C. & McManus, S. E. 2007. Methodological fit in management field research. *Academy of Management Review*, 32: 1155-1179.
3. Buchanan, D. A. & Bryman, A. 2007. Contextualizing methods choice in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 10: 483-501.
4. Hackman, J.R. 2003. Learning more by crossing levels: Evidence from airplanes, hospitals, and orchestras. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24: 905-922.
5. Klein, K. J. & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (2000). From micro to meso: Critical steps in conceptualizing and conducting multilevel research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 3: 211-236.
6. Ployhart, R. E. & Vandenberg, R. J. 2010. Longitudinal research: The theory, design, and analysis of change. *Journal of Management*, 36: 94-120.

Some further readings:

Bono, J. E. & McNamara, G. (2011). Publishing in AMJ – Part 2: Research design. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54, 657-660

Freeman, J. 1978. The unit of analysis in organizational research. In M. Meyer (ed.), *Environment and Organization*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, K. D. & Tsang, E. W. K. 2011. Testing management theories: Critical realist philosophy and research methods. *Strategic Management Journal*, 32(2): 139-158.

Van Maanen, J., Sorensen, J. B., & Mitchell, T. R. 2007. The interplay between theory and method. *Academy of Management Review* 32(4): 1145-1154.

(5) **Empirical Concerns in Quantitative & Qualitative Research - 2/16/16**

Topics:

- Causal inference
- Selection bias, measurement error, omitted variables, endogeneity
- Construct measurement, validity and reliability
- Mediators and moderators
- Replication

Required readings:

1. Shadish, W. R., Cook T. D., & Campbell, D. T. 2001. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Causal Inference*. Chapters 2 (Statistical Conclusion Validity and Internal Validity) and 3 (Construct Validity and External Validity): pp. 33 – 102.
2. Aguinis, H., & Edwards, J. R. 2014. Methodological wishes for the next decade and how to make wishes come true. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51: 143-174.
3. Baron, R. M. & Kenny, D. A. 1986. The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 6: 1173-1182.
4. Staw, B. M. 1975. Attribution of the "causes" of performance: A general alternative interpretation of cross-sectional research on organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13: 414-432.
5. Hamann, P. M., Schiemann, L. B., & Guenther, T. W. (2013). Exploring the dimensions of organizational performance: A construct validity study. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16, 67-87.
6. Open Science Collaboration. (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science*, 349 (6251): 943 -

Some further readings:

Boyd, B. K., Gove, S., & Hitt, M. 2005. Construct measurement in strategic management research: Illusion or reality? *Strategic Management Journal*, 26: 239-257.

Allison, P. 1977. Testing for interaction in multiple regression. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83: 374-381.

Mathieu, J. E. & Taylor, S. R. 2006. Clarifying conditions and decision points for meditational type inferences in organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27: 1031-1056.

(6) **NO CLASS – WEEK OF 2/22/16**

I will be out of town on Tuesday, February 23 – our normal meeting day. I will be available on February 25 and 26 to meet with students one-on-one. Please sign up well in advance.

(7) Writing, Publishing & Ethics – 3/1/16

Topics:

- Writing well
- Navigating the publishing process
- Maintaining high ethical standards

Required readings on writing and publishing:

1. Bem, D. 1987. Writing the empirical journal article. In M. P. Zanna & J. M. Darley (Eds.), *The Compleat Academic: A Practical Guide for the Beginning Social Scientist*: 171-201. New York: Random House.
2. Schneider, B. 1995. Some propositions about getting published. In L. Cummings & P. Frost (Eds.), *Publishing in the Organizational Sciences*, 2nd ed.: 193-200. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
3. Winston, R. B. (1985). A suggested procedure for determining order of authorship in research publications. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 63, 515-518.
4. Klein, K. J, Knight, A. P., Ziegert, J. C., Lim, B.C., & Saltz, J. L. (2011). When team members' values differ: The moderating role of team leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 114, 25–36.
(NOTE: be sure to read the reviews we received on prior versions of the paper)

Required readings on ethical issues:

5. Rosenthal, R. 1994. Science and ethics in conducting, analyzing, and reporting psychological research. *Psychological Science*, 5(3): 127-134.
6. Policy Regarding Human Subject Research in the Sociobehavioral Sciences. University of Pennsylvania.
<http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v53/n06/or-hsresearch.html>
7. Nosek, B. A., Spies, J. R., & Motyl, M. (2012). Scientific utopia: II. Restructuring incentives and practices to promote truth over publishability. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7(6): 615-631.

Some further reading:

Grant, A. M. & Pollack, T. G. (2011). Publishing in AMJ – Part 3: Setting the hook. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54, 873-879.

Zinsser, W. (1990). *On Writing Well* (4th ed.). New York: Harper Collins, Chapters 1-7, pp. 3-49.

SPRING BREAK – WEEK OF MARCH 7, 2016: NO CLASS

(8) Laboratory Experiments – 3/15/16

Topics:

- Laboratory research

Required readings on laboratory methods:

1. Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., & Brewer, M. 1998. Experimentation in social psychology. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, Volume 2 (4th Ed.): 99-142. New York: McGraw-Hill.
2. Colquitt, J. A. (2008). Publishing laboratory research in AMJ: A question of when, not if. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51, 616-620.
3. Mitchell, G. (2012). Revisiting truth or triviality: The external validity of research in the psychological laboratory. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7, 109-117.

Required readings using laboratory methods:

4. Carton, A. M., Murphy, C., & Clark, J. R. (2014). A (blurry) vision of the future: How leader rhetoric about ultimate goals influences performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57: 1544-1570.
5. Billinger, S., Stieglitz, N., & Schumacher, T. R. (2014). Search on a rugged landscape: An experimental study. *Organization Science*, 25, 93-108.
6. Di Stefano, G., King, A. A., Verona, G. (2014). Kitchen confidential? Norms for the use of transferred knowledge in gourmet cuisine. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25: 1645-1670.

Some further readings:

Shadish, W. R., Cook T. D., & Campbell, D. T. 2001. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Causal Inference*. Chapters 8 and 9: pp. 246-313.

Highhouse, S. 2009. Designing experiments that generalize. *Organizational Research Methods*, 12: 554-566.

Tetlock, P. E. 2000. Cognitive biases and organizational correctives: Do both disease and cure depend on the politics of the beholder? *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45(2): 293-326.

Schweitzer, M. E., Ordóñez, L. & Douma, B. 2004. Goal setting as a motivator of unethical behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(3): 422-432.

Greenberg, J., & Eskew, D. E. 1993. The role of role playing in organizational research. *Journal of Management*, 19: 221-241.

(9) Field Experiments & Quasi-Experiments – 3/22/16

Topics:

- Field-experiment and quasi-experimental research

Required readings on field/quasi-experimental methods

1. Grant, A. M., & Wall, T. D. 2009. The neglected science and art of quasi-experimentation: Why-to, when-to, and how-to advice for organizational researchers. Forthcoming in *Organizational Research Methods*.
2. Shadish, W. R., Cook T. D., & Campbell, D. T. 2001. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Causal Inference*. Chapters 4 (Quasi-Experimental Designs that Either Lack a Control Group or Lack Pretest Observations on the Outcome) and 4 (Quasi-Experimental Designs that Use Both Control Groups and Pretests): pp. 103-170.

Required readings using field/quasi-experimental methods

3. Ramarajan, L., Barsade, S. G., & Burack, O. R. (2008). The influence of organizational respect on emotional exhaustion in the human services. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 3; 4-18.
4. Bandiera, O., Barankay, I., & Rasul, I. (2007). Incentives for managers and inequality among workers: Evidence from a firm level experiment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122, 729 – 773.
5. Bertrand, B. & Mullainathan, S. 2004. Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *The American Economic Review*, 94: 991- 1013.
6. Staw, B. M. 1974. Attitudinal and behavioral consequences of changing a major organizational reward: A natural field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 29: 742-751.
7. Morgan, W. B., Walker, S. S., Hebl, M. R., & King, E. B. (2013). A field experiment: Reducing interpersonal discrimination toward pregnant job applicants. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98: 799-809.

Further reading:

Christensen, L. J., Siemsen, E., & Sridhar, B. 2015. Consumer behavior change at the base of the pyramid: Bridging the gap between for-profit and social responsibility strategies. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36: 307-317.

(10) Qualitative Research March 29

Topics:

- Conducting interviews, using interview data
- Qualitative case studies – research designs and analyses
- Writing up qualitative data

Required readings on interview methods:

1. Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 488-511.
2. Weiss, R. S. 1994. *Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies*. New York, NY: Free Press. Chapters 3-5, pp. 39-150.
3. Pratt, M. 2009. From the editors: For the lack of a boilerplate: Tips on writing up (and reviewing) qualitative research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52: 856-862.

Required readings using interview methods:

4. Klein, K. J., Ziegert, J. C., Knight, A. P., Xiao, Y. (2006). Dynamic delegation: Shared, hierarchical, and deindividualized leadership in extreme action teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50, 590-621.
5. Graebner, M. E. (2009). Caveat venditor: Trust asymmetries in acquisitions of entrepreneurial firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 435-472.
6. Plowman, D. A., Baker, L. T., Beck, T. E., Kulkarni, M., Solansky, S. T., & Travis, D. V. (2007). Radical change accidentally: The emergence and amplification of small change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 515-543.
7. Bingham, B. C. & Eisenhardt, K. M. (2011). Rational heuristics: The 'simple rules' that strategists learn from process experience. *Strategic Management Journal*, 32: 1437-1464.

Some further readings:

Barker, J. R. 1993. Tightening the iron cage: Concertive control in self-managing teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38: 183-190.

Barley, S. 1986. Technology as an occasion for structuring: Observations on CT scanner and other diagnostic technologies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31: 78-108.

Elsbach, K. D., & Kramer, R. M. 1996. Members' responses to organizational identity threats: Encountering and countering the Business Week rankings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(3): 442-476.

Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. 2001. Cultural diversity at work: The moderating effects of work group perspectives on diversity. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46: 229-273.

- Gibson, D. R. 2005. Talking turns and talking ties: Networks and conversational interaction. *American Journal of Sociology*, 110: 1561-1597.
- Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. C. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Ibarra, H. 1999. Provisional selves: Experimenting with image and identity in professional adaptation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44: 764-791.
- Lofland, D., Snow, D., Anterson, L., & Lofland, L. H. 2006. *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. Chapter 5: "Logging Data", pp. 99-107.
- Margolis, J. D. & Molinsky, A. 2008. Navigating the bind of necessary evils: Psychological engagement and the production of interpersonally sensitive behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51: 847-872.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. 1994. *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Siggelkow, N. 2007. Persuasion with case studies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50: 20-24
- Spradley, J. P. 1979. *The Ethnographic Interview*. "Asking Descriptive Questions", pp. 78-91.
- Van Maanen, J. 1988. *Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Yin, R. 1984. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

.(11) Archival Methods – 4/5/16

Topics:

- Modes of archival research
- Levels, materials, methods

Required readings on archival methods:

1. Ventresca, M. J., & Mohr, J. W. 2002. Archival research methods. In J. A. C. Baum (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to Organizations*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. Chapter 35, pp. 805-828.
2. Combs, J. G. 2010. Big samples and small effects: Let's not trade relevance and rigor for power. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(1): 9-13.

Required readings using archival methods:

3. Bidwell, M. (2011). Paying more to get less: The effects of external hiring versus internal mobility. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 56, 369-407.
4. Chen, G. & Hambrick, D. C. (2012). CEO replacement in turnaround situations: Executive (mis)fit and its performance implications. *Organization Science*, 23: 225-243.
5. Mollick, E. (2012). People and process, suits and innovators: The role of individuals in firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 33, 1001-1015.
6. Henisz, W. J., Dorobantu, S., & Nartey, L. J. (2014). Spinning gold: The financial returns to stakeholder engagement. *Strategic Management Journal*, 35: 1727-1748.

Some further readings:

Heckman, J. J. 1990. Varieties of selection bias. *American Economic Review*, 80(2): 313-318.

Winship, C., & Morgan, S. L. 1999. The estimation of causal effects from observational data. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25: 659-706.

Hamilton, B. H., & Nickerson, J. A. 2003. Correcting for endogeneity in strategic management research. *Strategic Organization*, 1(1): 51-78.

Angrist, J. D., & Pischke, J-S. 2008. *Mostly Harmless Econometrics: An Empiricist's Companion*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

(12) Surveys – 4/12/16

Topics:

- Survey sampling, survey design, survey measures

Required readings on survey methods:

1. Hinkin, T. R. 1998. A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods*, 1: 104-121.
2. Schwarz, N. 1999. Self-reports: How the questions shape the answers. *American Psychologist*, 54: 93-105.

Required readings using survey methods:

3. Barsade, S. G. & O'Neill, O. A. (2014). What's love got to do with it? A longitudinal study of the culture of companionate love and employee and client outcomes in a long-term care setting. *Administrative Science Quarterly*.
4. O'Neill, O. & Rothbard, N. (2015). Is love all you need? The effects of emotional culture, suppression, and work-family conflict on firefighter risk taking and health. *Academy of Management Journal*.
5. Haas, M. R. & Hansen, M. T. 2005. When using knowledge can hurt performance: The value of organizational capabilities in a management consulting company. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26: 1-24.
6. Govindarajan, V., & Kopalle, P. K. 2006. Disruptiveness of innovations: Measurement and an assessment of reliability and validity. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27: 189-199.
 - a. NOTE: Skim this article, but look closely at the appendix, describing the survey measure of disruptive innovation, which we will discuss in some depth.
7. Plambeck, N. & Weber, K. (2009). CEO ambivalence and responses to strategic issues. *Organization Science*, 20, 993-1010.

Some further readings:

Cycota, C. S. & Harrison, D. A. 2006. What (not) to expect when surveying executives: A meta-analysis of top manager response rates and techniques over time. *Organizational Research Methods*, 9: 133-160.

Edmondson, A. C. 1999. Psychological safety in work groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44: 350-383.

Fowler, F. J. 1995. *Improving Survey Questions: Design and Evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage.

Klein, K. J., Conn, A. B. & Sorra, J. S. (2001). Implementing computerized technology: An organizational analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 3-16.

Mangione, T. W. 1998. Mail surveys. In L. Bickman & D. J. Rog (Eds.), *Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods*, 399-428.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N. P. 2003. Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 879-903.

Reeve, C. L. & Smith, C. S. 2001. Refining Lodahl and Kejner's job involvement scale with a convergent evidence approach: Applying multiple methods to multiple samples. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4: 91-111.

Simsek, Z. & Veiga, J. F. 2001. A primer on internet organizational surveys. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4: 218-235.

Spector, P. E. 2006. Method variance in organizational research: Truth or urban legend? *Organizational Research Methods*, 9: 221-232.

(13) Simulation Methods – 4/19/16

Topics:

- Computer simulations

Required readings on simulation methods:

1. Lave, C. & March, J. 1975. *An Introduction to Models in the Social Sciences*. New York: Harper & Row. Chapter 2, "An Introduction to Speculation".
2. Davis, J. P., Eisenhardt, K. M., & Bingham, C. B. 2007. Developing theory through simulation methods. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 480-499.
3. Hughes, H. P. N., Clegg, C. W., Robinson, M. A., & Crowder, R. M. 2012. Agent-based modeling and simulation: The potential contribution to organizational psychology. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 85: 487-502.

Required readings using simulation methods:

4. March, J. 1991. Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2(1): 71-87.
5. Levinthal, D. 1991. Random walks and organizational mortality. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36(3): 397-420.
6. Csaszar, F. A. & Siggelkow, N. 2010. How much to copy? Determinants of effective imitation breadth. *Organization Science*, 21: 661-676.
7. Markle, A. B. 2011. Dysfunctional learning in decision processes: The case of employee reciprocity. *Strategic Management Journal*, 32: 1411-1425.
6. *Previously assigned (please review for this class session):* Davis, J. P., Eisenhardt, K. M., & Bingham, C. B. (2009). Optimal structure, market dynamism, and the strategy of simple rules. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54: 413-452.

Some further readings:

Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. 1976. A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17: 1-25.

Carroll, G. & Harrison, J. R. 1998. Organizational demography and culture: Insights from a formal model and simulation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43: 637-667.

Gavetti, G. & Levinthal, D. 2000. Looking forward and looking backward: Cognitive and experiential search. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45: 113 – 137.

Rudolph, J. & Reppenning, N. 2002. Disaster dynamics: Understanding the role of quantity in organizational collapse. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47: 1-30

(14) Wrapping-up – 4/26/16

APPENDIX

Guidelines for Assignments

Assignments are due by 11:59 on the following dates:

- | | |
|--|-------------------------|
| • Research topic description | Due: Jan 29 |
| • Annotated bibliography & commentary | Due: Feb 12 |
| • Draft research proposal – Part I | Due: Mar 4 |
| • Research exercise #1 – Interview | Due: Mar 25 |
| • Draft research proposal – Parts I & II | Due: Apr 3 |
| • Research exercise #2 – Survey | Due: Apr 8 |
| • Reviews of two research proposals | Due: Apr 15 |
| • Final research proposal – Parts I & II | Due: May 13 (tentative) |

Research Proposal (40% of final grade)

In this assignment, you are asked to define a research problem in your area of interest, outline a theoretical explanation for the problem, summarize recent relevant research, develop several testable hypotheses, and propose a research design for investigating them empirically. Model your research proposal on the introduction and method section of articles published in top-tier management journals (e.g., *AMJ*, *ASQ*, *JAP*, *SMJ*, *Org. Science*, *Management Science*).

You are welcome to define a research problem that you want to develop for another course, for your second year paper in Management, or for a project on which you are currently working. However, your research proposal must be original to you – an idea that’s clearly your own and a project where you’re in the driver’s seat (and would be the sole author or at least the first author).

Please discuss your plans with me in the early stages, so that I can provide guidance and feedback as you develop your ideas, and to ensure that I am aware of any connections to other courses or projects that you are working on. If your topic is far outside my areas of expertise, I may suggest that you discuss your paper topic and show drafts of your work to a faculty advisor who knows more about your content area. Even if this is not critical for a particular area, it would still be helpful to discuss your topic with another faculty member and show him/her drafts of your work.

All written assignments (Part I, Part II, and final proposal) should be double-spaced, with 1-inch margins, in a standard 12-point font.

Research topic description

Due: Jan 29

Please turn in a 1-2 page description of your topic, plus a list of at least 10 empirical articles, published in top-tier management journals, of relevance to your topic. If possible, focus on your search on relatively recent literature, as it will be important to show how your proposed research contributes to and builds on the current literature.

Annotated bibliography & commentary

Due: Feb 12

Please turn in an annotated bibliography /chart of at least 10 empirical articles related to your topic. In your chart, list (for each article):

- Author
- Journal, date
- Independent variables (including how measured)
- Dependent variables (including how measured)
- Sample
- Method
- Key findings

Provide a short (2 - 3 pages, double-spaced) commentary: What have you learned from this exercise? What kind of research strategy is most common in your area of interest? What topics have been neglected? What topics – hypotheses – are most common? And, what lessons do you take away for your own research plans, ideas, and goals? That is, how has doing this exercise informed your thinking, plans, and aspirations for your own research?

Draft research proposal – Part I

Due: Mar 4

Part I of your draft research proposal will (a) present your specific research topic, explaining and justifying why this topic is important to study; (b) situate the topic in the literature, summarizing relevant theory and research findings; and (c) present and justify testable hypotheses. Model your draft after the introductory sections (up to the method) of top-tier management journals. (But, feel free to write questions to me throughout the draft (e.g., “Do I need to say more to justify this hypothesis?”))

Part I should be no more than 12 pages (all inclusive).

This part of the research process – the conceptual work entailed in choosing and justifying one’s topic and hypotheses – is often a challenging part of the research process. You may find it helpful to answer the following eight questions before you begin to write. Your answers to these questions should ideally appear in the first 2 – 4 pages of your draft research proposal:

Eight Questions:

1. Why is it important to study X?
2. Who has studied X? That is, what fields, communities, or subdisciplines, if any, have studied X?
3. What do we clearly know about X? That is, what has the extant research literature already established?
4. What don’t we know? More specifically, what is the gap in the literature that you hope to fill (or at least begin to fill)?
5. Why is it important to fill this gap? (Because no one has done this before is not an adequate answer.)
6. What theoretical frameworks or prior research will you draw on to develop the hypotheses that will allow you to fill this gap?
7. In brief, what is your core idea? To answer this question, fill in the blanks: Drawing on ____, I argue that ____ shapes _____. (Or, answer a similarly worded question, please.)

8. What are the 2 – 3 most important ways in which your findings will contribute to the extant literature? (Note that your answer to this question is likely to change as you develop your proposal and certainly will change if you actually carry out the research.)

Draft research proposal – Parts I & II

Due: Apr 3

This draft of your proposal should reflect a revision of your earlier draft and the inclusion of a method section, presenting your research design and methodology (sample, procedures, and measures). Model your draft of Part II on the method sections you see published in top-tier management journals.

Part II should be no more than 8 pages, all inclusive, and thus your draft proposal, including Parts I and II, should be no more than 20 pages, all inclusive.

Typically, method sections include (a) a description of the procedure – that is, a description of and justification for your research design and data collection plans; (b) a description and justification for your sample; and (c) a description of the measures – that is, a detailed description of how you will operationalize your variables, including discussion of the reliability and validity of the measures. At the end of the standard method section, please comment on strengths and weaknesses of your research design.

Reviews of two research proposals

Due: Apr 15

You will review two fellow students' draft research proposals (Parts I & II) and provide constructive and detailed written feedback for each proposal.

To assist you in writing good reviews, please carefully read and try to follow the following "Guidelines for Reviewers" published by AMJ and AMR:

<http://journals.aomonline.org/amj/reviewer-resources>

http://www.aom.pace.edu/amr/reviewer_guidelines.html

Final Research Proposal

Due: May 13

Please further develop and write up your proposal in a research paper format of 20-30 pages, i.e. including an introduction, theory, hypotheses, and methods section. You should incorporate the feedback you received from me and the two fellow students who reviewed your Parts I & II.

Additionally, please append:

- A detailed "Response to the Reviewers" that summarizes how you responded to the reviewers' most important comments. (Here, you should focus most on how you addressed my comments. Note also how you addressed the most important and helpful comments other reviewers provided.)

- A description of “Next Steps” – that is, work that you plan to do on the proposal in the future, or work that you would do, if you had more time.

Research Exercise #2: Interview (14% of final grade)

Due: March 25

Exercise:

Conduct a qualitative interview that will yield primary data - new insights and ideas – related to your research proposal or other research interests.

- Develop a short interview guide designed to elicit data related to the topic of your research proposal or another one of your research interests. Be clear about the purpose of your interview—what are you trying to learn with the protocol you developed?
- Select an interviewee with characteristics (e.g., job, position, experience, identity) similar to those that would characterize the population from which you might ultimately draw your sample.
- The interview should yield data that would be potentially useful to analyze (code, etc.) for insights into the phenomena you plan to investigate in the study you will design for this course.
- Develop the protocol as if you were going to interview more than one person in the setting.
- Ideally, the interviewee should be someone whom you do not already know.
- The interview should take at least 30 minutes to complete (of course, you may take longer if you wish).
- If possible, conduct the interview with a partner from this course sitting in with you. After the interview, ask your partner for feedback on your interviewing technique:
 - What did you do or ask that was particularly effective?
 - What could you do better next time?
- Audio-record the interview (if the interviewee grants permission).
- Write field notes on what you learned from doing the interview.
- Listen to the interview and transcribe the “best portion” of the interview – that is, a 5-10 minute portion of the interview that you find particularly interesting and valuable for your research or learning.

Written Assignment (6 pages maximum, double-spaced):

Reflect in writing on this exercise, as follows:

- What was your purpose in conducting the interview? Provide as much background, including research questions, as you think is necessary to understand why you are conducting the interview and what you hope to learn from it.
- Describe whom you interviewed and why you chose that person. How would you choose the rest of your sample?
- What was surprising for you in conducting this exercise?
- Reflect on the “best portion” of the interview. What made it so interesting or valuable to you? What do you think you did particularly well during this portion of the interview? What could you improve?
- What are your “takeaways” for your research? For the next time you conduct an interview?

Research Exercise #1 – Survey (6% of final grade)

Due: April 8

Exercise:

Based on the assigned readings on survey research methods:

- Choose a construct that interests you, that you believe lends itself well to assessment via a survey, and for which there are no well-established survey measures. If there is a construct related—even if only tangentially—to the question you generated for Part 1 of your research proposal, I would advise selecting that construct.
- Develop a set of at least 7 survey items designed to measure this construct.
- Include instructions to the survey respondent to accompany the items you develop.
- Exchange your survey with at least three other members of the class. Ask them to read your items and write down all the thoughts they have about responding to them. The goal is to identify ambiguities or difficulties respondents may have in answering the questions. Coordinate, on your own time frames, as to when you can provide each other feedback, but it must be completed before the assignment is due.
- Revise your survey items based on the feedback you receive.

Written Assignment (3 pages maximum, double-spaced):

- What is the construct(s) you intend to measure with your survey?
- How is this construct related to your research project or, if unrelated to your research, how could it be used as a measure in some other research project related to that construct?
- Why do you believe a survey is an appropriate way to assess this construct? What are the shortcomings of this approach?
- What would your sample be and how would you select it?
- Submit a copy of your original survey instructions and items and a copy of how they were revised or updated after your feedback meeting (show revisions using track changes).