

MGMT953: RESEARCH METHODS IN MANAGEMENT
Course Syllabus (V5)
Spring 2017: 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 17
2. Research Questions & Agendas	Jan 24
3. Theory Development	Jan 31
4. Research Design Choices	Feb 7
5. Empirical Concerns in Quantitative & Qualitative Research	Feb 14
6. Writing, Publishing, & Ethics	Feb 21 (With Professor Mauro Guillen)
7. Varieties of Research Design: Field Experiments	Feb 28 (With Professor Nancy Rothbard)
SPRING BREAK	
8. Varieties of Research Design: Laboratory Experiments	Mar 14 (With Professor Laura Huang)
9. Varieties of Research Design: Survey Research	Mar 21
10. Varieties of Research Design: Archival Research	Mar 28 (With Professor Tyler Wry)
11. Varieties of Research Design III: Simulation	Apr 4 (With Professor Dan Levinthal)
12. Varieties of Research Design: Qualitative Research	Apr 11
13. Wrap-up discussion	Apr 18
14. No Class	Apr 25

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 | 35% |
| • Research exercise (Survey or Interview) | 10% |
| • Research proposal | 45% |
| • Reviews of two research proposals | 10% |

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

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| • Research topic description | Due: Jan 27 |
| • Annotated bibliography & commentary | Due: Feb 10 |
| • Draft research proposal – Part I | Due: Mar 3 |
| • Research exercise #1 –Survey | Due: Mar 18 |
| • Draft research proposal – Parts I & II | Due: Mar 31 |
| • Research exercise #2 – Interview | Due: Apr 8 |
| • Reviews of two research proposals | Due: Apr 14 |
| • Final research proposal – Parts I & II | Due: May 17 |

Participation in class discussions (35%)

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 exercise (10%)

Working in a group of 2 or 3 students, you will undertake two one research exercise, focused *either* on collecting (1) survey data or (2) interview data. Detailed guidelines for conducting and writing up each of these research exercises are provided in the Appendix. Students will self-select into groups to do the two exercises, as long as we have at least one group focused on survey data and one on interview data.

Research proposal (45%)

- Your main writing assignment in this class is to prepare a 20-t30 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.
- The course assignments are designed to guide you through the stages of creating a strong research proposal. In separate assignments that build on one another, you will:
 - 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 to test your hypotheses (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 – 1/17

Topics:

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

Required readings:

1. Chen, G., Crossland, G., & Luo, S. (2015). Making the same mistake all over again: CEO overconfidence and corporate resistance to corrective feedback. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36, 1513-1535.
2. Fang, R., Landis, B., Zhang, Z., Anderson, M., Shaw, J., & Kilduff, M. (2015). Integrating personality and social network: A meta-analysis of personality, network position, and work outcomes in organizations. *Organization Science*, 26, 1243-1260.
3. 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.
4. Little, L. M., Major, V. S., Hinojosa, A., & Nelson, D. L. (2015). Professional image maintenance: How women navigate pregnancy in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58, 8-37.
5. Zietsma, C. & Lawrence, T. B. (2010). Institutional work in the transformation of an organizational field: The interplay of boundary work and practice work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55, 189-221.

(2) Research Questions and Agendas - 1/24

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. Eagly, A. H. (2016). When passionate advocates meet research on diversity, does the honest broker stand a chance? *Journal of Social Issues*, 72, 199-222.
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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Palmer, D., Dick, B., & N. Freiburger, N. 2009. Rigor and relevance in organization studies. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 18: 265-272.
- Van de Ven, A. 2007. *Engaged Scholarship: A Guide for Organizational and Social Research*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

(3) Theory Development – 1/31

Topics:

- What is a theory? What is not a theory?
- What are the components and characteristics of theory?
- What are the merits and drawbacks of expecting empirical work to make a theoretical contribution?

Required readings:

1. Sutton, R. I. & Staw, B. M. 1995. What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 371-384.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. Nilsson, W. (2015). Positive institutional work: Exploring institutional work through the lens of positive organizational scholarship. *Academy of Management Review*, 40, 370-398.
5. Van de Ven, A. (2015). Welcome to the Academy of Management Discoveries. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 1, 1-4.
6. Bamberger, P. & Ang, S. (2016). The quantitative discovery: What is it and how to get it published. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 2, 106.
7. Silberzahn, R. & Menges, J. (2016). Reading the face of a leader: Women with low facial masculinity are perceived as competitive. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 2, 272-289.

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.
- Davis, G. 2010. Do theories of organizations progress? *Organizational Research Methods*, 13(4): 690-709.
- Mohr, L. 1982. *Explaining Organizational Behavior*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Chapter 2: "Approaches to explanation: Variance theory and process theory".
- Van Maanen, J. 1995. Style as theory. *Organization Science*, 6: 133-143.

(4) Research Design Choices – 2/7

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. 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.
5. Hackman, J.R. 2003. Learning more by crossing levels: Evidence from airplanes, hospitals, and orchestras. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24: 905-922.
6. 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.

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.
- Ployhart, R. E. & Vandenberg, R. J. 2010. Longitudinal research: The theory, design, and analysis of change. *Journal of Management*, 36: 94-120.

(5) **Empirical Concerns in Quantitative & Qualitative Research – 2/14**

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 & 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. Aguinis, H., Edwards, J. R., & Bradley, K. J. (2016). Improving our understanding of moderation and mediation in strategic management research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 1-21.
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. Boyd, B. K., Gove, S., & Hitt, M. 2005. Construct measurement in strategic management research: Illusion or reality? *Strategic Management Journal*, 26: 239-257.
6. Open Science Collaboration. (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science*, 349 (6251).
7. Singal, J. (2017, January 11). Psychology's favorite tool for measuring racism isn't up to the job. New York Magazine: <http://nymag.com/scienceofus/2017/01/psychologys-racism-measuring-tool-isnt-up-to-the-job.html>

Some further readings:

- Hamann, P. M., Schieman, L. B., & Guenther, T. W. (2013). Exploring the dimensions of organizational performance: A construct validity study. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16, 67-87.
- Mathieu, J. E. & Taylor, S. R. 2006. Clarifying conditions and decision points for mediational type inferences in organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27: 1031-1056.

(6) Writing, Publishing & Ethics – 2/21

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.

(7) Field Experiments & Quasi-Experiments – 2/28

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. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. Mollick, E. & Rothbard, N. (2016). Mandatory fun: Consent, gamification, and the impact of games at work. Working paper.

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.
- Chakravarti, A., Menon, T. & Winship, C. (2014). Contact and group structure: A natural experiment in interracial college roommate groups. *Organization Science*, 25, 1216-1233.
- 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.

SPRING BREAK – WEEK OF MARCH 6th: NO CLASS

(8) Laboratory Experiments – 3/14

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. Huang, L. & Pearce, J. L. (2015). Managing the unknowable: The effectiveness of early-stage investor gut feel in entrepreneurial investment decisions. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 60, 634-670.
5. Kilduff, G. J., Galinsky, A. D., Gallo, E., & Reade, J. J. (2016). Whatever it takes to win: Rivalry increases unethical behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59: 1508-1534.
6. Billinger, S., Stieglitz, N., & Schumacher, T. R. (2014). Search on a rugged landscape: An experimental study. *Organization Science*, 25, 93-108.
7. 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:

- Greenberg, J., & Eskew, D. E. 1993. The role of role playing in organizational research. *Journal of Management*, 19: 221-241.
- Highhouse, S. 2009. Designing experiments that generalize. *Organizational Research Methods*, 12: 554-566.
- Schweitzer, M. E., Ordóñez, L. & Douma, B. 2004. Goal setting as a motivator of unethical behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(3): 422-432.
- 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.
- 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.

(9) Surveys Research – 3/21

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. Martin, S. R., Cote, S., & Woodruff, T. (2016). Echoes of our upbringing: How growing up wealthy or poor relates to narcissism, leader behavior, and leader effectiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59, 2157-2177.
6. Klein, K. J., Conn, A. B. & Sorra, J. S. (2001). Implementing computerized technology: An organizational analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 3-16.
7. 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.

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.
- 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.

(10) Archival Methods – 3/28

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. Cobb, J. A., Wry, T., & Zhao, E. Y. (2016). Funding financial inclusion: Institutional logics and the contextual contingency of funding for microfinance organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59, 2103-2131.
4. Mollick, E. (2012). People and process, suits and innovators: The role of individuals in firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 33, 1001-1015.
5. Henisz, W. J., Dorobantu, S., & Nartey, L. J. (2014). Spinning gold: The financial returns to stakeholder engagement. *Strategic Management Journal*, 35: 1727-1748.
6. Haas, M. R., Criscuolo, P., & George, G. (2015). Which problems to solve? Online knowledge sharing and attention allocation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58, 680-711.

Some further readings:

- Chen, G. & Hambrick, D. C. (2012). CEO replacement in turnaround situations: Executive (mis)fit and its performance implications. *Organization Science*, 23: 225-243.
- 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.

(11) Simulation Methods – 4/4

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 3, "The Evaluation of Speculations."
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. Levinthal, D. 1991. Random walks and organizational mortality. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36(3): 397-420.
5. Markle, A. B. 2011. Dysfunctional learning in decision processes: The case of employee reciprocity. *Strategic Management Journal*, 32: 1411-1425.
6. Grand, J. A., Braun, M. T., Kuljanin, G., Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Chao, G. T. (2016). The dynamics of team cognition: A process-oriented theory of knowledge emergence in teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(10), 1353-1385
7. Siggelkow, N. & Rivkin, J. W. (2009). Hiding the evidence of valid theories: Coupled search processes obscure performance differences among organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54, 602-634.

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

(12) Qualitative Research 4/11

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. Barley, S. R. (2015). Why the internet makes buying a car less loathsome: How technologies change role relations. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 1, 31-60.

Some further readings:

- Barley, S. 1986. Technology as an occasion for structuring: Observations on CT scanner and other diagnostic technologies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31: 78-108.
- Ibarra, H. 1999. Provisional selves: Experimenting with image and identity in professional adaptation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44: 764-791.
- 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.

(13) Wrapping-up – 4/18

APPENDIX

Guidelines for Assignments

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

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| • Research topic description | Due: Jan 27 |
| • Annotated bibliography & commentary | Due: Feb 10 |
| • Draft research proposal – Part I | Due: Mar 3 |
| • Research exercise #1 –Survey | Due: Mar 18 |
| • Draft research proposal – Parts I & II | Due: Mar 31 |
| • Research exercise #2 – Interview | Due: Apr 8 |
| • Reviews of two research proposals | Due: Apr 14 |
| • Final research proposal – Parts I & II | Due: May 17 |

Research Proposal (45% 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 27

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 10

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 3

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: March 31

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: April 14

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 17

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 (10% of final grade)

This assignment is designed to give you hands-on experience either in:

1. Designing a survey measure; collecting survey data; and conducting preliminary survey data analyses (e.g., Cronbach's alpha); or
2. Designing a qualitative interview guide; collecting interview data; and conducting preliminary interview data analyses.

You must complete one of the two assignments and should work in a team of 2 or 3 students to complete the assignment.

Survey Exercise *Due: March 18*

For this assignment, you will:

- Choose and define a construct that interests you and your research partner(s), that you and your partner(s) believe lends itself well to assessment via a survey, and for which there are no well-established survey measures.
- Develop a set of at least 10 survey items designed to measure this construct.
- Include instructions to the survey respondent to accompany the items you develop.
- Ask at least 3 adults (e.g., friends, family members, members of the class, doctoral students who are not in the same program with you) to answer your survey ideas and have them tell you or write down all the thoughts and questions they had about responding to them. The goal is to identify ambiguities or difficulties respondents may have in answering the questions.
- Revise the survey, select the best 5 – 7 survey items, and administer your survey on Mechanical Turk, ideally collecting at least 25 responses to your survey. Include in your survey established measure(s) of constructs that you'd like to correlate with your survey measure (e.g., age, education, job satisfaction, burnout, etc.).
- Analyze your Mechanical Turk survey data, reporting the mean, SD, and frequencies for your survey items; Cronbach's alpha for your survey scale; and the correlation of your scale with the other survey measures you collected.

Written Assignment (4 pages maximum, double-spaced, plus tables):

- What is the construct(s) you intended to measure with your survey? Be sure to include the definition.
- Why do you believe a survey is an appropriate way to assess this construct? What are the shortcomings of this approach?
- What would your ideal sample be and how would you select it?
- What was surprising for you in conducting this exercise?
- What are your substantive "takeaways" from your research?
- What are your procedural "takeaways" from your research? What would you do differently next time?
- Be sure to submit a copy of your original survey instructions and items and a copy of how they were revised or updated after the feedback (prior to your data collection on Mechanical Turk).

Qualitative Interview Exercise – due April 8th

For this assignment, you will design a qualitative interview guide, conduct and record two actual interviews, analyze your data (in a very basic fashion), and report on the substantive and procedural insights you've gained – what you've learned about the focus of your interviews and about the process of doing interviews.

- Develop an interview guide designed to elicit data related to a topic that is of mutual interest to you and your research partner(s). Be clear about the purpose of your interview—what are you trying to learn with the protocol you developed?
- Identify and recruit two interviewees with characteristics (e.g., job, position, experience, identity) that are a good fit to shed light on your research question(s). Ideally, the interviewees should be someone whom you do not already know.
- Your interviews should last at least 30 minutes to complete. (I've found I need at least 45 minutes to have a conversation that is not superficial.)
- Conduct the interviews together – so that members of your research team can each conduct one interview AND observe one interview. After you conduct your 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 interviews (if your interviewees grant permission).
- Write field notes on what you learned from doing the interview.
- Listen to the interview and transcribe the “best portion” of the interviews – that is, a 5 -10 minute portion of each interview that you find particularly interesting and valuable for your research or learning.

Written Assignment (4 pages maximum, double-spaced):

Reflect in writing on this exercise, as follows:

- What was your purpose in conducting the interview?
- 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 substantive “takeaways” from your research?
- What are your procedural “takeaways” from your research? What would you do differently next time?