

MGMT 953: RESEARCH METHODS IN MANAGEMENT
Course Syllabus (V2 – as of February 3, 2021)
Spring 2020: Tuesday 1:30 – 4:30 pm
Professor Katherine Klein
Cell phone: 202/491-7177
[Class Zoom Link](#)

Course Description

This is an introductory doctoral seminar on research methods in management. We will examine core concepts and challenges 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 research using experimental, survey, qualitative, and archival methods). We will discuss readings that present the fundamental logic and details of these modes of research as well studies that illustrate how management scholars have used them in their work, separately and in combination.

Please note that we will not examine 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. I am looking forward to a very stimulating and engaging semester with you. Please feel free to share your suggestions and feedback about the class with me at any time.

Course Outline

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| 1. January 26 | Introduction |
| 2. February 2 | Research Questions and Agendas |
| 3. February 9 | Theory and Hypothesis Development |
| 4. February 16 | Research Design Choices and Standards |
| 5. February 23 | Writing, Publishing, and Ethics |
| 6. March 2 | Varieties of Research Design: Survey Research |
| 7. March 9 | Varieties of Research Design: Archival |
| 8. March 16 | Varieties of Research Design: Laboratory Experiments |
| 9. March 23 | Varieties of Research Design; Field experiments and quasi-experiments |
| 10. March 30 | <u>Engagement Day – No class</u> |
| 11. April 6 | Levels of Analysis |
| 12. April 13 | Varieties of Research Design: Qualitative Research |
| 13. April 20 | TBD |
| 14. April 27 | Final Class Reflections and Discussion |

Course Requirements and Due Dates

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 | 33% |
| • Research proposal | 50% |
| • Reviews of two research proposals | 10% |
| • Portrait of a contemporary scholar whose work you admire | 7% |

Assignments are due by 11 pm ET on the following dates:

- | | |
|--|----------------------------|
| • Research topic description | Due: Saturday, February 6 |
| • Annotated bibliography & commentary | Due: Saturday, February 20 |
| • Draft research proposal – Part I | Due: Saturday, March 20 |
| • Draft research proposal – Parts I & II | Due: Saturday, April 17 |
| • Portrait of a contemporary scholar whose work you admire | Due: Saturday, April 24 |
| • Reviews of two research proposals | Due: Saturday, May 1 |
| • Final paper | Due: Saturday, May 15 |

Participation in Class Discussions (33%)

During our weekly synchronous class session on Zoom, please keep your video camera on during the entire class session. If this is difficult for you for any reason, just let me know. We will of course take at least one break from Zoom during every class session.

Please be sure to respond to the weekly Discussion Question on Canvas by Monday at 6 pm ET.

And, of course, 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 Proposal (50%)

Please note: More detailed guidelines for preparing the annotated bibliography, Part I, Part II and the final research proposal are provided in the Appendix at the end of this syllabus.

- 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 or that you plan to work on in a concurrent class, but you must let me know in advance if this is the case.
- 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.

- Your research proposal must include hypotheses and a research design to test your hypotheses using empirical data. This means you can use any research method we cover in class except simulation (no empirical data) or a qualitative design (no hypotheses).
- 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.

Research Proposal Feedback (10%)

Please note: More detailed guidelines for preparing your reviews of your colleagues' drafts are provided in the Appendix at the end of this syllabus.

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.

Portrait of a Contemporary Scholar Whose Work You Admire (7%)

Please note: More detailed guidelines for preparing your portrait of a scholar are provided in the Appendix at the end of this syllabus.

For this assignment, you will pick a management scholar whose research you admire, you will read at least five top-tier management publications by this person, you will review and "analyze" this person's articles and CV, and you might also reach out to this person to talk with them. A key goal is for you to draw lessons from analyzing this person's – this role model's – work.

Please note: The person you pick must have received his/her Ph.D. in the last 20 years, must be employed as a professor in a business school (but not Wharton), and must have published at least two empirical articles in the last ten years in AMJ, ASQ, Org. Science, SMJ, or JAP. (If there is someone you really want to write about who doesn't fit this description, please let me know.)

(1) Introduction – January 26

Topics:

- What makes for compelling, convincing management research?
- What will we be doing in this course?
- What makes these specific articles award winners?

Required readings:

1. Kanze, D., Huang, L., Conley, M. A., & Higgins, E. T. 2018. We ask men to win and women not to lose: Closing the gender gap in startup funding. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61: 856-614.
2. Kleinbaum, A. M. (2012). Organizational misfits and the origins of brokerage in intrafirm networks. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 407-452.
3. Chatman, J.A., Greer, L.L., Sherman, E., & Doerr, B. (2019). Blurred Lines: How the Collectivism Norm Operates Through Perceived Group Diversity to Boost or Harm Group Performance in Himalayan Mountain Climbing. *Organization Science*, 30, 235-259.
4. Kang, S. K., DeCelles, K. A., Tilcsik, A., & Jun, S. (2016). Whitened resumes: Race and self-presentation in the labor market. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2016,
5. Adner, R. & Kapoor, R. (2010). Value creation in innovation ecosystems: how the structure of technological interdependence affects firm performance in new technology generations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 31: 306-333.

(2) Research Questions and Agendas – February 2

Topics:

- What's interesting?
- Where do research ideas come from?
- Can management researchers achieve rigor and relevance? How?
- Can and should management researchers be "honest brokers"? Always?

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.

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 and Hypotheses in Management Research – February 9

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. Sparrowe, R. T., & Mayer, K. J. 2011. Publishing in AMJ – Part 4: Grounding hypotheses. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54: 1098-1102.
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. Schaffer, J. A., DeGeest, D., & Li, A. 2016. Tackling the problem of construct proliferation: A guide to assessing discriminant validity of conceptually related constructs. *Organizational Research Methods*, 19: 80-110.
5. Hernandez, E. & Menon, A. 2021. Corporate strategy and network change. *Academy of Management Review*, 46: 80-107.

Some further readings:

- 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.
- 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".

(4) Research Design Choices and Research Standards – February 16

Topics:

- How do we test our theories?
- How do we match our questions, theories, and methods?
- How do we evaluate the rigor of empirical studies?

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. Brewer, M. B. 2000. Research design and issues of validity. In Reiss and Judd (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology* (pages 3-16).
3. Edmondson, A. C. & McManus, S. E. 2007. Methodological fit in management field research. *Academy of Management Review*, 32: 1155-1179.
4. Aguinis, H. & Vandenberg, R. J. (2014). An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure: improving research quality before data collection. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1: 569-595.
5. Nosek, B. A. & Errington, T. M. 2020. What is replication? *PLOS Biology*: 1-8.
6. Carlson, K. D., & Wu, J. 2012. The illusion of statistical control: Control variable practice in management research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 15: 413-435.

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) Writing, Publishing & Ethics – February 23

Topics:

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

Required readings on writing and publishing:

1. Silvia, P. J. 2007. How to write a lot. Chapters 1 – 3 (pages 3- 49). American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.
2. 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.
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. Hambrick, D. C., Misangyi, V. F., & Park, C. A. 2015. The quad model for identifying a corporate director's potential for effective monitoring: Toward a new theory of board sufficiency. *Academy of Management Review*, 40: 323-344.
5. Chatterjee, A. & Hambrick, D. C. 2007. It's all about me: Narcissistic chief executive officers and their effects on company strategy and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52: 351-386.

Required readings on ethical issues:

6. Rosenthal, R. 1994. Science and ethics in conducting, analyzing, and reporting psychological research. *Psychological Science*, 5(3): 127-134.
7. Hollenbeck, J. R. & Wright, P. M. 2017. Harking, sharking, and tharking: Making the case for post hoc analysis of scientific data. *Journal of Management*, 43: 5-18.

Recommended:

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

(6) Survey Research – March 2

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. Mathieu, J. E., Luciano, M. M., D’Innocenzo, L., Klock, E. A., & LePine, J.A. 2019. The development and construct validity of a team processes survey measure. *Organizational Research Methods*.
3. Likert scales – some basic information:
 - a. Survey Monkey: https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/likert-scale/?utm_expId=.i0iggfDmTnW1fu17LcS81w.0&utm_referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com%2F
 - b. Wikipedia: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Likert_scale

Required readings using survey methods:

4. Ozcelik, H. & Barsade, S. G. 2018. No employee an island: Workplace loneliness and job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61: 2343- 2366.
5. Zhang, Y., Waldman, D. A., Han, Y-L., & Li, X-B. 2015 . Paradoxical leader behaviors in people management: Antecedents and consequences. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58: 538-566.
6. Danneels, E. 2016. Survey measures of first- and second-order competences. *Strategic Management Journal*, 37: 2174-2188.
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.

(7) Archival Research – March 9

Required readings on archival methods – especially big data:

1. 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.
2. Simsek, Z., Vaara, E., Parachuri, S., Nadkarni, S., & Shaw, J. D. 2019. New ways of seeing big data. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62: 971-978.
3. Tonidandel, S., King, E. B., & Cortina, J. M. 2018. Big data methods: Leveraging modern data analytic techniques to build organizational science. *Organizational Research Methods*, 21; 525-547.

Required readings using archival methods:

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. Feldman, E., Gartenberg, C. & Wulf, J. 2018. Pay inequality and corporate divestitures. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39: 2829-2858.
6. Bidwell, M. (2011). Paying more to get less: The effects of external hiring versus internal mobility. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 56: 369-407.

Some further readings:

- Dorobantu, S., Henisz, W. J., & Nartey, L. 2017. Not all sparks light a fire: Stakeholder and shareholder reactions to critical events in contested markets. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2017: 561-597.
- Greenberg, J. & Mollick, E. 2017. Activist choice homophily and the crowdfunding of female founders. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 62: 341-374.
- 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.
- 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.

(8) Laboratory Experiments – March 16

Topics:

- What are laboratory experiments most useful for?
- When are laboratory experiments necessary or sufficient for publishing in top-tier management journals?
- What are common errors in designing lab experiments?

Required readings on laboratory methods:

1. Kirk, R. E. 2012. Experimental design. Chapter 2, *Handbook of Psychology, 2nd Edition*. Wiley.
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.
4. Highhouse, S. 2009. Designing experiments that generalize. *Organizational Research Methods*, 12: 554-566.

Required readings using laboratory methods:

5. Billinger, S., Stieglitz, N., & Schumacher, T. R. 2014. Search on a rugged landscape: An experimental study. *Organization Science*, 25, 93-108.
6. Rosette, A. S., Leonardelli, G., & Phillips, K. W. 2003. The white standard: Racial bias in leader categorization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93: 758-777.
7. Kanze, D., Huang, L., Conley, M. A., & Higgins, E. T. 2018. We ask men to win and women not to lose: Closing the gender gap in startup funding. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61: 856-614.
 - a. Please re-visit the experiment (Study 2) in Kanze et al.'s paper.
8. Kang, S. K., DeCelles, K. A., Tilcsik, A., & Jun, S. (2016). Whitened resumes: Race and self-presentation in the labor market. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2016,
 - a. Please re-visit the experiment (Study 2) in Kang et al.'s paper.

RECOMMENDED:

- Aguinis, H. & Bradley, K. J. 2014. Best practice recommendations for designing and implementing experimental vignette methodology studies. *Organizational Research Methods*, 17: 351-371.

(9) Field Experiments and Quasi-Experiments – March 23

Required readings on field/quasi-experimental methods

1. Eden, D. 2017. Field experiments in organizations. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4: 91-122.
2. 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. *Organizational Research Methods*.

Required readings using field/quasi-experimental methods

3. Bertrand, M. & 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.
4. Quillian, L., Pager, D., Hexel, O., & Midboen, A. H. 2017. Meta-analysis of field experiments shows no change in racial discrimination in hiring over time. *PNAS (Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences)*, 10870-10875.
5. McDonnell, M-H. & Werner, T. 2016. Blacklisted businesses: Social activists' challenges and the disruption of corporate political activity. *Administrative Science Quarterly*.
6. Klein, K.J., Harrison, D. A., Keller, JR., Vittengl, J. R., Schwartz, S. E., & Cohen, N. A. (2020). Changing leaders, leading change: How successors drive change in collective engagement and organizational performance. *Working paper*.

RECOMMENDED:

- Wing, C., Simon, K. & Bellow-Gomez, R. A. 2018 Designing difference in difference studies: Best practices for public health policy research. *Annual Review of Public Health*.
- Hui, C., Lam, S.S.K., Law, K.K.S. 2000. Instrumental values of organizational citizenship behavior for promotion: A field quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85: 822-828.
- 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.
- 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.

(10) Engagement Day – No Class

(11) Levels of Analysis – April 6

Topics:

- What are levels of analysis?
- How do levels issues influence theory, construct definitions, measurement, samples, and analyses?
- What are key steps in the analysis of multilevel data?

Required readings on multilevel research

1. 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.
2. Moliterno, T. P. & Ployhart, R. E. 2016. Multilevel models for strategy research: an idea whose time (still) has come. In *Research Methods for Strategic Management* (edited by Dagnino, G. B. & Cinici, M. C.), pages 51-77.
3. Hofmann, D. A. 1991. An overview of the logic and rationale of hierarchical linear models. *Journal of Management*, 23: 723-744.

Required readings that are examples of recent multilevel research

4. Bamiatzi, V., Bozoz, K., Cavusgil, S. T., & Hult, G. T. M., 2016. Revisiting the firm, industry, and country effects on profitability under recessionary and expansion periods: A multilevel analysis. *Strategic Management Journal*, 37: 1448-1471.
5. D’Innocenzo, L., Luciano, M. M., Mathieu, J. E., Maynard, M. T., & Chen, G. 2013. Empowered to perform: A multilevel investigation of the influence of empowerment on performance in hospital units. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59: 1290-1307.
6. Knight, A. P., Menges, J. I., Bruche, H. 2018. Organizational affective tone: A meso perspective on the origins and effects of consistent affect in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61: 191-219.

(12) Qualitative Research April 13

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.
4. Conducting qualitative interviews – some basics:
 - a. Harvard Sociology:
https://sociology.fas.harvard.edu/files/sociology/files/interview_strategies.pdf
 - b. Digital Advisor: <https://msu.edu/user/mkennedy/digitaladvisor/Research/interviewing.htm>

Required readings using interview methods:

5. Padavic, I., Ely, R. J., & Reid, E. M. 2020. Explaining the persistence of gender inequality: The work-family narrative as a social defense against the 24/7 work culture. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 65: 61-111,
6. 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.
7. De Rond, M. & Lok, J. 2016. Some things can never be unseen: The role of context in psychological injury at war. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59: 1965-1991.

RECOMMENDED:

- 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) To Be Decided – April 20

This class day is currently open and unscheduled. We will decide as a class how best to use this class day.

(14) Last Class – April 27

During this final class session:

- Each student will present a brief overview of his or her research question, one or more of his/her hypotheses, and proposed research method; and
- We will discuss lessons learned in the process of reaching and writing your portraits of scholars you admire.
- We will reflect as a class on lessons learned

APPENDIX

Guidelines for Assignments

A reminder that your grade in this class will be based on your performance on the following assignments:

- | | |
|--|-----|
| • Participation in class discussions | 33% |
| • Research proposal | 50% |
| • Reviews of two research proposals | 10% |
| • Portrait of a contemporary scholar whose work you admire | 7% |

Assignments are due by 11 pm ET on the following dates:

- | | |
|--|----------------------------|
| • Research topic description | Due: Saturday, February 6 |
| • Annotated bibliography & commentary | Due: Saturday, February 20 |
| • Draft research proposal – Part I | Due: Saturday, March 20 |
| • Draft research proposal – Parts I & II | Due: Saturday, April 17 |
| • Portrait of a contemporary scholar whose work you admire | Due: Saturday, April 24 |
| • Reviews of two research proposals | Due: Saturday, May 1 |
| • Final paper | Due: Saturday, May 15 |

Research Proposal (50% 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*).

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

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 (e.g., *ASQ*, *AMJ*, *AMR*, *SMJ*, *Org Sci*, *JAP*, *JOM*), of relevance to your topic. Focus your search on relatively recent literature (since 2010), as it will be important to show how your proposed research contributes to and builds on the current literature. Further, as you are taking this class in the first semester of

your graduate school career, it's best to pick a topic on which there is some relevant research – not a brand new topic for management research. Please be sure to describe your current thoughts and plans regarding (a) your focal outcome unit of analysis (e.g., individuals, teams, firms, industries); (b) possible or likely dependent variables; and (c) possible or likely independent variables. Your plans may change over the course of the semester, but it's helpful for your research project development and my understanding of your interests if you describes your (perhaps tentative plans and thoughts) regarding (a), (b), and (c).

Annotated bibliography & commentary

Please turn in an **annotated bibliography /chart** of at least 10 empirical articles published in **top-tier management journals** related to your topic. Try to find articles published in the last ten years.

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

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 approximately 8 – 12 pages of double-spaced text.

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 – 5 pages (the first 1,250 words) 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

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 approximately 4- 8 pages, all inclusive, and thus your draft proposal, including Parts I and II, should be approximately 12 - 20 pages of double-spaced text.

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

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

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 "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.

Portrait of a Contemporary Scholar Whose Work You Admire

For this assignment, you will pick a management scholar whose research you admire, you will read at least five top-tier management publications by this person, you will review and “analyze” this person’s CV, and you might also reach out to this person to talk with them.

Please note: The person you pick must have received his/her Ph.D. in the last 20 years, must be employed as a professor in a business school (but not Wharton), and must have published at least two empirical articles in the last ten years in AMJ, ASQ, Org. Science, SMJ, or JAP. (If there is someone you really want to write about who doesn’t fit this description, please let me know.)

Your 4 – 6 page double-spaced portrait (1000 – 1500 words) should answer each of the following questions (and others that you may want to answer too):

1. What do you most admire about this person’s research?
2. What are the distinctive features of this person’s research?
3. What are the consistent features of this person’s research?
4. Who has this person co-authored with and what do you discern from this pattern of co-authorship?
5. Where did this person study and who was (were) this person’s adviser(s)?
6. If the person is tenured, when/where did they get tenure?
7. And, **most importantly**, what have you learned from doing this analysis? What lessons do you draw from analyzing this person’s – this role model’s – work? Note that you do NOT have to think you will certainly apply those lessons, but even seeing the lessons and patterns in this person’s work will, I expect, be very useful for you.