

about organizational phenomena. Throughout the semester, we'll discuss aspects of what it means to work as a professor and the skills necessary for doing so. We'll have a lot to mull over regarding the publication process, and I encourage you to ask questions about that at any time.

PREREQUISITES

This course covers a lot of difficult, abstract material. It is designed for Ph.D. students in various administrative sciences, or anyone who will be conducting organizational research. Although the course is not primarily about statistics, we will discuss some statistical procedures in a fairly broad, top-down way. Statistics are just one (large) set of tools in your research toolkit. All students should have taken and had no trouble with a graduate-level statistics course, specifically one that covers the basics of linear regression. Most MBA programs or masters' programs in science or engineering have such a course. A final prerequisite is an open mind and a high initial interest in doing research. As you've probably been told, a Ph.D. is a research degree. Those who learn it have a responsibility to add to what is known about the world, and to pass that knowledge along to others in a lucid way.

TEXTBOOKS & READING MATERIALS

Dixon, Singleton, R.A. & Straits, B.C. 2015. *The Processes of Social Research, first edition*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Dropbox Directory containing a variety of chapters and articles all in pdf format.

EXPECTATIONS FOR CLASS PERFORMANCE

CLASS CONTRIBUTION: Class contribution will make up **20%** of your grade. Contributions are made both through the questions you ask and the answers you provide. As much as I love the dulcet tones of my own voice, it is important that you also actively participate in the conversation. Participation in intellectual conversation is an important part of your grade and more importantly, your education. Take the opportunity to further your understanding of the issues. The question you ask will likely help the other students in class. In order to do so, you need to show up regularly and on time to class and not leave early. Attendance problems will keep you from doing well.

To prepare for our discussions you'll need to read the assigned materials. *Read to get the big picture*. Ask questions to fill in the small pictures that make up the big one. *Read with applications in mind*.

EXERCISES: There will be three take-home exercises that I'll grade. **Exercises 1 and 3 are worth 30%** of your grade each and **Exercise 2 is worth 20%** of your grade (so 80% total). Each exercise is designed to further embed and illustrate the methodological topic(s) we cover in class. Exercises 1 and 3 are progressive, building on each other and thus allow you to use the same conceptual domain or phenomenon you want to study in each one. I will discuss these more fully on the first day of class and throughout the semester.

The due dates of these exercises are noted on the course calendar (see below); they are due at 1:30 p.m. on these dates via ANGEL dropbox. Late submissions will be marked down one grade per day late.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

According to the Penn State Principles and University Code of Conduct:

Academic integrity is a basic guiding principle for all academic activity at Penn State University, allowing the pursuit of scholarly activity in an open, honest, and responsible manner. In accordance with the University's Code of Conduct, you must not engage in or tolerate academic dishonesty. This includes, but is not limited to cheating, plagiarism, fabrication of information or citations, facilitating acts of academic dishonesty by others, unauthorized possession of examinations, submitting work of another person, or work previously used without informing the instructor, or tampering with the academic work of other students.

Any violation of academic integrity will be investigated, and where warranted, punitive action will be taken. For every incident when a penalty of any kind is assessed, a report must be filed, using the *pdf* form at this URL: www.smeal.psu.edu/smeal/integrity. This form is used for both undergraduate and graduate courses. This report must be signed by both the instructor and the student, and then submitted to the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs (s16@psu.edu).

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION & SEXUAL HARASSMENT

The Pennsylvania State University is committed to a policy that all persons shall have equal access to programs, facilities, admission, and employment without regard to personal characteristics not related to ability, performance, or qualifications as determined by University policy or by Commonwealth or Federal authorities. Penn State does not discriminate against any person because of age, ancestry, color, disability or handicap, national origin, race, religious creed, sex, sexual orientation, or veteran status. Direct all inquiries to the Affirmative Action Office, 211 Willard Building.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

The Smeal College of Business Administration welcomes persons with disabilities to all of its classes, programs, and events. If you need accommodations, or have questions about access to buildings where Smeal College activities are held, please contact us in advance of your participation or visit. If you need assistance during a class, program, or event, please contact the member of our staff or faculty in charge. Access to courses should be arranged by contacting the Management & Organization Office: (814) 865-1789.

AN INVITATION TO STUDENTS WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES

It is Penn State's policy to not discriminate against qualified students with documented disabilities in its educational programs. If you have a disability-related need for modifications in your testing or learning situation, your instructor should be notified during the first week of classes so that your needs can be accommodated. You will be asked to present documentation from the Office of Disability Services (located in 116 Boucke Building, 863-1807) that describes the nature of your disability and the recommended remedy. You may refer to the Nondiscrimination Policy in the *Student Guide to University Policies and Rules*.

COURSE CALENDAR

SESSION	DUE	CONTENT
1 - 1/8		Research process; Ontology, Epistemology & Philosophy
2 - 1/15		Choosing problems, questions & hypotheses
3 - 1/23		Writing
4 - 1/29		Research Design and Validities
5 - 2/5		Sampling; Statistical Conclusion Validity
6 - 2/12		Construct Validity
7 - 2/19	Exercise 1	Reliability and Related Technical Issues
8 - 2/26		External Validity/Triangulation
Spring Break	No Class	
9 - 3/12		Experimental Designs; Internal Validity
10 - 3/19	Exercise 2	Quasi-Experimental Designs
11 - 3/26		Surveys
12 - 4/2		Archival Research Designs
13 - 4/9		Role of Time in Research Designs
14 - 4/16		Drawing Inferences
15 - 4/23	Exercise 3	(Un)ethical methods

Week 1

The Research Cycle; Ontology, Epistemology and Philosophy

(Note: References for required articles are listed in an order that would generate the best understanding)

DS&S: Chap 2

McGrath, et al. (MMK): Ch 1-2

Wells, W.D. 1993. Discovery-oriented consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19: 489-504.

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

Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. 1979. *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis*. Portsmouth, NH: Heineman: 1-9.

Lee, A.S. 1991. Integrating positivist and interpretive approaches to organizational research. *Organization Science*, 2: 342-365

Optional

Cacioppo, J. T., Semin, G. R., & Berntson, G. G. 2004. Realism, instrumentalism, and scientific symbiosis: Psychological theory as a search for truth and the discovery of solutions. *American Psychologist*, 59: 214-233.

Astley, W. G., & Van de Ven, A. H. 1983. Central perspectives and debates in organization theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28: 245-273.

Cook, T. D., & Campbell D. T. 1979. Causal inference and the language of experimentation. In T. D. Cook and D. T. Campbell (Eds.) *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings* Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin. 1-36.

Platt, J. R. (1964) Strong Inference, *Science*, 146: 347-353.

Suddaby, R. 2006. What grounded theory is not. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(4): 633-642.

Week 2

Choosing Problems, Questions, and Hypotheses

- Colquitt, J.A. & George, G. 2011. *From the editors*, Publishing in AMJ—Part 1: Topic choice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(3): 432-435.
- 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.
- Pillutla, M.M. & Thau, S. 2013. Organizational sciences' obsession with 'that's interesting!' Consequences and an alternative. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 3: 187–194.
- Sutton, R. I., & Staw, B. M. 1995. What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 371-384.
- Corley, K.G. & Gioia, D.A. 2011. Building theory about theory building: What constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review*, 36(1): 12-32.
- Ashford, S.J. 2013. Having scholarly impact: The art of hitting academic home runs. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 12(4): 623-633.
- Oldham, G.R. & Hackman, J.R. 2005. How job characteristics theory happened. In K.G. Smith and M.A. Hitt (Eds.) *Great minds in management: The process of theory development*, 151-170. Oxford University Press: New York.

Optional

- Davis, G.F. 2015. Editorial essay: What is organizational research for? *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 60(2): 179-188.
- Aguinis, H., Shapiro, D.L., Antonacopoulou, E.P. & Cummings, T.G. 2014. Scholarly impact: A pluralist conceptualization. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 13(4): 623–639.
- Weick, K. E., 1995. What Theory is Not, Theorizing Is, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 385-390.
- DiMaggio, P. J. 1995. Comments on “What Theory is Not.” *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 391-397.
- Mintzberg, H. 2005. Developing theory about the development of theory. In K.G. Smith and M.A. Hitt (Eds.) *Great minds in management: The process of theory development*, 355-372. Oxford University Press: New York.
- Edwards, J.R. & Berry, J.W. 2010. The presence of something or the absence of nothing: Increasing theoretical precision in management research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 13(4): 668-689.
- Muchinsky, P. M. 2003. Boxes and arrows. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 41: 130-132.
- Martocchio, J.J., & Harrison, D.A. 1993. To be there or not to be there?: Questions, theories, and methods in absenteeism research. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 11: 259-328. (helpful for your eventual critique, but in a broad way)
- Brief, A. P. & Dukerich, J. M. 1991. Theory in organizational behavior: Can it be useful? In B. M. Staw (Ed.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 13: 327-352.

Week 3

Writing and Publishing Academic Articles

- Locke, K., & Golden-Biddle, K. 1997. Constructing opportunities for contribution: Structuring intertextual coherence and "problematizing" in organizational studies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40: 1023-1062.
- Grant, A.M. & Pollock, T.G. 2011. *From the Editors*, Publishing in AMJ—Part 3: Setting the hook. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(5): 873-879.
- Sparrow, R.T & Mayer, K.J. 2011. *From the editors*, Publishing in AMJ—Part 4: Grounding hypotheses. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(6): 1098-1102.
- Zhang, Y. & Shaw, J.D. 2012. *From the editors*, Publishing in AMJ—Part 5: Crafting the methods and results. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(1): 8-12.
- Geletkanycz, M. & Tepper, B.J. 2012. *From the editors*, Publishing in AMJ—Part 6: Discussing the implications. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(2): 256-260.
- Lamott, A. 1994. Shitty first drafts, in *Bird by Bird: Some Instructions on Writing and Life*. New York, NY: Anchor Books: 21-27.
- Ragins, B.R. 2012. Editor's comments: Reflections on the craft of clear writing. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(4): 493-501.
- Pollock, T.G. & Bono, J.E. 2013. *From the Editors* – Being Scheherazade: The importance of storytelling in academic writing. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(3): 629-634.
- ### Optional
- Lange, D. & Pfarrer, M.D. 2017. Editor's comments: Sense and structure—the core building blocks of an AMR article. *Academy of Management Review*, 42(3): 407-416.
- Bajwa, N.U.H., König, C.J. & Harrison, O.S.V. 2016. Toward Evidence-Based Writing Advice: Using Applied Linguistics to Understand Reviewers' Expectations. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 15(3): 419-434.
- Cloutier, C. 2016. How I write: An inquiry into the writing practices of academics. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 25(1): 69-84.
- Johanson, L.M. 2007. Sitting in your reader's chair: Attending to your academic sensemakers. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 16: 290-294.
- Gans, J.S. & Shepherd, G.B. 1994. How are the mighty fallen: Rejected classic articles in economics. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 8: 165-179.
- Staw, B.M. 1994. Repairs on the road to relevance and rigor: Some unexplored issues in publishing organizational research. In P. J. Frost & S. M. Taylor (Eds.) *The Rhythms of Academic Life* (pp.85-97). New York, NY: Jossey-Bass.
- Bem, D. 2004. Writing the empirical journal article. In M. P. Zanna, J. M. Darley & H.L. Roediger (Eds.), *The complete academic: A practical guide for the beginning social scientist 2nd edition*, 185-219. Random House: New York.
- Oppenheimer, D.M. 2006. Consequences of erudite vernacular utilized irrespective of necessity: Problems with using long words needlessly. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 20(2): 139-156.

- Ferber, R. 1979. Editorial: How not to write a prize-winning article. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 5: 303-305.
- Golden-Biddle, K., Locke, K. & Reay, T. 2006. Using knowledge in management studies: An investigation of how we cite prior work. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 15(3): 237-254.
- Sternberg, R. J. 1992. How to win acceptances by psychology journals: 21 tips for better writing. *APS Observer*, 4: 12-18.
- Meyer, A. D. 1992. Journey 3: From loose coupling to environmental jolts. In P. Frost and R. Stablein (Eds.), *Doing exemplary research*, (pp. 79-112). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Taylor, S.E., & Martin, J. 1988. The present-minded professor: Controlling one's career. In B. Latané and J. Darley (Eds.), *The compleat academic*, (pp. 23-60).
- Robinson, S. J. 1992. Top 10 things you should know about doing research in an organization. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 29: 79-81.
- Harrison, D. A. 2003. Obligations and obfuscations in the review process. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46: 1079-1084.
- Holbrook, M. B. 1986. A note on sadomasochism in the review process: I hate when that happens. *Journal of Marketing*, 50: 104-108.
- Bedeian, A. G. 2004. Peer review and the social construction of knowledge in the management discipline. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 3: 198-216.

Week 4

Research Design; Types of Validity

DS&S: Chap 5, pp. 116-122

MMK: Ch 3: pp. 69-80

Bono, J.A. & McNamara, G. 2011. *From the editors*, Publishing in AMJ—Part 2: Research design. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(4): 657-660.

Schwab, D. P. 2005. Ch. 2 (A Model of Empirical Research).

Schwab, D. P. 2005. Ch. 5 (Research Design Foundations), pp. 53-65

Klein, K. J., Dansereau, F., & Hall, R. J. 1994. Levels issues in theory development, data collection, and analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 19: 195-229. (not a debate, and not easy to digest, but a vitally important and widely cited set of prescriptions for the unit of analysis in theorizing).

Shadish, Cook & Campbell, 2002. Ch. 2 (on Validity), pp. 33-42

Cooper, W. H., & Richardson, A. J. 1986. Unfair comparisons. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71: 179-184.

Week 5

Sampling/Statistical Conclusion Validity

DS&S:Chap 6 pp. 148-168

Shadish et al., 2002. Ch. 2 (Statistical Conclusion Validity), pp. 42-53.

Schwab, 2005. Chapter 12 .Statistical Inference Foundations. *Research Methods for Organizational Studies*,

Pedhazur, E.J., & Schmelkin, L.P. 1991. Chap 15, pp. 322-329. *Measurement, design, and analysis: An integrated approach*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Wasserstein, R.L. & Lazar, N.A. 2016. The ASA's statement on p-values: Context, process, and purpose. *The American Statistician*, 70(2): 129-133.

Cohen, J. 1992. A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112: 155-159.

Cortina, J.M. & Landis, R.S. 2009. When small effect sizes tell a big story, and when large effect sizes don't. In C.E. Lance & R.J. Vandenberg (Eds.) *Statistical and Methodological Myths and Urban Legends*: 287-308. New York, NY: Routledge.

Example

Lee, P.M., Pollock, T.G. & Jin, K. 2011. The contingent value of venture capitalist reputation for entrepreneurial firms. *Strategic Organization*, 9(1): 33-69. (Using archival data)

Optional

Austin, J. T., Boyle, K. A., & Lualhati, J. C. 1998. Statistical conclusion validity for organizational science researchers: A review. *Organizational Research Methods*, 1: 164-208.

Smith, P. C., Budzeika, K. A., Edwards, N. A., Johnson, S. M., Bearse, L. N. 1986. Guidelines for clean data: Detection of common mistakes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71: 457-460.

Week 6

Construct Validity

- Schwab, 2005. Chapter 3. Validity and Validation. *Research Methods for Organizational Studies*.
- Shadish et al., 2002. Chapter 3 (pp. 64-83)
- Pedhazur, E.J., & Schmelkin, L.P. 1991. Chapter 4. *Measurement, design, and analysis: An integrated approach*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. (pp. 54-59)
- Suddaby, R. 2010. Editor's comments: Construct clarity in theories of management and organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(3): 346-357.
- Churchill, G.A. Jr. 1979. A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16: 64-73.

Examples

- Morgesen, F.P. & Humphrey, S.E. 2006. The work design questionnaire (WDQ): Developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(6): 1321-1339.
- Lee, P.M., Pollock, T.G. & Jin, K. 2011. The contingent value of venture capitalist reputation for entrepreneurial firms. *Strategic Organization*, 9(1): 33-69. (Using archival data)

Optional

- Wall, T. D., Michie, J. M., Patterson, M., Wood, S. J., Sheehan, M., Clegg, C. W., & West, M. 2004. On the validity of subjective measures of company performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 57: 95-118.
- Boyd, B. K., Gove, S., and Hitt, M. A. 2005. Construct Measurement in Strategic Management Research: Illusion or Reality? *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(3): 239-257.
- Edwards, J. R., & Bagozzi, R. P. 2000. On the nature and direction of relationships between constructs and measures. *Psychological Methods*, 5: 155-174.
- Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. 1955. Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52: 281-302.
- Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. 1959. Convergent and discriminant validation by the multi-trait-multi-method matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56: 81-105.
- Carlson, K. D., Herdman, A. O. 2012. Understanding the impact of convergent validity on research results. *Organizational Research Methods*, 15: 17-32.
- Schmitt, N. & Stults, D. M. 1986. Methodology review: analysis of multitrait-multimethod matrices. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 10: 1-22.
- Kumar, N., Stern, L. W., & Anderson, J. C. 1993. Conducting interorganizational research using key informants. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36: 1633-1651.
- Hinkin, T. R. 1998. A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods*, 1: 104-121.
- Van Bruggen, G. H., Lilien, G. L., & Kacker, M. 2002. Informants in organizational marketing research: Why use multiple informants and how to aggregate responses. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 29: 469-478.
- Peter, J. P. 1981. Construct validity: a review of basic issues and marketing practices. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18: 133-145.
- Woehr, D. J., Putka, D. J., & Bowler, M. C. 2012. An examination of G-Theory methods for modeling multitrait-multimethod data: clarifying links to construct validity and confirmatory factor analysis. *Organizational Research Methods*, 15: 134-161.

Week 7

Reliability and Related Technical Issues

Pedhazur, E.J., & Schmelkin, L.P. 1991. Chap 5: 81-97

Schwab, 2005. Chapter 17. On Reliability. *Research Methods for Organizational Studies*.

Traub, R.E., & Rowley, G.L. 1991. Understanding reliability. *Educational Measurement: Issue and Practice*, 10: 37-45.

Peterson, R.A. 1994. A meta-analysis of Cronbach's coefficient alpha. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21: 381-391.

Chan, D. 2009. So why ask me? Are self report data really that bad? In C.E. Lance & R.J. Vandenberg (Eds.) *Statistical and Methodological Myths and Urban Legends*: 309-336. New York, NY: Routledge.

Optional

Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. 1996. Measurement error in psychological research: Lessons from 26 research scenarios. *Psychological Methods*, 2: 199-223.

Hughes, M. A., & Garrett, D. E. 1990. Intercoder reliability estimation approaches in marketing: A generalizability theory framework for quantitative data. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 27: 185-195.

Week 8

External Validity/Triangulation

DS&S, Ch. 11

Shadish et al., 2002. Chapters 3 (pp. 83-95) & 13 (pp. 417-435)

Scandura, T. A., & Williams, E. A. 2000. Research methodology in management: Current practices, trends, and implications for future research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43: 1248-1264.

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

Humphrey, S. E. 2011. What does a great meta-analysis look like? *Organizational Psychology Review*, 1: 99-103.

Examples

Joshi, A., Son, J., & Roh, H. 2015. When can women close the gap? A meta-analytic test of sex differences in performance and rewards. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58: 1516-1545.

Uzzi, B. 1996. The sources and consequences of embeddedness for the economic performance of organizations: The network effect. *American Sociological Review*, 61: 674-698. (Example of a study combining qualitative and archival studies)

Grant, A.M., Campbell, E.M., Chen, G. Cottone, K., Lapedis, D. & Lee, K. 2007. Impact and the art of motivation maintenance: The effect of contact with beneficiaries on persistence behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 103: 53-67. (Example of combining a field quasi-experiment and lab experiments)

Optional

Currall, S. C., Hammer, T. H., Baggett, L. S., & Doniger, G. M. 1999. Combining qualitative and quantitative methodologies to study group processes: An illustrative study of a corporate board of directors. *Organizational Research Methods*, 2: 5-36.

Field, A. P. & Gillett, R. 2010. How to do a meta-analysis. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 63: 665-694.

Dipboye, R. L., & Flanagan, M. F. 1979. Research settings in industrial and organizational psychology: are findings in the field more generalizable than findings in the laboratory? *American Psychologist*, 34: 141-150.

Jick, T. D. 1979. Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: triangulation in action. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24: 672-691.

Lewis, M. W. & Grims, A. J. 1999. Meta-triangulation: building theory from multiple paradigms. *Academy of Management Review*, 24: 672-691.

Hubbard, R., Vetter, D. E., & Little, E. L. 1998. Replication in strategic management: scientific testing for validity, generalizability, and usefulness. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19: 243-254.

Mook, D. G. 1983. In defense of external validity. *American Psychologist*, 38: 379-387.

Molina-Azorin, J. F. 2012. Mixed methods research in strategic management: impact and applications. *Organizational Research Methods*, 15: 33-56.

Aytug, Z. G., Rothstein, H. R., Zhou, W., & Kern, C. 2012. Revealed or concealed? Transparency of procedures, decisions, and judgment calls in meta-analyses. *Organizational Research Methods*, 15: 103-133.

Week 9

Experimental Designs & Internal Validity

DS&S: Chap 7: 176-200

Shadish et al., 2002, Ch. 2 (Internal Validity), pp. 53-63; Ch. 8 (Randomized Experiments), pp. 246-251

Ilgen, D.R. 1986. Laboratory research: A question of when, not if. In E.A. Locke (Ed.), *Generalizing from laboratory to field settings*, (pp. 257-267). Indianapolis, IN: D.C. Heath.

Colquitt, J.A. 2008. *From the editors*, Publishing laboratory research in AMJ: A question of when, not if. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(4): 616-620.

Anderson, C. A., Lindsay, J. J., & Bushman, B. J. 1999. Research in the psychological laboratory: Truth or triviality? *Psychological Science*, 8: 3-9.

Perdue, B. C., & Summers, J. O. 1986. Checking the success of manipulations in marketing experiments. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 23: 317-326.

Aiman-Smith, L., Scullen, S. E., & Barr, S. H. 2002. Conducting studies of decision making in organizational contexts: A tutorial for policy-capturing and other regression-based techniques. *Organizational Research Methods*, 5: 388-414.

Examples

Meloy, M.G. 2000. Mood-driven distortion of product information. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27: 345-359.

Sapienza, H. J., & Korsgaard, M. A. 1996. Procedural justice in entrepreneur-investor relations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39: 544-574. (Example of a judgment task)

Optional

Aronson, E., Brewer, M., & Carlsmith, J.M. 1985. Experimentation in social psychology. In L.L. Berkowitz, (Ed.), *Handbook of social psychology*, (Vol. 2, pp. 441-485).

Shimp, T. A., Hyatt, E. M., & Snyder, D. J. 1991. A critical appraisal of demand artifacts in consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18: 273-283.

Priem, R.L. & Harrison, D.A. 1994. Exploring strategic judgment: Methods for testing the assumptions of prescriptive contingency theories. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15: 311-324.

Marlow, C. M., Schneider, S. L., & Nelson, C. E. 1996. Gender and attractiveness biases in hiring decisions: Are more experienced managers less biased? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81: 11-21.

Wiseman, D. B. & Levin, I. P. 1996. Comparing risky decision making under conditions of real and hypothetical consequences. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 66: 241-250.

Fischhoff, B. 1996. The real world: What good is it? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 65: 232-248.

Harrison, D. A., Mohammed, S., McGrath, J. E., Florey, A. T., & Vanderstoep, S. 2003. Time matters in team task performance: Effects of member familiarity, entrainment, and task discontinuity on speed and quality. *Personnel Psychology*, 56: 633-669.

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

Week 10

Quasi-Experimental Designs

MMK: Ch3 p72-80

Shadish et al. 2002. Ch. 4 & 5, pp. 103-130, 135-153 & 156-161

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*, 12: 653-686.

Davis, G.F. 2010. Do theories of organizations progress? *Organizational Research Methods*, 13(4): 690-709.

Examples

Grant, A.M. & Hofmann, D.A. 2011. It's not all about me: Motivating hand hygiene among healthcare professionals by focusing on patients. *Psychological Science*, 22(12): 1494-1499. (Example of a field quasi-experiment)

Pollock, T.G., Fischer, H.M. & Wade, J.B. 2002. The role of power and politics in repricing executive options. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(6): 1172-1182. (Example of an archival quasi-experiment)

Optional

Peterson, S. J., & Luthans, F. 2006. The impact of financial and nonfinancial incentives on business-unit outcomes over time. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91: 156-165. (Example of a field quasi-experiment)

Hollenbeck, J. R. 2002. Quasi-experimentation and applied psychology: Introduction to a special issue of *Personnel Psychology*. *Personnel Psychology*, 55: 587-588.

Westman, M., & Eden, D. 1997. Effects of a respite from work on burnout: Vacation relief and fade-out. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82: 516-527.

McWilliams, A., & Siegel, D. 1997. Event studies in management research: Theoretical and empirical issues. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40: 626-657.

Hui, C., Lam, S. S. K., & Schaubroeck, J. 2001. Can good citizens lead the way in providing quality service? A field quasi experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44: 988-995.

Morgeson, F. P., & Campion, M. A. 2002. Minimizing tradeoffs when redesigning work: Evidence from a longitudinal quasi-experiment. *Personnel Psychology*, 55: 589-612.

Cialdini, R. B. 2005. Don't throw in the towel: Use social influence research. *American Psychological Society Newsletter*, 18: 33-34. (a fun little description of a simple, yet potent manipulation in the field).

Week 11 Survey Designs

DS&S Chap 8

- Mitchell, T.R. 1985. An evaluation of the validity of correlational research conducted in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 10: 192-205.
- Dillman, D. A. 1991. The design and administration of mail surveys. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 17: 225-249.
- Rogelberg, S. G. & Stanton, J. M. 2007. Understanding and dealing with survey non-response. *Organizational Research Methods*, 10(2): 195-209.
- Gosling, S. D., Vazire, S., Srivastava, S., & John, O. P. 2004. Should we trust web-based studies: A comparative analysis of six preconceptions about internet questionnaires. *American Psychologist*, 59: 93-104.

Examples

- Harrison, D. A. 1995. Volunteer motivation and attendance decisions: Competitive theory testing in multiple samples from a homeless shelter. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80: 371-385.
- Westphal, J.D. 1998. "Board games: How CEOs adapt to increases in structural board independence from management". *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43: 511-537. (Example of successfully surveying a difficult population)

Optional

- Richardson, H.A., Simmering, M.J. & Sturman, M.C. 2009. A tale of three perspectives: Examining post hoc statistical techniques for detection and correction of common method variance. *Organizational Research Methods*, 12: 762-800.
- Rogelberg, S. G., & Luong, A. 1998. Nonresponse to mailed surveys: A review and guide. *Psychological Science*, 7: 60-65. (note that they didn't even cite the master! Dillman)
- Rynes, S. L., McNatt, B., & Bretz, R. D. 1999. Academic research inside organizations: Inputs, processes, and outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, 52: 869-898.
- Seidel, M. L., & Westphal, J. D. 2004. Research impact: How seemingly innocuous social cues can lead to change in board of director network ties. *Strategic Organization*, 2: 227-270.
- Bednar, M. & J.D. Westphal. 2006. Surveying the corporate elite: Theoretical and practical guidance on improving response rates and response quality in top management survey questionnaires. In D.J. Ketchen, and D.D. Bergh (Eds.) *Research Methodology in Strategy and Management*, Vol 3: 37-56. JAI press.
- Harrigan, K.R. 1983. Research methodologies for contingency approaches to business strategy. *Academy of Management Review*, 8: 398-405.

Week 12

Archival Research Designs

DS&S:Chap 10

Blossfeld, H. P. Golsch, K. & Rohwer, G. 2007. *Event History Analysis with Stata*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum & Assoc. Chapter 1, pp 5-13 (top)

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S., & Aiken, L. 2003. Models for count data. *Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. pp. 525-532.

Duriau, V. J., Reger, R. K. & Pfarrer, M. D. 2007. A content analysis of the content analysis literature: Research themes, data sources, and methodological refinements. *Organizational Research Methods*, 10(1): 5-34.

Berk, R. A. 1983. An introduction to sample selection bias in sociological data. *American Sociological Review*, 48: 386-398.

Examples

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

Wade, J.B., Porac, J.F. & Pollock, T.G. 1997. Worth, words and the justification of executive pay. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18: 641-664.

Optional

Bascle, G. 2008. Controlling for endogeneity with instrumental variables in strategic management research. *Strategic Organization*, 6: 285-327.

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

Murray, M.P. 2006. Avoiding invalid instruments and coping with weak instruments. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 20(4): 111-132.

Fichman, M. & Cummings, J. C. 2003. Multiple Imputation for missing data: Making the most of what you know. *Organizational Research Methods*, 6(2): 282-308.

Week 13

Role of Time in Research Design

The Role of Time in Research Design

Kelly, J.R., & McGrath, J.E. 1988. Time and the logic of method. In *On time and method*, (pp. 9-28). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Zaheer, S., Albert, S., Zaheer, A. 1999. Time scales and organizational theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 24: 725-741.

Blossfeld, H. P. Golsch, K. & Rohwer, G. 2007. *Event History Analysis with Stata*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum & Assoc. Chapter 1:13-30

Yamaguchi, K. 1991. *Event History Analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. Chapter 1: 3-9.

Examples

Guler, I. 2007. Throwing good money after bad? Political and institutional influences on sequential decision making in the venture capital industry. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51(2): 248-285. (Example of event history analysis)

Chen, G., Hambrick, D.C. & Pollock, T.G. 2008. Puttin' on the Ritz: Pre-IPO enlistment of prestigious affiliates as deadline-induced remediation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(5): 954-975. (Example of how time affects organizational actions)

Optional

Jebb, A.T. & Tay, L. 2017. Introduction to time series analysis for organizational research: Methods for longitudinal analyses. *Organizational Research Methods*, 20(1): 61-94.

Mitchell, T. R., & James, L. R. 2001. Building better theory: Time and the specification of when things happen. *Academy of Management Review*, 26: 530-547.

Allison, P. D. 1984. *Event History Analysis: Regression for Longitudinal Event Data*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage: 9-22

Ostrom, C.W. 1990 *Time Series Analysis Regression Techniques Second Edition*. Newbury Park: Sage: 7-29.

Yamaguchi, K. 1991. *Event History Analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. Chapter 6: 130-139

Kelly, J.R., & McGrath, J.E. 1988. Temporal issues in strategy, design, and validity of studies. In *On time and method*, (pp. 29-56). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Kelly, J.R., & McGrath, J.E. 1988. Exploring the X-Y interval: Some tactics for the time structuring of study procedures. In *On time and method*, (pp. 77-96). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Mosakowski, E., & Earley, P. C. 2000. A selective review of time assumptions in strategy research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25: 796-812.

Week 14 Drawing Inferences

Pedhazur, E.J., & Schmelkin, L.P. 1991. Ch. 18: 414-422, 428-433, 446-451

Atinc, G. Simmering, M. J., & Kroll, M. J. 2012. Control variable use and reporting in macro and micro management research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 15: 57-74.

Schwab, A., Abrahamson, E., Starbuck, W.H. & Fidler, F. 2011. Researchers should make thoughtful assessments rather than null-hypothesis significance tests. *Organization Science*, 22(4): 1105-1120.

Greckhamer, T., Misangyi, V.F., Elms, H. & Lacey, R. 2008. Using qualitative comparative analysis in strategic management research: A combination of industry, corporate and business-unit effects. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11(4): 695-726.

Examples

Lee, P.M., Pollock, T.G. & Jin, K. 2011. The contingent value of venture capitalist reputation for entrepreneurial firms. *Strategic Organization*, 9(1): 33-69. (Interpreting effects – just look at results)

Misangyi, V.F. & Acharya, A.G. 2014. Substitutes or compliments? A configurational examination of corporate governance mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(6): 1681-1706. (Example of fs/QCA)

Mishina, Y., Pollock, T.G. & Porac, J.F. 2004. Are more resources always better for growth? Resource stickiness in market and product expansion. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25: 1179-1197. (Assessing Model Significance – just look at results)

Optional

Aguinis, H., Edwards, J.R. & Bradley, K.J. 2017. Improving our understanding of moderation and mediation in strategic management research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 20: 665-685.

Bernerth, J. & Aguinis, H. 2016. A critical review and best-practice recommendations for control variable usage. *Personnel Psychology*, 69: 229-283.

Chow, S. L. 1988. Significance test or effect size? *Psychological Bulletin*, 103: 105-110.

Ferguson, T. D., & Ketchen, D. J. 1999. Organizational configurations and performance: the role of statistical power in extant research. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20: 385-395.

Mone, M. A., Mueller, G. C., and Mauland, W. 1996. The perceptions and usage of statistical power in applied psychology and management research. *Personnel Psychology*, 49: 103-120.

Spector, P.E. & Brannick, M.T. 2011. Methodological urban legends: The misuse of statistical control variables. *Organizational Research Methods*, 14(2): 287-305.

Week 15 (Un)Ethical Methods

D S&S: Chap 3

Research Ethics Vignettes

Ulrich Lichtenthaler article retractions: <http://retractionwatch.wordpress.com/2012/07/17/three-papers-by-german-management-prof-retracted-for-duplication-statistical-issues/#more-8733>

Academy of Management. 2005. Academy of Management code of ethical conduct. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 1188-1192.

Colquitt, J.A. 2012. From the Editors: Plagiarism policies and screening at AMJ. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(4): 749-751.

Levin, J. 1981. Ethical problems in sociological research. In A.J. Kimmel (Ed.), *New Directions for Methodology of Social and Behavioral Science: Ethics of Human Subject Research*, 10: 49-54. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Suls, J.M., & Rosnow, R. L. 1981. The delicate balance between ethics and artifacts in behavioral research. In A. J. Kimmel (Ed.), *New Directions for Methodology of Social and Behavioral Science: Ethics of Human Subject Research*, 10, 55-67. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rosenthal, R. 1994. Science and ethics in conducting, analyzing, and reporting psychological research. *Psychological Science*, 5: 127-134.