

in the scientific process, including choosing conclusions from one's results. Yes, "choosing" conclusions.

This course was developed jointly with the marketing department at Smeal, and is focused squarely on helping you prepare for a career in a research-oriented academic institution where you publish studies 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

Singleton, R.A. & Straits, B.C. 2005. *Approaches to Social Research, fourth edition*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

McGrath, J.E., Martin, J., & Kulka, R.A. 1982. *Judgment Calls in Research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. (referred to as MMK; It's out of print, but the pdf is on your CD)

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

FORMAT

Like my attire, my teaching style is pretty informal. However, unlike my OT content seminar, I'll spend most of each session lecturing, with significant time spent on class discussions. Get in on those discussions, but don't do so just to mark your 'air time;' this is not an MBA class. 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. As you'll read about below (see 'Grades'), our discussion will depend in part on a priori questions you ask and circulate after reading the assigned chapters or articles. Finally, please don't come to class late or leave early. There is only one door and there are not many people in class; to them, it is distracting, disruptive and oftentimes just rude.

EXPECTATIONS FOR CLASS PERFORMANCE

CLASS CONTRIBUTION: Class contribution will make up **30%** 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. 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.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS: Each week I will email you a discussion question to help you prepare for the next week's class. I will expect you to have prepared an answer to this question that you will be ready to discuss in class. Each week I will pick a different person to lead off the discussion of the question. If you have not adequately prepared an answer to this question and are called on, not only will it be embarrassing for you, it will affect your class contribution grade. To prepare for these discussions you'll need to read the assigned materials. I've tried to keep those materials from being too "thick." That is, articles and chapters stuffed with Greek symbols have been kept to a minimum. Still, there is a pretty stiff quantitative backbone to what we'll be discussing. The Cook and Campbell terminology can be especially difficult. Note now that we'll be covering it in week 4. *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 two take-home exercises that I'll grade. **Each is worth 20%** of your grade and each will be designed to further embed and illustrate the issues we cover in class. They will be a blend of ways for you to push your final paper forward as well as demonstrate your understanding of the methodological principles we cover. I don't want your semester to be horribly back-end loaded. So, these two assignments will be spread through the term. Your review paper, described below, will be due the last week of class.

PAPER: The final paper is worth **30%** of your grade. It isn't just a proposal or "practice" piece. You need to write it in a way that improves its chances of acceptance at a journal or a national conference in your field (including using the proper format and so on). It will involve a review and critique of the theoretical and empirical research (methods used) in a particular area of research in your discipline. The trickiest thing will be to get to the proper scope (not too big, not too small) in terms of the area you're going to cover in the review.

TAKE-HOME EXERCISES

The exercises will be take-home assignments dealing with methodological topic(s) we cover in class. They'll also be progressive, building on each other. Their structure should allow you to use the same conceptual domain or phenomenon you want to study in each one. This will help you craft your end-of-semester paper (a research critique) and perhaps even your dissertation. Their format will be a mix of an assignment and something like a comp question. These exercise-exams are due at 9:00 a.m. *two weeks after they are assigned (i.e., at the beginning of class).* This will give me enough turnaround time to grade them before the following Tuesday's class, allowing us to discuss them right away. After 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, the exercises are worth zero points. You can email them to me or give me a hard copy (preferably hard copy, so I don't have to print them) any time up to that point.

RESEARCH PAPER / METHODOLOGICAL CRITIQUE

A major purpose of this class is to help you critically review research in your own area of organization science. Therefore, in your paper, you'll comprehensively summarize and critique

empirical investigations that have examined a substantive problem that interests you using a particular conceptual orientation or theoretical paradigm. The conceptual theory or hypothesis must have been examined in at least 30 or more *empirical* investigations. You will do a careful, exhaustive review and analysis of that published literature. An example of such a critique, although it is much wider and longer than I expect yours to be, is in your supplemental readings: Martocchio and Harrison (1993).

All papers must be prepared according to the format prescribed by your discipline. If you'd like to see an example paper in these format of your discipline, your graduate student colleagues and professors have several of them.

Papers should include a *critical view of how investigators have made choices regarding each of the important steps in the research process* that we cover in class. What we're really interested in at each step is how much a single methodological choice dominates the research area, and therefore the errors inherent in such a dominant choice, that might underlie general conclusions about substantive phenomena. To reduce some of ambiguity about what these choices or points of criticism are, you can use the Martocchio and Harrison (1993) paper as a very loose guide, and you can take cues from the paper grading sheet that I've attached to this syllabus. The text of the paper (i.e., not counting references, tables, figures, and appendices) should not exceed 25 pages of double-spaced (6 lines per inch, 3 of which contain text), Times-Roman 12-pitch proportional text, with one inch margins. **The paper is due by 9:00am on Friday, May 2nd.** I do not accept late papers or give incompletes. You will have already written the initial draft by completing the two take-home exercises, so you have no excuses.

We'll talk more about this critique as the semester goes on. As I mentioned above, each of the exercises will also add to the completion of this paper. In past years some students have used the paper to gain deep expertise in a topic area and then publish a meta-analytic summary of the research in that area, using the methodological critique as a guide.

COURSE CALENDAR

SESSION	DUE	CONTENT
1 - 1/15		The research process - Idealized vs. garbage can
2 - 1/22		Choosing problems, questions & hypotheses
3 - 1/29		Positivistic vs. interpretive approaches
4 - 2/5		Quasi-experimental designs
5 - 2/12		Experimental designs
6 - 2/19		Survey designs
7 - 2/26		Archival research I
8 - 3/4	Exercise 1	Archival research II; Using multiple methods
Spring Break		
9 - 3/18		Time and methods
10 - 3/25		Modes of treating constructs; Observation types
11 - 4/1		Choosing, developing and evaluating measures I
12 - 4/8		Choosing, developing and evaluating measures II
13 - 4/15	Exercise 2	Observations and data analysis
14 - 4/22		Data analysis and general linear modeling
15 - 4/29		(Un)ethical methods
Final Project - 5/2	Due by 9:00am	

Week 1

Idealized Cycle vs. Garbage Can

Writing, Publishing, and Exemplary Methods

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

MMK: Ch 1-2 | Ch3: p69-72

Bem, D. 2004. Writing the empirical journal article. In M. P. Zanna, J. M. Darley & H.L. Roediger (Eds.), *The compleat academic: A practical guide for the beginning social scientist 2nd edition*, 185-219. Random House: New York.

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: Jossey-Bass.

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

Ferber, R. 1979. Editorial: How not to write a prize-winning article. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 5: 303-305.

Gans, J.S. & Shepherd, G.B. 1994. How are the mighty fallen: Rejected classic articles in economics. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 8: 165-179.

(Optional -- Additional Writing and Career Considerations)

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.

McGrath, J. E. 1984. The joy of prose. Unpublished notes, Foundations of Social Psychology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

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.

Lengnick-Hall, C. A. 1997. Review of *Researchers hooked on teaching: Noted scholars discuss the synergies of teaching and research*, edited by R. André & P. J. Frost. *Academy of Management Review*, 22: 1001-1004.

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 2

Choosing Problems, Questions, and Hypotheses

S&S: Chap. 3

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.

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.

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.

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).

Sutton, R. I., & Staw, B. M. 1995. What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 371-384.

(Optional -- Debates and Perspectives on Organizational Science)

Muchinsky, P. M. 2003. Boxes and arrows. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 41: 130-132.

Organ, D.W., & Bateman, T.B. 1986. Theory and research in organizational behavior. In *Organizational behavior: An applied psychological approach*, (pp. 26-40). Plano, TX: BPI.

Priem, R. L., & Butler, J. E. 2001. Tautology in the resource-based view and the implication of externally determined resource value: Further comments. *Academy of Management Review*, 26: 57-66.

Harrison, D. A. 2002. Meaning and measurement of work role withdrawal: Current controversies and future fallout under changing technology. In M. Koslowsky & M. Krausz (Eds.), *Voluntary employee withdrawal and inattentance: A current perspective*, 95-132. Plenum Publishing. (read 95-108 if you're interested).

Malhotra, N. K., Peterson, M., & Kleiser, S. B. 1999. Marketing research: A state-of-the-art review and directions for the twenty-first century. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 27: 160-183.

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)

Lawler, E. E. III. 1985. Challenging traditional research assumptions. In E.E. Lawler et al. (Eds.), *Doing research that is useful for theory and practice*, (pp. 1-17). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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.

Pfeffer, J. 1993. Barriers to the advance of organizational science: Paradigm development as a dependent variable. *Academy of Management Review*, 18: 599-620.

Cannella, A.A. Jr., & Paetzold, R.L. 1994. Pfeffer's barriers to the advance of organizational science: A rejoinder. *Academy of Management Review*, 19: 331-341.

Week 3

Ontology, Epistemology, & Philosophy: Positivist versus Interpretive Strategies

S&S: Chap 2

MMK: Ch3 p72-80

- Lee, A.S. 1991. Integrating positivist and interpretive approaches to organizational research. *Organization Science*, 2: 342-365
- 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.
- Suddaby, R. 2006. What grounded theory is not. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(4): 633-642.
- Wells, W.D. 1993. Discovery-oriented consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19: 489-504.
- 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.
- **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.
- **this article is critical as an example of critiquing methods using the frameworks we'll use in class.

(Optional, inc. advantages of Computational Modeling Strategy)

- Davis, J.P, Eisenhardt, K.M. & Bingham, C.B. 2007. Developing theory through simulation methods. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2): 480-499
- Harrison, J.R., Lin, Z., Carroll, G.R. & Carley, K.M. 2007. Simulation modeling in organizational and management research. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4): 1229-1245.
- Hudson, L. A., & Ozanne, J. L. 1988. Alternate ways of seeking knowledge in consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*: 14: 508-521,
- Abrahamson, E., & Rosenkopf, L. 1993. Institutional and competitive bandwagons: Using mathematical modeling as a tool to explore innovation diffusion. *Academy of Management Review*, 18: 487-517.
- Carroll, G. R., & Harrison, J. R. 1998. Organizational demography and culture: Insights from a formal model and simulation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43: 637-667.

Week 4 Quasi-Experimental Designs

S&S: Chap 4: 76-90 | Chap 7: 187-194, 206-214

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

Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. 1976. The design and conduct of quasi-experiments and true experiments in field settings. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.) *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, (pp. 223-284, 298-326). Chicago: Rand-McNally.

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)

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)

(Optional -- Other Types, Examples of Quasi-Experimental Designs)

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. Mimizing 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 5 Experimental Designs

S&S: Chap 6 | Chap 7: 194-206

MMK: Ch3: 80-98

Overviews and Controversies

- 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.
- 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.
- Meloy, M.G. 2000. Mood-driven distortion of product information. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27: 345-359 (a nice, straightforward example of a lab experiment from a local personage).

Between-Subject and Within-Subject (Judgment Task) Designs

- 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.
- 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 – Other Examples of Lab Experiments)

- 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.
- Wager, T. D. 2005. The neural bases of placebo effects in pain. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14: 175-179. (some intriguing physiological evidence about why we need more than a simple control condition in experiments).
- 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.

Ordoñez, L. D. 1998. The effect of correlation between price and quality on consumer choice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 75: 258-273.

Turban, D. B., & Greening, D. W. 1996. Corporate social performance and organizational attractiveness to prospective employees. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40: 658-672.

Week 6 Survey Designs

S&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.
- 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. (Example of a survey study by our own Dave Harrison)
- 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 -- Back to Real-World Constraints)

- Harrigan, K.R. 1983. Research methodologies for contingency approaches to business strategy. *Academy of Management Review*, 8: 398-405.
- 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.

Week 7

Archival Research Designs I: Types of Data and Methods of Analysis

S&S: Chap 11

Types of Data and Methods of Analysis

Cross Sectional Data

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

Event Count Analysis

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

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 using archival network data)

Week 8: Archival Research II: Issues and Opportunities in Data Collection and Analysis; Using Multiple Methods

S&S: Chap 12 p381-401

Identifying Data Sources

Compustat

Execucomp

CRSP

SDC (New Ventures, VentureXpert, M&A)

EDGAR

Lexis-Nexis

Internet Archive Project

PSED Survey

Kauffman Conference on 35 Entrepreneurship Databases: <http://www.ssrn.com/link/2007-Kauffman.html>

Narrative Data and Content Analysis

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.

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. (Example Study of content analysis and event counts)

Selection Bias in Archival Research

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

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. (Example of how to deal with bias problems)

Optional

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.

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

Week 9 Time and Methods

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.

Blossfeld, H. P. Glosch, K. & Rohwer, G.2007. *Event History Analysis with Stata*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum & Assoc. Chapter 1: 13-34.

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

Problems and Issues associated with Time

Censoring

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*, Forthcoming. (Example of how time affects organizational actions)

(Optional)

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.

Blossfeld, H. P. Glosch, K. & Rohwer, G.2007. *Event History Analysis with Stata*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum & Assoc. Chapter 2: 38-46.

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.

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

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

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

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

Week 10

Modes of Treating Constructs; Observation Types; Sources of Data

S&S: Chap 14 pp. 445-467

MMK: Ch3 pp. 80-102

Schwab, D. P. 1999. Measurement foundations: Validity and validation. In *Research methods for organizational studies*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum: 31-48.

Week 11

Choosing, Developing and Evaluating Measures I: Types of Measures and Construct Validity

S&S: Chap 9

Pedhazur, E.J., & Schmelkin, L.P. 1991. *Measurement, design, and analysis: An integrated approach*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. Chap 5 pp. 81-88 (Hereafter listed as P&S)

Churchill, G.A. Jr. 1979. A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16: 64-73.

Kumar, N., Stern, L. W., & Anderson, J. C. 1993. Conducting interorganizational research using key informants. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36: 1633-1651.

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.

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.

Optional

S&S Chap 4: 90-107

Hinkin, T. R. 1998. A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods*, 1: 104-121.

Week 12

Choosing, Developing, and Evaluating Measures II: Technical and Quantitative Issues

P & S: Chap 5: 88-104, 109-117

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.

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

Optional

P & S Chap 4

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 13

Observations and Data Analyses

S&S: Chap 5

P & S: Chap 15: pp. 322-329

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

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.

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.

Optional

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

Sheth, J. N. 1971. The multivariate revolution in marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 35: 13-15.

Week 14

Data Analyses; Inferences; General Linear Model Assumptions, Basics and Problems

S&S: Chap 15

P&S: Ch17-18

Week 15

(Un)Ethical Methods

S&S: Chap 16

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

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.

Dirsmith, M., & Katz, J. E. 1987. A fifty-cent test: An approach to teaching integrity. *Advances in Accounting*, 5: 129-141.

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

PAPER EVALUATION

_____/2.0 pts. **FORMAT**

_____/0.5

References

_____/1.5

Rest of Paper (headings; organization, sequence, citations, etc)

_____/3.0 **COMMUNICATION** (brevity, clarity of expression; transition, flow; jargon-free)

_____/5.0 **INTRODUCTION SECTION**

_____/2.0

Statement/Framing of Problem (importance; relevance)

_____/3.0

Choices of Theories or Hypotheses (definitions; clarity of statement; rationale; presentation; consistency)

_____/16.0 **METHODS CRITIQUE SECTION**

_____/3.0

Research Strategy (relative uses of Big 8; rationale; + & - 's)

_____/2.0

Threats to Internal, External Validity

_____/2.0

Modes of Operation (design; rationale; match to hypothesis)

_____/3.0

Method(s) of Measurement (self-report, archive, etc.; reliability & construct validity; rationale for choices; use of manipulation checks)

_____/3.0

Consideration of Time Issues

_____/1.5

Consideration of Ethics (benefit/harm; informed consent; deception; debriefing; etc)

_____/1.5

Statistical Analyses (set-up; match to data; appropriateness for hypothesis; null hypothesis; choice & rationale)

_____/4.0 **DISCUSSION/CONCLUSIONS SECTION**

_____/2.0

Most Important Limitations on Current Conclusions

_____/2.0

Suggestions for Future Research (in light of critique)

_____/30.0 pts. **GRAND TOTAL**

(OTHER WRITTEN COMMENTS WILL BE ON YOUR PAPER)

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*.