

Management 953: Research Methods in Management
Professor Katherine Klein
Spring 2010 Syllabus – Version 1

This is an introductory doctoral seminar on research methods in management. Together, we will examine the building blocks of rigorous research in management. I want this seminar to be informative and useful for you, engaging, thought-provoking, and lively. Accordingly, I welcome your specific suggestions and feedback about class requirements, readings, and procedures. I've labeled this syllabus "Version 1" as I may make small revisions to the readings or other class details over the course of the semester.

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

1. Introduction to the Class (1/19/10)
2. From Theory to Research (1/26/10)
3. Research Design Choices and Causal Inferences (2/2/10)
4. Writing and the Publication Process (2/9/10)
5. Validity and Reliability (2/16/10)
6. Research Ethics and Content Analysis and Observational Research (2/23/10)
7. Experiments (3/2/10)
8. Quasi-experiments (3/16/10)
9. Qualitative Research Methods (3/23/10)
10. Survey Development (3/30/10)
11. Models and Simulation Analysis (4/6/10)
12. Levels of Analysis (4/13/10)
13. To be decided (4/20/10)
14. Final Course Wrap-up and Discussion of Research Proposals (4/27/10)

As explained below, your grade in this class will be based on your performance on the following requirements:

1. Participation in Class Discussions (20%)
2. Weekly Commentaries (15%)
3. Research Proposal (50%)
4. Feedback to two fellow students (5%)
5. Research Exercise (Observation, Survey, or Interview) (10%)

Participation in Class Discussions (20% of final course grade)

As a class we will discuss the readings and:

- Identify key terms, issues, and themes from the readings
- Relate the readings to prior classes
- Relate the readings to each student's research proposal
- Highlight key methodological contributions or flaws
- Suggest new topics for research

- Raise questions for discussion or debate

We will assume collective responsibility for these tasks and, more generally, for our learning, stimulation, and enjoyment in this class. *Accordingly, it's critical that you come to each class fully prepared to discuss the readings. You must read – not skim – and think about every assigned article or chapter before class.* As I read in one of the syllabi I examined in preparing another class: “To be ill-prepared for a seminar session is to tell other seminar members, the seminar moderator, and the instructor that your time is too valuable to spend preparing for class.” Your participation grade will be based on the quality of your input (e.g., demonstrated grasp of the readings, ability to develop and present new ideas and insights; ability to respond to others’ ideas and input) and by the quantity of your input (i.e., participation – but not domination – in every class discussion). To ensure everyone’s active participation in class discussions, I will “cold call” students – asking specific questions about specific articles – during each class. If, during the semester, you’d like feedback at any time about your participation in class discussions, just let me know.

Weekly Commentaries (15%)

Over the course of the semester, you must write five 2-3 page (double-spaced) commentary papers. Your commentary on one or more of the assigned readings for the week is due *by 5 pm on Monday night before the class session* for which I assigned the readings.

In your commentary papers, please do not summarize the readings. This is so important, let me say it again: *Do not summarize the readings.* Instead, write about your thoughts and reactions to the paper(s). What did you learn from the reading(s)? How can you apply insights and lessons from the readings to your own research? What grabbed you? What was exciting and helpful to you? What confused you? What questions or ideas – prompted by the readings – do you think we should in class?

Here are a few more do’s and don’ts: Do be personal. Do use the word “I.” Do use these essays as a means to clarify, hone, and perhaps expand your research agenda for the coming years. Do use these essays as a forum to improve your writing skills. Don’t whine, criticize, or complain (more than once or twice during the semester).

Your average commentary grade will count 20% towards your final course grade. I will grade your papers with a check (1 point) or check-plus (2 points). In the past, an average commentary paper grade of 1.5 or lower was a B or B+.

Research Proposal (50%) and Feedback to Fellow Students (5%)

Your main writing assignment in this class is to prepare a research proposal that is 20-30 pages long (double-spaced, conventional margins, spacing, and fonts, such as Times Roman 12-point font, including references, tables, etc.). Your proposal should include an introduction (literature review and conceptual argument, culminating in specific, novel,

and testable hypotheses) and research method. You should model your research proposal on the introduction and method sections of articles published in top management journals (*JAP, AMJ, ASQ, OBHDP, SMJ, Org. Science, Management Science*, etc.).

To facilitate your progress on this, over the course of the semester, I've set up several milestones, below. Note that you will have the opportunity to give feedback to and receive feedback from two fellow students. Your feedback to other students will factor into your overall course grade (5%).

If you plan to write on the same topic (or plan to write the same paper) for another class you are now taking, I need to know that prior to evaluating your topic. Similarly, if you plan to write on the same topic that you have written on in prior classes you have taken at Penn, I need to know that prior to evaluating your topic.

Further, if your paper topic is far outside my areas of expertise, I would like you to discuss your paper topic and show drafts of your work to a faculty advisor who knows more than I do about your content area. If you are working on a topic in OB or HR (topics I know more about), it would still be helpful to discuss your topic with another faculty member and show him/her drafts of your work.

Research Proposal Due Dates

- Tuesday, February 2, 2010 Due: Topic
 - Please turn in a 1-2 page description of your topic, PLUS a list of 10-25 empirical articles, published in top journals, of relevance to your topic. (Feel free to choose any topic that you think you'll want to pursue in your second year paper, and/or dissertation, etc.).
- Tuesday, February 16, 2010 Due: Annotated bibliography and commentary
 - Please turn in an annotated bibliography /chart of at least 10 empirical articles related to your topic. In your chart, list (for each article):
 - Author
 - Journal, date
 - Independent variables (including how measured)
 - Dependent variables (including how measured)
 - Sample
 - Key findings
 - Please also provide a short (3-4 page) 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?
- Tuesday, March 16, 2010 Due: Introduction and hypotheses
 - Please turn in the first draft of the introduction to your research proposal (that is, the introduction, literature review, and hypotheses). Model your draft after the introductory sections (up to the method) of top 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?” Your proposal should be prepared in APA or Academy of Management Format (you pick).

- Tuesday, April 13, 2010 Due: First Complete Draft of Proposal
 - Please turn in the first complete draft of your research proposal. This should reflect a revision of your earlier draft and the inclusion of a method section (sample, procedures, measures, analyses). (Please remember to use APA or AOM format.) Each student will read two other students’ research proposals and provided constructive and detailed written feedback regarding each of the two proposals.
- Tuesday, April 20, 2010 Due: Feedback on the Research Proposals
 - Your feedback to fellow students is due to me. (Please email me your comments.) Like the editor of a journal, I will take your feedback as reviewers and provide my own additional commentary. By Friday, April 30th, I will give each student my feedback and feedback from two fellow students, as well.
- Friday, May 28, 2009: Due: Final draft of the Research Proposal
 - Your final research proposal is due. Be sure to *also* turn in (a) a detailed response to the “reviewer” comments you received from me and your two fellow students; and (b) 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. In preparing your final draft, remember to use APA format.

As in the past, I have set the due date for the final draft of the research proposal after the end of Management doctoral students’ first year exams. Given how late the due date is, I cannot accept any extensions without a written doctor’s notice.

Research Exercise (10%)

Because students can learn a great deal simply by trying out a research method in a “quick and dirty” fashion, students are required to complete one of the following three research exercises. Students can work in groups of 2 to 4 to complete the assignment, which they will share with fellow students during the relevant class period. I will ask students to sign up for a specific exercise, to ensure that we have some students covering each of the three assignments. Please note their differing due dates:

- Content analysis or observational exercise: Due February 23, 2010
- Interview exercise: Due March 23, 2010
- Survey exercise: Due March 30, 2010

At least two weeks before the due date for your “quick and dirty” research exercise, please send me an email describing your ideas for your study. You must discuss your project and plans with me, and receive my approval, before you work on the paper.

Content analysis or observational research exercise: You may choose to do a “quick and dirty” content analysis, or a “quick and dirty” observational study.

If you choose to do a content analysis, here are the instructions: Based on the readings regarding content analysis and your own interests, your tasks are to (1) articulate a clear research question or hypothesis that you will investigate; (2) choose a set of documents to content-analyze (e.g., 10 web pages, or 10 newspaper, magazine, or journal articles, or specific pages or sections from 10 corporate annual reports); (3) determine your coding units (e.g., pages, articles, sentences, etc.); (4) decide on up to eight preliminary coding categories; (5) spend approximately 1 hour engaging in preliminary, independent coding (each team member codes the documents for 1 hour alone); (6) meet to discuss your coding results and refine your coding categories and rules, deciding on at least four codes that you will keep; (7) spend approximately 1-2 more hours each coding the documents of interest; (8) assess and report your inter-rater reliability (Cohen’s kappa) for each of your final codes; (9) analyze your data to answer your research question or test your hypothesis; and (10) write up the conclusions of your content analysis. Summarize your research, conclusions, and insights about this kind of research in a paper of no more than 5 pages double-spaced, which you will share and discuss with the class. Note: this is a helpful website on content-analysis: <http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=17>
Remember: *You must discuss your project and plans with me, and receive my approval, before you work on the paper.*

If you choose to do an observational study, here are the instructions: Based on the readings regarding observational research and your own interests, your tasks are to (1) articulate a clear research question or hypothesis that you will investigate; (2) choose a set of people to observe (e.g., individuals or groups in a public or work setting); (3) determine your coding units (e.g., individual behaviors on a minute by minute basis; completed dyadic interactions; early, middle, and late segments of meetings, etc.); (4) decide on up to eight preliminary coding categories – that is, behaviors to code; (5) spend approximately 1 hour engaging in preliminary, independent coding (each team member observes and codes individual or team behavior for 1 hour alone); (6) meet to discuss your coding results and refine your coding categories and rules, deciding on at least four codes that you will keep; (7) spend approximately 1-2 additional hours each coding individual or group behavior; (8) assess and report your inter-rater reliability (Cohen’s kappa) for each of your final codes; (9) analyze your data to answer your research question or test your hypothesis; and (10) write up the conclusions of your observational study. Summarize your research, conclusions, and insights about this kind of research in a paper of no more than 5 pages double-spaced, which you will share and discuss with the class. Remember: *You must discuss your project and plans with me, and receive my approval, before you work on the paper.*

Survey exercise: Based on the readings regarding survey research, your tasks are to: (1) pick a construct that you are interested in for which there are no well-established survey measures (or perhaps no survey measures whatsoever); (2) define the construct explicitly;

(3) write at least 10 survey items designed to measure the construct (try different strategies and formats); (4) administer your survey items PLUS a potentially related, but well-established survey measure (e.g., of self-esteem, organizational commitment, etc.) to at least 15 people; (5) analyze the data by calculating the correlations among the survey items, reporting alpha, and analyzing the correlation between the two measures (yours and the well-established one); and (6) report your results. What did you attempt to measure? What was your internal consistency reliability (alpha)? Did you need to drop any items? If so, why those items? What did you learn from your brief foray into survey research? Summarize your research, conclusions, and insights about this kind of research in a paper of no more than 5 pages double-spaced, which you will share and discuss with the class. Remember: *You must discuss your project and plans with me, and receive my approval, before you work on the paper.*

Interview exercise: Based on the readings regarding qualitative research, your tasks are to: (1) pick a topic or research question that you think is particularly well-suited to qualitative (here, interview) research; (2) develop a semi-structured interview protocol; (3) identify and gain permission to interview at least two individuals who are employed in organizations and whom you did not know prior to your interviews; (4) interview these two individuals (one at a time) regarding your chosen topic (each interview should last at least 30 minutes and you should tape-record the interview, with each interviewee's permission); (5) transcribe at least 1/4 of each interview (transcribing interviews is time-consuming); and (6) conduct a rudimentary analysis of your interview data and report your results. Be sure that you and your partner both attend each interview, but you should conduct one interview and your partner should conduct the other. Give each other feedback regarding each other's interview technique. Summarize your research, conclusions, and insights about this kind of research in a paper of no more than 5 pages double-spaced, which you will share and discuss with the class. *Be sure (a) to email me a document summarizing your plan and (b) to discuss your plan with me prior to undertaking your research project.*

(1) Introduction to the Class

1. Hansen, M. T. (1999). The search-transfer problem: The role of weak ties in sharing knowledge across organizational subunits. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44, 82-111.
2. Plowman, D. A., Baker, L. T., Beck, T. E., Kulkarni, M., Solansky, S. T., & Travis, D. V. (2007). Radical change accidentally: The emergence and application of small change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 515-543.
3. Barnett, M. L. & King, A. A. (2008). Good fences make good neighbors: A longitudinal analysis of an industry self-regulatory institution. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51, 1150-1170.
4. Harrison, D. A. & Klein, K. J. (2007). What's the difference? Diversity constructs as separation, variety, or disparity in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 1199 – 1228.

(2) From Theory to Research

1. Goodson, F. E. & Morgan, G. A. (1976). Evaluation of theory. In M. H. Marx & F. Goodson (Eds.), *Theories in contemporary psychology*. New York: MacMillan, 286-299.
2. Sutton, R. I. & Staw, B. M. (1995). What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 371-384.
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.
4. 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.
5. Hambrick, D. C. (2007). The field of management's devotion to theory: Too much of a good thing? *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 1346-1352.
6. Birkinshaw, J., Hamel, G., & Mol, M. J. (2008). Management innovation. *Academy of Management Review*, 33, 825-845.

Recommended:

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

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.

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

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

(3) Research Design Choices and Causal Inferences
(Description of your topic is due today.)

1. McGrath, J.E. Dilemmatics: The study of research choices and dilemmas. In J. E. McGrath, J. Martin, & R. A. Kulka (Eds.), *Judgment calls in research* (pp. 69-102). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
2. Edmondson, A. C. & McManus, S. E. (2007). Methodological fit in management field research. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 1155-1179.
3. Baron, R. M. & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 6, 1173-1182.
4. Mathieu, J. E. & Taylor, S. R. (2006). Clarifying conditions and decision points for mediational type inferences in Organizational Behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, 1031-1056
5. Staw, B. M. (1975). Attribution of the "causes" of performance: A general alternative interpretation of cross-sectional research on organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 414-432.
6. Ployhart, R. E. & Vandenberg, R. J. (2010). Longitudinal research: The theory, design, and analysis of change. *Journal of Management*, 36, 94-120.

Recommended

Buchanan, D. A. & Bryman, A. (2007). Contextualizing methods choice in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 10: 483-501.

(4) Writing and the Publication Process

1. Zinsser, William. (1990). *On writing well (4th ed.)*. New York: Harper Collins. Chapters 1-7 (pp. 3-49)
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. Random House: New York.
3. Schneider, B. (1985). Some propositions about getting published. In L. Cummings & P. Frost (Eds.), *Publishing in the organizational sciences*. Homewood, IL: Irvin, pp. 193-200.
4. 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.
5. Klein, K. J., Conn, A. B., Smith, D. B., & Sorra, J. S. (2001). Is everyone in agreement? An exploration of within-group agreement in survey responses. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 3-16.
 - Please be sure to read the reviews I received on prior versions of the paper submitted to JAP.

6. PLUS: Students’ choice of article

(5) Validity and Reliability

(Annotated bibliography and commentary are due today.)

1. Guion, R. M. (2002). Validity and reliability. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Handbook of research methods in industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 57-76). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.
2. Murphy, K. (2002). Using power analysis to evaluate and improve research. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Handbook of research methods in industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 119-138). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.
3. Aguinis, H., Werner, S., Abbott, J. L., Angert, C., Park, J. H., & Kohlhausen, D. (2009). Customer-centric science: Reporting significant research results with rigor, relevance, and practical impact in mind. *Organizational Research Methods*,
4. Hanges, P. J. & Dickson, M. W. (2004). The development and validation of the GLOBE culture and leadership scales. In R.J. House, P.J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P.W. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*: 122-151. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

(6) Research Ethics and Content Analysis and Observational Research
(Content analysis or observational research exercise is due today)

1. Aguinis, H. & Henle, C. A. (2002). Ethics in research. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), Handbook of research methods in industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 34-56). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.
2. Rosenthal, R. (1994). Science and ethics in conducting, analyzing, and reporting psychological research. *Psychological Science*, 5, 127-134.
3. Winston, R. B., Jr. (1985). A suggested procedure for determining order of authorship in research publications. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 63, 515-518.
4. 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.
5. Wenneras, C & Wold, A. (1997). Nepotism and sexism in peer review. *Nature*, 387, 341-343.
6. Mazzocco, K. et al. (2008). Surgical team behaviors and patient outcomes. *American Journal of Surgery*, 197, 678-685
7. Hebl, M. R., King, E. B., Glick, P., Singletary, S. L., & Kazama, S. (2007). Hostile and benevolent reactions toward pregnant women: Complementary interpersonal punishments and rewards that maintain traditional roles. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1499-1511.

Recommended

Fine, M. A. & Kurdeck, L. A. (1993). Reflections on determining authorship credit and authorship order on faculty-student collaboration. *American Psychologist*, 48, 1141-1147.

Duriau, V. J., Regar, R. K., & Pfarrer, M. D. (2007). A content analysis of the content analysis literature in organizational studies. *Organizational Research Methods*, 10, 5-37.

House, R. J., Spangler, W. D., & Woycke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in the U.S. presidency: A psychological theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 370-396. (This is also a content analysis)

Kaplan, S. (2008). Cognition, capabilities, and incentives: Assessing firm response to the fiber-optic revolution. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51, 672-695.

Bartel, C. A. & Saavedra, R. (2000). The collective construction of work group moods. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45, 197-231.

Gibson, D. R. (2005). Talking turns and talking ties: Networks and conversational interaction. *American Journal of Sociology*, 110, 1561-1597.

(7) Experiments

1. Shadish, W. R., Cook T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2001). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for causal inference*. Chapters 8 and 9, p 246-313
2. Anderson, C. A., Lindsay, J. J., & Bushman, B. J. (1999). Research in the psychological laboratory: Truth or triviality. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8, 3-9.
3. Aronson, E. (1999). The power of self-persuasion. *American Psychologist*, 875-884.
4. Audia, P. G., Locke, E. A., & Smith, K. G. (2000). The paradox of success: An archival and a laboratory study of strategic persistence following radical environmental change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 837-854.
5. Bertrand, B. & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *The American Economic Review*, 94, 991- 1013.
6. Schilling, M. A., Vidal, P., Ployhart, R. E., & Marangoni, A. (2003). Learning by doing something else: Variation, relatedness, and the learning curve. *Management Science*, 49, 39-56.

(8) Quasi-experiments

(First draft of research proposal – introduction and hypotheses – due today)

1. Shadish, W. R., Cook T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2001). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for causal inference*. Chapters 4 and 5, pp. 103-170.
(Recommended: Chapters 6 and 7, p. 171-206)

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. Forthcoming in *Organizational Research Methods*.
3. Hui, Ch., 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.
4. Allmendinger, J. & Hackman, J. R. (1996). Organizations in changing environments: The case of East German symphony orchestras. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, -369.
5. Goldin, C. & Rouse, C. (2000). Orchestrating impartiality: The impact of “blind” auditions on female musicians. *American Economic Review*, 90, 715-741.
6. Szulanski, G. & Jensen, R. J. (2006). Presumptive adaptation and the effectiveness of knowledge transfer. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27, 937–957

Recommended:

Mayer, R.C. & Davis, J. H. (1999). The effect of the performance appraisal system on trust for management: A field quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 123-136.

(9) Qualitative Research Methods

(Interview exercise write-up is due today.)

1. Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 532-550.
2. Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (Chapter 1, Introduction, pp. 1-15; Chapter 10, Making Good Sense: Drawing and Verifying Conclusions, pp. 245-287)
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. Brown, S. L. & Eisenhardt, K. M. (1997). The art of continuous change: Linking complexity theory and time-paced evolution in relentlessly shifting organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 1-34.

5. 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.
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.

(10) Survey Development

(Survey exercise write-up is due today.)

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. Mangione, T. W. (1998). Mail surveys. In L. Bickman & D. J. Rog (Eds.), *Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods*, 399-428.
3. Simsek, Z. & Veiga, J. F. (2001). A primer on internet organizational surveys. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4, 218-235.
4. Schwarz, N. 1999. Self-reports: How the questions shape the answers. *American Psychologist*, 54: 93-105.
5. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 879-903.
6. Reeve, C. L. & Smith, C. S. (2001). Refining Lodahl and Kejner's job involvement scale with a convergent evidence approach: Applying multiple methods to multiple samples. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4, 91-111.
7. Klein, K. J., Conn, A. B. & Sorra, J. S. (2001). Implementing computerized technology: An organizational analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 3-16.
8. Govindarajan, V. & Kopalle, P. K. (2006). Disruptiveness of innovations: Measurement and assessment of reliability and validity. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27, 189-199.

Recommended:

Spector, P. E. (2006). Method variance in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 9, 221-232.

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

(11) Models and Simulation Analysis

1. Davis, J. P., Eisenhardt, K. M., & Bingham, C. B. (2007). Developing simulation through simulation methods. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 480-499.
2. Macy, M. W. & Willer, R. (2002). From factors to actors: Computational sociology and agent-based modeling. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28, 143-166.
3. Levinthal, D. A. (1991). Random walks and organizational mortality. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 397-420.
4. Gavetti, G. & Levinthal, D. (2000). Looking forward and looking backward: Cognitive and experiential search. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45, 113 – 137.
5. Siggelkow, N. & Rivkin, J. W. (2005). Speed and search: Designing organizations for turbulence and complexity. *Organization Science*, 16, 101-122.
6. Rudolph, J. & Repenning, N. (2002). Disaster dynamics: Understanding the role of quantity in organizational collapse. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47, 1-30

(12) Levels of Analysis

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. Hackman, J.R. (2003). Learning more by crossing levels: Evidence from airplanes, hospitals, and orchestras. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 905-922.
3. Hofmann, D.A. (1997). An overview of the logic and rationale of hierarchical linear models. *Journal of Management*, 23, 723-744.
4. Chen, G. (2005). Newcomer adaptation in teams: Multilevel antecedents and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 101-116.

5. Jehn, K. A., Northcraft, G. B., & Neale, M. A. (1999). Why differences make a difference: A field study of diversity, conflict, and performance in workgroups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44, 741-763.

Recommended

Bliese, P.D. (2000). Within-group agreement, non-independence, and reliability: Implications for data aggregation and analysis. Chapter 8: Pgs. 349-381 from Klein & Kozlowski.

(13) To Be Decided

(Your feedback on two fellow students' proposals is due today)

(14) Class Wrap-Up and Discussion of Research Proposals

Daft, R. L. (1995). Why I recommended that your manuscript be rejected and what you can do about it. In L. L. Cummings & P. J. Frost (Eds.), Publishing in the organizational sciences (2nd ed., pp.164-182). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage