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**Brief introduction to the two research seminar courses:**

There are two research seminars; each is taught every other year. Both of these are designed to facilitate your work in our program by developing your professional skills and facilitating your work, including on your 3YP. Both include significant amounts of time in which you can ask for help on your work and help your classmates.

**MGMT 8872 Research seminar I** can best be termed as “tools for successful academic practice”. Its purpose is to help you become more proficient in a number of skills you should have and knowledge you should acquire to be successful as an academic, including writing, reviewing, knowledge of journals, and awareness of both your goals and what might disrupt your accomplishing them.

**MGMT 8873 Research seminar II** can best be termed as theory building. Its major focus is on developing the ability to understand the components of theories and to construct them.

**\* NOTE: THIRD YEAR STUDENTS SIGN UP FOR MGMT8874, which is identical to 8873**

Notes:

* If you haven't already joined the Academy of Management, please do so. Student rates are relatively inexpensive.
* Be sure you have gotten your Human Participants review approval from the BC Institutional Review Board before class starts, cf. <https://www.bc.edu/content/bc-web/research/sites/vice-provost-for-research/research-protections/training.html>
* All work prepared in conjunction with the class must use the AOM style guide.

**RequiredBooks** (both available at the bookstore):

Huff, A. S. 2009. ***Designing research for publication***. Los Angeles: Sage (H) *(Note: this book is used in both courses)*

Van de Ven, A. H. 2007. ***Engaged scholarship: A guide for organizational and social research***. New York: Oxford (V).

**Materials on our class *Canvas* site**: https://bostoncollege.instructure.com/courses/

Readings are included in the “**modules**” section of Canvas under the week during which they will be discussed

The AMR origins series videos are posted in the Panopto recordings on our CANVAS site.

The video with Andy Hoffman speaking (for the last class) is also posted in the Panopto recordings)

**Requirements**

***Third year students***. With the guidance of a two-person committee, each student will successfully complete the written third year paper by the end of the spring semester. Each student will also start serious planning for the dissertation proposal.

***Second year students***. With the guidance of a two-person committee, each student will design, carry out, and formally present a piece of empirical research throughout the calendar year. The assignment for this course “ends” with the oral presentation of the paper in December, 2022. The eventual final written project (to be completed by the end of the spring semester in May, 2023) should be of sufficiently high quality to submit to a suitable professional journal, at least after revision and editing.

***First year students***. In collaboration with faculty members with whom you are working, each student will make progress on one or more research projects.

Parts of class meetings are designed to facilitate work on these projects (and other research). Sessions will be devoted to student research projects (under the title “student-led discussion” in the course schedule). Each second and third year student will lead two (approximately) 30-minute discussions about their research. Each first year student will one 30 minute discussion about their research.

Classes will have two segments. The first, longer, one will be devoted to topics for the class and the second (shorter part) will usually be devoted to student led discussions and/or presentations. There will be two exceptions. One is a discussion with Jennifer Lopez, director of the office for sponsored programs, about getting grants. The other is a discussion with Erin Sibley, who is in charge of Human Participants Protection, about Institutional review board processes, regulations, and issues.

At least one discussion led by second year students must be about the third-year paper.

At least one discussion led by third year students must be about the proposed dissertation.

**Disability Notice**

If you are a student with a documented disability seeking reasonable accommodations in this course, please contact Kathy Duggan, (617) 552-8093, dugganka@bc.edu, at the Connors Family Learning Center regarding learning disabilities and ADHD, or Rory Stein, (617) 552-3470, rory.stein@bc.edu, in the Disability Services Office regarding all other types of disabilities, including temporary disabilities. Advance notice and appropriate documentation are required for accommodations.

If you are feeling stressed, having challenges managing your time, sleep, or making choices around alcohol and food, the Office of Health Promotion (OHP) offers Individual and Group Health Coaching appointments with a trained Health Coach. Please reach out by going to the Health Promotion website or walk over to Gasson 025 and talk with a staff member.

**Notes regarding making materials available**

When students are assigning reading to be done by class members in preparation for the student discussion section of a particular class, the materials must be made available by **Thursday** of the preceding week. Otherwise the grade for leadership of part of a class will be lowered. The simplest way to make materials available is to email them ***and*** put them in our shared dropbox folder.

*Some suggestions about the student-led portions of the class*

I encourage you to be creative about this use of time. To aid in this, I have included below several suggestions students from prior versions of our class have made that might help with structuring the discussion. *Part of your grade for leadership of a part of the class will depend on how well you have structured the discussion*.

\* It helps if you assign particular questions on which you want assistance.

\* When you conduct this discussion, you are welcome to invite faculty members you are working with or those with whom you expect to be working to join us.

\* If you spend the entire time presenting you will probably get less help than if you present a bit and spend the bulk of time getting feedback from your classmates.

\* You may want to record your session, or have one of your classmates take notes on it, so that you will be better able to concentrate on the conversation.

\* It is sometimes helpful if you assign certain parts of the paper in advance. For example, a second year student asking help in a third year paper may ask one classmate to pay special attention to the proposed literature, another to a proposed survey design, etc.

\* Students may wish help with a very small portion of the paper. You may, for example, ask everyone to look just at the conceptual framework. It is not necessary for the class to discuss an entire paper.

\* Those giving assistance need to remember that it is the presenter's paper on which we are working, not the paper they wish the presenter were writing.

\* Those giving assistance can be clear about how they can be helpful and the areas in which they cannot be helpful (e.g. theories with which they are totally unfamiliar)

**Course Schedule**

**Class 1. March 14**: Introduction to the class and introductory discussion of theory building.

*Readings*

Thatcher, S. M., & Fisher, G. 2022. From the Editors—The Nuts and Bolts of Writing a Theory Paper: A Practical Guide to Getting Started. ***Academy of Management Review***, 47(1): 1-8.

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.

Oldham, G. R., & Hackman, J. R. 2005. How job characteristics theory happened. In Smith, K. G., & Hitt, M. A. (Eds.). ***Great minds in management: The process of theory development: 151 – 170.*** New York: Oxford University Press

***ASQ Theory Forum*** that includes the three following papers:

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

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.

*Video and Reading*

An AMR origins series video (in Panopto) and its associated article (in the Canvas Module “articles discussed in AMR origins videos). Each student must choose a different video and article. Post a note about the article and video you have chosen in our shared dropbox folder.

*In preparation for this class*:

1. Second year student(s) Prepare your draft proposal
2. Some exercises based on the Thatcher and Fisher paper will be used during the semester. For now, just skim that paper
3. What is and is not organizational theorizing, or, perhaps, theoretical contributions?
4. What are "good" organizational theories? What differences does theorizing make in publications (cf. Colquitt and Zapata-Phelan)?
5. What did you learn from Oldham and Hackman about how a theory might be developed and what happens to it after that?
6. What most stands out for you about theorizing from the AMR origins videos in relation to the papers with which they are associated?

**Second year students:** *Prior to the beginning of class* second year students email copies of their proposals to all class members and post them in our shared dropbox.

*In class*:

1. Briefly review the syllabus
2. Second year student(s) present your proposal(s) formally (about 15 minutes [each]), using PowerPoint slides. (Send your proposal and the slides to me in advance.)
3. We will discuss answers to the preparation questions
4. Some class planning for the semester.

**Class 2. March 21:** Initial steps/decisions associated with theorizing and overview of building theory

*Readings*:

V, Ch. 1 – 4 and variance theory material discussion in Ch. 5

Alvesson, M., &Sandberg, J. 2011. Generating research questions through problematization. ***Academy of Management Review***, 36: 247–271

Cornelissen, J. 2017. Editor’s comments: Developing propositions, a process model, or a typology? addressing the challenges of writing theory without a boilerplate. ***Academy of Management Review***42: 1-9.

H ch. 11

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. 1976. Motivation through the design of Work: Test of a theory. ***Organizational Behavior and Human performance***, 16: 250 – 279.

Oldham, G. R., Hackman, J. R., & Pearce J. L. 1976. Conditions under which employees respond positively to enriched work. ***Journal of Applied Psychology***, 61: 395-403.

Thatcher & Fisher material related to **Exercise 1**

*In preparation for class*:

1. What are your thoughts about the various types of theory building Cornelissen describes?
2. Consider what epistemological stance underlies your work (V, ch. 2)
3. What would it mean to situate your research as problem focused (cf. V, p. 95f)
4. Consider the materials in the Van de Ven and Whetten (In Huff, ch.. 11) chapters using the Hackman and Oldham papers as examples
5. What questions/concerns/comments about theorizing are evoked for you by these materials?
6. Based on the Alvesson and Sandberg reading, use problematization to challenge at least one assumption from the Hackman and Oldham work.
7. Prepare exercise 1 from the Thatcher/Fisher paper

*In class:*

1. What are the parts of a theory and how is it constructed? Base answers to this on Whetten chapter in Huff, chapter 4 and part of chapter 5 (variance material) in Van de Ven

2. What are types of theories? From Cornelissen

3. What does it mean to conduct engaged scholarship? From Van de Ven

4. What is your personal epistemological stance? From Van de Ven

5. Look at the main theory paper of Hackman and Oldham. What are all the parts of their theory?

6. What did the Oldham et al paper add to the Hackman and Oldham theory?

7. What does it mean to problematize assumptions? From Alvesson & Sandberg

8. What are some assumptions in the Hackman and Oldham model? Problematize them.

9. Exercise 1 from Thatcher and Fisher

*Second portion of class: Student-led discussion (two students)*

**Class 3. March 28.** Qualitative, process, and phenomenon based theorizing and then your own building of variance constructs.

*Readings*:

Cloutier, C., & Langley, A. 2020. What makes a process theoretical contribution? ***Organization******Theory***, 1(1): [https://doi.org/10.1177/2631787720902473](https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2631787720902473)

Fisher, G., Mayer, K., & Morris, S. 2021. From the editors: Phenomenon-based theorizing. ***Academy of Management Review***, 46: 631-639.

Howard-Grenville, J., Metzger, M. L., & Meyer, A. D.2013. Rekindling the flame: Processes of identity resurrection. ***Academy of Management Journal,*** 56: 113–136

Gehman, J., Glaser, V. L., Eisenhardt, K. M., Gioia, D., Langley, A., & Corley, K. G. 2018. Finding theory–method fit: A comparison of three qualitative approaches to theory building. ***Journal of Management Inquiry*,** 27(3): 284-300.

H. p. 217 – 223, exercises 38 (1 – 3) or 39 (1 – 6)

Suddaby, R. 2010. Editor’s comments: Construct clarity in theories of management and organization. ***Academy of Management Review***, 35(3), 346-357.

D’Costa, K. 2017. Why don’t people return their shopping carts? <https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/anthropology-in-practice/why-dont-people-return-their-shopping-carts/>

*In preparation for class*:

1. What are defining characteristics of process studies and process theorizing?
2. What does phenomenon-based theorizing add to process studies? To variance-based theorizing?
3. How might theorizing happen in qualitative studies, as per Gehman et al?
4. We will “walk through” the materials in the Gehman et al. Langley et al., and Fisher et al. readings using the Howard-Grenville et al paper as an example.
5. Prepare Exercise 4 from the Thatcher & Fisher paper.

Then switch and start constructing your own variance-based theoretical model

1. What are the constructs in the D’Costa article?
2. Choose or invent some focal ***variance*** construct in which you’re at least somewhat interested (along with complementary constructs) and that you think you can develop in new ways. Do NOT use an already completely defined and developed construct and do NOT use a construct that is central to your third-year paper that you are using the same way in your paper.
3. Using all of Suddaby’s categories define your construct
4. If this is a new construct do exercise 38 (1-3) in H. If it is an already existing construct do exercise 39 (1-6) in H.

***Send a paragraph or so about your construct and its development so far to everyone by Sunday night before class***

*In Class*

1. What are defining characteristics of process studies?
2. What does phenomenon-based theorizing add?
3. How might theorizing happen in qualitative studies, as per Gehman et al?
4. We will “walk through” the materials in the Gehman et al. Cloutier and Langley and Fisher et al. readings using the Howard-Grenville et al paper as an example.
5. Exercise 4 from Thatcher and Fisher

Beginning the process of theorizing

1. What are the constructs in the D’Costa article?
2. How does theory *elaboration* differ from theory *building*?
3. Discuss and define your constructs to this point.
4. Discuss what you will need to do in order to assure the validity of the constructs.

*Second part of class* starting about 2:45 pm

Student led discussion: 1 student

(starting at about 3:15): Jennifer Lopez, the director of the Office of Sponsored Programs at BC, <http://www.bc.edu/research/osp.html>, will discuss what is involved in getting grants, especially by means of PIVOT. We will prepare some questions for her in advance

**Class 4. April 4:** Your own theory-building/elaboration: relationships between the constructs and “because”/causal models and mechanisms

*Readings*:

H, p. 223-224 – through #12, exercises 38 (4, 5) or 39 (7),

H, p. 224 - 225 #13,

Mawritz, M. B., Greenbaum, R. L., Butts, M. M., & Graham, K. A. 2017. I just can’t control myself: A self-regulation perspective on the abuse of deviant employees. ***Academy of Management Journal***, 60(4): 1482-1503. *Front end only*

Zipay, K. P., Mitchell, M. S., Baer, M. D., Sessions, H., & Bies, R. J. 2021. Lenient reactions to misconduct: Examining the self-conscious process of being lenient to others at work. ***Academy of Management Journal***, 64(2): 351-377. *Front end only*

D’Costa, K. 2017. Why don’t people return their shopping carts? <https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/anthropology-in-practice/why-dont-people-return-their-shopping-carts/>

*In preparation for class*:

1. What are the relationships between constructs in the D’Costa article?
2. The Mawritz et al (proposed mediator) and Zipay (proposed moderator) papers illustrate typical proposed relationships between constructs in a variance model. Use these as a guide in considering and picturing your relationships between constructs.
3. Begin with (a revised version of) the materials you developed for the March 9 class. Develop relationships between the constructs. As with the prior week, if you are working with (a) new construct(s) carry out exercise 38 (4-5); if you are elaborating something already existing, carry out exercise 39 (7).
4. Include at least one moderator and/or mediator
5. Develop a causal model that incorporates all your constructs.
6. Remembering the “why” in the Hackman and Oldham (1976) paper, answer the question “why” with regard to the crucial links in your model. It helps if the “why” is related in some way to some already existing theory.
7. What is the answer to “why” in the Mawritz et al. study? In the Zipay et al. study?
8. Prepare Exercise 2 from Thatcher and Fisher
9. ***Write out one or more paragraphs describing what you have done with regard to theorizing to this point (including the prior weeks) and send this material to everyone by Sunday night before class***

*In class*

1. Discuss relationships among the constructs in the D’Costa article and, to the extent you can determine this, why the constructs are linked as they are.
2. Discuss the *proposed* mediators and moderators and their links in the Mawritz et al and Zipay et al papers (you don’t need to worry about the findings)
3. Discuss relationships among your own constructs to this point
4. What are the answers to “why” in the Mawritz et al and Zipay et al papers.
5. Discuss your answers to *why* your constructs are linked as they are.
6. Exercise 2 from Thatcher and Fisher

*Second portion of class: Student-led discussion (two students)*

**Class 5. April 11:** Contextual and conceptual assumptions and ethics in organizational research

*Readings*

H, 225-227, Exercise 38 (6) or Exercise 39 (8).

Alvesson and Sandberg, revisited

*Academy of Management* Revised code of ethical conduct.

Colquitt, J. 2013. From the editors: Data overlap policies at AMJ. ***Academy of Management Journal***, 56: 331-333.

Kacmar, M. 2009. From the editors: An ethical quiz. ***Academy of Management Journal***, 52, No. 3, 432–434.

Lee, T. W., & Mitchell, T. R. 2011. Working in research teams: Lessons from personal experiences. ***Management and Organization Review*** 7:3 461–469

Chen, X. 2011. Author ethical dilemmas in the research publication process. ***Management and Organization Review*** 7:3 423–432

*In preparation for class:*

1. Develop your contextual and conceptual assumptions, taking special account of the recommendations in the Alvesson and Sandberg paper. Add these to your presentation of your constructs and their relationships
2. As with prior weeks, if you are working with (a) new construct(s) carry out exercise 38 (6); if you are elaborating something already existing, carry out exercise 39 (8).
3. ***Write a short document elaborating all the theoretical work you have done to this point, and send it to everyone by Sunday night before class***
4. Read all of the assigned readings on ethics and prepare to describe the issues that any or all of them evoke for you, remind you of, or that you’re aware have happened.

Second (sic) portion of class:

1 pm. Erin Sibley, BC office of research protections, will discuss the work of the IRB. We will prepare questions for her in advance

First (sic) portion of class

1. Discuss the contextual and/or conceptual assumptions in the D’Costa article
2. Discuss your assumptions regarding your model to this point.
3. Having constructed a theory, what would you say to Alvesson and Sandberg at this point?
4. What ethical issues are surfaced for you by the readings? What resources are available to deal with them?

**Class 6. April 19 (Tuesday):** (Somebody else’s) theory and theory building.

*Readings*:

For this class, each student will choose one theory whose core components are described in ***AMR*** (that is different from the theories other students choose) on which they will lead a theoretical discussion in class. ***Students will need to assign the article(s) you want your classmates to read a week in advance*.** They will then lead class discussion that analyzes and critiques the theory in terms of the Whetten, Van de Ven, Langley et al., other pertinent class materials, and your own experience constructing theory.

(Note: You MAY, if you wish, use the theory you chose for the beginning class and/or another theory that had an “origins” YouTube video. But you don’t need to.)

*First portion of class*

For each theory:

1. What is this theory? Describe its constructs, the links between constructs, why the constructs are linked as they are, and the contextual and conceptual assumptions.

2. How adequate is this theory “theoretically”, based on the material in class readings?

*Second portion of class: Student-led discussion (two students)*

**Class 7. April 25:** Theory? And impact?

*Readings*

Van de Ven, ch. 8

Lange, D., & Pfarrer, M. D. 2017. Editors’ comments: Sense and structure—the core building blocks of an AMR article. ***Academy of Management Review***, 42(3): 407-416.

Tourish, D. 2020. The triumph of nonsense in management studies. ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 19(1): 99-109.

Bartunek, J. M. 2020. Theory (what is it good for?). ***Academy of Management Learning & Education***, 19(2): 223-226.

Aguinis, H., & Cronin, M. A. In Press. It’s the theory, stupid. ***Organizational Psychology Review***.

*Video*

Watch Andy Hoffman’s talk from the University of Kansas Engaged Speaker Series (his talk ends about 34 minutes in, and you don’t need to watch the Q&A)

*In preparation for class*

1. Prepare exercise 5 from Thatcher and Fisher (building on Lange & Pfarrer)
2. Based on Tourish, Aguinis and Bartunek, Can be theory be saved? Does it need to be saved? Should it be saved? Can it actually be good?
3. Consider impact and engaged scholarship from the perspective of what you’re learned so far in your doctoral program to far. What would you say to Andy Van de Ven and Andy Hoffman?

*In class*:

1. Exercise 5 from Thatcher and Fisher
2. Based on Van de Ven and Hoffman, what must happen for scholarly knowledge to be transferred into practice?
3. Discuss the (lack of) value of theory
4. Discuss impact and its complications

Second portion: Student-led discussion (two students)

**Monday, May 3 Final Paper Assignment, incorporating exercises 6 and 7**

Turn in a final written paper that completely sketches out in a coherent fashion your constructs, links among them, reasons for the links (i.e. the answer to “why”), and your assumptions in a textual form. Include a discussion section (exercise 6) and an abstract (exercise 7). Write this paper as if it is a very first draft of a paper for AMR

**December, 2022** The last day of class. For second year students: **Formal oral research presentations**

**Grading**

The grade for first year students will be will be given at the end of the semester. It will depend on

\*student preparation for and participation in class discussion, including the quality of materials sent to students (40%),

\* leadership of class sessions, which includes getting materials to classmates out sufficiently prior to class and structuring the class discussion well (30%).

Your final paper for this class (30%)

Current Second year students will receive a "J" grade at the end of the semester. The class grade will be computed after the presentation in December. The grade will depend on

\*how well developed the draft proposal for your second year project is on the first day of class (10%), \*student preparation for and participation in class discussion, including the quality of materials sent to students (10%),

\*leadership of class sessions, which includes getting materials to classmates out sufficiently prior to class and structuring the class discussion well (10%)

\*Your final paper for this class (20%)

\*and the oral presentation (50%), which of course will depend on the research work done over the course of the year. The grade for the presentation will be given by the chair of the student's committee.

The grade for third year students will be given at the end of the semester. It will depend on

\*student preparation for and participation in class discussion, including the quality of materials sent to students (30%),

\* leadership of class sessions, which includes getting materials to classmates out sufficiently prior to class and structuring the class discussion well (40%). At least one session must address thoughts regarding a dissertation proposal. It is expected that students will have sketched out at least preliminary ideas of an introduction section and some sense of the likely methodology to be used.

\*Your final paper for this class (30%)

***About independent studies associated with your third year paper***. Up until now, at least, third year students have signed up for a pre-dissertation project course, MGMT889801 associated with their third year paper. The grade is computed when the written third year paper is completed satisfactorily in the spring semester of the third year.

**Reminder of weekly due dates**

The **Thursday before class** for materials for student-led discussions

A **week in advance** for the “someone else’s” theory articles

The **Sunday before class** for your own theory-building materials