Business 9704 – Research Methods Part 1

Fall 2023

Professor June Cotte	**Faculty Assistant: Olga Aguilar**
Office No. 3360	**Office No. 3319**
jcotte@ivey.ca	**oaguilar@ivey.ca**

Date and Time: Tuesdays, 9:00 – 12:00
Location: TBA
(12 Sessions)

"…data analysis alone does not enable researchers to achieve their main goal, namely, to answer questions. To reach that goal, researchers must concentrate on their design: it must be as sound as possible, and it must be appropriate for the questions they want answered… Though there are numerous techniques of data analysis, no techniques, regardless of its elegance, sophistication, and power can save the research when the design is poor, improper, confounded, or misguided. As we have stated, and will state again, sound inferences and generalizations from a piece of research are a function of design and not statistical analysis…" (Keppel & Zedeck, 1991, pg. 12)

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course will introduce different ways of conducting research. The focus is on methodological and philosophy of science issues – it is not a statistics class. It will help you develop skills to conduct and evaluate research. By the end of the course, you will have some appreciation of the research process. But this course will not make you an expert and it only marks the beginning of your methodological training. Enrollment in this course is restricted to graduate students in the Ivey PhD Program, as well as any student that has obtained special permission to enroll in this course from the course instructor as well as the Graduate Chair (or equivalent) from the student's home program.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

1. Provide a foundation for understanding the research process, including its philosophical basis.
2. Provide exposure and ignite interest in classic and emerging research methodologies, and research design decisions.
3. Introduce commonly used methods and tools in organizational, management, and broader social science research.
4. Provide training and competencies in critically evaluating research and research design.
5. Increase competency in identifying "real world" applications and extensions of theory.

METHODS OF EVALUATION

Class Contribution	25%	Throughout the term
Critiques	20%	9:00 am on date the reading assigned
Paper Presentations	20%	November 28
Term 1 Research Paper	35%	8:00 pm December 12
	100%	

MATERIALS

(1) A. F. Chalmers, <u>What Is This Thing Called Science?</u> (4th edition please)

(2) Leonard Bickman and Debra J. Rog, <u>Applied Social Research Methods</u> (a good reference book – I'm assigning readings based on 2nd edition)

(3) Jesse Singal: <u>The Quick Fix: Why Fad Psychology Can't Cure Our Social Ills</u> – please try to read ahead of the first class meeting

(4) Various readings (articles, book chapters) available on Learn

CLASS CONTRIBUTION (25%)

The course is a seminar, a format that requires you to speak. I evaluate your contribution on the quality and quantity of your verbal contributions. Do all the readings carefully. Be thoughtful. Make well-substantiated and logical arguments. Be critical. Take risks. Listen. Ask questions, answer questions, respond to comments, wonder aloud, provoke discussion etc… regularly during classes. Comments that are unambiguously based on a thorough reading of the assigned readings are especially appreciated. There are two ways to contribute:

Ask questions, answer questions, respond to comments, wonder aloud, provoke discussion etc… regularly during classes. Comments that are unambiguously based on a thorough reading of the assigned readings are especially appreciated.

You will present ideas. Most of these will involve presenting assigned readings, while a few others are different kinds of assignments or exercises that I explain in the reading list below. For the assigned readings, you determine what is important. Yes, that means you will have to ignore content. You are limited, at most, to 15 minutes and three powerpoint slides. If you need less time to do an effective job, take less time. Your job is to teach the important content in whatever manner you think will be clear and effective. Do not read your notes and do not regurgitate lists of facts. Remember that all students are responsible for reading all assigned readings, so you are not summarizing them. Your job is to pull out of the assigned reading key insights, theories, ideas, facts etc… in order to reach a superior understanding of the topics and ideas in a given reading. Each student has a code (e.g. RP1, RP2 etc…) below that shows which readings you are responsible for. You can find these in a separate document in Learn.

CRITIQUES (20%)

Throughout the fall, I have assigned five articles for which you must write a critique. To help you prepare, read the How to Write a Critique in Supplement 1 of this outline. You must upload the critique via LEARN (which will be submitted to Turn It In then be sent to me).

You may throw out your worst critique grade of the year. If you hand in a critique late or miss one, you get 0% on it, but that presumably would be the one you would throw out.

Deadline: upload your critique no later than the start of class in which we discuss the related paper. Don't leave it too close - I will not accept late papers and whatever the time stamp on Turn It In says, that's the time stamp I'm using. Class starts at 9:00 – strive to submit no later than 8:30.

Formatting: Critiques may not exceed 2 pages, typed, single spaced, 1-inch margins, 12-point font, Times New Roman. Please make sure your name appears prominently somewhere on the critique. However, you are allowed an additional page if you would like to compare/contrast with AI (see next paragraph).

NOTE ON GENERATIVE AI (e.g., ChatGPT4). This is a task that it may be tempting to allow AI to do for you. **Let me be very clear that this is NOT allowed**. However, you may get creative. For example, as part of your critique (after you write yours), you could run one on AI, and compare and contrast your work with the AI's work (you could use an additional page for this). Note that this is not required, but I suspect many of you are interested. AI makes many, many mistakes (called "hallucinations") so you may find this an interesting add-on.

TERM 1 RESEARCH PAPER (35%)

Over the year in this course (both Terms 1 and 2) you will develop a complete research paper on a topic related to business, management or organizations that interests you. It may emerge from or be related to what you present in Session 6, or it may be something else (in case you abandon your Session 6 topic). In any event, the paper must be *de novo (*e.g.*,* independent of other current or past coursework or workplace efforts). The topic can be related to something you became interested in before (e.g., master's thesis), but the paper and the theoretical model must be original. Also, you may use an idea given to you by a professor at Ivey, or even work with that person to develop your ideas, but you must be the 'primary' on the paper (e.g., first author) and be the major force driving the ideas and paper forward. Though you may work with a professor on the conceptualizing of the paper, it is not permissible to have them read or provide feedback on a draft of the manuscript prior to handing it in and it is not permissible to use any form of copy editor or assistance, either human or generative AI, in writing the paper. It must represent your own work.

You have approximately six months (from September to the date that the Term 2 paper is due) to obtain ethics approval (if necessary), conduct your study and analyse the data. Keep in mind that it will take about a month to have your ethics/IRB application approved. It will also take time to collect and analyse the data. In short, we strongly urge you to start moving with the paper/presentation components of this course early. One reasonable goal you should expect of yourself is to submit the final paper to one of your area's major conferences. You will be in much better shape if you submit your ethics application before the end of Term 1 of the course (i.e., no later than late November).

NOTE: If your study involves human-subjects, you will have to obtain ethics approval (i.e. see Western's Office of Human Research Ethics for details). To do this, you'll have to be sponsored by a professor and have your actual study designed (e.g. know how you plan to recruit, what measures you'll collect, etc… It is very specific). It also usually takes at least a month to get approval.

Term 1 paper (this fall)

You will write a paper that, in essence, would be the first part of a research paper (up to, but not including, the 'Data and Methods' section or any analysis).

The paper you submit should be aimed at a quality that would generate interest from reviewers at good journals in your field. You must do original research. Meta-analysis or conceptual papers are not allowed. The paper must be hypothesis (2-4 hypotheses) or research question driven. The paper must demonstrate a good grasp of the literature; it must attempt to make an explicit and significant contribution; it must be logical, persuasive and put theory front and centre. The Term 1 paper must include everything you would typically see in a top journal article up to (but not including) the Data and Methods section (though you should briefly state where your data will come from). The paper must have seven sections:. That is:

1) **Title page and abstract** (title, your name + abstract of <150 words)

2) **Statement of contribution** (For an example see "Consumer Relevance and Contribution Statement" https://consumerresearcher.com/manuscript-preparation#consumer-relevance-and-contribution-statement). One page. This is different from an abstract. It forces you to state and explain each of your intended contributions (theoretical, practical, methodological etc…).

3) **Introduction section**. This section should briefly layout the general topic and direction of the paper, the area of research that it ties into, and the importance of the paper. What do you intend to contribute to the academic literature? What is your general approach?). In general, you should emulate an empirical paper from a top journal in your field. You should also very briefly—one or two sentences—mention the data that you will employ.

4) **Literature review**. Derived from and supports your research question. This section should include hypotheses (or research question) generation. This should not be merely an annotated bibliography. Instead, you should make sure to tie research together under themes, making sure to demonstrate how they are related and build on each other. Your goal should be to clearly demonstrate where there are gaps in our knowledge, why those gaps are there, why the gaps are important, and how you will attempt to fill them.

5) **Research questions** Clearly state the research questions or hypotheses that you will test. Be sure to briefly explain how they build on existing research (i.e., how do they tie into the literature review above?). While you should not report any new findings, you must include an explicit theoretical model (not a process model). This can be done in the form of a path diagram that demonstrates how you conceptualize your core variables and the relationships among them.

6) **Data.** This section should indicate only which type of data you will use. For this paper, you are not expected **to** provide details on measurement. However, you should be clear about how access to the data will be obtained. Moreover, if you are collecting new data on human subjects, you should provide evidence that Ethics approval has been requested.

7) **References**. Your list must be accurate and complete. Also, while you should list everything that you have cited, you should not list anything that has not been cited.

DUE DATE: *8:00 pm, December 12.*

Submit via LEARN (which will submit the papers to Turn It In), but also email me (CC'ing yourself) a PDF copy as a backup. I am limiting you to 3000 words of text (not including references, tables and figures, contribution statement, abstract/title page). It is vital that you keep a good length/contribution ratio – let me say this another way: if you only have 2500 words of content, don't use the remaining 500 words because you feel compelled to get to 3000. High quality is better than high quantity. You must develop your ideas logically and clearly. I value depth over breadth in this endeavour. You are free to hand the paper in early but you are only permitted to hand it in once (I tend to grade these as I receive them).

Text Formatting: typed, 1.5 spaced, 1-inch margins, 12-point font, Times New Roman. For other formatting issues (e.g. references, tables/figures…), adopt the style used by a top research journal in your respective field. Please place your figures and tables in the text of the paper (not at the end).

PAPER PRESENTATION (20%)

Presentation skills can make the difference in landing the job you want. Being able to condense your research into an informative and enthusiastic "talk" is an invaluable skill to develop. Please see Supplement II: Guidelines for Preparing an Academic Presentation.

You will present your Term 1 Final Paper in our last class session (November 28) which will allow you to get valuable feedback from your classmates before the final due date for your final paper.

REQUIRED READING / COURSE SCHEDULE

See the Detailed Session Schedule Section below for a list of the required readings and accompanying articles. The readings for each session are listed below and will be available on Learn. Sometimes I assign a video or two to watch as well. Assignment deadlines are listed under Methods of Evaluation section.

COURSE RULES

I will not accept late assignments except by prior written arrangement or unless I receive what I judge to be unambiguous evidence of extenuating circumstances in which cases it is at my discretion how to handle grading. Otherwise, late assignments will earn an automatic grade of zero.

I expect you to attend all classes and I expect you to be on time and prepared. If you plan to be absent or late, email me ahead of time. You are responsible for consulting your classmates to determine what you missed. I will not meet to provide an overview of the missing session. If you miss three or more classes, you may not hand in the final paper.

Pay attention to the quality of your writing/arguments (well-organized and articulated; specific and clear meanings; perfect formatting etc…). I tend to be hard on poorly written assignments.

I use Turn It In.com for all written assignments: "*All required papers may be subject to submission for textual similarity review to the commercial plagiarism-detection software under license to the University for the detection of plagiarism. All papers submitted for such checking will be included as source documents in the reference database for the purpose of detecting plagiarism of papers subsequently submitted to the system. Use of the service is subject to the licensing agreement, currently between The University of Western Ontario and Turnitin.com(http://www.turnitin.com)."* See also *https://www.lib.uwo.ca/tutorials/plagiarism/* and *https://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/appeals/scholastic_discipline_grad.pdf* .

ENROLLMENT RESTRICTIONS

Enrollment in this course is restricted to graduate students in the Ivey PhD Program, as well as any student that has obtained special permission to enroll in this course from the course instructor as well as the Graduate Chair (or equivalent) from the student's home program.

ACADEMIC OFFENCES: PLAGIARISM AND ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Scholastic offences are taken seriously and students are directed to read the appropriate policy, specifically, the definition of what constitutes a Scholastic Offence, at http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/appeals/scholastic_discipline_grad.pdf.

All required papers may be subject to submission for textual similarity review to the commercial plagiarism-detection software under license to the University for the detection of plagiarism. All papers submitted for such checking will be included as source documents in the reference database for the purpose of detecting plagiarism of papers subsequently submitted to the system. Use of the service is subject to the licensing agreement, currently between The University of Western Ontario and Turnitin.com (http://www.turnitin.com).

HEALTH AND WELLNESS SERVICES

As part of a successful graduate student experience at Western, we encourage students to make their health and wellness a priority. Western provides several on campus health-related services to help you achieve optimum health and engage in healthy living while pursuing your graduate degree. See https://www.uwo.ca/health.

Students who are in emotional/mental distress should refer to Mental Health Support at https://www.uwo.ca/health/psych/index.html for a complete list of options about how to obtain help. Additionally, students seeking help regarding mental health concerns are advised to speak to someone they feel comfortable confiding in, such as their faculty supervisor, their program director or program coordinator.

ACCESSIBLE EDUCATION WESTERN

Western is committed to achieving barrier-free accessibility for all its members, including graduate students. As part of this commitment, Western provides a variety of services devoted to promoting, advocating, and accommodating persons with disabilities in their respective graduate program.

Graduate students with disabilities (for example, chronic illnesses, mental health conditions, mobility impairments) are strongly encouraged to register with Accessible Education Western (AEW), a confidential service designed to support graduate and undergraduate students through their academic program. With the appropriate documentation, the student will work with both AEW and their graduate programs (normally their Graduate Chair and/or Course instructor) to ensure that appropriate academic accommodations to program requirements are arranged. These accommodations include individual counselling, alternative formatted literature, accessible campus transportation, learning strategy instruction, writing exams and assistive technology instruction.

DETAILED SESSION SCHEDULE

Session 1: It Begins…(September 12)

READ:
The Quick Fix: Why Fad Psychology Can't Cure Our Social Ills

Session 2: Interesting Research (September 19)

READ:
Davis (1971), "That's Interesting!" RP4
Tellis (2017), "Interesting and Impactful Research: on Phenomena, Theory, and Writing" RP8
Goyanes (2020), "Against Dullness: On What it Means to be Interesting in Communication Research" RP2

CRITIQUE:
Ghasemizad et al. (2012), "A Study of the Relationship between Teachers and Principals' Spiritual Leadership, Quality of Work Life, Job Satisfaction and Productivity".

Session 3: Writing (September 26)

READ:
Cochrane (2005), "Writing Tips for Ph.D. Students" RP5
Bem (2003), "Writing the Empirical Journal Article" RP6
Webster and Watson (2002) "Analyzing the Past to Prepare for the Future: Writing a Literature Review" RP7
Paul and Criado (2020), "The Art of Writing Literature Review" RP1

Session 4: Retractions, Reviewing, and Ethics (October 3)

Retractions

BROWSE:

Peruse the Retraction Watch website (https://retractionwatch.com). Generate a list of the common reasons that papers are retracted. It would be helpful if you focused on retractions that occur in business or social sciences journals, especially good ones. Also, please look there the global initiative on replications here: https://mgto.org/core-team/ There are excellent resources on that site. We will discuss your findings in class.

Reviewing

READ:

Bagchi et al (2017) "A Field Guide for the Review Process: Writing and Responding to Peer Reviews"
Houston and Hulland (2021) "Reviewers as Developmental Coaches"

Ethics

READ:

Tri-Council Policy Statement (2018), "Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans" [1] Chapter 1 RP3
Tri-Council Policy Statement (2018), "Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans" Chapter 2 RP4
Tri-Council Policy Statement (2018), "Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans" Chapter 3 RP5
Tri-Council Policy Statement (2018), "Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans" Chapter 4 RP6
Tri-Council Policy Statement (2018), "Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans" Chapter 5 RP7

Background Reading: Bickman and Rog, Chapter 4

CRITIQUE: (choose one)

Milgram (1969) "Obedience to Authority", Chapters 1, 2 and 14
Haney et al. (1973), "A Study of Prisoners and Guards…"

Note: your critiques of Haney et al. or Milgram should be based on applying the principles laid out in the Tri-Council Statement. That is, before you write a critique, you need to read the materials.

---

[1] https://ethics.gc.ca/eng/documents/tcps2-2018-en-interactive-final.pdf

Session 5: Research Productivity (October 10)

READ:
Lord (2003) "A Guide to PhD Graduate School: How They Keep Score in the Big Leagues." RP2
Williamson and Cable (2003) "Predicting Early Career Research Productivity: The Case of Management Faculty" RP1
Stack (2004) "Gender, Children, and Research Productivity" RP3
Mitra and Golder (2008), "Does Academic Research…" RP9

CRITIQUE:
Williamson and Cable (2003) "Predicting Early Career Research Productivity: The Case of Management Faculty"

Session 6: Ideas and Writing (October 17)

READ:
Wicker (1985) "Getting Out of Our Conceptual Ruts"

DO:
Find an interesting problem or phenomenon that exists in the world but that is relatively new, meaning it's unlikely to have been extensively addressed in the literature. Prepare a 5-10 minute presentation where you address four issues: (1) What is the problem or phenomenon? Assume we are smart people who know little about it. Teach us. (2) Why do you think it is interesting? (3) In what specific ways would solving the problem or obtaining a better understanding the phenomenon make the world a better place? Who and how will this help? (4) Based on what you know about this problem or phenomenon, give us the broad strokes of a potential research question. Do not do a deep dive into the academic literature. Focus on the problem or phenomenon as it exists in the world. You can (not must) use up to 3 powerpoint slides in your presentation.

Session 7: Scientific Method (October 24)

WATCH:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EYPapE-3FRw
https://www.ted.com/talks/michael_shermer_why_people_believe_weird_things?language=en
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Dkjkh3OrjeA

READ:
Chalmers, Chapter 1 RP10
Chalmers, Chapter 5 RP11
Chalmers, Chapter 6 RP12
Chalmers, Chapter 7 RP13

Session 8: Theory (October 31)

READ:

Klein and Zedeck (2004) "Theory in Applied Psychology: Lessons (Re)learned" RP1
Bacharach (1989) "Organizational Theories: Some Criteria for Evaluation" RP2
Sutton and Staw (1995) "What Theory is Not" RP8
Flexner, "The Usefulness of Useless Knowledge" RP4

Background Reading: Chalmers, Chapter 8, 9

Session 9: Grounded Theory and Interpretive Approaches (November 7)

DO:

Find a public place where you can safely and unobtrusively watch people from a distance. Bring something to write on. Spend an hour doing two things: (a) record what you see happening and (b) write down some ideas about how you might explain what you are observing. Why is it happening? What does it mean? That is, in a small way, propose some theory to advance what you are witnessing. Come to class ready to discuss.

READ:

Chalmers, Chapter 2 RP9
Chalmers, Chapter 4 RP10
Corbin and Strauss (1990) "Grounded Theory Research: Procedures, Canons and Evaluative Criteria" RP11
Suddaby (2006), "From the Editors: What Grounded Theory is Not" RP13
Corley, Bansal and Yu (2020) RP14

CRITIQUE:

Goulding et al (2008), "The Marketplace Management of Illicit Pleasure"

Session 10: Qualitative Data and Analysis (November 14)

READ:

Arsel (2017), "Asking Questions with Reflexive Focus: A Tutorial on Designing and Conducting Interviews
Giesler and Thompson (2016), "A Tutorial in Consumer Research: Process Theorization in Cultural Consumer Research"

Background Reading: Bickman and Rog, Chapters 8, 9 and 17

CRITIQUE:

Mardon, Cocker and Daunt (2023), "How Social Media Influencers Impact Consumer Collectives: An Embeddedness Perspective"

Session 11: Big Data (November 21)

WATCH:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=irP5RCdpilc
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fZuDwiM1XBQ

READ:
Tausczik and Pennebaker (2010), "The Psychological Meaning of Words…" RP14
Albert and Thomson (2018), "A Synthesis of the…" RP1
Packard and Berger (2020), "Thinking of You…" RP2
Li, Shi and Wang (2019), "Video Mining…" RP3
Zhang et al (2022), "What Makes a Good Image? Airbnb Demand Analytics Leveraging Interpretable Image Features" RP5

Session 12: Final Paper Presentations (November 28)

You will have been working on your problem/phenomenon and developed your ideas to the point you have a specific research question. You should be able to clearly articulate the intended (managerial and/or theoretical) contributions of addressing the research question. You should have reviewed the literature, developed hypotheses (at least 2, no more than 4), drawn a theoretical model and identified how you will go about studying (i.e. empirically) the question. All of this is the topic of your presentation. In other words, this is a presentation of your paper, in advance of handing it in. You have 15 minutes and may use up to 10 Powerpoint slides.

<div align="center">

Supplement I
HOW TO WRITE A CRITIQUE

</div>

Summarize (4-5 lines and not more) – in your own words, not cut and paste from the abstract for example – and then in detail assess the reading. You cannot do an effective job at critiquing an article if you have not read the other assigned readings for a session. Here are some guidelines[2] (things to think about when preparing critiques). You won't have room to talk about all these things in any given critique, but this is a good set of questions etc… to get you focused. Remember, only focus on important aspects of the paper.

My guess is that most people will write better critiques working from an outline, which itself is based on notes that you take while reading the article. Writing a critique and figuring out your ideas for a critique are two different skills that are probably not best attempted at the same time.

1) Briefly summarize the question the author is trying to answer. Is this question interesting and important? Why or why not? In evaluating the importance of the question, you should consider whether the author's review of the literature suggests a logical need for this research. Some issues you might want to think about are: Is this research the first empirical test of an important theoretical prediction? Does it extend existing theory? Does it test competing theoretical predictions? Does it remedy important flaws in past empirical research?

2) Briefly describe the model the author uses to answer the research question. What are the key concepts in the model and what are the relationships between those concepts? Try to be as specific as possible in describing the model (e.g., do not say "this paper tests a transactions costs theory of the employment relationship," rather say that "this paper examines the idea that the firm specificity of employees' skills affects the mechanisms a firm uses to govern the employment relationship".) Your summary of the model should be brief; it should indicate that you understand that author's model without describing it in detail. If you are able, you may wish to comment on how well the model fits with existing literature in the area. How well does the model represent what we already know about the author's research question?

3) Discuss the appropriateness of the author's methodology. Does the methodology appear to be able to answer the author's research question? Some issues to consider are: Is the sample appropriate (e.g., if the author wants to study factors that affect the death of firms, does the sample include both firms that died and comparable firms that did not die?) Are the measures reasonable representations of the constructs in the author's model (e.g., in the study just described, how does the author measure organizational death? Is this measure consistent with the author's theoretical description of the construct?).

4) Include some evaluation of the appropriateness of the statistical tests. Are the tests reasonable, given the author's research question? Does the author explore alternative explanations for the results and test them where possible? How well does the author explain anomalous or unexpected results? Are the author's explanations for these results tested, where possible? Be careful not to get bogged down in detail. Do not criticize the statistical tests unless you can offer some reasonable explanation for why the test is inappropriate or for why an alternative test would be more appropriate. For example, do not say "the author should have used a regression analysis instead of comparing means across organizations" unless you can explain why a simple

---

[2] I have pulled most of this content from Prof. Jay Anand's (Ohio State University) syllabus on Research Methods.

comparison of means is not appropriate and how a regression analysis would have improved the author's results.

5) Evaluate the author's conclusions. Do the conclusions address the author's research question? Are the conclusions consistent with the results? Are there any untested alternative explanations for the author's results? If these alternative explanations cannot be tested in this research, does the author suggest ways in which these explanations might be tested in future research? Does the author discuss the limitations of the research and describe ways of remedying those limitations in future research?

6) Provide suggestions for improvement (this can be done in conjunction with each of the items listed above or as a separate section of the critique). For each major criticism of the work, suggest ways in which the work could be improved. For example, if you feel that the research question is not important, suggest a related, but more important, research question. If you believe that the sample is flawed, suggest a more appropriate, but still reasonable sample. You should refrain from making suggestions that are correct theoretically but infeasible practically. For example, you could criticize most research by saying "the author should have selected a random sample of organizations." While this is true in theory, it is typically impossible in practice and thus is not a very useful criticism. Your suggestions for improvement should focus on practical, reasonable steps that the author could take to improve the research. If you are one of the fortunate few who reviews a study that, like Mary Poppins, is "practically perfect in every way," you should have several ideas for expanding the research.

NOTE: It is much better to focus your critique on ideas, concepts, contributions, constructs, measurement, arguments, interpretations, hypotheses, evidence, conclusions, etc… It's tempting (because it's easy) to focus on surface things like writing style, writing quality, diction, spelling, organization but that's not going to push your brain very hard. If these cursory things are a devastatingly major issue, note them BRIEFLY (one sentence) and move on.

Supplement II
Guidelines for Preparing an Academic Presentation
(Adapted from Cait Poynor Lamberton, University of Pennsylvania and Rebecca Reczek, Ohio State University)

The main thing to keep in minds as you prepare to present your work at an academic conference is that you have a limited amount of time (typically 15-20 minutes) in which to convey the main ideas. So be succinct! You cannot discuss all of the details of your work. The most common mistake at conferences is poor time management – specifically, overkill on the literature review and hypotheses. It is important that you embed your work in the relevant theoretical network, but it is <u>critical</u> that you leave sufficient time to convince the audience that your work makes a contribution to the field's body of knowledge. This is done by presenting your empirical work. The key aspects of your presentation and ballpark estimates for time allocation are below:

1-2 minutes	The Problem – What is the phenomenon and why is it interesting? Use real world examples as much as possible.
3-5 minutes	Literature review/hypothesis development – Focus only on the most relevant literature.
8-10 minutes	Empirical work – avoid text heavy slides. Walk the audience through KEY studies from the point of view of a study participant. Use simple figures and graphs to share results. Be prepared to offer more detail or to reference non-focal studies when the opportunity presents itself, for example, in response to a question from the audience. Hidden slides may be useful. Take your time. Be clear. Practicing aloud on your own will help you to be succinct.
2-3 minutes	Conclusions/Implications – Clearly articulate the theoretical and practical contributions. Also, go beyond what's written to CONNECT this work to other papers we've read in class. Does it converge with prior work? Diverge? Challenge? Explain? Extend?
1-2 minutes	Next steps – How would you follow up on this work?
Questions	Anticipate these in advance. This is where hidden slides or examples may be handy.

As an Audience Member: Asking Questions and Providing Suggestions

We will be able to discuss our research together in our final class. You are expected to fully engage with your classmates' presentations. Remember that questions should be phrased in constructive ways. Also, remember, if you get a bad answer, is it because your question was unclear, or is it because the speaker was not able to answer your question? At what point is it time to accept the answer as provided or move the discussion off-line? Understanding these dynamics is crucial in being a good audience member and departmental citizen.