9704 Research Methods [2021-2022]

Mondays 8 – 11 a.m. Eastern Standard Time
(First Meeting: Sept. 13, 2021 on Zoom)

Professor: Matt Thomson
Phone: (519) 661 4279
Office: Room 3357
Phone: (519) 661 4279
Email: mthomson@ivey.ca (best way to contact me)

Personal Zoom Meeting Room: 854 917 5870 (i.e. https://ivey-uwo.zoom.us/j/8549175870). This is not the link for class (which I’ll send you separately). It is for office hours and things like that.

The schedule may be juggled (e.g. to accommodate changes to guests’ availability etc…). Also, to accommodate whatever may change with COVID, we may have to change the class format (online to hybrid; hybrid to in person, something else…).

“...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)

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.

Enrolment 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.

Evaluation: Performance will be assessed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critiques</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December paper</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam - Poster</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final average in this class will likely be in the 80% to 85% range, though there is no policy specifying it
cannot be higher or lower. 90%+ = A+ (= truly exceptional); 80-90% = A (doing just fine); 70-80% = B (‘we should talk’).

Materials:

1. A. F. Chalmers, What Is This Thing Called Science? (3rd edition please)
3. Sudhir Venkatesh, Gang Leader for a Day (any paperback version is fine)
4. Jesse Singal: The Quick Fix: Why Fad Psychology Can’t Cure Our Social Ills
5. Various readings (articles, book chapters) available on a network folder

+ PDFs of the remaining readings (i.e. excluding assigned books) are located at \livey.ca\PHDShared\Research Methods Course.

Contribution: The course is a seminar, a format that requires you to speak. If you have not carefully prepared the readings for the week, it’s better not to talk. To paraprase Bausell (1994, p. 18), I will not accept intellectual bullshitting and neither should you. 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. There are two ways to contribute:

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

2. 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. These choices are as interesting as reading the phone book. 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.

Critiquing: This is an individual assignment. Throughout the year, I will assign articles for which you write a critique (see How to Write a Critique below). All students will also write a critique of the Venkatesh book (which counts as two critiques). 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. To help you, read the How to Write a Critique content outlined below. So for each critique, you must upload the critique via LEARN (which will be submitted to Turn It In then be sent to me).

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.

Your critique of the Venkatesh book may be 3 pages long. All others may not exceed 2 pages.

Formatting: typed, single spaced, 1-inch margins, 12-point font, Times New Roman. Please make sure your name appears prominently somewhere on the critique. Also, at various times during the year, I may ask for a
version of your critique that is anonymized – this is so I can distribute a version to the class without giving away your identity (so other students can learn from your work).

**December Paper:** Write a paper on a management topic that interests you. It may emerge from or be related to what you present in Session 6 (see reading list below), 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 in writing the paper. It must represent your own work.

Make it a small enough idea that you can get it done, but a big enough one that if you collected data on it, you could present it next year at a conference. The papers you submit should be aimed at a quality that would generate interest from reviewers at good journals in your field. Do not propose a meta-analysis or conceptual paper. The paper must be hypothesis driven (present no less than two and no more than four hypotheses) and it 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 paper includes everything you would typically see in a top journal article up to (but not including) the “Study 1” section. That is:

- Title page (title, your name + abstract of <150 words)
- Statement of Contribution (see [http://www.ejcr.org/contribution-statement.htm](http://www.ejcr.org/contribution-statement.htm) or [https://www.ama-assn.org/submission-guidelines-journal-of-marketing/](https://www.ama-assn.org/submission-guidelines-journal-of-marketing/) under “Statement of Intended Contribution”). One page. This is different from an abstract. It forces you to state and explain each of your intended contributions (theoretical, practical, methodological etc…).
- Introduction section (e.g. Position paper. What are you examining? What is the research question? Why is this paper important and interesting? What do you intend to contribute? What is the general approach?). Read an empirical paper from any top journal – this is what your need to emulate. Just a reminder: this section must clearly state your research question.
- Literature Review: Derived from and supports your research question. This section should include hypotheses generation.
- Figures, tables etc… You must include an explicit theoretical model (not a process model), a picture of how you conceptualize the relationships among your core variables.
- References: must be accurate and complete.

Due: 5 pm, Monday Dec. 20, 2021. 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).
Final Exam – Poster: Your final exam will be in the form of a poster. Many students present the updated version of their December paper while others present other research they have been working on since starting at Ivey, but the same rules apply – it must be your work that you have developed while at Ivey. It must be in the form of a high-quality poster presented at any top conference, including explicit statement of research question(s), moderately detailed description of studies/methods, your theoretical model, clear summary of results and contributions, references etc… It has to be able to ‘stand on its own’ (that is, be clear and comprehensive without your having to explain it). Imagine you are at a conference; for every person you talk to about your poster, many others will look at it and not be able to talk to you). You should make yourself familiar with the expectations of a poster as well as talk to senior students about their formatting ideas. Sometime in the spring, I’ll also show you examples of prior students’ posters to give you a sense for different ways you might format them.

Here is the hard part. You must present actual data. You have ~8 months (from September to the presentation date) to obtain ethics approval (if necessary - see NOTE below), conduct a study and analyze the data. It does not have to be an enormous study, but it must be tight, defensible, thoughtful etc…

Keep in mind that it will take about a month to have your ethics/IRB application approved (if you are using human-subjects data). It will take time to collect and analyze the data. You should start moving with the paper/presentation components of this course early. One reasonable goal you should expect of yourself is to submit this paper to one of your area’s major conferences. You will be in much better shape if you submit your ethics application by early December.

Depending on where we are with in-person vs. virtual teaching, COVID, social gathering etc…., this may be in person or it may be virtual. I’ve scheduled the last session (24) as a placeholder for the presentation of posters, but we may not be able to keep that date. So, basically, the exact format and timing of this deliverable will remain undetermined until probably about Reading Week.

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.

Course Rules:
- I will not accept late papers or assignments except by prior written arrangement or unless I receive what I judge to be unambiguous evidence of extenuating circumstances in which case it is at my discretion how to handle grading. Otherwise, late papers, assignments etc… will earn an automatic grade of zero. Assignments that exceed page limits will be treated as late (i.e. 0%).
- I expect you to attend all classes and I expect you to be on time. If you plan to be absent or late, email me ahead of time. If you miss 5 or more classes, you may not do the final exam (i.e. the poster). In any event, if you miss a class, you are responsible for completing the assignment and readings on time.
- Pay attention to the quality of your writing/arguments (well organized and articulated; specific and clear meanings; perfect formatting etc…). COMMUNICATE IN SUCH A MANNER THAT YOU CANNOT POSSIBLY BE MISUNDERSTOOD. If you can’t communicate your amazing ideas, they’re bad ideas. I tend to be hard on poorly written assignments.
- No Wikipedia. You are a doctoral student now.
- 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

**Academic integrity:** Plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty will be dealt with consistent with the official policies of the university. This concept applies with equal force to all assignments and is considered a major Scholastic Offence. I want to be clear: If I find you to be cheating, plagiarizing etc…, I will do everything in my power to have you removed from the class, the program and the university. I will be holding you, as a PhD student, to a high standard of integrity and professional conduct. If you have concerns, queries etc…, talk to me immediately. If you feel yourself to be under pressure and are tempted to do something you know you shouldn’t, talk to me before you do anything regrettable. I am not inflexible and I will always try to work something out with people acting in good faith. During my time at Ivey, I have seen many PhD students leave the university due to academic integrity violations. Talk to me. Here is some language that the university requires: “Scholastic offences are taken seriously and students are directed to read the appropriate policy, specifically, the definition of what constitutes a Scholastic Offence, at the following Web site: http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/handbook/appeals/scholastic_discipline_grad.pdf

**Mental Health:** 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. For example, to support physical activity, all students, as part of their registration, receive membership in Western’s Campus Recreation Centre. Numerous cultural events are offered throughout the year. Please check out the Faculty of Music web page http://www.music.uwo.ca/, and our own McIntosh Gallery http://www.mcintoshgallery.ca/. Information regarding health- and wellness-related services available to students may be found at http://www.health.uwo.ca/

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 (graduate chair), or other relevant administrators in their unit. Campus mental health resources may be found at http://www.health.uwo.ca/mental_health/resources.html

To help you learn more about mental health, Western has developed an interactive mental health learning module, found here: http://www.health.uwo.ca/mental_health/module.html. This module is 30 minutes in length and provides participants with a basic understanding of mental health issues and of available campus and community resources. Topics include stress, anxiety, depression, suicide and eating disorders. After successful completion of the module, participants receive a certificate confirming their participation.

**Accessible Education Western (AEW)**

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.
How to Write a Critique

Summarize briefly (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 guidelines¹ (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 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 remediing 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

¹ I have pulled most of this content from Prof. Jay Anand’s (Ohio State University) syllabus on Research Methods.

Version August 16, 2021
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.

7. 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.

```plaintext
+++++=
```

**USE THE FOLLOWING TO FIGURE OUT YOUR CRITIQUES (SEE READING LIST)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Reading Presented By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>Guerin</td>
<td>RP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behnaz</td>
<td>Abedini</td>
<td>RP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingqing</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>RP3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>RP4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>LaButte</td>
<td>RP5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haishan</td>
<td>Yuan</td>
<td>RP6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingxiao</td>
<td>Leng</td>
<td>RP7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Hyginus</td>
<td>RP8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Tumurchudur</td>
<td>RP9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantea</td>
<td>Saremi</td>
<td>RP10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parisa</td>
<td>Rajabi</td>
<td>RP11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>RP12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabrina</td>
<td>Goestl</td>
<td>RP13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikash</td>
<td>Kumar</td>
<td>RP14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rezvan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Shahabbasi</strong></td>
<td><strong>RP15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Xiaoxue</strong></td>
<td><strong>Zhang</strong></td>
<td><strong>RP16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SESSIONS 1-6 ONLY*
**READING LIST:**

**Session 1: It Starts** (Sept. 13)
- The Quick Fix: Why Fad Psychology Can’t Cure Our Social Ills

**Session 2: Writing** (Sept. 20)
- Cochrane (2005), “Writing Tips for Ph.D. Students” RP15

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: Retractions and Reviewing** (Sept. 27)
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. We will discuss your findings in class.


_I will distribute articles and reviews about a week before this class. We will dissect them._

**Session 4: Ethics** (Oct. 4)
Background Reading: Bickman and Rog, Chapter 4

WATCH:
- [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9&v=mOUEC5YXV8U](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9&v=mOUEC5YXV8U)
- [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xPO6BrFTsWM](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xPO6BrFTsWM)


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 watch the videos and read the materials.*

**Session 5: Graduate School** (Oct. 18)
IN ADVANCE: Identify an Ivey faculty member with a good publication record (number and quality of papers, citations/impact etc.). Use any publicly available source (e.g. CV, Google Scholar profile) and do some detective work. In light of the three articles below, what are the most likely explanations for this person’s publication record? Come prepared to discuss your ideas and supporting evidence. It would be helpful if you each reviewed a different faculty’s profile.

---


Session 6: Ideas and Writing (Oct. 25)
• Davis (1971) [this is a detailed article. Do something between read carefully and scan this article]

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 of 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 (Nov. 1)
WATCH:
• https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o8GA2w-qrec
• 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=Dkjk3OrjeA

• Chalmers, Chapter 1 RP10
• Chalmers, Chapter 5 RP11
• Chalmers, Chapter 6 RP12
• Chalmers, Chapter 7 RP13
• Kerlinger (1973) “Science and the Scientific Approach” (note this is PDF contains three chapters as below)
  o Chapter 1: Science and the Scientific Approach RP14
  o Chapter 2: Problems and Hypotheses RP1
  o Chapter 3: Constructs, Variables, and Definitions RP2

Session 8: Theory (Nov. 8)
WATCH:
• https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=36GT2zI8IWA
• https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=60ZJQI7_3M

• Chalmers, Chapter 8 RP3
• Chalmers, Chapter 9 RP4
• Flexner, “The Usefulness of Useless Knowledge” RP8

Session 9: Grounded Theory/Humanistic Inquiry (Nov. 15)
WATCH:
• https://www.ted.com/talks/brene_brown_the_power_of_vulnerability
• https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IJyNoJCAuzA
• https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R1vskiVDwl4

IN ADVANCE: 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.

• Chalmers, Chapter 2 RP9
• Chalmers, Chapter 4 RP10
• Corbin and Strauss (1990) “Grounded Theory Research: Procedures, Canons and Evaluative Criteria” RP11
• Hirschman (1986) “Humanistic Inquiry in Marketing Research: Philosophy, Method and Criteria” RP12
• Corley, Bansal and Yu (2020) RP14


Session 10: Qualitative Summary (Nov. 22)
Background Reading: Bickman and Rog, Chapters 8, 9 and 17

Critique Due: Venkatesh, Gang Leader for a Day (all students must write a critique of this book; you may not opt out)

Session 11: Scale Development, Measurement (Nov. 29)
• Peter (1979) “Reliability: A Review of Psychometric Basics and Recent Marketing Practices” (ignore marketing practices section) RP1
• Churchill (1979) “A Paradigm for Developing Better Measures of Marketing Constructs” RP3

Critique Due: Bennett and Robinson (2000) “Development of a Measure of Workplace Deviance”

Sessions 12 (Dec. 6) and 13 (Dec. 13): Student Presentations
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 6 powerpoint slides.

Session 14: Self-Report Measures (Jan. 10)
• Podsakoff and Organ (1986) “Self-reports in Organizational Research: Problems and Prospects” RP5
• Podsakoff et al. (2003) “The Mismeasure of Man(agement) and its Implications for Leadership Research” RP6
• Schwarz (1999) “Self Reports: How the Questions Shape the Answers” RP7

Session 15: Biases etc. (Jan. 17)
• Greenberg (1987) “The College Sophomore as Guinea Pig: Setting the Record Straight” RP9
• Sawyer (1975) “Demand Artifacts in Laboratory Experiments in Consumer Research” RP12
• Weber and Cook (1972) “Subject Effects in Laboratory Research” RP13

Session 16 Big Data (Jan. 24)
WATCH:
• https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=irP5RCdpilc
• https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fZuDwiM1XBQ

• Tausczik and Pennebaker (2010), “The Psychological Meaning of Words…” RP14
• Albert and Thomson (2018), “A Synthesis of the…” RP1
• Li, Shi and Wang (2019), “Video Mining…” RP3

Session 17: Surveys I (Jan. 31)
Every student find a survey – it doesn’t matter if it is academic, by government, a company... Half of you (RP1, RP2, RP3, RP7, RP13, RP14) will show your survey to the class and systematically explain what is bad about it (and how you would fix it). Remember, you should be ready to show this survey electronically (‘show your screen’ in Zoom probably works best).

Background Reading: Bickman and Rog, Chapter 3 & 12
• Dillman et al., “From Questions to a Questionnaire” RP4

Session 18: Surveys II (Feb. 7)
See directions from last class. Today, all remaining students who did not present their surveys previously will do so here.
• Fowler (1992), “How Unclear Terms Affect Survey Data” RP7
• Blair et al. (1977), “How to Ask Questions about Drinking and Sex…” RP8
• Bishop et al. (1986), “Opinions on Fictitious Issues…” RP10
• Weijters et al. (2010), “The Effect of Rating Scale Format…” RP12

Session 19: Experiments (Feb. 14)
Background Reading: Bickman and Rog, Chapter 2, 5 and 6
• Chalmers, Chapter 3 RP13
• Greenwald (1976) “Within-Subjects Designs: To Use or Not To Use?” RP1
• Meyvis and van Osselaer (2018), “Increasing the Power…” RP2

Session 20: Mediation, Moderation etc… (Feb. 28)
• Krishna, “A Clearer Spotlight on Spotlight…” RP3
• Zhao, Lynch and Chen “Reconsidering Baron and Kenny…” RP4
+ Practicum on Interactions (I will distribute a dataset before class. It would be a good idea to download and install the PROCESS macro – it is available for SPSS and SAS already and is supposed to be available for R soon. Download at [http://www.processmacro.org/index.html](http://www.processmacro.org/index.html). Install it, open the dataset and start playing around with it).

**Session 21: Natural & Quasi-experiments** (March 7)
- Abadie et al. (2015), “Comparative Politics…” RP8
- Fremeth et al. (2017), “Bridging…” RP9

**Session 22: Controversies in Research** (March 7)
Go to datacolada.org and find any of the ‘Data Replicada’. Locate the original article and read the associated replication on the datacolada website. Come prepared to discuss your ideas.

- Simmons et al. (2011), “False-Positive Psychology: Undisclosed Flexibility in Data Collection and Analysis Allows Presenting Anything as Significant” RP10
- Simonsohn (2012), “Just Post It: The Lesson from Two Cases of Fabricated Data Detected by Statistics Alone” RP1

**Session 23: People’s Choice** (Mar 14)
*Each student find what they view to be an important RM-related paper that we have not covered in this class. During our last session, each student will present their chosen paper, explaining its significance, why it is interesting or important from an RM perspective. Work among yourselves to ensure nobody presents the same paper.*

**Session 24: Final Posters** (TBD)