

University of Cincinnati

MGMT 9026: Quantitative Research Methods

Fall 2019 (22-MGMT9026-001)

Tuesdays 11am-2pm; Lindner 3455

Instructor: Dr. Eli Awtrey
Assistant Professor of Management
eli.awtrey@uc.edu

Office: Lindner 3352, 513-556-4582

Office Hours: By appointment; WebEx or in-person

Course website: <https://uc.instructure.com/courses/1233655>

“...if you have bad data, you have a design problem, not an analysis problem.”

–Vandenberg, R. J., & Cortina, J. M. 2013. Introduction to the Research Design Feature Topic. Organizational Research Methods, 16(4): 499–500.

COURSE PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

This course is designed to prepare students to understand and critique the research designs and analyses commonly used in management and related disciplines. As such, this course is intended as a supplement to, and not a replacement for, in-depth courses on regression, multilevel analysis, structural equation modeling, etc. Students will learn methodological principles that cross all stages of the scientific process: (1) the role of theory and good research questions, (2) the importance of valid research designs, (3) understanding analysis and measurement, and (4) culminating in discussions of ongoing debates. The course will place a heavy emphasis on students becoming informed producers and consumers of research, primarily in order to publish in top academic journals. While this course will not make students an expert in any particular method, they will gain an initial set of tools to understand what research designs—and the data produced from those designs—can (and cannot) reveal about a phenomenon of interest.

COURSE METHODS AND EXPECTATIONS

As with most doctoral seminars, the primary pedagogical approach in this course is in-depth discussion. Through the assigned readings, we will engage the methodological concepts at hand in detail. Thus, it is imperative that you come to class prepared—this means reading the assigned readings once or more, with an emphasis on engaging the content with a critical and thoughtful eye. This preparation will enable us to substantively discuss the tradeoffs involved in organizational research.

DELIVERABLES

All deliverables are due on Canvas by class time on the due date. Grades on late work will be reduced by 10% per day. Documents should be double-spaced with standard margins unless otherwise noted.

Assignment	Description	Weight
1. Discussion participation	<p>The most critical component of this course is our class discussion, which is only functional if we are all prepared every week to talk about each topic. To help in this regard we will do the things:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Each student will be responsible for at least one of the assigned readings each week. By responsible, I mean that you will provide a two-minute summary to the class (and an outline for everyone) and raise questions for discussion. 2) For weeks 5-8, you will also pick one of the “exemplar” papers and write a brief summary that describes the research design’s strengths, weaknesses, and applicability to the research question. 3) As you do your reading for the week, take note of your thoughts, insights, questions regarding the articles. Before the class session (24 hours prior), upload these in bullet-point form to Canvas. I will read this before we meet and use this to help guide our discussion <p><i>This can be a fun and exciting seminar if we all chip in!</i></p>	50%
2. Research design project	<p>To apply the design issues discussed in this course, you will build a research proposal over the semester. The intermediate steps will give me an opportunity to provide feedback, with only the final paper receiving a grade.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Literature review (W3): Background on a research topic of your choice. Can be in bullet point form; 2-3 pgs. 2) Theory and hypotheses (W7): Should build a motivation, logic and justification for a testable model. You can incorporate your literature review. 6-10 pgs. 3) Proposed design and analysis: (W10): Describe how you will test the model designed in step 2. 5-8 pgs. 4) Final paper (W15): Combines steps 2 and 3 and incorporates feedback. 10-20 pgs. 	50%

TEXTBOOK AND OTHER USEFUL TITLES

We will use the text *Approaches to Social Research* (6th edition) by Singleton and Straits to guide our discussions. (The 5th edition is also permissible.) While this is written by sociologists rather than organizational scholars specifically, it provides important background information and offers a framework for thinking about our specific task of designing rigorous organizational research. In addition to the assigned textbook, you may want to consider the following texts to supplement your development in a given area:

- Design
 - Kerlinger, F. N., & Lee, H. B. (2000). *Foundations of behavioral research* (Vol. 4). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt.
 - Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
 - Babbie, Earl R. *The Practice of Social Research*. 12th ed. Belmont, Calif: Wadsworth Cengage, 2010.
- Analysis
 - Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
 - Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York: Guilford Press.
 - Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
 - Tabachnick, Barbara G., and Linda S. Fidell. *Using Multivariate Statistics*. 6th ed. Boston: Pearson Education, 2013.
 - Snijders, T. A. B., and R. J. Bosker. *Multilevel Analysis: An Introduction to Basic and Advanced Multilevel Modeling*. 2nd ed. Los Angeles: Sage, 2012.
 - Hayes, Andrew F. *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis: A Regression-Based Approach*. Second edition. *Methodology in the Social Sciences*. New York: Guilford Press, 2018.
 - Raykov, Tenko, and George A. Marcoulides. *Introduction to Psychometric Theory*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2011.
- Writing
 - Pinker, Steven. *The Sense of Style: The Thinking Person's Guide to Writing in the 21st Century*. New York, New York: Viking, 2014.
 - Silvia, Paul J. *Write It up: Practical Strategies for Writing and Publishing Journal Articles*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2015.
 - Silvia, Paul J. *How to Write a Lot: A Practical Guide to Productive Academic Writing*. Second edition. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2019.

WEEKLY ARTICLE SCHEDULE

These readings should all be found through the library website. Let me know if you have trouble finding specific articles.

Week 1: Introduction and philosophy of science: How do we know what we know? (8/27/19)

- 1) Singleton & Straits, Ch 1
- 2) Singleton & Straits, Ch 2
- 3) Pfeffer, J. (1993). Barriers to the advance of organizational science: Paradigm development as a dependent variable. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(4), 599–620.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1993.9402210152>
- 4) Kilduff, M., Mehra, A., & Dunn, M. B. (2011). From blue sky research to problem solving: A philosophy of science theory of new knowledge production. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(2), 297–317. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2009.0164>
- 5) Pfeffer, J. (2007). A modest proposal: How we might change the process and product of managerial research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(6), 1334–1345.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.28166117>

Week 2: Getting the topic: Designing a good research question (9/3/19)

- 1) Davis, M. S. (1971). That's interesting!: Towards a phenomenology of sociology and a sociology of phenomenology. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 1(2), 309–344.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/004839317100100211>
- 2) Gulati, R. (2007). Tent Poles, Tribalism, and Boundary Spanning: The Rigor-Relevance Debate in Management Research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 775–782.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/20159889>
- 3) Ashford, S. J. (2013). Having Scholarly Impact: The Art of Hitting Academic Home Runs. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 12(4), 623–633.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2013.0090>
- 4) Colquitt, J. A., & George, G. (2011). Publishing in AMJ—Part 1: Topic Choice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(3), 432–435. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.61965960>

Week 3: A methodological approach to theory development (9/10/19)

- 1) Fisher, Greg, and Herman Aguinis. "Using Theory Elaboration to Make Theoretical Advancements." *Organizational Research Methods* 20, no. 3 (July 1, 2017): 438–64.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428116689707>.
- 2) Leavitt, Keith, Terence R. Mitchell, and Jeff Peterson. "Theory Pruning: Strategies to Reduce Our Dense Theoretical Landscape." *Organizational Research Methods* 13, no. 4 (October 1, 2010): 644–67. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428109345156>.
- 3) Davis, Gerald F. "Do Theories of Organizations Progress?" *Organizational Research Methods* 13, no. 4 (October 1, 2010): 690–709. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428110376995>.
- 4) Vancouver, Jeffrey B., Mo Wang, and Xiaofei Li. "Translating Informal Theories Into Formal Theories: The Case of the Dynamic Computational Model of the Integrated Model of Work Motivation." *Organizational Research Methods*, June 20, 2018, 1094428118780308.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428118780308>.
- 5) Howard, Matt C., and Michael E. Hoffman. "Variable-Centered, Person-Centered, and Person-Specific Approaches: Where Theory Meets the Method." *Organizational Research Methods* 21, no. 4 (October 1, 2018): 846–76. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428117744021>.

- Supplemental readings:
 - Sparrowe, R. T., & Mayer, K. J. (2011). Publishing in AMJ—Part 4: Grounding Hypotheses. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(6), 1098–1102. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.4001>
 - Sutton, Robert I., and Barry M. Staw. "What Theory Is Not." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 40, no. 3 (1995): 371–84. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393788>.
 - Whetten, David A. "What Constitutes a Theoretical Contribution?" *Academy of Management Review* 14, no. 4 (1989): 490–495. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1989.4308371>.
 - Corley, Kevin G., and Dennis A. Gioia. "Building Theory about Theory Building: What Constitutes a Theoretical Contribution?" *Academy of Management Review* 36, no. 1 (2011): 12–32. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2009.0486>.
 - Colquitt, Jason A., and Cindy P. Zapata-Phelan. "Trends in Theory Building and Theory Testing: A Five-Decade Study of the Academy of Management Journal." *Academy of Management Journal* 50, no. 6 (2007): 1281–1303. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.28165855>.
 - Ketokivi, Mikko, and Saku Mantere. "Two Strategies for Inductive Reasoning in Organizational Research." *Academy of Management Review* 35, no. 2 (2010): 315–333. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.35.2.zok315>.

Week 4: Research design overview: Optimizing validity and feasibility (9/17/19)

- 1) Singleton & Straits, Ch 4
 - 2) Singleton & Straits, Ch 6
 - 3) Chatman, Jennifer A., and Francis J. Flynn. "Full-Cycle Micro-Organizational Behavior Research." *Organization Science* 16, no. 4 (July 1, 2005): 434–47. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1050.0136>.
 - 4) Buchanan, David A., and Alan Bryman. "Contextualizing Methods Choice in Organizational Research." *Organizational Research Methods* 10, no. 3 (July 1, 2007): 483–501. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428106295046>.
 - 5) Edmondson, Amy C., and Stacy E. McManus. "Methodological Fit in Management Field Research." *Academy of Management Review* 32, no. 4 (October 2007): 1155–79. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2007.26586086>.
- Supplemental readings:
 - Klein, K. J., and S. W. J. Kozlowski. "From Micro to Meso: Critical Steps in Conceptualizing and Conducting Multilevel Research." *Organizational Research Methods* 3, no. 3 (July 1, 2000): 211–36. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810033001>.
 - Scandura, T.A. and Williams, E.A. 2000. Research methodology in management: Current practices, trends and implications for future research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 1248-1264.
 - Johns, G. (2006). The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 386-408.
 - Hackman, J.R. 2003. Learning more by crossing levels: Evidence from airplanes, hospitals, and orchestras. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24: 905-922.

Week 5: Experimental designs (lab and field) (9/24/19)

1. Singleton & Straits, Ch 7
 2. Singleton & Straits, Ch 8
 3. Highhouse, S. (2007). Designing Experiments That Generalize. *Organizational Research Methods*, 12(3), 554–566. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428107300396>
 4. Grant, A. M., & Wall, T. D. (2008). The Neglected Science and Art of Quasi-Experimentation: Why-to, When-to, and How-to Advice for Organizational Researchers. *Organizational Research Methods*, 12(4), 653–686. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428108320737>
 5. Bandiera, Oriana, Iwan Barankay, and Imran Rasul. "Field Experiments with Firms." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 25, no. 3 (2011): 63–82. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.25.3.63>.
- Exemplars (choose one):
 - Melwani, S. & Barsade, S. G. (2011). Held in contempt: The psychological, interpersonal, and performance outcomes of contempt in a work setting. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 101, 503-520.
 - Earley, P. C. & Mosakowski, E. (2000). Creating hybrid team cultures: An empirical test of transnational team functioning. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 26-49.
 - Billinger, S., Stieglitz, N., & Schumacher, T. R. (2014). Search on a rugged landscape: An experimental study. *Organization Science*, 25, 93-108.
 - Hekman, D. R., Aquino, K., Owens, B. P., Mitchell, T. R., Schilpzand, P. & Leavitt, K. (2010). An examination of whether and how racial and gender biases influence customer satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53, 238-264.
 - Bandiera, O., Barankay, I., & Rasul, I. (2007). Incentives for managers and inequality among workers: Evidence from a firm level experiment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122, 729 – 773.
 - Bertrand, B. & Mullainathan, S. 2004. Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination. *The American Economic Review*, 94: 991- 1013.
 - Staw, B. M. 1974. Attitudinal and behavioral consequences of changing a major organizational reward: A natural field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 29: 742-751.
 - Hui, C., Lam, S.S.K., Law, K.K.S. 2000. Instrumental values of organizational citizenship behavior for promotion: A field quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85: 822-828.
 - Lanaj, Klodiana, Trevor A. Foulk, and Amir Erez. "Energizing Leaders via Self-Reflection: A within-Person Field Experiment." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000350>.
 - Morgeson, F. P. & Campion, M. A. (2002). Minimizing tradeoffs when redesigning work: Evidence from a longitudinal quasi-experiment. *Personnel Psychology*, 55, 589-612.
 - Supplemental reading:
 - Aguinis, H., & Bradley, K. J. (2014). Best Practice Recommendations for Designing and Implementing Experimental Vignette Methodology Studies. *Organizational Research Methods*, 17(4), 351–371. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428114547952>
 - Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., & Brewer, M. 1998. Experimentation in social psychology. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, Volume 2 (4th Ed.): 99-142. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Colquitt, J. A. (2008). Publishing laboratory research in AMJ: A question of when, not if. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51, 616-620.
- King, E. B., Hebl, M. R., Botsford Morgan, W., & Ahmad, A. S. (2013). Field Experiments on Sensitive Organizational Topics. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16(4), 501–521. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428112462608>
- Mitchell, G. (2012). Revisiting truth or triviality: The external validity of research in the psychological laboratory. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7, 109-117.

Week 6: Survey designs (10/1/19)

1. Singleton & Straits, Ch 9
 2. Singleton & Straits, Ch 10
 3. Hinkin, T. R. "A Brief Tutorial on the Development of Measures for Use in Survey Questionnaires." *Organizational Research Methods* 1, no. 1 (January 1, 1998): 104–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109442819800100106>.
 4. Schwarz, Norbert. "Self-Reports: How the Questions Shape the Answers." *American Psychologist* 54, no. 2 (1999): 93–105. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.54.2.93>.
 5. Cychota, Cynthia S., and David A. Harrison. "What (Not) to Expect When Surveying Executives: A Meta-Analysis of Top Manager Response Rates and Techniques Over Time." *Organizational Research Methods* 9, no. 2 (April 1, 2006): 133–60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428105280770>.
 6. Hardy, Ben, and Lucy R. Ford. "It's Not Me, It's You: Miscomprehension in Surveys." *Organizational Research Methods* 17, no. 2 (April 1, 2014): 138–62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428113520185>.
- Exemplars (choose one):
 - Barsade, S. G. & O'Neill, O. A. (2014, in press). What's love got to do with it? A longitudinal study of the culture of companionate love and employee and client outcomes in a long-term care setting. *Administrative Science Quarterly*.
 - Haas, M. R. & Hansen, M. T. 2005. When using knowledge can hurt performance: The value of organizational capabilities in a management consulting company. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26: 1-24.
 - Govindarajan, V., & Kopalle, P. K. 2006. Disruptiveness of innovations: Measurement and an assessment of reliability and validity. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27: 189-199.
 - Plambeck, N. & Weber, K. (2009). CEO ambivalence and responses to strategic issues. *Organization Science*, 20, 993-1010.
 - Johnson, Russell E., Klodiana Lanaj, and Christopher M. Barnes. "The Good and Bad of Being Fair: Effects of Procedural and Interpersonal Justice Behaviors on Regulatory Resources." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 99, no. 4 (July 2014): 635–50. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035647>.
 - Harrison, Spencer H., and David T. Wagner. "Spilling Outside the Box: The Effects of Individuals' Creative Behaviors at Work on Time Spent with Their Spouses at Home." *Academy of Management Journal* 59, no. 3 (June 1, 2016): 841–59. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2013.0560>.
 - Supplemental readings:
 - Simsek, Z. & Veiga, J. F. 2001. A primer on internet organizational surveys. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4: 218-235.

- Dillman, Don A., Jolene D. Smyth, and Leah Melani Christian. *Internet, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*. 3rd ed. Hoboken, N.J: Wiley & Sons, 2009.

Week 7: Archival designs (10/8/19)

1. Singleton & Straits, Ch 12
 2. Boyd, B. K., Bergh, D. D., Ireland, R. D., & Ketchen, D. J. (2013). Constructs in Strategic Management. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16(1), 3–14.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428112471298>
 3. Ketchen, David J., R. Duane Ireland, and LaKami T. Baker. “The Use of Archival Proxies in Strategic Management Studies: Castles Made of Sand?” *Organizational Research Methods* 16, no. 1 (January 1, 2013): 32–42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428112459911>.
 4. Combs, James G. “Big Samples and Small Effects: Let’s Not Trade Relevance and Rigor for Power.” *Academy of Management Journal* 53, no. 1 (February 1, 2010): 9–13.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.48036305>.
- Exemplars (choose one):
 - Bidwell, M. (2011). Paying more to get less: The effects of external hiring versus internal mobility. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 56, 369-407.
 - Carton, Andrew M. “‘I’m Not Mopping the Floors, I’m Putting a Man on the Moon’: How NASA Leaders Enhanced the Meaningfulness of Work by Changing the Meaning of Work.” *Administrative Science Quarterly* 63, no. 2 (June 1, 2018): 323–69.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839217713748>.
 - Carton, Andrew M., and Ashleigh Shelby Rosette. “Explaining Bias against Black Leaders: Integrating Theory on Information Processing and Goal-Based Stereotyping.” *Academy of Management Journal* 54, no. 6 (2011): 1141–58.
 - Chen, G. & Hambrick, D. C. (2012). CEO replacement in turnaround situations: Executive (mis)fit and its performance implications. *Organization Science*, 23: 225-243.
 - Kaplan, S. 2008. Cognition, capabilities, and incentives: Assessing firm response to the fiber-optic revolution. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51: 672-695.
 - Mollick, E. (2012). People and process, suits and innovators: The role of individuals in firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 33, 1001-1015.
 - Supplemental readings
 - Heckman, J. J. 1990. Varieties of selection bias. *American Economic Review*, 80(2): 313-318.
 - Ventresca, M. J., & Mohr, J. W. 2002. Archival research methods. In J. A. C. Baum (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to Organizations*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. Chapter 35, pp. 805-828.

Week 8: Computational designs: Simulation & big data (10/15/19)

1. Fioretti, Guido. “Agent-Based Simulation Models in Organization Science.” *Organizational Research Methods* 16, no. 2 (April 1, 2013): 227–42.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428112470006>.
2. Tonidandel, Scott, Eden B. King, and Jose M. Cortina. “Big Data Methods: Leveraging Modern Data Analytic Techniques to Build Organizational Science.” *Organizational Research Methods* 21, no. 3 (July 1, 2018): 525–47. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428116677299>.
3. Vancouver, Jeffrey B., and Justin M. Weinhardt. “Modeling the Mind and the Milieu: Computational Modeling for Micro-Level Organizational Researchers.” *Organizational*

- Research Methods 15, no. 4 (October 1, 2012): 602–23.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428112449655>.
4. Luciano, M. M., Mathieu, J. E., Park, S., & Tannenbaum, S. I. 2018. A Fitting Approach to Construct and Measurement Alignment: The Role of Big Data in Advancing Dynamic Theories. *Organizational Research Methods*, 21(3): 592–632.
 5. Wenzel, Ramon, and Niels Van Quaquebeke. “The Double-Edged Sword of Big Data in Organizational and Management Research: A Review of Opportunities and Risks.” *Organizational Research Methods* 21, no. 3 (July 1, 2018): 548–91.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428117718627>.
 - Exemplars (choose one):
 - Braun, Michael T., Goran Kuljanin, and Richard P. DeShon. “Special Considerations for the Acquisition and Wrangling of Big Data.” *Organizational Research Methods* 21, no. 3 (July 1, 2018): 633–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428117690235>.
 - March, J. 1991. Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2(1): 71-87.
 - Levinthal, D. 1991. Random walks and organizational mortality. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36(3): 397-420.
 - Rivkin, J. & Siggelkow, N. 2009. Hiding the evidence of valid theories: How coupled search processes obscure performance differences among organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54: 602-634.
 - Rudolph, J. W., Morrison, J. B., & Carroll, J. S. (2009). The dynamics of action-oriented problem solving: Linking interpretation and choice. *Academy of Management Review*, 34, 733-756.

Week 9: Empirical considerations: Construct measurement (10/22/19)

1. Singleton & Straits, Ch 5
2. Podsakoff, Philip M., Scott B. MacKenzie, and Nathan P. Podsakoff. “Recommendations for Creating Better Concept Definitions in the Organizational, Behavioral, and Social Sciences.” *Organizational Research Methods* 19, no. 2 (April 1, 2016): 159–203.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428115624965>.
3. Chan, David. “Functional Relations among Constructs in the Same Content Domain at Different Levels of Analysis: A Typology of Composition Models.” *Journal of Applied Psychology* 83, no. 2 (April 1998): 234–46. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.2.234>.
4. Edwards, Jeffrey R. “The Fallacy of Formative Measurement.” *Organizational Research Methods* 14, no. 2 (August 11, 2010): 370–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428110378369>.
5. Certo, S. Trevis, John R. Busenbark, Matias Kalm, and Jeffery A. LePine. “Divided We Fall: How Ratios Undermine Research in Strategic Management.” *Organizational Research Methods*, May 31, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428118773455>.

Week 10: Empirical considerations: Correlation and causation (10/29/19)

1. Singleton & Straits, Ch 13
2. Antonakis, John, Samuel Bendahan, Philippe Jacquart, and Rafael Lalive. “On Making Causal Claims: A Review and Recommendations.” *The Leadership Quarterly* 21, no. 6 (2010): 1086–1120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.10.010>.
3. Hamilton, Barton H., and Jackson A. Nickerson. “Correcting for Endogeneity in Strategic Management Research.” *Strategic Organization* 1, no. 1 (February 2003): 51–78.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1476127003001001218>.

4. Sharp, Barton M., Donald D. Bergh, and Ming Li. "Measuring and Testing Industry Effects in Strategic Management Research: An Update, Assessment, and Demonstration." *Organizational Research Methods* 16, no. 1 (January 1, 2013): 43–66. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428112470847>.
5. Podsakoff, Philip M., Scott B. MacKenzie, Jeong-Yeon Lee, and Nathan P. Podsakoff. "Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 88, no. 5 (October 2003): 879–903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>.

Week 11: Empirical issues: Time (11/5/19)

1. Kozlowski, Steve W. J., Georgia T. Chao, James A. Grand, Michael T. Braun, and Goran Kuljanin. "Advancing Multilevel Research Design Capturing the Dynamics of Emergence." *Organizational Research Methods* 16, no. 4 (October 1, 2013): 581–615. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428113493119>.
2. Mitchell, Terence R., and Lawrence R. James. "Building Better Theory: Time and the Specification of When Things Happen." *Academy of Management Review* 26, no. 4 (October 2001): 530–47. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2001.5393889>.
3. Jebb, Andrew T., and Louis Tay. "Introduction to Time Series Analysis for Organizational Research: Methods for Longitudinal Analyses." *Organizational Research Methods* 20, no. 1 (January 1, 2017): 61–94. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428116668035>.
4. Ployhart, Robert E., and Robert J. Vandenberg. "Longitudinal Research: The Theory, Design, and Analysis of Change." *Journal of Management* 36, no. 1 (January 1, 2010): 94–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309352110>.

Week 12: Empirical issues: Analytical choices (11/12/19)

1. Singleton & Straits, Ch 15
2. Singleton & Straits, Ch 16
3. Silberzahn, R., E. L. Uhlmann, D. P. Martin, P. Anselmi, F. Aust, E. Awtrey, Š. Bahnik, et al. "Many Analysts, One Data Set: Making Transparent How Variations in Analytic Choices Affect Results." *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science* 1, no. 3 (September 1, 2018): 337–56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245917747646>.
4. Holland, S. J., Shore, D. B., & Cortina, J. M. 2017. Review and Recommendations for Integrating Mediation and Moderation. *Organizational Research Methods*, 20(4): 686–720.
5. Aguinis, H., Edwards, J. R., & Bradley, K. J. 2017. Improving Our Understanding of Moderation and Mediation in Strategic Management Research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 20(4): 665–685.
6. Gardner, R. G., Harris, T. B., Li, N., Kirkman, B. L., & Mathieu, J. E. 2017. Understanding "It Depends" in Organizational Research: A Theory-Based Taxonomy, Review, and Future Research Agenda Concerning Interactive and Quadratic Relationships. *Organizational Research Methods*, 20(4): 610–638.
- Supplementary readings
 - Sardeshmukh, S. R., & Vandenberg, R. J. 2017. Integrating Moderation and Mediation: A Structural Equation Modeling Approach. *Organizational Research Methods*, 20(4): 721–745.
 - Baron, R. M. & Kenny, D. A. 1986. The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 6: 1173-1182.

Week 13: Writing and publishing: The end goal (11/19/19)

1. Singleton & Straits, Ch 17
2. Ragins, B. R. (2012). Editor's Comments: Reflections on the Craft of Clear Writing. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(4), 493–501. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2012.0165>
3. Grant, A. M., & Pollock, T. G. (2011). Publishing in AMJ—Part 3: Setting the Hook. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(5), 873–879. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.4000>
4. Zhang, Y. (Anthea), & Shaw, J. D. (2012). Publishing in AMJ—Part 5: Crafting the Methods and Results. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(1), 8–12. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.4001>
5. Rosenthal, Robert. "Science and Ethics in Conducting, Analyzing, and Reporting Psychological Research." *Psychological Science* 5, no. 3 (May 1, 1994): 127–34. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.1994.tb00646.x>.

Week 14: Hot topics: Current debates, issues, landmines, and pitfalls (12/3/19)

1. Bedeian, Arthur G., Shannon G. Taylor, and Alan N. Miller. "Management Science on the Credibility Bubble: Cardinal Sins and Various Misdemeanors." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 9, no. 4 (December 1, 2010): 715–25. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.9.4.zqr715>.
 2. Cortina, Jose M., and Ronald S. Landis. "The Earth Is Not Round ($p = .00$)." *Organizational Research Methods* 14, no. 2 (December 13, 2010): 332–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428110391542>.
 3. Carlson, Kevin D., and Jinpei Wu. "The Illusion of Statistical Control Control Variable Practice in Management Research." *Organizational Research Methods* 15, no. 3 (July 1, 2012): 413–35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428111428817>.
 4. Schweinsberg, Martin, Nikhil Madan, Michelangelo Vianello, S. Amy Sommer, Jennifer Jordan, Warren Tierney, Eli Awtrey, et al. "The Pipeline Project: Pre-Publication Independent Replications of a Single Laboratory's Research Pipeline." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, Rigorous and Replicable Methods in Social Psychology*, 66 (September 1, 2016): 55–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2015.10.001>.
- Supplemental readings
 - Aguinis, H., Pierce, C. A., Bosco, F. A., Dalton, D. R., & Dalton, C. M. 2010. Debunking Myths and Urban Legends About Meta-Analysis. *Organizational Research Methods*, 14(2): 306–331.
 - Williams, L. J., & O'Boyle, E. 2010. The Myth of Global Fit Indices and Alternatives for Assessing Latent Variable Relations. *Organizational Research Methods*, 14(2): 350–369.
 - Lance, Charles E., Marcus M. Butts, and Lawrence C. Michels. "The Sources of Four Commonly Reported Cutoff Criteria: What Did They Really Say?" *Organizational Research Methods* 9, no. 2 (April 1, 2006): 202–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428105284919>.

COURSE POLICIES

Academic integrity: As with all Lindner College of Business efforts, in this course you will be held to the highest ethical standards, critical to building character. Ensuring your integrity is vital and ultimately is your responsibility. To help ensure the alignments of incentives, the Lindner College of Business has implemented a “Two Strikes Policy” regarding Academic Integrity that supplements the UC Student Code of Conduct (see: http://www.uc.edu/conduct/Code_of_Conduct.html)

- All academic programs at the Lindner College of Business use this “Two Strikes Policy”; Any student who has been found responsible for two cases of academic misconduct may be dismissed from the College.
- All cases of academic misconduct (**e.g., copying assignments of other students, failure to adequately cite or reference, cheating, plagiarism, falsification, etc.**) will be formally reported by faculty; and
- Students will be afforded due process for allegations as outlined in the policy.

Attendance: Because of the discussion format of this class, your attendance at each class is critical. If you have a legitimate absence due to illness or something similar, please let me know before class. When you return, please follow-up with a classmate to find out what you’ve missed.

Disability: Students with disabilities who need academic accommodations or other specialized services while attending the University of Cincinnati will receive reasonable accommodations to meet their individual needs as well as advocacy assistance on disability-related issues. Students requiring special accommodation must register with the Disability Services Office.
<http://www.uc.edu/aess/disability.html>

Counseling Services, Clifton Campus: Students have access to counseling and mental health care through the University Health Services (UHS), which can provide both psychotherapy and psychiatric services. In addition, Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) can provide professional counseling upon request; students may receive five free counseling sessions through CAPS without insurance. Students are encouraged to seek assistance for anxiety, depression, trauma/assault, adjustment to college life, interpersonal/relational difficulty, sexuality, family conflict, grief and loss, disordered eating and body image, alcohol and substance abuse, anger management, identity development and issues related to diversity, concerns associated with sexual orientation and spirituality concerns, as well as any other issue of concerns. After hours, students may call UHS at 513-556-2564 or CAPS Cares at 513-556-0648. For urgent physician consultation after-hours students may call 513-584-7777.

Title IX: Title IX is a federal civil rights law that prohibits discrimination on the basis of your actual or perceived sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, or sexual orientation. Title IX also covers sexual violence, dating or domestic violence, and stalking. If you disclose a Title IX issue to me, I am required forward that information to the Title IX Office. They will follow up with you about how the University can take steps to address the impact on you and the community and make you aware of your rights and resources. Their priority is to make sure you are safe and successful here. You are not required to talk with the Title IX Office. If you would like to make a report of sex or gender-based discrimination, harassment or violence, or if you would like to know more about your rights and resources on campus, you can consult the website www.uc.edu/titleix or contact the office at 556-3349.