

B794
Intro to Qualitative and Quantitative Methods
Winter 2022 Course Outline

Human Resources and Management
DeGroote School of Business
McMaster University

COURSE OBJECTIVE

This seminar course provides students with an introduction to some methods commonly used in management research that fall under the umbrella of qualitative and quantitative research. The objectives are for students to become familiar with (1) what kinds of questions these methods can help answer, and (2) how to use these methods.

This seminar also provides exposure to research design and methods in business, psychology and the behavioural sciences more generally, with an emphasis on developing skills fundamental to designing and critically evaluating research projects, with an emphasis on a positivist and empirical paradigm.

INSTRUCTOR AND CONTACT INFORMATION

Professors

Trish Ruebottom

ruebott@mcmaster.ca

Office Hours: by appointment

Catherine Connelly

connell@mcmaster.ca

Office hours: by appointment

Classes: TBD

Room: TBD

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Part A:

The first half of this course is designed to survey the key methods that fall under the umbrella of qualitative research. It cannot be exhaustive, due to time limitations, but it will hopefully give you a taste of qualitative research and provide you with the orientations necessary to help you go further.

This course will be conducted as a seminar. There will be six three-hour meetings. Every week we will read some articles about the particular method or research design topic we are discussing. These will be complemented by a recent or classic article that illustrate the method or design. Through reading and discussing these articles, we will learn about both the theory of how this is done, and how it is done in practice.

In this course, the role of the professor will be to stimulate and guide student discussion. I will ask questions and encourage you to present, and support, different points of view in discussion.

Part B:

This half-course seminar provides an exposure to, and overview of, key issues, methods and approaches to conducting research from a positivist, empirical perspective. Six weeks constrains us to a highly selective readings list, with concentration on foundational topics with the understanding that you will need to continually learn new research methods for your dissertation and throughout your career.

In-class discussions contribute to the value you gain from this seminar, so it is essential that you come prepared, having read and reflected on the assigned manuscripts.

For the first half of each class, we will discuss the readings in depth. This is also a good opportunity for you to ask questions. Before the class break I will assign you the parameters for a new study that you will design that incorporates some elements of our discussion thus far. After the break, students will be asked to present their design, and they will receive feedback on the rigor of what they have proposed.

LEARNING OUTCOMES

This course will:

1. Test students' understanding of methods presented in the readings.
2. Develop skills in communicating ideas, in developing and presenting arguments, in listening to and understanding others, and in challenging others' views in a way that advances everyone's understanding.

3. Learn to think independently and critically: you will need to be able to analyze the methodological strengths and deficiencies of the articles that are being discussed, and how these methods issues influence the kinds of theoretical claims that can be made. These skills will be useful to you when you conduct your own research.

COURSE MATERIALS AND READINGS

Books:

These should be available second-hand online.

Charmaz, Kathy. 2006. Constructing Grounded Theory.

Weiss, Robert. 1994. Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies.

S.G. Rogelberg (Ed.). (2004). Handbook of Research Methods in Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.: Malden: MA.

Articles:

As noted in each class session. These are all available via the McMaster library system.

EVALUATION

Notes about the types of assessments used as well as notes regarding how group work will be evaluated.

Components and Weights

There are two graded components to this part of the course.
Students' grades will be calculated as follows:

Four Assignments	40%
Final Take Home Exam	60%

Conversion

At the end of the course your overall percentage grade will be converted to your letter grade in accordance with the following conversion scheme.

Grade	Points	Equivalent Percentages
A+	12	90 – 100
A	11	85 – 89
A-	10	80 – 84
B+	9	77 – 79
B	8	73 – 76
B-	7	70 – 72
F	0	69 and under

Four Assignments (4 x 10% = 40%)

Over the course of the term you will complete four assignments. These assignments are designed to help you practice using the methods and will help you work towards developing your final exam for the class.

All work must be completed independently. Each assignment is 1 page single-spaced (plus any necessary appendices) and should be submitted to the instructor **via email on the day before our class OR when stated in the detailed outline below**, according to the order of the class schedule. Late assignments will not be accepted.

Part A:

I ask you to share your work with your classmates because an important part of learning to be an academic is learning from your colleagues' work and learning how to help your colleagues in their work. Part of every class session will therefore be devoted to helping each other advance your respective research projects.

Part B:

The goal of the assignments is for you to become adept at coming up with interesting research questions AND to know how to investigate them rigorously. Two of your assignments will be handed in (so that I can provide you with more detailed feedback), but we will also devote half of each class to similar exercises.

Final Take Home Exam (60%)

Your final assignment is a take home exam, similar to a comps question. You will be given a research topic and your task is to design a qualitative or quantitative study to address the topic. This will include creating a research question, describing appropriate methodology and data that will be gathered, as well as a detailed discussion about the rationale for each element of your research design (with citations as appropriate). The exam should be ~10 pages, double-spaced, in 12-point font.

The topic provided will give flexibility in potential research designs, so there are multiple directions that you could take. However, the exam will be graded based on the fit between the research question

and the methodology chosen, coherence between the elements of the design you have chosen, and the strength of your rationale.

This exam is due one week after our final class meeting. No extensions are available except under extraordinary circumstances.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

You are expected to exhibit honesty and use ethical behaviour in all aspects of the learning process. Academic credentials you earn are rooted in principles of honesty and academic integrity.

Academic dishonesty is to knowingly act or fail to act in a way that results or could result in unearned academic credit or advantage. This behaviour can result in serious consequences, e.g. the grade of zero on an assignment, loss of credit with a notation on the transcript (notation reads: “Grade of F assigned for academic dishonesty”), and/or suspension or expulsion from the university.

It is your responsibility to understand what constitutes academic dishonesty. For information on the various types of academic dishonesty please refer to the Academic Integrity Policy, located at:

www.mcmaster.ca/academicintegrity

The following illustrates only three forms of academic dishonesty:

1. Plagiarism, e.g. the submission of work that is not one’s own or for which other credit has been obtained.
2. Improper collaboration in group work.
3. Copying or using unauthorized aids in tests and examinations

MISSED ACADEMIC WORK

Late assignments will not be accepted. No extensions are available except under extraordinary circumstances. Please discuss any extenuating situation with your instructor at the earliest possible opportunity.

STUDENT ACCESSIBILITY SERVICES

Students who require academic accommodation must contact Student Accessibility Services (SAS) to make arrangements with a Program Coordinator. Academic accommodations must be arranged for each term of study. Student Accessibility Services can be contacted by phone 905-525-9140 ext. 28652 or e-mail sas@mcmaster.ca.

For further information, consult McMaster University's Policy for Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities:

<http://www.mcmaster.ca/policy/Students-AcademicStudies/AcademicAccommodation-StudentsWithDisabilities.pdf>

ACADEMIC ACCOMMODATION FOR RELIGIOUS, INDIGENOUS OR SPIRITUAL OBSERVANCES (RISO)

Students requiring academic accommodation based on religious, indigenous or spiritual observances should follow the procedures set out in the RISO policy. Students requiring a RISO accommodation should submit their request, including the dates/times needing to be accommodated and the courses which will be impacted, to their Program Office normally within 10 days of the beginning of term. Students should also contact their instructors as soon as possible to make alternative arrangements for classes, assignments, and tests.

POTENTIAL MODIFICATION TO THE COURSE

The instructor reserves the right to modify elements of the course during the term. There may be changes to the dates and deadlines for any or all courses in extreme circumstances. If either type of modification becomes necessary, reasonable notice and communication with the students will be given with explanation and the opportunity to comment on changes. It is the responsibility of the student to check their McMaster email and course websites weekly during the term and to note any changes.

The University reserves the right to change the dates and deadlines for any or all courses in extreme circumstances (e.g., severe weather, labour disruptions, etc.). Changes will be communicated through regular McMaster communication channels, such as McMaster Daily News, A2L and/or McMaster email.

RESEARCH USING HUMAN SUBJECTS

All researchers conducting research that involves human participants, their records or their biological material are required to receive approval from one of McMaster's Research Ethics Boards before (a) they can recruit participants and (b) collect or access their data. Failure to comply with relevant policies is a research misconduct matter. Contact these boards for further information about your requirements and the application process.

McMaster Research Ethics Board (General board): <https://reo.mcmaster.ca/>

Hamilton Integrated Research Ethics Board (Medical board): <http://www.hireb.ca/>

COURSE SCHEDULE

Course Schedule & Topics	Agenda
<p>WEEK 1: What are qualitative methods, and what are they good for?</p>	<p>Readings:</p> <p>Edmondson, Amy C., and Stacy E. McManus. "Methodological fit in management field research." <i>Academy of management review</i> 32.4 (2007): 1246-1264.</p> <p>Charmaz, Kathy. 2006.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 1. An invitation to grounded theory. • Chapter 2. Gathering rich data. <p>Example study: Ranganathan, Aruna. "The Artisan and His Audience: Identification with Work and Price Setting in a Handicraft Cluster in Southern India." <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i> (2015): 0001839217725782.</p> <p>Topics for class discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are qualitative methods and what are they good for? In what ways do they differ from quantitative methods? What are qualitative research questions? • What is "grounded theory"? • What are the main sources of data used in qualitative methods? • What are the strengths and challenges associated with qualitative methods? • What arguments does Ranganathan make? How are the methods (rather than just the findings) employed in the paper important to being able to adjudicate between different possibilities? Would her argument be feasible without the specific research design employed? What are some challenges and benefits of the research design described? <p>In-class workshop:</p> <p>We will workshop your theoretical questions and help you refine them and begin to identify appropriate qualitative data sources and field sites so that you can make progress on this question over the semester.</p>

<p>WEEK 2: Ethnography and the Participant Observer</p>	<p>Readings:</p> <p>Charmaz, Kathy. 2006. • Chapter 4. Memo-writing. Pg. 72-95.</p> <p>Emerson, R.M., Fretz, R.I., & Shaw, L.L., 2011. Writing ethnographic field notes. 2nd ed. University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London. • Chapter 1 and 2 (to be provided)</p> <p>Kozinets, Robert V., Pierre-Yann Dolbec, and Amanda Earley (2014), Netnographic Analysis: Understanding Culture through Social Media Data,” in Uwe Flick, ed. Sage Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis, Sage: London, 262-275.</p> <p>Example study: Chown J. 2021. The Unfolding of Control Mechanisms inside Organizations: Pathways of Customization and Transmutation. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 66(3): 711-752. doi:10.1177/0001839220980015</p> <p>Assignment due two days before class 3 (Saturday by 9:30am). Choose a site for observation, and complete two time periods of one-hour observations. Write detailed field notes to capture your observation. Summarize your observations in a one-page memo comparing the two time periods, and include your field notes as an appendix. If your writing is legible, this can be a picture of your hand-written notes. Please state your research question at the beginning of the assignment, as it guides the type of observations that should be captured.</p> <p>Topics for class discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How does one make observations, take notes, and write memos? How do you find the focus?• How do you manage being an insider or an outside?• What arguments do Mazmanian and colleagues make in the article? In what ways are the ethnographic methods crucial to the authors’ ability to make these arguments? How might you further test the arguments made in these papers? What methods might be most helpful in doing so? <p>In-class workshop: You will spend time practicing your observational skills.</p>
---	--

<p>WEEK 3: Interviewing, Part 1</p>	<p>Readings:</p> <p>Weiss, R. 1994. Learning from Strangers. • Chapter 1: Introduction. Pg. 1-14. • Chapter 2. Respondents: Choosing them and Recruiting Them. Pg. 15-38. • Chapter 4. Interviewing. Pg. 61-120.</p> <p>Lamont, Michèle, and Ann Swidler. "Methodological pluralism and the possibilities and limits of interviewing." <i>Qualitative Sociology</i> 37.2 (2014): 153- 171.</p> <p>Example study: Pratt, Michael G., Douglas A. Lepisto, and Erik Dane. "The Hidden Side of Trust: Supporting and Sustaining Leaps of Faith among Firefighters." <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i> (2018): 0001839218769252.</p> <p>Assignment: No formal assignment. However, come to class having identified up to five people who you think might be helpful in better understanding your research question, and who you think you could interview in the next week. Draft 10 questions to pose to them.</p> <p>Topics for class discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- What kind of research questions can interviews answer?- What kind of questions can interviews not answer?- How can we design a useful interview guide?- What argument do Pratt and colleagues make? In what ways is the method – interviewing – and the data it produces important to supporting their argument? What other kinds of data might you want? <p>In-class workshop: Interviewing clinic You will have an opportunity to practice interviewing in-class, focusing on open-ended questions and probing for richer data. We will also workshop and refine your interview questions.</p>
--	---

<p>WEEK 4: Interviewing, Part 2</p>	<p>Readings</p> <p>Weiss, R. 1993. Learning from Strangers. • Chapter 5. Issues in Interviewing. Pg. 121-150.</p> <p>Charmaz, Kathy. 2006. • Chapter 3. Coding in Grounded Theory Practice. Pg. 42-71. • Chapter 5. Theoretical sampling, saturation and sorting. Pg. 96-122.</p> <p>Alvesson, M. (2003). Beyond neo-positivists, romantics, and localists: A reflexive approach to interviews in organizational research. Academy of Management Review, 28, 13-33.</p> <p>Assignment (due two days before class 5: Saturday at 9:30am): Complete one interview to better understand your research question. Write a one-page memo summarizing what you saw and observed, with some quotes from the interview, and what you think you need to understand next to address your research question. In your write-up include your interview guide as an appendix.</p> <p>Topics for class discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Strategies for growing your sample: focused vs. snowball sampling- What do we learn from pilot interviews, and how can we incorporate that into future interviews? <p>In-class workshop:</p> <p>We will workshop your interview memos, helping you to make sense of the data, and consider what best way to further build your sample.</p>
--	---

<p>WEEK 5: Analyzing your Qualitative Data</p>	<p>Readings:</p> <p>Eisenhardt, Kathleen M., Melissa E. Graebner, and Scott Sonenshein. "Grand challenges and inductive methods: Rigor without rigor mortis." (2016): 1113- 1123.</p> <p>Gioia, Dennis A., Kevin G. Corley, and Aimee L. Hamilton. 2013. "Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research: Notes on the Gioia methodology." <i>Organizational research methods</i> 16.1: 15-31.</p> <p>Deterding, Nicole M., and C. Mary. 2021. "Flexible coding of in-depth interviews: A 21st Century Approach." <i>Sociological Methods & Research</i>.</p> <p>Example Study: Kaplan, Sarah. "Framing contests: Strategy making under uncertainty." <i>Organization Science</i>. 19.5 (2008): 729-752.</p> <p>Topics for class discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- How do we make sense of and structure data? What is involved in coding?- How can we represent data and the sense we have made of it to readers?- Some current debates in how analysis is best done.- What argument is Kaplan making? How does Kaplan represent data? How do the representations contained in the paper support or hinder the argument being made? What other representations of data might you want to see? <p>In-class workshop:</p> <p>We will workshop your initial thoughts about analysis and help you think about how to move forward.</p>
---	--

<p>WEEK 6: Developing Theory from Your Qualitative Data.</p>	<p>Readings</p> <p>Langley, Ann. "Strategies for theorizing from process data." <i>Academy of Management review</i> 24.4 (1999): 691-710.</p> <p>Eisenhardt, K.M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 14, 532-551.</p> <p>Charmaz, 2006.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 6. Reconstructing Theory in Grounded Theory Studies. Pg. 123-150. • Chapter 7. Writing the draft. Pg. 151-176. <p>Pratt MG, Sonenshein S, Feldman MS. Moving Beyond Templates: A Bricolage Approach to Conducting Trustworthy Qualitative Research. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i>. June 2020. doi:10.1177/1094428120927466</p> <p>Corley K, Bansal P (Tima), Yu H. An editorial perspective on judging the quality of inductive research when the methodological straightjacket is loosened. <i>Strategic Organization</i>. 2021;19(1):161-175. doi:10.1177/1476127020968180</p> <p>Example study: Bring previous example papers that we will use to explore theory building.</p> <p>Assignment: No assignment. Please come to class with all of your observation and interview notes for discussion.</p> <p>Topics for class discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How can we build theory from qualitative data? - How can we construct our contributions and convince readers? - How do Scaroboto and Fischer describe their data analysis and theory building? How does their description convince? How does this paper position and describe its contributions? - Example papers and their utility in writing up? <p>In-class workshop: You will have an opportunity to discuss your research so far and how to move it forward.</p>
<p>February 21 - 25</p>	<p>READING WEEK</p>

<p><u>WEEK 7:</u></p> <p>Reliability and validity</p>	<p>Mackenzie, S.B., Posakoff, P.M., & Podsakoff, N.P. (2011). Construct measurement and validation procedures in MIS and behavioral research: Incorporating new and existing techniques. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 35, 293-334.</p> <p>Guion, R.M. (2004). Validity and reliability. In S.G. Rogelberg (Ed.). <i>Handbook of Research Methods in Industrial and Organizational Psychology</i>. pp 57-76. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.: Malden: MA.</p> <p>Stone-Romero, E.F. (2004). The relative validity and usefulness of various empirical research designs. In S.G. Rogelberg (Ed.). <i>Handbook of Research Methods in Industrial and Organizational Psychology</i>. pp 77-98. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.: Malden: MA.</p> <p>Love, E., Ceranic Salinas, T. & Rotman, J.D. (2020). The ethical standards of judgment questionnaire: Development and validation of independent measures of formalism and consequentialism. <i>Journal of Business Ethics</i>. 161, 115-132.</p> <p>Colquitt, J.A., George, G., (2011). From the Editors: Publishing in AMJ – Part 1: Topic Choice, <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 54:3, 432-435</p> <p>Bono, J.E., & McNamara, G. (2011). From the Editors: Publishing in AMJ-Part 2: Research Design. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 54:4, 657-660.</p> <p>No assignment. Please come to class well-prepared to discuss all the articles.</p>
--	--

<p><u>WEEK 8:</u></p> <p>Method Biases and control variables</p>	<p>Podsakoff, N.P., Whiting, S.W., Welsh, D.T., & Mai, K.M. (2013). Surveying for “artifacts”: The susceptibility of the OCB-performance evaluation relationship to common rater, item, and measurement context effects. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>, 98(5), 863-874.</p> <p>Conway, J.M. & Lance, C.E. (2010). What reviewers should expect from authors regarding common method bias in organizational research. <i>Journal of Business & Psychology</i>, 25: 325-334.</p> <p>Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B, Lee, J.Y., & Podsakoff, N.P. (2003). Common method bias in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>, 88, 879-903.</p> <p>Spector, P.E. & Brannick, M.T. (2011). Methodological urban legends: The misuse of statistical control variables. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i>, 14:2, 287-305.</p> <p>Aguinis, H., Hill, N.S., & Baily, J.R. (2021). Best practices in data collection and preparation: Recommendations for reviewers, editors, and authors. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i>, 24(4), 678-693.</p> <p>Grant, A.M. & Pollock, T.G. (2011). Publishing in AMJ – Part 3: Setting the Hook. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 54:5, 873-879.</p> <p>No assignment. Please come to class well-prepared to discuss all the articles.</p>
---	---

<p><u>WEEK 9:</u></p> <p>Considering the “level” of your unit of analysis</p>	<p>Klein, K.J., Dansereau, F. & Hall, R.J. (1994) Levels issues in theory development, data collection and analysis. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 19:2, 195-229.</p> <p>Chan, D. (1998). Functional relations among constructs in the same content domain at different levels of analysis: A typology of composition models. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>, 83(2), 234-246.</p> <p>Hofmann, D.A. (2004). Issues in multilevel research: Theory development, measurement, and analysis. In S.G. Rogelberg (Ed.). <i>Handbook of Research Methods in Industrial and Organizational Psychology</i>. pp 247-274. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.: Malden: MA.</p> <p>Johnson, R.E., Rosen, C.C. & Chang, C-H (2011). To aggregate or not to aggregate: Steps for developing and validating higher-order multidimensional constructs. <i>Journal of Business & Psychology</i>, 26: 241-248.</p> <p>Eckardt, R., Yammarino, F.J., Dionne, S.D., & Spain, S.M. (2021). Multilevel methods and statistics: The next frontier. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i>, 24(2), 187-218.</p> <p>Kunze, F., Boehm, S.A., & Bruch, H. (2021). It matters how old we feel in organizations: Testing a multilevel model of organizational subjective-age diversity on employee outcomes. <i>Journal of Organizational Behavior</i>. 42(4), 448-463.</p> <p>Assignment (due night before to me): Provide me with a one-page proposal of a research study that you would like to conduct, that uses a quantitative method. You must include a title, theory, hypotheses, sample, analytical technique, and contribution.</p> <p>Please note that one-page = one-page with normal margins and font size.</p>
--	--

<p><u>WEEK 10:</u></p> <p>Sampling (including ESM)</p>	<p>Landers, R.N. & Behrend, T.S. (2015). An inconvenient truth: Arbitrary distinctions between organizational, Mechanical Turk, and other convenience samples. <i>Industrial and Organizational Psychology</i> (2015; March), 1-23.</p> <p>Cheung, J.H., Burns, D.K., Sinclair, R.R., & Sliter, M. (2017). Amazon Mechanical Turk in Organizational Psychology: An evaluation and practical recommendations. <i>Journal of Business & Psychology</i>, 32:4, 347-361.</p> <p>Uy, M.A., Foo, M-D., & Aquinis, H. (2010). Using experience sampling methodology to advance entrepreneurship theory and research. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i>, 13:1, 31-54.</p> <p>Gabriel, A.S., Podsakoff, N.P., Beal, D.J., Scott, B.A., Sonnentag, S., Trougakos, J.P., & Butts, M.M. (2019). Experience sampling methods: A discussion of critical trends and considerations for scholarly advancement. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i>. 22(4), 969-1106.</p> <p>Nesher Shohan, H., Venz, L. (2021). Daily deep acting toward coworkers: An examination of day-specific antecedents and consequences. <i>Journal of Organizational Behavior</i>. DOI: 10.1002/job.2555</p> <p>Zhang, Y. & Shaw, J.D. (2012). From the Editors: Publishing in AMJ-Part 5: Crafting the Methods and Results. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 55:1, 8-12.</p> <p>Sparrowe, R.T. & Mayer, K.J. (2011). Publishing In AMJ-Part 4: Grounding Hypotheses, <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 54:6, 1088-1102.</p> <p>No assignment. Please come to class well-prepared to discuss all the articles.</p>
---	---

<p><u>WEEK 11:</u></p> <p>Policy capturing and experiments</p>	<p>Tomassetti, A.J., Dalal, R.S., & Kaplan, S.A. (2016). Is policy capturing really more resistant than traditional self-report techniques to socially desirable responding? <i>Organizational Research Methods</i>, 19(2), 255-285.</p> <p>Aiman-Smith, L., Scullen, S.E., & Barr, S.H. (2002). Conducting studies of decision making in organizational contexts: A tutorial for policy-capturing and other regression-based techniques. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i>, 5(4), 388-414.</p> <p>Cooper, W.H. & Richardson, A.J. (1986). Unfair comparisons. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>. 71(2), 179-184.</p> <p>Highhouse, S. (2009). Designing experiments that generalize. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i>. 12(3), 554-566.</p> <p>Leavitt, K., Qui, F., & Shapiro, D.L. (2021). Using electronic confederates for experimental research in organizational science. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i>. 24(1), 3-25.</p> <p>Jensen, J.M., & Raver, J.L. (2021). A policy capturing investigation of bystander decisions to intervene against workplace incivility. <i>Journal of Business & Psychology</i>. 36(5), 883-901.</p> <p>Assignment (due night before to me): Provide me with a one-page proposal of a research study that you would like to conduct, that uses a quantitative method. You must include a title, theory, hypotheses, sample, analytical technique, and contribution.</p> <p>Please note that one-page = one-page with normal margins and font size.</p>
---	--

<p><u>WEEK 12:</u> Ethics</p>	<p>Aguinis, H., & Henle, C.A. (2004). Ethics in research. In S.G. Rogelberg (Ed.). <i>Handbook of Research Methods in Industrial and Organizational Psychology</i>. pp 34- 56. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.: Malden: MA.</p> <p>Cunliffe, A.L., & Alcadipani, R. (2016). The politics of access in fieldwork. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i>. 19(4), 535-561.</p> <p>Murphy, K.R. & Aguinis, H. (2019). HARKing: How badly can cherry-picking and question trolling produce in published results? <i>Journal of Business and Psychology</i>. 34: 1-17.</p> <p>Vancouver, J.B. (2018). In Defense of HARKing. <i>Industrial & Organizational Psychology</i>, 111:1, 73-80.</p> <p>Honig B. et al. (2018). Reflections on Scientific Misconduct in Management: Unfortunate Incidents or a Normative Crisis? <i>Academy of Management Perspectives</i>, 32:4, 412-442.</p> <p>Geletkanycz, M. Tepper, B.J. (2012). Publishing in AMJ-Part 6: Discussing the implications. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 55:2, 256-260.</p> <p>No assignment. Please come to class well-prepared to discuss all the articles.</p>
---	---