

Qualitative Research Methods

The Road Not Taken (by Robert Frost in 1916)

Two roads diverged in a yellow wood,
And sorry I could not travel both
And be one traveler, long I stood
And looked down one as far as I could
To where it bent in the undergrowth;

Then took the other, as just as fair,
And having perhaps the better claim,
Because it was grassy and wanted wear;
Though as for that the passing there
Had worn them really about the same,

And both that morning equally lay
In leaves no step had trodden black.
Oh, I kept the first for another day!
Yet knowing how way leads on to way,
I doubted if I should ever come back.

I shall be telling this with a sigh
Somewhere ages and ages hence:
Two roads diverged in a wood, and I—
I took the one less traveled by,
And that has made all the difference.

Ronald Coase (1988, p 185): “In my youth it was said that what was too silly to be said may be sung. In modern economics it may be put into mathematics.” (source: *The Firm, the Market, and the Law*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.)

Thomas Cook, a methodologist, claims in 1995: Qualitative researchers have won the qualitative-quantitative debate:

- Won in what sense?
 - Won acceptance
-

Class Time: Tuesday. 14:20 ~17:10

Classroom: R833, TSMC Building

Instructor

Shih-Chang Hung, NTHU Chair Professor of Strategy and Innovation

I'm in cubicle 827 on the eighth floor of the TSMC Building I. I read my e-mail frequently via iPhone. Send your messages to schung@mx.nthu.edu.tw.

Telephone: Work: (03) 574-2448

(<http://mx.nthu.edu.tw/~schung/>)

Objectives

- Introduce some issues and problems in the philosophy of social science.
- Introduce the means of assessing the key assumptions underlying the selection and use of qualitative (and quantitative) methods.
- Introduce a range of qualitative research methods, including naturalistic inquiry, interpretive practice, case study, narrative analysis, grounded theory approach, comparative method, particularly as they applied to field of organization and management.
- Introduce the use of qualitative data analysis software (e.g., NVivo).

Course Format

This course utilizes the seminar approach, consisting of student presentations/critiques (in English/Chinese) and instructor elaboration (in English/Chinese).

I view the research seminar as a lively place in which we encourage and constructively develop everyone's ideas. Effective seminars require participants to engage in the following behaviors:

- You will be expected to have completed the required essential readings before each session. You may also want to read the supplementary readings associated with the session.
- Read something each week that is NOT required in the lists provided.
- Actively participate in the class by contributing commentary on the assigned readings (but also respect others' air time). Willingness to constructively engage the ideas presented by others.

Skills

The course will also give you a chance to practice the generic research skills that are valued by supervisors and employers, including communication skills, time controls, paper reviews, network building, and team working.

Class Design

The class includes discussions over classic books and scholarly papers.

Paper presentations

Paper presentations should take the form of an Academy of Management-style presentation of papers, on PowerPoint slides, (with usually 7-10 slides), within 15 minutes the norm. The presentation should convey the main contents of the paper, as if you were the authors (adopt 'we' voice). In accordance with the need to attract the interest of a conference audience, the presentation should make sure also to convey the wider significance of the paper, for instance by linking it to more general theoretical or practical issues. (As chair, I shall cut off presentations at 15 minutes regardless.)

Paper critique

Paper critiques will summarize the strengths and weaknesses of both the paper itself and the tradition(s) in which it is situated, also proposing ways forward for research (this critique should go substantially beyond the limitations and opportunities identified in the paper itself). *With respect to our course purpose, you should also particularly assess the adequateness of research methods used.* You should adopt the style of a constructive yet probing AOM discussant: i.e. recognizing strengths, but identifying possible weaknesses and suggesting possible extensions or developments (see Appendix 1: The Reviewer Guidelines of AOM).

Note: Each student should complete a pre-class note of no more than two-page words of text INDIVIDUALLY and submit it to iLMS before 8:00 am of each lecture.

Assessment

1. 50% by class performance
2. 30% by individual pre-class note of each week
3. 20% by a terms project of your own – in which you apply one or more of the analyses being conveyed this semester. Instructor will evaluate this. This will demonstrate your understanding of the course topics. The best measure is actually completing the project and getting it published after the course has concluded.

Course Readings

The following readings represent a comprehensive list of books, book chapters and papers that are relevant to the topics and issues discussed during the course.

Background Readings in Organization/Management

- Aldrich, H. and Ruef, M. 1999. *Organizations Evolving*. London, UK: Sage (2nd in 2006).
- Donaldson, L. 1996. *For Positivist Organization Theory: Proving the Hard Core*. London, UK: Sage.
- Hatch, M. J. 1997. *Organization Theory: Modern, Symbolic, and Postmodern Perspectives*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press (4th in 2018).
- Miles, J. A. 2012. *Management and Organization Theory*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Perrow, C. 1972. *Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay*. New York, NY: Random House (4th in 2014).
- Scott, W. R. 1981. *Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall International (5th in 2003).
- Scott, W. R. 2007. *Organizations and Organizing: Rational, Natural, and Open System Perspectives*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education International.

Philosophy of Social Science

- Chalmers, A. F. 1976. *What Is This Thing Called Science?* Buckingham, England: Open University Press (4th in 2013).
- Davis, M. S. 1971. That's Interesting! Towards a phenomenology of sociology and a sociology of phenomenology. *Philosophy of the Social Science*, 1(2): 309-344.
- Hollis, M. 1994. *The Philosophy of Social Science: An Introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kuhn, T. S. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press (4th in 2012).

Popper, K. 1959. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. London, UK: Hutchinson (2nd in 2002).

Popper, K. 1972. *Objective Knowledge: An Evolutionary Approach*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

Sociological Understanding and Qualitative Conception

Berger, P. L. and Luckmann, T. 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Bourdieu, P. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Bourdieu, P. 1998. *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. J. D. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Burrell, G. and Morgan, G. 1979. *Sociological Paradigm and Organizational Analysis*. London, UK: Heinemann.

Crotty, M. 1998. *The Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and Perspective in the Research Process*. London, UK: Sage.

Frost, P. and Stablein, R. (eds.) 1992. *Doing Exemplary Research*. London, UK: Sage.

Geertz, C. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York, NY: Basic Books (3rd in 2017).

Giddens, A. 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Lincoln, Y. S. and Guba, E. G. 1985. *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Linstead, S. 1993. From postmodern anthropology to deconstructive ethnography. *Human Relations*, 46(1): 97-120.

Maylor, H. and Blackmon, K. 2005. *Researching Business and Management*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave-Macmillan (2nd in 2017).

Woolgar, S. 1996. Psychology, qualitative methods and the ideas of science. In J. Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods for Psychology and the Social Sciences*, pp.11-24. Leicester: British Psychological Society.

Qualitative Research Methods

Alasuutari, P. 1995. *Researching Culture: Qualitative Method and Cultural Studies*. London, UK: Sage.

Alvesson, M. and Shöldberg, K. 2000. *Reflexive Methodology: New Vistas for Qualitative Research*. London, UK: Sage (2nd in 2009).

- Archer, D. and Erlich, L. 1985. Weighing the evidence: A new method for research on restricted information. *Qualitative Sociology*, 8(4): 345-358.
- Atkinson, P. 1990. Ethnography and the poetics of authoritative accounts. In *The Ethnographic Imagination: Textual Constructions of Reality*, pp. 35-56. London, UK: Routledge.
- Bauer, M. and Gaskell, G. (eds.) 1999. *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound*. London, UK: Sage.
- Becker, H. 1998. *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think about Your Research While You're Doing It*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bell, J. and Opie, C. 2002. *Learning from Research: Getting More from Your Data*. Buckingham, UK: Open University.
- Berg, B. L. 1989. *Qualitative Research Methods for Social Sciences*. New York, NY: Pearson (8th in 2011).
- Bitektine, A. 2008. Prospective case study design: Qualitative method for deductive theory testing. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11(1): 160-180.
- Blaikie, N. 2000. *Designing Social Research: The Logic of Anticipation*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press (2nd in 2010).
- Burawoy, M. 1998. The extended case method. *Sociological Theory*, 16, 4-33.
- Burgess, R. G. 1984. *In the Field: An Introduction to Field Research*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Cannell, C. F. and Kahn, R. L. 1968. Chapter 15 - Interviewing. In G. Lindzey, and E. Aronson (eds), *The Handbook of Social Psychology, Volume 2: Research Methods*. London, UK: Addison Wesley.
- Carr, E. H. 1961. *What is History?* London, UK: Penguin (Penguin Modern Classics International Edition in 2018).
- Coffey, A. and Atkinson, P. 1996. *Making Sense of Qualitative Data: Complementary Research Strategies*. London, UK: Sage. (Read Chapters 2, 6, and 7)
- Creswell, J. 2003. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches*. London, UK: Sage (5th in 2018).
- Cunliffe, A. L. and Alcadiyani, R. 2016. The politics of access in fieldwork: Immersion, backstage dramas, and deception. *Organizational Research Methods*, 19(4): 535-561.
- deMarrais, K. B. 1998. *Inside Stories: Qualitative Research Reflections*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- d'Iribarne, P. 1997. The usefulness of an ethnographic approach to the international comparison of organizations. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 26(4): 30-47.
- Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. 1994. *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage (5th in 2017).
- Denzin, N. K. 1989. *Interpretive Interactionism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage (2nd in 2001).
- Denzin, N. K. 1997. *Interpretive Ethnography: Ethnographic Practices for the 21st century*. London, UK: Sage.
- Dopson, S. 2003. The potential of the case study method for organisational analysis. *Policy and Politics*, 31(2): 217-26.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. 1989. Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532-550.
- Ely, M. et al. 1991. *Doing Qualitative Research: Circles within Circles*. Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Feldman, M. S. 1995. *Strategies for Interpreting Qualitative Data*. London, UK: Sage.
- Flick, U. 2007. *Managing Quality in Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Frost, P. and Stablein, R. (eds) 1992. *Doing Exemplary Research*. London, UK: Sage.
- Garfinkel, H. 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall (2nd in 1984).
- Glaser, B. G. and Strauss, A. L. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New York, NY: Aldine.
- Glesne, C. and Peshkin, A. 1992. *Becoming Qualitative Researchers: An Introduction*. White Plains, NY: Longman (5th in 2015).
- Golden-Biddle, K. and Locke, K. 1993. Appealing work: An investigation of how ethnographic texts convince. *Organization Science*, 4(4): 595-616.
- Hammersley, M., Gomm, R., and Foster, P. (eds.) 2000. *Case Study Method: Key Issues, Key Texts*. London, UK: Sage. (Read particularly Chapter 1 and 2.)
- Hamel, J., Dufour, S. and Fortin, D. 1993. *Case Study Methods*. London, UK: Sage.
- Kirk, J. and Miller, M. L. 1986. *Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research*. London, UK: Sage.
- Langley, A. 1999. Strategies for theorizing from process data. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(4): 691-710.

- Lieberson, S. 1991. Small N's and big conclusions: an examination of the reasoning in comparative studies based on a small number of cases. *Social forces*, 70(2): 307-320.
- Litosseliti, L. 2003. *Using Focus Groups in Research*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Lee, T. W. 1999. *Using Qualitative Methods in Organizational Studies*. London, UK: Sage.
- Locke, K. 2001. *Grounded Theory in Management Research*. London, UK: Sage.
- Lofland, J. 1995. *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*. London, UK: Wadsworth. (Read Chapter 5)
- Marshall, C. and Rossman, G. 1995. *Designing Qualitative Research*. London, UK: Sage. (Read especially Chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5)
- Martin, P. Y. and Turner, B. A. 1986. Grounded theory and organizational research. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 22(2): 141-157.
- Maxwell, J. 1996. *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. London, UK: Sage (3rd in 2013).
- Mills, C. W. 1970. Chapter 1 – 'The Promise'. in Mills, C. W. *The Sociological Imagination*, pp.3-11. London, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Miles, M. B. and Huberman, A. M. 1983. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage (3rd in 2013).
- Miller, D and Slater, D. 2000. *The Internet: An Ethnographic Approach*. Oxford, UK: Berg. (Read chapter 1 and 2)
- Mishler, E. G. 1986. *Research Interviewing: Context and Narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mill, C. W. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. London, UK: Oxford University Press (40th anniversary edition in 2000).
- Minichiello, V. and Kottler, J. A. 2009. *Qualitative Journeys: Student and Mentor Experiences with Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Morgan, G. and Smircich, L. 1980. The case for qualitative research. *Academy of Management Review*, 5(4): 491-500.
- Naumes, W. and Naumes, M. J. 1999. *The Art and Craft of Case Writing*. London, UK: Sage (3rd in 2011).
- Neyland, D. 2007. *Organizational Ethnography*. London, UK: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. 2001. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications (4th in 2015).
- Pettigrew, A. M. 1997. What is a processual analysis? *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 13(4): 337-348.

- Pettigrew, A. M. 1990. Longitudinal field research on change: Theory and practice. *Organization Science*, 1(3): 267-292.
- Pink, S. 2001. *Doing Visual Ethnography*. London, UK: Sage (3rd in 2014).
- Ragin, C. C. 1987. *The Comparative Method*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Ragin, C. C. and Becker, H. S. (eds.) 1992. *What is a Case? Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry*. NY, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Riessman, C. K. 1993. *Narrative Analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Rubin, H. and Rubin, I. 1995. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. London, UK: Sage. (Read Especially Chapters 1, 2, 3, 6)
- Rumsey, S. 2004. *How to Find Information: A Guide for Researchers*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.
- Siggelkow, N. 2007. Persuasion with case studies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1): 20-24.
- Silverman, D. 2000. *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. London, UK: Sage (4th in 2013).
- Silverman, D. 1993. *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction*. London, UK: Sage (3rd in 2006).
- Stake, R. E. 1995. *The Art of Case Study Research*. London, UK: Sage.
- Strauss, A. L. 1987. *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. M. 1990. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage (4th in 2014).
- Symon, G. and Cassell, C. (eds.) 1998. *Qualitative Methods and Analysis in Organizational Research: A Practical Guide*. London, UK: Sage.
- Taylor, S. J. and Bogdan, R. (eds.) 1984. *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods: A Guidebook and Resource*. New York, NY: Wiley (4th in 2015).
- Thorne, B. 1980. "You still takin' notes?" Fieldwork and problems of informed consent. *Social Problems*, 27(3): 284-297.
- Tracy, S. J. 2010. Qualitative quality: Eight "big-tent" criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10): 837-851.
- Van Maanen, J. 1988. *Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press (2nd in 2011).
- Van Maanen, J. 1995. *Representation in Ethnography*. London, UK: Sage.
- Van Maanen, J. (ed.) 1998. *Qualitative Studies of Organizations*. London, UK: Sage.
- Weber, R. P. 1985. *Basic Content Analysis*. London, UK: Sage (2nd in 1990).

Wilcott, H. F. 1994. *Transforming Qualitative Data: Description, Analysis, and Interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yin, R. K. 1984. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage (5th in 2013).

Reading, Searching, Writing, Publication and Ethics

Alvesson, M. and Sandberg, J. 2013. *Constructing Research Questions: Doing Interesting Research*. London, UK: Sage.

Becker, H. S. 1986. *Writing for Social Scientists: How to Start and Finish Your Thesis, Book, or Article*. London, UK: University of Chicago Press (2nd in 2007).

Cummings, L. L. and Frost, P. J. 1985. *Publishing in the Organization Sciences*. Homewood, IL: Irwin (2nd in 1995).

Girden, E. R. 1996. *Evaluating Research Articles from Start to Finish*. London, UK: Sage (3rd in 2010).

Gray, C. 2004. *Doing Research in the Real World*. London, UK: Sage (2nd in 2009).

Hart, C. 1998. *Doing a Literature Review: Releasing the Social Science Research Imagination*. London, UK: Sage. (Especially Chapters 1 and 2)

Hart, C. 2001. *Doing a Literature Search: A Comprehensive Guide for the Social Sciences*. London: Sage. (Especially Chapters 5, 6 and 9)

Huff, A. S. 1999. *Writing for Scholarly Publication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Huff, A. S. 2008. *Designing Research for Publication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Iphofen, R. and Tolich, M. 2018. *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research Ethics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Locke, L., Silverman, S. and Spirduso, W. 1998. *Reading and Understanding Research*. London, UK: Sage (3rd in 2009).

O'Leary, Z. 2004. *The Essential Guide to Doing Research*. London, UK: Sage.

Oliver, P. 2003. *The Student's Guide to Research Ethics*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University (2nd in 2010).

Phillips, E. and Pugh, D. S. 1987. *How to Get a PhD? A Handbook for Students and Their Supervisors*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press (5th in 2010).

Rugg, G. and Petre, M. 2004. *The Unwritten Rules of PhD Research*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press (2nd in 2010).

Rumsey, S. 2004. *How to Find Information: A Guide for Researchers*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press (2nd in 2008).

van den Hoonaard, W. C. 2002. *Walking the Tightrope: Ethical Issues for Qualitative Researchers*. Toronto, CA: University of Toronto Press.

- Wallace, M. and Wray, A. 2006. *Critical Reading and Writing for Postgraduates*. London, UK: Sage (2nd in 2011).
- Wolcott, H. F. 1990. *Writing Up Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage (3rd in 2009).

Books Reporting Qualitative Research Findings

- Doz, Y. and Wilson, K. 2018. *Ringtone: Exploring the Rise and Fall of Nokia in Mobile Phones*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press (Winner of AOM's George R. Terry Book Award in 2018).
- Harper, R. 1998. *Inside the IMF: An Ethnography of Documents, Technology and Organizational Action*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- McKendrick, D. G., Doner, R. F. and Haggard, S. 2000. *From Silicon Valley to Singapore: Location and Competitive Advantage in the Hard Disk Drive Industry*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Murtha, T., Lenway, S. A. and Hart, J. 2001. *Managing New Industry Creation: Global Knowledge Formation and Entrepreneurship in High Technology*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Pettigrew, A. 1985. *The Awakening Giant: Continuity and Change in Imperial Chemical Industries*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Saxenian, A. 1994. *Regional Advantage: Culture and Competition in Silicon Valley and Route 128*. London, UK: Harvard University Press.
- Scott, R. W., Ruef, M., Mendel, P. J. and Caronna, A. C. 2000. *Institutional Change and Healthcare Organizations: From Professional Dominance to Managed Care*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Special Issue on Qualitative Research Method

Articles from special issue of *ASQ*, 24(4) December 1979.

Read especially:-

- Van Maanen, J. 1979. Reclaiming qualitative methods for organizational research: A preface. *ASQ*, 24(4): 520-526.
- Mintzberg, H. 1979. An emerging strategy of "direct" research. *ASQ*, 24(4): 582-589.
- Miles, M. 1979. Qualitative data as an attractive nuisance: The problem of analysis. *ASQ*, 24(4): 590-601.
- Jick, T. D. 1979. Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action. *ASQ*, 24(4): 602-611.

Articles from special issue of *AMR*, 14(4) October 1989.

Read especially:–

Bacharach, S. 1989. Organizational theories: Some criteria for evaluation. *AMR*, 14(4): 496-515.

Whetten, D. 1989. What constitutes a theoretical contribution? *AMR*, 14(4): 490-495.

Articles from special issue of *ASQ*, 40(3) September 1995.

Read especially: –

Sutton, R. and Staw, B. 1995. What theory is not. *ASQ*, 40(3): 371-384.

Weick, K. 1995. What theory is not, theorizing is. *ASQ*, 40(3): 385-390.

DiMaggio, P. 1995. Comments on “What theory is not”. *ASQ*, 40(3): 391-397.

Articles from special issue of *QRM*, 20(2) April 2017.

Read especially: –

Molina-Azorin et al. 2017. Mixed methods in the organizational sciences: Taking stock and moving forward. *QRM*, 20(2): 179-192.

Gibson, C. B. 2017. Elaboration, generalization, triangulation, and interpretation: On enhancing the value of mixed method research. *QRM*, 20(2): 193-223.

Journals

You should also familiarize yourself with the following journals (* means they are listed in the FT 50):

Academy of Management Annals (ANA)

Academy of Management Journal (AMJ) *

Academy of Management Review (AMR) *

Administrative Science Quarterly (ASQ) *

American Journal of Sociology (AJS)

American Sociological Review (ASR)

Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice (ETP) *

Human Relations (HR) *

Industrial and Corporate Change (ICC)

Journal of Business Venturing (JBV) *

Journal of Management Studies (JMS) *

Organizational Research Methods (ORM)

Organization Science (OSc) *

Organization Studies (OSt) *

Research Policy (RP) *

Strategic Management Journal (SMJ) *

Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal (SEJ) *

Strategic Organization (SO)

109/1 QRM Course Schedule

| Week | Date | Content |
|------|-------|---|
| 1 | 09/15 | Introduction |
| | | A. Yin, R. K. 1984. Case Study Research: Design and Methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage (5th in 2013). |
| | | B. Emirbayer, M. & Mische, A. 1998. What is agency? American Journal of Sociology, 103(4): 962-1023. |
| 2 | 09/22 | C. Hung, S.-C., & Whittington, R. 1997. Strategies and institutions: A pluralistic account of strategies in the Taiwanese computer industry. Organization Studies, 18(4): 551-575. |
| | | A. Eisenhardt, K. M. 1989. Building theories from case study research. Academy of Management Review, 14(4): 532-550. |
| | | B. Battilana, J., Leca, B., & Boxenbaum, E. 2009. How actors change institutions: Towards a theory of institutional entrepreneurship. Academy of Management Annals, 3(1): 65-107. |
| 3 | 09/29 | C. Lee, C. K., & Hung, S. C. 2014. Institutional entrepreneurship in the informal economy: China's shan-zhai mobile phones. Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 8(1): 16-36. |
| | | A. Burawoy, M. 1998. The extended case method. Sociological Theory, 16: 4-33. |
| | | B. Abdelnour, S., Hasselbladh, H., & Kallinikos, J. 2017. Agency and institutions in organization studies. Organization Studies, 38(12): 1775-1792. |
| 4 | 10/06 | C. Barley, S. R. 1986. Technology as an occasion for structuring: Evidence from observations of CT scanners and the social order of radiology departments. Administrative Science Quarterly, 31(1): 78-108. |

| | | |
|---|-------|--|
| 5 | 10/13 | <p>A. Martin, P. Y. and Turner, B. A. 1986. Grounded theory and organizational research. <i>Journal of Applied Behavioral Science</i>, 22(2): 141-157.</p> <p>B. Cardinale, I. 2018. Beyond constraining and enabling: Toward new microfoundations for institutional theory. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 43(1): 132-155.¹</p> <p>C. Tushman, M. L., & Anderson, P. 1986. Technological discontinuities and organizational environments. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 31(3): 439-465.</p> |
| 6 | 10/20 | <p>A. Langley, A. 1999. Strategies for theorizing from process data. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 24(4): 691-710.</p> <p>B. Greenwood, R., Raynard, M., Kodeih, F., Micelotta, E. R., & Lounsbury, M. 2011. Institutional complexity and organizational responses. <i>Academy of Management Annals</i>, 5(1): 317-371.</p> <p>C. Christensen, C. M., & Bower, J. L. 1996. Customer power, strategic investment, and the failure of leading firms. <i>Strategic Management Journal</i>, 17(3): 197-218.</p> |
| 7 | 10/27 | <p>A. Lieberman, S. 1991. Small N's and big conclusions: An examination of the reasoning in comparative studies based on a small number of cases. <i>Social Forces</i>, 70(2): 307-320.</p> <p>B. Waeger, D., & Weber, K. 2019. Institutional complexity and organizational change: An open polity perspective. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 44(2): 336-359.</p> <p>C. McPherson, C. M., & Sauder, M. 2013. Logics in action: Managing institutional complexity in a drug court. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 58(2): 165-196. (The ASQ Blog)²</p> |

¹ Also see: Harmon, D. J., Haack, P., & Roulet, T. J. (2019). Microfoundations of Institutions: A Matter of Structure Versus Agency or Level of Analysis?. *Academy of management review*, 44(2), 464-467; Cardinale, I. (2019). Microfoundations of institutions and the theory of action. *Academy of Management Review*, 44(2), 467-470; Cardinale, I. On action, embeddedness, and institutional change. *Academy of Management Review*.

² <https://asqblog.com/2013/08/08/mcpherson-sauder-2013-logics-in-action-managing-institutional-complexity-in-a-drug-court/>

| | | |
|----|-------|---|
| 8 | 11/03 | A. Cunliffe, A. L. and Alcadipani, R. 2016. The politics of access in fieldwork: Immersion, backstage dramas, and deception. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i> , 19(4): 535-561. |
| | | B. Vaara, E., & Whittington, R. 2012. Strategy-as-practice: Taking social practices seriously. <i>Academy of Management Annals</i> , 6(1): 285-336. |
| | | C. Knight, E., Paroutis, S., & Heracleous, L. 2018. The power of PowerPoint: A visual perspective on meaning making in strategy. <i>Strategic Management Journal</i> , 39(3): 894-921. |
| 9 | 11/10 | Mid-term/No Class |
| 10 | 11/17 | A. Siggelkow, N. 2007. Persuasion with case studies. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> , 50(1): 20-24. |
| | | B. Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. 2000. Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. <i>Annual Review of Sociology</i> , 26: 611-639. |
| | | C. Rosenbloom, D., Berton, H., & Meadowcroft, J. 2016. Framing the sun: A discursive approach to understanding multi-dimensional interactions within socio-technical transitions through the case of solar electricity in Ontario, Canada. <i>Research Policy</i> , 45(6): 1275-1290. |
| 11 | 11/24 | A. Tracy, S. J. 2010. Qualitative quality: Eight “big-tent” criteria for excellent qualitative research. <i>Qualitative Inquiry</i> , 16(10): 837-851. |
| | | B. Scheufele, D. A. (1999). Framing as a theory of media effects. <i>Journal of Communication</i> , 49(1): 103-122. |
| | | C. Lempiälä, T., Apajalahti, E. L., Haukkala, T., & Lovio, R. 2019. Socio-cultural framing during the emergence of a technological field: Creating cultural resonance for solar technology. <i>Research Policy</i> , 48(9): 103830. |
| 12 | 12/01 | A. Hannigan, T., Haans, R. F. J., Vakili, K., Tchalian, H., Glaser, V., Wang, M., Kaplan, S., & Jennings, P. D. 2019. Topic modeling in management research: Rendering new theory from textual data. <i>Academy of Management Annals</i> , 13(2): 586-632. |
| | | B. Cornelissen, J. P., & Werner, M. D. 2014. Putting framing in perspective: A review of framing and frame analysis |

| | | |
|----|-------|--|
| | | across the management and organizational literature. Academy of Management Annals, 8(1): 181-235. |
| | | C. Gurses, K., & Ozcan, P. 2015. Entrepreneurship in regulated markets: Framing contests and collective action to introduce Pay TV in the US. Academy of Management Journal, 58(6): 1709-1739 |
| 13 | 12/08 | A. LeBaron, C., Jarzabkowski, P., Pratt, M. G., & Fetzer, G. 2018. An introduction to video methods in organizational research. Organizational Research Methods, 21(2): 239–260. |
| | | B. Cornelissen, J. P., Durand, R., Fiss, P. C., Lammers, J. C., & Vaara, E. 2015. Putting communication front and center in institutional theory and analysis. Academy of Management Review, 40(1): 10-27. |
| | | C. Gylfe, P., Franck, H., Lebaron, C., & Mantere, S. 2016. Video methods in strategy research: Focusing on embodied cognition. Strategic Management Journal, 37(1): 133-148. |
| 14 | 12/15 | A. Akemu, O., & Abdelnour, S. 2020. Confronting the digital: Doing ethnography in modern organizational settings. Organizational Research Methods, 23(2): 296-321. |
| | | B. Ocasio, W., Loewenstein, J., & Nigam, A. 2015. How streams of communication reproduce and change institutional logics: The role of categories. Academy of Management Review, 40(1): 28-48. |
| | | C. Kroezen, J. J., & Heugens, P. P. (2019). What is dead may never die: Institutional regeneration through logic reemergence in Dutch beer brewing. Administrative Science Quarterly, 64(4): 976-1019. (The ASQ Blog) ³ |
| 15 | 12/22 | A. Lê, J. K., & Schmid, T. 2020. The practice of innovating research methods. Organizational Research Methods, 1094428120935498. |
| | | B. Harmon, D. J., Green, S. E., Jr., & Goodnight, G. T. 2015. A model of rhetorical legitimation: The structure of |

³ <https://asqblog.com/2019/07/26/kroezen-heugens-2018-what-is-dead-may-never-die-institutional-regeneration-through-logic-reemergence-in-dutch-beer-brewing/>

| | | |
|----|-------|---|
| | | communication and cognition underlying institutional maintenance and change. <i>Academy of Management Review</i> , 40(1): 76-95. |
| | | C. Lifshitz-Assaf, H. 2018. Dismantling knowledge boundaries at NASA: The critical role of professional identity in open innovation. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i> , 63(4): 746-782. (The ASQ Blog) ⁴ |
| 16 | 12/29 | A. Argyres, N. S., De Massis, A., Foss, N. J., Frattini, F., Jones, G., & Silverman, B. S. 2020. History-informed strategy research: The promise of history and historical research methods in advancing strategy scholarship. <i>Strategic Management Journal</i> , 41: 343-368. |
| | | B. Schoeneborn, D., Kuhn, T. R., & Kärreman, D. 2019. The communicative constitution of organization, organizing, and organizationality. <i>Organization Studies</i> , 40(4): 475-496. |
| | | C. Carton, A. M. 2018. “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. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i> , 63(2): 323-369. (The ASQ Blog) ⁵ |
| 17 | 01/05 | Final Report |
| 18 | 01/12 | No Class |

PLUS Two Full-day Lectures

- 09/20, 09:00~16:00
- 10/18, 09:00~16:00

⁴ <https://asqblog.com/2019/01/20/podcast-lifshitz-assaf-2018-dismantling-knowledge-boundaries-at-nasa-the-critical-role-of-professional-identity-in-open-innovation/>

⁵ <https://asqblog.com/2018/11/15/podcast-carton2018-im-not-mopping-the-floors-im-putting-a-man-on-the-moon-how-nasa-leaders-enhanced-the-meaningfulness-of-work-by-changing-the-meaning-of-work/>

Appendix 1: The Reviewer Guidelines of AOM

REVIEWER GUIDELINES*

With the opening of the Centralized Reviewer System and the enthusiastic response, we would like to thank all of you who have reviewed in the past and welcome those of you who are new to reviewing. With that said we offer these guidelines as suggestions which we encourage you to take to heart as the quality of the Annual Meeting Program is based upon the reviews you provide for the Division and Interest Group Program Chairs.

Setting the Tone of the Review

- Please keep your comments constructive. If the problems you identify cannot be fixed, try to provide the authors with constructive ideas for how they might improve upon their submission as they develop their research. It is also important to try and identify the strengths of a manuscript to help the author(s) improve their work.
- One of the greatest services that Division reviewers perform is the development of the research of members who submit their work. Identify areas of weakness in a manuscript, but also provide specific guidance on *how the authors might address the limitations you have noted*. The more specificity you provide in your review, the more likely it is that the authors will benefit from your efforts.
- Authors deserve to be treated with respect, regardless of your evaluation of their work. Remember, you are representing the particular Division with your review and ultimately the AOM.
- Please try to be open-minded to different authors using different theoretical frameworks. Try to judge manuscripts based on how well they stimulate thinking and discussion. Also, keep in mind that many AOM members come from disciplinary backgrounds and research traditions with diverse theoretical and methodological orientations.

Review Format

- You must submit your review within the timelines provided. There is no slack in our schedule. Please see the annual meeting website (<http://meetings.aomonline.org/>) for more information.
- Provide a structured review by separating and numbering comments. Also, where appropriate, cite specific page numbers, passages, tables, and figures in your review.
- If you are uncertain about your comments in terms of some aspects of your review, please do your best to determine the accuracy of your position. Remember that

inaccuracies in your review reflect on the division you are reviewing for as a whole as well as on AOM.

- Do not provide information in your review that reveals your identity and do not seek to discover the identity of the authors. This protects the integrity of the “double-blind” review process.
- A good review is typically 1 single-spaced page in length. This year through the Central Reviewer System, we hope to increase the number of reviewers for each Division and Interest Group (DIG), in order to decrease the number of submissions each reviewer had to evaluate. When you signed up to review for a DIG, you commit to reviewing up to 3 papers. It is our overall goal to have you review fewer submissions, and provide higher-quality, division reviews.

General Areas to Cover

- In addition to commenting on the theoretical development of a submission and the technical correctness of the methodology, you should also consider the overall value-added contribution the submission offers. Does the submission pass the so what test? Also, consider whether the submission has any practical value, and comment on its implications for the practice community.

Specific Areas to Consider

The following points are some suggested criteria that might help you structure your evaluations of the submissions sent to you.

- **Introduction**

- ✓ Is there a clear research question, with a solid motivation behind it?
- ✓ Is the research question interesting?
- ✓ After reading the introduction, did you find yourself motivated to read further?

- **Theory**

- ✓ Does the submission contain a well-developed and articulated theoretical framework?
- ✓ Are the core concepts of the submission clearly defined?
- ✓ Is the logic behind the hypotheses persuasive?
- ✓ Is extant literature appropriately reflected in the submission, or are critical references missing?
- ✓ Do the hypotheses or propositions logically flow from the theory?

- **Method (for empirical papers)**

- ✓ Are the sample and variables appropriate for the hypotheses?
- ✓ Is the data collection method consistent with the analytical technique(s) applied?

- ✓ Does the study have internal and external validity?
- ✓ Are the analytical techniques appropriate for the theory and research questions and were they applied appropriately?
- **Results (for empirical papers)**
 - ✓ Are the results reported in an understandable way?
 - ✓ Are there alternative explanations for the results, and if so, are these adequately controlled for in the analyses?
- **Contribution**
 - ✓ Does the submission make a value-added contribution to existing research?
 - ✓ Does the submission stimulate thought or debate?
 - ✓ Do the authors discuss the implications of the work for the scientific and practice community?

*These guidelines were from the Organizational Behavior Division Reviewer Guidelines which were adapted from reviewer guidelines developed by Catherine Daily and Albert A. Cannella Jr. for the Business Policy and Strategy Division and for use in a BPS Professional Development Workshop on reviewing sponsored by the Academy of Management Review (AMR) and the Academy of Management Journal (AMJ). Don Bergh, Javier Gimeno, Bruce Avolio, and David Ketchen also contributed to the revision of these guidelines. We would like to thank both the BPS and OB Divisions for their willingness to share these reviewer guidelines for the benefit of everyone.