USC Marshall
School of Business

MOR 605: Research Methods in Organizational Behavior (Spring 2023)

Time: Mondays 10:00AM-12:50PM
Location: ACC 312
Professor: Eric Anicich, Ph.D.
Email: anicich@marshall.usc.edu
Office: HOH 411
Office Hours: by appointment

Course Description and Objectives

This course is an introductory doctoral seminar on research methods in organizational behavior. If the goal of organizational research is to develop knowledge about organizations and management, this course is about the process by which such knowledge is generated. The objectives for this course are as follows:

1. You will learn to effectively conduct the full cycle of the research process, including topic selection, literature review, theorizing, research design, scientific inference, dissemination (including written and oral presentation), and revision.

2. You will develop an actionable understanding of the processes for conducting and evaluating a wide range of empirical modes of inquiry including ethnography, case studies, interviews, surveys, archival studies, and field experiments.

3. You will enhance your ability to critically review and evaluate others' research.

By the end of this class, you should be able to demonstrate fluency in the basic and essential skills of organizational scholarship.

We will begin the semester by discussing the philosophy of science, topic choice, literature review, theorizing, choices in research design, and basic concerns about empirical testing. We will then revisit each of these issues in the contexts of various modes of empirical inquiry, including qualitative research, experimental designs, surveys, and archival studies. In the process, we will read and discuss pieces that 1) explain the best practices and primary concerns involved in executing these methodologies and/or 2) illustrate the use of these methodologies by organizational scholars.

My hope is that our activities in this course will be both fun and rigorous and, most importantly, will provide a firm foundation for your career as an organizational scholar. To that end, I welcome your feedback and suggestions about any aspect of the class at any time. I also encourage you to make appointments to meet with me to discuss the course, your research agenda, your experience in graduate school, and/or any other topic that would be helpful to you.

Here is an overview of our topics and schedule:
1. Philosophy of social science, personal goals, and research process overview   Jan 9
2. Goals of org. research, scholarly impact, topic choice, research questions   Jan 23
3. Literature review and meta-analysis   Jan 30
4. Theories and theorizing   Feb 6
5. Design choices and validity   Feb 13
6. Ethics and the replication crisis   Feb 27
7. Laboratory, field, and quasi-experiments   Mar 6
8. Archival research, big data, and textual analysis   Mar 20
9. Surveys   Mar 27
10. Ethnography & case studies   Apr 3
11. Interviews   Apr 10
12. Writing, presenting, & translating your research   Apr 17
13. Concluding session   Apr 24

Required Materials, Prerequisites, and Notes

All readings for this course will be posted to Blackboard and will be available in this shared Dropbox folder. The only prerequisite is admission into the doctoral program of the Marshall School of Business's Department of Management and Organization or the permission of the instructor (email me to request permission).

Overview of Grading and Assignments

Your grade will be based on the following assignments:
- Class participation   30%
- Research exercises   20%
- Research proposal   40%
- Reviews of two proposals   10%

Assignment due dates are as follows (by beginning of class):
- Research topic description   Due: Jan 23
- Annotated bibliography and commentary   Due: Feb 6
- Draft research proposal – Part I   Due: Mar 6
- Research exercise #1 – Survey   Due: Mar 27
- Draft research proposal – Parts I & II (to reviewers)   Due: Apr 3
- Reviews of two research proposals   Due: Apr 10
- Research exercise #2 – Interview or observation   Due: Apr 10
- Final research proposal – Parts I & II (to me)   Due: Apr 24

Assignment and Requirement Details

Class Participation
Class participation constitutes 30% of your grade. You will be expected to participate actively in every class session. Please come to each class fully prepared to discuss each of the readings for the week and ready to take personal responsibility for the quality of the classroom discussion.

High quality participation entails demonstrating:
1. A clear understanding of the readings
2. Thoughtful engagement and critique of the authors' and your colleagues' ideas
3. Ability to integrate insights from our in-class discussions

To prepare effectively, read each assignment carefully and consider the following questions:
- What are the central concerns and themes in each reading?
- How do the readings relate to one another and to other ideas you've encountered?
- What are the strengths and limitations of the work?
- What are the implications of the readings for your own research?

In addition, please note that the detailed calendar and reading list contains specific instructions to prepare for each class (e.g., questions for consideration, mini-assignments, etc.). The fulfillment of these instructions is also factored into your participation grade. Students will also be asked to lead one or more days of class discussion (to be allotted and described in our first session).

Research Exercises
You will conduct two brief research exercises designed to help you get your feet wet conducting field research. For the first assignment, you will design a field-based survey. For the second assignment, you will engage in either observational or interview-based field data collection. These exercises are each worth 10% of your grade (for a total of 20%).

Research Proposal
The research proposal assignment is designed to help you build your research program by creating a 20-30 page proposal (Times New Roman, double-spaced, 1-inch margins, inclusive of tables/references/figures) that lays out an actionable multi-method research plan to tackle an interesting and important question in organizational behavior. It constitutes 40% of your grade. You will turn in components of the proposal for feedback throughout the semester. You will receive qualitative feedback from me at each stage, but I will only be grading the final proposal that you submit to me at the end of the semester. Please note that this paper cannot be based on or derivative of another paper you've submitted for another class.

Research Proposal Review
You will be asked to provide a written review of two of your classmates' research proposals (parts I & II, which you will receive on April 3). Each review constitutes 5% of your grade. This assignment will help you to develop your ability to constructively critique others' work.

Please note: For all assignments, please discuss your plans with me in the early stages, so that I can provide guidance and feedback as you are developing your ideas.

Week	Date	Topics	Reading/Prework (all readings are available here)	Be Prepared to Answer/Discuss	Deliverables & Due Dates
1	1/9/2023	Philosophy of social science, personal goals, and research process overview	• Popper https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-X8Xfl0JdTQ • Kuhn https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Yn8cCDtVd5w • Popper vs. Kuhn https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zrX6qGjuW54 • Theocharis, T., & Psimopoulos, M. (1987). Where science has gone wrong. *Nature*, 329(6140), 595-598. • Bio of Paul Feyerabend: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paul_Feyerabend • Ponterotto, J. G. (2005). Qualitative research in counseling psychology: A primer on research paradigms and philosophy of science. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(2), 126-136. • Pfeffer, J. (1993). Barriers to the advance of organizational science: Paradigm development as a dependent variable. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 599-620. • Chatman, J. A., & Flynn, F. J. (2005). Full-cycle micro-organizational behavior research. *Organization Science*, 16(4), 434-447. • Also, make sure you have a good handle on the distinction between inductive and deductive research. If you've got this down already, great. If not, this video is good primer: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KCSa_mUIarg	1) What are your goals as an organizational scholar? Why are you doing research? 2) Which philosophy of social science is closest to your own view: Popper, Kuhn, or Feyerabend? 3) Which of the research paradigms described by Ponterotto is closest to your own view/intentions for your research? 4) What do you think Popper would say about inductive research? What about Kuhn? Feyerabend?	1) **Identify 2-3 core stories from your life**. Core stories are events or experiences that have had a deep impact on your life and on how you see yourself. Core stories are the experiences that shape who we are. Examples might be a religious experience, the death of a loved one, becoming a parent, and so forth. Or it may be a smaller moment that has taken on surprising importance in your life. Please think of 2-3 such experiences that you are willing to share with the class (don't worry—we'll be a small group!). We will listen to one another's stories and then reflect those stories back to one another in the hopes of helping each other identify key themes. 2) Pick your four favorite academic journals. Skim through the titles and abstracts of those journals for the past 5 years. **Select about 30 abstracts that you find interesting. Print them out, one to a page, and bring the stack of abstracts to class**. 3) Finally, take a look over the summary of course topics on the syllabus, and **identify the topics for which you'd be most interested in serving as a discussion leader**. We'll discuss this role and divide up the remaining sessions in our first class meeting.
2	1/16/2023	**No class today (Martin Luther King Jr. Day)**			
3	1/23/2023	Goals of organizational research, scholarly impact, topic choice, research questions	• Davis, G.F. (2015). Editorial essay: What is organizational research for? Administrative Science Quarterly, 60(2): 179-188. • Davis, M. S. (1971). That's interesting! Toward a phenomenology of sociology and a sociology of phenomenology. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 1, 309-344. • Pillutla, M.M. & Thau, S. (2013). Organizational sciences' obsession with 'that's interesting!' Consequences and an alternative. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 3: 187–194. • Colquitt, J.A. & George, G. (2011). From the editors, Publishing in AMJ—Part 1: Topic choice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(3): 432-435. • Ashford, S.J. (2013). Having scholarly impact: The art of hitting academic home runs. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 12(4): 623-633.	1) Where do you find inspiration for your research questions? 2) What criteria do you use when evaluating research impact? 3) In what ways are pre-tenure faculty incentivized or disincentivized to conduct impactful research?	1) **Generate 2-3 research questions that you are considering tackling in your research proposal for this class** (due at the end of the semester). The research questions should focus on some aspect of organizational behavior. 2) **Prepare a few slides about your proposed questions and be prepared to present them in class**. Your slides should state your proposed research questions and justify the value of those questions by referencing the readings. What makes you think this is a good question? What makes you think anyone else would? See further details in our Assignments document.
4	1/30/2023	Literature review and meta-analysis	• Breslin, D., & Gatrell, C. (2020). Theorizing through literature reviews: The miner-prospector continuum. *Organizational Research Methods*, 26(1): 139-167. • Field, A. P. & Gillett, R. (2010). How to do a meta-analysis. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 63: 665-694. • Tipton et al. (2022). Why Meta-Analyses of Growth Mindset and Other Interventions Should Follow Best Practices for Examining Heterogeneity. Working paper. • Schaerer, M., du Plessis, C., Yap, A. J., & Thau, S. (2018). Low power individuals in social power research: A quantitative review, theoretical framework, and empirical test. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 149, 73-96. • Goh, J. X., Hall, J. A., & Rosenthal, R. (2016). Mini meta-analysis of your own studies: Some arguments on why and a primer on how. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 10(10), 535-549.	1) Based on these readings and your experiences with your research, what do you see as the benefits and drawbacks of narrative vs. quantitative literature reviews? 2) What is your evaluation of the authors' approaches (e.g., related to the two meta-analyses referenced in the Tipton article and the Schaerer et al. article?) 3) Were their methods well-executed? 4) What drawbacks do you see? 5) Have reviews in your field been more quantitative or qualitative? 6) Are there aspects of the literature that would benefit from some form of comprehensive integration and summary? 7) How might your work contribute to that endeavor?	Anatomy of a literature review in-class exercise: **Identify two papers from top journals related to your research interests**. Focus on the literature review portion of the paper (i.e., everything before the methods section). **Go paragraph by paragraph through each paper and in one sentence or less describe the contribution of that paragraph to the author's arguments**. What role does each paragraph serve? In what ways are the structures similar or different? Be prepared to verbally describe (no slides needed) the anatomy of the two literature reviews you analyzed.

5	2/6/2023	Theories and theorizing	• Bacharach, S.B., (1989). Organizational Theories: Some criteria for evaluation. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 496-515. • Whetten, D.A. (1989). What constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 490-495. [Or review from GSBA 625] • Sutton, R. I., & Staw, B. M. (1995). What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 371-384. [Or review from MOR 601] • Weick, K. (1995). What theory is Not, Theorizing is, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 385-390. • Suddaby, Roy. (2010). Construct Clarity in Theories of Management and Organization, *Academy of Management Review* 35(3), 346-357. • Nisbett, R. E. (1990). The anticreativity letters: Advice from a senior tempter to a junior tempter. *American Psychologist*, 45(9), 1078-1082.	1) What is the current state of theory in your topic area? 2) Is there a paradigmatic theory that many researchers use? 3) Do you see a proliferation of theory and constructs? 4) What opportunities do you see for theoretical contribution in your subfields?	**Annotated bibliography/chart of 10 empirical articles related to your research question (w/ 2-3 pages of double-spaced commentary) due (details posted on Blackboard).**
6	2/13/2023	Design choices and validity	• McGrath, J. E. (1981). Dilemmatics: The study of research choices and dilemmas. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 25(2), 179-210. • Dipboye, R. L., & Flanagan, M. F. (1979). Research settings in industrial and organizational psychology: Are findings in the field more generalizable than in the laboratory? *American Psychologist*, 34, 141-150. • Mook, D. G. (1983). In defense of external invalidity. *American Psychologist*, 38, 379-387. • Turner, S. F., Cardinal, L. B., & Burton, R. M. (2017). Research design for mixed methods: A triangulation-based framework and roadmap. *Organizational Research Methods*, 20, 243- 267. • Edmondson, A. C. & McManus, S. E. (2007). Methodological fit in management field research. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 1155-1179. • Vazire, S., Schiavone, S. R., & Bottesini, J. G. (2022). Credibility beyond replicability: Improving the four validities in psychological science. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 31(2), 162-168.	1) Are all methods inherently flawed? 2) How do you explain the dominance of certain methodological approaches in various fields (e.g., laboratory experiments in chemistry and physics, survey research in sociology, case studies in clinical psychology)? 3) What is your position on the debate regarding the relative merits of laboratory versus field research? 4) Do you believe field settings yield results that are more generalizable than those from laboratory studies? 5) Do you believe laboratory studies can capture all that is essential for generalization of results to the field? 6) What methodological approaches dominate your areas of inquiry? 7) What are the benefits and drawbacks of these approaches? 8) Are there approaches that are under-utilized? If so, why?	**Identify a dissertation in your field** that was published by someone who graduated from a top university within the past 5 years and that uses one or more of the research methods covered in this class. **Thoroughly review the methods used. Observe the level of detail and quality compared to papers published in top journals on similar topics**. In what ways were the author's design choices and methods appropriate or inappropriate to test their research question? Would you have done anything differently? Did you learn anything that might be helpful for you as you prepare to write your own dissertation? **Be prepared to present your reactions to these questions to the group using 2-3 Powerpoint slides**. You may find dissertations by searching for "ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global" here: https://libraries.usc.edu/
7	2/20/2023	**No class today (President's Day)**			
8	2/27/2023	Ethics and the replication crisis (Guest Speaker)	• Nelson, L. D., Simmons, J., & Simonsohn, U. (2018). Psychology's renaissance. *Annual review of psychology*, 69, 511-534. • John, L. K., Loewenstein, G., & Prelec, D. (2012). Measuring the prevalence of questionable research practices with incentives for truth telling. *Psychological science*, 23(5), 524-532. • Van Bavel, J. J., Mende-Siedlecki, P., Brady, W. J., & Reinero, D. A. (2016). Contextual sensitivity in scientific reproducibility. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(23), 6454-6459. • Logg, J. M., & Dorison, C. A. (2021). Pre-registration: Weighing costs and benefits for researchers. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 167, 18-27. • Rohrer, J. M. et al. (2021) 'Putting the Self in Self-Correction: Findings From the Loss-of-Confidence Project', *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. • Schweinsberg, M., Madan, N., Vianello, M., Sommer, S. A., Jordan, J., Tierney, W., ... & Uhlmann, E. L. (2016). The pipeline project: Pre-publication independent replications of a single laboratory's research pipeline. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 66, 55-67. • NYT Magazine (2017) - When the Revolution Came for Amy Cuddy • Hafenbrack, A. C., LaPalme, M. L., & Solal, I. (2022). Mindfulness meditation reduces guilt and prosocial reparation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 123(1), 28–54. **[Only need to skim to familiarize yourself w/ guest speaker's work]**	1) What are the tradeoffs researchers face in the research process? 2) How have you personally encountered and experienced these tradeoffs? 3) What do you see as best practices for our field moving forward?	

9	3/6/2023	Laboratory, field, and quasi-experiments	• Bless, H., & Burger, A. M. (2016). A closer look at social psychologists' silver bullet: Inevitable and evitable side effects of the experimental approach. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 11(2), 296-308. • Anderson, C. A., Lindsay, J. J., & Bushman, B. J. (1999). Research in the psychological laboratory: Truth or triviality? *Psychological Science*, 8, 3-9. • Colquitt, J.A. (2008). From the editors, Publishing laboratory research in AMJ: A question of when, not if. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(4), 616-620. • Spencer, S.J., Zanna, M. P., & Fong, G. T. (2005). Establishing a causal chain: why experiments are often more effective than mediational analyses in examining psychological processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89, 845-851. • Aguinis, H., & Bradley, K. J. (2014). Best-practice recommendations for designing and implementing experimental vignette methodology studies. *Organizational Research Methods*, 17, 351-371. • Eden, D. (2017). Field experiments in organizations. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4: 4, 91-122. • Grant, A. M., & Wall, T. D. (2009). The neglected science and art of quasi-experimentation: Why-to, when-to, and how-to advice for organizational researchers. *Organizational Research Methods*, 12, 653-686.	1) What types of experiments are most commonly used in your field? Why does this method or these methods dominate? 2) What are the (dis)advantages of laboratory experiments compared to field experiments? Online vs. in-person experiments? Vignette/scenario experiment vs. behavioral experiment?	Draft research proposal – Part 1 due (details posted on Blackboard). You will present Part 1 of your proposal to the class. Thus, **in addition to turning in your draft on this day, you will also be presenting your question, theory, and hypotheses in slide form.**
10	3/13/2023	**No class today (Spring Break)**			
11	3/20/2023	Archival research, big data, and textual analysis	• Barnes, C. M., Dang, C. T., Leavitt, K., Guarana, C. L., & Uhlmann, E. L. (2018). Archival data in micro-organizational research: A toolkit for moving to a broader set of topics. *Journal of Management*, 44(4), 1453-1478. • Hill, N. S., Aguinis, H., Drewry, J., Patnaik, S., & Griffin, J. J. (2022). Using macro archival databases to expand theory in micro research. *Journal of Management Studies*, 59(3), 627-659. • Combs, J. G. (2010). Big samples and small effects: Let's not trade relevance and rigor for power. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(1), 9-13. • Delios, A., Clemente, E. G., Wu, T., Tan, H., Wang, Y., Gordon, M., … & Uhlmann, E. L. (2022). Examining the generalizability of research findings from archival data. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(30), e2120377119. • Hannigan, T. R., Haans, R. F., Vakili, K., Tchalian, H., Glaser, V. L., Wang, M. S., … & Jennings, P. D. (2019). Topic modeling in management research: Rendering new theory from textual data. *Academy of Management Annals*, 13(2), 586-632.	1) How might you use archival data, big data, and/or textual data in your own research? 2) What are the potential benefits and drawbacks of using these forms of data in your research? 3) What is the most interesting example of archival data/big data/textual data that you have come across in a published article? If no articles come to mind, what would the ideal type of archival data/big data/textual data look like for your research?	Choose a paper from a top journal in your field that uses archival or textual data. Be prepared to describe the paper, method, and findings to the class, as well as to describe your view of the paper's strengths and weaknesses. Here are three options to consider, but you are not required to choose one of these three: • Berg, J. M. (2022). One-Hit Wonders versus Hit Makers: Sustaining Success in Creative Industries. Administrative Science Quarterly, 67(3), 630-673. • DeCelles, K.A., Kouchaki, M., & Halevy, N. (2022). Unexpected employee location is associated with injury during robberies. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 119(39), e2200026119. • Kanze, D., Huang, L., Conley, M. A., & Higgins, E. T. 2018. We ask men to win and women not to lose: Closing the gender gap in startup funding. Academy of Management Journal, 61: 856-614.
12	3/27/2023	Surveys (Guest Speaker)	• Hinkin, T. R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods*, 1, 104-121. • Schwarz, N. (2010). Measurement as cooperative communication: What research participants learn from questionnaires. In G. Walford, E. Tucker, & M. Viswanathan (Eds.). *The Sage Handbook of Measurement*. London: Sage. • Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 879-903. • Djurdjevic, E., Stoverink, A. C., Klotz, A. C., Koopman, J., da Motta Veiga, S. P., Yam, K. C., & Chiang, J. T. (2017). Workplace status: The development and validation of a scale. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102, 1124-1147. • Jachimowicz, J. M. (2022). Embracing Field Studies as a Tool for Learning. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 1, no. 5: 249–250.	1) What are common pitfalls you have experienced with survey-based research in the past? If you don't have personal experience with surveys, what are some of the challenges or concerns you perceive related to using surveys in your research?	Research Exercise #1 Due (details posted on Blackboard); come to class prepared to present your scale and the construct it is intended to measure using 1-2 slides

13	4/3/2023	Ethnography & case studies	• Paluck, E.L., & Cialdini, R. (2014). Field research methods. *Handbook of Research Methods in Personality and Social Psychology*. Reis, H. T., & Judd, C. M., (Eds). Cambridge University Press. • Lofland, D., Snow, D., Anterson, L., & Lofland, L. H. (2006). *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. pp 1-51. • Eisenhardt, K. M. & Graebner, M. E. (2007). Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1), 25-32. • Emerson, R., Fretz, R., & Shaw, L. (1995). *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. pp 1-63. • Pratt, M. G., Sonenshein, S., & Feldman, M. S. (2022). Moving beyond templates: A bricolage approach to conducting trustworthy qualitative research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 25(2), 211-238.	1) What do you see as the strengths and limitations of these approaches? 2) How have ethnographic and case study methods been used in your own areas of research? 3) Do you see new opportunities for contribution here?	<mark>1) **Draft research proposal – Parts I & II due to reviewers** (details posted on Blackboard) 2) **Choose a paper from a top journal in your field that uses either case study or ethnographic methods. Be prepared to describe the paper, method, and findings, as well as to describe your view of the paper's strengths and weaknesses**.</mark> Here are three options to consider, but you are not required to choose one of these three: • 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. Administrative Science Quarterly, 63(2), 323-369. • Karunakaran, A. (2022). Status–authority asymmetry between professions: The case of 911 dispatchers and police officers. Administrative Science Quarterly, 67(2), 423-468. • Anicich, E. M. (2022). Flexing and floundering in the on-demand economy: Narrative identity construction under algorithmic management. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 169, 104138.
14	4/10/2023	Interviews (Guest Speaker)	• Weiss, R. S. (1994). *Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies*. New York, NY: Free Press, pp. 39-119. • Lofland, D., Snow, D., Anterson, L., & Lofland, L. H. (2006). *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*, pp. 99-108. • Pratt, M. (2009). From the editors: For the lack of a boilerplate: Tips on writing up (and reviewing) qualitative research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 856-862. • Bansal, P., & Corley, K. (2012). Publishing in AMJ—Part 7: What's different about qualitative research? *Academy of management Journal*, 55(3), 509-513. • Frey, E. L. (2022). "I Go Here... But I Don't Necessarily Belong": The Process of Transgressor Reintegration in Organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 65(1), 119-157. **[familiarize yourself with this paper to prepare for our guest speaker]**	1) What factors contribute to an (in)effective research interview?	<mark>1) **Reviews of two research proposals due** (details posted on Blackboard) 2) **Research Exercise #2 Due (details posted on Blackboard); come to class prepared to present your interview guide, interview transcript excerpt, and learnings/takeaways using a few powerpoint slides**</mark>
15	4/17/2023	Writing, presenting, & translating your research	• Bem, D. (2003). Writing the empirical journal article. In J. M. Darley, M.P. Zanna, & H. L. Roediger III (Eds) (2003). *The Compleat Academic: A Practical Guide for the Beginning Social Scientist*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. • Grant, A.M. & Pollock, T.G. (2011). From the Editors, Publishing in AMJ–Part 3: Setting the hook. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(5), 873-879. • Sparrow, R.T & Mayer, K.J. (2011). From the editors, Publishing in AMJ–Part 4: Grounding hypotheses. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(6), 1098-1102. • Zuckerman (2008). Tips For Article-Writers • Zuckerman (2017). On Genre: A Few More Tips to Article-Writers • Edwards, P. N. (2014). How to give an academic talk, v 5.2. Retrieved from: http://pne.people.si.umich.edu/PDF/howtotalk.pdf • Morgan, N. (2008). How to become an authentic speaker. *Harvard Business Review*, 11(86), 115-119.	1) When are you at your best as a writer? 2) What factors contribute to your (in)efficiency and (lack of) productivity as a writer? 3) What factors contribute to your (in)effectiveness as a presenter? 4) What role should researchers have in translating and disseminating their findings to wide audiences?	
16	4/24/2023	Concluding session	• Berg, M. & Seeber, B. K. (2015). *The slow professor: Challenging the culture of speed in the academy*. University of Toronto Press. • Sandhu, S., Perera, S., & Sardeshmukh, S. R. (2019). Charted courses and meandering trails: Crafting success and impact as business school academics. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 18(2), 153-185. • Schwartz, M. A. (2008). The importance of stupidity in scientific research. *Journal of Cell Science*, 121(11), 1771-1771.		<mark>**Final Research Proposal due** (details posted on Blackboard); you will present your final proposal in class, including both the theory and methods sections. Thus, **in addition to turning in your final written draft on this day, you will also be presenting it to the class (~15 min presentation).**</mark>

Academic Integrity

The University of Southern California is a learning community committed to developing successful scholars and researchers dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge and the dissemination of ideas. Academic misconduct, which includes any act of dishonesty in the production or submission of academic work, comprises the integrity of the person who commits the act and can impugn the perceived integrity of the entire university community. It stands in opposition to the university's mission to research, educate, and contribute productively to our community and the world.

All students are expected to submit assignments that represent their own original work, and that have been prepared specifically for the course or section for which they have been submitted. You may not submit work written by others or "recycle" work prepared for other courses without obtaining written permission from the instructor(s). Other violations of academic integrity include, but are not limited to, cheating, plagiarism, fabrication (e.g., falsifying data), collusion, knowingly assisting others in acts of academic dishonesty, and any act that gains or is intended to gain an unfair academic advantage.

The impact of academic dishonesty is far-reaching and is considered a serious offense against the university. All incidences of academic misconduct will be reported to the Office of Academic Integrity and could result in outcomes such as failure on the assignment, failure in the course, suspension, or even expulsion from the university.

For more information about academic integrity see the student handbook or the Office of Academic Integrity's website, and university policies on Research and Scholarship Misconduct. Please ask your instructor if you are unsure what constitutes unauthorized assistance on an exam or assignment, or what information requires citation and/or attribution.

Students and Disability Accommodations

USC welcomes students with disabilities into all of the University's educational programs. The Office of Student Accessibility Services (OSAS) is responsible for the determination of appropriate accommodations for students who encounter disability-related barriers. Once a student has completed the OSAS process (registration, initial appointment, and submitted documentation) and accommodations are determined to be reasonable and appropriate, a Letter of Accommodation (LOA) will be available to generate for each course. The LOA must be given to each course instructor by the student and followed up with a discussion. This should be done as early in the semester as possible as accommodations are not retroactive. More information can be found at osas.usc.edu. You may contact OSAS at (213) 740-0776 or via email at osasfrontdesk@usc.edu.

Support Systems

Counseling and Mental Health - *(213) 740-9355 – 24/7 on call*
Free and confidential mental health treatment for students, including short-term psychotherapy, group counseling, stress fitness workshops, and crisis intervention.

988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline - *988 for both calls and text messages – 24/7 on call*
The 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline (formerly known as the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline) provides free and confidential emotional support to people in suicidal crisis or emotional distress 24 hrs/day, 7 days/week, across the U.S. The Lifeline is comprised of a national network of over 200 local crisis centers, combining custom local care and resources with national standards and best practices. The new, shorter phone number makes it easier for people to remember and access mental health crisis services (though the previous 1 (800) 273-8255 number will continue to function indefinitely) and represents a continued commitment to those in crisis.

Relationship and Sexual Violence Prevention Services (RSVP) - *(213) 740-9355 – 24/7 on call*
Free and confidential therapy services, workshops, and training for situations related to gender- and power-based harm (including sexual assault, intimate partner violence, and stalking).

Office for Equity, Equal Opportunity, and Title IX (EEO-TIX) - *(213) 740-5086.* Info about how to get help or help someone affected by harassment or discrimination, rights of protected classes, reporting options, and other resources for students, faculty, staff, visitors, and applicants.

Reporting Incidents of Bias or Harassment - *(213) 740-5086 or (213) 821-8298*
Avenue to report incidents of bias, hate crimes, and microaggressions to the Office for Equity, Equal Opportunity, and Title for appropriate investigation, supportive measures, and response.

USC Campus Support and Intervention - *(213) 740-0411.* Assists students and families in resolving complex personal, financial, and academic issues adversely affecting their success as a student.

Diversity, Equity and Inclusion - *(213) 740-2101.* Information on events, programs and training, the Provost's Diversity and Inclusion Council, Diversity Liaisons for each academic school, chronology, participation, and various resources for students.

USC Emergency - *UPC: (213) 740-4321, HSC: (323) 442-1000 – 24/7 on call*
Emergency assistance and avenue to report a crime. Latest updates regarding safety, including ways in which instruction will be continued if an officially declared emergency makes travel to campus infeasible.

USC Department of Public Safety - *UPC: (213) 740-6000, HSC: (323) 442-1200 – 24/7 on call*
Non-emergency assistance or information.

Office of the Ombuds - *(213) 821-9556 (UPC) / (323-442-0382 (HSC).* A safe and confidential place to share your USC-related issues with a University Ombuds who will work with you to explore options or paths to manage your concern.

Occupational Therapy Faculty Practice - *(323) 442-2850 or* otfp@med.usc.edu
Confidential Lifestyle Redesign services for USC students to support health promoting habits and routines that enhance quality of life and academic performance.