

Strategy Paper Development Doctoral Seminar Spring 2019

Syllabus Version 3.0, Released 31 March 2019

Professors Jovan Grahovac & Richard Makadok

Course goals:

This doctoral seminar is a bit different from our area's other doctoral seminars. Rather than covering a set of existing research literature on some specific strategy-related topic, this seminar will instead function as an eight-week research paper development workshop. The goal will be for each doctoral student to take one of their existing research ideas (perhaps based on a term project from a previous doctoral seminar, or perhaps something different) and develop it into a real manuscript that is strong enough to be accepted for presentation at a major conference like AOM or SMS, or perhaps even strong enough to submit to a journal.

General course logistics:

- Class meets seven times, on Mondays from 1:00 pm to 4:00 pm, from March 4 to April 22 (except March 11) in Rawls Hall room 3013 RAWL.
- Class schedule is subject to change as needed in order to accommodate guest speakers.
- All writing assignments should be submitted by 12:00 noon on the Friday before class meets.
- All peer feedback assignments should be submitted by 12:00 noon on the day when class meets.
- All documents, including assigned readings, assignments, drafts, and peer feedback, will be shared via the “Paper Development Seminar” cloud storage folder on OneDrive.

Assignments and grading:

The grade for this course will consist of four components:

- 50% based on a set of 7 weekly writing assignments that will challenge you to develop various parts of your research paper. Each week's writing assignment should be submitted by uploading it into the appropriate section of the class's shared OneDrive cloud storage folder. Each of these 7 weekly writing assignments will be graded separately, and weighted equally.
- 25% based on a set of 7 weekly brief written feedback assignments in which you evaluate two of your classmates' weekly writing assignments. Each week's feedback assignment should be submitted by uploading it into the appropriate section of the class's shared OneDrive cloud storage folder. Each of these 7 weekly feedback assignments will be graded separately, and weighted equally. The grading for each of these feedback assignments will be lenient. As long as you have done a reasonably decent job, you will get full credit for the week. If you have done a really blatantly bad job, you will get half credit. If you miss the week's deadline without a good excuse, you may get less than half credit. This relaxed grading is intended to reflect the modest amount of effort that should be put into this assignment. **Please DO NOT over-invest in these feedback assignments. They are NOT intended for you to spend lots of time and effort on them.** For most weeks, you should only need, at most, about 30 minutes to write your feedback. If you're spending more than an hour writing a weekly feedback assignment, then you're clearly doing way too much.
- 10% based on preparing two written questions each week for the week's guest speaker. Each week's pair of questions should be submitted by uploading it into the appropriate section of the class's shared OneDrive cloud storage folder, **BUT** you should also bring a printed copy of your questions to class so that you can have them available to ask the guest speaker. Each of these 7 weekly question pairs will be graded separately, and weighted equally. The grading for each of these question pairs will be lenient. As long as you have done a reasonably decent job, you will get full credit for the week. If you have done a really blatantly bad job, you will get half credit. If you miss the week's deadline without a good excuse, you may get less than half credit. This relaxed grading is intended to reflect the modest amount of effort that should be put into this assignment. **Please DO NOT over-invest in these guest speaker questions. They are NOT intended for you to spend lots of time and effort on them.** If you're spending more than ten minutes writing questions for a week's guest speaker, then you're clearly doing way too much.
- 15% based on the instructors' (admittedly subjective) evaluation of your class participation.

Week One: Finding an interesting research question

Class meets on Monday March 4, 1:00 to 4:00 pm.

Writing assignment due 12:00 noon on March 1:

Submit your current draft of whatever paper you plan to develop during our seminar. If you do not yet have a paper draft that you want to develop further, then please submit a one-page explanation of an idea for a paper that you would like to pursue.

Peer feedback assignment due 12:00 noon on March 4:

You will be assigned **two** of your classmates' writing assignments to review. For each of them, please answer the following questions: Does this project have an "interesting" research question? If so, what is interesting about it? If not, why not? What could be done to make it more interesting? Please limit your comments to a maximum of ten sentences per paper.

Required readings:

1. Davis, MS. 1971. "That's Interesting!" Towards a Phenomenology of Sociology and a Sociology of Phenomenology." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 1: 309-344.
2. Bartunek JM, Rynes SL, Ireland RD. 2006. What Makes Management Research Interesting, and Why Does It Matter? *Academy of Management Journal* 49(1): 9-15.
3. Alvesson, M., Sandberg, J. 2011. "Generating Research Questions Through Problematization." *Academy of Management Review*, 36(2): 247-271.

Optional readings/videos:

- Christensen C., Raynor M. 2003. Why Hard-Nosed Executives Should Care About Management Theory. *Harvard Business Review* 81(9): 66-74.
- Barley SR. 2006. When I Write My Masterpiece: Thoughts on What Makes a Paper Interesting. *Academy of Management Journal* 49(1): 16-20.
- Dutton JE, Dukerich JM. 2006. The Relational Foundation of Research: An Underappreciated Dimension of Interesting Research. *Academy of Management Journal* 49(1): 21-26.
- How to Ask Interesting Questions (Keith Hmieleski & Shaker Zahra):
https://youtu.be/tgvF7_r03pM

Skype guest speaker: Janet Bercovitz (3:00 pm to 4:00 pm)

Week Two: Making a contribution to theory

Class meets on Monday March 18, 1:00 to 4:00 pm.

Writing assignment due 12:00 noon on March 15:

Ignoring any earlier draft that you may have previously written, and carefully following the guidance provided by the required readings assigned for this week and last week, write a completely new draft of the theory section of your paper. This draft should articulate the central research question that your paper addresses. In footnotes or endnotes, describe in a sentence or two which ones of the theory-building levers from the Makadok et al. article assigned below you are using and how, and also identify the type of theoretical contribution the paper will make. This theory section should ideally be about 3 to 6 pages in length, and it should not contain any text from any previous draft you may have previously written. If your paper will not have a theory section, then please speak with the instructors to arrange a different writing assignment for this week.

Peer feedback assignment due 12:00 noon on March 18:

You will be assigned **two** of your classmates' writing assignments to review. For each of them, please answer the following questions: Based on the criteria explained in the Whetten article assigned below, does this draft constitute a theoretical contribution? Why or why not? How clear and relevant is this theoretical contribution and do you see any ways to make it clearer and/or more relevant? How appropriately does it use the theory-building levers from the Makadok et al article assigned below, and do you see any opportunities to improve some of them or use more of them? Please limit your comments to a maximum of ten sentences per paper.

Required readings:

1. Whetten, DA. 1989. "What Constitutes a Theoretical Contribution?" *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4): 490-495.
2. Makadok, R., Burton, R., Barney, J. 2018. "A Practical Guide for Making Theory Contributions in Strategic Management." *Strategic Management Journal*, 39: 1530-1545. **(PLEASE SKIP SECTION 3.)**
3. **Table 2 only** from: MacInnis DJ. 2011. A Framework for Conceptual Contributions in Marketing. *Journal of Marketing* 75(4): 136-154.

Optional readings/videos:

- Full version of: MacInnis DJ. 2011. A Framework for Conceptual Contributions in Marketing. *Journal of Marketing* 75(4): 136-154.
- Hal Varian, "How to Build an Economic Model in Your Spare Time" chapter from *Passion and Craft: Economists at Work*, edited by Michael Szenberg, University of Michigan Press, 1997.
- Rich Makadok's blog post on Formal Modeling in Strategy from OrganizationsAndMarkets.com, including comments section.

Skype guest speaker: Joe Mahoney (3:00 pm to 4:00 pm)

Week Three: Conducting the study

Class meets on Monday March 25, 1:00 to 4:00 pm.

Writing assignment due 12:00 noon on March 22:

Ignoring any earlier draft that you may have previously written, and carefully following the guidance provided by the required readings assigned below for this week, write a completely new draft of the methods section of your paper. This draft should answer all relevant methodological questions, such as: How and why the data in your paper were, or will be, obtained? How the data were, or will be, analyzed? If your paper will not have a methods section, then please speak with the instructors to arrange a different writing assignment for this week.

Peer feedback assignment due 12:00 noon on March 25:

You will be assigned **two** of your classmates' writing assignments to review. For each of them, please answer the following questions: Is the data and/or collection method adequate for this project? Can you think of ways to supplement or improve the data set or the data collection process? Is the proposed analytical method appropriate and can you think of ways to improve it? Please limit your comments to a maximum of ten sentences per paper.

Required readings:

1. Bono, JE., McNamara, G. 2011. "Part 2: Research Design," *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(4): 657-660.
2. Zhang, YA, Shaw, JD. 2012. "Part 5: Crafting the Methods and Results," *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(1): 8-12.
3. Simcoe, T. "Empirical Etiquette": <http://people.bu.edu/tsimcoe/etiquette.html>

Optional readings/videos:

- Bettis, R., Gambardella, A., Helfat, C., Mitchell, W. 2014. "Quantitative Empirical Analysis in Strategic Management." *Strategic Management Journal*, 35: 949-953.
- Bettis, R., Ethiraj, S., Gambardella, A., Helfat, C., Mitchell, W. 2016. "Creating Repeatable Cumulative Knowledge in Strategic Management: A Call for a Broad and Deep Conversation Among Authors, Referees, and Editors." *Strategic Management Journal*, 37: 257-261.
- Bansal, T., Corley K. 2012. "Part 7: What's Different About Qualitative Research?" *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(3): 509-513.

Skype guest speaker: Will Mitchell (1:00 pm to 2:00 pm)

Week Four: Audience selection and framing

Class meets on Monday April 1, 1:00 to 4:00 pm.

Writing assignment due 12:00 noon on March 29:

Ignoring any earlier draft that you may have previously written, and using Barney's three-paragraph "ABCD" introduction method explained on the last slide of the Makadok slide deck reading assigned below, write a completely new draft of the introductory section of your paper. This introduction should ideally be 2 pages in length, but definitely no longer than 3 pages, and it should not contain any text from any previous draft you may have previously written.

Peer feedback assignment due 12:00 noon on April 1:

You will be assigned **two** of your classmates' writing assignments to review. For each of them, please answer the following questions: Does the introduction of this paper clearly identify the paper's intended audience? Does it clearly identify the problem that the paper will try to solve? Does it clearly identify the solution that the paper will use to fix that problem? Does the introduction speak to you? Is there anything missing, is there something that makes you skeptical, is something redundant or overplayed? Please limit your comments to a maximum of half of one page per paper.

Required readings:

1. Makadok, R. "Advice on Academic Career & Publishing Research" PowerPoint slide deck.
2. Colquitt, JA and George, G. 2011. "Part 1: Topic Choice," *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(3): 432-435.
3. Grant, AM, Pollock, TG. 2011. "Part 3: Setting the Hook," *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(5): 873-879.
4. Zuckerman, EW. 2015. "On Genre: A Few More Tips to Article-Writers": <https://www.dropbox.com/s/a3n1ux6lnu7wbpe/On%20Genre.pdf>

Optional readings/videos:

- Peters, T. 1997. "The Brand Called You," *Fast Company* 10 (10): 83-87.
- Gray, P. and Drew, D. "What They Didn't Teach You In Graduate School: 116 Helpful Hints," unpublished PDF.
- "Everything Is a Remix" (Kirby Ferguson): <https://youtu.be/nJPERZDfyWc>

Skype guest speaker: Nick Argyres (2:00 pm to 3:00 pm)

Week Five: Meeting your audience where they are

Class meets on Monday April 8, 1:00 to 4:00 pm.

Writing assignment due 12:00 noon on April 5:

Follow the peer feedback and instructor feedback that you have received so far on your first drafts to prepare second drafts of the last three assignments (introduction, theory, and methods sections) by editing and rewriting them as needed. When doing so, also follow the guidance provided in the readings assigned below for this week.

Peer feedback assignment due 12:00 noon on April 8:

You will be assigned **two** of your classmates' writing assignments to review. For each of them, please answer the following questions: What improvements have been made between the first and second drafts? What problems still remain, and how should they be solved? Is the theory development in this paper sound? Are all the relevant perspectives and literatures present? Are any superfluous? Why? Based on the guidance provided in the readings assigned below for this week, how well does this second draft "meet the audience where they are," and how could this be improved? Please limit your comments to a maximum of ten sentences per paper.

Required readings:

1. Johanson, LM. 2007. "Sitting in Your Reader's Chair: Attending to Your Academic Sensemakers," *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 16(3): 290-294.
2. Sparrowe, RT., Mayer, KJ. 2011. "Part 4: Grounding Hypotheses," *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(6): 1098-1102.

Optional readings/videos:

- Last 10 minutes of "Developing and Sustaining a Research Career" (Shaker Zahra): <https://youtu.be/KblycLGkg5Y?t=1231>

Skype guest speaker: Kyle Mayer (1:00 pm to 2:00 pm)

Week Six: Icing the cake

Class meets on Monday April 15, 1:00 to 4:00 pm.

Writing assignment due 12:00 noon on April 12:

Ignoring any earlier draft that you may have previously written, and carefully following the guidance provided by the required readings that are assigned for this week and were assigned earlier for week 3, write a completely new draft of the results and discussion/conclusion sections of your paper. The results section should report what was found – or what you expect to find, if you don't yet have any results to report. The discussion/conclusion section should briefly summarize the paper, articulate the paper's potential future implications (e.g., for theory, for empirics, for practice), explain the paper's limitations, and identify opportunities for subsequent future research (e.g., extensions that might overcome this paper's limitations). Each of these two sections should be about 3 to 5 pages in length, for a total of about 6 to 10 pages, and they should not contain any text from any previous draft you may have previously written.

Peer feedback assignment due 12:00 noon on April 15:

You will be assigned **two** of your classmates' writing assignments to review. For each of them, please answer the following questions: How clearly does this document explain the results (or expected results)? How well does it articulate the paper's potential future implications (e.g., for theory, for empirics, for practice)? How well does it explain the paper's limitations? How well does it identify opportunities for subsequent future research? Please limit your comments to a maximum of ten sentences per paper.

Required readings:

1. Pollock, TG , Bono JE. 2013. "Being Scheherazade: The Importance of Storytelling in Academic Writing," *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(3): 629-634.
2. Geletkanycz, M., Tepper, BJ. 2012. "Part 6: Discussing the Implications," *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(2): 256-260.

Optional readings/videos:

- "Getting Into Print" (Howard Aldrich): <https://youtu.be/-orSDpNEPts>

Skype guest speaker: Tim Pollock (1:00 pm to 2:00 pm)

Week Seven: Writing, rewriting, and revising

Class meets on Monday April 22, 1:00 to 4:00 pm.

Writing assignment due 12:00 noon on April 19:

Prepare a complete draft of the manuscript by combining the earlier assignments and editing and rewriting them as needed to address the peer feedback and instructor feedback that you have received so far.

Peer feedback assignment due 12:00 noon on April 22:

You will be assigned **two** of your classmates' writing assignments to review. For each of them, please answer the following questions: What three aspects of the paper do you like the most? What three aspects of the paper need the most improvement, and what are your specific suggestions about how to make these improvements? Please limit your comments to a single page per paper.

Required readings:

1. Ragins, BR. 2012. Editor's comments: "Reflections on the Craft of Clear Writing," *Academy of Management Review*, 37: 493-501.
2. Agarwal, R., Echambadi, R., Franco, AM, Sarkar, MB. 2006. "Reap Rewards: Maximizing Benefits from Reviewer Comments," *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2): 191-196.

Optional readings/videos:

- "Tackling a Revise & Resubmit" (Nicolai Foss): <https://youtu.be/AIqKeo-upc0>

Skype guest speaker: Rajshree Agarwal (3:00 pm to 4:00 pm)