

**EARL G. GRAVES SCHOOL of BUSINESS and MANAGEMENT (GSBM)**

**COURSE SYLLABUS for Spring 2023 SEMESTER**

**MGMT878: THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP RESEARCH**



**Professor:** Dr. Golshan Javadian **Office:** GSBM 640/Virtual

**Email:** [Golshan.javadian@morgan.edu](mailto:Golshan.javadian@morgan.edu) **Class:** M: 1pm – 3:50pm

**Office Phone:** (443)885-4213

**Office Hours:**

Monday: 8:00am to 1pm

Tuesday or Thursday: 9am-11am and 1pm to 3:00pm (please make an appointment)



**Statement of Teaching Philosophy:**

My goal as an instructor is to help you learn. I believe everyone can learn and that what you learn depends on the level of effort you invest in learning. Learning is hard work and can be frustrating. Learning can also be very rewarding and joyful. You may need to explore different strategies or approaches to learning to determine the most effective strategies for you. If you need help, support, or feedback, I am here to advise and consult with you about possible strategies and to offer encouragement, support, and feedback. I expect you to learn a lot and to learn how to be an even more effective learner. I know you are capable of a high level of performance and I expect you to achieve a high standard in this course.

It is my job to provide you with opportunities to learn; it is your job to take advantage of those opportunities and learn. You must decide on the level of effort you want to invest in yourself, in your learning, in your achievement. I will be here to encourage and support you throughout the process.

**Course Description, Overview, and Objectives:**

This doctoral seminar seeks to provide students with a broad overview of the major theories and theoretical extensions in entrepreneurship research. The seminar encompasses classic research in the discipline and an in-depth look at the major debates ongoing today. The aim throughout the seminar will be to debate the utility of the major theoretical perspectives, their respective strengths and weaknesses, and their comparative ability to explain relevant phenomena.

To publish interesting, original research, doctoral students must understand the foundations of others’ ideas and their strengths and weaknesses. From this basis, they can then identify ways to improve or add to existing knowledge in meaningful ways. The goal of this seminar is to build their knowledge base to support their ability to generate a future research stream of original, interesting research.

Upon completion of the course, the student will be expected:

* Explain the different theories developed and utilized in entrepreneurship research
* Examine the impact of individual and institutional level factors on entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial ventures
* Compare and contrast the different theoretical foundations in entrepreneurship field
* Evaluate the evolvement of entrepreneurship theories from the origins to now

**Grading:**

Grading will be based on the following components:

Active participation in class discussions 120 12%

Integrative summary 100 10%

Final Exam 230 23%

Research Paper Assignments and Presentation 550 55%

**Total 1000 100%**

**Grading Scale**: A = ≥ 900 B = 800 – 890 C = 700 – 790 F < 700

* Each component of grading has rubrics associated with them on Canvas.

**Description of the Grading Components**

**Discussion Participation:** All students are expected to come to class ready for discussion. The class is led by students’ discussions. This means that ALL students are expected to read ALL readings and come to class ready for discussion. I have provided some discussion questions for each module in the reading list. For quantitative articles, we will be discussing questions available in Appendix C to critique the articles.

**Integrative Summary:** students are assigned to provide an integrative summary of specific modules (those in blue and orange in the reading list). An integrative summary includes a summary of the readings that is well connected and is followed by a future research recommendation. Students are encouraged to provide a model/diagram of the readings if possible. Integrative summaries are due BEFORE we discuss the topic in class. Integrative summaries are graded for the following components:

**Content**  
All or majority readings should be covered. Readings should be cited probably

**Flow**  
An integrative summary of the readings is presented. Arguments should be connected well. Readings should be used to make well connected arguments.

**Research Recommendations**  
Future research is recommended based on your understanding of the readings. The recommendation is based upon the gap YOU identified in the readings. A reflective summary is presented first, followed by the gap, followed by the research recommendation and justification on what covering that gap is important.

**Research Paper and Presentation:** Each seminar participant will write and present one major research paper (front end of a quantitative paper). The paper should relate to an area of entrepreneurship. The goal is to produce a paper that serves as the foundation for a conference or journal submission (after completion of the empirical part). To ensure that you receive critical feedback before the final paper due, you will be submitting the following items before the final paper is due:

**Assignment 1**: Broad overview of the research (research topic, research question, research model, hypotheses and scales)

**Assignment 2:** Introduction and literature review excel file

**Assignment 3**: Revised introduction and literature review and hypotheses development

**Assignment 4**: final paper revised based on feedback from assignment 1-3

Detailed instructions about these assignments as well as the instructions for final research paper is available in **Appendix A**. Please note papers that have been written for other courses may not be modified or revised for this course.

Each student will be required to present his or her paper to the seminar. This presentation should be modeled on academic professional conference presentations. The presentation should be 10 minutes in length and should include PowerPoint slides. A formal question and answer session of at least 10 minutes will follow the presentation. **Appendix B** includes guidelines on presentations.

**Final exam**: to prepare and familiarize students with the comprehensive exam, there will be a final exam assessing the students’ knowledge and understanding of the readings. The exam will be timed and closed books/notes. Final exam is graded for content, flow and research recommendations similar to the integrative summary.

**Class Policies**

**Instructor Responsibility**: Every effort will be made to return the student’s graded written assignments within one or two weeks of submission depending on the assignment. The grades will be accompanied by feedback explaining the grade on Canvas. Grading rubrics will be used and student’s final grade is based upon the points they earned as reflected in the rubrics. In the event that the student does not have an explanation or do not understand the explanation, please make sure to ask for clarification. Contact me by e-mail, or in person to get any questions answered.

I will respond to your email communications within 24-48 business hours. I will try to leave out sufficient class time to address questions and students are welcome to visit me during office hours. I do not check my emails during the weekends and holidays.

**Expectations from Students:** Since the course will be highly interactive and discussion oriented, the student is expected to read the assigned material carefully before coming to class. Only prepared minds can participate actively in the classroom discussions and benefit from the classroom activities. Therefore, the student is expected to both attend regularly and be prepared by reading the appropriate reading material and thinking about the reading before coming to class. The classroom atmosphere will be informal and should not be stressful to the student. The student should assist in creating such an atmosphere.

Please remove headphones and turn off pagers, cell phones, and all other electronic devices during class. Store all electronics out of sight. If the student has registered for Morgan's Electronic Emergency Alert system, that device may be left on in "silent" mode.

**No late assignment will be accepted for this class**.If your scheduled is dropped and you are removed from Canvas, it is your responsibility to continue to attend class and submit all assignments on time (through email).

**Attendance**: All students will be required to attend class on a regular basis. In addition, the students are required to arrive on time for each class session and to stay for the entire class period. If a student is not present when roll is taken, then the student is considered absent. If a student misses more than 10 minutes of a class session, it will not be considered present. Students are allowed one unexcused absences during the semester. After one (1) unexcused absence during the semester, the following occurs:

* Two unexcused absences from class will result in one “full grade reduction” from the final course grade (e.g., if the course grade average is A and the student has two unexcused absences from class, then the student will receive a final grade of B);
* Three unexcused absences from class will result in a “grade reduction of two grades” from the student final course grade (e.g., if the course grade average is A and the student has three unexcused absences from class, then the student will receive a final grade of D);

Please note that excused absences are limited to illness (your illness, not that of a relative or friend) and job interviews. Your illness must be documented with a doctor's note or a note from Morgan's Woolford Infirmary (Student Health Services). Any other absence from class may or may not be considered excused at the discretion of the professor.

**MSU's Policy on Academic Dishonesty:**  Academic Dishonesty (Cheating), in any form, will result in an automatic grade of “F” in the course, the removal of the student from the course, and immediate reporting of the student’s actions to the Office of the Dean of the Earl G. Graves School of Business and Management. Cheating includes but is not limited to collaboration on any outside assignments, which might be made on an individual basis for a grade, including regular homework assignments, and the preparation of project materials for submission. It also includes plagiarism, unauthorized preparation of notes for use on examinations, use of such notes during an examination, looking at another student's examination answers, allowing another student to look at his or her own examination answers, the requesting or passing of information during an examination, or the acquisition, without permission, of tests of other academic material belonging to a faculty member or staff. Please see Attachment C for additional information on plagiarism. This policy is intended to protect the honest student from unfair competition with unscrupulous individuals who might attempt to gain an advantage through cheating. Students who become aware of suspicious activities on the part of others are asked promptly to notify the professor/instructor so that immediate corrective action can be taken.

In addition, all work, including those that are to be done outside of class, is to be typed and done by THE INDIVIDUAL STUDENT. If there is any evidence that work has been performed by someone else, or as a learning team, the student and/or all members of the student’s learning team will receive a zero (0) on the work and may receive a failing grade in the course. Cheating on any work is regarded as academic dishonesty. The consequences for dishonesty are viewed to be sufficient for a recommendation for immediate dismissal from the class.If there is sufficient doubt regarding a grade on any graded work, the student(s) in question may receive a grade of zero (0) until the situation is resolved. It is Dr. Javadian’s responsibility to inform the student(s) being questioned, the action taken, and the appropriate steps should a grade appeal be requested. The student should familiarize him/herself with Morgan's Policy on Academic Dishonesty. It can be found on page 36 of the Morgan State University 2016-2017 Catalog, and it may also be found on the online .PDF version of the Catalog at this URL:

<http://www.morgan.edu//Documents/ACADEMICS/academic_catalog/grad/SGS%202016-2017%20Catalog%20Regulations%20and%20Procedures%2010-25-2016Upload2%20(1).pdf>. Plagiarism or other forms of cheating evident in team assignments will result in a zero grade (0) for that assignment for all members of the team. Additionally, other penalties may be imposed per the aforementioned information.

Just to reiterate, academic dishonesty in any form is not tolerated at Morgan State University. All students should be familiar with the University’s Policy on Academic Dishonesty, which can be found on pages 36-37 in the current University Catalog. Any student found to have engaged in academic dishonesty shall fail the assignment/exam in question at a minimum, and could face more severe punishment including dismissal from the University. Students should seek guidance from the instructor if they have any questions about the Policy.

**Americans with Disability Act Notice:** If the student has a disability for which the student is requesting an accommodation, the student is encouraged to contact both the student’s instructor and Services for Students with DisabilitiesOffice, Earl S. Richardson Library, Rooms 127A or 131, at (443)885-1719 for more information within the first week of classes and must present the appropriate documentation.

**Computer/Library Usage:** The student will be required to use word processing software for assignments done outside of class. The student may also benefit from using the Internet or other library databases for some or all of his/her assignments.

**Contact Information:** The students must have a valid Morgan email address, as information will be sent electronically. In addition, it is imperative that the student provides contact information so Dr. Javadian may contact the student in case of an emergency.

**Changes**: The instructor might make changes to the syllabus and the schedule as needed. Changes will be communicated in class and through email.

**TENTATIVE SCHEDULE OF CLASSES AND TOPICS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Week 1 (Jan 23) | **Introduction to entrepreneurship research**  Read the Syllabus  Module 1 Readings |
| Week 2 (Jan 30) | **Examples of Entrepreneurship Research**  Module 2 Readings |
| Week 3 (Feb 6) | **Writing an entrepreneurship paper- part 1: topic choice & literature search**  Module 3 Readings |
| Week 4 (Feb 13) | **Systematic Reviews of Entrepreneurship Research**  Module 4 Readings  Assignment 1 is due by Feb 19 |
| Week 5 (Feb 20) | **Writing an entrepreneurship paper- part 2: introduction**  Module 5 Readings |
| Week 6 (Feb 27) | **Austrian Approach to Entrepreneurship**  Module 6 Readings |
| Week 7 (March 6) | **Writing an entrepreneurship paper- part 3: Literature review and hypothesis development**  Module 7 Readings  Assignment 2 is due by March 12 |
| Week 8 (March 20) | **Resource Based View**  Module 8 Readings |
| Week 9 (March 27) | **Network Theory and Social Capital**  Module 9 Readings |
| Week 10 (April 3) | **Writing Week**  Assignment 3 is due by April 9 |
| Week 11 (April 10) | **Psychology of Entrepreneurship-part 1 (cognitions and behavior)**  Module 10 Readings |
| Week 12 (April 17) | **Psychology of Entrepreneurship-part 2 (affect)**  Module 11 Readings |
| Week 13 (April 24) | **Minority Entrepreneurship**  Module 12 Readings |
| Week 14 (May 1) | **Writing Week**  Assignment 4 and slides is due by May 7th |
| Week 15 (May 8) | **Research Presentations** |
| Week 16 (May 15) | **Final Exam** |

**Appendix A**: **Front end of a Quantitative Paper Guidelines**

The goal is to produce a paper that serves as the foundation for a conference or journal submission (after completion of the empirical part). To ensure that you receive critical feedback before the final paper due, you will be submitting the following items before the final paper is due: Broad overview of the research (research question, research model, hypotheses), first draft of the introduction and research proposal. Below is detailed instruction for each of the assignments.

**Assignment 1: Overview of the Research**

Here you will submit a broad overview of your proposed research. The overview must include the following:

1. ***Research topic****:* Choose a topic based on the recommended ways to get research ideas (slides on Canvas)

The topic you choose should be guided by these five criteria:

* 1. Significance: taking on “grand challenges” (Colquitt & George, 2011, p.432)
* In tackling unresolved problems, pursue bold ideas and adopt less conventional approaches
* Doing so can allow the merging of theory and practical application
  + Not all problems are in this scope, though
  + Even so, framing the topic within a ‘grand challenge’ provides the ‘so what’, which lets us see how the study solves part of a larger puzzle and how it moves forward the field with rigor and relevance (p. 432)
  1. Novelty: changing the conversation
* Does the study change the existing conversation in the field? Does it merely add to the voices, or does it cause heads to turn by redirecting conversation to a new avenue? (p 433)
* The “traps” (p. 433)

1. The Familiarity trap

* Topic that is too familiar could result in perception of study as only a marginal extension of the conversation

1. The maturity trap

* Topic that is too mature could result in perception of study whose contribution is redundant – already been done

1. The nearness trap

* Topic that is too near existing bodies of lit could result in perception of study that is too overlapping and that departs TOO much from the core of the current conversation
  1. Curiosity: Catching and holding attention (p. 433)
* Topics grab us when their propositions counter a reader’s taken for granted assumptions (Davis, 1971)
* Mystery grabs us; solve the mystery or reformulate it
  + Unexpected findings in one’s own data – or the extant literature -- that can’t be explained by methodological shortcomings or the existing conversation
  1. Scope: Cast a wider net
* Studies can’t tackle grand challenges if the studies haven’t thoroughly explored relevant constructs, mechanisms, and perspectives (p. 434)
* Goal: fully explore the current landscape in a given domain; may use multiple lenses
  1. Actionability: Insights for practice
* Topic should offer insights for managerial or organizational practice

**For the assignment, state your research topic with a short paragraph on how your topic meets the above criteria. Also provide details on where you got the topic from (from a review paper, a journal’s call for papers, etc.)**

1. ***Research question*:** State you research question and possible sub questions. Research questions are usually in the comparison or correlational format.
2. ***Research model***: Show research model. Research model is usually showing as diagram a “boxes and arrows” model showing how you believe your variables of interest are related. This model should answer your research question.
3. ***Hypotheses***: Clearly state your hypotheses clearly written. They should demonstrate how the variables in the model are related.
4. Find your ***scale/measures*** for the variables in the model. Make sure you include the model in the submission. You should cite the article which originally developed the scale and layout all the items in the scale.
5. Based on the scales you selected, what would be the appropriate **sample** for your study?

*Remember that your topic, research questions, research model, hypotheses and scales should be in line with each other.*

**Assignment 2: Introduction and lit review excel file**

In this assignment you will be submitting your (1) introduction and (2) your working literature review excel file AND a summary analysis/framework.

You can start writing your introduction by first answering these questions. Or you can use the template provided on Canvas.

* + Why is it important to study X?
  + Who has studied X? That is, what fields, communities, or subdisciplines, if any, have studied X?
  + What do we clearly know about X?
  + What gaps exist in the literature that you hope to address? That is, what don't we know? (In other words, what is your core, overarching research question?)
  + Why should we care about this gap/question? That is, why is it important to begin to address and close this gap / answer this question? (Because no one has done this before is not an adequate answer.)
  + What theoretical framework or prior research will you draw on to develop hypotheses that will allow you to close this gap / answer these questions?
  + In brief, what is your core idea? That is, what is your proposed answer to your question? (Fill in the blanks: Drawing on \_\_\_\_, I argue that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ shapes \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.. or answer a similarly worded question, please)
  + How will you test these ideas?

**1.Introduction**

You can then turn your responses into the introduction of the paper. Your introduction must include the following: (Grant & Pollock, 2011, p.873)

1. *Who cares?*

* What is the topic or research question, and why is it interesting and important in theory and practice?
* Aspects of an effective intro: simplicity, unexpectedness concreteness, credibility, emotionality, and story
* Two AMJ archetypal hooks for opening an article:
  + the quote and
  + the trend (highlight trends on Main Street or in the Ivory tower) p. 874

1. *What do we know, what don’t we know, and so what?* What key theoretical perspectives and empirical findings have already informed the topic or question? What major, unaddressed puzzle, controversy, or paradox does this study address, and why does it need to be addressed?

* Answer these questions by identifying the conversation that the study is joining, where the conversation hasn’t gone yet, and why it should go there (Huff, 1999) – also called establishing and problematizing the intertextual field (Locke & Golden-Biddle, 1997)
* Establishing the field
  + Synthesized coherence: entering two different conversations and joining them
  + Progressive coherence: identify ongoing conversation and describe how it needs to move forward
  + Noncoherence: present competing perspectives and explain how I will resolve them
* Problematizing the field involves convincing the reader about:
  + Incompleteness: convince readers that knowledge about topic needs to be developed further
  + Inadequacy: knowledge about topic is deficient because it fails to incorporate important perspectives
  + Incommensurability: knowledge about topic is altogether inaccurate
  + Pitfalls:
    - Timid authors don’t want to make enemies by claiming incompleteness, so they end up making a marginal contribution
    - Aggressive authors attack incommensurability too harshly and make enemies
    - Thus, Inadequacy strikes the middle ground

1. *What will we learn? How does your study fundamentally change, challenge, or advance scholars’ understanding?*

* Final element of effective intro is a preview of my work’s theoretical contribution
  1. Identifying a gap in and of itself isn’t important; what is critical is explaining why filling this particular gap is important and interesting (p. 874)
* Two key ways to frame a contribution (Hollenbeck, 2008)
  1. Consensus “shifting”
     + Authors identify widely held assumptions, proceed to challenge them, and describe implications for ongoing research
  2. Consensus “creation”
     + Authors show that there’s a lack of consensus in the literature and then either clarify the lines of debate or resolve the conflict
* Can be viewed as a standalone “mini-summary” of the paper (p. 874):
  + Clearly position the research question of the paper in the relevant literature or identify the importance of the phenomena being examined,
  + Articulate the research question succinctly,
  + outline the main theoretical lens and empirical methodology including empirical context, and
  + discuss in brief the contributions.
* Pitfalls:
  + 1. Failing to motivate the paper and problematize the literature (providing insufficient justification for the importance of the topic)
  + 2. Lacking focus – trying to cram too much into an overlong intro
  + 3. Overpromising in the intro and then failing to deliver

*The structure of your introduction should be similar to the example papers we review in class or the quantitative papers you read in good journals.*

**2) Working literature review excel file and summary**

Submit a summary of your literature review using the excel sheet template you have. I expect to see at least 20 articles in your excel file.

* + At least 80% of the cited articles should come from A\*, A, and B journals (based on ABDC ranking).

You must also provide a summary analysis ( a model or framework or few paragraphs) on what you have observed in the literature

**Assignment 3:** **Revised Introduction and** **Literature review and Hypothesis Development**

For this assignment you should submit your revised introduction AND literature review and hypotheses development section. You submission should include the following:

1. Title page

2. Revised Introduction (revised version based on feedback)

* 1. Do you “set the hook” (Grant & Pollock, 2011)? Should answer three questions:

1. Who cares?
2. What do we know, what don’t we know, and so what?
   1. Establishing the field; problematizing the field
3. Clearly state the research questions
4. What will we learn? What are the contributions of your study? How does your study fundamentally change, challenge, or advance scholars’ understanding?
   1. Consensus shifting; consensus creating

3.Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

* 1. Include the major authors and theories that provide the foundation for your research.
  2. Provide definitions of independent and dependent variables.
  3. At least 80% of the cited articles should come from A\*, A, and B journals (based on ABDC ranking).
  4. It crucial to conduct the literature review based on the provided instruction

Guidelines on hypothesis development:

How may hypotheses be substantiated (Sparrowe & Mayer, 2011)?

*First, though, purpose of theory section:*

The purposes of a theory section are to ground the hypotheses, which includes (p. 1098):

* + - 1. Positioning those hypotheses in relation to related research
* enter a constructive dialogue with other authors who have engaged in this research stream
* cite the relevant literature but avoid “argument by citation” (p. 1098)
  + citations should be used to illustrate elements of one’s own argument (Sutton & Staw, 1995)
* look beyond citing specific empirical results to focus on the underlying theoretical issues being addressed
  + in other words, to engage in the conversation means to discuss the underlying theory, not the specific results
    - 1. Developing a clear, logical argument explaining why the core variables or processes are related in the proposed fashion
* How to Substantiate the hypotheses
  1. link a hypothesis to a similar logical relationship that is a central tenet of an established theory or conceptual framework
  2. offer empirical evidence supporting claims similar to what the hypothesis states. Here, the implicit argument is that if it has been shown to occur in similar circumstances, then it should also apply in the present circumstances (p.1099)
  3. focus on *how* the hypothesized relationship occurs by crafting a narrative that describes the role of intervening states and/or processes.
* Be sure to identify boundary conditions if hypotheses apply to specific contexts rather than being general in nature
* Multiple theories can be effective way to make strong theory. But, using multiple theories challenges author to clearly explain why multiple theories are needed and what the contribution will be by joining the theories. Possible approaches of multiple theories (p. 1100):
  1. Pit one against the other through competing hypotheses
  2. Combine theories to give more complete account of an organizational phenomenon
  3. Seek integration between two theories by explaining how the two perspectives are complementary (assumptions of one theory implicitly requires those of the other to be fully realized, and vice versa)
     + 1. Creating a sense of coherencein the relationships among the variables and processes in the proposed model.
* An effective theory section is explaining why one has chosen a specific set of explanatory variables over others. Without a strong discussion of coherence, readers and reviewers will wonder what holds a theoretical narrative together (Dubin, 1976; Whetten, 1989).
* When using multiple theories, it is more challenging to make coherent argument if theories are from different base disciplines
* Coherence is achieved when one addresses the question of why these variables (and only those variables) were selected. An effective theory section must explain how these variables fit together in a way that creates a strong and coherent theoretical

contribution and doesn’t leave the reader wondering why other variables weren’t included. The proposed hypotheses should be linked a way that

creates an overall contribution to the topic.

* Pitfalls
  + Lack of specificity (using logic to explain your theory that derives from a much broader or more general theory)
  + Fragmented theorizing (supporting each link in a hypothesized relationship with different theories)
  + Stating the obvious – if the hypothesis states the obvious or claims to be common knowledge, it’s likely to be trivial
    - To avoid this, consider the plausibility of the null hypothesis (p. 1101)

Below are some additional guidelines on theory development:

What five elements do not represent theory (Sutton & Staw, 1995)? Contrast this view with that of Sparrowe and Mayer (2011)

While there is argument about what does constitute theory, there is more agreement about what does not. Five elements do not represent theory (below).

* + 1. References
       - Why confused with theory and how to avoid it:
         * Simply listing references and naming their theories isn’t enough; have to EXPLAIN how the causal logic that they contain (p.372)

For instance, does one citation explain the theory in a second citation? You have to WRITE about this connection

Don’t need to review every nuance of every theory cited, but you DO have to include of “pertinent logic from the” cited work so that the reader can grasp your logical arguments (p.373)

* + 1. Data
       - Why confused with theory and how to avoid it:
         * Data are important to confirming or disputing existing theory but are NOT theory themselves
         * Data describe *which* empirical patterns are observed; theory explains *why* those patterns were observed (0p. 374)
         * Prior findings by themselves cannot generate new hypotheses; there has to be explanative matter to argue the link
    2. Lists of Variables or Constructs
       - Why confused with theory and how to avoid it:
         * Well crafted definitions and carefully explained constructs are important, but they are NOT theory in and of themselves.
         * Making lists and developing categorical schemes are NOT theory
         * Must explain WHY the related variables are expected to be strong predictors – what is the theory underlying the variables?
    3. Diagrams
       - Why confused with theory and how to avoid it:
         * Figures that show causal relationships and temporal diagrams that show unfolding of a pattern over time are helpful and illustrative (p. 376) but are NOT theory
         * They are the “stage props” to the performance itself. (P. 376)
         * They don’t explain WHY the proposed connections will be observed

The underlying logic needs to be explained in words

* + 1. Hypotheses
       - Why confused with theory and how to avoid it:
         * Hypotheses serve as crucial bridges between theory and data (p. 376)
         * They make explicit how the variables and the relationships that follow from a logical argument are operationalized (p. 376)
         * Hypotheses state *what* is expected to occur, not *why (p. 377)*
       - Predictions (hypotheses) without underlying causal logic are not theory! (p. 377)
       - Warning signs: too many hypotheses in a paper may result in none being adequately explained

Overall, strong theory generally stems from a single or small set of research ideas.

What theory is (p. 378):

* Connections among phenomenon
* A story about why acts, events, structure, and thoughts occur
* Emphasizes the nature of causal relationships, identifying what comes first and the timing of subsequent events
* Looks at underlying processes to understand the systematic reasons for a particular occurrence or nonoccurrence
* Laced with set of convincing and logically interconnected arguments

Arguments against theory

* Write narrative descriptions of organizations for 10 years or so, then start writing theory again (p. 378)
* It is more important to isolate a few successful change efforts than to understand the causal nuances that underlie them (p. 379)

How do Sutton and Staw (1995) set their “hooks”?

* + Sutton and Staw: Intro is 2 pages, relatively succinct. Answers “who cares”
  + Tells us what is known and what isn’t; not too much of a an explicit ‘so what’
  + Establishes the field in a couple of manners – presents competing dialogues
    - They add another stream but don’t resolve any of the discussions
* Problematize the field to some extent but don’t go beyond problem identification

**Assignment 4:** **Final paper (front end of the quantitative paper)**

Revise assignment 3 based on the feedback you receive and submit it.

**Appendix B: Research Presentations**

At a minimum, students should have the following as part of their PowerPoint presentation:

1. Cover Slide with title of paper, student name, and date.
2. Brief literature review and the gap in the literature. Cite the major authors and theories that provide the foundation for your research.
3. Purpose of your study and research questions
4. Discuss your hypotheses and how they are grounded in the literature/theory.
5. Discuss *possible* implications of your research and future research directions.
6. Conclusion.

* Use good technique in preparing your slides: bullet points with short phrases; easily readable point size; minimal text per slide.
* Do NOT read from slides your notes. You should know your research by heart and be comfortable talking about it!

**Appendix C: Quantitative Article Critique Questions**

1. Research Questions
   1. Did the authors offer any research questions?
      1. If so, are the research questions listed explicitly or implicitly?
         1. If the research questions are listed explicitly, what are the research questions?
         2. If the research questions are listed implicitly, what is the purpose of the study?
      2. Are the explicit or implicit research questions clear?
   2. What is(are) the contribution(s) of the study?
2. Hypotheses
   1. Are the research variables provided for the study?
   2. What are all of the research variables for the study?
   3. Are all research variables clearly defined in the study?
   4. Are there any control variables used for the study?
   5. Did they provide a reason why the control variables should be used?
   6. Do the researchers offer any hypotheses?
   7. Are the hypotheses clearly stated?
   8. Do the hypotheses match the explicit or implicit research question?
3. Participants
   1. What was the target population for the study?
   2. Why were the participants selected?
   3. Is the sample appropriate for the study?
   4. How were the participants selected?
   5. How large is the sample?
   6. Was it a probability or non-probability sample?
   7. What type of sampling method was utilized?
   8. Did the Institutional Review Board (IRB) review and approve the study? If no, please answer the following questions:
      1. If not reviewed and approved by the IRB, were the participants fully informed about the nature of the study?
      2. If not reviewed and approved by the IRB, was the autonomy or confidentiality of the participants guaranteed?
      3. If not reviewed and approved by the IRB, were the participants protected from harm?
      4. If not reviewed and approved by the IRB, was ethical permission granted for the study?
4. Instruments
   1. What instruments or tools were used in the study, and who developed them?
   2. Do the instruments or tools directly measure the variables of interest (i.e., do the variables of interest definition match the instruments or tools selected? Are the instruments appropriate?)
   3. What was the reliability of the instrument or tool in the paper?
   4. What reliability was used?
   5. Does the research clearly describe how the means or scores are derived from the instruments?
5. Research Design
   1. What specific research design was used [i.e., quantitative (experimental, non-experimental), qualitative, mixed method, analytical]?
   2. What is the data collection technique?
   3. Can the research design be duplicated or replicated?
   4. Are there potential limitations identified and addressed? Please justify your response.
6. Data Trustworthiness
   1. Are methods reported to establish data trustworthiness (credibility, dependability, confirmability, transferability?
   2. Is triangulation (e.g., theories, data sources, data collection methods) utilized? If so, what type of triangulation is used?
   3. Do you think the research is credible?
7. Summary
   1. What are the most imperative weaknesses of the article?
   2. Provide a suggestion on how you think the research design could be improved for the article.