

In this course the scholar will spend the semester learning how to analyse your topic, problem statement, research question, and data and use it to write a strong findings section of a research paper suitable for eventual publication in an academic journal. The course has been structured around the idea that *mixed methods data analysis is inextricably linked to the writing process*. You will thus be doing much writing this semester! In doing so, you will learn how to: identify your problem statement, ensure relevant and rigorous literature reviews, identify luminous data; ask questions of your data; code; memo; develop an argument; situate the data in literature (and then re-frame it again and again); identify what additional data is needed; describe the scene, people, and place; use counts and negative cases; show variation; show not tell; and put the self in your writing. In addition, we will think about the ethical dilemmas of mixed methods research that present themselves in the writing process.

Theoretically, we will consider questions such as the following (among many others):

- What is the problem statement?
- What is it best suited for?
- By what criteria does it meet or fail to meet the standards of scientific evidence?
- What are the roles of induction and deduction in qualitative research?
- Can quantitative research verify hypotheses, or only generate them?
- Can qualitative research explain the problem/phenomena, or only interpret them?
- What are alternative ways of assessing empirical or theoretical significance?
- What are different ways to approach analysis?
- How to translate all the results into your own research manuscript for a suitable publication?
- How to write a research manuscript and what are the basic requirements to ensure the manuscript is suitable for at least a conference publication?
- How to ensure your own written manuscript is free of plagiarism?

Practically, we will consider questions such as the following:

- How does one go from data to methods to analysis and finally to finding section?
- How do you connect theory, research design, data collection, and data analysis?
- How do we analyze your analytical data?
- What are different frameworks to apply when writing your research paper?
- How does one advance arguments?
- What to include in analysis and methods section?
- How does one begin theorizing a storyline from beginning to end of paper?
- How does one give a presentation based on interview data?

This course is for doctoral students in management, commerce, visual media communications and computing.

Course Objectives:

In short, this course is organized with three objectives in mind:

1. Give you basic training in defining your problem statement, ensuring rigorous literature review is linked to the problem statement and developing research questions and finally using data analyzing qualitative data and quantitative data, including exposure to multiple research paradigms and analytical strategies.
2. Understand the issues and decisions involved in writing and presenting on qualitative data and quantitative data, including how to assess what is enough data and what is good data, making evidence claims, developing arguments, and what are the limits of data.
3. Give basic training on writing a research manuscript ensuring that it can be submitted to at least a Scopus-indexed conference.
4. Examine the ethical responsibilities of mixed method researchers.

Learning Outcomes:

After completing the course, the student should be able to:

- Adapt the content and structure of scientific research papers according to research objective and and justify their choices within the literature reviews and references
- Apply rhetorical strategies typical for research papers, especially in your own research paper
- Apply effective writing strategies in order to compose clear and precise text in English for developing your own research paper.
- Critically review and suggest changes to scientific texts written by others, considering e.g. audience, purpose, structure and language, and use others' feedback to improve their own text in order to produce scientific research papers in English for publication in relevant journals

Course Policies:

1. Our weekly class will be Discussion-Based/Seminar Style Classes. We will discuss the progress, questions and concerns of each scholar and utilize it for each of our research paper. Each of the participants will showcase their progress and we will utilize the development and concerns about the progress for everyone's development of the research paper.
2. Assignments are due before the day before class or in class. Assignments not received by the deadline will receive a deduction, and the deduction will be in tune to the number of days delayed.
3. As we can only cover so much in a four hour class, I have included the structure for every week so you can delve deeper into a specific topic. All of these readings are useful for your own research and better writing. Finally, I have done my best to choose the most comprehensive yet pithy articles for each topic area. However, I know for many of you this may be the first time covering these topics, some of which are quite dense, hence I will devote some time at the beginning of each class to provide an overview of the readings. I will also solicit feedback about what readings were most helpful.
4. The main component of the class involves analyzing your data that culminate into a methods and finally into a research paper. I know that it takes much work and even more time to turn raw data into a

5. Coherent story and something that resembles a theoretical contribution and my intention is to support you in this journey.

6. I am excited to meet with you and to answer any questions about the course. I also would like to see how I can best help you so that we can learn together. To that end, please feel free to set up an appointment to meet. I will try to stay a few minutes after each class. If you have any “small” questions, then this will be an excellent time to approach me. I would like you to get as much out of the class as possible, so please do not hesitate to ask questions and to get feedback on your work.

7. I know staying focused during a four-hour class can be challenging. We will take a break and ensure the discussions are lively.

Course Evaluations are based on ASSIGNMENTS & GRADING:

<u>Assignments:</u>	<u>Date Due</u>	<u>% of Grade</u>
Class Participation	Ongoing	15
#1: Identification of Research Topic and Demonstration of Extensive Literature Reviews	October 01	10
#2: Identification of Research Problem; Research Questions (RQ) and Research Objective (RO)	November 11	10
# 3: Finalizing Research Design, Research Methodology and The Theoretical Foundation and Conceptual Framework	December 7	15
# 4: Completion of Data Analysis using Quantitative and/or Qualitative Methods	January 4	15
#5: Theorising the Storyline; Draft Research Paper Due; Revising as per Critics	January 18	15
#6: Final Research Paper Due; Presentation and Viva-Voce	January 24	20

Note on turning in assignments and grading weights:

- Assignments should be submitted on the day before each class or on the day of class. Any assignment received after the deadline will be graded but there will be penalty based on the number of days.
- Given how each of the assignments below are equally important to the writing process each assignment has equal weight.
- The final research paper is due on the day of End-Term Exam (subjected to change).

Course-Class Delivery and Lecture/Seminar timeline and dates:

Week 1; Aug31: Fundamentals of Research: Beginning to Bring it All Together. Overview of the course
Week 2; Sept21: Beginning to Bring in the Research Topic and Literature Reviews
Week 3; Oct 19: Identifying the Research Problem, The Research Questions and the Research Objectives
Week 4: Nov 11: Identifying the Research Problem, The Research Questions and the Research Objectives
Week 5: Nov 23: Constructing the Research Design and the Research Methodology
Week 6: Dec 7: Constructing the Research Design and the Research Methodology
Week 7: Dec 21: Data Analysis: Quantitative Analysis Techniques & Qualitative Analysis Techniques
Week 8: Jan 04: Data Analysis: Quantitative Analysis Techniques & Qualitative Analysis Techniques
Week 9: Jan 18: The Writing Process: Theorizing the Storyline; Writing and Responding to Critics
Week 10: Jan 25/26: Submission of Final Research Paper; Presentation and Viva-Voce

Week 1: Fundamentals of Research: Bringing it All Together. Overview of the course

In this class, we will examine four basic elements of research – the research objective, performing literature reviews, identifying research question, the theory, the data, and the analysis of data – and discuss on how to consolidate your work and analysis into a research manuscript. In this class, we will discuss the complete 10 class details and what are the important aspects of the research paper and how to progress to ensure a final research manuscript is drafted for a scopus-indexed conference.

Come to class to discuss why you find your research area interesting, how good are your Research Questions and how intriguing is your data, and also tell us about the status of your data collection.

Week 2: Beginning to bring in your Research Topic and Explore the Rigorous Literature Reviews:

Topic selection can be a daunting task and needs to generate plenty of research. Work with your research guide to choose your topic. Aim for specificity, with a flavor of novelty. Your topic should be specific and yield a collection of research through rigorous literature reviews.

It is the literature survey that narrows and refines the objects of research and leads to the framing of the research question. Hence, you need to ensure to perform a critical literature review towards your research topic.

What ethical issues need to be flagged in the course of a literature review?

Readings for Literature Reviews:

Brewer, R. (2007) Your PhD thesis: how to plan, draft, revise and edit your thesis. Abergele: Study Mates.Ref: LS131 | Skills for Learning |March 2018

Steane, P. (2004) Fundamentals of a literature review, in Steane, P. and Burton, S. (eds). Surviving your thesis. London: Routledge, pp. 124-137.

Thomson, P. (2016) Five ways to structure a literature review Available at:
<https://patthomson.net/2016/08/29/five-ways-to-structure-a-literature-review/>

Skills for Learning (2018) Guide to writing a literature review for doctoral students [online].
Wolverhampton: University of Wolverhampton. [Available at: <http://www.wlv.ac.uk/skills>

Week 3: Identify the Research Problem and Research Question and Research Objective:

When picking a research philosophy, a your/researcher must clearly define the research problem and questions you want to investigate. The research questions must be specific, measurable, and relevant to the research problem. The researcher must assess whether a positivist, interpretive, critical, or other scheme is required to solve the problem. Researchers are required to consider their epistemological position or view of the world. These questions are helpful: Do you believe that there is a single objective reality that can be measured and quantified (positivism)? Or do you consider knowledge to be subjective and context-dependent (interpretivism)? Researchers must consider their ontological position or their perspective on the nature of reality. These questions may prove useful: Do you believe that reality is fixed and unchanging (objectivism)? Or do you believe that reality is dynamic and shaped by human interpretation (constructivism)?

Framing the research question is an important step in planning research. The research question feeds into the description of the research paper and defines it.

Week 4: Research Design, Research Methodology:

In this section, the definition and types of research designs, how to select a research design, and the advantages and disadvantages of different research designs have been discussed.

The research scholar has to plan or strategy that defines how the research will be conducted, including the methods and processes that will be utilised to gather and analyse data.

The scholar has to plan the decisions regarding the sort of inquiry that will be carried out, the research topic, the sampling strategy, as well as the techniques of data collection and analysis.

Researchers must carefully consider which type of research design is most appropriate for their specific research question and goals.

The research scholar should develop a scientifically sound research design and also an ethically sound.

The objective of research design, methods, tools is to maximize the gathering of data that the study requires.

The scholar needs to clearly mention the process of gathering information and data through various methods and techniques in order to answer the research question.

The scholar needs to calculate the appropriate sample size for quantitative and qualitative research involving different methods.

The scholar should also ensure that the sample size is adequate and representative, and that the data collection process is well-documented and transparent.

Week 5: Data Analysis, Qualitative Data Analysis and Quantitative Data Analysis:

The scholar should perform data analysis and examine and interpret the data collected through various methods and techniques to answer the research question (Creswell, 2012). The scholar should also mention if the analysis involves both quantitative and qualitative methods.

Week 6: The Writing Process & Theorizing the Storyline

During this week the scholar needs to focus on building a theorizing storyline from our first sentence to the last. The scholar will learn how to develop and write up theoretical arguments, including considering what to present up front versus in the discussion section.

Readings on the writing process:

- Belcher, W.L. “*Writing Your Journal Article in 12 Weeks: a Guide to Academic Success.*” Thousand Oaks; Sage; Strengthening your structure, pp. 171-188.
- Charmaz, K. (2010) Chapter 7: *Writing the Draft, Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications: 151-176.
- Golden-Biddle, Karen and Karen Locke. (2007) Introduction and Chapter 1: The Style and Practice of Our Academic Writing, *Composing Qualitative Research*: 1-24.
- Karl E. W.(1989) Theory construction as disciplined imagination. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4): 516-531.

Recommended Readings on the writing process:

- Becker, H. (1986) *Writing for Social Scientists: How to Start and Finish Your Thesis, Book or Article.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Becker, H. S. (1998) Chapter 2: Imagery, *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think About your Research While You're Doing It.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press: 10-66.
- Gioia, D., K.G. Corley and A. Hamilton. (2013) Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research: Notes on the Gioia methodology. *Organizational Research Methods* 16(1):15-31.
- Golden-Biddle, K. and K. Locke (2007) Chapter 2: Crafting a theorized storyline, Chapter 3: Developing the theorized storyline, *Composing Qualitative Research*: 25-60.
- Kamler, B., & Thomson, P. (2014). *Helping doctoral students write: Pedagogies for supervision.* Routledge.
 - *I cannot recommend this book highly enough!*
- Kilbourn, Brent. 2006. “The Qualitative Doctoral Dissertation Proposal.” *Teachers College Record* 108: 529-76.
- Richardson, Laurel. Writing: A Method of Inquiry. In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Sage, 1994)
- Sword, Helen. (2017) *Air & Light & Time & Space: How Successful Academics Write.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Discussion Questions: The research scholar should approach and craft a theoretical contribution into the research paper. Also, come prepared to discuss some of your favorite practices and techniques for writing.

Week 7: Writing & Responding to Critiques

During this week, the scholar will have the opportunity to practice your journal-reviewing skills and to see how the journal-review process unfolds. The scholar will take this opportunity to focus more explicitly on the paper-crafting-and-reviewing process by reading what scholars have written about these processes and by seeing an example.

Readings on crafting and reviewing papers:

- Cristiano, G. (2020). Tips for Writing a Review.
https://docs.google.com/document/d/18L0fIMCINu5m-iuzOi14Skgr_aUFCdOI/edit

- Daft, R.L. (1995) Chapter 9: Why I recommended that your manuscript be rejected and what you can do about it, L.L. Cummings and P. Frost (Eds.), *Publishing in the Organizational Sciences*: 164-182.
- Locke, K and K,Golden-Biddle. (1997) Constructing opportunities for contribution: Structuring intertextual coherence and ‘problematizing’ in organizational studies, *Academy of Management Journal*. 40(5):1023-1062.
- Ragins, B. R. (2015). Editor's comments: Developing our authors. *Academy of Management Review*. You can find this paper in the folder “Files → Articles Not in Study.Net”
- **Paper to review:** Cameron, L. Alliance or Adversaries ? Original submission to Organization Science. You can find this paper in the folder “Files → Articles Not in Study.Net”

Recommended readings on validity & reviewing:

- Bagozzi, R., Y. Yi, and L. Phillips, (1991). Assessing construct validity in organizational research, *Administrative Science Quarterly*. (36): 421-458.
- Campbell, D. T. and Fiske, D. (1959) Convergent and discriminant validation by the multi trait-multimethod matrix, *Psychological Bulletin* (56): 81-105.
- Cook, T. D., and D. T. Campbell (1979). Chapter 2: Validity, Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin: 37-94. Editorial. (1993) Article review checklist: A criterion checklist for reviewing research articles in applied psychology, *Personnel Psychology* (46): 705-718.
- Duneier, M. (2011). How not to lie with ethnography. *Sociological Methodology*, 41(1), 1-11.
- Pratt, M. G. (2000) Some thoughts on publishing qualitative research, *Research Methods Forum* Vol. 5.

Recommended readings on reviewing:

- Grimes, M. (2020). Matthew Grimes One-Page Reviewing Scheme:https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ZEEd0TfTsP4h_TUdz8LLM4dZefb4uRNdW4skjepJ2C1U/edit
- Leblebici, H. (1996). The act of reviewing and being a reviewer. *Rhythms of academic life: Personal accounts of careers in academia*, 269-274.
- Romanelli, E. (1996). Becoming a reviewer: Lessons somewhat painfully learned. *Rhythms of academic life: Personal accounts of careers in academia*, 263-268.
- Zuckerman, E.W. (2008) “Tips for Article-Writers”
<http://web.mit.edu/ewzucker/www/Tips%20to%20article%20writers.pdf>

Discussion Questions: What did you think of the reviewers’ comments? How did they compare with your comments? What did you think of the changes made? How did construct clarity, support and the framing of novelty improve? How were relationships between constructs established? What makes a good review? What does this experience teach you about being a good reviewer for others? Having seen the whole review process for this paper, what do you take away as lessons about the journal-reviewing process?