

---

**Current Issues in Management and Business Ethics:  
Contributions of a Sociocognitive Approach  
Fall 2013  
9-13 September  
Michael D. Pfarrer, Ph.D.**

---

**INSTRUCTOR**

**Michael D. (Mike) Pfarrer, Ph.D.**

Assistant Professor

Department of Management

Terry College of Business

University of Georgia

**Email:** [mpfarrer@uga.edu](mailto:mpfarrer@uga.edu)

**ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS**

**Time:** Monday-Thursday, 0900-1100 and 1300-1500. Friday, 0900-1100 and 1300-1600.

**Location:** Seminarraum UNK-E-2, Universitätsstr. 84, 8006 Zürich  
(Tram-Station Winkelriedstrasse, Line 9 & 10).

**COURSE DESCRIPTION**

This doctoral seminar reviews research in the field of management research, particularly in the areas of organizational theory (OT) and behavioral strategy. Additionally, content analysis and related methodologies in the organizational sciences will be emphasized. The seminar is tailored for a maximum of 8-9 students.

**COURSE OBJECTIVES**

The purpose of this seminar is to introduce doctoral-level students to the field of management research. There are four goals in this course:

- 1) Introduce the students to the relevant research literature in management research, including exposure to traditional, classic, and current texts.
- 2) Help students learn to better understand, evaluate, and interpret the conceptual and methodological aspects of research in management, especially in the areas of OT and behavioral strategy.
- 3) Further develop the student's skills necessary to publish in and review for top-tier journals.
- 4) Expose students to content analysis and related methodologies in the organizational sciences.

- 5) Provide feedback to students' work in progress and offer guidance in developing a paper suitable for submission to a top-tier journal.

## STUDENT ATTENDANCE AND PERFORMANCE ISSUES

*If you have a health, work, or other related issue that may adversely impact your attendance and/or performance, please see me promptly to discuss potential accommodations.*

Please note that the number of participants is **limited**. Please send your application including a short CV to Patrick Haack ([patrick.haack@uzh.ch](mailto:patrick.haack@uzh.ch)) by Friday, August 23rd, 2013. For further details and questions, please contact Patrick Haack; 0041 44 634 5307.

## CHANGES TO THE SYLLABUS

*This is a dynamic setting. The professor reserves the right to revise this syllabus and the course calendar, if necessary.*

## REQUIRED COURSE MATERIAL

1. Access to electronic texts of selected readings.
2. Additional readings will be provided either through electronic access or in hard copy.

## ASSIGNMENTS & GRADING

Participation	50%
Working Paper + Presentation	50%

### Grading Scale:

Pass	= 70% or above on <b>both assignments</b>
Fail	= below 70%

*Your final grade will be a weighted average of the assignments listed above. You **must pass all assignments to receive a passing grade**. Please note that I do not "round grades up." For example, a final grade of 69.50 or 69.99 will receive a failing grade.*

*Please also note that generally, I do not 1) accept extra credit, 2) accept late assignments, 3) reschedule due dates, or 4) give incompletes ("I" grades). Late assignments or missed exams will result in a **0 score** unless the student provides a documented excuse for his or her absence.*

## Grade Appeals

Any appeals of grades must be done in writing within **48 hours** of receiving a grade. Upon receiving a written grade appeal, I will review the merits of the appeal and re-grade the

assignment in light of these comments. Thus, your new grade may be higher or lower than the original grade.

### **PARTICIPATION (50%)**

Students are expected to actively participate in class, regardless of who is leading the discussion for a particular reading. You should read all required articles before the class time and be ready to talk about the main message, theory, methods, and possible extensions of each paper. During our discussions, avoid simple summaries. Rather focus on critique and extensions.

For each reading, the assigned student will serve as lead discussant during class. All students are encouraged to participate.

In general, consider shaping your discussion like you would an outline of an *AMR* or *AMJ* paper. That is, each summary should address the following, where applicable:

1. What is the main research question? Why is it important?
2. How does the paper fill a “gap” in the literature? Should it? What else should it have done?
3. Who is the paper’s main audience? What theory/framework is being used and what are they key assumptions in the paper? Are they valid?
4. What are the central hypotheses/propositions/arguments? Are they valid?
5. What is the sample and research design?
6. What are the key constructs/variables in the paper? Are the operationalizations valid?
7. Is the empirical method appropriate?
8. What are the results? What is (un)interesting?
9. What are the research and practical implications of the paper?
10. What limitations did the authors (not) address?
11. What future research could be derived from the paper? Based on the week’s topics, what theoretical and empirical question(s) remain and why are the question(s) interesting? What are possible extensions?
12. How would you position the article among the assigned readings or in the field?
13. Concluding thoughts.

### **Paper + Presentation (50%)**

Students will present their work-in-progress, based on a working paper. Students should submit their working paper (length of 10-30 pages) to me via email by Monday, September 2, 2013. I will provide further details during the week.

## COURSE SCHEDULE & LITERATURE

### Day 1, Morning: Theoretical Foundations

1. 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.
2. Whetten, D. A. 1989. What constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 490-495.
3. Colquitt, J. A. & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. 2007. Trends in theory building and theory testing: A five-decade study of the Academy of Management Journal. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50: 1281-1303.

### Day 1, Afternoon: Methodological Foundations

1. Schwab, A., Abrahamson, E., Starbuck, W. H., & Fidler, F. 2011. PERSPECTIVE— Researchers should make thoughtful assessments instead of null-hypothesis significance tests. *Organization Science*, 22(4): 1105-1120.
2. Antonakis, J., Bendahan, S., Jacquart, P., & Lalive, R. 2010. On making causal claims: A review and recommendations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21: 1086-1120.
3. Duriau, V.J., Reger, R.K., & Pfarrer, M.D. 2007. A content analysis of the content analysis literature in organization studies: Research themes, data sources, and methodological refinements. *Organization Research Methods*, 10: 5-34.

### Further Reading (Optional):

1. Bascle, G. 2008. Controlling for endogeneity with instrumental variables in strategic management research. *Strategic Organization*, 6(3): 285-327.
2. Corley, K. & Gioia, D. 2011. Building theory about theory building: What constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review*, 36: 12-32.
3. Halaby, C. 2004. Panel models in sociological research: Theory into practice. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30: 507-544.

### Day 2, Morning: Institutional Theory

1. DiMaggio, P. & Powell, W.W. 1983. The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48: 147-160.

2. Oliver, C. 1991. Strategic responses to institutional processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(1): 145-179.
3. Pfarrer, M.D., Smith, K.G., Bartol, K.M., Khanin, D.M., & Zhang, X. 2008. Coming forward: The effects of social and regulatory forces on the voluntary restatement of earnings subsequent to wrongdoing. *Organization Science*, 19: 386-403.

### **Day 2, Afternoon: The Sociocognitive Approach**

1. Rindova, V., Rege, R. K., Dalpiaz, E. 2008. The mind of the strategist and the eye of the beholder: The socio-cognitive perspective in strategy research. **Book chapter posted online.**
2. Mishina, Y., Block, E., & Mannor, M. 2012. The path dependence of organizational reputation: How social judgment influences assessments of capability and character. *Strategic Management Journal*, 33(5): 459-477.
3. Rao, H., Greve, H. & Davis, G. 2001. Fool's gold: Social proof in the initiation and abandonment of coverage by Wall Street analysts. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46: 502-526.
4. Hargadon, A. & Douglas, Y. 2001. When innovations meet institutions: Edison and the design of the electric light. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46, 476-503.

### **Further Reading (Optional):**

1. Deephouse, D. L. 1996. Does isomorphism legitimate? *The Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4): 1024-1039.
2. Hoffman, A. J. & Ocasio, W. 2001. Not all events are attended equally: Toward a middle-range theory of industry attention of external events. *Organization Science*, 12 (4): 414-434.
3. Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. 1979. Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2): 263-291.
4. Meyer, J., & Rowan, B. 1977. Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*: 340-363.
5. Porac, J., Thomas, H., & Baden-Fuller, C. 1989. Competitive groups as cognitive communities: The case of Scottish knitwear manufacturers. *Journal of Management Studies*, 26: 4: 397-416.
6. Powell, T. C., Lovaglio, D., & Fox, C. R. 2011. Behavioral strategy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 32(13): 1369-1386.

7. Weick, K., Sutcliffe, K., & Obstfeld, D. 2005. Organizing and the process of sensemaking. *Organization Science*, 16(4): 409-421.

### **Day 3, Morning: Reputation and Legitimacy**

1. Deephouse, D. L., & Suchman, M. 2008. Legitimacy in organizational institutionalism. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby, & K. Sahlin-Andersson (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*: 49–77. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. **Posted online.**
2. Rindova, V., Williamson, I., Petkova, A., & Sever, J. 2005. Being good or being known: An empirical examination of the dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of organizational reputation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48: 1033–1049.
3. Deephouse, D. 2000. Media reputation as a strategic resource: An integration of mass communication and resource-based theories. *Journal of Management*, 26(6): 1091-1112.

### **Day 3, Afternoon: Celebrity and Status**

1. Rindova, V., Pollock, T., & Hayward, M. 2006. Celebrity firms: The social construction of market popularity. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1): 50-71.
2. Pfarrer, M.D., Pollock, T.G., & Rindova, V.P. 2010. A tale of two assets: The effects of firm reputation and celebrity on earnings surprises and investors' reactions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53: 1131-1152.
3. Washington, M., & Zajac, E.J. 2005. Status evolution and competition: Theory and evidence. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48: 281-296.

### **Further Reading (Optional):**

1. Bitektine, A. 2011. Towards a theory of social judgments of organizations: The case of legitimacy, reputation, and status. *Academy of Management Review*, 36: 151-179.
2. Deephouse, D., & Carter, S. 2005. An examination of differences between organizational legitimacy and organizational reputation. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(2): 329-360.
3. Devers, C., Dewett, T., Mishina, Y., & Belsito, C. 2009. A general theory of organizational stigma. *Organization Science*, 20(1): 154-171.
4. Lange, D., Lee, P. M., & Dai, Y. 2011. Organizational reputation: A review. *Journal of Management*, 37(1): 153-184.

5. Phillips, D., & Zuckerman, E. 2001. Middle status conformity: Theoretical restatement and empirical demonstration in two markets. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107(2): 379-429.

#### **Day 4, Morning: The Double-Edged Sword**

1. Brooks, M., Highhouse, S., Russell, S., & Mohr, D. 2003. Familiarity, ambivalence, and firm reputation: Is corporate fame a double-edged sword? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5): 904-913.
2. Rhee, M., & Haunschild, P. 2006. The liability of good reputation: A study of product recalls in the U.S. automobile industry. *Organization Science*, 17(1): 101-117.
3. Mishina, Y., Dykes, B. J., Block, E. S., & Pollock, T. G. 2010. Why “good” firms do bad things: The effects of high aspirations, high expectations, and prominence on the incidence of corporate illegality. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(4): 701-722.

#### **Day 4, Afternoon: Perception Management**

1. Pfarrer, M.D., DeCelles, K.A., Smith, K.G., & Taylor, M.S. 2008. After the fall: Reintegrating the corrupt organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 33: 730-749.
2. Westphal, J. D., & Deephouse, D. L. 2011. Avoiding bad press: Interpersonal influence in relations between CEOs and journalists and the consequences for press reporting about firms and their leadership. *Organization Science*, 22: 1061-1086.
3. Zavyalova, A., Pfarrer, M.D., Reger, R.K., & Shapiro, D.L. 2012. Managing the message: The effects of firm actions and industry spillovers on media coverage subsequent to wrongdoing. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55: 1079-1101.

#### **Further Reading (Optional):**

1. Barnett, M., & King, A. 2008. Good fences make good neighbors: A longitudinal analysis of an industry self-regulatory institution. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(6): 1150-1170.
2. Coombs, W. 2007. Protecting organization reputations during a crisis: The development and application of situational crisis communication theory. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 10(3): 163-176.
3. Graffin, S., Carpenter, M., & Boivie, S. 2011. What's all that (strategic) noise? Anticipatory impression management in CEO successions. *Strategic Management Journal*, 32: 748-770.

4. Pollock, T., Rindova, V., & Maggitti, P. 2008. Market watch: Information and availability cascades among the media and investors in the US IPO market. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 51(2): 335-358.
5. Green, S. E. 2004. A rhetorical theory of diffusion. *The Academy of Management Review*, 29(4): 653-669.
6. Koschmann, M.A., Kuhn, T.R., & Pfarrer, M.D. 2012. A communicative framework of value in cross-sector partnerships. *Academy of Management Review*, 37: 332-354.
7. Lounsbury, M., & Glynn, M. 2001. Cultural entrepreneurship: Stories, legitimacy, and the acquisition of resources. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(6-7): 545-564.

### **Day 5: Student Presentations**

*The purpose of the student presentations is to discuss in-progress research with the goal of aiding the student in further developing his or her research. The presentation is based on a student's working paper. Students should submit their working paper (length of 10-30 pages) to me via email by Monday, September 2, 2013.*

*Presentation slots are 40 minutes in length, whereas the presentation itself should not take longer than 15 minutes. The remaining time of 25+ minutes is scheduled for peer and instructor feedback. I will provide more details during the week.*