
**Current Issues in Management and Business Ethics:
Contributions of a Sociocognitive Approach
Fall 2015
7-10 September
Michael D. Pfarrer, Ph.D.**

INSTRUCTOR

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

Associate Editor, Academy of Management Review
Associate Professor
Department of Management
Terry College of Business
University of Georgia
Email: mpfarrer@uga.edu

ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS

Time: Monday-Wednesday, 0900-1200 and 1300-1600. Thursday, 0800-1100.

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

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This doctoral seminar reviews research in management and business ethics, with an emphasis on a sociocognitive perspective. Writing, reviewing, and publishing techniques will be emphasized.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

There are four goals in this course:

- 1) Expose students to relevant theories in management and business ethics.
- 2) Expose students to relevant methodologies in management and business ethics.
- 3) Help students learn to understand, evaluate, and interpret the conceptual and methodological aspects of research in management and business ethics.
- 4) Develop the skills necessary to publish in and review for top-tier journals.

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) by Friday, August 14, 2015. 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	33%
Presentation	33%
Paper	34%

Grading Scale:

Pass	= 70% or above on all assignments
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, 4) reschedule exams, or 5) 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 exam/paper in light of these comments. Thus, your new grade may be higher or lower than the original grade.

PARTICIPATION (33%)

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.

PRESENTATION (33%)

Each student will prepare a conference-style presentation of a research project on Thursday, September 10. I will provide details during the week.

PAPER (34%)

Each student will send me a research paper for feedback by December 31, 2015. I will provide details during the week.

COURSE SCHEDULE

PART I: Foundations of the Field; Writing and Publishing Theory

Emphasis on understanding the publication and review process and “making a contribution”

Day 1, Morning.

1. Ragins, B. R. 2012. Editor's comments: Reflections on the craft of clear writing. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(4): 493-501.
2. Pollock, T. G., & Bono, J. E. 2013. From the Editors: Being Scheherazade: The importance of storytelling in academic writing. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56: 629-634.
3. Abrahamson, E. 2008. 22 things I hate: Mini-rants on management research. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 17: 422-425.
4. The Review Process: AMJ FTE 8; Feldman 1, 3, 4

PART II: Theoretical Foundations of Management and Business Ethics

Emphasis on developing rigorous theory and critiquing articles and work-in-progress

Day 1, Afternoon.

1. Suddaby, R. 2014. Editor's comments: Why theory? *Academy of Management Review*, 39: 407-411.
2. Whetten, D. A. 1989. What constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 490-495.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. Muller, A.R., Pfarrer, M.D., & Russell, S. An emotion-based theory of stakeholder management. Under 2nd review at the *Academy of Management Review*.

Day 2, Morning.

1. Rindova, V. P. 2008. Publishing theory when you are new to the game. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(2): 300-303.

2. Fulmer, I.S. 2012. Editor's comments: The craft of writing theory articles-variety and similarity in AMR. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(3): 327-331.
3. Haack, P., Pfarrer, M.D., & Scherer, A.G. 2014. Legitimacy-as-feeling: How affect leads to vertical legitimacy spillovers in transnational governance. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51: 634-666.
4. Muller, A.R., Pfarrer, M.D., & Little, L.M. 2014. A theory of collective empathy in corporate philanthropy decisions. *Academy of Management Review*, 39: 1-21.
5. Bundy, J., & Pfarrer, M.D. 2015. A burden of responsibility: The role of social approval at the onset of a crisis. *Academy of Management Review*, forthcoming.

PART III: Empirical Foundations of Management and Business Ethics

Emphasis on developing rigorous empirics and critiquing articles and work-in-progress

Day 2, Afternoon.

1. Publishing in AMJ: From the Editors 1 and 3
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. Hubbard, T., Pollock, T.G., Pfarrer, M.D., & Rindova, V.R. Too hot, too cold, or just right? The effects of celebrity and status on newly public firms. Under review at the *Academy of Management Journal*.

Day 3, Morning.

1. Publishing in AMJ: From the Editors 4, 5, and 7
2. 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.

3. Zavyalova, A., Pfarrer, M.D., Reger, R.K., & Hubbard, T.D. Reputation as a benefit *and* a burden? How organizational reputation affects low- and high-identification stakeholders' reactions to a negative event. Conditionally accepted at the *Academy of Management Journal*.
4. Halebian, J.M., Pfarrer, M.D., & Kiley, J. High-reputation firms and their differential acquisition behaviors. 2nd revise and resubmit at the *Strategic Management Journal*.

PART IV: Student Presentations and Feedback

Emphasis on presenting and critiquing in-progress research

Day 3, Afternoon + Day 4, Morning.