Paper Development Workshop

This version: 21.02.2018 (First official draft)

Course instructors

Name: **Prof. Dr. Oliver Alexy**

Room: 2011 (Entrepreneurship Center in Garching, Lichtenbergstr. 6)

Tel.: +49 89 289 52 803

e-mail: o.alexy@tum.de

Further instructors will be asked to join the course,
and may do so based on availability and interest

Application procedure

Goal and target audience

The goal of this course is to increase your odds of publishing in a top journal. What is a top journal? For this course, it will be the "Top 6" (AMJ, AMR, ASQ, ManSci, OrgSci, SMJ) and leading journals in other disciplines (e.g., AJS, ASR, MISQ, Nature, Science…). In turn, we will focus on what the requirements for publications in these journal are. Usually, this boils down primarily to one thing: how can I make a "theoretical contribution?"

We cordially invite applications from PhD students and post-docs who are the lead author on a paper targeted at a top journal. This paper has to be at least at working paper stage (i.e., a full and complete paper); no paper proposals will be accepted. Bringing an existing R&R, a paper previously rejected from a top journal, or a paper that has been presented at conferences before is highly encouraged. Topic-wise, preference will be given to candidates working in areas, in which we have expertise (roughly speaking: firm-level qualitative, quantitative, or conceptual papers fitting into the TIM, STR, OMT, or ENT divisions; no modelling; economics only as it fits the above journals). Given the purpose of this course, we are not interested in papers targeted at field journals (i.e., no papers targeted at Research Policy, Journal of Business Venturing, etc.).

This course will be highly interactive and feature intense, personal coaching. Accordingly, seating will be limited to about 8 people. Strict preference will be given to individuals who have received prior training in theory, theorizing, methodology, and the philosophy of science. Among PhD student applications, if otherwise qualified equally, we will prioritize individuals accepted to the Research Excellence Program.

Application process

Please submit to me by **31.03.2018**: a cover letter, a full, up-to-date academic resume, the paper you would like to bring into this course, any review(s) you have received previously. In your cover letter (2 pages max), please specify (1) the topic and state of your PhD thesis, (2) why and how you think that taking this specific course will help you become a better scholar, (3) what scholar you would like to become, (4) the history of your paper (where does it come from, where has it been), and your goals for the paper (where do you want to submit it, when, and why), and (5) why you think this paper can make a contribution, what that contribution is, and who would care. Please note that no feedback can be provided on applications that are turned down.

Course aims

What this course is

In this course, we want to enable PhD students and post-docs who have the ambition and basic training to become excellent researchers to take the next step and prepare them to engage with the brightest of their peers through publication in the leading journals of our discipline. In doing so, we want to enable our students not just to make contributions to their fields of study, but to participate in actively *shaping the discourse*, which is led first and foremost by the conversations going on in those journals.

Accordingly, in this course, we will focus on three things. First, we will re-establish what it means to make a contribution, and look into the process by which these are produced via academic journals. Second, we look how you can engage in this process, studying how you take on or rebut comments the revision process. Third, in 1:1 conversations, you will receive specific individual feedback on your paper and career plans. Finally, we will have students partake on a smaller scale in this discourse by discussing and presenting their work.

What this course is not
- An "introduction to theory/theorizing class" – if you do not know the key theories in your field and/or what a "contribution" is, you need additional training before you can benefit from this course.
- A "please fix my paper" course – while we will be generous with our feedback (and demand absolutely nothing in return), we can only help you make a good thing even better; we will not rewrite etc. for you
- A listening-only class – as should be clear by now, all the heavy-lifting will be done by you.

Course objectives

Knowledge Objectives

In this course, we strive to help you see what it takes to make a meaningful contribution that advances management scholarship broadly. In doing so, you should not only master your understanding of what "theory" and "contribution" are, but a clearer picture of the process by which they are created and evaluated.

Skills Objectives
- Improve diagnostic, analytical, an verbal skills via class and group discussions
- Enhance up critical thinking and interpretation skills
- Build-up or improve writing and review(er)-management skills

Learning Objectives

At the end of this course, students will be able to demonstrate understanding, critical assessment and application of the following:
- What makes for a good contribution for which audience, in which journal
- How to clearly convey that a paper is interesting
- How to navigate the journal submission processes

Preliminary schedule

All courses take place at the Entrepreneurship Research Institute (Building 5433) at Garching (Room 2001), from 9:00am-5:15 pm. Below are the topics and some guiding questions for the sessions.

Session	Date	Topic
1	04.05.2018	*Where you should be?* (workshop/course) - What are your papers and intended contributions? - How do you pick the right journal? - What is a contribution (to what journal)? - What is the contribution that I want to make? - How do I make that contribution? - How will that contribute to my career?
2	18.05.2018	*What can I make of it and how do I get there?* (workshop/course) - How do I convince people of my contribution? - How can others help me make a contribution? - How do I devise a strategy to improve my paper?
By individual appointment (week of June 4-8)		*Am I on the right track? (1:1 feedback session)* - How can I make my paper even better? - What is the story I want to tell more generally?
3	06.07.2018	*Am I there, or at least getting close(r)?* (presentation day) - Do people get the contribution I want to make? - Do people believe my research question and methods?

On day 1, we will begin with you introduction what you are doing, and link it to a recap of what a contribution is. From there, we will move to the role and ambition, of journals, the publication process, and academic careers.

On day 2, we will give one another preliminary feedback on the current versions of our respective papers. We will then think about how to respond to these comments, as well as reviewer comments more generally. For those of you who have an R&R, please to bring those to class. All others will be provided with original papers and reviewer letters. Based on these insights, we will develop (in-class) a "revision plan" for your current paper.

Armed with your ideas from the first two days, you will have a separate 1:1 meeting of up to two hours. In this meeting, we can discuss your paper, revision plan, and/or academic career ambitions

On day 3, each participant will have the opportunity to present their paper. All participants are expected to have read everyone else's revised paper in order to provide rich and meaningful feedback. Presentation & question time per presenter will be determined conditional upon the number of course participants, but will not be less than 45 minutes.

Core readings

You should have seen all of these works, repeatedly, in previous courses. Accordingly, we expect that you have read *all* of the following texts, *and* applied all knowledge contained therein to the work you will bring to class.

What makes a good contribution?
- Davis, M. 1971. That's interesting! *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 1: 309-344.
- Sutton, R. & Staw, B. 1995. What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 371-384.
- Weick, K. 1995. What theory is not, theorizing is. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 385-390.
- DiMaggio, P. 1995. Comments on "what theory is not." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 391-397.
- Bettis, R. A., Ethiraj, S., Gambardella, A., Helfat, C., & Mitchell, W. 2016. Creating repeatable

cumulative knowledge in strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 37(2): 257-261.

How can you organize to make a good contribution?
- Huff, A.S., 1999. Writing for scholarly publication. Sage

How do you actually make a good contribution?
- Colquitt, J.A. and George, G. (2011). Publishing in AMJ Part 1: Topic Choice, *Academy of Management Journal* 2011, Vol. 54, No. 3, 432–435.
- Bono, J.E. and McNamara, G. (2011). Publishing in AMJ —Part 2: Research Design, *Academy of Management Journal* 2011, Vol. 54, No. 4, 657–660.
- Grant, A.M. and Pollock, T.G. (2011). Publishing in AMJ — Part 3: Setting the Hook, *Academy of Management Journal* 2011, Vol. 54, No. 5, 873–879.
- Sparrowe, R.T. and Mayer, K.J. (2011). Publishing in AMJ — Part 4: Grounding Hypotheses, *Academy of Management Journal* 2011, Vol. 54, No. 6, 1098–1102.
- Zhang, Y.A. and Shaw, J.D. (2011). Publishing in AMJ — Part 5: Crafting the Methods and Results, *Academy of Management Journal* 2012, Vol. 55, No. 1, 8–12.
- Geletkanycz, M. and Corley, K. (2011). Publishing in AMJ – Part 6: Discussing the Implications, *Academy of Management Journal* 2012, Vol. 55, No. 2, 256–260.
- Bansal, P.T. and Corley, K. (2011). Publishing in AMJ — Part 7: What's Different about Qualitative Research?, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 55, No. 3, 509-513.
- George, G. 2012. Publishing in AMJ for non-U.S. Authors. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 55, No. 5, 1023-1026.

Course procedures

Have Fun
Contributing new theoretical insights to the academic debate *is the very core of our profession*. In turn, our goal is to equip you with the core set of skills that are necessary to do so. Applying principles of academic inquiry, rigorously and in the right context, is what any scholar *wants* to do! Put differently (and bluntly), if you do not enjoy the subject matter of this class, you might want to reconsider some of your career decisions.

Prepare and Participate Actively
To make this class a success for everyone, we need you to prepare for class and participate in *every session*. Week. We highly recommended that you prepare notes in sufficient detail to enable your regular participation in the discussion. You are encouraged to prepare for class with your colleagues, however, each member of the class should be fully conversant in the material — expect to be cold-called in class. For example, you should be able to outline the topic that each reading addresses, describe its core points, and explain how it links to what you know, what you have learnt in other PhD classes, and to your paper.

Give feedback
Your feedback – in class or in private – on any aspect of this course is welcome at any time. It can help make this course an excellent experience for you and for us. We encourage you to contact us via email and we will respond as soon as possible (usually within the same day the email is received). If you wish to see one of us in person, please let us know so that we can prepare. Come prepared.

Assessment

For participants, the course will be worth 4 ECTS, and feature at least 22.5 presence hours.

Given the completely interactive nature of this course, attendance and participation are mandatory, and not properly excused absence or poor preparation will immediately lead to your being excluded from the course. In addition, note how you will be pass-fail graded on this course based on four elements:

- Your homework and its presentation for Day 1 and 2:
    - **Day 1: Be prepared to answer the following questions:**
        - What are the conversations that I want to contribute to?
        - What is the state of the art in that conversation? What is the best possible answer existing for my research question?
        - How does my research question promise to lead to non-trivial insights beyond that research question?
        - What is the key argument I am putting forward?
        - What is my empirical approach, and why is it solid?
        - What is my actual contribution?
        - What is the best possible alternative explanation for my results & contribution? Why am I sure that I can rule it out?
        - Whose socks am I knocking off with that contribution? Why?
        - Throughout my paper, which theories am I interacting with explicitly and implicitly? Which of these do I extend, where do I only borrow?
    - **Day 2: Prepare in writing, submit to me before class, and bring to class:**
        - In your view, what is the weakest part about my own paper? Why?
        - If you have reviews: what are the core points my reviewers are making? Why?
            - If you do not have reviews for your own paper, you will be provide a paper with reviews. You should be to answer both preceding sets of questions for that paper.
        - You will also be given a paper from one of your peers. In your own words, state what you think the three best and the three weakest things about that paper are. Be clear about why you think the good things are good, and the weak things are weak.
        - How would you go about fixing the weak things? Be as constructive as possible, but do not shy away from saying – "this project needs to be done again" if that is your honest opinion! Do NOT share your feedback with the paper author before class.
- Your presentation on Day 3. **Note: you must submit (to me) (a) your presentation at least on the day before the presentation day and (b) your revised paper at least 7 days before (on June 30).**
- Your interaction throughout the course, and in particular your comments (quality!) to other participants
- Your overall progress, as evidenced by improvements of the paper you submitted with your application to an **updated version, which you will have to submit three weeks (sharp) after Day 3 (on July 27).** If you want to make sure that I understand what you updated, feel free to attach an accompanying letter explaining your updates (and, possibly, to lay out why you updated some parts, but not others)

You will need to pass all four elements individually in order to pass this course. Yes, I do fail people.