This Course Syllabus Provides a General Plan For The Course;

Deviations May Be Necessary

INSTRUCTOR:

Name:	Dr. Arun Rai
Office:	Robinson College of Business, 35 Broad Street, 4th Floor, Room 423
Phone:	404-413-7857 (Office)
Email:	arunrai@gsu.edu
Web site:	http://arunrai.us
Office Hours:	By appointment

REQUIRED TEXTBOOKS AND MATERIALS

- Van de Ven, A. H., Engaged Scholarship: A Guide for Organizational and Social Research, Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Huff, Anne S., Writing for Scholarly Publications, Sage Publications, 1999.
- Scholarly journal articles as listed in the syllabus and as announced in class

RECOMMENDED BOOKS

- Smith, K. G., & Hitt, M. A. (Eds.). (2005). *Great Minds in Management: The Process of Theory Development*. Oxford University Press on Demand.
- Venkatesh, V., *Road to Success: A Guide for Doctoral Students and Junior Faculty Members in the Behavioral and Social Sciences*, (Please order from https://vvenkatesh.com/book/ to obtain discounted student rate.)
- Weston, A., *Rulebook for Arguments*, Hackett Publishing, 3rd edition, 2000.
- Strunk, W., and White, E.B., Elements of Style, Longman, 4th edition, 1999.
- Young, J., *Techniques for Producing Ideas*, McGraw-Hill, 2003. (Kindle version available.)

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Students develop an understanding about developing theory and about its critical role in surfacing a theoretical and practical contribution. They understand how to formulate problems to develop compelling research questions. They learn about the key elements of a theory and the approaches to build a theory. They understand the distinctions between process and variance models and between different types of process and variance models. They learn how to achieve correspondence between logical arguments and the specification of the different elements of a model including constructs, measures, functional forms of relationships, assumptions, and boundary conditions. They develop an understanding about how to leverage context and time in the theory building process, and also about the roles of multi-dimensional constructs and multi-level models in theory development. Cumulatively, they develop the skills and understanding to formulate a problem and specify research questions, synthesize the relevant literatures, build a theory, and specify a model and to achieve correspondence between these essential elements.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

At the conclusion of the course, students should be able to:

1. Understand the challenges and strategies to develop a theoretical contribution, and to achieve rigor and relevance in research.
2. Formulate a research problem, specify research objectives/questions and motivate their importance.
3. Synthesize the literature and surface the gaps in knowledge related to the research question.
4. Differentiate process and variance models, and align the type of model with the research question and the informing theoretical lens
5. Specify the key elements of process and variance models and achieve correspondence between theoretical arguments and model specification
6. Conceptualize multidimensional constructs and develop multi-level models
7. Define the role of context in the research process and leverage in the theory development process
8. Evaluate the role of time in the definition of constructs and the nature of the relationships
9. Understand the process of communicating and using research knowledge
10. Critique research proposals and manuscripts from a theoretical perspective

CLASS PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION OF "SYNTHESIS" SLIDES

The course will be run in a seminar format that will include discussion. Students will be called upon to lead the discussion on the topic being covered and all students are expected to participate actively in the discussion. **They should thoroughly read all assigned readings prior to class, prepare a synthesis of the readings, and submit the synthesis PowerPoint slides by noon on the day of the class**.

The PowerPoint slides are to be submitted through the *iCollege System*. Dropbox folders have been set up for each session. Please (1) consolidate all slides for a given session into one PowerPoint file and (2) use the following file name nomenclature: *Last Name+_First Name+_Month+_Date, for example, Rai_Arun_January_16.*

The class will also include in-class and take-home individual and group exercises on the development of various types of variance and process models.

RESEARCH PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT

<u>Process</u>

Students will use a **staged approach** to develop a research proposal. They will be provided feedback on the deliverable at each stage (which also includes revisions to the previous stage's deliverable and a response document – a summary of major changes that were made and point-by-point responses to issues that were raised). At the end of the semester, they will submit the research proposal as the deliverable for the course. The final deliverable is graded while the intermediate stages receive feedback but are not graded.

Stages	Deliverable
Stage 1 **Due: 1/30, 5:00 pm** • Problem Statement • Form of Engaged Scholarship • Candidate Journals	Describe the research problem, enumerate why the problem is important from both a practical and scholarly standpoint, and specify the research objectives/questions (1 page). Identify the Engaged Scholarship approach that will be used and explain the reasons for the choice (0.5 page). Identify candidate scholarly journals that are likely to be suitable targets for the research and explain why these can be suitable outlets (0.5 page). *Articles from these journals should serve as exemplars for the approach taken to develop the proposal.*
Stage 2 **Due: 3/6, 5:00 pm** • Literature Synthesis	Synthesize the ~ **10-15 major articles** that are relevant to the problem and research questions, clearly articulating what is known and the gaps in knowledge pertaining to the problem that motivate the research (3 pages).
Stage 3 **Due: 4/24, 5:00 pm** • Role of theory • Type of model • Model specification	Specify the role of existing theory for the research. What theories will be used to inform the study? Why? (1 page). Specify if a process or variance approach will be used for the study and justify the choice (0.5 page). Develop the key elements of the process or variance model. Ensure that there is correspondence between the theoretical arguments and the specification of the model (3-4 pages, including figures and tables).

Submission Instructions

1. For each stage, create one integrated Word document with all deliverables collated in the document and without track changes.
2. Name your Word document file Last Name + space + First Name + Stage n, where n will be 1, 2 or 3.
3. Log into icollege.gsu.edu and upload your assignment to the appropriate Dropbox—for example, upload your Stage 1 deliverable to the Dropbox folder named Stage 1 deliverable.

<u>**Final Research Proposal Instructions**</u>

Your final proposal is due on 4/24 by 5:00 pm EST.   This is a hard deadline—late submissions will not be accepted.

1. **Please submit one integrated Word document through the Dropbox for Stage 3 set up at icollege.gsu.edu.**
2. **Provide all references at the end of the document and use in-text citations as you see in journal articles.**
3. On the first page, provide your responses to how you addressed my comments from the last round (Stage 2).
4. Your document must **not** include track changes or comments from previous stages.
5. Your complete submission will need to include a) a revised version of your problem statement and research question, b) a revised version of your literature synthesis, and c) the role of theory and the development of a variance or process model.
6. For the last section on the role of theory and development of a variance or process model, please include the following:
     i. Specification of whether you are developing a process or variance model, with your reasons for the choice.
    ii. Discussion of how the literature and/or theories inform the selection and definition of constructs and the overall logic of the model.
   iii. A figure showing the constructs and their relationships
    iv. Specification of the key elements of the process or variance model. This will include the following: (a) a table of definition of constructs, (b) plausible relationships among the constructs (this may include formal hypotheses or propositions) and (c) the reasons underlying the plausible relationships.

GRADING

There are three components to grade assessment:

Component	Criteria	Percentage
PowerPoint "Synthesis" slides	• **Synthesis quality** • "Meets Expectation": 8.5 out of 10 (Very good performance) • Adjustments will be made to the Meets Expectations anchor if performance is (1) exceptional or (2) below expectation.	25%
In-class Participation	• **Quality *and* quantity** of participation • "Meets Expectation": 8.5/10 (Very good performance) • Adjustments will be made to the "Meets Expectation" anchor when performance is (1) exceptional or (2) below expectation. • Quantity of participation does not substitute for quality.	25%
Research Proposal	• Although a staged approach will be used to provide developmental feedback, **only Stage 3 (final proposal) will be graded**.	50%

Synthesis Slides Grading

The slides will be graded using the following rubric:

Excellent (10.0 out 10): (1) Key concepts in assigned materials effectively captured, (2) thoughtful integration of concepts across materials achieved, and (3) thought-provoking, well-motivated take-away is identified.

Meets expectation (8.5 out of 10): Key concepts in assigned materials well captured—that is, work is well done.

Below expectation (7.5 out of 10): Significant issues or several minor flaws in conceptual understanding and the quality of work—that is, work is while effort has been invested, the work does not meet expectations.

Work not submitted (0 out of 10): The work was not submitted when it was due.

In-class Participation

A PhD seminar is only effective when participants have carefully read and synthesized the assigned readings prior to class and are prepared to contribute to the class discussion. Individuals will be "cold called" to contribute to the discussion.

Both the quantity of comments (i.e. how many times a student speaks) and, more importantly, the quality of the comments are important. The quality of your comments is assessed using the following criteria:

- Does the comment represent a solid understanding of concepts or just a reiteration of what is stated in an article?
- Does the comment address the question currently on the floor, or is it way off the mark?
- Does the comment demonstrate an ability to listen to and build from what others have said?
- Is the point made concisely, or is it buried in a long, rambling, diatribe?
- Does the comment connect the discussion to an important related area or does it just rephrase what others have said?
- If "cold called," was the individual prepared?
- Does the comment reflect constructive disagreement?
- Does the comment represent regard, respect and acknowledgment of other's contributions?

The following participatory patterns will be viewed negatively:
- Lack of involvement - silence, detachment or disinterest
- Leading the discussion into unrelated topics
- Spending undue amount of time on minor points
- Long, rambling comments
- Being absent or unprepared, or passing on a cold call

Class participation will be graded as 10 (excellent), 8.5 (meets expectations), and 7.5 (below expectation).

Final Course Grade

Final grades for the course will be based on a normal 100% scale and will be determined by adding up the points earned. The overall grading scale for the course is as follows:

Letter grade	Quality Pts Earned	Range	Meaning
A	4.0	> 94	Excellent; hard to improve upon
A-	3.7	89-93	Very professional
B+	3.3	87-88	Above normal professional expectations
B	3.0	83-86	Expected professional performance
B-	2.7	79-82	Slightly below what would be professionally expected
C+	2.3	77-78	Significant flaws or multiple minor flaws, but generally acceptable
C	2.0	73-76	Significant flaws that require professional rework to be acceptable
C-	1.7	69-72	Several significant and minor flaws that border on unacceptable professional work
D	1.0	60's	Unacceptable; salvageable only with significant effort to remedy the nature and multitude of flaws
F	0.0	< 60	Reject; well below minimal expectations

"W" and "WF" will be accorded as per university policies to students that qualify for such grades.

(10 sessions of 4 hours each; * indicates skim as an example/potential future resource as will be discussed in class)

MM/DD	Topics	Reading Assignments	Deliverables
SESSION 1: INTRODUCTION			
1/9	**Overview of the course** • Introduction to Engaged Scholarship • Scholarship as conversation • Roles of problem, theory, and methods in generating scholarly contribution	• Van de Ven, Chapter 1 • Huff, Chapters 1-2	• **10 slides synthesizing** Van de Ven Chapter 1 plus the Whetten, Sutton and Staw, Weick, DiMaggio and Bacharach articles. • **Use the 10th slide** to state **three** interesting (and important) questions based on the readings.
1/9	**Foundations of theory building** • What theory is (and is not) • Theorizing • Terms of a theory • Theoretical contribution	• Bacharach (1989) • DiMaggio (1995) • Sutton & Staw (1995) • Weick (1995) • Whetten (1989)	
SESSION 2: PROBEM FORMULATION			
1/16	**Formulating the Problem and Research Question** • Business problem vs. Scientific problem Identifying gaps in knowledge (but being cautious about the criticisms of gap-spotting, sans importance, research objectives) • Problemitization of assumptions • Motivating and formulating research objectives/questions	*Concepts* • Van de Ven, Chapter 3 • Alvesson & Sandberg (2011) • Rai (2017) • Simon (1980) *Examples of problem formulation* • Brown and Drake (2014)* • Cardinals & Yin (2015)* • Haumann et al. (2015)* • Rai et al. (2009)* • Shang et al. (2009)* • Venkatesh et al. (2016)* • Wolfe et al. (2002)* *Additional resources- problem formulation* • Weber (2003)	• **9 slides synthesizing the following**: (1) Van de Ven, Chapter 3; (2) Simon, 1980, (3) Alvesson and Sandberg, 2011, and (4) Weber 2003. • **10th (last) slide:** state **one** key take-away/implication of the readings for your project/research.

MM/DD	Topics	Reading Assignments	Deliverables
1/16	**Ideation on research proposal – Take 1**	• Recipe form -- in-class exercise	**Complete the recipe form before class — do not submit**
SESSION 3: THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTION; SYNTHESIZING THE LITERATURE			
1/23	**Types of theoretical contribution (based on emphasis on theory development vs. theory testing)**	• Colquitt & Zapatta-Phelan (2007)	• **6 slides synthesizing** (1) Colquitt & Zapatta-Phelan) (1 slide) and (2) the six articles on *Approaches to Achieving Theoretical Contribution* (5 slides).
1/23	**Approaches to achieve theoretical contribution** • Perspectives on "interesting questions," "sticky papers," and "rigor vs. relevance,"	• Barley (2006) • Bergh (2003) • Corley & Gioia (2011) • Huber (2008) • Lee (1999) • Rynes (2002) *Additional resources- Achieving contribution* • Benbasat & Zmud (1999) • Feldman (2004a) • Zmud (1996)	• **3 slides synthesizing** (1) LaPine and King (2) Webster and Watson (2002) and (3) Bern (1995).
1/23	**Synthesizing the literature** • Concept-based synthesis • Surfacing the gaps in understanding relative to the problem and question as formulated, or a perspective taken on a phenomenon • Meta-analysis	• Techniques: Handouts - Indiana University, North Carolina State University • Bem (1995) • LePine & King (2010) • Webster & Watson (2002) *Examples of literature synthesis* • Ahuja et al. (2008)* • Alavi & Leidner (2001)* • Carter and Hodgson (2006)* • Cascio & Aguinis (2008)* • Cropanzano & Mitchell (2005)* • Eisenhardt (1989)* • Haumann et al. (2015)* • Niazkhani et al. (2009)* • Wade (2004)*	• **10th (last) slide:** state **one** key take-away/implication of the readings for your project/research. • **Submit a consolidated deck of 10 slides**
1/23	**Choices that Make Publication More Likely**	• Huff, Chapters 3-5	• In-class discussion

MM/DD	Topics	Reading Assignments	Deliverables
1/23	**Ideation of research proposal – Take 2**		• **2 slides on your *proposed* Stage 1 Research Proposal** • What is the problem, why is it important, what aspect(s) will you investigate, what is the question • **Do not submit these slides; please them with you for in-class discussion**
<td colspan="4" align="center">**1/30: STAGE 1 RESEARCH PROPOSAL DUE**</td>
<td colspan="4" align="center">**SESSION 4: BUILDING A THEORY**</td>
2/6	**Building a theory** • Abduction, deduction, induction • Terms of a theory • Ladder of abstraction • Propositions and hypotheses • Structure of arguments • Logical validity • Defining the *what, how, why* and the *who, when, where* elements	• Van de Ven, Chapter 4	• **6 slides synthesizing** Van de Ven, Chapter 4 • **1 slide synthesizing** Suddaby • **2 slides synthesizing** Okhuysen and Bonardi • **10th (last) slide:** state **one** key take-away/implication of the readings for your project/research.
2/6	**Construct clarity**	• Suddaby (2010)	
2/6	**Building theory by combining lenses**	• Okhuysen & Bonardi (2011)	• **Submit a consolidated deck of 10 slides**
2/6	**Building a theory**	• *In-class exercise*	
<td colspan="4" align="center">**SESSION 5: VARIANCE VS. PROCESS MODELS; WRITING THEORY/EMPIRICAL ARTICLES**</td>
2/13	**Differentiating between variance and process models**	• Van de Ven, Chapter 5	• **4 slides synthesizing** Van de Ven, Chapter 5
2/13	**Writing theory articles**	• Fulmer (2012) • Rivard (2014)	• **2 slides synthesizing** Fulmer & Rivard
2/13	**Writing empirical articles**	• Bem (2003) • Feldman (2004b) • Huff, Chapters 6 - 11	• **3 slides synthesizing** Bem, Feldman, and Huff, chapters 6-11. • **10th (final) slide:** state **one** key take-away/implication of the readings for your

MM/DD	Topics	Reading Assignments	Deliverables
			project/research. • **Submit a consolidated deck of 10 slides**
2/13	**Formulating variance and process questions for the <u>same</u> problem or phenomenon**	• *In-class exercise*	
SESSION 6: DEVELOPING VARIANCE MODELS			
2/20	**Achieving correspondence of theoretical arguments and the specification of variance models** • Alternative forms of fit • Moderation • Mediation • Moderated-mediation, mediated-moderation • Nonlinear relationships (e.g., threshold effects; U; inverted-U; Quadratic moderation)	• Van de Ven, Chapter 6 • Venkatraman (1989) ***Examples of Variance Models*** • Brown & Drake (2014)* • Cardinals & Yin (2015)* • Feng et al. (2015)*. • Haumann et al. (2015)* • Overby (2008)* • Venkatesh et al. (2016)* • Xue (2011)*	• **6 slides synthesizing** Van de Ven, Chapter 6. • **3 slides synthesizing** Venkatraman (1989) • **10th (final) slide:** state **<u>one</u>** key take-away/implication of the readings for your project/research. • **Submit a consolidated deck of 10 slides**
2/20	**Developing variance models**	• *In-class exercise*	
SESSION 7: DEVELOPING PROCESS MODELS			
2/27	**Theorizing process models**	• Van de Ven, Chapter 7 • Pentland (2003) (Please review p. 528-532) ***Examples*** • Maitlis & Ozcelik (2004)* • Montealegre (2002)* ***Additional Resources on Process Models*** • Langley (1999) • Sabherwal & Robey (1993) • Van de Ven & Poole (1995)	• **5 slides synthesizing** Van de Ven, Chapter 7 • **2 slides synthesizing** Pentland • **8th (final) slide**: state **<u>one</u>** key take-away/implication of the readings for your project/research. • **Submit a consolidated deck of 8 slides**
2/27	**Developing process models**	• *In-class exercise*	
3/6: STAGE 2 RESEARCH PROPOSAL DUE (includes revisions to Stage 1 and response document)			

MM/DD	Topics	Reading Assignments	Deliverables
**SESSION 8: DEVELOPING MULTILEVEL MODELS**
3/20	**Developing multilevel theories**	• Chan (1998) • Klein et al. (1994) • Klein & Kozlowski (2000) (p. 211-221) • Rousseau (2011) • Zhang and Gable (2017) *Examples* • Burton-Jones & Gallivan (2007)* • Rai et al. (2009)* *Additional Resources on Multilevel Theorizing* • Klein et al. (1999) • Mathieu & Chen (2011) • Morgeson & Hofmann (1999)	• **9 slides synthesizing** Klein et al. (1994); Klein & Kozlowski (2000, 211-221); Chan (1998), Rousseau (2011), Zhang & Gable (2017). • **10th (final) slide**: state **one** key take-away/implication of the readings for your project/research. • **Submit a consolidated deck of 10 slides**
3/20	**Developing multilevel models**	*In-class exercise*	
**SESSION 9: LEVERAGING CONTEXT AND TIME IN THEORY DEVELOPMENT**
3/27	**Leveraging context in theory development**	• Bamberger & Pratt (2010) • Johns (2006) • Johns (2017) *Examples* • Hong et al. (2013)* • Klein & Rai (2009)* • Venkatesh et al. (2016)* *Additional Resources on Context in Theorizing* • Alvesson & Karreman (2007) • Locke (2007)	• **5 slides synthesizing** Bamberger & Pratt (2010), Johns (2006) and Johns (2017) • **6th slide**: state **one** key take-away/implication of the readings on context for your project/research.
3/27	**Leveraging time in theory development**	• Ancona et al. (2001) • Mitchell & James (2001) *Examples* • Chiu et al. (2013)* • Romanelli & Tushman (1994)* • Shipp et al. (2009)* • Venkatesh et al. (2006)* *Additional Recommendations on Time in*	• **5 slides synthesizing** Mitchell & James, and Ancona et al. • **6th slide:** state **one** key take-away/implication of the readings on time for your project/research. • **Submit one consolidated 12-slide deck**

MM/DD	Topics	Reading Assignments	Deliverables (context, 6 slides; time, 6 slides)
		Theorizing • Bluedorn & Denhardt (1988)	
3/27	**Leveraging context, time**	*In-class exercise*	
SESSION 10: MULTIPLE PARADIGMS AND PARADOX; TYPOLOGIES; MULTIDIMENSIONAL CONSTRUCTS			
4/10	**Leveraging multiple paradigms and paradox for theory development**	• Lewis & Grimes (1999) • Poole & Van de Ven (1989)	• **5 slides synthesizing the following:** Lewis & Grimes and Pool & Van de Ven articles.
4/10	**Typologies as a form of theory building**	• Doty & Glick (1994)	• **2 slides synthesizing** Doty & Glick
4/10	**Specifying multidimensional constructs**	• Law et al. (1998)	• **2 slides** on Law et al.
		Additional Recommendations on Construct Specification • Jarvis et al. (2003) • Petter et al. (2007) • Wong et al. (2008)	• **10th (final) slide**: state **one** key take-away/implication of the readings for your project/research. • **Submit a consolidated deck of 10 slides**
4/10	**Developing typologies, multidimensional constructs**	*In-class exercise*	
SESSION 10: WRAP-UP			
4/10	**Communicating and Using Research Knowledge Practicing Engaged Scholarship**	• Van de Ven, Chapter 8 & 9	
4/24: STAGE 3 RESEARCH PROPOSAL DUE (includes revisions and responses to comments on Stage 2)			

Bibliography

Ahuja, G., Lampert, C. M., & Tandon, V. 2008. Chapter 1: Moving Beyond Schumpeter: Management Research on the Determinants of Technological Innovation. *Academy of Management Annals*, 2(1): 1-98.

Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. 2001. Review: Knowledge Management And Knowledge Management Systems: Conceptual Foundations And Research Issues. *MIS Quarterly*, 25(1): 107-136.

Alvesson, M., & Karreman, D. A. N. 2007. Constructing Mystery: Empirical Matters in Theory Development. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4): 1265-1281.

Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. 2011. Generating Research Questions through Problematization. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(2): 247-271.

Ancona, D. G., Goodman, P. S., Lawrence, B. S., & Tushman, M. L. 2001. Time: A New Research Lens. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(4): 645-563.

Bacharach, S. B. 1989. Organizational Theories: Some Criteria for Evaluation. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4): 496-515.

Bamberger, P. A., & Pratt, M. G. 2010. Moving Forward by Looking Back: Reclaiming Unconventional Research Contexts and Samples in Organizational Scholarship. *Academy of Management Journal*, *53*(4): 665–671.

Barley, S. R. 2006. When I Write My Masterpiece: Thoughts on What Makes A Paper Interesting. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(1): 16-20.

Bem, D. J. 1995. Writing a review article for Psychological Bulletin. *Psychological Bulletin*, 118(2): 172-177.

Benbasat, I., & Zmud, R. W. 1999. Empirical Research in Information Systems: The Practice of Relevance. *MIS Quarterly*, 23(1): 3-16.

Bergh, D. D. 2003. From the Editors Thinking Strategically about Contribution. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(2): 135-136.

Bluedorn, A. C. & Denhardt, R. B. 1988. Time and Organizations. *Journal of Management,* 14(2): 299-320.

Brown, J.L., & Drake, K.D., 2013. Network Ties among Low-tax Firms. *The Accounting Review*, 89(2): 483-510.

Burton-Jones, A., & Gallivan, M. J. 2007. Toward A Deeper Understanding of System Usage in Organizations: A Multilevel Perspective. *MIS Quarterly*, 31(4): 657-679.

Cardinaels, E., & Yin, H. 2015. Think Twice Before Going for Incentives: Social Norms and the Principal's Decision on Compensation Contracts. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 53(5): 985-1015.

Carter, R., & Hodgson, G.M. 2006. The Impact of Empirical Tests of Transaction Cost Economics on the Debate on the Nature of the Firm, *Strategic Management Journal,* 27(5): 461-476

Cascio, W. F., & Aguinis, H. 2008. Chapter 3: Staffing Twenty-first-century Organizations. *Academy of Management Annals*, 2(1): 133-165.

Chan, D. 1998. Functional Relations among Constructs in the Same Content Domain at Different Levels of Analysis: A Typology of Composition Models. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2): 234-246.

Chiu, P.C., Teoh, S.H., & Tian, F., 2012. Board Interlocks and Earnings Management Contagion. *The Accounting Review*, 88(3): 915-944.

Corley, K. G., & Gioia, D. A. 2011. Building Theory about Theory Building: What Constitutes a Theoretical Contribution? *Academy of Management Review*, 36(1): 12-32.

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M.S. 2005. Social Exchange Theory: An Interdisciplinary Review. *Joural of Management*, 31(6): 874-900

DiMaggio, P. J. 1995. Comments on "What Theory is Not", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(3): 391-397.

Doty, D. H., Glick, W. H., & Glick, W. H. 1994. Typologies As a Unique Form Of Theory Building: Toward Improved Understanding and Modeling. *Academy of Management Review*, 19(2): 230-251.

Eisenhardt, K.M. 1989. Agency Theory: An Assessment and Review, *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1): 57-74

Feldman, D. C. 2004a. What are We Talking About When We Talk About Theory? *Journal of Management*, 30(5): 565-567.

Feldman, D. C. 2004b. Being A Developmental Reviewer: Easier Said Than Done, *Journal of Management*, 30(2): 161-164.

Feng, H., Morgan, N. A., & Rego, L. L. 2015. Marketing Department Power and Firm Performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 79(5): 1-20.

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.

Haumann, T., Güntürkün, P., Schons, L. M., & Wieseke, J. 2015. Engaging Customers in Coproduction Processes: How Value-Enhancing and Intensity-Reducing Communication Strategies Mitigate the Negative Effects of Coproduction Intensity. *Journal of Marketing*, 79(6): 17-33.

Hong, W., Chan, F. K., Thong, J. Y., Chasalow, L. C., & Dhillon, G. 2013. A Framework and Guidelines for Context-Specific Theorizing in Information Systems Research. *Information Systems Research*, 25(1): 111-136.

Huber, J. 2008. The Value of Sticky Articles. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 45(3): 257-260.

Jarvis, C. B., Mackenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., Mick, D. G., & Bearden, W. O. 2003. A Critical Review of Construct Indicators and Measurement Model Misspecification in Marketing and Consumer Research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30(2): 199-218.

Johns, G. 2006. The Essential Impact of Context On Organizational Behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(2): 386-408.

Johns, G. 2017. Reflections on the 2016 Decade Award: Incorporating Context in Organizational Research. *Academy of Management Review***,** 42(4), 577-595.

Klein, K. J., Dansereau, F., & Hall, R. I. 1994. Levels Issues In Theory Development, Data Collection, And Analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 19(2): 195-229.

Klein, K. J., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. 2000. From Micro to Meso: Critical Steps in Conceptualizing and Conducting Multilevel Research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 3(3): 211-236.

Klein, R., & Rai, A. 2009. Interfirm Strategic Information Flows In Logistics Supply Chain Relationships. *MIS Quarterly*, 33(4): 735-762.

Klein, K. J., Tosi, H., & Cannella Jr, A. A. 1999. Multilevel Theory Building: Benefits, Barriers, And New Developments. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(2): 248-248.

Langley, A. 1999. Strategies For Theorizing From Process Data. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(4): 691-710.

Law, K. S., Chi-Sum, W., & Mobley, W. M. 1998. Toward A Taxonomy Of Multidimensional Constructs. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(4): 741-755.

Lee, A. 1999. Strategizing for Compelling and Significant Research. *MIS Quarterly*, 23(2): 145-145.

LePine, & King, A. W. 2010. Editors' Comments: Developing Novel Theoretical Insight From Reviews Of Existing Theory And Research. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(4): 506–509.

Lewis, M. W., & Grimes, A. I. 1999. Metatriangulation: Building Theory From Multiple Paradigms. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(4): 672-690.

Locke, E. A. 2007. The Case for Inductive Theory Building. *Journal of Management*, 33(6): 867-890.

Maitlis, S., & Ozcelik, H. 2004. Toxic Decision Processes: A Study of Emotion and Organizational Decision Making. *Organization Science*, 15(4): 375-393.

Mathieu, J. E., & Chen, G., 2011. The Etiology of the Multilevel Paradigm in Management Research. *Journal of Management*, 37(2): 610-641.

Mitchell, T. R., & James, L. R. 2001. Building Better Theory: Time And The Specification Of When Things Happen. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(4): 530-547.

Montealegre, R. 2002. A Process Model of Capability Development: Lessons from the Electronic Commerce Strategy at Bolsa de Valores de Guayaquil. *Organization Science*, 13(5): 514-531.

Morgeson, F. P., & Hofmann, D. A. 1999. The Structure And Function Of Collective Constructs: Implications For Multilevel Research And Theory Development. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(2): 249-265.

Niazkhani, Z., Pirnejad, H., Berg, M., & Aarts, J. 2009. The Impact of Computerized Provider Order Entry Systems on Inpatient Clinical Workflow: A Literature Review. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 16(4): 539-549.

Okhuysen, G., & Bonardi, J.-P. 2011. The Challenges of Building Theory by Combining Lenses. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(1): 6-11.

Overby, E. 2008. Process Virtualization Theory and the Impact of Information Technology. *Organization Science*, 19(2): 277-291.

Pentland, B. T. 2003. Sequential Variety in Work Processes. *Organization Science*, 14(5): 528-540.

Petter, S., Straub, D., & Rai, A. 2007. Specifying Formative Constructs In Information Systems Research. *MIS Quarterly*, 31(4): 623-656.

Poole, M. S., & Van de Ven, A. H. 1989. Using Paradox to Build Management and Organization Theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4): 562-578.

Rai, A., Editorial: Avoiding Type III Errors: Formulating IS Research Problems that Matter, *MIS Quarterly*, 42(2), 2017, iii-vii.

Rai, A., Maruping, L. M., & Venkatesh, V. 2009. Offshore Information Systems Project Success: The Role Of Social Embeddedness And Cultural Characteristics. *MIS Quarterly*, 33(3): 617-641.

Rivard, S. 2014. **The Ions of Theory Construction** *MIS Quarterly* (38:2), pp. iii-xiii.

Romanelli, E. & Tushman, M. L. 1994. Organizational Transformation as Punctuated Equilibrium: An Empirical Test. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 37(5): 1141-1666.

Rousseau, D. M. 2011. Reinforcing the Micro/Macro Bridge: Organizational Thinking and Pluralistic Vehicles. *Journal of Management*, 37(2): 429-442.

Rynes, S. 2002. Some Reflections on Contribution. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45 (2): 311-313

Sabherwal, R. & Robey, D. 1993. An Empirical Taxonomy of Implementation Processes Based on Sequences of Events in Information System Development. *Organization Science*, 4(4): 548-576.

Shang, J., Yildirim, T. P., Tadikamalla, P., Mittal, V., & Brown, L. H. 2009. Distribution Network Redesign for Marketing Competitiveness. *Journal of Marketing*, 73(2): 146-163.

Shipp, A. J., Edwards, J. R., & Lambert, L. S. 2009. Conceptualization and Measurement of Temporal Focus: The Subjective Experience of the Past, Present, and Future. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 110(1): 1-22.

Simon, H. 1980. Random Thoughts about Methods of Research. Pittsburgh, *Unpublished Manuscript*, Carnegie Mellon University: 1-10.

Suddaby, R. 2010. Editor's Comments: Construct Clarity in Theories of Management and Organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(3): 1-13.

Sutton, R. I., & Staw, B. M. 1995. What Theory is Not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(3): 371-384.

Van de Ven, A. H. & Pool, M. S. 1995. Explaining Development and Change in Organizations. *Academy of Management Review,* 20(3): 510-540.

Venkatesh, V., Maruping, L. M., & Brown, S. 2006. Role of Time in Self-Prediction of Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* 100(2): 160-176.

Venkatesh, V., Rai, A., Sykes, T.A., & Aljafari, R. 2016. Combating Infant Mortality in Rural India: Evidence From A Field Study of EHealth Kiosk Implementations. *MIS Quarterly, forthcoming*.

Venkatraman, N. 1989. The Concept of Fit in Strategy Research: Toward Verbal and Statistical Correspondence. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(3): 423-444.

Wade, M., & Hulland, J. 2004. Review: The Resource-based View and Information Systems Research: Review, Extension, and Suggestions for Future Research. *MIS Quarterly*, 28(1): 107-142

Weber, R. 2003. The Problem of the Problem. *MIS Quarterly*, 27(1): 1-1.

Webster, J., & Watson, R.T. 2002. Analyzing the Past to Prepare for the Future: Writing a Literature Review. *MIS Quarterly*, 26(2): 3.

Weick, K. E. 1995. What Theory Is Not, Theorizing Is. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(3): 385-390.

Whetten, D. A. 1989. What Constitutes A Theoretical Contribution? *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4): 490-495.

Wolfe, R. M., Sharp, L. K., & Lipsky, M. S. 2002. Content and Design Attributes of Antivaccination Web Sites. *The Journal of American Medical Association*, 287(24): 3245-3248.

Wong, C.S., Law, K. S., & Huang, G.H. 2008. On the Importance of Conducting Construct-Level Analysis for Multidimensional Constructs in Theory Development and Testing. *Journal of Management*, 34(4): 744-764.

Xue, L., Ray, G., & Bin, G., 2011, Environmental Uncertainty and IT Infrastructure Governance: A Curvilinear Relationship, *Information Systems Research*, 22(2): 389-399.

Zhang, M., and Gable, G., 2017, A Systematic Framework for Multilevel Theorizing in Information Systems Research, *Information Systems Research*, 28(2): 203-224.

Zmud, B., & Ives, B. 1996. Editor's Comments. *MIS Quarterly*, 20(3): 257-257.