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|  |
| --- |
| **Cruising past the scrutiny. Toward a general theory of social exchanges in issue settlements (Aula B)** |
| Claudio Biscaro(WU Vienna) | 25.02.2019 | 12:30-14:00 | Monday |
| This study examines the heated debate surrounding the cruise ships, ‘grandi navi,’ in Venice, Italy. Drawing upon multiple data sources, we trace how the social exchanges among different field actors are able to neutralize the threat to the status quo and alter the natural course of the issue settlement that actors’ public framing would predict. Specifically, we show how the cruise industry indirectly targets regulators with the provision of resources and these actions decouple regulators’ public framing from their private decision to settle a contested issue. This work contributes to the literature on issue fields and issue settlements by providing a general theory of issue settlements that includes social exchanges. We advance propositions on the conditions in which social exchanges are likely to occur and on identify potential targets for exchanges from their statements in the public discourse. (co-authors: Giuseppe Delmestri, Mia Raynard) |
| **Recommended reading:** Furnari, S. 2018. When does an issue trigger change in a field? A comparative approach to issue frames, field structures and types of field change. *Human Relations*, 71(3): 321-348.Granovetter, M. 2007. The social construction of corruption. In V. Nee & R. Swedberg (Eds.), *On Capitalism*: 152-172. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. |

|  |
| --- |
| **The Epistemic Roots of Elitist Utopianism (room A221)** |
| Marc Orlitzky(University of South Australia) | 28.02.2019 | 12:00-13:30 | Thursday |
| Many fields of inquiry in Management and Organization Theory run the risk of abandoning the description of scientific truth because they are becoming arenas of social activism. Indeed, within the Academy of Management, the normative quest for social change—the creation of a better world—is booming. However, the root causes of this remarkable utopian impulse—sometimes implicit, other times explicit—may not only lie in organizational, behavioral, and social scientists' sociopolitical values and proclivities. Rather, the epistemic root cause is the Standard Social Science Model, in combination with the pragmatist renunciation of Hume's Guillotine, which sharply demarcates facts from values. The resulting elitist utopianism is illustrated via three specific research areas in Human Resource Management, Organizational Behavior, and Corporate Social Responsibility, even though it has much wider applicability within many other Management fields of inquiry. Finally, the conclusion of this seminar proposes several solutions that address this fundamental epistemological and sociopolitical problem. |
| **Recommended reading:** Orlitzky, M. (2019). Fake organization science: The epistemic roots of elitist utopianism. Unpublished working paper. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Brokerage and Network Cognition: the Creativity of the Tertius Ignarus.** |
| Claudio Biscaro(WU Vienna) | 04.03.2019 | 12:00-14:00 | Monday |
| The theory of structural holes predicts that individuals who broker among cliques of other individuals are able to turn ideas into good ones as they have the opportunity to tap into diverse pockets of knowledge, information and perspectives. Yet, many empirical studies on creativity report that returns on spanning structural holes vary profoundly. This study targets this puzzling evidence focusing on the network cognition held by each individual in the network. We conduct a mixed method study in a digital media company to assess network cognition and creativity. Results on the actual network confirm that spanning structural holes has a positive effect on creativity. However, the effect of network cognition is opposite: individuals are more creative when they think that the network that surrounds them is cohesive. We illustrate that when brokers ignore the fact that they are brokers, they benefit from the psychological support that the network sources, feel more risk-taker and enjoy more experimentation. We highlight that creativity draws mostly on psychological aspects rather than a rational and calculative behavior. (co-author: Fabrizio Montanari) |
| **Recommended reading:** Burt, R. S., Kilduff, M., & Tasselli, S. 2013. Social Network Analysis: Foundations and Frontiers on Advantage. ***Annual Review of Psychology***, Vol 64, 64: 527-547. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Comparative Research (part 1)** |
| Peter Schmidt(University of Gießen) | 09.03.2019 | 11:00-13:00 | Saturday |
| Overview of the whole course. Comparative Data-Set (European Social Survey) and Type of Models. Causality and empirical research, notation, different types of models, theory testing, use of the MPLUS 8 manual and Discussion of the Course material. Use of own data. Presentation of own models at 18.8. and consultations. List of appointmentsPRACTICAL SESSION: MPLUS and the logic of its use. Selected items and constructs: Values in the three Benelux countries. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) with one theoretical construct (factor). ML and MLR estimation Preparation of EXAMPLE 1: (input file: Benelux\_nomissing.dat). Tradition and Conformity in the three Benelux countries with four indicators. Computation and Output Interpretation of model 1.Foundation of CFA: Process of linear causal modelling, Raw Data as input, assumptions, Types of constraints including Equality constraints, formalization, formative vs. reflective indicators, typology of models, Maximum Likelihood Estimation (ML) and Robustified Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLR). Ordinal Indicators and WLSMV Estimator.PRACTICAL SESSION: Preparation of CFA EXAMPLES 2a (parallel), 2b (tau-equivalent) and 2c (congeneric ordinal): (input file: NL2.dat). Output interpretation and comparison of quantitative and ordinal models in terms of fit, coefficients and explained variance. Restrictions, Identification, Model Modifications, Global and Detailed Model Fit, Simultaneous Confirmatory Factor Analysis (SCFA) vs. Seperate Confirmatory Factor Analysis. Cross-Loadings and Measurement Error correlations. Model Modification with J-Rule and Power Analysis.PRACTICAL SESSION: Preparation of EXAMPLES 3a and 3b: (input File: NL2.dat). Simultaneous Confirmatory Factor Analysis and its modification: Tradition/Conformity, Universalism and Attitude toward immigration. Examination of detailed and global model fit. Multiple Group Confirmatory Factor Analysis (MGCFA). Configural, metric and scalar invariance in cross cultural research. Classical and new fit measures for testing invariance. The concept of partial invariance. The new Alignment procedure in MPLUS for comparisons of many groups(Fixed and Random)PRACTICAL SESSION: MGSCFA. Preparation of EXAMPLE 4a: (Benelux\_noMissing.dat) Multiple group comparisons with the top down approach (MGCFA) due to BENELUX countries.EXAMPLE 4b: CONFIGURAL METRIC SCALAR: the new procedure to perform a simultaneous test of measurement invariance (same input File) EXAMPLE 4c ALIGNMENT(Fixed and Random, ML ) as an alternative invariance testing procedure (same input File). Scalar invariance in cross cultural research as a prerequisite of comparing observed and latent means. Mean Comparisons of items, Indices and Latent Variables. Drawbacks of the t-Test. Approximate Measurement Invariance and the Bayesian approach. Higher order CFA. General Strategy for testing measurement models in comparative research. How to report CFA results in comparative research.PRACTICAL SESSION: EXAMPLE 5: (Input Files: Benelux.dat) CFA with latent means: Subgroups Belgium, Netherlands, Luxemburg. Output interpretation. EXAMPLE 6: (same input File) Approximate Measurement Invariance and Bayesian estimation with a-priori information for estimating latent means. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Making sense of Organization Theory** |
| Tuomo Peltonen(Åbo Akademi University) | 09.03.2019 | 13:15-15:00 | Saturday |
| Organization theory is a robust field of theorizing about the nature of organizations and organizing. Yet in its current form, it is highly fragmented into different camps and schools of thought, with little grasp of its overall development and of the relations between different perspectives. In this seminar, I will offer some tools to make sense of the field of organization theory. The approach adopted is largely meta-theoretical, i.e. focusing on the philosophical and paradigmatic aspects of different theories or groups of theories. I will start with the influential paradigm scheme of Burrell and Morgan (1979), and then describe the ensuing debate about the problem of multiple paradigms in management studies. Topics include: the controversy over the state of paradigm fragmentation, the possibility of multiparadigm research and the emergence of new paradigms – especially postmodernism - since Burrell and Morgan book. The seminar will be of interest to researchers working in organization and management, but also to others who are interested in gaining awareness of the deeper theoretical assumptions and background traditions associated with their research approach and methodology. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Comparative Research (part 2)** |
| Peter Schmidt(University of Gießen) | 10.03.2019 | 11:00-13:00 | Sunday |
| See description for the Part 1. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Learning From Failures. Tricks To Turn A Draft Into A ‘Work Of Art.'** |
| Claudio Biscaro(WU Vienna) | 13.03.2019 | 10:00-11:45 | Wednesday |
| My goal is to make you reflect on the role of the writer, and how to convey best a message. To do so, I would like you to wear the hat of the reviewer or simply of the reader. After all, the reviewer is not a stubborn and grumpy old man, who unsatisfied with life and wants you to follow his idea.More usually, the reviewer is just a reader, who has accepted to dedicate her time on someone’s manuscript, and is eager to learn something new. Therefore, she is unhappy when she receives a reading that is not convincing or up to her standards. Probably, the reviewer is just someone like you… who happens to know a bit (or a lot) of what you are about to tell him. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Meta-Analysis Part I** |
| Marc Orlitzky(University of South Australia) | 13.03.2019 | 12:00-13:30 | Wednesday |
| Part I of the seminar provides an overview of the meta-analytic research process, focusing on problem formulation, literature search, and meta-analytic data collection/coding. Part I discusses several widespread myths and urban legends about meta-analysis and, more specifically, reviews the criteria used to evaluate the quality of primary studies (the raw data in meta-analysis). At the conclusion of Part I, I will ask seminar participants to apply the first four steps of meta-analysis to your own area, which will then be discussed in Part II.  |
| **Recommended reading:** Eden, D. (2002). Replication, meta-analysis, scientific progress, and *AMJ'*s publication policy. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(5), 841-846. Aguinis, H., Pierce, C. A., Bosco, F. A., Dalton, D. R., & Dalton, C. M. (2011). Debunking myths and urban legends about meta-analysis. *Organizational Research Methods, 14*(2), 306-331.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Turning Quotes Into Maps. Augmenting Rigor and Clarity Of Qualitative Data.** |
| Claudio Biscaro(WU Vienna) | 23.03.2019 | 10:00-12:30 | Saturday |
| Abstract to be provided at the later date. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Meta-Analysis Part II** |
| Marc Orlitzky(University of South Australia) | 03.04.2019 | 12:00-14:00 | Wednesday |
| The second part of this seminar focuses on the statistical techniques associated with meta-analysis. So, the focus in Part II is on data analysis, interpretation of findings, and report writing (i.e., the Meta-Analysis Reporting Standards, or MARS, of the APA). In the overview of data analysis, I discuss: • the correction for study artifacts (such as measurement error) • moderator analysis (categorical and continuous moderators; meta-regression) • meta-analytic path modeling (using one of my current working papers for illustrative purposes) • publication bias. I also compare and contrast the Hedges-Olkin meta-analytic methods (HOMA) and the Hunter-Schmidt meta-analytic methods (HSMA). Finally, we will discuss the participants' MA applications |
| **Recommended reading:** El-Akremi, A., Gond, J.-P., Orlitzky, M., Shen, J., & Swaen, V. (2019). *How does corporate social responsibility influence workplace outcomes? A meta-analysis of mediating mechanisms.* Unpublished working paper [illustrating MASEM].  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Paper development seminar I: Books** |
| Tuomo Peltonen(Åbo Akademi University) | 08.04.2019 | 12:00-14:00 | Monday |
| A seminar on book publishing (monographs + book chapters). Although not as esteemed as journal publishing, books continue to be valued within humanities and social sciences. The seminar will explain the dynamics of the international book market in management, with a variety of publishing houses and types of books (monographs, edited volumes, handbooks and textbooks). In the practical side, the seminar will go through the book proposal crafting and review process, and give tips on how to translate a thesis into a book. I will use my recent experience with Palgrave to explain what is expected of a book proposal and how the book publishing process proceeds. In addition, I will tackle the specific features of book chapters, as well the various pros and cons of book chapter publishing, especially in relation to journal publishing. Young scholars interested in getting their work published in international books can benefit from this seminar. |

**Notes about Visiting Scholars**

|  |
| --- |
| **Claudio Biscaro** |
|  | Claudio Biscaro is an Assistant Professor in Change Management at the WU Vienna, University of Economics and Business. Prior to joining WU, Claudio was a post-doctoral fellow in Organization Studies at the JKU Linz, Austria, and a research fellow at the Ca’ Foscari University of Venice, Italy, in the department of Economics and sustainability. He obtained his PhD in Business from the department of Management at the Ca’ Foscari University of Venice, Italy. Claudio’s research positions in the discipline of Organization Theory. Specifically, his interests direct him toward studying creativity and innovation as well as change in business and society. He currently examines organizations’ responses and reactions to external pressure, the institutionalization of new forms of social controls, the survival versus extinction of online-communities, as well as creativity. Analytically, he focuses on the effects of micro-processes, such as social exchanges, framing, language tropes such as metaphors, and individual cognition, on macro-phenomena. Claudio’s work has been published in outlets such as *Organization Science*, *Plos One*, *Natural Hazards* and *Environmental Research Letters*. He reviews for Organization Science, Organization Studies, Human Relations, and Plos One.He has been an invited speaker in several universities: University of Southern California (USA), Cass Business School at City University (UK), Said Business School at University of Oxford (UK), University of Nottingham (UK), University of Trento (Italy), University of Venice (Italy), and WU Vienna (Austria).  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Marc Orlitzky** |
|  | Professor Marc Orlitzky (Ph.D., University of Iowa) is Chair in Management (full professor) at the University of South Australia Business School. The Orlitzky, Schmidt, and Rynes (2003) meta-analysis has become the most highly cited article ever published in the journal *Organization Studies*, garnering more than double the citations of the second-most highly cited article in this EGOS journal. More specifically, as of January 2019, this article was cited 2,173 times on the *Web of Science*, while the most cited articles of 2003 published in *Academy of Management Journal (AMJ)* and *Academy of Management Review* received 689 and 1,393 citations, respectively. Only one *AMJ* article published since 2000 (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007) received more citations than this meta-analysis. Overall, Marc's research has been cited over 10,000 times on *Google Scholar*.In his doctoral studies, Marc was trained and mentored by one of the developers of psychometric meta-analysis, Frank Schmidt. His previous academic positions included Lecturer at the University of New South Wales (UNSW in Sydney, Australia), Senior Lecturer above the Bar at the University of Auckland, and tenured Associate Professor at Penn State University, Altoona. With an L-Index (see Belikov & Belikov, 2015) of 7.0, he has published research in, among other journals, *Organizational Research Methods, Business Ethics Quarterly, Academy of Management Perspectives, Journal of Business Ethics, Long Range Planning, Organization Studies, Academy of Management Learning & Education (AMLE),* and *Personnel Psychology*. His research has received several awards, including the 2004 Moskowitz award for outstanding quantitative study in the field of social investing and the 2001 Best Article Prize awarded by the International Association for Business & Society (IABS) in association with California Management Review, and, most recently (in Nov. 2018), a Research Excellence Award from the University of South Australia. Marc's current research interests focus on the biological explanations of organizational behavior and issues in the philosophy of science. With respect to the former, his studies examine how variables of central importance in evolutionary psychology (e.g., life history strategies and the physical environment) affect employee and entrepreneurial preferences, intentions, and outcomes—and how these influences are moderated by biological sex. As for the latter, he investigates how particular paradigmatic assumptions (influencing not only research methods but also theory) may impede the scientific search for truth. In addition, he continues to work on team projects that investigate the impact of corporate social responsibility and environmental sustainability on workplace outcomes and financial performance.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Tuomo Peltonen** |
|  | Tuomo Peltonen received his PhD from Aalto University School of Business (formerly Helsinki School of Economics) in 1998. Since then, he has been a visiting scholar at Keele University, UK, and, later, professor at four Finnish universities. Tuomo is currently professor of organization and management at Åbo Akademi University, Turku, Finland. In addition to that, he holds a docent appointment at Aalto University. His early research dealt with internationalization and managerial career identities. More recently, he has published on business ethics, organizational knowledge, international management, research methods, and architecture and spatiality, often from a poststructuralist or interpretative conceptual and/or methodological perspective. He has had a special interest on the implications of the work of Michel Foucault, as well as on the debates surrounding the use of Actor-Network Theory in management studies. Tuomo’s current research interests have signalled a shift towards classical philosophical problems regarding truth, morality and good governance. These themes are discussed in his works on history and philosophy of organization theory, spirituality and religion in organizations, and the possibilities for wisdom in strategic decision-making. He is an Editorial Board member of *Organization Management Journal* and *International Journal of HRM*. During his academic career, Tuomo has published about 35 refereed articles and book chapters, and three international monographs. Recent books include: *Towards Wise Management (Palgrave), Spirituality and Religion in Organizing* (Palgrave), *Organization theory* (Emerald), and *Origins of Organizing* (Peltonen, T., Gaggiotti, H., Case, P., eds; Edward Elgar). |