

Getting Started 2022

Session II

October 18, 2022

Henri Schildt, Ewald Kibler

Agenda

1. Presentations: Doctoral thesis journeys
2. Discussion & reflections
3. Key take-aways & learnings
4. Assignment for next session
5. Literature review assignment



Insights from interviews on doctoral thesis journeys (each ~20min)

5-10-minute presentation. The format is free. Exemplary themes:

- What were the phases of writing the dissertation? What was the researcher's main research question and task, and how did that come out in the dissertation? Does the doctoral thesis in your view address this task or question?
- An account that presents both from the researcher's and her/his advisor's point of view answers to the following questions: (a) What made it possible to finish the dissertation (successfully)? (b) Why is the dissertation like it is? (e.g. regarding the structure, choices of literatures and methods, style of the essays, ...)
- Any observations, insights or questions evoked by this inquiry regarding the process doctoral studies and writing the dissertation.

Presentations: Thesis journeys

Hanh This Duc Doan: Marja Svanberg (Martti Häyry), *Business and Ethics?-A Study of a Dichotomy*

Hanne Savolainen: Outi Vanharanta (Henri Schildt), *Innovativeness contested – discrepancies between managerial ideals and employee identities*

Apurva Ganoo: Tua Björklund (Matti Vartianen), *The Dynamics of Proactive Striving - Initiating and sustaining development efforts in product design and entrepreneurship*

Anastasiya Koptsyukh: Philipp Back (Pekka Malo), *AI for Optimal and Sustainable Forest Management*

Anna Kevätsalo: Jukka Rinamäki (Andre Spicer), *Collective memory and corporate irresponsibility - A collection of essays.*

Baolin Yang: Katharina Cepa (Henri Schildt), *Digitalizing interorganizational relationships: How technology-induced transparency and digital mediation shape collaborative dynamics*

Coffee break



Presentations: Thesis journeys

Hanh This Duc Doan: Marja Svanberg (Martti Häyry), *Business and Ethics?-A Study of a Dichotomy*

Hanne Savolainen: Outi Vanharanta (Henri Schildt), *Innovativeness contested – discrepancies between managerial ideals and employee identities*

Apurva Ganoo: Tua Björklund (Matti Vartianen), *The Dynamics of Proactive Striving - Initiating and sustaining development efforts in product design and entrepreneurship*

Anastasiya Koptsyukh: Philipp Back (Pekka Malo), *AI for Optimal and Sustainable Forest Management*

Anna Kevätsalo: Jukka Rinamäki (Andre Spicer), *Collective memory and corporate irresponsibility - A collection of essays.*

Baolin Yang: Katharina Cepa (Henri Schildt), *Digitalizing interorganizational relationships: How technology-induced transparency and digital mediation shape collaborative dynamics*

Points for discussion

- a) The process of making – how was the thesis made?
- b) What enabled success?
- c) How to make an original contribution?
- d) How to overcome challenges?
- e) What kind of learning took place?
- f) How to find your audience?
- g) Local vs. global researcher community?
- h) You as a researcher, in comparison to the doctor interviewed?
- i) Advisor / researcher collaboration and changes over time?

What did you learn from the exercise?

- How did you experience the assignment?
- What is your most important observation or conclusion?
- Were you surprised by anything?
- What questions did the exercise evoke?

Assignment for session III

Submit an essay (as PDF, 1500-2000 words) based on your reflections of published qualitative research by 14 November 2022. Also, based on your essay, prepare a 5–10-minute presentation for **Session 3** (16 November).

- To do so, select two qualitative empirical studies that are of interest to you. Specifically, select one article published in the *Academy of Management Journal* and one article published in different journal on the FT-50 journal list.
- Send an email to Ewald (ewald.kibler@aalto.fi) by **Monday, 24 October**, where you provide and confirm the references of the two articles.

Assignment for session III (contd)

Do not repeat the article texts in your paper but try to formulate a more general understanding and critical reflection of the research – exemplary themes and questions:

- Why did you select these papers? Why do you find them appealing?
- How is the paper framed theoretically (the conceptual frontend)?
- What are the data like and how has it been analyzed? How are the findings presented?
- What is the main theoretical insight? And, what kind of contributions does it make to what literatures or conversations, and how?
- What did you learn in terms of how to write a qualitative research paper?
- What are the main differences (along the themes above) between the articles?
- What was difficult or unclear? Any other observations, insights or questions evoked by this inquiry regarding the process doctoral studies and writing the dissertation?

FT-50 journals relevant to our fields

- **Academy of Management Journal**
- *Academy of Management Review (conceptual papers only, not suited for this purpose)*
- **Administrative Science Quarterly**
- *Harvard Business Review (practice-oriented, not suited for this purpose)*
- **Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice**
- **Human Relations**
- **Human Resource Management**
- **Journal of Business Ethics**
- **Journal of Management**
- **Journal of Management Studies**
- **Journal of Business Venturing**
- **Journal of International Business Studies**
- **Organization Science**
- **Organization Studies**
- **Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes**
- **Research Policy**
- *Sloan Management Review (practice-oriented, not suited for this purpose)*
- **Strategic Management Journal**
- **Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal**

Literature review assignment

- Select (at least) three review papers from the ***Academy of Management Annals (AMA)*** where you think these might be interesting and useful for their own work. Submit the **three (or more) references** by **31 October** here.
- **Discuss with your peers (at least two times during November)** and gradually develop a rationale for why one review article (as compared to other selected ones) serves as the most important base for your own research, for instance with regards to theoretical discourse/home, research focus/question, theoretical lens, key concepts, etc.

Literature review assignment (contd)

- Write a **short informal reflection (as PDF, 1200-1500 words)** of what you feel/think your **research topic** could be and why this one **AMA review paper** could/will be a fundament for their own work.
- DL for submitting the short essay is **16 December**.

Peer groups for Review Assignment

GROUP I: Baolin Yang, Hanh This Duc Doan & Anna Kevätsalo

GROUP II: Apurva Ganoo, Hanne Savolainen & Anastasiya Koptsyukh

Materials to be shared on MyCourses

- **Assignments will be made accessible to everyone in the class – OK?**
- **Editorials on qualitative research**
- **Papers guiding literature reviews**
- **Editorials on quantitative research**

“Originality” - what does it mean?

Joshua Guetzkow, Michèle Lamont and Grégoire Mallard (2004):
What is Originality in the Humanities and the Social Sciences?
American Sociological Review 69, 190–212.

- An analysis of “the criteria that individuals serving on funding panels used to evaluate proposals and by examining the various meaning they gave to originality.”

Types of originality (Appendix, 206-210):

Original approach

New approach

New question

New perspective

New appr. to tired/trendy topic

Appr. that makes new connections

New argument

Innovative appr. for discipline

Original theory

New theory

Connecting / mapping ideas

Synthesis of literatures

New application of existing theory

Reconceptualization

Unconventional use of theory

Types of originality (contd)

Original method

Innovative method/research design
Synthesis of methods
Resolve old question
Innovative for discipline

Original topic

New topic
Noncanonical topic
Topic choice is unconventional

Understudied area

Understudied region
Understudied period

Original data

New data
Multiple sources
Noncanonical data

Original results

New insights
New findings

Questions?
