

1. Introduction

This course aims to provide in-depth knowledge of research methods and common research approaches in general and in Industrial Engineering and Management in particular. It also provides students with relevant tools to plan and carry out their future master theses.

In order to facilitate the learning activities in a structured way, the course is divided into five modules. Each module has its own structure and literature. Following a flipped classroom approach (to some extent), students are introduced to the learning material before class. In this regard, some significant parts of the learning process consist of activities outside of the classroom.

Module 1 gives an *introduction* to science, theory and methods as well as research ethics

Module 2 focuses on *literature review* and *research questions*

Module 3 focuses on *qualitative* methods.

Module 4 focuses on *quantitative* methods.

Module 5 focuses on *critical review* of others' works and *research proposal development*.

Each module is given as a combination of several learning activities, e.g., readings, assignments, lectures, seminars, reviews and proposal development.

2. Teachers, disposition and communications

The course involves an examiner, seminar leaders and some invited guests and lecturers:

- **Examiner / course coordinator:** Emrah Karakaya [EK]
- **Seminar leaders / teaching assistants:** Nils Wikland [NW], Tatiana Nevzorova [TN] & Beatriz Pérez Horno [BH]
- **Supporting teachers:** Olov Engwall (OE), Pablo Oliveras (PO)
- **Guests and other lecturers**

- **Synchronous**
 - Bo Karlsson (Director of Studies, INDEK, KTH) [BK]
 - Tim Gisseman (Graduate, TIEMM, Machine Learning track) [TG]
 - Simon Okwir (Lecturer, Uppsala University) [SO]
 - Åsa-Karin Engstrand (Assoc. Prof., KTH) [ÅE]
 - Niklas Arvidsson (Prof., KTH) [NA]
 - Kristina Nyström (Prof. KTH) [KN]
 - Mats Engwall (Prof., KTH) [ME]
- **Asynchronous**
 - Daniel Kamangar (Graduate, TIEMM, Financial Mathematics track)
 - Frauke Urban (Assoc. Prof., KTH)
 - Christofer Laurell (Assoc. Prof., KTH)
 - Ed Saedi (Assist. Prof., BI Norwegian Business School)
 - Johann Packendorff (Prof., KTH)

The course has the following preliminary disposition of the lectures and seminars. Please follow the online schedule for details.

Week	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thurs	Fri
35	Lecture Introduction to the course, [EK, NW, TN, BH, TG & BK, separate for ME2003 & ME2004]		Lecture – Module 1 Theory, Method, Context [EK]		Lecture – Module 1 Research Traditions & Research Ethics [EK] Lecture – Module 1 Research Traditions CS vs. IM [OE, only for ME2004] Workshop– Module

					1 Science, theory and methods [NW, separate for ME2003 & ME2004]
36			Lectures – Module 2 Literature Review & Research Questions Problematization vs. gap-filling [EK]		
37	Seminar Day – Module 2 Literature Review and Research Questions [TN]	Seminar Day – Module 2 Literature Review and Research Questions [TN,BH]	Seminar Day – Module 2 Literature Review and Research Questions [BH]		
38	Lecture – Module 3 Qualitative Methods [SO]	Lecture – Module 3 Qualitative Methods [ÅE]		Seminar Day – Module 3 Qualitative Methods [NW]	Seminar Day – Module 3 Qualitative Methods [NW]
39	Seminar Day – Module 3				Two Lectures –

	Qualitative Methods [NW]				Module 4 Quantitative Methods [NA, KN]
40		Seminar Day – Module 4 Quantitative Methods [NW]	Seminar Day – Module 4 Quantitative Methods [NW]	Seminar Day – Module 4 Quantitative Methods [NW]	
41			Two Lectures – Module 5 Critical Review of Others Work [EK] & Master thesis & Research Proposal [ME]	Lecture – Module 5 Research Proposal & The way forward [EK] + Optional Event	
42					
43					
44		Seminar Day– Module 5 Research Proposal [TN]	Seminar Day– Module 5 Research Proposal [TN, NW]	Seminar Day– Module 5 Research Proposal [NW]	

Students are encouraged to attend all lectures in order to facilitate the learning process (however they are not compulsory). There are four sets of seminars in the course. Each set has its own structure. All require preparation. See specific information for each module on Canvas.

- **Seminars – Modules 2, 3 and 4:** Students work in teams of 3-4 students
- **Seminars – Modules 5:** Students work individually or in pairs

Each student needs to be assigned to one of the seminar groups for Modules 2, 3, 4 and 5. This means that each student attends four compulsory seminars in total.

- If a student misses one of the seminars (e.g., because of sickness etc.), the student needs to come to the extra seminar scheduled on the 16th of November at 13:15-15:00. In this extra seminar, the student will conduct the activities that were missed in the corresponding seminar (e.g., reflection on module readings and discussion on the module submissions). The extra seminar takes place in Seminar room 443, Lindstedtsvägen 30.

The communication is managed through CANVAS. If you have any questions and comments that can be of interest to other students (e.g., in regard to assignments, deadlines or activities), post them in the "Questions & Answers (Q&A) forums" on CANVAS. Email should not be used for these types of questions and comments. In the event that such questions and comments are sent via email to us (the examiner and teaching assistants), we will go ahead and post both the question and reply in the "Questions & Answers (Q&A) forums". If you have a personal question (e.g., sickness-related etc.), write an email to Nils (nwikland@kth.se).

A reference group will be formed, composed of the examiner, seminar leaders and 3-4 students. The purpose of the reference group is to discuss ongoing activities in the course and exchange feedback. The reference group is expected to meet four times preliminarily scheduled the 8th of September, 20th of September, 10th of October and 13th of November at lunch time. If you are interested in participating, send an email to Nils (nwikland@kth.se).

3. Assignments, examination and grading

The examination is composed of four main elements (spread over five modules) as follows.

Type (code)	Credits	Scale	Individual or collaborative	Content
Assignment (INL1)	1.0	P, F	Individual	Module 1
Seminar assignment (SEM1)	3.0	P, F	Group work of 3-4 students	Module 2, Module 3 & Module 4
Assignment (INL2)	1.0	P, F	Individual	Module 5
Project (PRO1)	2.5	P, F	Individual or in pairs	

The alignment among the intended learning outcomes (ILOs), modules and examination follows.

ILO	Examination Elements
Explain and reflect on scientific knowledge, different research traditions and research ethics.	<p><i>Module 1</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Quiz (assignment)</i> - <i>Reflection (assignment)</i>
Critically review scientific literature and formulate relevant research questions.	<p><i>Module 2</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Draft report</i> - <i>Final report</i>

<p>Apply both qualitative and quantitative research methods.</p>	<p><i>Module 3</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Draft report</i> - <i>Final report</i> <p><i>Module 4</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Draft report</i> - <i>Final report</i>
<p>Critically review and assess a scientific text according to its aim, methodological rigor, contributions, relevance to practice as well as sustainability aspects.</p> <p>Formulate a plan for a scientific study including well motivated method choices and assessment of ethical issues and sustainability aspects.</p>	<p><i>Module 5</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Critical review of published work</i> - <i>Draft report</i> - <i>Critical review of peers' draft work</i> - <i>Final report</i>

The details (including the deadlines) of the assignments, seminar works and research proposals are posted on CANVAS. An overview of the agenda can be seen in the following Gantt chart.

Week	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thurs	Fri
------	-----	-----	-----	-------	-----

35	Lecture - Intro		Lecture – Module 1		Lecture & Workshop – Module 1
36		<i>Module 1 Quiz & Reflection</i>	Lectures – Module 2		
37	<i>Module 2 Draft report (just before your assigned seminar)</i> Seminar Day – Module 2	Seminar Day – Module 2	Seminar Day – Module 2		<i>Module 2 Final report</i>
38	Lecture – Module 3	Lecture – Module 3		<i>Module 3 Draft report (just before your assigned seminar)</i> Seminar Day – Module 3	Seminar Day – Module 3
39	Seminar Day – Module 3		<i>Module 3 Final report</i>		Two Lectures – Module 4
40		<i>Module 4 Draft report (just before your assigned seminar)</i>	Seminar Day – Module 4	Seminar Day – Module 4	

		Seminar Day – Module 4			
41	<i>Module 4 Final report</i>		Two Lectures – Module 5	Lecture – Module 5 Optional event	
42					<i>Module 5 Critical review of published work</i>
43					
44	<i>Module 5 Draft Report (Single deadline for all)</i>	<i>Module 5 Presentation (Just before your assigned seminar)</i> Seminar Day– Module 5	Seminar Day– Module 5	Seminar Day– Module 5 <i>Module 5 Critical review of peers' work</i>	
		<i>Module 5 Final Report</i>			

For Module 2, Module 3, Module 4, and Module 5 students are required to fulfill:

- Draft submission (any time before the corresponding seminar starts)
- Active participation in the corresponding seminar (e.g., reflections on readings, cross-team presentations & feedback on others' works)
- Final submission (by given deadlines)

For the draft submission, students are expected to conduct preparatory reading of the course literature and to perform the given assignment to the best level possible. The final submission is a development of the draft submission to reach the grading criteria with help from feedback during the seminars. From experience of previous course rounds, students that prepare more for the draft submission are more likely to experience a richer learning process.

In the seminars, students are required to actively participate by presenting their reflections on the readings of the course literature, having cross-team presentations and providing feedback. In essence, the learning process is expected to start before the corresponding lecture, be reinforced during the seminar activities and continue thereafter. Specific structure of each seminar can vary and seminar details are posted in the corresponding module page on Canvas.

In the assignments, students are required to use either APA or Harvard referencing system consistently. Some basic information about referencing can be found here: <https://www.kth.se/en/biblioteket/skriva-referera/skriv-referenser-1.856564>

3.1. Feedback on assignments and revisions

If students do not pass an examination element, students are required to revise and resubmit their corresponding assignment/project within two weeks after they are graded as failed. When this happens, a resubmission will be assessed within two weeks after the resubmission deadline, i.e. four weeks after initially being graded with a fail.

Due to the tight schedule in the course, students are not likely to receive their grades in one module before starting the next. Grading is done within three weeks after deadline (except re-submissions). For instance, grades in module 2 may not be expected before the course has reached module 5. It is therefore important that you listen actively and work with feedback from the examiner, seminar leaders, and peers to be able pass the examination elements and avoid resubmissions piling up at the end of the course.

If students fail a resubmitted assignment/project, the final grade will be a fail. In such cases, students can consider taking a re-exam (the format and content of which may vary) on the 8th of December at 13:15-16:00 or the 14th of December at 13:15-16:00.

3.2. Plagiarism

In this course, plagiarism is not accepted. All the submissions will be checked for plagiarism. More information on plagiarism (along with a handbook) can be found at: <https://www.kth.se/en/student/stod/studier/fusk-1.997287>

4. Course literature

The course literature is categorized according to the modules. They are found through [KTH Primo](#). There is a lot of optional reading, which is primarily added to help you navigate the methodological literature when writing your master thesis. The optional reading can help you deepen your understanding already in this course. However, we believe that the mandatory course literature is sufficient for you to reach a basic level of understanding.

See the following links (or below) for the course literature:

- [Module 1 - Course Literature](#)
- [Module 2 - Course literature](#)
- [Module 3 - Course literature](#)
- [Module 4 - Course literature](#)
- [Module 5 - Course literature](#)

5. Examination adapted to students with special needs

For students with disabilities who have a statement from KTH's FUNKA unit on recommended support during examination, the following applies in this course:

- All support under code R (i.e. adjustments relating to space, time and physical circumstances) are granted without special decision by the examiner
- Support under code P (educational adaptation) must be actively granted or rejected by the examiner after contact has been made by the student in accordance with KTH's rules. Normally, support actions under code P will also be approved.

Course Literature

Module 1

Course Literature

Basics

- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2015). Chapter 4. Understanding research philosophy and approaches to theory development. In *Research methods for business students* (Seventh ed.). New York: Pearson (access [here](#) or [here](#))

Differences between natural and social sciences

- Moon, K., & Blackman, D. (2014). [A guide to understanding social science research for natural scientists](#). *Conservation Biology*, 28(5), 1167-1177.
- Gitch (2002). Comparing the Epistemologies of Scientific Disciplines in Two Distinct Domains: Modern Physics versus Social Sciences: [Part 1](#) and [Part 2](#). *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*

Issues related to theory development

- Cows, Josh, and Ralph Schroeder. "[Causation, correlation, and big data in social science research](#)." *Policy & Internet* 7.4 (2015): 447-472.
- Berthon, Pierre, et al. "[Potential research space in MIS: A framework for envisioning and evaluating research replication, extension, and generation](#)." *Information Systems Research* 4 (2002): 416-427.

Ethics in management field

- Bell, Emma, and Alan Bryman. "[The ethics of management research: an exploratory content analysis](#)." *British journal of management* 18.1 (2007): 63-77.

Optional suggested further readings (which you can for instance revisit during your master thesis)

- Winch, Peter. *The idea of a social science and its relation to philosophy*. Routledge, 2008
- Creswell, John W. "Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches." (2002).
- SAGE Research Methods: Available at: <http://methods.sagepub.com/>
- Collis, Jill, and Roger Hussey. *Business research: A practical guide for undergraduate and postgraduate students*. Macmillan International Higher Education, 2013.
- Lindgren, M., & Packendorff, J. (2009). Social constructionism and entrepreneurship: Basic assumptions and consequences for theory and research. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 15(1), 25-47.
- The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (2017). Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/other/hi/h2020-ethics_code-of-conduct_en.pdf
- The guide "Good Research Practice", published by the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet). Download at: http://www.vr.se/download/18.3a36c20d133af0c1295800030/1321519981391/Good+Research+Practice+3.2011_webb.pdf
- Lennerfors, Thomas Taro (2019). *Ethics in Engineering*. Studentlitteratur. ISBN:9789144127682
- Morgan, G., & Smircich, L. (1980). [The Case for Qualitative Research](#). *The Academy of Management Review*, 5(4), 491-500.
- Makadok, Richard, Richard Burton, and Jay Barney. "[A Practical guide for making theory contributions in strategic management](#)." *Strategic Management Journal*(2018).

Module 2

Course Literature

- Tranfield, David, David Denyer, and Palminder Smart. "[Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review](#)." *British journal of management* 14.3 (2003): 207-222.
- Snyder, H. (2019). [Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines](#). *Journal of business research*, 104, 333-339.
- Durach, C. F., Kembro, J., & Wieland, A. (2017). [A new paradigm for systematic literature reviews in supply chain management](#). *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 53(4), 67-85.
- Alvesson, Mats, and Jörgen Sandberg. "[Generating research questions through problematization](#)." *Academy of management review* (2011): 247-271.

Optional suggested further readings

In particular for students aiming for a MSc thesis project in Computer Science

- Write a Research Question <https://csedresearch.org/write-a-research-question/>

General

- Sandberg, Jörgen, and Mats Alvesson. "[Ways of constructing research questions: gap-spotting or problematization?](#)" Organization 18.1 (2011): 23-44.
- Borrego, M., Foster, M. J., & Froyd, J. E. (2014). [Systematic literature reviews in engineering education and other developing interdisciplinary fields](#). Journal of Engineering Education, 103(1), 45-76.
- Tay, Andy. [How to write a superb literature review](#). Nature (2020).

Module 3

Course Literature

Qualitative research in general

- Morgan, G., & Smircich, L. (1980). [The Case for Qualitative Research](#). The Academy of Management Review, 5(4), 491-500.
- Gehman, J., Glaser, V. L., Eisenhardt, K. M., Gioia, D., Langley, A., & Corley, K. G. (2018). Finding theory–method fit: A comparison of three qualitative approaches to theory building. Journal of Management Inquiry, 27(3), 284-300. Available via KTHB/SAGE [here](#).
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. The qualitative report, 13(4), 544-559. Available via TQR [here](#).

Analyzing qualitative data in specific

- Saunders et al (2015/2012) Chapter 13 (Analysing qualitative data) in the book ‘Research methods for business students’. 6th or 7th edition. Pearson. Available EBSCOhost [here](#) or [here](#)

- Chapter 18, 20 and 25 of the book: Flick, Uwe, ed. (2014) *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis*. Sage. Available via KTHB/SAGE [here](#).
 - Kozinets, R. et al. (2014) Chapter 18. Netnographic Analysis: Understanding Culture through Social Media Data. *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*.
 - Roulston K. (2014) Chapter 20. Analysing Interviews. *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*.
 - Coffey A. (2018) Chapter 25. Analysing Documents, *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*.

Optional suggested further readings

- Aguinis, H., & Solarino, A. M. (2019). Transparency and replicability in qualitative research: The case of interviews with elite informants. *Strategic Management Journal*. Available via Wiley [here](#).
- Cassell, C., Cunliffe, A. L., & Grandy, G. (2018). *The Sage handbook of qualitative business and management research methods: History and Traditions*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9781526430212. Available via KTHB/SAGE [here](#).
- Yin, R.K., 2003. *Case Study Research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, London New Delhi.
- Flyvbjerg, Bent. "Five misunderstandings about case-study research." *Qualitative inquiry* 2 (2006): 219-245.
- Gioia, Corley, & Hamilton. 2013. "Seeking Qualitative Rigor in Inductive Research: Notes on the Gioia Methodology". *Organizational Research Methods*, 16(1):15-31.
- Suddaby, R., 2006, "What Grounded Theory is Not", *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(4), 633-642.
- Van Maanen, John (1979). The fact of fiction in organizational ethnography. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 539-550.
- Czarniawska, Barbara. *Narratives in social science research*. Sage, 2004.
- Fetterman, David M., ed. *Ethnography: Step-by-step*. Vol. 17. Sage, 2010.
- Ellet, William. *The case study handbook: How to read, discuss, and write persuasively about cases*. Harvard Business Press, 2007.
- Eisenhardt, Kathleen M. 1989, "Building theories from case study research." *Academy of management review* 14(4): 532-550.
- Eisenhardt, Kathleen M., and Melissa E. Graebner. "Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges." *Academy of management journal* 1 (2007): 25-32.
- Siggelkow, N, 2007, "Persuasion with case studies", *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1): 20–24.
- Alvesson, M., & Sköldböck, K. (2017). *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research*. Sage.
- Rowley, J. (2012), "Conducting research interviews", *Management Research Review*, Vol. 35 Np. 3/4, pp. 260-271.
- Upton, D., Macadam, S. (1997), "Why (and how) to take a plant tour", *Harvard Business Review*, May-June, 97-106.
- Lobe B. et al. (2020) Qualitative Data Collection in an Era of Social Distancing, *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 19, 1-8.

Module 4

Course Literature

- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2015 or 2012). Chapter 12. Analysing quantitative data. In *Research methods for business students* (Seventh ed.). New York: Pearson.
- [Gelman, A. \(2017\). Ethics and statistics: Honesty and transparency are not enough. *Chance*, 30\(1\), 37-39.](#)
- [Gelman, A. \(2012\). Ethics and statistics: Statistics for cigarette sellers. *Chance*, 25\(3\), 43-46.](#)
- [Wasserstein, Ronald L., Allen L. Schirm, and Nicole A. Lazar. "Moving to a world beyond “p< 0.05”." *The American Statistician* 73.sup1 \(2019\): 1-19.](#)

Optional suggested further readings

- [Echambadi, R., Campbell, B., & Agarwal, R. \(2006\). Encouraging best practice in quantitative management research: An incomplete list of opportunities. *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 43 \(8\), pp. 1801-1820.](#)
- [Amrhein, V., Greenland, S., & Mcshane, B. \(2019\). Scientists rise up against statistical significance. *Nature*, Vol. 567 \(7748\), pp. 305-307.](#)
- [Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. \(2015\). Chapter 11. Collecting primary data using questionnaires. In *Research methods for business students* \(Seventh ed.\). New York: Pearson.](#)
- [Ioannidis, J. \(2019\). Why Most Published Research Findings Are False. *CHANCE*, Vol. 32 \(1\), pp. 4-13.](#)
- [Goodman, S., & Greenland, S. \(2007\). Why Most Published Research Findings Are False: Problems in the Analysis \(Correspondence\). *PLoS Medicine*, Vol. 4 \(4\), E168.](#)
- [Shah, R., & Goldstein, S. \(2006\). Use of structural equation modeling in operations management research: Looking back and forward. *Journal of Operations Management*, Vol. 24 \(2\), pp. 148-169.](#)
- [Bamberger, P. A. \(2019\). On the Replicability of Abductive Research in Management and Organizations: Internal Replication and Its Alternatives. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 5\(2\), 103-108.](#)
- Pallant, J. (2010). *A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS*. Berkshire UK: McGraw-Hill Education.

Module 5

Course Literature

Research design and process

- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2015). [Chapter 5. Formulating the research design](#). In *Research methods for business students* (Seventh ed.). New York: Pearson.
- Dubois, A., & Gadde, L. E. (2014). [“Systematic combining”—A decade later](#). *Journal of Business Research*, 67(6), 1277-1284.

Enhancing rigor in research

- Shah, Sonali K., and Kevin G. Corley. "[Building better theory by bridging the quantitative–qualitative divide](#)." *Journal of management studies*8 (2006): 1821-1835.
- Schaefer, S. M., & Alvesson, M. (2020). [Epistemic attitudes and source critique in qualitative research](#). *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 29(1), 33-45.
- Goffin, K., Åhlström, P., Bianchi, M., & Richtnér, A. (2019). [Perspective: State-of-the-art: The quality of case study research in innovation management](#). *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 36(5), 586-615.
- Maula, M., & Stam, W. (2020). [Enhancing Rigor in Quantitative Entrepreneurship Research](#). *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 44(6), 1059–1090.

Crafting a text

- Heath, M., and Caroline Tynan. "[Crafting a research proposal](#)." *The Marketing Review* 10.2 (2010): 147-168.
- Mensh, Brett, and Konrad Kording. "[Ten simple rules for structuring papers](#)." *PLoS computational biology*9 (2017): e1005619.

Reflecting on sustainability

- M. Nilsson, E. Chisholm, D. Griggs, P. Howden-Chapman, D. McCollum, P. Messerli, B. Neumann, A.S. Stevance, M. Visbeck, M. Stafford-Smith [Mapping interactions between the sustainable development goals: lessons learned and ways forward](#) *Sustain. Sci.*, 13 (6) (2018), pp. 1489-1503
- Susur, E., & Karakaya, E. (2021). [A reflexive perspective for sustainability assumptions in transition studies](#). *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 39, 34-54.

Optional suggested further readings

In particular for students aiming for a MSc thesis project in Computer Science

- Amaral, J. About Computing Science Research Methodology. ([Local copy](#)). University of Alberta, Canada.

Critical review of others work

- Mentzer, J. T. (2008). Rigor versus relevance: why would we choose only one?. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 44(2), 72-77.
- Baruch, Y., & Holtom, B. C. (2008). Survey response rate levels and trends in organizational research. *Human relations*, 61(8), 1139-1160.
- Schmenner, R. W., Van Wassenhove, L., Ketokivi, M., Heyl, J., & Lusch, R. F. (2009). Too much theory, not enough understanding. *Journal of Operations Management*, 27(5), 339-343.
- Guba, E. (1981) “Criteria for Assessing the Trustworthiness of Naturalistic Inquiries”, *Educational Communication and Technology Journal*, 29(2): 75-91.
- Graebner, M., Martin, J., and Roundy, P., (2012), “Qualitative Data: Cooking without a recipe”, *Strategic Organization*, 10(3): pp. 276-284.
- Tracy, S. (2010), “Qualitative Quality: Eight “Big-Tent” Criteria for Excellent Qualitative Research”, *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10) 837-851.
- Bansal, P., Smith, W., and Vaara, E. (2018), “From the editors: New ways of seeing through qualitative research”, *Academy of Management Journal* , 61(4): 1189–1195.
- Eisenhardt, K., Graebner, M., Sonenshein, S. (2016), ”From the editors: Grand challenges and inductive methods: Rigor without Rigor mortis”, *Academy of management Journal*, 59(4): 1113-1123.
- Bansal, P., and Corley, K., (2011), “From the editors: The coming of age for qualitative research. Embracing the diversity of qualitative methods”, *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(2): 233-237.

Research proposal development and writing

- Writing a research proposal, University of Southern California (2018). Available at <http://libguides.usc.edu/writingguide/researchproposal>
- Blomkvist, Pär, and Anette Hallin. *Method for engineering students: Degree projects using the 4-phase Model*. Studentlitteratur, 2015.
- Zina O'Leary (2017) *The Essential Guide to Doing Your Research Project*

- Writing a Research Proposal. University Library. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (2018). Available at http://guides.library.illinois.edu/research_proposal
- Organizing Your Social Sciences Research Paper, University of Southern California (2018). Available at <http://libguides.usc.edu/writingguide>
- Federico Caniato, Des Doran, Rui Sousa, Harry Boer, (2018) "Designing and developing OM research – from concept to publication", International Journal of Operations & Production Management, Vol. 38 Issue: 9, pp.1836-1856.
- Pratt, M. (2009), "For the lack of a Boilerplate: Tips on writing up (and reviewing) qualitative Research", Academy of Management Journal, 52(5), 856-862.
- Langley, A., & Abdallah, C. (2011). [Templates and turns in qualitative studies of strategy and management](#). In Building methodological bridges (pp. 201-235). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.