ME2003-2004 Course PM

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's 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 partly flipped classroom approach, students are introduced to the learning material before class. In this regard, some significant aspects of the learning process involve activities outside 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 offered as a combination of several learning activities, e.g., readings, assignments, lectures, seminars, reviews and proposal development.
The course includes students from three programs:

- Master's Programme, Industrial Management (TINEM)
- Master's Programme, Technology-based Entrepreneurship (TTBEM)
- Degree Programme in Industrial Engineering and Management (CINEK)

For TINEM and TTBEM, the course code is ME2003. For CINEK, the course code is ME2004.

2. Teachers, disposition, and communications

The course involves two examiners, a teaching team as well as a number of invited guests and lecturers:

- **Examiners / course coordinators**: Philip Kappen (ME2003) and Frauke Urban (ME2004)
- **Teaching team:** Emrah Karakaya, Beatriz Pérez Horno, Arvid Svenson, and Olov Engwall
- **Guests and other lecturers**: Bo Karlsson (Director of Studies, INDEK, KTH), Åsa-Karin Engstrand (Assoc. Prof., KTH), Niklas Arvidsson (Prof., KTH), Kristina Nyström (Prof., KTH)
- **Pre-recorded:** Daniel Kamangar (Handelsbanken, an alumnus of CINEK), Frauke Urban (Prof., KTH), Christofer Laurell (Research Leader, Länsförsäkringar), Ed Saedi (Assist. Prof., BI Norwegian Business School), Johann Packendorff (Prof., KTH)

3. Schedule ME2003/4 Autumn 2025, including lectures, seminars, and deadlines

Lecture 1, 27 August at 13-15h, Introduction: Frauke Urban & Philip Kappen, B2

Lecture 2, 28 August, 8-10h, track computer science lecture (on Zoom, voluntary to attend for other tracks), Olov Engwall

Lecture 3, 29 August, 13-15h: Theory, method, context, research philosophy, Emrah Karakaya, F2

Deadline 2 September: Submit individual quiz answers on Canvas (module 1) by 19:00

Lecture 4, 3 September, 10-11h, Master thesis process, Bo Karlsson, Q1

Lecture 5, 3 September, 11-12h, Research ethics, Philip Kappen, Q1

Lecture 6, 5 September, 13-15h, Research questions and literature review, Beatriz Pérez Horno, Q1

Seminar series 1 on campus, 9 / 10 / 11 September, 10-12h, 13-15h, 15-17h

Deadline 15 September: Submit group report for module 2 on Canvas by 19:00

Lecture 7, 17 September, 13-15h: Qualitative methods – interviews and focus group discussions, Frauke Urban, M1

Lecture 8, 19 September, 13-15h: Qualitative research methods – research paradigm, Åsa Karin Engstrand, M1

Seminar series 2 on Zoom and in break-out rooms, 23 September, 10-12h

Deadline 26 September: Submit group report for module 3 on Canvas by 19:00

Lecture 9, 1 October at 10-11h, quantitative methods – introduction, Niklas Arvidsson, M1

Lecture 10, 1 October at 11-12h, quantitative methods – SPSS, Philip Kappen, M1

Lecture 11, 3 October, 13-15h, quantitative methods – case studies, Kristina Nyström, M1

Seminar series 3 on Zoom and break-our rooms: 7 October, 10-12h

Deadline 10 October: Submit group report for module 4 on Canvas by 19:00

Lecture 12, 30 October, 13-15h, Research proposal, Emrah Karakaya Q1

Lecture 13, 5 November, 14-16h, Peer-review process, Frauke Urban & Philip Kappen, Q1

Seminar series 4 on campus, 11 / 12 / 13 November, 10-12, 13-15, 15-17h

Deadline 17 November: Submit individual report for module 5 on Canvas by 19:00

Deadline 24 November: Submit Master thesis proposal for module 5 on Canvas by 19:00

While the lectures are not mandatory, students are strongly encouraged to attend all lectures in order to facilitate the learning process. If you do not attend the lectures, you may have difficulties completing and subsequently pass the assignments.

Students need to attend four mandatory seminars in total (one seminar in each seminar series and four in total). Each seminar set has its own structure. They all require preparation. See specific information for each module on Canvas.

- **Seminars – Modules 2, 3 and 4:** Students work in teams of 5-6 students
- **Seminars – Modules 5:** Students work individually for the assignment and individually or in pairs for the Master thesis proposal

Each student needs to be assigned to one of the seminar groups for Modules 2, 3, 4, and 5. Please self-assign to groups on Canvas.

If a student misses one of the seminars (e.g., because of sickness, etc.), the student needs to submit the seminar content as a video recording (e.g., a recorded presentation or recorded Q&A session answering some questions).

The communication is managed through CANVAS. If you have any questions and comments that can be of interest to other students (e.g. concerning assignments, deadlines or activities), post them in the "Questions & Answers (Q&A) forums" on CANVAS. If you have a personal question (e.g., sickness-related, etc.), you can write an email to Philip Kappen for ME2003 (philip.kappen@indek.kth.se) or Frauke Urban for ME2004 (fraukeu@kth.se).

A reference group will be formed, composed of the examiners / teachers and 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 at a time that suits those who participate (exact time to be agreed upon later). If you are interested in participating in the course reference group, send an email to Philip or Frauke.

4. 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**	**Deadlines – all submissions on Canvas**
Assignment (INL1)	1.0	P, F	Individual	Module 1	2 September: Submit individual quiz answers
Seminar assignment (SEM1)	3.0	P, F	Group work of 5-6 students	Module 2, Module 3 & Module 4	15 September: Submit group report for module 2 26 September: Submit report for module 3 10 October: Submit report for module 4
Assignment (INL2)	1.0	P, F	Individual	Module 5	17 November: Submit individual report for module 5

Project (PRO1)	2.5	P, F	Individual or in pairs	Module 5	24 November: Submit Master thesis proposal for module 5

The alignment among the intended learning outcomes (ILOs), modules and examination is as follows:

ILO	Examination Elements
Explain and reflect on scientific knowledge, different research traditions and research ethics.	*Module 1* - Quiz (assignment)
Critically review scientific literature and formulate relevant research questions.	*Module 2* - Report and peer review throughout seminar
Apply both qualitative and quantitative research methods.	*Module 3* - Report and peer review throughout seminar *Module 4* - Report and peer review throughout seminar
Critically review and assess a scientific text according to its aim, methodological rigor, contributions, relevance to practice as well as sustainability aspects. Formulate a plan for a scientific study including well motivated method choices and assessment of ethical issues and sustainability aspects.	*Module 5* - Report, Master thesis proposal and peer review throughout seminar

Deadlines for assignments

Deadline 28 August: Submit individual quiz answers on Canvas (module 1)

Deadline 15 September: Submit group report for module 2 on Canvas

Deadline 26 September: Submit group report for module 3 on Canvas

Deadline 10 October: Submit group report for module 4 on Canvas

Deadline 17 November: Submit individual report for module 5 on Canvas

Deadline 24 November: Submit Master thesis proposal for module 5 on Canvas

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

- Submission of report (by given deadlines)
- Active participation in the corresponding seminar (e.g. reflections on readings, cross-team presentations & feedback on others' works)

For the report submission, students are expected to conduct a reading of the course literature and to perform the given assignment to the best level possible. From experience of previous

course rounds, students who prepare more for the submission are more likely to experience a richer learning process.

During 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 through reflection thereafter. The 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 the 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

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 and the large number of students, 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 to 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

- 15 December at 13:00-14:00
- 16 December at 13:00-14:00
- 17 December at 13:00 -14:00
- 12 January at 13:00 -14:00

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

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.
- Please inform the examiners to let them know if you need support.

6. 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.

Course literature list

Module 1

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.
-

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. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*

Theory development

- Cowls, Josh, and Ralph Schroeder. "Causation, correlation, and big data in social science researchLinks to an external site." 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)

- Reinecke, J., Arnold, D., & Palazzo, G. (2016). “Qualitative Methods in Business Ethics, Corporate Responsibility, and Sustainability Research”. Business Ethics Quarterly, 26(4), Xiii-Xxii. https://doi:10.1017/beq.2016.67
- Basias, N. and Pollalis, Y., 2018. “Quantitative and Qualitative Research in Business & Technology: Justifying a Suitable Research Methodology”. Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research, Vol. 7, Supplementary Issue 1 91,

http://buscompress.com/uploads/3/4/9/8/34980536/riber_7-s1_sp_h17-083_91-105.pdf
- 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 Handboook of Qualitative Data Analysis.
- Roulston K. (2014) Chapter 20. Analysing Interviews. The SAGE Handboook of Qualitative Data Analysis.
- Coffey A. (2018) Chapter 25. Analysing Documents, The SAGE Handboook 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., & Sköldberg, 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*Links to an external site.(1), 37-39Links to an external site .
- 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.

Note

We would like to make a clarification concerning the basic assumptions for multiple linear regression as introduced in Saunders et al. (2015, 2012):

- Assumption 1 – the relationship between the dependent and independent variables is linear.
- Assumption 2 – the variance around the regression line is the same for all values of the dependent variable(s), i.e. homoscedasticity.
- Assumption 3 – absence of correlation between two or more independent variables, collinearity or multi-collinearity.
- Assumption 4 – the data for the independent variables and dependent variable are normally distributed.

We have been in contact with Mark Saunders who has confirmed that the fourth assumption is incorrect and that this is changed in the seventh version of the book. The new text reads as follows:

The residuals are normally distributed (discussed earlier in this section and Section 12.4). The residuals are the ‘errors’ between the predicted values of the dependent variable and the observed value when using the resultant regression equation. The simplest diagnostic tools to use here are to either draw a histogram of the residual values and look for a normal distribution (Figure 12.7), and plot the residual (error) values against the predicted values on a scatter graph and look for a diagonal line running from bottom left to top right.

Module 5

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 laterLinks to an external site . *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. 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 (2023). Available at https://libguides.usc.edu/writingguide/assignments/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
- 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.