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**OVERVIEW**

This PhD Course is designed to give Management PhD students exposure to and experience with techniques on two commonly underappreciated and neglected parts of PhD matriculation: [1] how to write interesting and important introductions and front-ends of articles; and [2] how to do a great (conference) presentation of one’s research. Accordingly, our focus will be on the written and oral communication of academic work.

This course requires reading and the discussion of readings, but it is fundamentally a “learning-by-doing” course. My approach is to have you undergo an iterative process where you (a) communicate your research, (b) receive feedback, (c) revise your communication, and then cycle through this process again. The goal (and the metric I used to evaluate the effectiveness of this course) is to start you on the path of being among the best communicators of your generation.

Most of the readings talk about communicating research or give you a sense of how one might position their particular topic and/or research question. And as we discuss these readings, you will be encouraged to incorporate those insights in your own work. Not everything will be equally relevant to your work, but common principles across the readings are very useful to identify. I have selected readings from scholars who have different perspectives, so when they all agree on something, consider that as something as close to a “law” as you will find. Also, whenever possible, I will send around a “reading guidance” if there are particular readings or topics within the readings that I would like you to focus on, or whether there are things that I think you should just skim. That said, most of the articles will not involve the deep reading that a journal article requires.

Drawing readings from a diverse set of scholars also has another motivation. Working in a business school means learning from and communicating with people with different disciplinary orientations. This requires appreciating different written and oral communication styles. This is especially true for writing articles. The introduction of a great economics article might have the same underlying elements as a great psychology or sociology article, but the expression of those elements can vary. For this reason, I plan to invite different faculty from the division to come in and speak so that you can understand the similarities and differences between them. Also, you will find that many of our discussions of the readings will focus on which article has the best piece of advice, the things that the articles have in common, as well as those things that are specific to a particular academic sub-field.

Grading

The grading will be in three components: 40% will be given for your written communication of research (the title and introduction to an article that you will write and revise), 40% for oral communication (including video-taped presentations), and 20% for class participation.

* Written (40%)
  + You will have to write the title and introduction to a journal article. While I prefer that this be a new introduction, upper-year students may submit the introduction of a paper that would be part of your dissertation. The best situation occurs when your introduction matches the presentation that you will be practicing during the term, but this is not necessary.
  + You will turn in the first draft of the introduction during Session 6. During this session you will present your title and introduction to 1-2 of your classmates, and will also hear the same classmates present their titles and introductions to you.
  + During Session 7 you will turn in written feedback (~1 page) to the introductions that were presented to you during the previous session. This means that everyone will be receiving feedback from 1-2 classmates during Session 7, as well as feedback from me.
  + During Session 8 you will turn in a reflection piece noting where and how you can improve your title and introduction. I have found this reflection aspect to be helpful in progressing as a communicator.
  + Based on this feedback you will rewrite and succinctly present your introduction during Session 9 to the entire class. This time no one will give their feedback in writing, only verbally during that class. Final versions of your introductions are due in Session 11. So, to summarize:
    - Session 6 (10% of final grade): Turn in 1st draft of introduction. Present it to two classmates.
    - Session 7 (5% of final grade): Turn in feedback from any introductions you were given to read.
    - Session 8 (5% of final grade): Turn in your reflection based on the feedback.
    - Session 9: Turn in 2nd draft of introduction. Present it to entire class and receive feedback.
    - Session 11 (20% of final grade): Turn in final draft of the introduction.
* Oral Presentation (40%)
  + You will present multiple times, and it is advised that you do the same presentation at least twice. The total number of times that you present depends on the how many people sign up. For example, if 12 people sign up each person presents about 3 times. Each time you present you will be asked to write a one page (max) reflection piece, which is due the week after you present. Your grade is based on your improvement as much as it is based on the overall quality of the presentation. Thus a very good presentation that does not improve much over the course of the term will rarely get a higher grade than a poor presentation that improves to average quality. In this way your presentation grade has three sub-components:
    - Overall quality of the presentation – (15% of final grade)
    - Your reflection piece(s) – (10% of the final grade)
    - Degree of improvement over course of the quarter (15% of final grade)
* Class Participation (20%)
  + The participatory component refers to leading and participating in class discussions on the readings, the feedback to your classmates on their presentations (e.g., compliments, appropriately ‘tough’ questions, constructive criticism), some of your favorite articles that I will ask you to bring to class, as well as the oral and written feedback on the titles and introductions that your peers produce.

**----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

**OUTLINE OF EACH SESSION**

The first three sessions will be virtual sessions. We will focus on writing short essays and commentaries on others essays, increasingly important forms of communication as science moves to online publishing and post-publication commentary.

You will be doing reading in the first weeks that lays a basis for the weeks to come and I will ask you to write a short essay each week and publish it on *Yellowdig* for the audience of me and your fellow students. One useful form of essay is to challenge to one of the reading’s conclusions. As standards shift across the years, you may advocate for some newer principles and feel free to link to articles or websites making the case for different standards.

Another useful form of essay is to apply the general arguments to a particular case, perhaps a paper that’s important in your research area. You could explain how this paper exemplifies, contradicts, or could be improved by the recommendations in the reading. Use yellowdig to link the case article, so that fellow students reading and commenting on your post can easily see it and evaluate your arguments about it.

You should respond to the essays of your fellow students. Please respond to their substantive points and also give them feedback about their writing—what’s engaging or unclear. We will schedule extra sessions as need in October to make sure you all have enough chances to give presentations and get feedback.

Some ground rules in this class both for writing and speaking:

1. We communicate clearly and engagingly. Put thought into composing your short essays so that readers will find them lucid and lively. Mix short and long sentences, formal and informal language, keep parallel construction. Its always a good idea to compose your essays in a word processor and then paste them over--use the spell checker and grammar checker to eliminate little errors that distract and tire out a reader.
2. We will give feedback with radical candor. Please treat all class communication as private, not to be repeated or paraphrased outside of class. Please give feedback diplomatically but precisely, as everyone in the class (including me) is trying to become a more effective speaker and writer. I tend to use filler words (“you know,” “sort of”) too often when communicating verbally, and I hope that you will point it out if you hear me doing it. If a classmate fails to enunciate, makes a grammatical mistake, or expresses him or herself in a needlessly wordy fashion, it is your duty to give them feedback. Good feedback is actionable. It’s not just a complaint; it’s a suggestion about how to do it better.

**Session 1 (**09/04/2019**): How to Write Good Empirical Articles (I)**

* Readings:[[1]](#footnote-1)
  + [Daft, R. L. 1995. Why I recommended that your manuscript be rejected and what you can do about it.](https://courseworks2.columbia.edu/courses/90249/files/search?preview=5529988&search_term=why+i+)
  + [McCloskey, D. 1999.](https://courseworks2.columbia.edu/courses/90249/files/search?preview=5529988&search_term=why+i+) *[Economical Writing](https://courseworks2.columbia.edu/courses/90249/files/search?preview=5529988&search_term=why+i+)*[, 187-222.](https://courseworks2.columbia.edu/courses/90249/files/search?preview=5529988&search_term=why+i+) <http://www.deirdremccloskey.com/docs/pdf/Article_86.pdf>
  + Carson, S.H., Fama, J., and K. Clancy 2012. Chapter 3: Do’s and Don’ts of Effective Writing in Psychology, *Writing for Psychology (Harvard Dept of Psychology)*. pp. 24-29.
  + <http://writingproject.fas.harvard.edu/files/hwp/files/writing_for_psych_final_from_printer.pdf>

* + Zuckerman, E.W. 2008. Tips for article writers. <http://web.mit.edu/ewzucker/www/Tips%20to%20article%20writers.pdf>
* [S1 - How To Tell a Story - Do Not Do Case Questions.pdfPreview the document](https://courseworks2.columbia.edu/courses/90199/files/5464961/download?wrap=1)

Please do all the readings and then write an essay related to one of them that includes an illustrative story, informed by the reading about story.

**Session 2 (**09/11/2019**): How to Write Good Empirical Articles (II)**

* Readings:
  + Bem, D. 2003. *Writing the Empirical Journal Article.* dbem.ws/WritingArticle.pdf

<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/0403/b24ae2c7dbe81c05529436167646f1b21c08.pdf>

* + Belcher, W. L. 2009. “Opening and Concluding Your Article,” *Writing Your Journal Article in 12 Weeks*, Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA. 201-217 (excerpt)

<https://courseworks2.columbia.edu/courses/90249/files/search?preview=5529989&search_term=Opening+and+Conc>.

* + Helping Readers Find Your Article: *https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/help-readers-find-your-article*
    - See also: [Guidelines for author names](https://us.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/author-names-guidelines_0.docx)

### Dudenhefer, P. 2009. [*A Guide to* Writing *in Economics - Duke University*](https://econ.duke.edu/sites/econ.duke.edu/files/file-attachments/Dudenhefer%2C%20Paul%20-%20Guide%20to%20Writing%20in%20Economics.pdf). 1-29, 46-50.

* + - Cochrane (2005). Writing Tips for PhD Students. <https://faculty.chicagobooth.edu/john.cochrane/research/papers/phd_paper_writing.pdf>

Please do all the readings and then write an essay related to one of them that challenges or applies one of the principles.

**Session 3 (**09/18/2019**): What Makes Good “Theory”? How to Think About Relevance?**

* Readings:
  + Davis, Murray S., That's Interesting: Towards a Phenomenology of Sociology and a Sociology of Phenomenology , Philosophy of the Social Sciences, 1:4 (1971:Dec.) p.309-344. <https://proseminarcrossnationalstudies.files.wordpress.com/2009/11/thatsinteresting_1971.pdf>
* Sutton and Staw (1995). What Theory is Not. [www.jstor.org/stable/2393788](http://www.jstor.org/stable/2393788) with Comments Karl Weick (1995). *What Theory is Not, Theorizing Is.* <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2393789>
* Klein and Zedeck (2004). [Theory in applied psychology](http://www-management.wharton.upenn.edu/klein/documents/new_folder/klein_zedeck_theory_applied_psychology.pdf): Lessons (Re)Learned.

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/232466220_Introduction_to_the_Special_Section_on_Theoretical_Models_and_Conceptual_Analyses_Theory_in_Applied_Psychology_Lessons_ReLearned>

* Gabaix and Laibson 2008. The Seven Properties of Good Models.

<https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4481492/Laibson_SevenProperties.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y>

Please do all the readings and then write an essay related to one of them engages with the argument in some way. Even though you are discussing abstract topics—theory—keep your writing easy to read and engaging by using metaphors, examples, analogies etc.

**Session 4 (**09/25/2019**): How to Give an Academic Talk**

* Readings:

### [Suggestions on Preparing for Presentations](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=0CDkQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.econ.umn.edu%2F%7Etkehoe%2Fclasses%2FTipsOct05.pdf&ei=J3q_UK-jK6GR0gG4pICAAw&usg=AFQjCNE-eqGx_HphzOcaqqokV3QDFF3Tww&sig2=UGs31Uc3lc_NM-Dr5-VQIA) (Kehoe 2005)

* + Giving an Academic Talk: <http://www.cs.berkeley.edu/~jrs/speaking.html>

### [How to Give an Academic Talk, v4.0 - Paul N. Edwards](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CDAQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fpne.people.si.umich.edu%2FPDF%2Fhowtotalk.pdf&ei=ZHy_UIKwB8LD0QHs8YGgDw&usg=AFQjCNHpW47RrdRsl4xHLICzwFuclAnPBw&sig2=g7YGU0wBpHK9y0blN_QNog) (2010)

### Optional:

### <http://www.muhlenberg.edu/depts/psychology/Presentations.htm>

* Discussion on how to set up empirical articles.
* Presentations, 15-20 min each, plus 5 minutes Q&A.
* Presentation debrief.
* Sign-up for reading discussion leaders.

**Session 5 (**10/02/2019**): Matching the Style, Strength, and Audience to the Journal**

* Bring in 2 articles that have a similar underlying argument or theory but are in different journals.
* Readings:
* Rynes et al. 2005. Everything You’ve Always Wanted to Know about AMJ. *Academy of Management Journal*. 48, 5, 732-737. <http://aom.org/uploadedFiles/Publications/AMJ/EverythingYouWantedToKnow.AMJ.pdf>
* Gulati, R. 2007. Tent Poles, Tribalism, and Boundary Spanning: the rigor-relevance Debate in Management Research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 4, 775-782.

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.516.6247&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

* Palmer et al. 2009. Rigor and Relevance in Organizational Studies. [http://jmi.sagepub.com/content/18/4/265.full.pdf](http://jmi.sagepub.com/content/18/4/265.full.pdf+html)
* Optional:
  + Thompson, P. J. 2007. How to Choose the Right Journal for your Manuscript. Chest, 132, 1073-76.

<https://journal.chestnet.org/article/S0012-3692(15)36678-2/fulltext>

* + APA. 2012. Preparing Manuscripts for Publication in Psychology Journals. <http://www.apa.org/pubs/authors/new-author-guide.aspx>
* A sample of journals:
  + Administrative Science Quarterly Invitation to Reviewers
    - <http://orgtheory.wordpress.com/2012/07/28/what-every-journal-should-put-on-its-web-page/>
    - <http://www2.johnson.cornell.edu/publications/asq/contributors.html>
    - <http://asq.org/knowledge-center/ask-an-editor-faqs>
  + American Economic Review
    - <http://www.aeaweb.org/aer/2012report.pdf>
  + American Sociological Review
    - <http://www.asanet.org/journals/editors_report_2011.cfm>
  + Journal of Personality and Social Psychology
    - <http://www.jbo.com/jbo3/submissions/dsp_jbo.cfm?journal_code=psp2>
* Presentations, 15-20 min each, plus 5 minutes Q&A.
* Presentation debrief.

**Session 6 (**10/9/2019**): Introductions and the World of “PowerPoint”: Written assignment 1 due**

* Readings:
* Duarte, *HBR Guide to Persuasive Presentations* (I recommend that you buy this in kindle version. It’s an easy read. Ch 1-5 )
* 10 Tips for Academic Talks<http://matt.might.net/articles/academic-presentation-tips/>

### If you are presenting to an intelligent but non-academic audience, the model used by Tedx has produced a lot of positive results: <http://blog.ted.com/10-tips-for-better-slide-decks/>

### Critiques of Powerpoint

### Pratt, C. B. (2003). The misuse of PowerPoint. *Public Relations Quarterly, 48*(2), 20-24. <https://courseworks2.columbia.edu/courses/90249/files/search?preview=5529985&search_term=powerpoint>

### Tufte, E. F. 2006. The Cognitive Style of PowerPoint: Pitching Out Corrupts Within. *Beautiful Evidence*. Graphics Press LLC., Cheshire, CT. <https://www.inf.ed.ac.uk/teaching/courses/pi/2016_2017/phil/tufte-powerpoint.pdf>

* Some excerpted advice on giving talks from Tufte (Bisbort 1999):

1. Lay out the problem: who cares about it and what the solution is.
2. When you talk, TALK: avoid the obvious reliance on notes.
3. Never apologize.
4. Use humor, but make it relevant and never irritating.
5. Use gender-neutral speech.
6. Practice intensely beforehand.
7. Take questions, but NEVER condescend to the questioner. Keep in mind that most questions arise from personal concerns.
8. Express enthusiasm about your material, but only if your enthusiasm is real.
9. Finish early.

* Roundtable for written assignments
  + Bring in 3 copies of your written assignment (the title and introduction of your article). You will pass two of them along to 1-2 classmates. Ideally only one of the two classmates will have your disciplinary orientation. For example, if you are more oriented to psychology, only one of the two classmates who review the paper should be someone oriented to psychology.
  + Once in a group of 2 or 3 you will be asked to take up to 10 minutes to explain your paper title and introduction. During this time you would also explain what you are trying to accomplish with the article and what you see as the target audience/journal. You then will have five minutes of Q&A where your other two classmates ask you questions about what you have written.
  + Each classmate that you gave the introduction to is responsible for giving written feedback (between a half page and a full page) at the beginning of next week’s class (Session 7).
* Presentations, 15-20 min each, plus 5 minutes Q&A
* Presentation debrief

**Session 7 (**10/23/2019**): Introduction (II) and Handing the Q&A. – Turn in feedback on written assignments.**

* Brief discussion of feedback
  + Each person turns in the feedback on their colleague’s introduction. Bring two copies. One for me, and one for your colleague. Alternatively, you may email it in advance.
  + We will discuss the main kinds of advice we gave.
* Bring in 1 or 2 articles of very good or very bad introductions from work that is published in a peer-reviewed journal.
  + We will sample among these and discuss what is good and/or bad about the articles that you bring into class.
* Readings
  + “How do I handle the Q&A?”
    - Giving the Oral Presentation http://www.acponline.org/residents\_fellows/competitions/abstract/prepare/oral\_pres.htm
    - Asking and Answering Questions: <https://chroniclevitae.com/news/922-the-professor-is-in-the-job-talk-q-a>
    - <http://conorneill.com/2011/04/01/how-to-handle-questions-during-your-presentation/>
    - <http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/ld/resources/presentation/questions>
* Presentations, 15-20 min each, plus 5 minutes Q&A.
* Presentation debrief.

**Session 8 (**10/30/2019**): Turn in reflection of feedback on written assignments**

* Turn-in a one-page (max) reflection piece based on the feedback from me and your classmates. This piece should focus on how you can bolster the strong parts of your introduction, and improve the weaker parts.
  + We will discuss the reflection pieces as well as the readings for the day.
* Paste the introduction of your article [here](http://writersdiet.com/test.php) to get an analysis of whether your writing is “fit” or “flabby.” It is from [The WritersDiet Test](http://writersdiet.com/about.php), is a coarse diagnostic tool designed identify some of the sentence-level grammatical features that most frequently weigh down stodgy prose. Come to class with the results of the analysis.
* Readings
  + Zinnser, William. (2010). [Writing English as a second language](https://theamericanscholar.org/writing-english-as-a-second-language/). *Point of Departure* (Winter). Americanscholar.org.
  + Becker. H. S. 2007. “Freshman English for Graduate Students,” *Writing for Social Scientists*, 1-25.

<https://courseworks2.columbia.edu/courses/90249/files/search?preview=5529985&search_term=powerpoint>

* + Becker, H. S. 2007. “Persona and Authority,” *Writing for Social Scientists*, 26-42.  
    <https://epdf.pub/writing-for-social-scientists-how-to-start-and-finish-your-thesis-book-or-articl.html>
* Presentations, 15-20 min each, plus 5 minutes Q&A.
* Presentation debrief.

**Session 9 (**11/6/2019**): A second round of feedback on your introductions.**

* Brief presentations of revised written assignments
  + Here everyone will give succinct presentations of their title and introduction, and receive feedback from the rest of the class. Ideally, this would be 5 minutes for your presentation, and another 5 for Q&A.
* Presentations, 15-20 min each, plus 5 minutes Q&A
* Presentation debrief

**Session 10 (**11/13/2019**): Presenting data and analyses.**

* Readings

### Tufte, E. F. 2001. Aesthetics and Technique in Data Graphical Design. *The Visual Display of Quantitative Information*. Graphics Press: Cheshire, CT.

### <https://courseworks2.columbia.edu/courses/90249/files/search?preview=5530005&search_term=aesthetics>

* + Hunter, Matt 2012. Presenting Data in Powerpoint: Practical Advice on Slide Design. <http://www.slideshare.net/MattHunter/how-to-present-data-in-powerpoint>
  + Optional
    - <http://www.bettycjung.net/Graphing.htm>
* Based on the readings, each student will bring in 1 or 2 examples of good or bad presentations of data from work that is published in a peer-reviewed journal.
  + We will sample among these and discuss what is good and/or bad about the examples that you bring into class.
* Presentations, 15-20 min each, plus 5 minutes Q&A.
* Presentation debrief.

**Session 11 (**11/20/2019**): Full presentation day and any student-led topics**

* Student-led topics: here we will discuss topics a majority of students wish to cover but are not in the current syllabus.
* Presentations, 15-20 min each, plus 5 minutes Q&A
* Presentation debrief

**Session 12 (**12/04/2019**): Full presentation day (II)**

* Presentations, 15-20 min each, plus 5 minutes Q&A
* Presentation debrief
* Panel discussion: Fresh lessons from the job talk front lines. A panel of our newest faculty to talk about what they learned in the course of doing their job talks.

1. The readings will either be posted on Canvas or there is an associated link provided in the syllabus. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)