

**Current Topics in Management and Business Ethics:
Organizational Wrongdoing**

Universität Zürich
16-19 September 2019

Location:
Seminarraum UNK-E-2, Universitätsstr. 84, 8006 Zürich
(Tram-Station Winkelriedstrasse, Line 9 & 10).

Instructor:
Don Lange, PhD
W. P. Carey School of Business
Arizona State University
don.lange@asu.edu

Registration:
Please register for this doctoral seminar by sending an email with your CV and a short motivation statement to Florian Überbacher (florian.ueberbacher@business.uzh.ch) before 02 August 2019. The number of participants is limited and places will be assigned on a first-come first-served basis (due to the GSB regulations, UZH doctoral students have priority).

For questions regarding the seminar content, please contact Don Lange (don.lange@asu.edu).
The seminar is worth 3 ECTS points.

Schedule and topics:

Monday 16 September

09:00-12:00 Session 1: Theory building—purpose and process; structuring your writing
13:00-16:00 Session 2: Overview of the topic of organizational wrongdoing
16:00-17:00 Individual coaching (see note below)

Tuesday 17 September

09:00-12:00 Session 3: Focus on individual-level causes of organizational wrongdoing
13:00-16:00 Session 4: Focus on leadership, culture, and normal wrongdoing
16:00-17:00 Individual coaching (see note below)

Wednesday 18 September

09:00-12:00 Session 5: Social control agents; media framing
13:00-16:00 Session 6: Consequences of organizational wrongdoing
16:00-17:00 Individual coaching (see note below)

Thursday 19 September

09:00-12:00 Session 7: Student presentations; seminar wrap up

A note about the individual coaching sessions:

Individual coaching is not mandatory. If you are a seminar participant who would like to discuss a paper you are working on, please contact Don Lange (don.lange@asu.edu) before 30 August 2019 to send your paper and to arrange a time on the schedule.

OVERVIEW AND OBJECTIVES OF THIS SEMINAR

This is a doctoral-level seminar in which we will review research in management and business ethics, with a specific focus on the topic of organizational wrongdoing. We will address a mix of theoretical and empirical contributions. Due to time constraints, our examination of the material will be introductory rather than exhaustive. In addition to learning about the topic of organizational wrongdoing, we will devote attention to developing student research capabilities. In particular, we will address the purpose of theory in management research, the process of developing a theoretical contribution (whether that be for a paper that is entirely conceptual, or instead for a qualitative or quantitative paper with a theoretical component), and a structured approach to writing and presenting a research paper. For illustration, we will look at a theory-only paper from its conception to its final publication.

The main objective of this seminar is to familiarize you with some of the basic assumptions, concepts, theories, and findings in management and business ethics pertaining to organizational wrongdoing. In addition, we will emphasize the following objectives:

1. To help you build the resources and knowledge needed to develop a mental model of the literature pertaining to organizational wrongdoing.
2. To help you sharpen your ability to critically assess academic research in the field of management and business ethics.
3. To help make you stronger at developing new ideas and/or approaches that advance some portion of the literature in the field of management and business ethics.
4. To help you become a better communicator of your academic ideas, both orally and in writing.

SEMINAR STRUCTURE

In each session we will discuss the assigned articles. Our discussion will be descriptive, critical, and creative. In the descriptive mode we will explore what the author intended to accomplish and why. In the critical mode we will look at how well the authors did what they set out to do. In the creative mode we will address the question ‘what’s next in this line of research and in this general topic area?’ Thus, beyond an in-depth critique of the assigned articles we will devote time to raising and discussing new research questions.

In this seminar you will gain additional insight into what it means to be a contributor to the scholarly community. As such, my strong expectation is that you be an active participant in not only your learning, but also that of your peers. The class is discussion-oriented. My role is not to lecture, but rather to guide and facilitate the discussion.

Please note:

- 1) Reading all of the assigned papers is mandatory. There are no exceptions if you want a passing grade in the course. This is important, as the seminar will only work if everyone arrives well prepared for a thoughtful discussion.
- 2) You may have had other seminars in which particular students were assigned to present particular papers and to lead the discussion on those papers. We will not use that structure in this seminar. What does that mean for you? See “1”).

GRADING

This seminar is graded as pass-fail. Your learning and the learning of your classmates will depend upon you arriving to class fully prepared and then participating fully in the discussion. A grade of pass for the seminar indicates that your preparation for all the sessions and your participation in all the sessions were excellent.

PREPARING FOR CLASS

1. Read each assigned reading carefully, taking notes on key points, concepts, theories, and findings.

Use the following questions to guide your note taking:

- a. What is the basic argument/point made by the author(s)? What are its strengths?
- b. What are the weaknesses of the argument and/or the empirical method?
- c. What alternative explanations can account for the findings of the authors?
- d. If you disagree with an argument or method, what would it take to convince you?
- e. What are the scope conditions; under what circumstances is the argument meant to apply?
- f. How might the argument in the paper be extended or applied to a different case, another context, or a different theoretical perspective?

2. Prior to sessions 1 through 6, think of one question you would like to discuss about each of the readings. Email me your questions (don.lange@asu.edu) at least two hours before the start of the session. A good discussion question is thought-provoking. Try to avoid questions that would simply require someone in the class to summarize something from the reading. “Why” or “how” questions are good. You might also try to make connections with something we’ve discussed in the seminar.

PRESENTATIONS

In session 7, each participant will give a Pecha Kucha style presentation of your own research idea. Your idea could be one that you developed based on the content of this seminar. Or, it could be an ongoing research project of yours. In the latter case, present your ongoing research but make a point of bringing in some ideas you learned in the seminar. (Pecha Kucha style means that you will have 20 slides at 20 seconds each, advancing automatically, for a total presentation length of 6 minutes, 40 seconds.) I will send you more information about this in advance and we will discuss it for clarification during session 1.

READINGS

Session 1: Theory building—purpose and process; structuring your writing

Lange, D., & Pfarrer, M. D. 2017. Editor's comments: Sense and structure--The core building blocks of an AMR article. *Academy of Management Review*, 42(3): 407–416.

Lange, D., & Washburn, N. T. 2012. Understanding attributions of corporate social irresponsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(2): 300-326.

Session 2: Overview of the topic of organizational wrongdoing

Greve, H. R., Palmer, D., & Pozner, J. 2010. Organizations gone wild: The causes, processes, and consequences of organizational misconduct. *Academy of Management Annals*, 4(1): 53-107.

Ashforth, B. E., Gioia, D. A., Robinson, S. L., & Treviño, L. K. 2008. Re-viewing organizational corruption. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(3): 670-684.

Palmer, D. A. 2013. The new perspective on organizational wrongdoing. *California Management Review*, 56(1): 5-23.

Session 3: Focus on individual-level causes of organizational wrongdoing

Welsh, D. T., Ellis, A. P. J., Christian, M. S., & Mai, K. M. 2014. Building a self-regulatory model of sleep deprivation and deception: The role of caffeine and social influence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(6): 1268-1277.

Reed, A., II, & Aquino, K. 2003. Moral identity and the expanding circle of moral regard towards out-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(6): 1270-1286.

Gioia, D. A. 1992. Pinto fires and personal ethics: A script analysis of missed opportunities. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11(5/6): 379-389.

Session 4: Focus on leadership, culture, and normal wrongdoing

Galvin, B. M., Lange, D., & Ashforth, B. E. 2015. Narcissistic organizational identification: Seeing oneself as central to the organization's identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 40(2): 163-181.

Sims, R. R., & Brinkmann, J. 2003. Enron ethics (or: culture matters more than codes). *Journal of Business Ethics*, 45(3): 243-256.

Vaughan, D. 1999. The dark side of organizations: Mistake, misconduct and disaster. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25: 271-305.

Session 5: Social control agents; media framing

Lange, D. 2008. A multidimensional conceptualization of organizational corruption control. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(3): 710-729.

Palmer, D. 2012. The social control of organizational wrongdoing, in *Normal organizational wrongdoing: A critical analysis of theories of misconduct in and by organizations*: 243-267. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Clemente, M., & Gabbioneta, C. 2017. How does the media frame corporate scandals? The case of German newspapers and the Volkswagen diesel scandal. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 26(3): 287-302.

Session 6: Consequences of organizational wrongdoing

Alexander, C. R. 1999. On the nature of the reputational penalty for corporate crime: Evidence. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 42(S1): 489-526.

Jonsson, S., Greve, H. R., & Fujiwara-Greve, T. 2009. Undeserved loss: The spread of legitimacy loss to innocent organizations in response to reported corporate deviance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54(2): 195-228.

Pozner, J. 2008. Stigma and settling up: An integrated approach to the consequences of organizational misconduct for organizational elites. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 80(1): 141-150.