



Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Köhler, T;Gao, J

Title:

Methods in Responsible Management Learning and Education - A Review

Date:

2020

Citation:

Köhler, T. & Gao, J. (2020). Methods in Responsible Management Learning and Education - A Review. Moosmayer, D (Ed.). Laasch, O (Ed.). Parkes, C (Ed.). Brown, K (Ed.). The Sage Handbook Of Responsible Management Learning And Education, (1), pp.522-542. Sage.

Persistent Link:

<https://hdl.handle.net/11343/241475>

**METHODS IN RESPONSIBLE MANAGEMENT LEARNING AND EDUCATION – A
REVIEW**

Tine Köhler

Department of Management and Marketing

The University of Melbourne

198 Berkeley Street, Level 10

Parkville, VIC 3010 Australia

Phone: +61 3 9035 5852

Email: tkoehler@unimelb.edu.au

Jennifer Gao

Department of Management and Marketing

The University of Melbourne

198 Berkeley Street, Level 10

Parkville, VIC 3010 Australia

Email: jennifer.gao@unimelb.edu.au

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the current chapter is to examine which research methods have been employed to study RMLE phenomena and their contexts. This review allows us to determine if certain overarching approaches to generate knowledge as well as data collection and analysis tools are favored over others, which may indicate that the knowledge base created on RMLE may be stronger in some ways than in others. We also examine how research methods have been applied and provide examples of excellent applications. Our findings show that the most commonly applied overarching research approaches in RMLE are survey methodology, case studies, and content analysis. Data collection techniques predominantly include interviews, observations, survey data, and the analysis of organizational documents or archival textual data. Data analysis techniques are dominated by descriptive statistics, simple mean comparisons, and thematic analysis. Based on our review, we discuss specific challenges of RMLE research and provide recommendations for navigating these challenges in the application of specific research methods. We also provide suggestions for alternative research approaches that may prove fruitful for future RMLE research.

Keywords: Research methods; Sustainability; Responsibility; Ethics; Qualitative research methods; Quantitative Research Methods; Mixed Methods; Responsible management learning and education

METHODS IN RESPONSIBLE MANAGEMENT LEARNING AND EDUCATION – A REVIEW

The current chapter provides a review of the research methods and methodologies employed in current responsible management learning and education (RMLE) research. In general, reviewing the research methods (including data collection and analysis) of any given field is useful to determine how it has arrived at its current knowledge base. Research methods are the tools with which we explore our phenomena of interest and the contexts in which they exist. The research methods we use allow us to discover, explore, develop, examine, reflect on, assess, test, challenge, and refute knowledge. Over time, the use of research methods helps researchers create a knowledge base on a given phenomenon and the context in which it operates.

Yet, all research methods also have limitations. As McGrath (1995) discusses, all research methods are inherently flawed. Research methods are rooted in research philosophies about what exists (ontology) and how we can know what exists (epistemology). This means that employing a particular research method inherently imposes a specific lens through which a phenomenon and its context can be explored and understood. Furthermore, all research methods have strengths and weaknesses such that no one research method can fully capture a phenomenon and its context. Rather, a particular research method allows the researcher to explore certain characteristics of a phenomenon but not others or certain aspects related to how the phenomenon operates in its context but not in others. As such, the existing knowledge base on a phenomenon of interest and its context is strongly influenced by the research methods a field employs.

The purpose of the current chapter is to examine which research methods have been employed to study RMLE phenomena and their contexts. This review allows us to determine if certain tools to generate knowledge are favored over others, which may indicate that the knowledge base created on RMLE may be stronger in some ways than in others. We also examine how research methods have been applied and provide examples of excellent applications of research methods in RMLE research.

In the beginning of our chapter, we describe the method we employed to systematically review the use of research methods in RMLE research. We then report findings from our review that highlight which methods are most commonly employed. We also evaluate the current applications of these methods in RMLE research and provide specific examples for excellent applications of the method. We then discuss more generally some of the specific methodological challenges researchers face in RMLE research and offer suggestions for addressing and managing these challenges. Finally, we highlight alternative research approaches that show great promise for the future study of RMLE.

REVIEW OF RMLE METHODS

In this section, we describe the method we employed for our review of the research methods currently used in RMLE research. We also discuss the strengths and limitations of our chosen approach.

Search for Empirical Papers

For our review, we evaluated papers published over the last five years (i.e., 2013-2018) in the journals *Academy of Management Learning and Education (AMLE)*, *Journal of Management*

Education (JME), *Management Learning (ML)*, *Management Teaching Review (MTR)*, and *International Journal of Management Education (IJME)*. We limited our review to the last five years to ensure that our observations reflect the most current practices.

We chose the five journals above for several reasons. First, these journals all cover general management learning and education research, rather than more specific sub-topics, such as learning and education specifically related to leadership (e.g., *Journal of Leadership Education*), marketing (e.g., *Journal of Marketing Education*), or international business (e.g., *Journal of Teaching in International Business*). In this way, we ensure that we do not overrepresent particular research topics and associated research methods by reviewing published articles in journals that limit themselves to specific topics.

Second, the five chosen journals each have different research foci and serve slightly different communities of learning and education researchers. A review of their mission statements shows that AMLE focuses on the process and results of management teaching as well as the institutional environment of business schools (Academy of Management Learning & Education, 2018). JME publishes articles that “reflect changes and developments in the conceptualization, organization, and practice of management education” (Journal of Management Education, 2018). MTR publishes short teaching and learning resources (Management Teaching Review, 2018). IJME seeks to publish “reflective papers which bring together pedagogy and theories of management learning” (The International Journal of Management Education, 2018). ML “provide a unique forum for critical inquiry, innovative ideas and dialogue” (Management Learning, 2018).

Furthermore, our assertion that these journals publish different types of papers is also based on the personal experiences of the first author of this chapter. While being an Associate

Editor for AMLE, Köhler has held several workshops with Editors and Associate Editors of JME, MTR, and ML that have focused on how the journals differ in the content they publish, in the ontological and epistemological traditions in which most of their publications are rooted, and in the associated research methods that are frequently employed in the published papers. As such, in reviewing articles published in these five journals we can ensure a plurality of ontological and epistemological foundations as well as a plurality of specific approaches to research methods such as experimental research, simulations, survey research, different qualitative research methods, and many more.

Third, the five journals chosen for this review include arguably the most influential journals in MLE research. The journals are ranked consistently highly in popular publication ranking systems. Furthermore, the submission rates to these journals have increased over the last years (based on journal statistics from editorial board meetings and on personal conversations with the journals' editors), indicating that they are a popular and respected outlet for MLE research. Consequently, our review of research methods related to RMLE research in these five journals should allow us to review the most relevant methods for RMLE researchers.

In order to search for articles published on RMLE topics in these five journals, we used the following search terms: *sustainab** (which finds all matches related to this word stem, such as *sustainability*, *sustainable*, *sustainably*, and other words with the same word stem), *ethic** (i.e., *ethics*, *ethical*, *ethically*, *business ethics*, *ethic*, etc.), and *responsib** (i.e., *responsibility*, *corporate social responsibility*, *responsibly*, *responsibly*, etc.). Table 1 lists the initial search hits produced by the use of these search terms.

-----insert Table 1 here-----

Inclusion Criteria

To be included in our review, an article had to meet several inclusion criteria. First, the article had to be a research piece on RMLE topics. For example, several articles might have included the word “responsible,” but the use of the word was not related to responsible management learning and education. It might have been used in the sense of a manager being responsible for her or his employees or an antecedent being responsible for a certain effect. Similarly, an article may have included the word “sustainable” but only to say that certain teaching practices were not sustainable over the course of a semester. To be included in our review, an article’s main research topic had to be either a topic related to communicating learning content on sustainability, responsibility, or ethics or a topic related to teaching and educating in a responsible, sustainable, or ethical way.

Second, the article had to include an empirical component, i.e., a data collection and analysis. Conceptual, anecdotal, editorial, or opinion pieces were not included in our review. Consequently, our review included 11 papers from AMLE, 17 papers from JME, 0 papers from MTR (no empirical data was found in any of the RMLE studies we assessed in MTR), 19 papers from ML, and 18 papers from IJME.

Coding Approach

From each of the included articles we coded the following information about the employed research methods:

- Journal
- Publication year
- Did the paper follow a qualitative, quantitative, mixed method or other approach?
- Was the topic of the paper related to communicating RMLE content or related to RMLE as a characteristic of the educational experience?
- General approach employed (qualitative: e.g., grounded theory, case study analysis, ethnography, action research; quantitative: e.g., survey methodology, experiment, archival, vignette study)
- Data collection approach (qualitative: e.g., interviews, observations, artifacts, field notes; quantitative: e.g., panel survey, longitudinal measurement, repeated measures, archival data)
- Data analysis approach (qualitative: e.g., thematic analysis, discursive analysis, content analysis, grounded theory coding; quantitative: e.g., descriptive statistics, t-test, ANOVA, regression, SEM, HLM, social networks analysis)

For papers using a different approach than we would usually classify in the management discipline as quantitative, qualitative, or mixed method we collected all available information about the employed method. Table 2 presents the articles we coded and our coding decisions.

-----insert Table 2 here-----

FINDINGS

Over the last 5 years, we found 65 empirical articles in 5 journals, out of which we classified 10 as quantitative, 39 as qualitative, 15 employed some form of mixed methods, and 1 paper used another type of approach not commonly captured under these prior approaches.

Quantitative

Amongst the 10 papers using quantitative approaches, 9 papers used a survey approach. Out of these 9 survey papers, six used one-time measurement, 1 used measures at different points in time, and 3 used repeated measurement (note: some papers featured multiple data collections). In addition to using a survey approach, the paper by Rasche et al. (2013) also featured a longitudinal design, the paper by Klapper et al (2016) a quasi-experimental design, and the paper by Koris et al. (2017) used vignettes as stimulus material. The one quantitative paper that did not use a survey (Décamps et al., 2017) introduced the Sustainability Literacy Test platform (to demonstrate how higher education institutions can evaluate their sustainability teaching and learning) and reported statistics on sustainability literacy worldwide at present time. For data analysis, 3 papers used SEM or path modeling, 3 papers used t-tests, 2 papers used regression techniques, 2 papers used only descriptive statistics, 1 paper used factor analysis, and 1 paper used ANOVA techniques (note: Some papers used several techniques).

Qualitative

Amongst the 39 papers using a qualitative approach, 18 papers employed a case study analysis approach, 3 papers a grounded theory approach, 4 papers a narrative approach, 4 papers discourse analysis, 8 papers a content analysis approach, 4 papers an action research approach, and 3 papers an ethnographic approach (again, several papers combined multiple approaches). Data collection means included interviews (15 papers), focus groups (2 papers), observations (14

papers), surveys (9 papers), other documents or archival textual data (18 papers), non-textual data (e.g., photos; 4 papers), co-created materials (4 papers), personal reflections (2 papers), field notes (3 papers), journaling (3 papers), and vignettes (1 paper). Data in the qualitative papers were analyzed using thematic analysis (15 papers), analysis of discursive practices (5 papers), narrative analysis (4 papers), visual semiotic analysis (1 paper), grounded theory analysis (5 papers), inductive coding (2 papers), critical incident analysis (1 paper), interpretive analysis (1 paper), and reflective conversations (1 paper).

Mixed and Other

Amongst the mixed methods papers, 5 papers used a case study approach, 11 papers a content analysis approach, 13 papers a survey approach (with 1 longitudinal design among them), 1 paper a vignette study, and 1 paper student assessments. The data collection of these papers included surveys (13 papers with one-time measurement, 1 with repeated measures), interviews (3 papers), and the analysis of other documents or archival textual data (9 papers). Data analysis techniques included thematic analysis (11 papers), narrative analysis (3 papers), content analysis (3 papers), fuzzy set qualitative comparative analysis (1 paper), descriptive statistics as the dominant technique (11 papers), ANOVA/MANOVA (3 papers), t-tests (3 papers), other non-linear comparison tests (1 paper), and cluster analysis (1 paper).

We only found one paper that used a different approach than we would usually classify in the management discipline as quantitative, qualitative, or mixed method. The paper by Cummings and Bridgman (2016) created geographical maps using an algorithm into which textual data was fed. They also used a narrative textbook review as well as publication analyses.

As such, the most commonly employed techniques that we see in RMLE research are survey methodology, case study analysis, and content analysis of textual data. Quantitative data analysis techniques focus predominantly on descriptive statistics and some of the simpler mean comparison techniques. Qualitative data analysis techniques predominantly favor thematic analysis. In the following, we will highlight four example papers that have used different methods to examine their research questions. We chose these articles because of the demonstrated fit between the research question posed and the research method applied, which allowed each author team to address interesting research questions and uncover new knowledge.

Examples of Different Research Method Applications

Employing a qualitative multiple-case study analysis approach, Hanson et al. (2017) examine students' moral development across three different cultural contexts (USA, Morocco, and Brazil). The researchers adopted a constructionist epistemology in which they explored moral beliefs as being "created, altered, and affirmed in their daily experiences within the communities in which they are embedded" (Hanson et al., 2017, p. 396). Of specific interest to the researchers was how students' interactions with their institutions shaped their moral development process. Using triangulation in data collection (surveys, observations, artifacts, and interviews) and data analysis (coding notes, field notes, prolonged researcher engagement, member checks, the use of multiple coders, within-and across-case analysis), the authors were able to draw strong inferences about the model of moral development they were re-examining. Their study allowed them to confirm several dimensions of their theoretical model, modify two of the original dimensions, and add another influence factor to the model. In this paper, the case study approach was used very effectively for model elaboration and extension.

Gherardi and Rodeschini (2016) employed an ethnographic approach to study caring. Using a post-humanist approach to explore the practice of caring as an organizational competence, the authors conducted ethnographic field work in a nursing home for the elderly. The authors analyzed data from interviews, observations, prolonged field exposure, and official documents via a grounded theory approach focusing on critical incidents (i.e., “an emotional event in the life of a person or an organization in that it is a period of intense feelings;” Gherardi & Rodeschini, 2016, p. 272). Core insights from this research uncovered caring to be a common orientation of actors that is collectively performed, encoded in practices, and adapted through situated decision-making. The paper is a great example of the opportunities that ethnographic studies can provide for studying ethical decision-making and the enactment of responsible practices.

Adopting a quantitative survey approach, Roberts et al. (2018) developed an integrated moral conviction theory of student academic dishonesty. Drawing on models and concepts of moral philosophies, moral identity, and moral conviction, the authors propose multiple paths through which moral conviction may affect unethical decision-making among students. The authors collected survey data from undergraduate business students on the measures of moral conviction, moral identity, moral philosophy, moral disengagement and unethical decision-making. Based on the results of a confirmatory factor analysis and structural equation modelling, the research confirms moral conviction as a key factor that reduces student moral disengagement and unethical decision making. This paper illustrates how quantitative modelling can be applied to examine factors that predict (un)ethical decision making.

In their mixed-methods study, Beddewela, Warin, Hesselden, and Coslet (2017) examined staff and students views on responsible management education (RME) and

deficiencies in the existing curriculum. The authors used a three-phase data collection approach, which combined qualitative data from two business faculty workshops aimed at targeting a list of terms faculty associate with RME, qualitative data from a document analysis of the existing curriculum (e.g., syllabi, course descriptions, etc.), and quantitative data from a student survey. Results from thematic analysis and descriptive statistics revealed that while some faculty and student perceptions aligned, for example, with regard to the need of a more wide-spread and systematic incorporation of RME into the program's curriculum, some perceptions differed widely, for example, with regard to the importance of RME to students. Faculty members thought that students were less enthusiastic about RME, while students reported that RME weighs strongly in their consideration of program quality and choice. From their findings, the authors conclude that effective responsible management education requires business school-wide support.

In the next section, we discuss specific challenges that arise from the study of the three reviewed research topics in RMLE, i.e., ethics, sustainability, and responsibility. We review how current papers have addressed these challenges when selecting and applying specific research methods. In addition, we make some alternative suggestions for future RMLE work.

UNIQUE CHALLENGES OF THE RMLE CONTEXT

Studying research topics grounded in ethics, sustainability, and responsibility poses some specific challenges on the research methods being employed. Furthermore, there are specific challenges arising out of the two main research purposes, i.e., RMLE as content to be taught versus RMLE as a characteristic of the educational experience.

Teaching RMLE Content

Authors are often interested in an evaluation of the effectiveness of their approach for teaching RMLE content. Much of the published research we reviewed for this chapter highlights, though, that the teaching of RMLE content goes beyond teaching declarative, tangible knowledge. Rather, teaching RMLE content often involves, among other things, instilling moral values, changing existing beliefs and behavioral patterns, becoming aware of taken-for-granted thought patterns, and challenging one's own identity. On the one hand, these are complex topics to teach that require innovative learning approaches. Furthermore, when it comes to research methods, authors also need to take into account specific characteristics inherent in assessing these learning contexts.

In the papers we reviewed, it was noticeable that the number of qualitative studies far outweighed the number of quantitative studies (by about 4 to 1). It seems that authors consider qualitative work to be much more suitable to the research topic and context in RMLE. A closer look at the unique challenges presented in RMLE research may explain why. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, the teaching content chosen is complex. For example, changing values or morals to foster responsible and sustainable leadership or developing an ethical identity are topics that are hard to capture in a survey for two reasons.

First, the concepts themselves are hard to assess with static survey questions. Morals and values are malleable, and students may not assign the same meaning to them. As such, asking pre-worded questions about them negates the importance of the sense-making process that students may engage in when being taught about morals and values. Second, if the process of changing morals, values, or identities is of interest to the researcher, then the research method needs to be able to account for the fact that learning trajectories may differ between individuals.

It also needs to accommodate that learning rarely unfolds in a linear process (Wright & Gilmore, 2012). As such, a research method needs to be able to capture dynamic change over time.

Qualitative methods are uniquely qualified to cater to these requirements, especially methods that explore and uncover patterns alongside the research participants.

Along these lines, it is noteworthy that several of the qualitative papers that focus on teaching RMLE content have used action research approaches (García-Rosell, 2013; Gearty et al., 2015; Page et al., 2014; Warwick et al., 2017), ethnography (Gherardi & Rodeschini, 2016; Mangan et al. 2016), grounded theory (Montiel et al., 2018; Sutherland et al., 2015; Toubiana, 2014), narrative analysis (Deer & Zaretsky, 2017; Kassinis & Panayiotou, 2017; Tyran, 2017; Warhurst & Black, 2017), or discourse analysis (Heizmann & Liu, 2018; García-Rosell, 2013; Louw, 2015). All of these approaches focus in one way or another on the lived experiences of the participants, their sense-making processes, development over time, and the importance of context (physical context or relevant relationships and interactions) for said development. Furthermore, many of these approaches are rooted in epistemologies that assume the subjectivity of participants' experiences and focus on how experiences, sense-making, meaning-making, and identities are created. These include social constructionism, social constructivism, critical realism, interpretivism, and phenomenology.

If researchers are interested in RMLE research questions and don't expect change in the underlying construct specification of the main construct over time, then researchers may want to consider using quantitative techniques that can assess different learning trajectories, such as hierarchical linear modeling or time series analysis. For example, if the research question was to determine the most effective method to deliver knowledge surrounding sustainability or to increase engagement in sustainable practices, then researchers could administer different

instructional techniques in different classes (i.e., a nested design) and compare the learning curve slopes over time. Hierarchical linear modeling should be of interest to MLE researchers as they could use it to compare the effectiveness of different instructional designs administered to different groups of students. Time series analysis could be of interest to assess how learning unfolds, i.e., how the students' standing on the construct of interest changes over time. This type of data collection requires multiple measurement points at equally-spaced time intervals and strives to learn about the nature of a phenomenon by understanding how it changes over time.

Generally, these types of quantitative research are still rare in RMLE research (and more generally in learning and teaching research) but could be very valuable in assessing the value of different teaching techniques. The construct complexity in RMLE research, though, often makes the use of quantitative techniques difficult. Before quantitative techniques can be used more widely, we need to arrive at more appropriate and stable construct specifications, which may be very difficult if we know that constructs are malleable, subjective, and fickle.

Beyond the complexity of the chosen topic, RMLE research topics are challenging because they deal with potentially sensitive issues, such as discovering that one is not being as ethical, sustainable, or responsible as one thought. Sensitive topics can bring with them a whole range of psychological adjustments, distortions, and coping mechanisms to ameliorate the negative conclusions we may draw about ourselves. For example, we may engage in some form of positivity bias or self-deception (Goleman, 1996) to maintain an image that we are not as bad as we may have to conclude from a particular learning experience. Or we respond to questions on a survey in a way that is influenced by social desirability, i.e., we may acknowledge we are not the ethical or sustainable posterchild, but we do not want others to know that or judge us for it. In these cases, qualitative research that follows the participant over time can again be quite

useful. On the one hand, researchers can specifically explore self-deception or social desirability biases. Beyond procedures in survey research that may statistically correct for such biases to create data that is assumed to be largely free from its influence, qualitative work allows the researcher to explore why participants engage in these behaviors. Insights from such explorations may be particularly helpful to understand obstacles to learning and identity development.

Finally, many of the papers we reviewed have highlighted the importance of introducing reflexivity and reflection activities in their research on teaching RMLE content, including reflexivity of the researcher, i.e., reflexivity as a characteristic of the research approach. Through reflections, students observe, analyze, and reconsider different interpretations of their evaluations of a given situation. In order to change something as deeply rooted as values, morals, beliefs, or identities, deep reflection is often necessary (Hibbert & Cunliffe, 2015; Mirvis, 2008). Assessing this reflection process can provide important insights to researchers about appropriate teaching content, stimuli for initiating reflection, or offering assistance for reflection (Sutherland, Gosling, & Jelinek, 2015; Tomkins & Ulus, 2015, 2016).

RMLE as Characteristic of the Educational Experience

Many of the studies on RMLE as a characteristic of the educational experience focus on business schools' implementation of the UN's PRME principles to increase business schools' positive societal impact. Others focus on issues with student cheating or the influence of student organizations on students' moral development. The predominant research methods used for studies on educational experiences were case study analyses followed by surveys and content analysis. Many of the studies included analyses of business curricula, business school websites,

or textual data from reports. The survey studies gathered data directly from different stakeholders such as students, business school faculty, or career services staff.

When using secondary data, researchers face the challenge that they often do not have access to the thought processes involved in creating the secondary data. For example, when analyzing business school curricula across different business schools, researchers are often not privy to the decision-making processes underlying what was included in the curriculum and what was not. When studying PRME reports, researchers do not know if information was strategically left out of the report or if some aspects were worded a bit more optimistically than maybe warranted. In short, when studying secondary data, researchers must rely on the edited nature of the content they are analyzing. We can argue that this is likely going to be true for all business schools and thus, would ensure that we are still comparing like with like. However, this also means that we would never get the full picture of how business schools incorporate RMLE-related characteristics into their organizational and educational context.

When collecting primary data, for example, through surveys or interviews, researchers essentially face many of the same issues related to social desirability, self-deception, or the discussion of sensitive issues as outlined above. Furthermore, in order to rigorously carry out a survey research project, statistical power for running analyses needs to be strong. In the published studies, many of the surveys had a couple of hundred participants. However, practically none of the papers examined issues with the base rate of the behavior they were trying to assess. For example, if cheating practices are the topic of research, we have to take into account first how prevalent cheating is. If cheating is not prevalent in the data, then power for finding relationships between cheating and other variables of interest may be low.

Alternative Research Methods

To address unique challenges of RMLE research, we suggest a few specific research contexts and their associated methods. These may better allow for an assessment of how to teach RMLE content and how to create educational experiences anchored in RMLE.

The first research context relates to the use of games or simulations to teach RMLE content. Games and simulations are not just the teaching approach, but also an approach to research. Games and simulations have the advantage that students get experiential learning while being in a controlled environment (Fischlmayr, Lainema, & Saarinen, 2013). Many business simulations include ethical decision-making or decision-making under difficult conditions. This means that students can experience RMLE content in a research context that is akin to a quasi-experimental setting, in which instructors can manipulate aspects of the simulation or the context to foster specific learning. At the same time, by creating certain contexts and situations, researchers can study RMLE-related issues in a more targeted fashion.

An interesting example is the ViBu simulation (Köhler et al., 2013), where teams of students work together as either part of a company that produces medical equipment or as part of a sub-producer company that produces parts for the medical equipment. In a simulated market place, students in the sub-producer teams have to ensure the continuation of their production process and offer their products to the medical company. They are in competition with other sub-producer teams that are also negotiating deals with the medical company. Research using the simulation has shown that student teams often engage in unethical practices as they are competing with other teams (e.g., Fischlmayr, Lähteenmäki, & Saarinen, 2007). In some simulations, teams hacked the simulation of other teams to run the other team's company into

financial loss, so their own company could prosper. In other simulations, sub-producer teams colluded to create an alliance against the medical company to control price in the market.

Experiences such as these lend themselves to investigation of learning from and in difficult decisions. Rather than relying on students' previous experiences or the general context of their classes, simulations and games can be used to replicate contexts that foster questionable behaviors. In that way, researchers can more specifically study how students learn RMLE content and develop ethical, responsible, and sustainable mindsets and decision-making. In this context, qualitative research methods can be used to observe and track the students' learning process, especially when simulations are used in conjunction with student reflections on their learning experiences. Quantitative research methods could be employed, for example, using a quasi-experimental design, in which different student groups might be set up to isolate demographic or context factors and explore how they affect students' engagement in questionable practices. Students could then learn about these factors and how they impact on their decision-making.

As a note of caution though, we would like to remind researchers about the importance of researcher and instructor reflexivity about the learning process in these type of learning contexts. As Forray and Lund-Dean (Wright, Forray, & Lund-Dean, in press) have argued, many learning experiences like the one suggested here may be potentially challenging for students to process as they make students aware of their own susceptibility for practicing unethical behaviors. In addition, there may be unintended challenges to the students' identity and self-perception that instructors need to be prepared to manage and ameliorate. Thorough debriefing is necessary under such conditions to ensure the ethical treatment of research participants.

The second alternative research context we would like to highlight is real-life engagement projects, in which students engage directly with organizations, such as service learning projects or student consultancies. Prior research has shown that engagement projects can be highly effective in teaching students about RMLE content in a relevant context. Furthermore, by anchoring students' learning in real-life settings that are often designed to have a positive impact on the engaged stakeholders, instructors also achieve RMLE as a characteristic of the educational experience. In many of these learning contexts, students create "good" with their engaged partners and experience first-hand the challenges of responsible, ethical, and sustainable management. Furthermore, they are encouraged to find real solutions.

Different types of research questions could be explored in these contexts. In-depth qualitative research methods, for instance, allow researchers to examine the students' sense-making and learning. Prior service learning projects have used qualitative approaches such as content analysis of learning narratives (e.g., Pless, Maak, & Stahl, 2011) or case study analysis of specific projects, their unique settings, and the learning generated by them (e.g., Brower, 2011; Smith & Woodworth, 2012). Quantitative research methods, such as regression or ANOVA techniques (especially those employing longitudinal designs), might be used to assess the benefits of institutionalizing service learning in a given curriculum. Researchers could, for example, assess whether a curriculum that incorporates service learning projects increases beneficial collaborations with industry partners, increases student employability, helps improve community issues, develops core student learning outcomes, or increases the attractiveness of their programs to new student cohorts (e.g., Beddewela et al., 2017; Simons & Cleary, 2006; Yorio & Ye, 2012).

CONCLUSION

This chapter reviewed the research methods currently employed by researchers studying RMLE topics related to ethics, sustainability, and responsibility. The most common research methods employed were case study analysis, content analysis of textual data and survey methodology. Quantitative data analysis techniques focus predominantly on descriptive statistics and some of the simpler mean comparison techniques. Qualitative data analysis techniques predominantly favor thematic analysis. Our review indicated that qualitative studies outnumbered quantitative studies by 4 to 1. This indicates a strong preference for qualitative work that accounts for the complexity of the topics studied, captures dynamic change and differences in sense-making and meaning-making, and explores the important role of context. Furthermore, we discussed alternative research approaches of games, simulations, service-learning, and student consultancies that may offer interesting and valuable opportunities for studying RMLE topics in future research.

REFERENCES

- Academy of Management Learning & Education (2018). *Mission Statement*. Retrieved on September 10, 2018 from <http://aom.org/Publications/AMLE/Academy-of-Management-Learning--Education.aspx>
- Brower, H. H. (2011). Sustainable development through service learning: A pedagogical framework and case example in a third world context. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(1), 58-76.
- Fischlmayr, I., Lähteenmäki, S., & Saarinen, E. (2007). Cultural differences in the role of trust in virtual multicultural teams. In *3rd colloquium of the European Group of Organizational Studies in Vienna, Austria*.
- Goleman, D. (1996). *Vital lies, simple truths: The psychology of self deception*. Simon and Schuster.
- Hibbert, P., & Cunliffe, A. (2015). Responsible management: Engaging moral reflexive practice through threshold concepts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 127(1), 177-188.
- Journal of Management Education (2018). *Description*. Retrieved on September 10, 2018 from <https://au.sagepub.com/en-gb/oce/journal/journal-management-education#description>
- Köhler, T., Fischlmayr, I., Lainema, T., & Saarinen, E. (2013). Bringing the world into our classrooms: The benefits of engaging students in an international business simulation. In *Increasing student engagement and retention using classroom technologies: Classroom response systems and mediated discourse technologies* (pp. 163-198). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Management Learning (2018). *About this journal*. Retrieved on September 10, 2018 from <http://journals.sagepub.com/home/mlq>
- Management Teaching Review (2018). *About this journal*. Retrieved on September 10, 2018 from <http://journals.sagepub.com/home/mtr>
- McGrath, J. E. (1995). Methodology matters: Doing research in the behavioral and social sciences. In R.M. Baecker, J. Grudin, W.A.S. Buxton, & S. Greenberg (Eds.), *Readings in Human-Computer Interaction: Toward the Year 2000* (2nd ed.), 152-169. San Francisco, CA: Morgan Kaufman Publishers, Inc.
- Mirvis, P. (2008). Executive development through consciousness-raising experiences. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 7(2), 173-188.
- Pless, N. M., Maak, T., & Stahl, G. K. (2011). Developing responsible global leaders through international service-learning programs: The Ulysses experience. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(2), 237-260.
- Simons, L., & Cleary, B. (2006). The influence of service learning on students' personal and social development. *College Teaching*, 54(4), 307-319.
- Smith, I. H., & Woodworth, W. P. (2012). Developing social entrepreneurs and social innovators: A social identity and self-efficacy approach. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3), 390-407.
- The International Journal of Management Education (2018). *The International Journal of Management Education*. Retrieved on September 10, 2018 from <https://www.journals.elsevier.com/the-international-journal-of-management-education>
- Tomkins, L., & Ulus, E. (2015). Is narcissism undermining critical reflection in our business schools? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 14(4), 595-606

- Tomkins, L., & Ulus, E. (2016). 'Oh, was that "experiential learning"?!' Spaces, synergies and surprises with Kolb's learning cycle. *Management Learning*, 47(2), 158-178.
- Wright, S., Forray, J. M., & Lund Dean, K. (in press). From advocacy to accountability in experiential learning practices. *Management Learning*, 1-21.
- Wright, A. L., & Gilmore, A. (2012). Threshold concepts and conceptions: Student learning in introductory management courses. *Journal of Management Education*, 36(5), 614-635.
- Yorio, P. L., & Ye, F. (2012). A meta-analysis on the effects of service-learning on the social, personal, and cognitive outcomes of learning. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(1), 9-27.

References for Research Methods Coding

AMLE coding

- Arieli, S., Sagiv, L., & Cohen-Shalem, E. (2016). Values in Business Schools: The Role of Self-Selection and Socialization. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 15(3), 493-507. doi:10.5465/amle.2014.0064
- Aragon-Correa, J. A., Marcus, A. A., Rivera, J. E., & Kenworthy, A. L. (2017). Sustainability Management Teaching Resources and the Challenge of Balancing Planet, People, and Profits. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 16(3), 469-483. doi:10.5465/amle.2017.0180
- Baden, D. (2014). Look on the Bright Side: A Comparison of Positive and Negative Role Models in Business Ethics Education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 13(2), 154-170. doi:10.5465/amle.2012.0251
- Butler, N., Delaney, H., & Spoelstra, S. (2017). The Gray Zone: Questionable Research Practices in the Business School. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 16(1), 94-109. doi:10.5465/amle.2015.0201
- Cummings, S., & Bridgman, T. (2016). The Limits and Possibilities of History: How a Wider, Deeper, and More Engaged Understanding of Business History Can Foster Innovative Thinking. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 15(2), 250-267. doi:10.5465/amle.2014.0373
- Hanson, W. R., & Moore, J. R. (2014). Business Student Moral Influencers: Unseen Opportunities for Development? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 13(4), 525-546. doi:10.5465/amle.2012.0325
- Hanson, W. R., Moore, J. R., Bachleda, C., Canterbury, A., Franco Jr, C., Marion, A., & Schreiber, C. (2017). Theory of Moral Development of Business Students: Case Studies in Brazil, North America, and Morocco. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 16(3), 393-414. doi:10.5465/amle.2014.0312
- Montiel, I., Antolin-Lopez, R., & Gallo, P. J. (2018). Emotions and Sustainability: A Literary Genre-Based Framework for Environmental Sustainability Management Education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 17(2), 155-183. doi:10.5465/amle.2016.0042

- Rasche, A., Gilbert, D. U., & Schedel, I. (2013). Cross-Disciplinary Ethics Education in MBA Programs: Rhetoric or Reality? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *12*, 71-85.
- Snelson-Powell, A., Grosvold, J., & Millington, A. (2016). Business School Legitimacy and the Challenge of Sustainability: A Fuzzy Set Analysis of Institutional Decoupling. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *15*(4), 703-723. doi:10.5465/amle.2015.0307
- Sutherland, I. A. N., Gosling, J. R., & Jelinek, J. (2015). Aesthetics of Power: Why Teaching About Power Is Easier Than Learning for Power, and What Business Schools Could Do About It. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *14*(4), 607-624. doi:10.5465/amle.2014.0179

ML coding

- Burchell, J., Kennedy, S., & Murray, A. (2015). Responsible management education in UK business schools: Critically examining the role of the United Nations Principles for Responsible Management Education as a driver for change. *Management Learning*, *46*(4), 479-497. doi:10.1177/1350507614549117
- Crevani, L., & Hallin, A. (2017). Performative narcissism: When organizations are made successful, admirable, and unique through narcissistic work. *Management Learning*, *48*(4), 431-452. doi:10.1177/1350507617692295
- Dwyer, G., & Hardy, C. (2016). We have not lived long enough: Sensemaking and learning from bushfire in Australia. *Management Learning*, *47*(1), 45-64. doi:10.1177/1350507615577047
- García-Rosell, J.-C. (2013). Struggles over corporate social responsibility meanings in teaching practices: The case of hybrid problem-based learning. *Management Learning*, *44*(5), 537-555. doi:10.1177/1350507612451228
- Gearty, M. R., Bradbury-Huang, H., & Reason, P. (2015). Learning history in an open system: Creating histories for sustainable futures. *Management Learning*, *46*(1), 44-66. doi:10.1177/1350507613501735
- Gherardi, S., & Murgia, A. (2015). Imagine being asked to evaluate your CEO ...: Using the constructive controversy approach to teach gender and management in times of economic crisis. *Management Learning*, *46*(1), 6-23. doi:10.1177/1350507614549119
- Gherardi, S., & Rodeschini, G. (2016). Caring as a collective knowledgeable doing: About concern and being concerned. *Management Learning*, *47*(3), 266-284. doi:10.1177/1350507615610030
- Hawkins, B., Pye, A., & Correia, F. (2017). Boundary objects, power, and learning: The matter of developing sustainable practice in organizations. *Management Learning*, *48*(3), 292-310. doi:10.1177/1350507616677199
- Heizmann, H., & Liu, H. (2018). Becoming green, becoming leaders: Identity narratives in sustainability leadership development. *Management Learning*, *49*(1), 40-58. doi:10.1177/1350507617725189
- Kassinis, G., & Panayiotou, A. (2017). Website stories in times of distress. *Management Learning*, *48*(4), 397-415. doi:10.1177/1350507617690684
- Koris, R., Örtenblad, A., & Ojala, T. (2017). From maintaining the status quo to promoting free thinking and inquiry: Business students' perspective on the purpose of business school teaching. *Management Learning*, *48*(2), 174-186. doi:10.1177/1350507616668480

- Mangan, A., Kelemen, M., & Moffat, S. (2016). Animating the classroom: Pedagogical responses to internationalisation. *Management Learning*, 47(3), 285-304. doi:10.1177/1350507615598908
- Millar, J., & Price, M. (2018). Imagining management education: A critique of the contribution of the United Nations PRME to critical reflexivity and rethinking management education. *Management Learning*, 49(3), 346-362. doi:10.1177/1350507618759828
- Page, M., Grisoni, L., & Turner, A. (2014). Dreaming fairness and re-imagining equality and diversity through participative aesthetic inquiry. *Management Learning*, 45(5), 577-592. doi:10.1177/1350507613486425
- Porschitz, E. T., Smircich, L., & Calás, M. B. (2016). Drafting “foot soldiers”: The social organization of the war for talent. *Management Learning*, 47(3), 343-360. doi:10.1177/1350507615598906
- Smolović Jones, S., Smolović Jones, O., Winchester, N., & Grint, K. (2016). Putting the discourse to work: On outlining a praxis of democratic leadership development. *Management Learning*, 47(4), 424-442. doi:10.1177/1350507616631926
- Toubiana, M. (2014). Business pedagogy for social justice? An exploratory investigation of business faculty perspectives of social justice in business education. *Management Learning*, 45(1), 81-102. doi:10.1177/1350507612454097
- Warhurst, R., & Black, K. (2017). What do managers know? Wisdom and manager identity in later career. *Management Learning*, 48(4), 416-430. doi:10.1177/1350507616679346
- Zwack, M., Kraiczy, N. D., von Schlippe, A., & Hack, A. (2016). Storytelling and cultural family value transmission: Value perception of stories in family firms. *Management Learning*, 47(5), 590-614. doi:10.1177/1350507616659833

JME coding

- Bergman, J. Z., Westerman, J. W., Bergman, S. M., Westerman, J., & Daly, J. P. (2014). Narcissism, materialism, and environmental ethics in business students. *Journal of Management Education*, 38(4), 489-510.
- Bruni-Bossio, V., & Willness, C. (2016). The “Kobayashi Maru” meeting: High-fidelity experiential learning. *Journal of Management Education*, 40(5), 619-647.
- Deer, S., & Zarestky, J. (2017). Balancing Profit and People: Corporate Social Responsibility in Business Education. *Journal of Management Education*, 41(5), 727-749.
- Huster, K., Petrillo, C., O’Malley, G., Glassman, D., Rush, J., & Wasserheit, J. (2017). Global Social Entrepreneurship Competitions: Incubators for Innovations in Global Health? *Journal of Management Education*, 41(2), 249-271.
- Kuechler, W., & Stedham, Y. (2018). Management Education and Transformational Learning: The Integration of Mindfulness in an MBA Course. *Journal of Management Education*, 42(1), 8-33.
- Ledley, F. D., & Holt, S. S. (2014). Learning objectives and content of science curricula for undergraduate management education. *Journal of Management Education*, 38(1), 86-113.
- Louw, J. (2015). “Paradigm change” or No real change at All? A critical reading of the UN Principles for responsible management education. *Journal of Management Education*, 39(2), 184-208.

- McDonald, L. M. (2013). Using student-constructed cases to investigate crises. *Journal of Management Education*, 37(1), 115-134.
- O'Brien, K., Wittmer, D., & Ebrahimi, B. P. (2017). Behavioral Ethics in Practice: Integrating Service Learning into a Graduate Business Ethics Course. *Journal of Management Education*, 41(4), 599-616.
- Parris, D. L., & McInnis-Bowers, C. (2017). Business Not as Usual: Developing Socially Conscious Entrepreneurs and Intrapreneurs. *Journal of Management Education*, 41(5), 687-726.
- Rennie, K. D., Byrum, K., Tidwell, M., & Chitkara, A. K. (2018). Strategic Communication in MBA Curricula: A Qualitative Study of Student Outcomes. *Journal of Management Education*, 1052562918774593.
- Roberts, F., Thomas, C. H., Novicevic, M. M., Ammeter, A., Garner, B., Johnson, P., & Popoola, I. (2018). Integrated moral conviction theory of student cheating: an empirical test. *Journal of Management Education*, 42(1), 104-134.
- Sroufe, R., Sivasubramaniam, N., Ramos, D., & Saiia, D. (2015). Aligning the PRME: How study abroad nurtures responsible leadership. *Journal of Management Education*, 39(2), 244-275.
- Tomlin, K. A., Metzger, M. L., Bradley-Geist, J., & Gonzalez-Padron, T. (2017). Are students blind to their ethical blind spots? an exploration of why ethics education should focus on self-perception biases. *Journal of Management Education*, 41(4), 539-574.
- Vidal, N., Smith, R., & Spetic, W. (2015). Designing and teaching business & society courses from a threshold concept approach. *Journal of Management Education*, 39(4), 497-530.
- Volkema, R. J., & Kapoutsis, I. (2016). From Restaurants to Board Rooms: How Initiating Negotiations Teaches Management Principles and Theory. *Journal of Management Education*, 40(1), 76-101.
- Walker, J. L. (2018). Do Methods Matter in Global Leadership Development? Testing the Global Leadership Development Ecosystem Conceptual Model. *Journal of Management Education*, 42(2), 239-264.

IJME coding

- Annan-Diab, F., & Molinari, C. (2017). Interdisciplinarity: Practical approach to advancing education for sustainability and for the Sustainable Development Goals. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 15(2), 73-83.
- Awaysheh, A., & Bonfiglio, D. (2017). Leveraging experiential learning to incorporate social entrepreneurship in MBA programs: A case study. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 15(2), 332-349.
- Beddewela, E., Warin, C., Hesselden, F., & Coslet, A. (2017). Embedding responsible management education—Staff, student and institutional perspectives. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 15(2), 263-279.
- Borges, J. C., Cezarino, L. O., Ferreira, T. C., Sala, O. T. M., Unglaub, D. L., & Caldana, A. C. F. (2017). Student organizations and Communities of Practice: Actions for the 2030

- Agenda for Sustainable Development. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 15(2), 172-182.
- Borges, J. C., Ferreira, T. C., de Oliveira, M. S. B., Macini, N., & Caldana, A. C. F. (2017). Hidden curriculum in student organizations: Learning, practice, socialization and responsible management in a business school. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 15(2), 153-161.
- Burga, R., Leblanc, J., & Rezania, D. (2017). Analysing the effects of teaching approach on engagement, satisfaction and future time perspective among students in a course on CSR. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 15(2), 306-317.
- Carreira, F., Aguiar, A. C., Onça, F., & Monzoni, M. (2017). The Celsius Game: An experiential activity on management education simulating the complex challenges for the two-degree climate change target. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 15(2), 350-361.
- Cicmil, S., Gough, G., & Hills, S. (2017). Insights into responsible education for sustainable development: The case of UWE, Bristol. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 15(2), 293-305.
- Décamps, A., Barbat, G., Carteron, J. C., Hands, V., & Parkes, C. (2017). Sulitest: A collaborative initiative to support and assess sustainability literacy in higher education. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 15(2), 138-152.
- Greenberg, D. N., Deets, S., Erzurumlu, S., Hunt, J., Manwaring, M., Rodgers, V., & Swanson, E. (2017). Signing to living PRME: Learning from a journey towards responsible management education. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 15(2), 205-218.
- Jagger, S., & Volkman, R. (2014). Helping students to see for themselves that ethics matters. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 12(2), 177-185.
- Klapper, R. G., & Farber, V. A. (2016). In Alain Gibb's footsteps: Evaluating alternative approaches to sustainable enterprise education (SEE). *The International Journal of Management Education*, 14(3), 422-439.
- Kolb, M., Fröhlich, L., & Schmidpeter, R. (2017). Implementing sustainability as the new normal: Responsible management education—From a private business school's perspective. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 15(2), 280-292.
- Ortiz, D., & Huber-Heim, K. (2017). From information to empowerment: Teaching sustainable business development by enabling an experiential and participatory problem-solving process in the classroom. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 15(2), 318-331.
- Rive, J., Bonnet, M., Parmentier, C., Pelazzo-Plat, V., & Pignet-Fall, L. (2017). A contribution to the laying of foundations for dialogue between socially responsible management schools. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 15(2), 238-248.
- Ross, J., Valenzuela, M., Intindola, M., & Flinchbaugh, C. (2017). Preparing potential leaders: Facilitating a learning experience on LMX and fairness in the workplace. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 15(1), 84-97.
- Tyran, K. L. (2017). Transforming students into global citizens: International service learning and PRME. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 15(2), 162-171.

Warwick, P., Wyness, L., & Conway, H. (2017). 'Think of the future': Managing educational change from students' perspectives of an undergraduate sustainable business programme. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 15(2), 192-204.

Table 1. Overview of search results using the selected keywords

	Number of articles on			Row total	Included in review
Journal	Responsib*	Ethic*	Sustainab*		
AMLE	22	33	16	71	11
JME	12	28	7	47	17
ML	14	20	9	43	19
MTR	5	8	1	14	0
IJME	7	3	8	18	18
Column total	60	92	41	193	65

Table 2. Coded studies over the last 5 years in AMLE, JME, ML and IJME

Journal	Study	RMLE as content to teach (content) vs. RMLE as a characteristic of the educational experience (ed. experience)	General research method used	Data collection approach	Data analysis approach
AMLE	Aragon-Correa, Marcus, Rivera, & Kenworthy (2017)	content	Quant survey	Survey	Descriptive Statistics
AMLE	Arieli, Sagiv, & Cohen-Shalem (2016)	content	Mixed methods case study; longitudinal study	Survey; Documents and other archival data	Content analysis; MANOVA; t-test
AMLE	Baden (2014)	content	Qualitative	Survey	Thematic analysis
AMLE	Butler, Delaney, & Spoelstra (2017)	content	Qualitative	Interviews	Thematic analysis
AMLE	Cummings & Bridgman (2016)	content	Different approach	Publication analysis; textbook review; comparative analysis to other disciplines	Maps; textbook analysis; descriptive statistic; content coding
AMLE	Hanson & Moore (2014)	content	Qual case study	Interviews, Observations, Survey	Thematic analysis
AMLE	Hanson et al. (2017)	content	Qual case study	Interviews, Observations, Survey, Documents, Field notes	Grounded theory
AMLE	Montiel, Antolin-Lopez, & Gallo (2018)	content	Qualitative	Documents	Grounded theory
AMLE	Rasche, Gilbert, & Schedel (2013)	content	Quant survey	Survey- repeated measurement; longitudinal measurement; textual data	Descriptive statistics; content coding
AMLE	Snelson-Powell, Grosvold, & Millington (2016)	ed. experience	Mixed methods- case study; survey; longitudinal study	Survey interviews; Documents and other archival data	Content analysis; fs/QCA; descriptive statistics
AMLE	Sutherland, Gosling, & Jelinek (2015)	content AND ed. experience	Qualitative case study	Interviews, Observations	Grounded theory
IJME	Annan-Diab & Molinari (2017)	content	Qualitative case study (limited information on data collection and analysis)		
IJME	Awaysheh & Bonfiglio (2017)	content	Qualitative case study (limited information on data		

			collection and analysis)		
IJME	Beddewela, Warin, Hesselden, & Coslet (2017)	content AND ed. experience	Mixed methods (case study)	Survey; documents and other archival data	Thematic analysis; descriptive statistics
IJME	Borges et al. (2017)	ed. experience	Mixed-methods (content coding; survey)	Survey	Content analysis; descriptive statistics (count of comments)
IJME	Borges, Ferreira, de Oliveira, Macini, & Caldana (2017)	content AND ed. experience	Qualitative content coding	Questionnaire	Thematic analysis
IJME	Burga, Leblanc & Rezania (2017)	content	Quantitative survey	Survey (repeated measurement)	t-test; regression
IJME	Carreira, Aguiar, Onça, & Monzoni (2017)	content	Qualitative content coding (limited)	Observation	Thematic analysis
IJME	Cicmil, Gough & Hills (2017)	ed. experience	Qualitative case study	Observation	Thematic analysis
IJME	Décamps, Barbat, Carteron, Hands, & Parkes (2017)	content	Introduces Sulitest as a method to assess sustainability learning		
IJME	Greenberg et al. (2017)	content AND ed. experience	Mixed-methods (case study)	Interviews; survey	Narrative analysis; descriptive statistics (no actual description of data analysis process)
IJME	Jagger & Volkman (2014)	content	Qualitative content coding	Interviews	Thematic analysis
IJME	Klapper & Farber (2016)	content	Quantitative survey	Survey- repeated measurement; quasi-experiment	Saturated model specification test
IJME	Kolb, Fröhlich, & Schmidpeter (2017)	content AND ed. experience	Qualitative case study (claims to be mixed-methods, but no info on quantitative)	Documents and other archival data	More of description than analysis
IJME	Ortiz & Huber-Heim (2017)	content	Qualitative case study (more of a description rather than analysis)		
IJME	Rive, Bonnet, Parmentier, Pelazzo-Plat, & Pignet-Fall (2017)	ed. experience	Qualitative case study	Documents and other archival data	Description rather than analysis
IJME	Ross, Valenzuela, Intindola, & Flinchbaugh (2017)	content	Mixed methods (content analysis and survey)	Survey; documents and other archival data	Thematic analysis; descriptive statistics; MANOVA

IJME	Tyran (2017)	content	Qualitative narrative analysis	Observations; documents and other archival data	Narrative analysis (limited)
IJME	Warwick, Wyness, & Conway (2017)	content	Qualitative action research	Interviews; focus groups; observations	Thematic analysis
ML	Burchell, Kennedy, & Murray (2015)	content	Mixed-methods (case study; survey)	Survey; interviews	Thematic analysis; descriptive statistics
ML	Crevani & Hallin (2017)		Qualitative case study	Interviews; observations; documents and other archival data; non-textual data; co-creating or interaction; journaling	Inductive coding
ML	Dwyer & Hardy (2016)	content	Qualitative interpretive case study	Documents and other archival data	Interpretive analysis
ML	García-Rosell (2013)	content	Qualitative case study; action research	Observations; questionnaire; co-creating or interaction; personal reflections; field notes; journaling	Discourse analysis
ML	Gearty, Bradbury-Huang, & Reason (2015)	content	Qualitative action research	Interviews; co-creating or interaction	Co-creating learning histories
ML	Gherardi & Murgia (2015)	content	Qualitative case study	Documents and other archival data	Discourse analysis
ML	Gherardi & Rodeschini (2016)	content	Qualitative ethnography	Interviews; observations; documents and other archival data	Grounded theory; critical incident analysis
ML	Hawkins, Pye, & Correia (2017)	content	Qualitative case study	Observations; vignettes; action learning	Thematic analysis
ML	Heizmann & Liu (2018)	content	Qualitative discourse analysis	Documents and other archival data; non-textual data	
ML	Kassinis & Panayiotou (2017)	content	Qualitative case study	Documents and other archival data; non-textual data	Narrative analysis; visual semiotic analysis
ML	Koris, Ortenblad, & Ojala (2017)	content	Quantitative vignette study	Survey	ANOVA/ ANCOVA
ML	Mangan, Kelemen, & Moffat (2016)	content	Qualitative case study (Auto-ethnography)	Focus groups; personal reflections; field notes; journaling	Reflective conversations
ML	Millar & Price (2018)	ed. experience	Qualitative case study	Interviews	Discourse analysis; thematic analysis
ML	Page, Grisoni, & Turner (2014)	content	Qualitative action research	Observations; non-textual data; co-creating or interaction	

ML	Porschitz, Smircich, & Calás (2016)	ed. experience	Qualitative ethnography	Interviews; observations; documents and other archival data; field notes	Inductive coding
ML	Smolović Jones, Smolović Jones, Winchester, & Grint (2016)	content	Qualitative case study	Interviews; observations	
ML	Toubiana (2014)	content	Qualitative grounded theory	Interviews; questionnaire	Grounded theory
ML	Warhurst & Black (2017)		Qualitative narrative analysis	Interviews; non-textual data	Discourse analysis; narrative analysis
ML	Zwack, Kraiczy, von Schlippe & Hack (2016)	content	Mixed-methods (case study; survey; vignette study)	Survey; interviews	Thematic analysis; narrative analysis; ANOVA/MANOVA; other non-linear simple comparison tests
JME	Bergman, Westerman, Bergman, Westerman, & Daly (2014)	content AND ed. experience	Quantitative survey	Survey	SEM/ Path modelling
JME	Bruni-Bossio & Willness (2016)	content	Mixed-methods (content analysis; survey)	Survey; Documents and other archival data	Thematic analysis; Descriptive statistics
JME	Deer & Zarestky (2017)	content	Qualitative narrative analysis	Documents and other archival data	Content coding (thematic analysis; narrative analysis)
JME	Huster, Petrillo, O'Malley, Glassman, Rush, & Wasserheit (2017)	content	Mixed-methods (content analysis; survey)	Survey	Thematic analysis; descriptive statistics
JME	Kuechler & Stedham (2018)	content	Mixed-methods (content analysis; survey)	Survey (repeated measure); Documents and other archival data	Thematic analysis; t-test
JME	Ledley & Holt (2014)	content	Quantitative survey	Survey	t-test; correlation
JME	Louw (2015)	content	Qualitative discourse analysis	Documents and other archival data	Discourse analysis
JME	McDonald (2013)	content	Mixed-methods (content analysis; survey)	Survey; Documents and other archival data	Thematic analysis; Descriptive statistics (limited information on data analysis)
JME	O'Brien, Wittmer & Ebrahimi (2017)	content	Mixed-methods content analysis	Student assessments; Documents and other archival data	Thematic analysis; Descriptive statistics (limited information on data analysis)
JME	Parris & McInnis-Bowers (2017)	content	Qualitative content coding	Questionnaire; Documents and other archival data	Thematic analysis

JME	Rennie, Byrum, Tidwell & Chitkara (2018)	content	Qualitative content coding	Interviews; Documents and other archival data	Thematic analysis
JME	Roberts et al. (2018)	content AND ed. experience	Quantitative survey	Survey (different measures at different times, but not a pre-post design)	SEM/ path modelling; EFA/CFA/PCA; t-test (post-hoc)
JME	Sroufe, Sivasubramaniam, Ramos & Saiia (2015)	content	Qualitative content coding	Documents and other archival data	Thematic analysis
JME	Tomlin, Metzger, Bradley-Geist & Gonzalez-Padron (2017)	content	Qualitative content coding	Questionnaire	Thematic analysis
JME	Vidal, Smith & Spetic (2015)	content	Mixed-methods (content analysis; survey)	Survey; Documents and other archival data	Thematic analysis; Descriptive statistics; cluster analysis
JME	Volkema & Kapoutsis (2016)	content	Mixed-methods (content analysis; survey)	Survey (student feedback)	Thematic analysis; narrative analysis; t-test
JME	Walker (2018)	content	Quantitative survey	Survey	Regression

BIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENTS

Tine Köhler is Associate Professor for International Management at the University of Melbourne, Australia. Her research interests include global teamwork, the management of cross-cultural differences in norms, communication, and coordination, trust, and qualitative and quantitative research methods. Her methodological areas of expertise specifically revolve around quantitative methods including regression, meta-analysis, and research design, as well as qualitative methods including grounded theory, case study analysis, ethnography, and interviewing. She serves as an Associate Editor for *Organizational Research Methods* and was previously an *Associate Editor for Academy of Management Learning and Education*. She further serves on the editorial boards of *Journal of Management Studies*, *Journal of Management Education*, *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, and *Small Group Research*. Her work has appeared in *Organizational Research Methods*, the *Journal of International Business Studies*, *Journal of Management*, *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *Human Resource Management*, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, and *Small Group Research*.

Jennifer Hui-Han Gao is Lecturer at the Department of Management and Marketing, The University of Melbourne. She received her PhD in Management from The University of Auckland. Her research interests include human resource management, culture effects on HRM, work and careers, and development in East Asia. She has also completed a global dairy industry research project for the International Union of Foodworkers. Her research publications have appeared in *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* and *R&D Management*.