

# Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	x
<i>List of Tables</i>	xi
<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	xii
<i>Preface</i>	xxi
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xxvi
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xxvii
<b>Part I General/Introductory Chapters</b>	
1 Knowledge Creation and the Journal Editor's Role <i>Alison M. Konrad</i>	3
2 The Role of Editing in Knowledge Development: Consensus Shifting and Consensus Creation <i>John R. Hollenbeck</i>	16
3 How May I Help You? Editing as Service <i>Ann Marie Ryan</i>	27
4 A Letter to Editors <i>Stephen R. Barley</i>	39
<b>Part II Effective Editorship</b>	
5 Setting up an Effective Manuscript-Review Process <i>K. Michele Kacmar</i>	49
6 Communicating with Authors <i>Sara L. Rynes</i>	56
7 Building and Maintaining a Strong Editorial Board and Cadre of Ad Hoc Reviewers <i>Daniel C. Feldman</i>	68
8 Managing the Editorial Review Process: It's the People That Matter <i>Angelo S. DeNisi</i>	75
9 Being an Ethical Editorial Board Member and Editor: The Integral Role of Earned Trust <i>Debra L. Shapiro and Jean Bartunek</i>	88

10	Using Technology to Improve the Editorial Process <i>Martin Kilduff</i>	97
11	Moving a Journal up the Rankings <i>Gerard P. Hodgkinson</i>	104
12	The Developmental Editor: Assessing and Directing Manuscript Contribution <i>Donald D. Bergh</i>	114
13	The Case for an Activist Editorial Model <i>Jerry A. Jacobs</i>	124
14	Balancing Authorial Voice and Editorial Omniscience: The "It's My Paper and I'll Say What I Want To" versus "Ghostwriters in the Sky" Minuet <i>Arthur G. Bedeian</i>	134

### Part III Editing Different Types of Journals

15	Editing a Top Academic Journal <i>Sheldon Zedeck</i>	145
16	Editing a Bridge Journal <i>Theresa M. Welbourne</i>	157
17	Developing a Global Journal: Embracing Otherness <i>Haridimos Tsoukas</i>	167
18	Sustaining Independent Journals <i>Timothy Clark and Mike Wright</i>	176
19	Reflections on Creating a New Scholarly Journal: Perspectives from a Founding Editor <i>Larry J. Williams</i>	188
20	Running an Electronic Journal: Considerations and Possibilities <i>Bernard Forgues and Jeanie M. Forray</i>	197

### Part IV Editorship and Academic Career

21	Opening the Black Box of Editorship: Editors' Voice <i>Yehuda Baruch</i>	209
22	The Motivating Potential of an Associate Editor's Role <i>Carol T. Kulik</i>	223
23	How Editors are Selected <i>Wayne F. Cascio</i>	231

24	What Authors Need to Know to Navigate the Review Process Successfully: Understanding and Managing the Editor's Dilemma <i>Dov Eden</i>	239
25	Epilogue: Trade-Offs among Editorial Goals in Complex Publishing Environments <i>William H. Starbuck, Herman Aguinis, Alison M. Konrad, and Yehuda Baruch</i>	250
	<i>Author Index</i>	271
	<i>Subject Index</i>	276

# **Part I General/Introductory Chapters**



# 1

## Knowledge Creation and the Journal Editor's Role

*Alison M. Konrad*

Much has been written on the role of reviewers in the academic publishing process, yet little guidance is available to new editors of academic journals. When I took over as a new editor, what I received in the form of guidance was a set of cardboard boxes in the mail (filled with manuscripts) with all the best wishes of the previous editor. Upon asking senior people in the field for suggestions, I was told that I can do “anything I want.”

Autonomy is a wonderful thing, and something that many academics value; however, I do not believe that editors should be able to do “anything they want.” Given that the editorial role is so crucial to the development of the field as well as to the lives and careers of academics, it is important to start developing a set of process standards for assessing the quality of editorship. Outcome standards such as journal rankings by the ISI and other evaluation lists (e.g. Starbuck, 2005) already exist, but due to long lead times and the distal nature of outcomes, process standards are needed to help editors spend their time in ways that are most likely to result in the publication of high-quality manuscripts.

Given that the editor's work is to create, maintain, and extend the body of knowledge in the field, I thought that reading about knowledge creation might provide some useful implications for editorial action. By no means did I conduct a thorough reading of all of the knowledge-management literature, and I do not claim to provide a comprehensive synthesis of it here. I did find some very useful ideas, however, that helped to clarify and justify some of my own thoughts on what constitutes a high-quality editorial process.

First, the knowledge-creation literature suggests that the work of an editor is to *adjudicate the intersubjective knowledge-conversion process* whereby a manuscript representing the personal knowledge of the author(s) becomes part of the common body of knowledge in the field. As such, the work of an editor requires judgment, and the process is wrought with subjectivity. Subjectivity brings with it a set of knowledge-related exchange hazards, which others have considered in detail (Aguinis & Henle, 2002; Shapiro & Bartunek, this volume). The major point of this chapter will be that *the*

*subjectivity and complexity of the content which editors work with means that the use of editorial judgment and extensive communication with authors and reviewers is essential.*

### What is knowledge?

Defining knowledge is a nontrivial task, and the extant literature provides several definitions and debates about what knowledge is (see Calhoun & Starbuck, 2003). I found Tywoniak's (2007) "complexity" definition to be particularly interesting and useful for the discussion of the role of editors. Tywoniak begins by defining knowledge as "rules that reduce environmental uncertainty through connections between ideas and facts," which serve as guides for behavior (p. 53). He then suggests that this definition considers knowledge only as a structure, whereas a complexity perspective considers knowledge as a structure, a process, and a system (see Table 1.1).

As a structure, knowledge is stable, and as such can only be useful under stable conditions. Under conditions of instability, individuals must be able to generate new rules linking new sets of facts and ideas in order to adapt their behaviors to complicated and changing environments (Tywoniak, 2007, p. 57). Hence, knowledge must be more than a structure; it is also a process incorporating feedback loops to enable the generation of new heuristics. As individuals face new features in their environments, old behaviors may no longer result in desired outcomes, motivating a search for new solutions. Individuals continually modify and update their personal stores of knowledge by adjusting their behaviors to fit the new conditions they encounter, testing the new behaviors, and storing representations of the new behavioral contingencies in memory. This knowledge-development process, which is similar to Argyris and Schon's (1978) concept of single-loop learning, benefits individual survival in a complex and changing environment.

Tywoniak (2007) considers knowledge to have yet another level of complexity, arising due to the use of language. Human language facilitates the development of knowledge purely through the manipulation of symbols.

*Table 1.1* Tywoniak's (2007) complexity definition of knowledge

<b>Knowledge is ...</b>	<b>Description</b>
a structure	A set of rules that reduce environmental uncertainty through connections between ideas and facts which serve as guides for behavior
a process	A process incorporating feedback loops that enable the generation of new links between ideas and facts or heuristics
a system	The common language and the rules used to generate and validate new links between facts and ideas within a given community

This human capacity to increase understanding of the environment in the absence of immediate experience allows for the development of “ever greater quantities of knowledge, going beyond the cognitive ability of a single individual” (Tywoniak, 2007, p. 57). In other words, humans are able to learn from the experiences of others, through the process of communication. At this level, knowledge is a system or “network of rule generating processes inter-linked through social interaction” (Tywoniak, 2007, p. 58).

As the research of Nonaka and colleagues shows (Nonaka, von Krogh, & Voelpel, 2006), knowledge is not transmitted between individuals in a simple linear manner wherein one person speaks and the other absorbs. Rather, knowledge transmission is based on an intersubjective process whereby individuals compare similar experiences in order to develop a more refined set of links between facts and ideas. The challenge faced by individuals engaged in the knowledge-sharing process is to persuade others that they have interpreted their personal experiences accurately and in a way that is useful for others to know. When individuals, each of whom has a subjective experience of the world, reach agreement about a particular piece of knowledge, it is “converted” from the personal to the common realm (Nonaka et al., 2006).

Hence, the body of common knowledge is basically a judgment among a community that a particular set of links between ideas and facts is valid. It is continually evolving as the environment changes and as community members have new experiences from which they draw conclusions that they then discuss and debate with others. Using the rules of language, community members reach agreements to add new links to the extant knowledge structure. The common language and the rules used to generate and validate new links between facts and ideas constitute the *system* of knowledge of a given community (Tywoniak, 2007).

## Types of knowledge

Tywoniak (2007) suggests that there are (at least) four different types of knowledge. Personal knowledge is distinguished from common knowledge, and tacit knowledge is distinguished from explicit knowledge as follows (Tywoniak, 2007):

- Personal knowledge consists of the set of behavioral rules developed by a particular individual to reduce environmental uncertainty.
- Common knowledge is embedded in an interactive environment and consists of that evolving set of truth claims that has been validated through the intersubjective process discussed earlier.
- Tacit knowledge is processual in nature or “knowledge in action” that reflects the limitations of cognition.
- Explicit knowledge is the set of links between ideas and facts that has been formally codified.

Table 1.2 Relationships between the four types of knowledge

	<b>Personal</b>	<b>Common</b>	<b>Tacit</b>	<b>Explicit</b>
<b>Personal</b>				
<b>Common</b>	Interrelated			
<b>Tacit</b>	Capacity to act	Routines		
<b>Explicit</b>	Analogy	Formalized	Application	

Note: Summary of Tywoniak (2007).

Tywoniak relates all four knowledge types to each other, not in a two-by-two typology, but rather, in more of an association matrix (summarized briefly in Table 1.2).

For instance, according to Tywoniak (2007), personal and common knowledge are *interrelated*. Personal knowledge is based on common knowledge because individuals use language to organize their personal understanding of the world. Common knowledge depends upon personal knowledge for its existence also, because the body of common knowledge requires individuals to share their personal knowledge with others. When personal knowledge is validated through the intersubjective knowledge-conversion process (Nonaka et al., 2006), the body of common knowledge is honed, refined, modified, and extended. This process is absolutely essential if common knowledge is to remain useful as a guide to behavior in a complex and changing environment.

To fully appreciate all six of the associations, the reader is referred to Tywoniak's (2007) original article. Here, I mention those associations that I believe are most closely linked to the process of knowledge generation and validation in the social-science fields.

One such link is the association between tacit knowledge and personal knowledge. Tywoniak (2007) argues that tacit knowledge is related to personal knowledge through the capacity to act. Individuals may know many things explicitly, but they are only able to act effectively on those ideas for which they have sufficient tacit knowledge. This tacit knowledge on *how to use* the explicit knowledge is not codified, and hence, cannot be transmitted through language, but must be developed from experience.

Common knowledge is related to tacit knowledge through the development of organizational routines (Tywoniak, 2007). An example of this association occurs when a set of organizational positions and/or processes results in a particularly synergistic outcome that no one individual understands explicitly. Yet, if the organization can reliably produce this outcome without an explicit understanding of how it occurs, then the organization can be said to have a piece of common tacit knowledge.

Journal editors work with *explicit knowledge*. Manuscripts represent authors' *personal explicit knowledge* that they hope will be raised to the level of *common explicit knowledge* through publication. The editor's goal is to

identify those submissions that critique, modify, and extend the body of *common explicit knowledge* to do a better job of reducing environmental uncertainty for action.

The interrelatedness of common explicit knowledge with other types of knowledge has interesting implications for the development of research. *It implies that researchers can and perhaps should do more than just work with the extant body of common explicit knowledge.* The work of an author likely can be enriched by engaging in action to create personal tacit knowledge, which authors then make explicit and fit into the common body of knowledge (Vermeulen, 2005). Authors can also examine organizational routines in which common tacit knowledge is embedded, and then explicate and extend that knowledge. By linking the extant literature (our body of common explicit knowledge) with sources of personal tacit knowledge and common tacit knowledge, authors may be more likely to identify research questions constituting revolutionary advances to the field, rather than incremental adjustments to current thinking.

Although the sources of tacit knowledge have important implications for the research process, journal editors are not working with the personal tacit knowledge or common tacit knowledge that might have inspired any given manuscript submission. Editors receive only the text presenting the author(s)' views and has no access to the direct personal experience or organizational arrangements that inspired the author(s)' work. Hence, the editor works with the personal explicit knowledge of the author(s). The editor's job is to *guide the knowledge-conversion process* (Nonaka et al., 2006) to determine which of the many submissions containing statements of author(s)' explicit personal knowledge will become part of the body of common explicit knowledge in the field.

## Implications for journal editors

At least five implications for journal editors can be derived from the knowledge-creation literature:

- Editorial gatekeeping is necessary
- Judgment is critical to the editor's role
- Subjectivity enters into the editorial process
- Interests and the potential for moral hazard enter into the process
- Communication is essential

I discuss each of these implications briefly.

### Editorial gatekeeping is necessary

One of the implications of the knowledge-creation field is that editorial gatekeeping is a necessary activity. This conclusion is less than obvious, given the ongoing debate in the fields of management and organization studies regarding

the development of a paradigm (De Cock & Jeanes, 2006). Pfeffer (1993) argued that the openness of these fields to a wide variety of research questions, epistemologies, and methodologies has resulted in the failure to develop a strong paradigm, which he believes reduces the ability to make scientific progress. Pfeffer's ideas were quickly rebutted by Van Maanen (1995), who argued that a diversity of voices and approaches is essential for improving what he views as an overly consistent, unimaginative and mind-numbingly banal field. Van de Ven (1999) characterized the former of these two views as a "Pfefferdigm" aiming to weed the unruly garden of organization and management theory to support only the oaks; "They can be red oaks, American oaks, dwarf oaks, or Mexican oaks – as long as they're oak trees" (p. 119). Of the latter view, Van de Ven states that Van Maanen wants "a thousand flowers to bloom" (p. 120), so that the field will become "A quilt of a thousand rhetorical patches sewn together with the voices of many people ... singing their rounds of a chorus that has become disenfranchised" (p. 120).

Should we engage in editorial gatekeeping, or should we let a thousand flowers bloom? In the field of knowledge creation, Nonaka et al. (2006) provide a clear and unambiguous answer. These authors argue that gatekeeping through the knowledge-conversion process is absolutely necessary. One reason we must limit the amount of information added to the common body of knowledge is to prevent information overload among members of our community. Another reason is to safeguard against poor-quality papers, misleading papers, or even worse, fraud and plagiarism. By gatekeeping, we help our community identify the more important links between ideas and facts, without having to go through all possible manuscripts that any academic has ever thought to write. Given the fact that more and more academics are pressured to produce refereed journal publications around the world, the sheer volume of manuscripts being produced is increasing geometrically, and any respected journal has seen its submissions increase dramatically in the last five years.

Although I advocate the need for gatekeeping, *I do not mean that certain types of methods, epistemologies, or conceptual frames should be banned*. Rather, each piece of research should be judged for quality, such that our knowledge base reflects the best of what our various scholarly traditions have to offer. Furthermore, different research questions are best addressed with different epistemologies and methodologies, and the best work demonstrates a strong fit between the research question and the data. Achieving inclusion of a variety of research approaches requires a variety of journals reflecting different perspectives, as well as diverse editorial boards capable of properly assessing the quality of scholarship from the various traditions.

### **Judgment is critical to the editor's role**

Judgment is critical to the editor's role because the ideas scholars are working with are so complex. Especially in the field of organization studies,

where the number of theories and paradigms is large and growing, judgments are very complex because there is much disagreement about many factors, including epistemology, conceptual frameworks, research methods, and appropriate conclusions to be drawn from any given piece of research (Pfeffer, 1993; Van Maanen, 1995, Van de Ven, 1999).

The importance of judgment has some very clear implications for editorial practice. Some editors seem to use a “vote-counting” method, which entails “averaging” the judgments of the reviewers to come to a conclusion (e.g., one revise-and-resubmit [R&R] plus two rejects = reject). Such editors return manuscripts to authors with a form letter, and authors receiving the coveted “R&R” decision obtain little or no guidance as to how they can best craft their revision. In my view, vote counting is not appropriate, given the complexity of the content editors are working with and the complexity of the intersubjective knowledge-conversion process that they are adjudicating. Editors must assess the quality of the reviews before determining the weight they’ll place on any reviewer’s comments, and that means they must read both the manuscript and the reviews carefully before making a decision. Because the editor must synthesize the information from multiple sources to make a judgment, the editorial job is a step more complex than that of any individual reviewer.

The task of the editor also differs substantially from that of the reviewers. Reviewers only need to judge the quality of submissions, while the editor, on top of recruiting reviewers, overseeing the review process, and making judgments on final publication decisions, in the end, for the benefit of the readership (and the publisher), *must fill the pages of the journal*. In my experience, reviewers are better at rejecting manuscripts than they are at selecting them, and for my first several months as an editor, my review teams rejected absolutely everything that was submitted. At that point, I had to send them all a message explaining that we needed to publish *something*, so please do not hold these manuscripts to an impossible standard of perfection.

Perhaps it is the “validity threat” paradigm in which we social scientists are raised that makes it so easy for us to perceive the flaws in our work and so difficult for us to see its strengths. As authors, we are advised to list the limitations of our work, which is important to ensure that it is interpreted properly. Unfortunately, these sections can often leave the reader feeling as if the study accomplished pretty much nothing of value. It is important to remember that we usually make our methodological decisions for sound reasons. It is very valuable for authors to include the reasons for their methodological choices in the limitations section. No individual piece of research is perfect, and the best we can ask of authors is to choose the best methodological tradeoffs possible, given the research question, the state of the extant literature, and the realistic availability of data.

### **Subjectivity enters into the editorial process**

Although editorial judgment is necessary to the knowledge-creation process, neither the editorial process nor our judgments as editors are perfect. All of these judgments are affected by the limitations of the human cognitive structure. Editors are plagued with all of the perceptual biases that human beings are subject to, including personal biases (Is work in our own area of expertise really more worthy of publication than work in other subfields?), stereotyping (Is the work of an established scholar really higher in quality than that of an unknown author?), recency effects (Is a topic recently published in *Academy of Management Journal*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, or *Academy of Management Review* really more worthy than others?), sunk costs (Does the fact that the author has gone through two R&Rs mean that I have to accept the article at this point?), and more. These biases mean that editors are subject to both Type I and Type II errors, such that articles that should be published are rejected and vice versa.

Furthermore, the editorial process is inherently subjective because editors work only with texts and do not have access to the original data, that is, the material reality against which to validate or invalidate those texts. The only resources we have at our disposal to assess the quality of manuscripts are (1) our judgment as experienced professionals, (2) the judgments of the reviewers, and (3) the system of rules for generating, communicating, and validating knowledge within our field. Hence, our editorial work is very much like Nonaka et al.'s (2006) knowledge-conversion process. It is *intersubjective*, meaning that one person's knowledge can be validated or invalidated by another's knowledge, depending upon whether the authors and the editorial team can reach an agreement regarding the validity of the knowledge claim.

The editorial process is also *reflexive*, by which I mean that process of converting each piece of knowledge affects the character of the knowledge itself. The fact that scholarly papers are changed through the review process is a well-known frustration in the field, and recently, some have called for "as is" publication decisions allowing no requests for revision (Tsang & Frey, 2007). Although the reflexivity of the editorial process may seem ominous to authors, the nature of these changes is generally quite positive. In my experiences as an editor, the manuscripts submitted to my journal improved substantially over the course of the review and revision process. Given that manuscripts generally improve with revision, authors probably serve themselves and the field best when they are highly responsive to input from the editor and reviewers (not necessarily agreeing with the editorial team, but responding to all of their concerns thoroughly to maximize the strength of the methods used and to minimize needless confusion generated by the writing).

### **Interests and the potential for moral hazard enter into the process**

Beyond cognitive and process limitations, the subjectivity of the editorial process also invites what Foss (2007) terms "knowledge-related exchange

hazards" (p. 40). Foss identified two types of such hazards: knowledge appropriation and strategic knowledge accumulation. Knowledge appropriation is what we might call plagiarism. Strategic knowledge accumulation is what we might call lack of collegiality or unwillingness to help other scholars. The field of organization and management studies has seen the development of mechanisms to minimize both of these issues. The Academy of Management (December 2005) recently developed formal mechanisms for enforcing rules about plagiarism and other ethical violations in the field. We are also doing better with knowledge sharing, due to the statistical and measurement tools that are now available on the Internet, as well as information sharing on list serves. Many subtle ethical issues remain, however, and editors must grapple with these on occasion (see Shapiro & Bartunek, this volume).

One of the issues is whether editors should publish their own work in their journal. Although the editor may be capable of contributing a fine piece to a journal, as human decision makers, editors cannot be free from bias in assessing their own work. Hence, publishing one's own research is a questionable practice, at best.

Editors can and often do publish work by associate editors and members of their editorial boards, however. This practice is acceptable for multiple reasons. First, editors can provide such manuscripts with the same blind review process experienced by other authors, ensuring an equitable process. Second, given the substantial increase in the number of submissions to refereed academic journals in recent years, editorial boards have grown larger. Often, many of the finest contributors in the field are members of prestigious editorial boards. Not only would disallowing their contributions greatly reduce participation on these boards, it would also reduce the ability of the journal to publish the highest quality work with the best chance of subsequent citation and impact.

### **Communication is essential**

As adjudicators of a complex and evolving intersubjective knowledge-conversion process, communication is core to what editors do. First, a manuscript's quality of writing can often obscure the quality of a contribution. For authors, this means that the more effort you put into your writing, the better your chances of publication.

Perhaps less obviously, the quality of reviewer communication is also critical. Sometimes, reviewers do not communicate well by failing to provide citations or failing to clearly explain what they want authors to do. Such communication failures obviously create difficulties not only for the authors, who have a hard time satisfying the reviewer, but also for the editor, who is trying to evaluate the review and provide guidance to the authors. If, as a reviewer, you are not invited to join an editorial board or if you stop receiving manuscripts to review from your favorite journal, you might consider how well your communication has served the editor in the past.

Most importantly, communication from the editor is critically important to the process (Feldman, 2006). I learned this lesson from my experience as an author working with Nancy Eisenberg, who was the editor of *Psychological Bulletin* at the time. The first round of the review process resulted in three of the most challenging reviews ever written (at least, it seemed so to me). Fortunately, these reviews were accompanied by a detailed cover letter from Nancy Eisenberg, who made many suggestions for dealing with the concerns raised by the reviewers. She provided conceptual advice, methodological suggestions, and citations. She also helped me deal with two contradictory reviews by adjudicating them. She decided which reviewer's advice was more appropriate, and indicated so in the letter, as in, "on point 19, do what Reviewer X said and do not do what Reviewer Y suggested." This detailed advice was absolutely essential to the publication of the article, and I sent her a thank-you note for her contribution as editor. Since then, Nancy Eisenberg has been my role model for how I conduct myself as an editor.

## Conclusions for editors

As adjudicators of the knowledge-conversion system in our fields, editors are very powerful in many ways. Editors have substantial decision-making power, especially in the typical case where multiple reviewers disagree with one another (Calhoun & Starbuck, 2003). If the reviewers are in agreement, the editor must have a very strong rationale for contradicting them. If the reviewers disagree, however, the editor has almost absolute power to decide whether or not to invite a revision.

Beyond the power to affect the lives and careers of our fellow academics, one of the greatest powers editors have is to influence the content of the common body of knowledge. Given that common knowledge is the foundation upon which personal knowledge is built (Tywoniak, 2007), by influencing the common body of knowledge, we hope to influence personal knowledge and action in the material world. A small portion of the articles we select become incorporated into academic texts and classrooms, and eventually influence the thinking of practitioners. Although most articles are never cited, the ones that are cited influence subsequent research, a small portion of which eventually influences practical thought and action. Increasing the value of academic research for improving practice by helping to develop and select high-quality articles is an editor's primary power and primary goal.

With power comes substantial responsibility. I strongly disagree that editors should be able to do anything they want. On the other hand, I do not believe that editors should be completely beholden to reviewers. Following reviewers blindly means abdicating our responsibility to judge the quality of the reviews as well as the quality of manuscripts ourselves. Because the editor has more information available, s/he is the only person who can provide authors with a higher level of judgment that synthesizes the content of the manuscript with the content of multiple reviews. Exercising that higher-level

judgment is essential to the editorial process because of the complexity of the decisions we must make about complicated and abstract ideas (Tywoniak, 2007; Nonaka et al., 2006).

## Conclusions for authors

The complexity definition of knowledge suggests some avenues through which authors can enhance the impact of their research to advance the field in a more revolutionary and less incremental fashion. Research questions derived solely through deduction from even a thorough knowledge of the extant literature are likely to generate only incremental contributions to the field. Adding information from other sources, such as personal tacit knowledge and common tacit knowledge, and working to articulate and integrate those sources of knowledge with the extant academic literature holds considerably greater promise for enhancing understanding in a revolutionary way. Given that editors wish to enhance the impact of their journals by increasing citations, doing research that advances the field in revolutionary ways, or at least larger than average increments, is probably the best method for achieving publication.

Beyond doing high-quality research that advances the field, authors can also increase their probability of publication by attending to the communication process (Feldman, 2006). The manuscript should be viewed as a means of persuasion to readers who are well-versed in the area. The fact that the readers are very knowledgeable means that they will not be persuaded by an argument unless the author has demonstrated an understanding of the extant state of knowledge and debate on the topic. Leaving out a critical concept or debate in the field leaves an opening for reviewers to question whether the work is really adding anything new or is simply a replication of previously published work. Hence, it is very helpful for authors to begin their papers with a persuasive introduction that

- States the research question
- Summarizes existing knowledge on the topic
- Identifies the contribution of the current study
- Explains why that contribution is important for advancing the field (see chapters by Bergh and Hollenbeck in this volume for guidance on how to effectively craft a statement of a paper's contribution)

A two- to four-page introduction that accomplishes these four goals makes considerable progress in the author's quest for publication. The reason a statement of contribution is valuable up front is because most of the time, the editor and the ultimate readers of the journal are not experts in every subfield covered by every submission. Hence, without a clear statement of contribution up front, my experience as an editor has been that I'll read through the whole paper and wonder, what is new about this? Haven't I read something

like this before? As an editor, I find those reactions very frustrating because it makes me feel like I have to do a comprehensive literature search in order to be able to judge whether this new submission makes a contribution. And reviewing the extant literature is not the editor's job, it is the author's job. Specifically, it is the author's job to put the reader in a position where s/he can judge the value of the contribution to the literature based on the paper alone. If the author can accomplish that goal convincingly, the probability of publication is greatly enhanced.

Throughout the paper, authors should work to make their writing as clear and accessible as possible. Because readers do not have access to the data (i.e., the social and material reality the author is writing about), authors need to provide a clear chain of evidence from the data to their conclusions. That means providing full information on data collection, measurement, and analysis. For example, if survey items are new or have been modified from their original published versions in any way, providing the reader with full information on all items is essential to validate the authors' interpretations of their findings. If qualitative methods are used, authors need to provide a thorough description of how the data were systematically analyzed, to allow the reader to judge the validity of the conclusions drawn. Importantly, making explicit the reasons for the methodological tradeoffs made between the study's strengths and weaknesses can help to persuade the editorial team that the study merits publication despite its (inevitable) flaws.

Finally, if authors don't agree with the reviewers or the editor, often the source of the confusion is the quality of the original writing. If reviewers are asking authors to add something that the authors believe is already in the paper, it is likely that the point needs to be elaborated or emphasized, and simply telling the reviewer that the idea is already in the paper is probably insufficient. If the editor or reviewers make a methodological suggestion that is incorrect or unnecessary, the authors probably have to do a better job explaining the chosen method *in the paper* as well as in a rebuttal directed to the reviewers. Editors are likely to believe that issues raised by the reviewers are going to be raised in the mind of other readers as well, so authors serve themselves best by responding very fully to every issue and concern raised by the reviewers and the editor. Going beyond what is requested explicitly to *fulfill the spirit as well as the letter of all comments* helps authors to win the debate with the reviewers and move their work from the personal to the common realm of knowledge.

## References

- Academy of Management. (December 2005). *Academy of Management Code of Ethics: Policies and Procedures for Handling Charges of Ethical Standards Violations*. Available online at <http://www.aomonline.org/aom.asp?id=271> (last accessed May 7, 2007).
- Aguinis, H., & Henle, C. A. (2002). Ethics in research. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 34–56). Malden,

- MA: Blackwell Publishers [available online at <http://carbon.cudenver.edu/~haguinis/AguinisHenle2002.pdf>].
- Argyris, C., & Schon, D. (1978). *Organizational Learning: A theory of action perspective*, Addison-Wesley, Reading MA, 1978.
- Calhoun, M. A., & Starbuck, W. H. (2003). Barriers to creating knowledge. In M. Easterby-Smith & M. A. Lyles (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge* (pp. 471–90). London: Blackwell.
- De Cock, C., & Jeanes, E. L. (2006). Questioning consensus, cultivating conflict. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 15, 18–30.
- Feldman, D. C. (2006). Communicating more effectively with editors: Strategies for authors and reviewers. In Y. Baruch, S. E. Sullivan, & H. N. Schepmyer (Eds.), *Winning Reviews: A guide for evaluating scholarly writing* (pp. 236–50). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foss, N. J. (2007). The emerging knowledge governance approach: Challenges and characteristics. *Organization*, 14, 29–52.
- Nonaka, I., von Krogh, G., & Voelpel, S. (2006). Organizational knowledge creation theory: Evolutionary paths and future advances. *Organization Studies*, 27, 1179–208.
- Pfeffer, J. (1993). Barriers to the advance of organizational science: Paradigm development as a dependent variable. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 599–620.
- Starbuck, W. H. (2005). How much better are the most-prestigious journals? The statistics of academic publication. *Organization Science*, 16, 180–200.
- Tsang, E. W. K., & Frey, B. S. (2007). The as-is journal review process: Let authors own their ideas. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6, 128–36.
- Tywniak, S. A. (2007). Knowledge in four deformation dimensions. *Organization*, 14, 53–76.
- Van de Ven, A. H. (1999). The buzzing, blooming, confusing world of organization and management theory: A view from Lake Wobegon University. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 8, 118–25.
- Van Maanen, J. (1995). Style as theory. *Organization Science*, 6, 133–43.
- Vermeulen, F. (2005). On rigor and relevance: Fostering dialectic progress in management research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 978–82.

# Subject Index

- academic freedom, 247
- Academic Source Premier, 198
- Academy of Management (AOM), xii, 62, 66, 83, 89, 107, 189, 209, 216, 231, 234
- Academy of Management Ethics Committee, 95
- Academy of Management Executive*, 232
- Academy of Management Journal (AMJ)*, xiii, xiv, xv, xvii, xviii, xix, xx, xxiii, xxiv, 56–62, 65–67, 75, 77, 78, 89, 92, 94, 96, 118, 119, 136, 139, 177, 190, 198, 231–233, 235, 239–243, 247
- Academy of Management Learning and Education (AMLE)*, 231–233
- Academy of Management Perspectives*, 232
- Academy of Management Review (AMR)*, xiii, xix, xxiii, 59, 92, 97–102, 108, 139, 189, 231–233, 238, 241
- acceptance
  - conditional, 64, 80, 124, 126, 129, 130, 133
  - final, 126, 139
  - likelihood of, 29, 146, 152, 153, 180, 253
  - rates, 196
- Administrative Science Quarterly (ASQ)*, xiii, xvii, xix, xxiii, 10, 39, 43, 59, 97, 98, 108, 255
- Advanced Institute of Management (AIM), 113
- advance(s),
  - revolutionary, 7
- agency
  - funding, 201
- ambassador
  - journal's, 39, 40, 42, 107, 213
- American Journal of Public Health*, 260
- American Psychological Association (APA), xii, 83, 84, 145, 147, 148, 149, 153, 156, 209, 216, 237, 248, 260
- American Psychologist*, 260
- American Sociological Association, xxii
  - American Sociological Review (ASR)*, xvii, xxiii, 124, 129, 130
  - animosity
    - reviewer, 246
  - Annual Review of Psychology*, xvi, 267
  - Aomonline.org*, 231, 238
  - APA Publication Manual*, 248
  - applied organizational sciences, 18, 19, 26
  - applied psychology, 147, 154
  - Applied Psychology: An International Review*, xx, 153
  - article(s)
    - award winning, 120
    - high quality, 12, 195
    - important, 203
    - influential, 29
    - invited, 267
    - most cited, 254, 265
    - practitioner-oriented, 157
    - research methods, 189
  - assessment(s), xviii, 105, 118, 127, 152, 168, 169, 203, 214, 225, 227, 268
  - associate editors
    - qualifications, 68, 193, 235
  - Association for Psychological Science (APS), (formerly American Psychological Society), xiii, 260
  - Association of Research Libraries, 176, 186
  - Australia, xii, xvii, 71, 170, 223, 228
  - authors and reviewers
    - consensus between, 114, 257
    - authorship, 139, 141, 257, 267
      - ethics of, 139, 141
      - legitimate, 139, 141
      - prerogatives of, 139, 141
  - autonomy, 3, 135, 141, 223, 224, 228
  - award(s), xiii, 67, 69, 92, 182, 221
    - best reviewer, 67, 69, 92
    - journal, 69
    - special, 153
  - backlog, 98, 195, 234
  - balance, 75, 85, 87, 100, 109, 114, 149, 174, 179, 218, 236, 265, 266

- behavioral science, xiv, xxiii, 92, 95, 96, 209
- Best Article Award, xv, 119
- Best Paper of the Year Award, 136
- Best Reviewer Award, 67, 69, 92
- biases, 10, 41, 81, 82, 141, 226, 254, 256, 265, 267
- methodological, 226
- opposite, 267
- potential, 226
- Board of Governors (of the Academy of Management), xix, 193, 232
- boardroom, 84
- book review editor, 39
- branding opportunities, 73
- breakthroughs, 139
- Britain, iv, 173
- British Academy of Management (BAM) Annual Conference Issue, 108
- British Association of Sociology, 106
- British Journal of Management (BJM)*, xvi, xxiii, 104–113
- British Psychological Society, 106
- Budapest Open Access Initiative
- budgets
- page, 36, 177
- burden
- emotional, 244
- professional service, 28
- burnout
- editorial, 45
- Business Ethics - A European Review*, 178
- byline, 135
- calculation
- half-life, 146
- call for papers, 152, 162, 192
- capability(ies), 31, 100, 105, 107, 110, 184, 188, 200, 268
- organizational, 105, 110
- personal, 268
- resource, 107
- sophisticated, 200
- technical, 200
- to manage costs, 31
- capacity(ies), 5, 6, 36, 40, 106, 113, 213
- operational, 112
- strategic, 106
- career, 24, 28, 31, 64, 111, 224
- Career Development International*, xii, xxiv, 178
- Career Development Quarterly*, 178
- case studies, 158
- copyright
- reverse, 135
- certifications, 134
- chairs, 155, 190, 192
- change(s)
- editorial policy, 35
- evolutionary, 259, 261, 262, 266
- journal focus, 35
- methodological, 250
- revolutionary, 259, 261–262, 266
- technological, 97
- Chief Executive Officer (CEO), xix, 165
- China, xii, 170, 171
- choices
- publication, 181
- strategic, 266
- circulation(s), 145, 169, 199, 202, 251, 261–264, 266
- citation counts, 18, 92, 180, 202, 262, 264
- citation frequency, 90
- citation rates
- differences in, 203
- citation(s)
- few, 263
- increased, 256
- many, 255, 262, 264
- number of, 136
- ratio of, 146
- subsequent, 11
- total, 263
- citedness, 146
- citizenship, 27, 30, 31, 36
- civic virtue, 30
- civility
- norms of, 99
- co-author(ship), 225, 236, 257
- code of ethics, 14
- coeditors, xii, xxiv, 45, 169, 170, 265, 268
- collegiality, 11, 61
- lack of, 11
- commentary(ies), 61, 101, 173, 257
- detailed, 257
- commercialization, 202

- commitment, 21, 72–74, 87, 98, 110,  
     128, 154, 165, 194, 195, 198, 212,  
     216, 237, 255  
     time, 237  
 committee(s)  
     advisory, xvi, xviii, 89  
     promotion, 141, 192, 204  
     selection, 236, 237  
     tenure, 190  
     *see also* Journals Committee  
 communication(s), xix, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12,  
     13, 42, 57, 87, 91, 109, 123, 155,  
     194, 198, 213, 215  
 community  
     academic, 106, 168, 170, 174, 179,  
     183, 185, 198, 213, 214, 221, 242,  
     247  
     American, 168  
     caring, 221  
     ethical, 95  
     journal, 178, 185  
     niche, 222  
     of scholars, 140, 179, 183, 190  
     practitioner, xxiv  
     professional, 89, 91, 95, 152, 159  
 competence(y), 44, 89, 90, 92–94, 96,  
     212–214, 216, 220, 236  
     decision making, 214  
     reviewing, 216  
 competition, 76, 108, 158, 186  
 complaints  
     common, 132  
 compliance  
     organizational, 30  
 compulsivity, 248  
 conferences, 32, 41, 109, 155, 162, 179,  
     195, 198, 201  
 confidentiality, 153  
 conflict of interest, 30, 153, 236  
 conformity, 179  
 conscientiousness, 62  
 consciousness  
     quasi-global, 169  
     scholarly, 169  
 consensus, 17  
     lack of, 16, 17, 20, 24  
 consensus creation, 16, 17, 20, 24, 26  
 consensus shifting, 16, 17, 19, 20–26  
 consensus-challenging work, 182, 185  
 consequence(s), xix, 19, 40, 43, 63, 98,  
     109, 135, 182, 202, 252, 259  
 consistency, 69, 89, 92, 185  
     level of, 69  
 consulting editor, xv, xix, xx, 69, 75  
 content analysis, 210, 211  
 contingency(ies), 4, 24, 171, 173,  
     252–254, 257, 268  
     behavioral, 4  
     different, 267  
     historical, 171  
     situationally-specific, 171  
 continuum  
     micro-macro, 226  
 contract, 110, 209, 216, 257  
     psychological, 209, 216  
 coordinator  
     manuscript, 156  
 coproduction, 32, 33, 36  
 copyediting, 130, 131, 200  
 copying services, 156  
 copyright, iv, 153, 199, 200  
     ownership of, 199  
 Cornell University, xiii, xvii, xviii, xix,  
     255  
 correspondence  
     inappropriate, 33  
     personal, 72  
 cost containment, 83  
 cost(s)  
     marginal, 139  
     of printing, 97  
     opportunity, 177  
     production, 202  
 Council of the British Academy of  
     Management (BAM), 105  
 counseling, 242  
 counter-voice, 215  
 court of appeal, 258  
 Creative Commons Attribution License,  
     199  
 creativity, 26, 86, 119, 122, 140, 211  
 credibility, 71, 134, 161, 212  
 criteria, 26, 30, 58, 87, 91, 92, 94, 137,  
     169, 192, 234, 254  
     particularistic, 137  
     publication, 58  
 criticism(s), 82, 85, 91, 94, 139, 259  
     constructive, 94  
     developmental, 91  
     referee, 139  
 critique, 7, 42, 44, 71, 91  
     journal, 71

- Cultural Revolution, 171  
 culture(s), xix, 71, 169, 172, 209, 243  
   developmental, 243  
   editorial, 243  
   non-Western, 172  
 curiosity, 211, 213  
   intellectual, 213  
 current thinking, 7  
 Curriculum Vitae (CV), 234 (*see also*  
   *résumé*)  
 customer service, 27, 31–34  
 customized interactions, 33  
 cycle  
   decision, 97  
  
 deal breakers, 237  
 deans, 106, 141, 146, 155, 190, 192,  
   235, 250  
   business school, xix, 106  
   enthusiastic, 235  
 decision making, xiii, xvii, xxiii, 12, 17,  
   75, 93, 96, 99, 100, 180, 183, 184,  
   212, 214, 218, 240–242  
   agonizing, 242  
   editorial, xxiii  
*Decision Sciences*, xvii, xxii  
 dedication, 66, 69, 109, 110, 212  
 deference, 250  
 delay(s), 36, 43, 49, 53, 126, 127, 195,  
   198, 202, 225, 244, 254  
 delegation, 100, 129, 132  
 Department of Psychology at Berkeley,  
   155  
 desk reject(ion), 52, 53, 56, 58, 59, 66,  
   180, 241, 242  
 developmental feedback, 78, 149, 225,  
   242, 249  
 diamond in the rough, 95, 243  
 dignity, 91, 92  
 diplomacy, 80, 83, 213  
 Directory of Open Access Journals  
   (DOAJ), 176, 201–203  
 disagreement  
   inter-reviewer, 181  
 disrespect, 241  
 diversity, xii, xvii, xviii, xxiii, 8, 71,  
   149, 169, 170, 253, 254, 264  
   epistemological, 44  
   gender, xii  
   inherent, 169  
   international, 149  
   national, 149  
   public and private universities, 71  
   race/racial, 71  
 dustbowl empiricism, 149  
  
 Eastern Academy of Management  
   (EAM), 199  
 eclectic field, 104  
 ecology, 261  
 education  
   business, 169  
   executive, xix, 248  
   management, xvi, xviii, 231  
   post-doctoral, 256  
 educators  
   graduate, 29  
 effectiveness, 99, 100, 102, 151  
 efficiency, 51, 72, 97, 99, 100, 102, 182  
   control of, 100  
 ego, 28, 214  
   editor's, 131  
 e-journals, 202  
 elections, 236, 252  
 electronic form/version, 50, 130, 200  
*Electronic Journal of Radical Organization  
   Theory (EJROT)*, 198  
 electronic journal(s), xvi, xxiv, 197, 198,  
   200–204  
 electronic publishing, 98, 197  
 electronic review(s), 50, 180  
 electronic submission(s), 50, 52, 71,  
   101, 155, 196  
 electronic system, 92  
 empathy, 29, 212, 214  
 empowerment  
   editorial, 93  
 endorsements  
   institutional, 203  
 entrepreneurs  
   institutional, 167  
 entrepreneurship, xx, 178, 183  
*Epidemiology*, 261  
 epistemology(ies), xix, 8, 9  
 error(s)  
   human, 268  
   technical, 150  
   Type I, 10, 243  
   Type II, 10, 243  
 esteem, 28, 216, 220  
 ego-growth, 28  
 self, 220

- ethical dilemmas, 109  
 ethical violations, 11  
 ethics, xiv, xvii, 84, 95, 139, 141, 178, 266  
 etiquette  
   inappropriate reviewer, 151  
 excellence, xxiii, 89, 104, 203, 251, 255, 265  
 expenditure  
   library, 176  
   on serials, 176  
 experiment(s)  
   laboratory, 84  
   natural, 203  
 explicit knowledge, 5–7  
 extrinsic outcomes, 224  
 extroversion, 212  
  
 factor(s)  
   circumstantial, 219  
   contextual, 226  
   immediacy, 146  
   impact, 106, 108, 113, 146, 159, 192, 202, 203, 251, 261, 263, 267  
 faculty, xiii, xv, xvii, xviii, xix, 68, 69–74, 140, 148, 181, 188, 196, 239, 256  
   junior, 71, 73, 140, 196  
   new, 148  
   senior, 71, 73  
 fairness, xviii, 78, 218, 243, 254  
   perceived, 78  
   procedural, xviii  
 faith, 137, 138  
*faux* rigor, 137  
 favoritism, 40, 265  
 fear, 258  
 feeling, 9, 31, 33, 45, 56, 65, 105, 115, 180, 211–213, 215, 231, 239, 244  
 figure(s)  
   public, 39  
   supplemental, 130  
   turnaround, 180  
 finance, xx, 107, 177, 263  
 financial accounting, 156  
*Financial Times*, xix, 90  
 finding(s), 14, 20, 111, 115–117, 120–121, 125, 141, 160, 163, 211, 221, 256, 258–260, 266  
 first impression, 102, 120, 192  
  
 fit(s), 4, 7, 8, 30, 43, 53, 57, 59, 60, 78, 87, 118, 119, 147, 153, 165, 174, 189, 221, 228, 241  
   lack of, 60, 241  
 flaws, 9, 14, 42, 90, 119, 214, 226, 268  
   methodological, 268  
   serious, 214  
   theoretical, 226  
 flexibility, 55, 258  
 foreignness, 173  
 form letter, 9, 77–79  
 format(ing), 52, 94, 160, 200, 201, 204, 241  
   electronic, 200  
   give-away, 242  
   journal's, 241  
   poor, 160  
   section, 200  
 Forum  
   Executive, 158  
   HR Leadership, 158  
   HR Science, 158  
 forum(s), 32, 119, 139, 158, 169, 172, 228, 231, 260  
 editor's, 139  
   special, 260  
 framework(s), 9, 28, 58, 115, 116, 118, 119, 173, 223  
   extended, 116  
   generalized, 119  
   simplistic, 115  
   theoretical, 58, 173  
   tried-and-true, 223  
 framing, 19, 21, 26, 64, 102, 128  
   conceptual, 8, 128  
   theoretical, 102  
 framing manuscripts, 21  
 fraud, 8  
 freedom  
   academic, 247  
 frustration, 10, 32, 177, 220, 243  
 fulfillment  
   level of, 220  
 functions of volunteering  
   protective, 29  
   understanding, 29  
 funds, 233, 262  
   discretionary, 233  
 fusion  
   possible, 174

- games  
 evolutionary, 183  
 infantile, 249  
 sophomoric, 247
- gatekeeper/gatekeeping, 7, 8, 88–92, 95,  
 96, 154, 231, 236  
 editorial, 7, 8
- gathering  
 data, 259
- gender, xii, xvi, 71, 137, 149, 210
- generalization, 240, 252
- ghostwriters/ghostwriting, xxii, 63, 134,  
 135, 137
- gifts, 44, 73, 74  
 token, 74
- glamour, 234
- good reviewers, 42, 74, 76, 81–83, 213
- goodwill, 119
- governance mechanisms, 184, 185
- grace  
 sensitivity, 213
- grade, 215
- graduates  
 MBA, 259
- grammar  
 poor, 160
- grant(s), 20, 31, 154, 201
- graphs, 161
- gratification  
 delayed, 225
- Greek, 173
- grievance, 124
- ground(s), 44, 234, 259, 262  
 defensible, 262  
 logical, 259  
 new, 247  
 theoretical, 152
- group  
 distinguished, 148  
 large, 262  
 minor, 209  
 only, 189  
 significant, 209  
 small, 184, 199
- Group & Organization Management*, xii,  
 xvi, xxii, xxiv
- group think, 140
- guidance, xxvi, 3, 9, 11, 13, 33, 58, 59,  
 83, 115, 121, 124, 126, 128, 133, 181,  
 188, 190, 191, 196, 256, 258, 260  
 published, 188
- guidelines, 32, 36, 53, 58, 61, 78, 84,  
 119, 162, 241, 260  
 ethical, 84  
 journal, 32, 162  
 reviewer, 53  
 style, 58  
 submission, 36, 53
- half-life, 146
- Handbook of Organization*, 255
- hermeneutical exercise, 172
- hierarchical linear modeling, 33, 225
- higher education, 106
- high quality, xxi, 3, 12, 13, 35, 40,  
 82, 89, 94, 107, 112, 140, 152,  
 157, 158, 163, 165, 174, 180,  
 181, 185, 192, 194, 195, 197,  
 214, 222, 226, 229, 232, 240,  
 263, 265, 266
- high-risk revision, 243
- history of science, 16
- hit  
 citation wise, 218
- home institution, 69
- homogeneity, 254
- hospitals, 255
- HR Leadership Forum, 158
- HR Science Forum, 158
- HRM, 157, 166
- HRM Survey, 158
- [http://www.soros.org/openaccess/  
 resources.shtml](http://www.soros.org/openaccess/resources.shtml)  
 Budapest Open Access Initiative,  
 204
- Human Performance*, xx, 153
- Human Relations*, xii, xv, xvii, 92
- Human Resource Management (HRM)*, xii,  
 xiv, xv, xvii, xviii, xix, xxiii, xxvii,  
 157–160, 162–166, 177
- Human Resource Management Journal*,  
 xvii, 166, 178
- humanities, 168
- hypothesis(es), 24, 86, 116, 117, 157,  
 164, 259  
 alternative, 259  
 knowledge-driven, 24  
 new, 116  
 null, 259, 260  
 problem-driven, 24  
 statement of, 86  
 true, 259

- idealism, 122
- idea(s)
  - marketplace of, 115, 135, 140
  - revolutionary, 261
  - value-added, 90
- identification, 28, 30, 121, 148, 150, 255
  - professional, 38, 30, 35
- identity(ies), xxiv, 28, 35, 107, 111, 167–169, 173, 174, 185, 194, 223, 224, 226, 251, 254, 255, 261
  - American, 167
  - diffuse, 255
  - discursively influenced, 174
  - discursively produced, 169, 173
  - distinctive, 111, 261
  - dynamic, 174
  - European, 167
  - historically generated/shaped, 169, 174
  - homogenous, 167
  - intellectual, 169
  - journal's, 173, 174
  - professional, 35
  - task, 223, 224
  - volunteer role, 28
- image
  - ideal, 135, 139
  - journal's, 110, 192
- imagination, 247, 248
  - reader's, 247
- immaturity
  - disciplinary, 17
- immediacy factor, 146
- impact factor(s)
  - different, 263
  - instability of, 4
- impact(s), 26, 158, 176, 179, 202, 203, 217, 229, 259, 263, 264
- implications, xxiv, 3, 7, 9, 23–26, 36, 37, 53, 54, 63, 84, 86, 104, 110, 111, 120, 121, 125, 141, 147, 152, 161, 173, 176, 181, 185, 195, 209, 221, 236, 237, 248, 251
  - applied, 152
  - communal, 104
  - personal, 181
  - practical, 147
  - theoretical, 173
  - for practice, 23
- implied mediator, 23
- impulses
  - developmental, 251
  - different, 251
- inappropriateness, 261
- inauguration, 198
- incentive, 82, 149, 181, 261
- inception, 177
- inclusion, 8, 106
- income, 39, 201, 220
- incompatibility, 258
- incorporation, 126
- incremental contribution, 13, 247
- independence, 119, 212
- independent journals, xxiv, 176–186
  - non-affiliated to a professional association, 176
- index (indices),
  - immediacy, 146
- indicator(s), 90, 112, 146, 229, 260
  - career success, 220
- industry
  - publishing, 262
- Infornit e-Library, 198
- Infotrac, 198
- infrastructure
  - administrative, 112
  - electronic, 109
  - journal, 49
  - ready-made, 179
- initiative(s), xii, 30, 89, 120, 169, 204, 234, 261
  - editorial, 261
- insider, 40
- insights, xxii, 49, 53, 90, 116, 117, 118, 129, 145, 152, 176, 179, 184, 197, 231, 255
  - theoretical, 118, 152, 231
  - useful, 197
- instability, 4
- instinct
  - gut, 225
- institution(s), 69, 100, 200, 210, 215, 217, 218, 220, 223, 233, 234,
  - host, 233, 234
  - international, 168
  - obscure, 268
  - research-led, 210
  - societal, 171
  - sponsoring, 111
  - trajectory, 167

- instructions, 50, 62, 63, 152, 160, 162,  
241, 245, 248,  
format, 241  
journal's, 248  
publisher's, 160  
specific, 152  
submission, 50
- insurance, 126
- integrity, 30, 65, 89, 91–96, 134, 211,  
221
- intellectual property, 80
- intelligence, 211, 213  
analytical, 211
- intention(s), 23, 106, 138, 141, 157,  
219
- interest(s)  
collective, 31  
conflict of, 30, 153, 236  
conflicting, 75  
readers', 130  
self-, 31, 34  
vested, 77
- interface, 103, 182, 185
- interlocutor, 170, 172, 174
- international conference circuit,  
105
- International Journal of Human Resource  
Management*, 178
- internationalization, 100, 101, 108, 109,  
149
- internet, 11, 101, 155, 169, 174, 176,  
186, 197, 198, 200, 202, 204, 233,  
234, 262  
access to the, 198
- intervals  
confidence, 260
- intervention(s)  
editorial, 128, 254, 260  
strong, 254
- investigations  
original, 147  
theoretical, 147
- ISBN number, 84
- ISI (Institute of Scientific Information)  
Journal Citation Reports  
rating or ranking, 3, 90, 106, 146,  
183, 189, 202, 210, 211, 218, 262,  
263, 267
- issue(s)  
special, xii, xx, 69, 93, 108, 135, 165,  
182, 183, 185, 198, 263,
- iteration(s), 115, 122, 129  
final, 129  
several, 115, 129
- iterative effects, 224
- Job Characteristics Theory (JCT), 223, 224  
predictions of, 224
- Journal Citation Reports  
*see* ISI (Institute of Scientific  
Information) Journal Citation  
Reports
- journal lists, 181
- Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, xiv,  
xxiii
- Journal of Applied Psychology (JAP)*, xiii,  
60, 136, 145
- Journal of Business Venturing*, xx, 178, 183
- Journal of Consulting and Clinical  
Psychology (JCCP)*, 260
- Journal of Economic Literature*, 267
- Journal of Finance*, 177
- Journal of Financial Economics (JFE)*, 177
- Journal of Management (JOM)*, xii, xiv, xv,  
xvi, xvii, xviii, xix, xx, xxiii, xxiv,  
30, 49, 50–53, 55, 68, 104, 176, 186,  
223–229
- Journal of Management Studies (JMS)*, xv,  
xix, xx, xxiv, 176, 180, 183, 184,  
186
- Journal of Organizational Behavior*, xv,  
xvi, 59, 92, 183
- Journal of Personality and Social  
Psychology (JPSP)*, xvii, 80
- journal web sites, 58, 245
- Journals Committee, xxiv, 231–236, 238  
successive, 236
- judgment(s), xxi, 3–5, 7–10, 12, 13, 65,  
134, 136, 137, 181, 196, 212, 214,  
236, 240, 242, 244, 246, 250, 253,  
256, 258, 264, 266  
editorial, 4, 10
- independence of, 212
- objective, 244
- readers', 264, 266
- reviewer(s), 65, 264
- justice, xix, 77, 91
- key job characteristic  
Autonomy, 223  
Task Identity, 223  
Task Significance, 223

- keywords, 102
- knowledge
  - academic, 211, 221
  - accumulation, 11
  - advancement of, 203
  - advances(ing), 35, 138, 159
  - appropriation, 11
  - common body of, xxii, 3, 7, 8, 12
  - communicating, rules for , 5
  - creation, xxi, xxii, 3, 7, 8, 10, 88, 212, 214
  - current, 18, 90
  - deficiencies in, 116
  - definition of, 4, 13, 17
  - development, 4, 16, 17, 26, 145, 216, 256, 258
  - discipline, 220
  - dissemination, xxi, xxii, 88, 114
  - existing, 13, 19, 24, 25
  - explicit, 5, 6, 7
  - inside, 186
  - inter-subjective, xxii, 3, 6, 9, 11
  - research-based, 232
  - scientific, 262
  - sharing, 11
  - social construction of, 134
  - tacit, 5–7, 13
  - theory-based, 231
  - transmission, 5
  - validating, rules for, 5
- knowledge base, 8, 18, 21, 24–26, 37, 147, 149, 150, 152, 156, 203
- knowledge conversion, xxii, 3, 6–10, 12
- knowledge generation, 6, 21, 23–25
- knowledge management, 3
- knowledge sharing, 5, 11
- KSAOs
  - knowledge, skills, abilities, other characteristics, 237, 238
- laboratories
  - directors of, 256
  - research, 256
- leaders, 84, 110, 192, 267
- leadership
  - academic, 214
  - servant, xv, xxii, 27, 35, 213, 214
- learning, xiii, xvi, xviii, 4, 29, 43, 82, 98, 114, 161, 163–166, 185, 211, 212, 224, 231
- single-loop, 4
- legacy of service, 37
- legitimacy, 70, 71, 192, 197, 201–204
  - institutional, 71
  - perceived, 192, 203
- length(s), 34, 43, 58, 60, 70, 129, 130, 136, 183, 184, 241, 249, 263
  - article or manuscript, 58
  - average, 263
  - maximum, 130
- leniency, 69, 244
- letter(s)
  - acceptance, 244
  - accompanying, 246, 249
  - action, 155
  - conditional accept, 129
  - cover, 12, 53, 77, 246
  - decision, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 43, 45, 49, 50, 53, 57, 59, 60, 63–65, 69, 78, 83, 85, 98–100, 102, 126, 193, 196, 215, 245, 246
  - editorial, 93, 128, 180
  - personalized, 79
  - R&R/revise-and-resubmit, 60, 245, 260
  - recommendation, 234
  - rejection, 57, 59, 66, 79, 229, 243, 244
- liabilities, 117, 193, 259
- librarians, 262, 263
- library(ies), 107, 110, 204, 262
- license(ing), 176, 178
  - Creative Commons Attribution License, 199
- list serves, 11
- listing
  - business, 106
  - management, 106
- lists
  - evaluation, 3
  - journal, 181
- literature review, 32
- literature search, 14
- load
  - editorial, 170
  - increasing, 170
  - reduced teaching, 155
  - teaching, 155, 228
- lobbying, 106
- location(s), xvi, 50, 98, 100, 129, 169, 173, 193, 252
- logistical issues, 51
- longevity, 178, 184
  - journal, 178

- luck of the reviewer draw, 136
- Luddite, 97
- M@n@gement*, xvi, xxiv, 198–200
- mailing process, 49
  - international reviewers, 49
- mailing time
  - international, 49
- mainstream, 168, 170, 174, 177, 184, 185
- managing editor, 97–101, 215
- Manuscript Central, 92
- manuscript tracking database, 52
- market(s), 112, 122, 134, 168, 176, 178, 190, 251, 262
  - journals, 176
  - labor, 168
  - unified, 168
- marketing, xxvi, 69, 73, 107, 110, 112, 147, 165, 241
  - campaigns, 110, 112
- marketplace, xxiii, 68, 104, 106, 111, 115, 135, 140
  - economic, 135
  - global, xxiii, 104,
  - scientific, 135, 140
- masthead, 65, 81, 149
  - journal, 81
- material(s),
  - offensive, 135
  - permanent, 130
  - promotional, 193
  - supplemental, 130
  - technical, 160
- mechanism(s)
  - defense, 188
  - governance, 184, 185
  - internal support, 107
  - market, 112
  - quality-control, 134
  - support, 112
- meddling,
  - editorial, 131
- mediator(s), 22–24, 120, 258
  - editorial roles, 258
  - implied, 23
- medicine, 261
- member(s)
  - editorial board, 61, 68, 71, 72–74, 83, 88–94, 96, 110, 129, 181, 182, 184, 194, 233, 237, 253
  - editorial review board, 89, 232
  - international, 233
  - junior faculty, 71, 196
  - prospective, 237
- membership, 71, 89, 178, 179, 192, 199, 201, 232, 234, 237,
- memory, 4, 70, 71, 100, 101, 188, 224
  - institutional, 70, 71, 101
  - selective perceptual, 168
- mentor(s), 39, 41, 42, 89, 228, 249
  - role of, 42
- mentoring, xxii, 42, 62, 66, 213, 215, 242
- meritocracy, 71
- meta-analysis, 20
- method(s)
  - qualitative, 14
  - quantitative, 58
  - research, xix, 9, 63, 107, 159, 163, 189, 190, 192, 226, 256
  - rigorous, 157
  - statistical, 163
  - vote-counting, 9
- methodology(ies)/ methodologist(s),
  - xiv, 8, 9, 12, 14, 68, 71, 76, 93, 115, 117, 118, 121, 191, 228, 257, 265, 266, 268
  - survey, 228
- mindset, 86, 159
- minority
  - significant, 217
- misconceptions, 36
- misinformation, consequences, xxi
- mission statement, 58, 147, 148
- mission(s)
  - editorial, 107
  - journal, 52, 58, 60, 119, 122, 147, 241, 242
- moderator(s), xii, 22, 24, 120
- monographs, 176, 237
- Motivating Potential Score (MPS), 223, 224, 226, 228
- National Football League (NFL), 244
- network(s), xvii, 5, 56, 68, 162, 220, 225, 238
- networking, 70, 163, 213, 216, 265, 266
  - interpersonal, 265, 266
- neuroscience, 183
- New Orleans, 98
- New Zealand, xiii, 170
- Newsletter of the Academy of Management*, 232

- nomination, 28, 70, 102, 153, 216, 233  
 call for, 216  
 noncompliance, 258  
 norm(s), 71, 77, 99, 125, 141, 159, 210,  
 261, 265  
 journal, 159  
 professional, 265  
 North America, 105, 108, 110, 199  
 notification, 58, 199  
 widespread, 232  
 novelty, 116  
 nuances, 118, 168, 191
- obligation, 42–43, 73, 154–155, 221, 222  
 professional, 151  
 obsession  
 omnipresent, 247
- OCB  
 organizational citizenship behavior,  
 xxvii, 30–31
- office  
 central, 98–99  
 editorial, 102, 109, 112, 184  
 headquarters, 234  
 journal, 49–50, 54, 101  
 virtual, 50
- officers, 240
- online journal/publication, xxiv, 176,  
 197–205
- ontologies  
 alternative, 171
- oomph  
 positive emotional, 225
- open access, xxii, 176, 198–199, 201–204  
 open ended appointment, 221  
 Open Journal Systems (OJS)  
<http://pkp.sfu.ca/?q=ojs>, 204  
 open-mindedness, 94–95  
 underlying, 168
- openness, 8, 177, 179, 236  
 intellectual, 169  
 journal's, 218
- optimization, 267
- oracle, 40–41
- Organization Management Journal (OMJ)*,  
 xvi, xxvii, 199–200
- Organization Science*, xiv, xvi–xvii, xix, 92
- organization studies, xiii, xix, 7–8, 99,  
 104, 106, 170
- Organization Studies (OSS)*, xii, xvii, xxiv,  
 xxvii, 167–172
- organization theory, xvi, 60, 255
- organizational behavior, 147
- Organizational Behavior and Human  
 Decision Processes (OBHDP)*, xxvii,  
 60, 98
- organizational citizenship behavior  
 (OCB), xxvii, 30–31
- organizational compliance, 30
- organizational loyalty, 30
- organizational positions, 6
- Organizational Research Methods (ORM)*,  
 xiii–xiv, xvi, xix, xxix, 60, 188,  
 190–199
- Organizations*, 255
- outcome(s), 3, 6, 18, 24, 25, 29, 36, 43,  
 67, 75–76, 79, 90, 114, 180, 254  
 acceptance, 79–80  
 desired, xxi, 4, 31  
 intrinsic, 224  
 negative, xi, 220, 267  
 positive, xi, 80, 220, 223, 226, 267  
 precarious, 173  
 rejection, 36, 79
- outlet(s), xvi, xix, 19, 43, 60, 74, 78,  
 84, 86, 106, 107, 118, 123, 177,  
 189–193, 195, 196,  
 198, 232  
 alternative, 60, 78, 177  
 international, 107  
 legitimate, 198  
 possible, 232  
 potential, 195
- outline(s), 81, 129
- over-editing, 63
- overload, 8, 31, 61, 180, 210  
 information, 8, 61  
 significant, 210
- oversights, 42, 83, 183
- Oxford English Dictionary(OED)*, xxvii,  
 41–42
- p values, 260, 261
- pages  
 allotment of, 145  
 number of, 131, 165, 247  
 per volume, 108
- panel(s)  
 editorial, 228  
 meet the editor, 182  
 reviewer, 224
- paperwork, 227

- paradigm(s), 8, 9, 20, 44, 95, 125, 140, 177, 259, 262  
 Statistical Hypothesis Inference Testing, 20
- parochialism, 172, 174
- passion, 212, 237
- patience, 162, 180, 212
- payment(s), 200, 250
- peer(s), 163, 181
- peer evaluations, 113
- peer judgment(s), 134
- peer review, 27, 30, 33, 53, 124, 133–135, 137, 151, 152, 183, 198, 214, 215
- penalty, 244, 245
- Penn State, 99, 100, 102
- perceived justice, 77
- perception(s)  
 operating, 193  
 public, 70
- performance, xxiii, 57, 64, 66, 70, 96, 104–107, 184, 196, 217, 232, 240, 251, 252, 267,  
 editorial, 252  
 improving journal's, xxiii, 104
- performance-quality  
 constructiveness, 92
- permission, 175, 200
- personal touch, 78
- personal work values, 28
- personality, 29, 145
- Personnel Psychology*, xiii, xvi, xvii, xviii, xxii, 19, 147
- persuasion, 13, 175, 255  
 art of, 175
- persuasiveness, 234
- philosophy  
 editing, 228  
 open access, 201  
 personal, 227
- philosophy of science, 16
- pipeline, 40, 83, 200, 218, 239
- plagiarism, 8, 11, 95
- plagiarizing, 94
- pluralism, 168, 169
- plurality  
 ineradicable, 174
- policy makers, 106
- Policy Statement, 190, 191, 193, 194, 196
- policy(ies), xxi, 14, 32, 35, 41, 43, 45, 58, 60, 62, 66, 80, 84, 93, 106, 107, 110, 131, 149, 177, 178, 183, 190, 191, 202, 224, 227, 234, 241, 250, 252, 255, 261, 266  
 editor submission to own journal, 84  
 editorial, xxi, 35, 41, 66, 107, 177, 252, 261  
 extreme, 266  
 idiosyncratic, 261  
 open access, 202  
 Revise and Resubmit Once, 45
- politics  
 underlying, 161
- polls, 122
- pool  
 candidate, 238  
 potential, 192
- positivism  
 American, 168
- positivists, 167
- power, xxi, 12, 39, 65, 75, 76, 85, 87, 102, 166, 172, 209, 215, 220, 221  
 disciplinary, 172  
 influential, 220
- power, editorial, 39
- practice(s)  
 contribution to, 111, 159  
 implications for, 23
- practitioner(s), xviii, xxiv, 12, 25, 43, 157–162, 164, 166
- praise, 81, 91  
 false, 91
- pre-conditions  
 submitting, 58
- prejudices, 174
- pressure to publish, 43, 125, 253
- pressure(s),  
 institutional, 198  
 social, 28, 29  
 time, 126, 180, 195, 210, 217
- prestige, xxi, 18, 76, 84, 179, 188, 193, 203, 232  
 journal, 232  
 measure of, 203
- probability  
 publication, 13, 14
- problem-solving, 24, 25
- Proceedings, 84, 162, 193, 198, 203

Proceedings of the Critical Management  
 Studies conferences, 198  
*Proceedings of the National Academy of  
 Sciences (PNAS)*, 203  
 production(s), xxvi, 32, 34, 35, 39, 43,  
 103, 110, 112, 142, 147, 202,  
 productivity, 31, 55, 140  
   research, 31, 55  
 professional association, xxi, 40, 70, 84,  
 98, 137, 176, 178, 223, 238, 263  
 professional citizenship, 30, 36  
 professional community, 89, 91, 95,  
 152, 159  
 professional identification, 28, 30, 35  
 professional values, 28  
 profit making, 262  
 program(s)  
   doctoral, xiii, 168  
 promotion, 140, 141, 146, 154, 155,  
 181, 190, 192, 201, 204, 220, 221,  
 244  
   academic, 220  
 proofreader, 33  
*Psychological Bulletin*, 12, 19, 77  
 psychological contract, 209, 216  
*Psychological Methods*, 191  
 psychology, xiv, xv, xviii, 84, 105,  
 145–149, 152–154, 189, 203, 241,  
 260, 261, 267  
   applied, xii, xiii, xx, 60, 136, 145,  
 147, 152–154, 189  
   clinical, 148, 260  
   cognitive, 145  
   cross-cultural, 149  
   educational, 145  
   neuropsychology, 145  
   personality, 145  
   social, xvii, 80, 105  
 psychometricians, 260  
 public good, 70  
 publication(s)  
   downloaded, 183  
   non-refereed, 204  
   number of, 140, 146  
   number of days since, 203  
   time to, 180  
 publish or perish, xxi, xxii, 88, 149,  
 209  
 publisher(s)  
   academic, 112  
   commercial, 250

English-language, 200  
   online, 201  
   private, 83  
   professional, 112  
 publishing  
   academic, 3, 175, 177  
   publishing company(ies)  
     Blackwell Publishing (Blackwell), 83,  
       106, 108, 110, 166, 186, 209  
     Elsevier, 209  
     Emerald, 198  
     John Wiley & Sons (Wiley), 83, 166,  
       209  
     Oxford University Press, 209  
     Palgrave, 209  
     Sage Publications, Inc. (Sage), 190,  
       210  
   publishing work by Associate Editors,  
     11  
   publishing work by members of  
     Editorial Board, 70  
  
 qualifications, 68, 193, 235, 238, 253  
   associate editors, 68  
   editorial board/team, 193, 253  
   reviewers, 253  
 queries, 98, 128  
 quotes, 211, 212, 217  
  
 R&R 9, 10, 43, 45, 60, 62, 79, 80,  
 124–129, 131–133, 146, 150, 151,  
 161, 171, 242, 243–245,  
 257, 260 *see also*  
   revise-and-resubmit,  
  
 ranking(s), 113  
   institutional, 181  
   journal, xxiv, 3, 104, 106, 181, 185,  
     202–203  
 rate(s)  
   acceptance, 129, 136, 146, 153, 196,  
     199, 267  
   circulation, 202  
   citation, 203  
   desk-rejection, 66, 180  
   rejection, *see also* desk-rejection rates,  
     108, 112, 177, 192, 210  
   response, 210  
   submission, 69, 74  
 readership, 9, 30, 84, 204, 218  
   diverse, 263  
   international, 200

- reception(s), 109–110, 192
- recognition, 19, 28, 30, 103, 111, 114,  
221, 250, 253  
name, 28  
peer, 181
- recommendation(s), 25, 64, 78, 85,  
235–236, 260  
accept/not accept, 150  
author, 102, 120, 130, 159–160  
bottom-line, 150  
direct, 216  
for reviewers, 100  
letters of, 153, 234–235  
opposing, 121  
potentially conflicting, 109  
reviewer/referee, 78, 81–83, 85,  
121–122, 135, 151, 216, 239–240,  
255  
unanimous, 240
- record(s), 25, 89, 92, 96, 140, 243  
citation, 94, 203  
historical, 236  
performance, 107  
publication, 66, 70, 195–196, 225  
publishing, 212  
scholarly, 93
- referee(s)  
ad hoc, 110  
delinquent, chasing of, 110  
interests of, 138  
*see also* reviewers, 134–141, 215, 244,  
256
- regression  
stepwise, 261
- rejection(s), 9, 27, 36, 43, 53, 57, 59–61,  
64, 66, 77, 79, 94–95, 108, 112, 129,  
135–137, 151, 161, 163, 177, 192,  
210, 229, 240, 243–244, 247, 254,  
259, 265, 268  
desk, 52, 58, 59, 66, 180, 241–242  
early, 253  
high-quality, 229  
of revised papers, 80, 132  
outright, 236  
painful, 80, 126, 243, 253  
reason for, 57, 137  
successive, 203
- relevance, xxii, 28, 94, 161, 204  
conceptual, 162  
practical, 160
- reliability, 97, 138, 265
- reminder(s), 51–54, 95, 100, 227  
built-in, 54, 100  
email, 51, 53  
message, 52
- replication  
constructive, 247
- reprints, 204, 262
- reputation(s), 68, 84, 86, 105, 148,  
193–195, 199, 212, 224, 243, 256  
articles', 146  
author('s, s'), 243, 266, 268  
department scholarly, xxi  
imputed, 268  
individual scholarly, xxi  
institutional, 111, 181  
integrity, 30  
journal('s, s'), 29–30, 42, 49, 77–78,  
83, 105, 146, 149, 179–188, 193,  
195, 201, 203, 224, 251, 256–257,  
263–264  
professional, 70  
scholarly, xxi, 212
- research  
applied, 148  
approaches, 8  
compelling,  
consensus confirming, 22  
consensus-challenging, 177, 179–8  
creative, 140  
critical, 160  
cross-cultural, 148  
development of, 7  
directions for future, 32  
empirical, 58, 189, 241  
European, 168  
frequently cited, 256  
high quality, 13, 107, 140, 152, 157,  
174, 240  
imaginative, 248  
implications for, 7  
innovative, 248  
international, 59, 177, 228  
interpretive, 169  
micro, 235  
non-U.S. context, 149  
provocative, 87  
qualitative, 154, 161  
quality of, 232  
quantitative, 173  
rigorous, 158, 162  
theoretical, 149

- research (*Cont.*)  
 theory-testing, 58  
 types of, 148  
 unorthodox, 135, 140
- research methodology(ies), 71, 115
- research methods, 9, 63, 107, 159, 163, 189–190, 226, 256
- Research Methods Division (RMD), xxvii, 192–193
- research productivity, 31, 55
- research question(s), 7–9, 13, 24, 112, 115–116, 118–119, 121, 163–164
- researcher(s)  
 independent, 168  
 international, 228  
 medical, 261  
 US-trained, 228
- respect, 77–79, 91, 93, 215, 220, 250, 255
- respondents, 164, 209, 211
- response(s), 28, 33, 52, 61, 86, 94, 151–152, 158, 179, 210, 219  
 informal, 152  
 intriguing, 218  
 negative, 151  
 possible, 254  
 strong, 267
- responsibility(ies), xxi, 12, 62, 88, 94, 140, 180, 209, 193, 224, 228, 253, 255–256, 261  
 academic, 228  
 administration, 151  
 editor, 21, 34, 45, 65, 69, 88–89, 91–92, 96, 100, 104, 109, 111, 122, 225, 228, 240, 243  
 major, 209  
 management, 151  
 personal, 253  
 sense of, 105  
 single best service, 223  
 ultimate, 85
- responsiveness, 246
- resubmission(s), 61, 79–80, 268
- resumé (*see also* Curriculum Vitae) 171, 262
- revenues, 195, 200–201  
 subscription, 251
- reverse censorship, 135
- review cycle, 50, 52, 56
- Review of Financial Studies*, 177
- review process, vii, ix, xxiii, xxiv, 9–12, 18, 27, 30, 33, 36, 43, 49–67
- automated, 50  
 developmental, 136  
 disadvantages, 49–50, 80, 165  
 electronic, 50, 180  
 integrity of, 65, 134  
 phases, 43, 44  
 ritualized, 57
- review(s)  
 constructive, 53, 150, 194, 232, 237  
 contradictory, 12  
 cycle, 50, 52, 56  
 delayed, 49  
 developmental, 77, 94, 136, 242  
 exhaustive, 231  
 expedient, 49  
 fair, 77, 236  
 first set of, 127  
 helpful, 44, 83, 256  
 inappropriate tone, 34  
 independent, 162,  
 informative, 77  
 informed, 53  
 late, 227  
 lost, 49  
 mixed, 242  
 request, 44, 52–53  
 round of, 12, 76, 124, 136, 242–243  
 second round of, 45, 126–127, 129  
 time to complete, 44, 50  
 timeliness, 73, 93–94, 149–150  
 timely, 77, 81, 83, 91, 94, 112, 182, 194, 232, 237  
 weak, 34
- reviewer feedback, 78, 83, 149–151, 184, 224, 227, 236, 242, 245–246
- reviewer role  
 prosecutor, 65
- reviewer(s)  
 ad hoc, vii, xxiii, 51–53, 68, 71–74, 92, 94, 110, 112, 145, 147, 149–151, 155, 193, 196, 228–229, 237, 256  
 allocation, 100  
 appropriate, 151  
 assigning, 99, 102  
 behavior of, 32  
 best, 44, 67, 69, 92  
 choice of, 99  
 consensus among, 17  
 delinquent, 110

- reviewer(s) (*Contd.*)  
 discontent, 101  
 insulting a, 86  
 international, 49  
 late, 77  
 lukewarm, 181  
 negative, 181  
 non-responsive/ unresponsive, 34, 52  
 original, 52, 126  
 overdue, 98, 100  
 overemphasis on, 140  
 poor, 82,  
 practice-oriented, 24  
 qualified, 51, 85, 253  
 quality, 11, 52, 70  
 reluctant, xxiii  
 responsive, 44  
 timeliness of, 52, 92  
 unconstructive, 52  
 valued, 83, 180  
*see also* referee(s)
- revise and resubmit (R&R), xxvii, 9–10,  
 43, 45, 60, 62, 67, 79, 80, 124–133,  
 146, 150–151, 161, 171, 242–245,  
 257, 260
- revision(s), xxiii, 9, 10, 12, 29, 33, 35, 56,  
 61–63, 65, 78–80, 82, 85, 95, 116,  
 121–122, 124–129, 132, 136–137,  
 151, 171, 180, 195, 227, 239,  
 242–243, 245–247, 253, 257–258
- acceptable, 129  
 first, 227  
 high risk, 64, 67, 243  
 likelihood of a successful, 79, 81  
 multiple, 80, 126, 258  
 responsive, 10, 245–246  
 rounds of, 131  
 second, 21, 243  
 subsequent, 181  
 successful, 79, 81, 127, 171
- reward(s), 30, 31, 36, 44, 123, 149, 158,  
 250  
 fair, 190  
 immediate, 229  
 intrinsic, 250  
 psychological, 224  
 salient, 224
- rigor/rigour, 163–164, 179, 181, 199,  
 228  
*faux*, 137  
 theoretical, 109
- Royal Economics Society, 106
- royalties  
 payment of, 200
- sales, 32, 110  
 overseas, 110
- satisfaction  
 career, 210, 219  
 customer, 34  
 editor, 34, 45, 219, 250  
 job, 59, 67, 210
- scholar(s), xxi, xxii, xxiv, 8, 10, 28, 41,  
 68, 70, 72, 74, 81, 87–96, 107, 126,  
 132, 149, 151, 153, 155, 167,  
 169–173, 183–184, 189–192,  
 196–198, 204, 213, 220–221,  
 225, 232, 255
- academic, xxii, 155  
 aspiring, 188  
 community of, 140, 179, 183, 199  
 distinguished, 212  
 leading, 84, 212  
 prominent, 129  
 senior, 66, 71, 189, 192, 212, 219  
 young, 97, 242
- scholarly community, 59, 91–92, 105,  
 204, 222
- scholarship, 8, 45, 89–90, 96, 106, 214
- academic, 170, 172  
 American, 167  
 Anglo-Saxon, 173  
 British, 171  
 continental, 172  
 European, 172  
 organizational, 167, 169, 190  
 personal, 111  
 worldwide, 169
- science(s), xxi, 16, 24, 158, 171, 173
- applied organizational, 18, 26  
 basic, 99  
 behavioral, xxii, 92, 95–96, 209  
 management, 92, 209, 231, 236  
 organizational, xxii, 18  
 philosophy of, 16, 26  
 social, xxii, 6, 106, 121, 125, 146,  
 156, 168, 209, 231, 236, 255, 259
- sector  
 for-profit, 147  
 nonprofit, 147  
 private, 147  
 public, 107, 147

- selection process/ procedures, 71, 89, 94, 153, 216, 231–238
- sentiments, 62, 140
- separation, 244
- servant leadership, 27–37, 213–214
- service, 18, 27, 28, 32–37, 41, 50, 109, 112, 150, 185, 201, 223, 234
  - better, 29, 180, 185
  - conscientious, 74
  - editing as, 27–37, 234
  - free, 242
  - invisible, 27
  - legacy of, 37
  - mentoring, 242
  - professional, xxii, 27–28, 35
  - recovery, 32–34
  - reviewing, 34, 66, 68, 214, 242
  - terms of, 72
  - years of, 70, 239
- service behavior
  - discretionary, 30
- service orientation, 27
- service provider, 27, 32–34
- service recovery activities, 34
- significance
  - institutional, 181
  - statistical, 259–261
- single-loop
  - learning, 4
- Six-Sigma era, 139
- sizes
  - effect, 260
  - sample, 259
- skill(s), xxvii, 30, 42, 83, 90–91, 109, 226, 237
  - communication, 213
  - editing, 213
  - entrepreneurial, 213
  - requisite, 109
  - variety of, 224
  - writing, 213
- social interaction, 5
- social construction of knowledge, 134
- social dilemma, 31
- social sciences, 6, 106, 121, 125, 146, 168, 209, 231, 236, 255, 259
- Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI)*, xxviii, 104, 106, 108, 113
- socialization, xvi, xxi, 140, 243
- Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, xiii, xxvii
- Sociological Methods and Research*, 190–191
- sociologists, 255, 260
- sociology, 203
- sophomoric games, 247
- source of competitive advantage, 232
- special issues, xiii, xx, 69, 108, 165, 182–183, 185, 198, 263
- special sections, 147, 152
- sponsor(ship), 191–193, 201
- sportsmanship, 30
- staff, 42, 97–99, 156, 181, 233–234
  - administrative support, 101, 109
  - clerical, 109
  - day-to-day support, 112
  - strong, 133
- stage
  - career, 140, 196, 210, 216–218, 224
  - conditional accept, 124, 129–130, 133
  - copy editing, 130
  - revise and resubmit, 126–127, 129, 131–133, 161
- stakeholders, 91
  - advisory board, 104
  - authors, 94, 104–105
  - editorial team, 94, 104
  - journal, 90
  - key, 105
  - professional field, 90
  - reviewers, 94, 104–105
  - submitter, 90
  - subscribers, 104
- stamina, 213
- standard(s), 3, 30, 36–37, 40, 76, 89, 91, 93, 147, 157, 161, 168–169, 180, 213, 215, 232, 242, 255, 261
  - absolute, 237
  - journal, 36, 41, 58, 180, 186, 189, 242–243
  - quality, 29, 34–35, 91, 241
  - rigorous, 157–158
- standing, xxiii, 21
  - candidate's, 235
  - equal, 258
  - increase in, 109
  - international, 110
  - journal, 104–113, 184, 265

- statement(s), 7, 13, 17, 84, 86, 125, 148,  
151, 153, 235,  
candidate's, 234  
editor, 148, 243  
incorrect, 258  
policy, 190–6  
vision, 234–235
- statistics, 32, 77, 84, 220, 229, 251
- status(es)  
author's, 244  
social, 267
- stereotyping, 10
- stewardship, 35, 36, 111
- story telling, 164
- strain, 31
- strategic management, 69, 183
- Strategic Management Association, xvi,  
xxii, 199
- Strategic Management Journal*, xiv, xvi,  
xix, 60
- strategy(ies), xiii, 69, 86, 112, 147, 149,  
264, 266–267  
competitive positioning, 112  
corporate, 107  
editorial, 70  
internationalization, 108–109  
niche, 76
- strengths, 9, 116–118, 120, 131, 267  
personal, 251
- strengths and weaknesses, 14, 87, 114,  
190, 237, 251
- stress, 31, 35, 82, 220, 221
- structural equation modeling, 226
- style, 32, 150, 153, 160–162, 170, 173,  
241, 247, 256–257, 265  
collegial, 213  
guidelines, 32, 58  
intellectual, 169, 174  
matters of, 133  
non-jargonistic, 160  
scholarly, 173  
writing, 58, 64, 159–261
- style guide, 58
- subjectivity, 3–4, 7, 10
- submitter, 90–91
- subscriber fee  
individual, 201  
institutional, 201
- subscriber(s), 104, 188, 199, 202,  
263
- subscription, 43, 73, 145, 191, 195, 200,  
202, 203, 251  
free, 149, 199  
journal, 71, 176, 178, 201
- subsidies, 201
- success(es)  
career, xxi, 209, 220, 229  
chances of, 59, 188, 196, 243  
editor, 68, 74, 252, 262  
financial, 191  
highest probability of, 227  
journal, 105, 262  
likelihood of, 25  
long-term, 18, 190, 194  
prospects for, 60  
publication, 87
- succession, 69, 242
- successor, 41, 235, 250
- summary, 95, 111, 122, 141, 151, 161,  
164, 248, 249  
critical, 173
- sunk costs, 10
- support, 112, 266  
administrative, 109, 215  
clerical, 109  
course release, 69, 155  
financial, 155  
institutional, 215  
journal, 201  
ongoing, 200  
perceived, 217  
secretarial, 69, 233, 238  
technical, 200  
type of, 232, 237
- support function  
back office, 109
- support system, 105, 163
- supporters, 202, 262
- system(s), xxi, 4–5, 10, 12, 30, 34, 56,  
70–71, 97–103, 125, 165, 178, 182,  
185, 220  
administration, 109  
electronic, 72, 92, 110, 156, 180–181  
evaluation, 114  
flat hierarchy, 220  
institutionalized, 170  
knowledge as, 39543  
manuscript management, 49–50, 180  
manuscript processing, 49–55, 165  
manuscript tracking, 50, 133

- system(s) (*Contd.*)  
 online, 166, 180, 182,  
 parallel, 98  
 peer review, 151, 198, 215  
 promotion, 140  
 ranking, 181  
 rating, 146  
 review, 54, 180  
 support, 105, 163  
 web-based, 98–102
- Tables of Contents, 196  
*tabula rasa*, 169  
 tacit knowledge, 5–7, 13  
 technical glitches, 182  
 technology(ies), 97, 99, 101, 102, 103,  
 196, 203  
 change, 97–98, 198  
 distributed, 101  
 electronic, 198  
 graphical interface, 103  
 paperless, 97  
 printing, 262  
 voice recognition, 103
- template(s), 59, 96  
 desk rejection letter, 59
- tenacity, 213
- tenure, 33, 79, 134, 140, 154–155, 181,  
 190, 204, 216, 224, 244  
 editor's, 34, 45, 77, 108, 130, 179,  
 186, 221
- tenure case  
 important and critical to, 155
- tenure clock, 43, 140,
- tenure system, 140
- term(s), 16–35, 65, 70, 79–80, 92, 97,  
 98–99, 102, 106, 111, 114–115, 121,  
 148–153, 159, 164, 168–169,  
 178–181, 186, 190–195, 200, 204,  
 210, 213, 229, 233–234, 240  
 complete, 153, 229  
 editor's, editorial, 52, 59, 64, 68, 71, 74,  
 80, 98, 108–113, 127, 148, 153–156,  
 199, 225–229, 238–239, 251
- terms of service, 72
- testing  
 hypothesis, 259  
 statistical, 259  
 theory, 58, 116–121
- tests  
 detrimental, 259  
 null hypothesis significance, 259  
 significance, 259–261  
 textbook protocols, 25  
 textbook(s), 259, 261, 266  
 theory building, 24, 58  
 theory development  
 contribution to, 111  
 theory(ies), 8–9, 19, 23–24, 39, 41, 51,  
 58, 64, 84, 86, 95, 102, 105, 111,  
 115–118, 121, 141, 157, 160, 164,  
 180, 183, 199, 236, 248  
 complex systems, 183  
 cutting edge, 84  
 development of, 111, 157, 179, 235  
 existing, 116–118  
 importation of, 117  
 knowledge driven, 24  
 organization, xvi, xix, 60, 255  
 overlap of, 117  
 problem driven, 24  
 social identity, 226  
 social network, 225  
 stakeholder, 225  
 thin-skinned, 140  
 Thomson Scientific, 189  
 threshold(s), 181, 242
- time frames  
 expected, 218  
 varying, 146  
 viable, 140
- time(s)  
 review, 98, 180, 195  
 turnaround, 43, 52, 180, 185–186, 229
- timeline, 58
- timeliness, 52, 69, 73, 92–93, 139,  
 149–150, 159, 198, 200, 266
- title(s), 16, 130, 134, 146, 157, 270  
 awkward, 130  
 clear, 130  
 intriguing, 130, 170  
 inviting, 130  
 long, 130  
 similar, 166  
 succinct, 130  
 uninviting, 130
- tracking  
 manuscript, 50, 109, 133, 154–155  
 number, 52
- tradeoffs  
 methodological, 9, 14
- tradition(s), 8, 26, 172, 193

- academic, 168–169
- Anglo-Saxon, 173
- discursively produced, 173
- distinct, 171
- diverse, 168
- European, 111
- intellectual, 171–173
- scholarly, 8
- social-science, 259
- USA, 111
- training, xviii, 62, 129
  - doctoral, 152, 168, 188
  - economics, 60
  - management, 60
  - methods, 189
  - operations research, 60
  - professional, 152
- transparency, 121, 232
- trust, 89, 92–95
- trustworthiness, 88, 93, 94, 96
- turnaround
  - prompt, 43
- turnover, 73
- tutorial, 33
- tutoring, 242
  
- unethical acts, 95
- unfairness
  - sense of, 243
- United States (USA), xiii, 107–108, 111, 120, 167–168, 173
  - outside the, 148, 154, 231
- University of Hull, 171
- University of Texas, xii, 100, 102
- University of Waikato, 198
  
- vacancy, 232
  - editor, 232–233
  - upcoming, 232
- vacation(s), 51, 52, 54, 155
  - one-week, 234
- validity threat, 37
- value(s), 3, 9, 12, 14, 20, 28, 29, 30, 49, 51, 63, 68, 69, 99, 114, 121, 127, 134, 140, 142, 150, 157, 159, 172, 178, 179, 184, 189, 192, 203, 243, 254, 256, 259, 260, 261, 298
  - altruistic, 28
  - current, 262
  - idiosyncratic, 261
  - incremental, 179
  - intellectual, 191
  - limited, 135, 150
  - overall, 121
  - personal work, 28
  - potential, xxii, 262
  - professional, 28
  - proposed, 115
  - real, 21, 159, 229
  - well founded, 262
  - work, 69
- value added, xxii, 17, 18, 20, 90, 91, 120, 158, 173, 201, 247, 256, 297
- variability, 128
- variable, 23, 117, 120, 122, 132, 163, 210, 259
  - dependent, 15, 22
  - different, 117
  - independent, 22
- view(s)
  - alternative, 258
  - discrepant, 42
  - existing, 183
- viewpoint(s)
  - diverse, 251
  - evolutionary psychology, 31
  - minority, 227
- virtue, 31, 110, 132, 133, 162, 195
- vision, 68, 72, 74, 93, 126, 129, 211–212, 234
  - clear, 68, 111, 127, 212, 214
  - journal, 93, 122, 123, 191, 212, 234
  - long-term, 191
  - polyocular*, 174
  - strategic, 107, 112
- vision statement, 234, 235
  - breadth of, 234
  - depth of, 234
- voice(s), 8, 42, 109, 149, 170, 215
  - authorial, 134–141, 246
  - diversity of, 8
  - editor, editorial, 131, 209–222
  - intelligible, 175
  - stifle, 109, 139, 141
- volumes, 147, 239
  - edited, xvi, 239
- volunteering/volunteerism, 28–29, 36, 71, 196
  - sustained, 27
- volunteers, 36, 44, 234, 245
- votes, 235, 252
  - reviewers', 65, 240

wages

    ludicrously low hourly, 250

winner

    best paper, 58

wisdom

    collective, 125

word-scrubbing, 122

work sample, 94

workaholic, 220

workaholism, 213

workshop(s), 178

    professional development, 62

    publishing, 228

writers, textbook, 266