

Agenda

Why Is Reviewing Important?



Developmental Reviewing



Constructing a Review



Advice From Expert Reviewers



Navigating the AOM System

Importance of Reviewing

- Contribute to your field, strengthening the field by sharing your insights
- Develop other authors' contributions
- Improve your writing skills by learning from other Reviewers/ the Associate Editors
- Generate new ideas, pushing the boundaries of the field
- Become visible in the field, to receive recognition (best reviewer rewards at SIM and/or some journals, Business and Society)

Developmental Reviewer Skills

Rethinking the Role of Reviewer - Take a collegial role, think about what can be done to make the paper publishable in the appropriate forum



Imagining Face-To Face-Conversations - Pose questions that help authors flesh out their ideas or identify the boundary conditions or assumptions in their work



Focusing on the Author - Facilitate learning and development

Developmental Reviewing

What It Is

- Help authors envision a way to improve their work.
- Helps authors realize the potential of their ideas.
- Dig deep into the manuscript, suspend judgment, listen to the authors' voice, and try to take their perspective
- Developmental reviewing takes time and commitment. It also asks the reviewer to acquire a new set of skills and embrace a different perspective on the review process

What It Isn't

- Not just a positive sandwich, where you say a few nice things about the paper in addition to a long list of criticisms.
- Not Ghostwriting
- Not a Hierarchical Apprenticeship (Not telling the reviewers exactly what to do)
- Not Just for Newcomers

Example of Developmental Reviewing – “Firms’ Response to Slacktivism: When and Why are E-Petitions Effective?”

- **R1.1. First Set of Concerns:** I think the Introduction requires a major overhaul and the hypothesis setup (pp. 5 - 19, which I will now call Section 2) needs to be cut down, and that these two are connected. Section 2 is strong and fairly clear, but little of this clarity is evident in the Intro. At the same time, the hypothesis section, although clear, is repetitive and doesn't need to be. I think the best course of action is to address these points together.
- More specifically, in terms of the Introduction, your core question and core contributions are not very clear. You dance around a number of points, but do not state clearly your core focus (as I interpret it): there are strong arguments to expect that e-petitions will not matter, but we posit that there are reasons that they might matter, and we have a good dataset to test this core hypothesis.
- This seems to be a clear and compelling hook, but this does not come out in a clear and compelling way in the Intro. The good news is that I think you can move some of the clearer writing in the beginning of Section 2 (which is repetitive) to the Introduction.

General Advice for Reviewing

Begin	Begin with going through the manuscript, thinking about the strengths and weaknesses
Be	Be constructive in terms of tone and suggestions
Organize	Organize your review (following Jill's suggestions)
Provide	Provide the author with some specific advice, such as the "nuggets" that they should develop, research conversations they may want to join, additional articles that they may want to reference

Organize Your Review

- Very brief summary of the manuscript and the article's strengths and weaknesses.
- Research question: Is it clear? Is it unique and innovative?
- Theory: Does the manuscript have a strong conceptual premise? Does the theory contribute to the development of the hypotheses?
- Novelty/Contribution: Does the manuscript examine new constructs and phenomena?
- Methodology: Was the study well-executed?
- Summary: What can be done to make this publishable?

***Before hitting "submit" be sure to review and edit. Consider whether it is a laundry list or stream of consciousness. Number your points and categorize them as above.**

Suggested Papers



Feldman, D. C. (2004). Being a developmental reviewer: Easier said than done. *Journal of Management*, 30(2), 161-164.



Ragins, B.R., (2015), Editor's Comments: Developing our Authors. *AMR*, 40, 1-8, <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2014.0477>



Tsui, A. S., & Hollenbeck, J. R. (2009). Successful authors and effective reviewers: Balancing supply and demand in the organizational sciences. *Organizational Research Methods*, 12(2), 259-275.