What are the primary problems that are important to address?

- Reducing bias in reviewers.

- Does the anonymity of the review process exacerbate bias? / Our doctoral educational system may be too performance-oriented vs. valuing focus/impact / Less-diverse ERBs may simply not have the requisite variety to address things like non-US-based samples

- Bias in review process and supervision of doctoral students

- Openness to racial and other forms of diversity in our theorizing and in our methodology

- Eliminating reviewer bias.

- More attention to the fact that diversity and minority and race are very different terms with unique meanings for non-North American scholars.

- Diverse samples / Encouraging diversity research / Supporting diversity research as mentors, reviewers, and AEs

- Students are not trained on how to review and create antiracist, feminist, global research that does not reinforce biases. The academy needs to develop more trainings for learning the theoretical, methodological, and practical tools toward these goals.

- Editors and reviewers are against Non-Western samples.

- Derek's point about shifting standards seems especially critical--I focused potential solutions around solidifying standards to reduce this.

- Changing deeply held tacit assumptions; changing the systems which affect interdependent moving parts.

- What degree of bias would be acceptable since elimination is not a goal.

- Releasing some stigma around addressing biases and finding ways to show the importance of addressing and improving.

- I'd like to think more about demand and supply side experimentation for journals to reduce the impact of bias (and reduce bias itself - I found this to be a useful distinction).

- different cultural norms about scientific excellence and academic careers / US domination of samples and research templates / biases in review process

- differential scrutiny and standards for papers addressing diversity topics or diverse/international samples

- Differences in what minorities mean in different countries.

- Reviewer biases about samples, topics, etc.

- Management Theory that integrates racialized / diversity consideration / 2. Methods practices that make this transparent / 3. Review process that is subject to implicit biases /

- There are so many issues and types of diversity to address that it can be overwhelming. Thinking of it as a continuum with layers of diversity, contexts, etc. can be a way to capture this with scholars with deep interest and expertise, delving more deeply into topics so that holding the idea of the continuum and a broad view of diversity does not serve to weaken or take away from the deep work that needs to be done.

- Awareness and intentional efforts to reduce biases in the publication pipeline, including: / topic selection / theoretical framing / sampling / reviewer and editorial language and framing

- Bias in review process; etnocentrism in reviews; heuristic decision-making (which makes biases more likely to play a role)

- Elitism in the management and I/O psychology journals (i.e. impact factor, status quo of "top tier" journals, overreliance on publications for tenure) /

- We thought that the problems lie not just with the publication process but with the selection process or job market experiences. Perhaps, the discussion may need to be broadened to the areas of hiring or promotion practices of academia.

- Make our theories more inclusive so that everything else that follows is inclusive too

- Time pressures that editors/AEs are under in the review process. / More outreach for reviewers. / Bias in the review process. / Reduce cognitive load for AEs and reviewers

- Educating reviewers about potential bias in their reviews and holding diversity research to a higher standard

- First and foremost, the most important thing to address is the inclusiveness in our field itself-- not pushing women and minorities out, such as through tacit and explicit advice and hostile treatment (such as in the Google job market spreadsheet). We need more diverse authors and reviewers and editors to better recognize hostility in the review process and who value and understand diversity better.

- There is the methodological-- bias against certain samples etc., but there is also the issue that studying topics like race/gender/etc. have to meet a higher theoretical contribution bar and sometimes the bar will shift during the review process.

- We are the gatekeepers. / Generalizability as a construct is contributing to these issues.

- Higher bar/standard for manuscripts / Have to justify why mainstream construct/theory "applies" for diverse group / Lack of reviewer expertise

- Encouraging more research on diversity issues; educate editors and reviewers on the biases that diversity research sometimes faces. /

- Overly taxing review process with shifting standards / Pressure for false equivalence: many diversity dynamics are distinctly different for historically marginalized groups [e.g., WM in the minority get the glass escalator]

- There seems to be a lack of diversity at the top of some (most?) of the journals and so invites for reviews etc. are in themselves biased /

- We talked about issues stemming from the fact that management theory has traditionally been developed centering the U.S. and Whiteness and ways this impacts the review process and even theory development in work that focuses on underrpresented minorities.

- bias in mentoring and development / * departments/colleges that do not prioritize or support diversity research / * reviewers/editors that have biases that make getting papers on these topics published (implicit or explicit) / * organizations/society that do not see this as important

- The ways of valuing research in the Academy.

- We need to get feedback to reviewers. We often reward the WRONG parts of the review process (re: speed to accepting an invite, speed with turning in the review on time). What if we instead were

spending more time rating the extent to which the review was developmental only, or got incorporated into the letter? What if we document people who give out advice that diminishes diverse perspectives? I know of too many people who game the system (re: accepting an invite and turning it in 2-3 hours later) in order to get onto top editorial boards since that's the metric largely pulled.

- A major shift needs to be made in our scholarly society, one toward inclusiveness of research representativeness. All too much research and knowledge is built upon white males. We need the NORM to be full samples representative of our population!

- inequitable and biased review process discourages work in this area (especially for more junior scholars)

- Our group discussed both the internal/external pressures to not be a diversity scholar and the gatekeeper problems in journals.

- Reviewers / Editors who let biases about race, nationality, affect their assessment of a manuscript. / Authors who don't always adequately explain the advantages and limitations of their samples.

- Shifting standards and confirmation bias in the review process

- Subjectiviity is an inherent component of the review process, and it is likely that discomfort with the topic will indirectly impact the scrutiny papers receive, leading to disparities that disadvantage researchers on topics like diversity where there is higher discomfort.

- bias in the review process; encouraging (or discouraging) young scholars to engage in race research; anchoring quality standards against a white, American standard

- It is important to recognize that bias does appear in reviews, and that we do not have a good mechanism yet to address this. It is also important that we, as an industry, do a better job of addressing what the basis is for our comparisons (what is the standard for generalizability).

- Diversity on AE boards / Complaints about small sample sizes for diversity research / The over-reliance on theoretical contribution. Systemic racism still exists so don't we need to instantiate it in ALL contexts so people get it? Understand its pervasiveness? /

- Increasing opportunities to learn and develop awareness of biases and group differences that affect the research we do and that gets published; continuing to have opportunities to have these authentic conversations that can be eye-opening about other groups' experiences (like this one)

- I believe that everyone should have the same opportunities and black educators should be able to as well.

- As a student I have been continuously dissuaded and discouraged from asking and exploring research questions that address biases in our field. For instance, professors told me very early in my program that I should "consider changing my research identity" (which is cross-cultural management) and that "we don't study racial justice diversity issues here."

- The primary problems are our publication process infrastructure; how we can systematically hold reviewers, editors, and gatekeepers to a standard that puts journals in the best methodological position to be fair--not equitable--but fair to Diversity Research. Sometimes the shortcomings are misconstrued, such that people want Diversity Research to be better when really, it's held to a higher standard.

- Preconceptions by reviewers and editors about certain types of manuscripts; Concerns of reviewers about "controversial" findings

- The impact of implicit biases and assumptions in the review process (e.g. questioning the generalizability of some samples, but not others / 2. How to enable and support research on how the deep racial divides in our society, and racial injustice, play out in organizations. I see this as very different from research on "diversity" more broadly conceived.

- '-race/diversity/culture-based biases against research questions, samples, and researcher in the review process (journals, grants)

- How bias affects the political economy of publishing, which means it affects everything from research path to career path.

- Reviewers have implicit biases against diversity-related topics, making it difficult for these papers to get through the review process and be published.

- Additional hurdles faced in the publication process by people who are demographically diverse getting published. Research in the economics literature suggests that women face additional hurdles, and I suspect it's the same in our literature for women and BIPOC populations. / 2) Additional hurdles faced by people who conduct diversity research

- One issue isn't just about the review process but WHO is in our field. We are an overwhelmingly white male field dominated by north american scholars. Students of color in our field often face micro-aggressions in beginning their scholarship, which disenfranchizes their engagement in OB scholarship.

- Because there are so few diversity scholars, it is challenging for institutional knowledge about publishing diversity-related research to be passed down. Essentially, I think many junior scholars are "reinventing the wheel," because we do not have many senior scholars to go to with questions.

- Our entire profession (academia) is very homogenous, especially at top levels and with gatekeepers (Editors, AEs, leadership roles). This homogeneity (being mostly White men) is perpetuating itself and we don't see enough diversity at different levels of our profession and we also don't see this an inclusive environment.

- Reviewers tend to be more critical on the appropriateness (e.g., generalizability of findings) of non-majority samples.

- The fact that the editorial team members are so burdened so that they can easily succumb to the temptation of using quick heuristics that may activate bias against what they are less familiar with. As the number of submitted papers to the so-called top-tier journals as well as the degree of diversity in the author (i.e., supply) side is increasing at increasing rates, I think it's time to be empathetic not only with the people who are biased against but with those who are often being called out as a "perp." Put differently, we need to be aware of the situational constraints, and institutionalized influences, and try to "save all." This might be a cliche in a cartoon or animation, but I believe that an alleged villain may be also the person who is most anxiously looking for a hero.

- There appears to be a stigma associated with studying diversity, although the situation has improved in the last couple of years.

- The primacy of white, masculine ways of "knowing" or doing research (e.g. positivist, usually quantitative) over others. I think there is also the idea that studying race or gender is somehow more "political" or value-laden than other types of research. That might lead to the type of responses the presenters talked about where reviewers just don't believe something is true. / /

- How might previous theories change, if at all, with the addition or more "non-traditional" participants in research? / / If we find that there are different approaches to managing, interacting, and making decisions for different groups of people, should/can we push for change in policies, laws, and practices?

- Pushback on research related to gender, race...etc.

- I'm an early career researcher with limited publication experience, but the stories shared today were alarming. I think a more open discussion of bias in the review process with editors at major publications would be helpful.

What do you think we should do to address these problems?

- Come up with a way that authors can report suspected bias in the system. By collecting data on this issue and following up on the issues, we can make everyone more aware about how to minimize bias

- Maybe reveal reviewers after acceptance (like some other journals)? / More seminars like this! / Seek out intentional diversity of ERBs. Be gentle/patient if some scholars of color turn you down since they may be fielding multiple such demands (and there are fewer of us overall!)

- Ensuring breadth of reviewers and committee members

- Increase representation among reviewers and increase empathy and perspective taking through reviewer education

- Associate Editors and decision-makers can work to try to remove racial bias from the review process.

- More education and sharing across countries and cultures.

- Training for reviewers (junior faculty reviewer sessions) / Striving to have diverse reviewers - making sure not just sending to the same people over and over again / Provide feedback to reviewers when issues / Report race in Table 1 so we understand our samples better

- These trainings may include student review boards for journals that are similar to bridge reviewer assignments.

- More training and education on fair reviews.

- Discretion reduction in review process: / -Apriori standards on sample sizes, types / - "Rejectability criteria" more clear before AEs read papers / -Willingness to send reviews back to reviewers where tone/normative beliefs are dissuading a topic of study

- Research and diversity of thought. Welcoming and integrating new ways of thinking.

- Not being les by fear retribution.

- Some easier steps are to improve representation on editorial boards and among reviewers and associate editors to reflect the diversity of the field.

- prompt reviewers to autocorrect their sample questions/ or double check them before submitting reviews. Highlight possibility of biases if they work too quickly

- Reviewer socialization, prompts for reviewers and editors about bias as/when they are submitting their reviews, for authors reporting sample characteristics.

- Have more voices from diversity scholars in different countries

- A language analysis of all reviews of papers at 8-10 top journals for tone, themes, etc., followed by an analysis of how those relate to sample characteristics, author country, reviewer characteristics, etc. to see if there are systematic biases. That can inform editors as they make decisions on revisions and acceptances.

- Special issues / encouragements for racialized theorizing / 2. Requesting race / diversity data as part of transparency reporting / 3a. Editors / Associate Editors that weigh-in the evidence (manuscript and reviewers' comments) to exercise judgments about "reasonable" treatment of race and explanations in a paper / 3b. Editorial from a top journal /

- I wonder if we could re-examine the terms that we use in our editor/reviewing work. Using terms like "gatekeeper" may hold us back. What are the other terms? Research coaches? Quality control?

- Prompting reviewers and AEs to be aware of the potential for implicit bias, and perhaps providing prompts to make that potential more salient (and hopefully reduce it).

- We need a process around bias; Create tools that can capture bias in reviews (words, like plagiarism check); educate reviewers (should be done by the editors and/or journals); educate editors (when term starts); creating awareness by itself doesn't do much, we need tools to know what to do to avoid our biases affecting our decisions.

- While these issues are broad and there has been discourse regarding these issues already, I feel like progressing toward equitable research practices will facer greater obstacles until the elitist status quo is mitigated.

- I think the fundamental changes need to be made in the way that people think; however, this may take quite a time. Initiating discussions on these issues like today is good, but the follow-up must be made; for example, in the follow-up discussions, we may be able to discuss the specific solutions.

- Work on multiple fronts - / Examine assumptions underlying our theories and check if they are implicitly biases / More replication / Consider the systemic/structural issues that flow from our current understanding

- No one had solutions

- Reviewer education; potential special issues on diversity-related research

- Burn the job market spreadsheet / Report diversity metrics at journals (papers, reviewers, editors) and make public across them / Recruit and support women and minorities as students and faculty /

- We talked about taking a top-down approach. Providing a checklist for reviewers and editors so that every time they review a paper they can evaluate more slowly. One of the things I keep thinking about is how to build an inclusive review process, similar to an inclusive course design. / / I love Tracy's idea about adding in a question to the review process.

- Increase number of journals. / Have all papers include their samples/characteristics. / Have all papers speak to who the work generalizes to. / Inform editors and jounals/ train in anti-bias. /

- Reviewer and editor training / Ensure appropriate expertise for submissions related to diversity / Empowering Associate Editors to be advocates for authors and pushing back on reviewers / Ensuring diversity (of all types) in editors and reviewers / More special issues on diversity-related topics

- Editors and AE teams should have discussions about identifying biases related to diversity research; help them be more aware of their own biases an recognizing reviewer comments that are biases. / / Reviewers and AEs could strive to include gender and race analyses as supplemental analyses to all papers, where sample allows for it. / / Doctoral students need to be encouraged to study race and gender. / Keep in mind that in many countries, other demographics, besides race/ethnicity, are more relevant, such as religion. /

- We need to review each other's work supportively and in an empowering way. When you see a gem in someone else's paper - be the supportive reviewer that pushes the paper forward!

- Increase diversity at the top might help reduce bias and increase a range of perspectives (not just gender, race but also nationality) / * Support programmes that look to increase diversity of new PhDs entering the field

- We discussed reviewer representation and training as a potential way forward. I think that recognizing these issues and making sure that editorial boards are composed of scholars that are committed to reducing bias is important. I am not sure individual reviewer training would work. But maybe at the board/AE level and using the AE's as gatekeepers that are also evaluated based on their inclusiveness in the papers they accept would be great.

- editorials in journals on D&I / * get the data -- compile data on papers with these topics or samples (or even authors) re: diversity and see if they take longer or do not get published as easily (show them to all -- not just those already in the choir) / * confront reviewers who make biased comments instead of ignoring them as an editor (educate all parties)

- Recognise paradigm differences in research / Support new, non-mainstream ideas / Support new contexts or cultural lens in research /

- We need to give feedback to reviewers. As an AE, I have decided to call out anyone who provides feedback that is offensive (rude, sexist, racist, etc.). How often does that

happen though? AEs shouldn't be letting these types of comments stay in the editorial decisions.

- Have the panelists write an invited editorial in AMJ or AMR about this very topic, to keep this topic at the forefront of discussions. This will also give authors a strong citation to use in their defense, when needed for reviews.

- require all editors and reviewers to take dei training; publicize journal statistics for diversity articles (# of submissions, # of acceptances, # of review rounds, # of editors with dei expertise, etc.)

- Some suggestions: training for editors/AE's so they can be very clear if some reviewer comments should be ignored due to bias; Possible inclusion of diversity topics in doctoral seminars at AOM; regular collection of relevant diversity factors in your sample to report, even if not the focus of the study. We mentioned that there may have been some shift recent years in the discouragement of studying diversity-related topics, particularly in the US--we discussed whether there is a way to make sure it will be maintained past a few BLM-related or MeToo-related special issues.

- Help editors use their discretion and perhaps weigh in on leveling the publishing playing field for researchers of color or researcher who study issues related to racial diversity.

- We need to collect data (maybe via AI) to substantiate bias that shows up in reviewers' language. Then educate reviewers. Then potential redesign the review process such that at least portions of the process are objective. Wherever there is space for subjectivity, there is space for bias to infect the process.

- We need to collect more data on review outcomes and make these data public so that we can better identify the nature of the problem.

- Encouraging reviewers to acknowledge their own bias before beginning a review (and before submitting!); more sessions like this to encourage young scholars to engage in diversity research; developing theory research questions that incorporate race

- I think researchers should be called on to report demographic data so that these issues can be addressed. We should also encourage journals to adopt a way to find and address bias in reviews.

- Scour your boards and make sure they include POC / Monitor which diversity papers are being rejected because they are "phenomenological"

- We are scholars - we should apply our research skills to these problems in new ways. Theoretical assumptions - are they relevant to all, or just the dominant group? Prevention - how can we reduce the application of bias in workplaces (our own and elsewhere)? Continue to diversify the gatekeepers (through broader social networks and targeted recruitment) and scholars (through attraction and retention)

- I think that plan they are doing is going towards a positive way, just keeping it up and informing more people and they will be aware and changes will happen more and more.

- Faculty deeply need anti-bias training in how to recruit, mentor and support non-white, under-represented BIPOC students. I can't count the number of racially insensitive comments that were made by professors passingly in research meetings and in PhD seminars -- and nothing was said or done to address them. I am the only POC in my department and as a student I don't have status/power.

- Not only evaluate and train incoming reviewers, editors, etc. for their ability to review this research (if it will be their role), but also "refresh" gatekeepers and long-standing servers of our Management community. Also, encourage junior diversity scholars to keep carrying it out, and to not be afraid to focus on it!

- '-Encourage Editors/AEs to have some basic representativeness when they assign reviewers (e.g., for a paper on race have one minority reviewer, for an international paper have one reviewer from the same region of the world, for a gender paper, etc.) / -Consider region-blind or group blind registered reports / -Support authors of "controversial" papers that come under attack with the division.

- make boards more diverse; monitor reviews and decision letters for race/diversity/culture-related reactions to research questions and samples; communicate with editor team, board, and community

- I think we should request top AOM journals to specifically require research to address issues relating to race, even if that means that a lot of work is initially desk rejected. If research cannot generalize to issues of race, class, and gender, then it is not generalizable for top journal publication.

- Have a training session for associate editors to recognize reviewers' biases; Invite more diversity researchers to ERB, especially as associate editors.

- Obtain objective data and track how authors' demographics influence publication outcomes - at the same time design interventions to address this problem and track with objective data if those interventions are working. / 2) Obtain objective data and track how topic (diversity topics) influence publication outcomes - at the same time

design interventions to address this problem and track with objective data if those interventions are working

- One thing we need to get rid of is the job market spreadsheet, which has overt racism/sexism throughout. / Socially just recruitment of doctoral students and professors. / Monitor for micro-aggressions within our own departments / Call out the "bad apples" and "good apples" (see JMI anonymous letter) in our field. / Socially just practical implication sections and research questions (e.g., why are we writing papers about how "women are more creative than men"? What's the takeaway?)

- There should be a virtual diversity research resource center with information like a checklist to avoid offering low-hanging fruit to reviewers, anti-bias reviewer resources, and a directory of senior scholars (or senior students) who are willing to provide social or practical support to junior scholars.

- We need to be more proactive in making sure that we have diverse voices as reviewers, as Editors and AEs, as authors, and we need to be proactive about that and identify individuals from different backgrounds and invite them to the table. We also need more of international perspectives, we're way too much US-centric - need to internationalize. The same with any award or any other recognition - just look at the lists of awards or keynote speakers (mostly just White men)- it's impossible that there are no other deserving individuals - we just don't think of them. It's time to be more conscious about that and any time any award or recognition us run the pool needs to be diverse and we need to ensure it is diverse.

- Design the same standard to evaluate all samples; Recognize a convenient sample is used for theory testing, and all convenient samples face generalizability issues.

- FInd a way to reduce the burden of the editorial team members in the review process. / 2) Instead of villainizing anyone (which may backfire), we can accept that we all are biased to some extent and try to improve how we communicate with each other and to recognize that having diversity would benefit everyone. / 3) Agreeing with what panelists have said, recognize that (a) we all are doing research using a conveniently selected sample and (b) we are constantly wearing two hats: one as an author, the other as a reviewer.

- Encourage more scholars to investigate diversity-related issues. Incorporate diversity-related training in AOM doctoral consortia to increase the pipeline of scholars who are open to diversity research.

- Point out the value-laden nature of all social science research. Studying white men doing leadership in a Fortune 500 company is not value-neutral. Studying race and gender issues should not be maligned for being value-laden ("unscientific") while other topics feign neutrality.

- For supporting the publishing process: paper development workshops for authors working on papers on race and diversity (and perhaps grant proposal workshops, as Mo and Derek pointed out the importance of considering methods from the start); similar to the AMJ workshops. But perhaps also with an element of reflection for reviewers and authors on the comments they give to each others' papers / / Awards for best papers on diversity issues in all the major journals, or maybe OB/AOM wide rewards to

highlight the importance of this research and raise its prestige. Perhaps linked to

scholarships / invitations to work with leading scholars? / / Why do journals assume

that readers are only interested in generalizability? Surely they have taken note of

research on the importance of context (which would suggest that boundary conditions

matter, and that there is value in studying different settings)? / / Develop method

guidelines for research on diversity (e.g., a series ofg papers in Organizational Research

Methods, or a "From the Editors" series like the one in AMJ a few years ago - e.g.

expanding on some of the points that Derek and Mo mentioned during the panel

presentations/Q&A. Knowing such issues in advance might help researchers to take

them into account when designing their studies. And would give them arguments during

the review process. And might inform reviewers' judgment. / / Have more frequent

discussions like today (time went way too fast!!). / Thank you for organizing this!!

- Encourage the international and interdisciplinary collaboration of research to test
  theories.

- Start more special issues on race, gender, identity....etc.

- Direct communication with editors at major publications or an open letter to
  organization and management publications.