

FROM THE EDITORS

MOVING FORWARD AT *AMJ*

The beginning of 2017 marks the official change in the editorial team for the *Academy of Management Journal (AMJ)*. My team—*AMJ*'s 21st editorial team—takes its place on the masthead of a journal that continues to thrive, innovate, influence, and expand. Submissions at the *Journal* not only continue to rise, but are also being submitted from a set of talented researchers from a mounting number of disciplinary backgrounds and countries around the world. Impact factors, citation patterns, media attention, and other qualitative assessments show that *AMJ* papers have major influence throughout our field and beyond.

There are many people to thank for this favorable status quo. I begin by crediting the broader membership of the Academy of Management (AOM). The *Journal* ultimately stands on the quality, originality, and insightfulness of the papers that appear in its pages. *AMJ* papers originate, by and large, within the AOM membership. Our authors and their scholarly contributions should take the stage to the center of transitory editing teams. In my team, we will have authors stand in the spotlight. Further, the *Journal* is served faithfully by a talented editorial review board and large pool of occasional reviewers who submit constructive and timely reviews time and time again. *AMJ*'s norms for volunteerism and helpfulness are the envy of numerous journals within and outside of our discipline. In advance of our work together in the next three years, thank you! Thanks also to the 19th editor of *AMJ*, Jason Colquitt. During my term as associate editor (2011–2014), he was a thoughtful, humble, and inclusive leader. He has also been a source of support and guidance as I prepared for the editor-in-chief role in these past months.

My final words of gratitude go to the outgoing editorial team, led by its editor Gerald George. Along with his distinguished team of associate editors and his editorial review board, Gerry served the *Journal* admirably. His vision pushed our community of scholars to expand the boundaries of our discipline and to stretch our collective perspectives, skills, and approaches to previously untouched global issues. His team also maintained—even improved upon—*AMJ*'s standards for operational excellence. Their

tenure was an unqualified success and one that culminated in the ambitious Special Research Forum on “Grand Challenges” that appeared in the December 2016 issue of *AMJ*. Thank you, Gerry, and the 20th *AMJ* team.

THE 21st *AMJ* EDITING TEAM

The criteria for selecting my editorial team included reviewing quality, reviewing timeliness, research productivity, and content area coverage. I placed an emphasis on flexibility in the team, recruiting individuals who met the general criteria, but also who had a significant breadth of interests. The profile of submissions to the *Journal* is broad and levies a premium on flexibility and multidimensional skill sets within editors as well as across the team. Our team's editors have published about 3.5 papers in *AMJ*, on average, and all have significant experience publishing in top journals as well. As a group, they are proven, outstanding reviewers. In the past few years, they averaged about eight reviews per year for *AMJ*, returned their reviews by the required 30-day deadline, accepted nearly all assigned reviews, and had a reviewer evaluation score of 3.94 (out of 5). The team is diverse on a variety of dimensions, including affiliations at universities in nine countries—Canada, England, Finland, Hong Kong, New Zealand, The Netherlands, Singapore, Switzerland, and the USA. It is truly an international team serving an international journal.

For the first time in *AMJ*'s history, the team structure includes the role of deputy editor. This structural change was put in place to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the team, but also to temper the workload previously carried only by the editor-in-chief. For this role, I am proud to introduce two experienced, dedicated, and unique individuals. **Pratima (Tima) Bansal** (Western University) rejoins *AMJ* in the role of deputy editor. Tima served along with me as an associate editor on the 19th team. Her expertise lies at the intersection of strategy and organization theory, with an emphasis on sustainable development. Although she has experience with many research methods, she is

particularly well versed in qualitative designs. In addition to handling papers within her domain, she will provide mentoring for our dedicated qualitative associate editors and assist me in the development of editorial content and in our outreach efforts. **Marc Gruber** (EPFL) remains with *AMJ*, now as deputy editor, having just completed a term as an associate editor on the 20th team. Marc will handle particular entrepreneurship and innovation manuscripts, aid on certain strategic initiatives, and mentor our quantitative macro associate editors.

The new team includes 18 associate editors. Seven of these editors are dedicated to submissions roughly categorized as “quantitative micro” (e.g., organizational behavior, human resource management). **Markus Baer** (Washington University in St. Louis) serves as action editor on micro submissions related to creativity, innovation, and work-related outcomes. **Prithviraj (Raja) Chattopadhyay** (University of Auckland) handles papers related to teams, diversity, demography, and employment issues. **Lisa Leslie** (New York University) covers papers on diversity, cross-cultural organizational behavior, conflict management, and micro submissions that lie at the intersection of management and founding disciplines (e.g., economics, social psychology). **Jessica Rodell** (University of Georgia) serves as the action editor on topics such as justice, personality, performance, and emotions. **Jill Perry-Smith** (Emory University) processes papers related to social networks, creativity, and work–family issues. **Hui Liao** (University of Maryland) manages submissions in the leadership, attitudes, and strategic human resources management (HRM) realms. **Anthony Nyberg** (University of South Carolina) handles macro HRM, compensation, human capital, and other HRM submissions. An eighth associate editor, **Katherine DeCelles** (University of Toronto) splits her time between the quantitative and qualitative areas, serving as action editor on micro submissions related to power, politics, status, and aggression. Finally, I serve as action editor on papers on turnover, teams, fit, and employment relationships.

Eight associate editors comprise the “quantitative macro” team. **Brian Connelly**’s (Auburn University) assignments include papers in the areas of corporate governance, competitive dynamics, and organizational misconduct. **Sucheta Nadkarni** (University of Cambridge) handles papers in the realm of CEO characteristics, top management team diversity, innovation, and competitive advantage. **Gokhan Ertug** (Singapore Management University) covers firm reputation, social networks, and status, as well as

international business submissions. **Balagopal Vissa** (INSEAD) serves as action editor on entrepreneurship, networks, governance, and family business papers. **Srikanth Paruchuri** (Pennsylvania State University) covers the areas of technology and innovation management and event-related studies. **Pursey Heugens** (Erasmus University) handles submissions in the domains of organizational theory, institutional environments, and alternative organization forms. **Zeki Simsek** (Clemson University) covers many of the entrepreneurship submissions, plus those related to strategic leadership. **Kevin Steensma** (University of Washington) handles papers related to interfirm collaborations and alliances, technology, and international business.

In addition, we have two other dedicated qualitative associate editors on board. **Eero Vaara** (Aalto University) has interests in organizational change, strategic processes, and globalization. Eero handles, along with deputy editor Tima Bansal, much of the macro-level qualitative flow. **Wendy Smith** (University of Delaware) handles qualitative manuscripts that bridge micro and macro, as well as on topics such as strategic leadership and paradoxes. In total, the team has four editors who serve as action editors on qualitative submissions.

A stellar editorial review board of 320 members supports the editing team. Each board member reviews about eight papers per year and has agreed to review each paper in a timely manner (i.e., within 30 days). The selection criteria for the board mirrored that of the editing team—publishing experience in top-level journals, reviewing quality, review return timeliness, and a high acceptance rate of review invitations. Typically, board members must have published at least once in *AMJ*, although in fact many have published multiple times therein. We continue to evaluate and groom candidates for board membership and, later, for service as associate editors on future editorial teams. I plan to add a cadre of new board members in the weeks prior to the AOM annual meetings each summer of my term.

Michael (Mike) Malgrande continues his outstanding contributions to *AMJ* in the role of senior managing editor. Mike processes, and prepares for review, all papers upon submission, interfaces with ScholarOne, and does everything needed for the team to focus on the scholarly aspects of decision making. **Susan Zaid** (editorial services director) and **John Pescatore** (director of publishing), as well as several others at the journal office, provide invaluable support behind the scenes. I am also happy that **Hannah Webb** (Imperial College London) has agreed

to continue her role as the editor's assistant, with funds made available by my dean.

PRIORITIES AND OUTREACH

The team's priorities center on implementing the *Journal's* mission, the quality and efficiency of the review experience, and outreach to research communities and areas previously underserved by *AMJ* or where the journal and its mission are not well known.

Implementing *AMJ's* Mission

I intend to work diligently with the team to attract, develop, and ultimately publish the highest-quality, most innovative, bold, and inclusive papers possible in line with the mission. As a team, we intend to focus on the *totality* of *AMJ's* mission, which emphasizes the significance of the theoretical and empirical contributions, as well as the novelty, scope, and boldness of the contribution. We also aim to be open and evenhanded toward all empirical methods, conceptual and empirical levels of analysis, the disciplinary origin of the theory or methods (assuming relevance for management theory or practice), and the study's national context.

In line with Colquitt (2011), I believe we should embrace the emphasis on theoretical contribution as an important calling card for *AMJ*, keeping in mind that a journal cannot be "all things to all submitters" (Colquitt, 2011: 12). As a field, we appear to be in an era of self-punishment and reflective negativity regarding new theory and the notions of novelty, interestingness, and boldness. There are several examples of this type of editorializing in the literature in recent years. In one, Davis (2015) humorously compared the emphasis on new theory in organization theory to the Winchester Mystery House, a sprawling structure constructed continuously and without end game for more than 35 years. Unlike the house, Davis' arguments are cogently and logically constructed, and I agree with several of them. But, I make three brief points in support of the innovative theorizing elements of *AMJ's* mission, and about novelty and uniqueness in the management field in general. First, "novel," "interesting," and "bold" can be viewed as elements of papers that *AMJ's* editors and reviewers are *striving* to publish. Certainly, not every published paper will achieve a maximum level of uniqueness. Indeed, some papers make their contribution apparent by blending conceptual acumen, rigorous empirical design or analytic approach,

a focus on a new, critical, or difficult-to-study phenomenon, and/or insightful implications for theory and practice. In general, I see no downsides whatsoever in seeking out and attempting to attract, develop, and publish those rare papers that can truly offer bold, novel, or broad-scope theoretical contributions. We will continue our efforts to do precisely this.

Second, an emphasis on theoretical contribution, or on subelements such as novelty, interestingness, or boldness, does not obviate knowledge accumulation. One only must look at the prevalence of large-sample meta-analytic summaries (Cerasoli, Nicklin, & Ford, 2014; Colquitt et al., 2013; Park & Shaw, 2013) to see that major relationships of interest—even in poly-theoretic areas—are often replicated hundreds of times in the literature. To demonstrate novelty, researchers must situate conceptual ideas and empirical findings appropriately in the literature. In doing so, many, if not most, theory-contribution papers offer delineations between current and past approaches, and often indirect or partial replications of other major contributions. Using one of my examples above, it could easily be argued that the plethora of alternative or competing theories on the consequences of organizational-level turnover (Shaw, Gupta, & Delery, 2005) led to the current state of affairs—a vast multidisciplinary body of empirical work, with now more than 300 partial or indirect replications. This knowledge body was eventually cumulated and distilled in two major meta-analytic studies (Heavey, Holwerda, & Hausknecht, 2013; Park & Shaw, 2013). Based on the evidence, a robust set of conclusions with practical organizational value has been gleaned from the literature. One might argue that this situation took too many years to develop—maybe so. But, my point is that we may not have arrived at this stage had the literature not been something of a meandering theoretical mystery house to begin with.

Third, for quantitative research, the mission suggests that *AMJ* seeks theory-driven research. Some have concluded that this theory-driven focus leads to retrofitted, contorted, and/or inauthentically presented theory (e.g., see Bamberger & Ang, 2016). I believe this conclusion misrepresents the papers that *are actually published in AMJ*. Certainly, "post-result theorizing" is prevalent and many submitters likely take such an approach. But, I believe this retrofitting leaves telltale signs that consistently result in rejection-creating concerns and commentary among reviewers and editors. These concerns include ill-fitting or poorly justified theory, construct definition

problems, and construct–operationalization mismatch errors. My point—which I will discuss in detail in a future “from the editors” (FTE) column—is that post-result theorizing may be prevalent, but it is not advisable, among other reasons, because it *increases the likelihood of rejection*. Cortina (2016: 1145) argued that simpler, more refined approaches to initial theory development and subsequent testing are needed, and that, as a field, “we can do better.” I concur. From an editor’s perspective, my experience and the evidence at hand suggest that such refined approaches have been and will continue to be more effective ways for authors to publish their work in *AMJ*. For quantitative submissions, “*start with theory*” is the advisable maxim. To reinforce this advice, my editors and I aim to base our decisions on the quality of the theory and methods, not on patterns of supportive (or unsupportive) results. That is, the goodness of the theory and the quality of the research methods will take priority over patterns of results.

Quality and Efficiency in the Review Experience

We are constantly looking for ways to improve the efficiency and quality of the review experience for our submitting authors. With the new three-tier structure, we are able to more effectively match papers to qualified, appropriate action editors for handling. As editor-in-chief, I will continue to screen papers initially, making a judgment about whether the submission fits the mission of *AMJ*, whether it is of sufficient quality for review, and whether it adequately meets other submission criteria (passes our automated checks for plagiarism, is reasonably close to our suggested submission length of 40 pages, etc.). After this initial screening for “desk reject” and “desk edit” editorial decisions, the process includes a second step. If the paper is judged to be micro quantitative, I assign the paper directly to an action editor. For qualitative submissions, I pass the paper to deputy editor Tima Bansal for assignment to an appropriate qualitative action editor. If the paper is macro quantitative, I pass the paper to Marc Gruber for assignment to the relevant action editor. These steps take place quickly behind the scenes, and, typically in a matter of a few hours, the paper is then assigned to an action editor for reviewer selection.

We began processing manuscripts as the incoming team on July 1, 2016 and have already handled about 800 papers. At the time of this writing, our turnaround time is about 50 days for fully reviewed papers. I frequently hear laments about new-team

strictness bias at *AMJ* and other journals. To avoid this possibility, we engaged in extensive training and orientation with my deputy and associate editors in the months prior to receiving submissions. I am pleased to report that, in the first six months, the team has offered revision opportunities in line with our team goals (about 25% of fully reviewed papers) from the beginning. Internally, we emphasize four themes for our review process: developmental, inclusive, rigorous, and fair. As stewards of the journal for the next three years, we aim to uphold these principles for every manuscript submitted.

Outreach and Information Efforts

The nickname “the big purple tent” is a common one for *AMJ* (e.g., Colquitt, 2013). The big tent draws an extensive variety of submissions from a wide swath of researchers across the social sciences. Previous outreach and information-sharing efforts have been successful at increasing the percentage and quality of, for example, qualitative submissions and submissions from laboratory and experimental researchers. During my term, we aim to reach out to new research communities, regions, and fields where high-quality, *AMJ*-mission-relevant research is being conducted. The aim of these efforts is to sound a positive, promotive voice for the *Journal*, highlighting its mission, constructive reviews, and the advantages of publishing in the “big-purple-tent” platform. My editors and I gave nearly 40 outreach-based presentations in our first six months as the incoming team, and many more are scheduled for 2017. We welcome opportunities to discuss *AMJ* with communities and groups within and outside the management domain—please let us know of opportunities!

A final component of our information and outreach efforts will be in this FTE space. Many years ago, I worked for several years in a part-time role at a small-town daily newspaper in Oklahoma—*The El Reno Tribune*. I still remember anxiously awaiting the Sunday edition to read the latest editorial installment from the editor; typically, a short, pointed piece addressing issues relevant to the paper’s community and countryside readers. My goal for FTEs will be similar. They will be short, opinion-related installments on journal- and academy-relevant issues. They will be authored by me or other members of the editorial team. Several, including that in the April 2017 issue, will relate to our team’s theme, “new ways of seeing,” which I introduce briefly below.

A THEME: NEW WAYS OF SEEING

Our team seeks to infuse “new ways of seeing” into the stream of papers that appear in *AMJ*. This theme challenges our community of scholars to evoke or develop fresh, different, and new theoretical positions, and/or to consider unique sets of assumptions and frameworks for management-related topics. This theme is spurred by the realization we have a tendency to apply theories, frameworks, and patterns of thought developed decades ago to our new research topics. As such, in our search for forward progress, we may be guilty of “looking for our keys under the lamp post.” On the theory side, new ways of seeing implies that frameworks, perspectives, and lenses from outside of the management and organizations literature, and perhaps even outside common base disciplines (e.g., psychology, sociology, economics), may be used fruitfully to create a “new way of seeing” management issues. This theme likely lends itself well to meaningful multidisciplinary collaborations, with, for example, partnerships between management researchers and those in medicine, neuroscience, engineering, music, biology, anthropology, or any number of other fields. In this FTE space in the next issue, we will elaborate on the theme. To encourage research that offers new ways of seeing, we recently published a call for a Special Research Forum in *AMJ*, which can be found at this page: <http://aom.org/Publications/AMJ/Call-for-Papers-Special-Research-Forum.aspx>. Although the primary emphasis is on theory advances, submissions must also be empirical, including qualitative, quantitative, field, laboratory, meta-analytic, and/or mixed methods designs. The window for submission to the special issue is at the end of 2017. To support this effort, my editorial team will conduct a series of paper and idea development workshops over the next several months at Lancaster University Management School (in England; April 6–7, 2017), Ivey Business School at Western University (Canada; June 2–3, 2017), and at the PolyU Faculty of Business at Hong Kong Polytechnic University (Hong Kong; June 29–30, 2017). Please see the notification and information about these workshops in this issue or at <http://aom.org/amj/>.

CONCLUSION

It is my honor to have been chosen to lead *AMJ* forward for the next three years. It is a true joy to

work with such a distinguished and dedicated team of deputy and associate editors. We thank all in the Academy community for your support and, in advance, for your contributions to, and readership of, the *Journal* in these years. Please feel free to reach out to me (jason.shaw@polyu.edu.hk) to discuss *AMJ*'s activities and outreach efforts. I look forward to hearing from you.

Jason D. Shaw, Editor-in-Chief
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

REFERENCES

- Bamberger, P., & Ang, S. 2016. The quantitative discovery: What it is and how to get it published. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 2: 1–6.
- Cerasoli, C. P., Nicklin, J. M., & Ford, M. T. 2014. Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic incentives jointly predict performance: A 40-year meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140: 980–1008.
- Colquitt, J. A. 2011. From the editors: The next three years at *AMJ*—Maintaining the mission while expanding the Journal. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54: 9–14.
- Colquitt, J. A. 2013. From the editors: The last three years at *AMJ*: Celebrating the big purple tent. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56: 1511–1515.
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Rodell, J. B., Long, D. M., Zapata, C. P., Conlon, D. E., & Wesson, M. J. 2013. Justice at the millennium, a decade later: A meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98: 199–236.
- Cortina, J. M. 2016. Defining and operationalizing theory. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37: 1142–1149.
- Davis, G. F. 2015. Editorial essay: What is organizational research for? *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 60: 179–188.
- Heavey, A. L., Holwerda, J. A., & Hausknecht, J. P. 2013. Causes and consequences of collective turnover: A meta-analytic review. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98: 412–453.
- Park, T. Y., & Shaw, J. D. 2013. Turnover rates and organizational performance: A meta-analysis. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98: 268–309.
- Shaw, J. D., Gupta, N., & Delery, J. E. 2005. Alternative conceptualizations of the relationship between voluntary turnover and organizational performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48: 50–68.