

Journal of Management

<http://jom.sagepub.com/>

The Journal of Management's First 30 Years

David D. Van Fleet, Dennis F. Ray, Arthur G. Bedeian, H. Kirk Downey, J. G. Hunt, Ricky W. Griffin, Dan Dalton, Robert P. Vecchio, K. Michele Kacmar and Daniel C. Feldman

Journal of Management 2006 32: 477

DOI: 10.1177/0149206306286715

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://jom.sagepub.com/content/32/4/477>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



[Southern Management Association](#)

Additional services and information for *Journal of Management* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://jom.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://jom.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://jom.sagepub.com/content/32/4/477.refs.html>

The *Journal of Management's* First 30 Years

David D. Van Fleet*

Arizona State University at the West campus 4701 W. Thunderbird Road, Glendale, AZ 85306

with

Dennis F. Ray

Mississippi State University

J. G. Hunt

Texas Tech University

Robert P. Vecchio

University of Notre Dame

Arthur G. Bedeian

Louisiana State University

Ricky W. Griffin

Texas A&M University

K. Michele Kacmar

University of Alabama

H. Kirk Downey

Texas Christian University

Dan Dalton

Indiana University

Daniel C. Feldman

University of Georgia

The Journal of Management, now one of the preeminent journals in the discipline, completed its 30th year of publication in 2004. To provide an understanding of the journal's development, this article reviews its origins as recounted in reflections by its past editors, examines three decades of publication statistics, and provides a brief look at the journal's possible future. Thus, this is a history of the journal, a glimpse into the work of its editors, and a brief case study of organizational evolution.

Keywords: *journal development; editorial board; Annual Review; JOM; editorial reflection*

After 30 years of publication under the initiative and creativity of 10 editors, the *Journal of Management* has become one of the preeminent journals in the management discipline. Baden-Fuller, Ravazzolo, and Schweizer (2000) ranked the *Journal of Management* as Number 5 based on impact factors, and Tahai and Meyer (1999) ranked it Number 7 based on citation proportion truncated at the mode (see also Geary, Marriott, & Rowlinson, 2004).

*Corresponding author. Tel.: 602-543-6104.

E-mail address: ddvf@asu.edu

Journal of Management, Vol. 32 No. 4, August 2006 477-506

DOI: 10.1177/0149206306286715

© 2006 Southern Management Association. All rights reserved.

Starting with one issue in 1975, it has grown steadily, currently publishing six issues a year. In view of this success in a relatively short period of time, it seems appropriate to examine its origins and development. This article does that by presenting the reflections of its past editors and reviewing three decades of publication statistics. Thus, this article serves three related purposes: (a) It presents a history of the journal, (b) it provides a glimpse into the work of its editors, and (c) it presents a brief case study of one organization's evolution.

The Timeline

Table 1 is a 30-year, chronological sequence of events or timeline with statistics showing the development of the journal and the high points of that development under each editor.

The fall issues for each of the first three volumes of the *Journal of Management* (1970-1973) contained articles selected from papers presented at the annual Southern Management Association (SMA) meeting. The spring issues contained manuscripts submitted directly to the editor for review and possible publication. The success of the journal was such that its second editor moved to having both issues consist of manuscripts submitted directly to the editor so as to make it a national rather than just a regional journal.

As the timeline indicates, in the first 30 volumes (1975-2004), more than 2,000 authors published 946 articles totaling more than 18,500 pages. The journal has grown from a single issue in its first volume to six issues in the most recent volumes. The first volume had 8 articles from 16 authors, whereas Volume 30 had 43 articles from 106 authors. Not only has the number of articles increased over the years, but also article length has increased from an average of just under 7 pages to more than 20 pages in the most recent volumes.

The journal's growth is mirrored in the development of its stature in the discipline. The second editor significantly increased the journal's visibility by getting it indexed in the Psychological and Sociological Abstracts, *Current Contents in the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, and other established indexes, and by securing an International Standard Serial Number for the journal from the Library of Congress. To further increase its visibility, the fourth editor developed a unique logo and stylized the first letter in the word *Management* (used for 18 years) and introduced the *Yearly Review of Management* (now referred to as the *Annual Review*), thus making it a quarterly publication to increase library subscriptions. These developments, as well as those of other editors over the years, have resulted in the journal emerging as one of the top academic outlets in the management discipline (Geary, Marriott, & Rowlinson, 2004; Tahai & Meyer, 1999).

The Most Frequent Authors and Most Cited Articles

An examination of the tables of contents for the first 30 volumes reveals that numerous authors have published in the journal more than once. As shown in Table 2, Art Bedeian has appeared as an author 15 times—an average of one article in every other volume! Next in number are Mike Hitt (12) and Phil Podsakoff (8). Ten authors have published seven

Table 1
Summary Statistics and Timeline for the Journal of Management: Volumes 1-30

Volume	Year	Editor	Number of Issues	Article Pages	Number of Articles	Average Article Length	Average Citations per Article	Number of Authors	High Point(s)
1	1975	Dennis F. Ray	1	53	8	6.63	0.13	16	Conception and birth
2	1976		2	120	15	8.00	0.87	29	
3	1977		2	115	14	8.21	0.00	23	
4	1978	Arthur G. Bedeian	2	227	19	11.95	2.26	41	Moving from regional to national
5	1979		2	245	12	20.42	7.56	27	
6	1980	H. Kirk Downey	2	174	12	14.50	4.50	30	Stabilizing operations and blind reviews
7	1981		2	158	12	13.17	5.33	27	
8	1982		2	206	14	14.71	8.93	28	
9 ^a	1983	J. G. Hunt	2	205	16	12.81	4.94	32	Increasing visibility and expanding to a quarterly
10	1984		3	354	24	14.75	19.58	43	
11	1985		3	405	38	10.66	13.84	60	
12	1986		4	558	40	13.95	32.18	68	
13	1987	David D. Van Fleet	4	742	48	15.46	18.15	87	Automating office procedures and expanding feedback
14	1988		4	610	38	16.05	21.03	84	
15	1989		4	668	38	17.58	24.05	71	
16	1990	Ricky W. Griffin	4	815	42	19.40	30.79	91	Inviting what became most cited articles
17	1991		4	762	34	22.41	88.50	66	
18	1992		4	757	37	20.46	27.81	75	
19	1993	Dan Dalton	4	920	41	22.44	16.17	90	Getting the first publisher, JAI
20	1994		4	943	43	21.93	24.05	90	

(continued)

Table 1
(continued)

Volume	Year	Editor	Number of Issues	Article Pages	Number of Articles	Average Article Length	Average Citations per Article	Number of Authors	High Point(s)
21	1995		6	1,196	52	23.00	14.87	117	Expanding to six issues annually
22	1996	Robert P. Vecchio	6	909	36	25.25	17.33	80	Maintaining positive trajectory and avoiding biases
23	1997		6	814	31	26.26	21.39	70	
24	1998		6	777	32	24.28	14.84	69	
25	1999		6	946	36	26.28	13.56	87	
26	2000	K. Michele Kacmar	6	1,273	49	25.98	12.24	115	Automating submission and review processes
27	2001		6	814	38	21.42	tr	84	
28	2002		6	839	37	22.68	tr	81	
29	2003	Daniel C. Feldman	6	1,001	45	22.24	tr	116	Negotiating contract to use Sage Publications as publisher
30	2004		6	986	43	22.93	tr	106	

Note: Citations from the Web of Science, April 2005. tr = too recent to report meaningful numbers of citations.

a. *Journal of Management* logo and stylized first letter in the word *Management* appeared on all covers (except three Yearly Review issues) from 9(1) until 25(6). These then appeared on the inside first page for Volumes 26 and 27. With Volume 31, the logo was officially changed to *JOM* and that is currently prominently featured on the cover.

Table 2
The 30 Most Frequent *Journal of Management* Authors: Volumes 1-30

Number of Articles	Author or Coauthor
15	Bedeian, Arthur G.
12	Hitt, Michael A.
8	Podsakoff, Philip M.
7	Daily, Catherine M.
7	Dalton, Dan R.
7	Dess, Gregory G.
7	Feldman, Daniel C.
7	Griffeth, R. W.
7	Hoskisson, Robert E.
7	Judge, Timothy A.
7	Mossholder, Kevin W.
7	Ketchen, David J.
7	Vandenberg, Robert J.
6	Armenakis, Achilles A.
6	Bennett, Nathan
6	Ferris, Gerald R.
6	Ireland, R. Duane
6	Pierce, Jon L.
6	Smith, Kenneth G.
6	Wright, Patrick M.
5	Dobbins, Gregory H.
5	Ganster, Daniel C.
5	Harris, Michael M.
5	Jones, Gareth R.
5	Lee, Cynthia
5	Powell, Gary N.
5	Russell, Craig J.
5	Van Fleet, David D.
5	Wofford, Jerry C.
5	Wren, Daniel A.

articles, and another seven authors have published six each. Ten others have published five articles each.

The ISI Web of Science (<http://isiknowledge.com>) was used to tabulate the citations for all articles published in the journal's first 30 volumes. The information shown in Table 3 reflects simple counts and is not adjusted for year of publication. Whereas this method favors earlier articles because they have been around longer and thus have a greater chance of others having cited them, the 30 most cited articles are spread from 1984 to 1997 (over half under Ricky Griffin's editorship, 1990-1992). Jay Barney's 1991 article is far and away the journal's most widely cited article. On the other hand, Mike Hitt, Phil Podsakoff, Denny Organ, and Larry Williams each have two articles among the most widely cited. Greg Dess,

Don Hambrick, and Gary Yukl have unique distinctions. They were among the authors of the 30 most widely cited articles and also among the authors of the 10 most widely cited *Academy of Management Journal* articles from 1958 through 1995 (Mowday, 1997). Interestingly, most of these articles were invited contributions that appeared in the journal's *Yearly Review of Management*.

As the discipline has changed over time, so has the pattern of authorship in the journal. The percentage of articles having three or more authors (the highest is nine authors) has steadily increased to around 45% in recent years, whereas the percentage of articles with two authors fluctuates but seems relatively stable. This means, of course, that the percentage of single-authored articles has decreased to about 15% during that same time period. This pattern is not unique to the discipline of management as it has been observed in other disciplines as well (Kyvik, 2003; Sutter & Kocher, 2004).

Article Content

Several writers have suggested that there is particularism in journal review processes, whereby editors tend to favor manuscripts from colleagues at their institutions (Pfeffer, Leong, & Strehl, 1977; Stahl, Leap, & Wei, 1988), that are related to their fields of interests (Martinko, Campbell, & Douglas, 2000), or are consistent with their preferred theoretical perspectives (Bedeian, 2004). Extrascientific considerations have been shown to influence what is published in journals (Goodrick, 2000). Others have suggested that an author's reputation (Kerr, Tolliver, & Petree, 1977) or employing institution (Long, Bowers, Barnett, & White, 1998) seems to affect publication decisions. If any of these influences were to be present, some of the observed changes in the content of published articles over time could simply reflect either idiosyncratic characteristics of editors or authors as much as changes in the discipline. The content of the *Academy of Management Journal* (AMJ) was first studied by Adams and Davis (1986), and Mowday (1997) speculated that temporal changes in AMJ reflected changes in the development of the management discipline. Considering such influences, Beyer, Chanove, and Fox (1995) suggested that particularism was not evident for AMJ during Beyer's editorship. The objectivity of this self-assessment, however, has been questioned by Martinko et al. (2000).

There is little evidence of any such particularism in the *Journal of Management*. As shown in Table 4, content varies as much within volumes published by the same editor as across editors, and historically the journal has always published articles from a breadth of management fields. In Hunt's first volume (1983), for instance, there were no articles addressing policy and strategy, but more than 40% dealt with organizational behavior (OB). By contrast, Jerry's last issue, 4 years later, contained more than 15% strategy papers and OB had dropped to about 27%. Of course, a problem with trying to detect editorial bias is in ascribing "fields of interest" to editors. In the case of Van Fleet, for instance, what would be his "field of interest?" His doctoral training was in economics with a minor in management; he has taught strategy, general management, human resources, and OB; he has published articles dealing with strategy, strategic human resource management, quality circles, leadership, and the history of management thought,

Table 3
The 30 Most Frequently Cited *Journal of Management* Articles: Volumes 1-30

Number of Citations ^a	Author(s) and Article
1,395	Barney, J. B. 1991. Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. 17: 99-120.
651	Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. 1986. Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. 12: 531-544.
328	Greenberg, J. 1990. Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. 16: 399-432.
278	Conner, K. R. 1991. A historical comparison of resource-based theory and five schools of thought within industrial organization economics: Do we have a new theory of the firm? 17: 121-154.
172	Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. 1991. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. 17: 601-618.
160	Medsker, G. J., Williams, L. J., & Holahan, P. J. 1994. A review of current practices for evaluating causal models in organizational behavior and human resources management research. 20: 439-464.
153	Cohen, S. G., & Bailey, D. E. 1997. What makes teams work: Group effectiveness research from the shop floor to the executive suite. 23: 239-290.
131	Bettenhausen, K. L. 1991. Five years of groups research: What we've learned and what needs to be addressed. 17: 345-382.
127	Wright, P. M., & McMahan, G. C. 1992. Theoretical perspectives for strategic human resource management. 18: 295-320.
124	Low, M. B., & MacMillan, I. C. 1988. Entrepreneurship: Past research and future challenges. 14: 139-162.
118	Butler, J. K., Jr. 1991. Toward understanding and measuring conditions of trust: Evolution of a Conditions of Trust Inventory. 17: 643-664.
112	Ganster, D. C., & Schaubroeck, J. 1991. Work stress and employee health. 17: 235-272.
112	Dess, G. G., Ireland R. D., & Hitt, M. A. 1990. Industry effects and strategic management research. 16: 7-28.
104	Zahra, S. A., & Pearce, J. A., II. 1989. Board of directors and corporate financial performance: A review and integrative model. 15: 291-334.
104	Klimoski, R., & Mohammed, S. 1994. Team mental model: Construct or metaphor. 20: 403-438.
97	George, J. M. 1992. The role of personality in organizational life: Issues and evidence. 18: 185-214.
96	Ferris, G. R., & Judge, T. A. 1991. Personnel/human resources management: A political influence perspective. 17: 447-488.
95	Venkatraman, N., & Ramanujam, V. 1987. Measurement of business economic performance: An examination of method convergence. 13: 109-122.
92	Black, J. S., & Stephens, G. K. 1989. The influence of the spouse on American expatriate adjustment and intent to stay in Pacific Rim overseas assignments. 15: 529-544.
90	Hambrick, D. C. 1984. Taxonomic approaches to studying strategy: Some conceptual and methodological issues. 10: 27-42.
90	Van de Ven, A. H., Hudson, R., & Schroeder, D. M. 1984. Designing new business startups: Entrepreneurial, organizational, and ecological considerations. 10: 87-108.
89	Castanias, R. P., & Helfat, C. E. 1991. Managerial resources and rents. 17: 155-172.
88	Fiol, C. M. 1991. Managing culture as a competitive resource: An identity-based view of sustainable competitive advantage. 17: 191-212.
83	Hoskisson, R. E., & Hitt, M. A. 1990. Antecedents and performance outcomes of diversification: A review and critique of theoretical perspectives. 16: 461-569.

(continued)

Table 3
(continued)

Number of Citations ^a	Author(s) and Article
79	Damanpour, F. 1987. The adoption of technological, administrative, and ancillary innovations: Impact of organizational factors. 13: 675-688.
79	Avolio, B. J., Yammarino, F. J., & Bass, B. M. 1991. Identifying common methods variance with data collected from a single source: An unresolved sticky issue. 17: 571-588.
78	Igbaria, M., & Parasaraman, S. 1989. A path analytic study of individual characteristics, computer anxiety and attitudes toward microcomputers. 15: 373-388.
76	Yukl, G. 1989. Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. 15: 251-290.
73	Bluedorn, A. C., & Denhardt, R. B. 1988. Time and organization. 14: 299-320.
73	Fahr, J., Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. 1990. Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. 16: 705-722.

a. From the Web of Science, April 2005. The Web of Science did not index *JOM* until 1983, so the citation counts are understated or simply not reported for any article prior to that year.

among others; and he belongs to numerous divisions in the academy (for several years he was a member of every single division).

Perhaps largely the result of the innovative *Yearly Review of Management* issues begun by the fourth editor, the journal has consistently covered a broad range of topic areas. Indeed, topics associated with many academy divisions rarely if ever get publication space in *AMJ* or the *Academy of Management Review (AMR)* but do appear periodically in the journal. Among these are entrepreneurship, health care, consultation, history, operations, communication and IS, and public and nonprofit topics. It should be noted that just as the data used by Mowday (1997) were subjective, so, too, the data in Table 4 are subjective and reflect only the lead author's interpretation and categorization. There is thus an unknown margin of error. Nevertheless, the broad brush of content published in the journal is likely to be reflected in these data.

Reflections of Past Editors

Each of the editors, past and present, of the journal was asked to write a reflection on his or her term as editor. Their reflections help to more fully describe the journal's development and the changing roles of its editors. In addition to processing manuscripts, as shown in Table 5, early editors had to sell advertising; arrange printing; take care of mailing and billing; oversee copyediting; and, in a word, do everything. To meet deadlines, family members were frequently recruited to assist with more routine chores. Each editor thanks them, and each editor thanks and owes a debt to preceding and following editors, as well as all those associated with their editorial tasks. The "institutional memory" contained in these reflections is an invaluable part of the journal history, development, and operations over time and is included here in an appendix.

Table 4
AOM Divisional Content in the *Journal of Management*: Volumes 1-30

Division	Volume																														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	
Policy & Strategy	9.5				4.5	5.3			11.8	4.5	15.4	14.9	11.5	22.9	23.6	24.4	20.8	21.3	15.0	18.3	28.0	13.9	19.2	17.9	28.6	25.0	22.2	15.6	25.0		
Careers	5.0	4.8	7.4		10.5	4.8			1.9	5.4	1.9	4.2	5.5					3.3	3.3			1.9	2.0	1.3	1.5						
Conflict Management					5.3																1.4										
Entrepreneurship									2.9		2.7	1.9	2.1					4.2	1.6		1.4	4.0	2.8		2.6		3.2	11.7	1.6		
Gender & Diversity										1.9	1.4	7.7	4.2	1.8				2.1	3.3	1.7				3.9	7.1	3.9	4.4	9.5	2.6	1.6	
Health Care				3.7							5.4						4.4					2.0		1.9	2.0					1.6	
Human Resources	21.4	10.0	19.1	7.4	22.7	26.3	14.3	19.0	15.8	8.8	11.4	13.5	12.2	13.5	16.7	20.0	17.8	16.7	21.3	13.3	16.9	18.0	16.7	21.2	19.6	18.2	20.6	22.2	18.2	20.3	
International Management	7.1						4.8			7.7	1.4	5.8	2.1	5.5				6.3	1.6	6.7	5.6	2.0		7.1	5.2	7.4	3.2	3.9	4.7		
Management Consulting		5.0		3.7										1.9																	
Management, Education & Development	7.1	5.0	9.5	3.7	10.5			5.3		2.3	1.9	4.1	1.9	2.1	3.6			1.6	1.7	2.8					1.3		3.2	6.5			
Management History	14.3	5.0						5.3	2.9	2.3	5.8	1.4	1.9	4.2	1.8			2.1		1.7						1.5	1.6				
Managerial & Organizational Cognition	5.0							5.3			1.4									1.7											
Operations Management				3.7							2.3	1.9	1.4	1.9	2.1	1.8						2.0									
Organization & Management Theory	7.1	10.0	19.1	7.4	9.1	5.3	14.3	28.6	10.5	29.4	36.4	9.6	17.6	13.5	6.3	7.3	17.8	10.4	8.2	1.7	7.0	8.0	5.6	7.7	3.6	9.1	8.8	9.5	10.4	4.7	
Organizational Behavior	28.6	45.0	23.8	44.4	45.5	26.3	47.6	33.3	42.1	23.5	29.5	26.9	21.6	25.0	22.9	23.6	22.2	31.3	16.4	28.3	23.9	20.0	47.2	23.1	25.0	20.8	13.2	19.0	16.9	29.7	
Organizational Communication and Information Systems	7.1	10.0		7.4	4.5				2.9	1.9		3.9					6.7	1.6	1.7	2.8	4.0		3.8		3.9	7.4	1.3				
Organizational Development and Change														1.4		4.2								1.8	1.3	1.5					1.6
Public & Nonprofit Research Methods				3.7		5.3	4.8	4.8			1.9	2.7							1.6								1.5	1.6			
Social Issues			4.8								2.3							2.2	2.1				1.9	1.8							1.3
Technology & Innovation Management			9.5	3.7	4.5		4.8		5.9			1.4			2.1		0	4.2	3.3	1.7	2.8		1.9	1.8		4.4		5.2	7.8		
Number of Divisions Represented	8	9	8	12	7	9	8	5	7	9	9	13	17	15	15	11	8	10	13	13	11	10	6	12	12	12	9	12	11		

Note: Research Methods & Analysis was a separate part for volumes 19-22 excluding the *Yearly Review* issues. AOM = Academy of Management.

Table 5
Office Activities of Early Editors

The *Journal of Management*'s office dealt with all journal-related tasks except printing. Most important were the following:

- Processing submitted manuscripts, from submission, through the review process, to the ultimate decision (sometimes requiring several iterations) to accept or reject.
- Designing the cover.
- Preparing a layout for the printer to follow and providing liaison among the authors, printer, and the editorial staff.
- Copyediting the manuscripts.
- Providing the printer with mailing labels for subscribers and those obtained from the Southern Management Association (SMA) for SMA subscribers.
- Obtaining publishers' ads.
- Processing subscriptions.
- Handling exchange ads between the *Journal of Management* and other journals.
- Designing and implementing advertising campaigns.
- Preparing financial summaries based on university and credit union accounts and completing forms for the Internal Revenue Service.
- Soliciting additional manuscripts on a selective basis.
- Performing activities unique to the *Yearly Review of Management* (now *Annual Review*).

Source: Adapted from Hunt (1986a: 452-453).

APPENDIX
Reflections of Past Editors

The Conception and Birth of the *Journal of Management*, 1975-1977

Dennis F. Ray

The origins of the *Journal of Management* were briefly described in my Editorial Comments to Volume 1, Number 1, and are reproduced here verbatim.

"The creation of the *Journal of Management* represents an important landmark for the Southern Management Association (SMA) and its efforts to further contribute to the theory and practice of management. Because of the significance which this first issue represents to both the Association and the management profession, it seems appropriate to briefly describe the historical development of the *Journal of Management*.

Although a number of SMA members in recent years may have discussed the possibility of their Association publishing a journal devoted exclusively to management, the comments and discussions which most directly culminated in the publication of this first issue appear to have originated with the *Proceedings* of the 1972 meeting in Washington, D.C. Because of the appearance and contents of the 1972 *Proceedings*, and subsequently the *Proceedings* for the 1973 and 1974 meetings, numerous comments were made about the extent to which the *Proceedings* resembled a journal. At least several of these comments led into serious discussions about the possibility of SMA publishing a journal.

This reaction to the *Proceedings* reinforced prior thinking by the Editors of the 1972, 1973, and 1974 *Proceedings*—Thad B. Green and Dennis F. Ray, both of Mississippi State University. As a result,

they prepared a proposal for establishing a journal. Board member Dennis Ray presented this proposal to the Board of Directors of the Southern Management Association at the 1974 annual meeting in Atlanta. The name *Journal of Management* which was incorporated into the proposal was originally suggested by Thad Green. In that meeting, the Board went on record in support of both the concept of and name for the journal. Several weeks after the Board meeting, a mail ballot survey of the SMA membership indicated overwhelming support for establishing a journal. In view of the membership response, the SMA Board of Directors officially confirmed the decision to publish the *Journal of Management* at the Board meeting in New Orleans in mid-August 1975. At that meeting the Board elected Dennis F. Ray to serve as the first *Journal of Management* Editor.

The original proposal to establish a journal included the recommendation that it be a semi-annual publication with Fall and Spring issues. It was further recommended that the articles chosen for the Fall 1975 issue be selected from among the papers accepted for presentation at the November meeting. In accordance with this decision by the SMA Board, all papers accepted for presentation were considered for the *Journal of Management*. A large number of reviewers were involved in the anonymous refereeing process, with each paper being evaluated by at least three persons. Final publication decisions, however, were made by the Editorial Review Board in conjunction with the Editor and Associate Editor of the *Journal of Management*. This same reviewing process will be used for selecting articles for the 1976 Spring issue. However, that issue will consist solely of manuscripts submitted to the Editor specifically for publication consideration in the *Journal of Management*.

It is the editorial philosophy of the *Journal of Management* to publish only scholarly research. The *Journal of Management* will include both empirical and non-empirical studies across the broad range of management concepts. Because of the objectives of the *Journal of Management*, only high quality manuscripts will be considered for publication."

Moving From a Regional to a National Stage: The Postpartum Development of the Journal, 1978-1980

Arthur G. Bedeian

To be quite honest, my recollection about how I came to be named the *Journal of Management's* second editor is somewhat fuzzy. I was approached at the 1977 Southern Management Association (SMA) meeting in Atlanta by Thad Green, the journal's associate editor, who inquired about my interest. Shortly thereafter, Thad informed me that I had been appointed editor. The next day, on my way home, I recall discussing my new responsibilities with Achilles A. Armenakis and William H. Holley Jr. The next Monday, I asked Achilles to join me as the journal's second associate editor.

Although the journal had originally been conceived as a means of showcasing the work of SMA members and SMA members only, Achilles and I had other designs. We realized that the prestige of the journal would depend on the quality of the papers published, which in turn would enhance the reputation of the authors whose papers were accepted. We thus believed that, to achieve first-rate status, the journal would have to feature the discipline's best work, not just the leading work of authors within SMA's then-limited geographic boundaries. We also believed that this would result in the journal appealing to a wider range of contributors, thereby attracting a larger number of high-quality submissions. Thus, our first step in moving from a regional to a national stage was to solicit manuscripts without regard to geographic boundaries. In doing so, we proactively sought out promising manuscripts that had been presented at professional meetings and encouraged their authors to submit them for peer review. To build the journal's reputation as a desirable outlet, we also worked hard to ensure that

referee comments were constructive, distributing counterpart reviews among a manuscript's referees, so as to signal what others regarded as an acceptable review. Moving beyond a national stage, to increase the journal's worldwide visibility, we arranged to have its contents abstracted and indexed in major databases.

Anticipating opposition to this shift in emphasis, Achilles and I selected an editorial board, all of whom resided at southern universities but were nationally known scholars. Four of these individuals were or would go on to become presidents of the Academy of Management, and several were past SMA presidents, all of whom we believed would bolster our intent to make the journal a national publication. Moreover, we hoped that by involving the region's best scholars in the journal's review process, they might be more inclined to submit their own work to the journal. Furthermore, we decided that rather than devoting the fall issue of the journal to the best papers presented at the SMA meeting, we would only consider manuscripts that had passed through the journal's review process. As we had anticipated, there was grumbling about our intention to break with precedent, but our views prevailed.

As the title of my remarks suggests, throughout in my editorship, there were several extended episodes of postpartum blues. Achilles and I were committed to publishing quality work and were thus determined to resist pressure to accept manuscripts to simply fill an issue. The journal was then published twice a year. The subscription price was \$10. Fearful of inviting papers and taking potluck, we at first scanned meeting programs in search of promising manuscripts and invited their authors to submit them to the journal. As manuscripts were received, we also solicited ad hoc reviews from some established scholars as a means of not only obtaining quality reviews but publicizing the journal and, so we hoped, planting the idea that the journal might be an attractive outlet for their future work.

By late September in the first year of our editorship (i.e., 1978), we had received 97 submissions, but having only accepted eight papers, we were still short of the number necessary to complete our initial issue. Finally, in late October, we accepted two more papers and went to press. This was just a week or so before that year's SMA meeting in New Orleans. In an effort to reassure the SMA Board that we were still on the job, in our initial issue, we did list two manuscripts as forthcoming. Having just barely accepted enough manuscripts for our first issue, I nonetheless boldly noted in my Editorial Comment that we had future plans for expanding to three issues a year.

The fall 1978 issue, published in April 1979, contained 9 papers, with 2 listed as forthcoming. Over the 2 years of our editorship, we published 21 refereed papers, one letter to the editor with an accompanying author response, and a 4-paper symposium in memory of Ralph M. Stogdill. The symposium was edited by David D. Van Fleet and included papers by Carroll L. Shartle, Edwin P. Hollander, and Rensis Likert. In turning over the editorship, despite having received more than 200 submissions, I recall that there were no manuscripts waiting to be published. When asked why our editorship lasted 2 years rather than the customary 3, I respond by saying that we did 3 years' work in 2! Soliciting quality manuscripts for a journal that was new and regarded as a regional publication was indeed a challenge.

As suggested, a large measure of my labor was devoted to increasing the journal's visibility. By Volume 5, the journal was being abstracted or indexed by a dozen services, including *Psychological Abstracts* and *Sociological Abstracts*. I particularly recall my pleasure when the journal was included in the Institute for Scientific Information's *Current Contents in the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. It was during this period that we also secured an International Standard Serial Number from the Library of Congress and were invited to join the American Psychological Association Panel of Editors, by virtue of using the association's *Publication Manual* as the journal's format guide.

We were the first editors in our discipline to distribute counterpart reviews to referees, a practice we fell into after feeling compelled to reject some referees' reviews, returning them for revisions. By circulating reviews among a manuscript's referees, we enabled them to benchmark off one another's work

and to understand what others regarded as acceptable. By including a memo on malicious reviews with each manuscript sent to a referee, we also made it known that both tone and content were important. I can recall actually retyping some reviews so as to delete referee remarks that were unnecessarily disparaging or otherwise rude. In doing so, I justified my actions by noting that the reviews were anonymous and, thus, no pride of authorship was at stake and perhaps some measure of hurt or anger on the part of aspiring authors could be avoided.

I confess that I likely had no business being a journal editor so early in my career. At the time, of course, my shortcomings were not fully apparent to me, but looking back, they were likely obvious to others. The one saving grace may have been that the journal was new with few subscribers. Thus, my deficiencies were exposed to a limited audience. Much of what I have learned about the editorial process in the decades since is distilled in my June 2004 *Academy of Management Learning & Education (AMLE)* article on peer review, so I will not belabor them here. At another level, however, there is no doubt but that I also learned a great deal about drafting a manuscript and responding to referee and editor comments by being on the “inside” and seeing how some very skilled authors plied their trade. My experience as editor broadened my appreciation for our discipline’s depth and richness and expanded my range of professional contacts. I am amazed to look back now and realize that in only 2 years, Achilles and I commissioned 278 ad hoc reviews.

As I scan across the many years since my editorship and appreciate what the journal has become, I am proud to have been associated with what is now an internationally respected publication. Moreover, it is a distinct honor to have my name listed among those who have served the journal as editor. The evolution of the journal has been truly remarkable.

On Becoming a True Believer: The Blind Review Process, 1980-1983

H. Kirk Downey

My reflections as editor are perhaps different from many of my fellow editors because of my career after leaving the editorship in 1983. Just 3 years later, I left the world of research, for all practical purposes, and began a 12-year term as dean of the M. J. Neeley School of business at Texas Christian University. Following that, I left academics and have spent the past several years in corporate settings, including as the chair of the Board of Directors of a New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) company and as a trustee of a family of mutual funds. Consequently, I have spent most of my subsequent career as a “consumer” of, rather than an “actor in,” what I have come to consider a unique and wonderful process. That process is the academic, nonprofit control of the publication of research through the blind review process controlled by organizations such as the Southern Management Association. From the inside, it is easy to miss how unique this process is.

The Uniqueness of Academic Leaders

When I was asked to assume the editorship, I made my acceptance conditional on my university providing significant resources for the endeavor. Oklahoma State University (OSU), through the decisions of Dean Bob Sandmeyer, stepped forward without hesitation. He allocated significant space, equipment, staff, and release time for our associate editor, Bob Greer, and me. He did so knowing that, even though OSU would receive some benefit, the academic community as a whole would benefit the

most. Nonetheless, he was willing to do so because he understood that all educational institutions have a responsibility to the larger academic community. Good academic leaders understand this. I suspect that every editor of every academic journal has experienced this same attitude at his or her university. This is unique in organizations. Wouldn't it be nice if other segments of society had a similar feeling toward their larger communities or industries? I don't see this in the corporate world, and it is weaker for it.

The Uniqueness of Academic Colleagues

My associate editor, Bob Greer, worked tirelessly on the journal. I quite literally could not have gotten the job done without him. His skills covered up for my weakness, and he frequently had to work harder and longer to undo my mistakes. At the same time, he always kept his focus on the larger goal of providing a forum for academic research.

The previous editor and associate editor were also generous with their time and knowledge. They wanted nothing except for us to be successful. Their tenure as editors was over, but they were still committed to the enterprise. My mentors from Penn State, John Slocum and Don Hellriegel, had extensive experience with editing academic journals. They were free with their help. They, too, were committed to the larger academic enterprise. Reviews were almost always on time, were well intended and helpful. Authors always received criticisms without rancor and in the spirit in which they were given. We never had a reviewer or author who was not civil to us or to each other.

The attitudes and behaviors of these colleagues in our experience with the journal are unique in organizations. Wouldn't it be nice if colleagues in other segments of society treated each other like these colleagues did? Unfortunately, I do not see it as much in the corporate world, and it is weaker for it.

The Uniqueness of the Academic Blind Review Process

We were all taught in our Ph.D. programs about the academic blind review process, and as young assistant professors seeking tenure and promotion, we knew we could not avoid it. My term as editor of the journal, however, made me a "true believer" in it. During those 3 years, I never saw a manuscript that I suspected was fraudulent in any way. Likewise, I never saw a review that I suspected was self-serving or intentionally negative or positive for some sinister reason. Authors were consistently trying to produce the best "product" and were willing to work endlessly to do so. Reviewers were consistently trying to recognize quality "products," trying to help improve them, and to block "products" that did not meet the community standards.

Is the blind review process perfect? *No!* Does the blind review process always recognize quality research? *No!* Does the blind review process always reject poor-quality research? *No!* It is, however, better than any other process that I have seen and certainly better than any single person's opinion. The blind review process may reject an individual's high-quality work one or more times in his or her career, but it is not likely to do so all of the time. Likewise, the blind review process may accept an individual's low-quality work one or more times in his or her career, but it is not likely to do so all of the time. In short, my time as editor made me a "true believer." I trust the blind review process more than my own judgments. The blind review process is unique to academic organizations. It is undertaken with integrity and fairness. It is accomplished without regard to personal gain or reward. I don't have the same faith in everything I see in the corporate world, and it is weaker for it.

As an ex-academic looking from the outside in, I urge you to take special pride in the self-control of the research process in which you are engaged. It is unique and quite special. I thank the Southern Management Association for the opportunity to learn that.

Nearly a Day Late and a Dollar Short: The Entrepreneurial Era, 1983-1987

J. G. Hunt

Unlike many current journals, an important part of this one was obtaining adequate funding (Nearly a . . . dollar short . . .), which was provided by the Southern Management Association (SMA) and controlled by the officers and board. So in addition to elaborating on points raised by others and on the way to discussing the *Journal of Management's* strategic plan as I envisioned it, I had to get the financial house in order before I could implement my vision for the journal. So first I talk briefly about funding—the shadow of which formed a specter during the first 2 years of this endeavor and had much to do with the strategy since at least some of it was funding dependent.

The Funding Specter and Becoming a Quarterly

I was convinced that if the journal were ever to achieve its potential, it needed to be a quarterly as opposed to the two issues per year I inherited, and that would call for a rather substantial increase in funding. Thus, I wrote a number of proposals that were not convincing, and this lack of persuasiveness caused considerable weeping and gnashing of teeth on my part.

All the proposals called for a dues increase, and like politicians everywhere, the board would not approve a dues increase. In the proposal that finally led to success, I proposed a four-issue budget of \$32,000 (current printing costs at that time) less \$10,000 (subscriptions, advertising, reprints, etc.) that the journal was able to generate separately. Thus, \$22,000 was requested. The SMA board concluded that SMA could not afford \$22,000 but suggested we move to three issues or \$14,000 ($\$8000 \times 3 = \$24,000 - \$10,000$ journal-generated funds), which it could provide. Figuring half a loaf (actually three fourths of a loaf) was better than none, we made the move to three issues in 1984 and 1985.

In the meantime, however, we tried renegotiating printing costs to see if we could reduce them enough for four issues. In late 1984, several SMA officers/board members—Achilles Armenakis, Art Bedeian, Jack Duncan, and Bill Holly—traveled to Atlanta to see what could be negotiated with Darby Press, then the printer for the two Academy of Management journals. They were able to obtain a price of \$22,000 (\$5,500 per issue), which when further reduced by the roughly \$10,000 brought in by the journal would be within the \$14,000 budget specified by the board. Craftmaster, the journal's longtime printer, matched the offer, and voilà, we had ourselves a quarterly with no dues increase.

The Strategy Statement (~1983-1986)

The seven components of my strategy statement were published in the journal (Hunt, 1986a) and are summarized below, starting with the journal's identity, visibility, and image as reflected through its

1. I especially thank W. Jack Duncan for providing copies of materials based on SMA minutes and board meetings and a *Journal of Management* strategy statement prepared by me in 1984.

Figure A1
Early *Journal of Management* Logo and Nameplate

a



b



logo, title, and cover designs. These components obviously did not spring full-blown from the fingers of Zeus; rather, they evolved. They are presented here as highpoints and are elaborated more in editorial policy guidelines contained in each issue. Strategy Statement:

1. Develop key aspects of the journal's strategic identity, visibility, and image—its logo and nameplate (see Figure A1), as well as its cover design—all of which have changed in the subsequent 20 years.
2. Develop a separate and unique *Yearly Review* logo, nameplate, and cover design (also now changed).
3. Grow into an international quarterly of management research.
4. Publish original research articles related to the study of management and organizations that are international, interdisciplinary, theoretical, empirical, micro, or macro.
5. Expand the scholarly study of management by (a) encouraging articles that are based on critical theory or radical perspectives; or use qualitative methods; or focus on organizational culture, symbolism, or myths; and (b) requiring an emphasis on implications of research for managerial practice and summarizing descriptive sampling information for all articles.
6. Employ alternative formats: traditional articles, brief theoretical/empirical/methodical notes, point/counterpoint debates, special issues devoted to specific topics, and topical symposia (several related articles within a single issue).
7. Publish one issue a year as the *Yearly Review of Management* (now the *Annual Review*):
 - Divide management into selected areas
 - Use outstanding scholars to review these areas over recurring 2-year cycles, with about half the areas reviewed each year

Once the journal became a quarterly, the term was emphasized by our editorial team, indeed almost incessantly, for whatever venue seemed important.

The fourth component emphasized original scholarly management research. Although we published both conceptual and empirical pieces, the latter were instructed to include a strong theoretical background (e.g., Hunt 1986b). Also, in addition to the international thrust previously mentioned, the

journal emphasized interdisciplinary pieces with a micro- and macromanagement and organizational focus. Articles such as the above were unquestionably the mainstay of the journal. However, although expressing satisfaction at the time with the number of published international articles (see Hunt, 1986a, pp. 453-454), in hindsight, I would like the journal to have done better. Part of not doing better, I suspect, was the state of development of the field, and part was that those writing the articles were unfamiliar with the journal. Had we been in a position to publish more special issues, this focus would have been a good one to use as a follow-up to a cross-cultural piece published in the 1986 *Yearly Review* (discussed below).

Although international work and the types of articles mentioned in the fifth *component* were and still are pretentious goals—especially for an initial two-issue-a-year journal that even today is sponsored by a regional association—I nevertheless desired to “sin bravely” by pushing the journal two ways. The first was a thrust into the philosophy of science realm, one form of which was reflected in *Yearly Review* pieces by Blair and Hunt (1986) and Hunt and Blair (1987). We hoped this philosophy of science emphasis would encourage thinking about both the scholarly management field along with the ontological and epistemological aspects of management knowledge. The second push was a special issue on organizational symbolism, guest edited by the late Peter Frost in 1985.

A *quite different* extension within this fifth component was a *focus* on practical implications of scholarly work for managers, to which was *added* an emphasis on descriptive sampling information (Hunt, 1986b, inside back cover) that called for careful documentation of means, correlations, sample information, and so forth to assist in future literature reviews using meta-analysis and related techniques. Interestingly, at least during the 1983-1986 period, much of this information was not routinely provided in *scholarly journals*.

Aside from traditional articles, the first of the alternative formats mentioned in component six of *this* strategy was “brief theoretical/empirical/methodological notes.” These were similar to empirical notes appearing in the *Academy of Management Journal (AMJ)* and theoretical notes sometimes appearing in the *Academy of Management Review (AMR)*. An additional feature was “point/counterpoint debates.” “The Organizational Symbolism” issue was actually the second of the special issues *contributions* mentioned in *Component 6*. A very different special issue and, indeed the initial one, covered “Organizational Design,” guest edited by John Slocum. Special issues, of course, are more frequent now as more and more journals have moved from four issues to six a year.

The final strategic component focuses on the often-mentioned *Yearly Review of Management (YR)*. The initial issue was published during my last year, and one was released when the new editor took over. It was not only an adventure because of the content but because of the *YR* logo and cover design. My associate editor, John Blair, came up with the *YR* idea and helped develop the concept as well as being a coauthor of the two previously mentioned philosophy-of-science works by us.

In a nutshell, the *Yearly Review* (now called the *Annual Review*) was roughly patterned after reviews such as those in psychology and sociology. For us, we divided the management field into 20 areas (corresponding closely to Academy of Management divisions) with the intention of reviewing each of these over a recurring 2-year cycle or so. The articles were short (around 20 printed pages), providing for the coverage of most of our fields across the indicated 2-year period, with a recycling for each topic. The 2-year cycle and article page length probably were too short, and some subsequent editors embraced the general notion more strongly than others. Currently, it seems alive and well and, as expected, seems to have increased citation counts.

Processes and Editorial Team

Between January 1, 1983 and August 31, 1986, we received 893 submissions for an annual rate of about 244 manuscripts. And although our acceptance rate varied as the operations stabilized, it ended up

at about 10%. Manuscript turnaround was about 47 and 45 days respectively for new and revised submissions. For the entire 4-year period (1983-1986), 12 issues were published, including 9 competitive ones, two special issues, and one *Yearly Review*. The 1987 *Yearly Review* was published under David Van Fleet's watch, but we prepared it.

Editorial team members, exclusive of manuscript reviewers, numbered about 20 (virtually all part-time), and their names appear in the winter 1986 issue. John Blair was the associate editor throughout the entire term. Even in those early days, we held editorial board meetings at the annual SMA meetings. There were about 40 regular reviewers accompanied by numerous ad hoc reviewers. I am beholden to all these people more than they know.

One of the things that has stuck with me—besides what a wise mentor called the “after-dinner test” (journals tend to be read after a hard day's work and a good dinner and should be savory enough to withstand both)—is my reading of a colleague's review from a conference. Reading it did not take long, and the review consisted of one word scribbled across the top: “loser.” To avoid this, we encouraged what are now called “developmental” reviews (a subject of controversy in some quarters because of what is sometimes termed “reviewer ghost writing,” e.g., Bedeian, 1996). We simply asked for thoroughness, civility, and timeliness. I can say with some assurance that the reviews were not as detailed as most are today.

Conclusions

Clearly, we were in an entrepreneurial mode during my tenure. It is quite obvious to me that at the start of my term, the journal had moved out of the birth stage and was undergoing the transition phase between the birth and growth stage of a life-cycle model (see Baliga & Hunt, 1988). I found myself in a period of rapid growth with many innovative opportunities. I really owed much to my predecessors, especially Art Bedeian, who had put a professional stamp on what was originally just a gleam in the eye of SMA movers and shakers.

For me, the editorship was a great honor. In one of my writings (Hunt 2002), I describe myself as “born to edit,” and this position certainly gave me the opportunity. *In terms of editorial gatekeeping*, I believe the state of development of the journal allowed more degrees of freedom than would be encountered in a more mature journal. Explicating and expanding its strategy allowed for an emphasis on underrepresented aspects of the management field. The *Yearly Review* and special issues are a couple of cases in point. Of course, at the individual manuscript level (for competitively refereed issues), the editor can indeed publish only what is received. However, my experience has been that the selection of reviewers has a real impact on gatekeeping. It does not take long to preordain a manuscript's fate through discerning those reviewers who will reject (or accept) almost any manuscript. Of course, I do not believe any of the *Journal of Management* editors would consciously engage in such activity.

Editors can also do some manuscript shaping (from modest to substantial) through revisions. Although I do not want to “ghost write,” a key concern mentioned earlier, I have sometimes accepted manuscripts sharply different from what they originally were. At the same time, an editor's influence is felt in the accept, reject, revise, and resubmit decisions. Campbell (1982) has shown *reviewer* correlations for such decisions to range from .20 to .50, with an arithmetic mean of .41 for a sample of *Journal of Applied Psychology* manuscripts. An editor's decision can loom large, indeed.

When the smoke clears, I would like to see our editorial team best remembered for these accomplishments: (a) moving the journal from two issues to four issues a year; (b) *emphasizing special issues*; (c) introducing and editing the first two *Yearly Review* issues; and (d) formulating and implementing a strategic plan, including logo and title and cover design. Along the way, *among other things*, we raised money, *handled subscriptions*, and introduced the glimmerings of computerization, which

has since loomed so large for virtually all scholarly journals. Perhaps we even had some impact on forward movement of the management field in terms of content.

Continuing the Push for Quality and Growth: Taking Over From a Champ, 1987-1989

David D. Van Fleet

When I became the fifth editor of the *Journal of Management*, following Jerry Hunt, the journal had just undergone major changes and was still in a period of transition. Taking over from a champ was daunting, so I wanted to be able to duplicate as much as possible whatever Jerry was doing that might have contributed to his success in building a solid, respected journal. Therefore, one of the first things that I did was to arrange a trip to visit with Jerry and John. My assistant editor, Tim Peterson, and I spent a couple of days in Lubbock learning how the office was organized, how manuscripts were handled, and all of the various ins and outs of the journal's office.

Just as it had been with previous editors, we were to be in charge of everything. Not only would we have to persuade colleagues to submit manuscripts and then usher them through the review process, but we would have to do a myriad of other things as well. We oversaw production and distribution including arranging copyediting, printing, and mailing. We arranged exchange ads with other journals to try to increase the visibility of the journal. We tried to persuade publishers to buy ads. We actively promoted the journal to libraries and others in an effort to expand its subscriber base. And we did all of this with a minimal budget and staff.

Texas A&M generously provided office space (including storage space for the sizable manuscript flow as well as back issues), a secretary, computer and other office equipment, and a phone (including long-distance charges!). In addition, Tim helped set up the office, including actually implementing the office automation that Jerry had envisioned, which provided an information system for managing the manuscript review process and subscriptions. After the 1st year, Tim was replaced by Jon Beard. I had a series of editorial and production assistants to help as well. One summer, I also brought along my daughter and son, Marijke and Dirk, as office assistants to help out.

Getting the office up and running, though critical, was really only supportive of the main function—publishing high-quality articles. To tackle that function, I needed other assistance. Following the lead of those before me, I identified an outstanding candidate for the position of associate editor, and Ricky Griffin agreed. Together, we worked to establish an Editorial Review Board that would be representative of most if not all of the divisions within the Academy of Management. This, we felt, would help to ensure potential contributors that their work would be appreciated by the journal. Also, following the lead of the *Academy of Management Journal's* editor, Jan Beyer, Ricky and I began to provide extended feedback to authors rather than merely a form letter along with reviewers' comments.

I also knew that occasionally very difficult decisions would need to be made regarding the publishability of manuscripts. Whereas Ricky would clearly provide another view for such decisions, I wanted to have some more experienced "eyes" to look at those tough decisions. Thus, I created the new position of consulting editor to serve in this role. I called upon three individuals with extensive experience and who came from different divisions with the academy to serve in this capacity: John Slocum, Jack Pearce, and Tom Mahoney. Although seldom used (yet probably more than they would have liked), they did provide solid backup for the occasional tricky decision.

Thankfully, not all decisions were complicated; some were merely interesting. On occasion, I would receive a list of "abstracts" with a letter volunteering to expand any of the abstracts into full articles;

I had only to identify which I would publish. I also soon noticed that many if not most of the manuscripts that had arrived with a letter stating that they had been presented to the national Academy of Management were being rejected. As best I could tell, there seemed to be a pattern regarding these. Novelty seemed to be more important than methodology in getting the paper on the academy program, whereas methodological flaws were the predominant reason for the later rejection of the papers by our reviewers. Such is the life of an editor of a developing journal.

Further Increasing Article Quality: Reflections on My Editorship of the Journal, 1990-1992

Ricky W. Griffin

My formal affiliation with the *Journal of Management* spanned a period of 12 years. It began when Jerry Hunt asked me to join the journal's editorial review board, continued when David Van Fleet asked me to serve as his associate editor, and culminated when I was appointed as David's successor as editor. Finally, it unexpectedly continued another 3 years when Dan Dalton asked me to continue a role with the journal as his consulting editor.

Transitions and Training

Every editor except me has faced one common challenge during the early period of his or her editorship—setting up an office. Because I followed in David's footsteps, my colleague at Texas A&M University at the time, that hard groundwork had already been done. When I assumed the position of editor, I already had an experienced assistant, an information system for managing the manuscript review process and the subscription and production processes, and a knowledgeable assistant editor, Jon Beard. In addition to an established infrastructure, I was also very well prepared for the position because I had had a close working relationship with David and because he had mentored me to be a more effective editor than I would otherwise have been. Indeed, there were several opportunities and tasks that he invited me to participate in that provided a very healthy dose of on-the-job training.

For example, for many years, the editors of most mainstream management journals, including *AMJ*, *AMR*, and *JOM*, generally kept themselves detached from the feedback process to authors. For instance, if the editor had decided to reject a manuscript, the authors generally received a letter that went something like this:

I have now received two reviews of your manuscript. The reviewers agree that your paper should not be accepted for publication. Their reasoning is detailed in the enclosed reviews. I'm sorry to have to convey this decision, but I hope you will consider [journal name] as a possible outlet for your future work.

And I know this to be true because I received several of these! Under different circumstances, the author might receive a letter similar to this:

I have now received two reviews of your manuscript. The reviewers see potential in your paper but agree that a revision is needed before a decision can be made. Therefore, I am inviting you to revise your manuscript and resubmit it for further consideration.

If the author was lucky, good, or both, the next letter might have gone something like this: "I have now received the reviews of your revised manuscript. The reviewers agree that your paper is now ready for publication. Congratulations." Again, I can provide samples! Of course, there were also various permutations when the original reviewers differed in their assessment, when additional revisions were needed, and so forth.

But during David's editorship of the journal, Janice Beyer, editor of the *AMJ*, began changing the editorial role in very substantial ways, most notably by providing detailed and explicit feedback from the editor in addition to feedback from the reviewers. Suddenly, the expectations of what editors were supposed to do, and as a result their own personal workloads, increased substantially and quickly.

David invited me to work with him to implement this new model. He would still make the decisions, of course. He would subsequently retain both those manuscripts invited for revision and those to be published and work closely with their authors to make those papers as good as they could be. I was given the manuscripts that David had decided to reject, and I then attempted to provide some additional feedback, encouragement, and direction for their authors. Together, I think we elevated the quality of feedback that all authors received from the journal.

I was also heavily involved in the planning and publication of the *Yearly Review* during David's term. Indeed, I served as guest editor of one such issue and coedited another with him. Hence, although I believe that all of the editors of the journal have carried out their responsibilities in highly effective ways, thanks in part to David and in part to the serendipity of location, I was well prepared to step into the role of editor when the opportunity was presented to me.

Personal Assessment of Accomplishments

There are a couple of things that I like to believe were my primary contributions to the journal. First, we worked hard and aggressively to expand the subscriber base of the journal, actively promoting it to libraries and other potential subscribers. I like to believe that this effort helped create a financial structure for the journal that later made it more attractive to JAI. On a more substantive note, I also take great pride in the quality and impact of the articles we accepted. In large part because my transition into the role of editor was fairly easy and allowed me to avoid myriad start-up tasks and problems, I made a strategic decision from Day 1 to aggressively solicit manuscript submissions from well-established and highly visible scholars in the discipline. I made personal telephone calls, wrote dozens of letters, cajoled, and yes, even bought a few drinks! But I think the results were well worth the effort.

For instance, of the 30 most frequently cited articles to have been published in the journal, I take great pride in the fact that I was involved in inviting for submission, reviewing, and/or accepting for publication 16 of them. Of course, it takes a community of scholars to achieve success and to move our discipline forward. The opportunity and preparation provided by Van Fleet; the contributions made by my associate editors Stuart Youngblood, Jay Barney, and Bob Hoskisson; and our review board, combined with the authors of about a thousand manuscripts, were the key ingredients. My main job was directing the flow of a few pieces of paper.

A Closing Comment

I am sometimes asked what my toughest decision was as editor. The answer is really very clear. I once had to reject a paper that had no substantive flaws that could be used as the basis for the decision. While not pleasant, it's relatively straightforward to reject a paper that is methodologically flawed or has other weaknesses or shortcomings that can be used as the basis for such a decision. This particular paper,

though, was very well written, internally logical and consistent, based on comprehensive previous literature, and accomplished its stated purpose. So why was it rejected? Because in my opinion and in the opinions of two reviewers, its topic was simply not significant enough to justify valuable journal space. I still recall the words of one reviewer, who noted privately to me that the paper was akin to writing a book on how to open a bottle of soda. While opening a soda might be important, most people already know how to do it, and the others could be easily taught. That's a tough message to deliver to an author!

Obtaining the First Professional Publisher: A Productive Time, 1992-1995

Dan R. Dalton

It was a privilege for me to serve as editor of the *Journal of Management*, an assignment I thoroughly enjoyed then as I do reflecting on it now. I am indebted to those who entrusted the journal to my stewardship. There are several aspects of the journal's development that I fondly recall.

It was a time of dynamic growth for the journal. At the start of my editorship, I was visited by representatives of JAI, a company with an impressive reputation for publishing academic journals. JAI was very interested in a partnership with the Southern Management Association (SMA) to produce and publish the journal. Herbert M. Johnson, the founder, president, and publisher of JAI Press, Inc., a man whose professionalism I admired and whose friendship I enjoyed, and I set about to "negotiate" this matter. A mutually advantageous agreement was soon reached.

It was this contract and its successors that importantly supported our ability to answer the challenge of the growth to which I earlier referred. This returns me to Mr. Johnson, his business acumen, and his sense of fair play. When circumstances changed and could be leveraged for joint benefit of the journal and JAI, a formal contract was never an impediment. In a matter of days, Mr. Johnson and I would just draw another one.

With the JAI relationship, 100 or so pages were added to each issue, and the number of articles increased by some 20%. In 1995, the journal expanded from four issues per year to six. Happily, this change was not accompanied by increased costs to SMA or its membership. Beyond that, the "profits" that accrued from the JAI partnership were sufficient to fully fund the journal's editorial offices and provide substantial funding to SMA as well. Our enthusiasm to expand the capacity of the journal was driven in large measure by a continuing increase in demand for its scarce pages—we processed about 900 manuscripts during the period.

That growth led to yet another change in a critical aspect of the journal's scale. According to the "records," there were some 57 members on the editorial board just prior to my editorship. At the end of my time, that number was more than 100. With the steep increase in manuscripts, our insistence on evaluations by three reviewers, and near-compulsive guidelines for timely feedback, we were not maintaining the objectives set by myself, the SMA board, and the journal's board. In retrospect, the math was daunting and should have been (mea culpa) better anticipated: Consider on the order of 900 manuscripts, 50-something reviewers, and requiring 3 reviewers for each manuscript (plus bringing revisions to closure). We just did not have enough folks! Our attempts to rely on ad hoc reviewers to help spell the demands on our editorial board were simply not enough.

Accordingly, we set out to increase the number of editorial board members. In retrospect, those results are easily among the most satisfying experiences of my formal association with the journal. We identified relatively junior faculty members whose early work clearly indicated an enviable research portfolio. And, we invited those imminently qualified "candidates" to join the editorial board . . . and join they did. We

substantially improved our breadth and garnered a group of dedicated, research-active, high-trajectory board members. It has been a pleasure to look back at that board and recognize the tremendous careers that its members have carved out in our profession—then and now. They made the journal better, and for that I will always be grateful. Over these years, many of these women and men thanked me for giving them a chance. With respect, they have that hopelessly backwards; it is they who helped me animate my chance.

My immediate predecessor as editor was Ricky W. Griffin. I thank him and all those who preceded him for delivering the journal to me in exceptional condition, so clearly on an upwards trajectory. I also thank those who succeeded me singly and jointly for taking the journal to an even better place. The journal has a proud legacy, and I am very pleased to have been a very small part of it—as an author, an editorial board member, an editor, an advocate, and as an ardent reader.

Continuing the Upward Trajectory: Some Notable Events That Happened on My Watch, 1995-1999

Robert P. Vecchio

My overarching goal as editor was to maintain the positive trajectory that already had been established. As such, I continued the tradition of seeking manuscripts that met high standards of scholarship. The competent services of talented review board members and associate editors (Syd Finkelstein, Roger Griffeth, and Janet Near) helped to ensure that these standards were met. It also seemed fitting that a management journal should be well managed. Hence, I sought to reduce turnaround time by closely monitoring reviewer response (bringing median turnaround down to approximately 42 days, with roughly 75% of all new submissions being acted on within 56 days or less). In addition, I tried to make useful changes to journal operations and focus. One major change was the creation of a Web site that, in its infancy, merely presented information to prospective authors. With the addition of links to other Web sites and periodic updates on manuscript flow, the journal's Web site helped to establish an initial presence in cyberspace. At first, I believed that the Internet was just an alternative method for obtaining information about a journal. Later, I came to appreciate the value of automating the entire process with electronic submissions, reviews, and galley transmissions.

A second goal of my term was to solicit manuscripts for the *Yearly Review* that were prepared by top-notch scholars in their respective areas. I regard these *Yearly Review* issues as some of the true "high points" of my editorial term. Although I continue to hear positive feedback on the volumes that were published during those years, the 1997 issue (that examined leadership research) appears to have been a genuine "standout" collection of articles.

One proposal that surfaced during my term as editor was to carve out a section of the journal that would operate in an autonomous fashion, with a dedicated focus on research methods. My view, as well as the view of others on the Southern Management Association (SMA) Governing Board, was that the journal was already open to papers devoted to the area of research methods. Hence, a formal proposal to partition the journal was rejected by the Governing Board. Nonetheless, a new niche journal, *Organizational Research Methods*, was subsequently launched. However, my sense is that the journal still entertains submissions related to research methods that have relevance for management research.

Another important change that occurred toward the completion of my term was the purchase of JAI Press by Elsevier. Although the consequences of this change more strongly affected my successors,

initially the association with Elsevier (with their substantial experience in journal and book publication) enhanced the production process. Yet, as I have watched the rising cost of journals for university libraries, it is clear that there is a need for some form of price control with an outside publisher. At Notre Dame, we recently were forced to cancel more than 1,500 electronic journal subscriptions and discontinue the print version of another 1,000 journals. As described to me by the library staff, the problem partly involves publishers of journals feeling that they have a captive audience that has heretofore been willing to accept expenditures on periodicals that double every seven years. Perhaps one solution to this problem is for key journals to negotiate (a) limits on the rate at which prices can be increased and (b) how revenues from price increases will be distributed.

A further concern of mine during my term as editor was whether bias operated in the review process. Much has been written about the expectation (or norm) that contributions to scientific knowledge should be judged in accordance with impersonal, preestablished criteria and that social and demographic attributes of submitters should be irrelevant to any evaluation. To monitor the review process for potential bias, I maintained records on the attributes of different submitters (such as first author's sex, school affiliation, foreign versus domestic affiliation, number of authors, and macro versus micro focus of the paper), and the recommendations of reviewers. I am pleased to report that there was no serious pattern of discernible bias in the data. In all likelihood, the "blindness" of the review process made it difficult for reviewers to estimate submitter attributes. Notably, the attribute of "foreign versus domestic" may be identifiable, but it revealed no relationship to reviewer recommendation. Interestingly as well, my sense was that the "blind" character of the review process led some authors to guess the identity of reviewers (they were invariably wrong) and some reviewers to guess the identity of the author(s) (they were invariably correct, although the clues that reviewers have available for identifying the author are more numerous and more useful as predictors).

Although there were no charges of plagiarism during my time as editor, there were several attempts at self-plagiarism. They were often identified by reviewers or by me when doing background reading. This seemingly "victimless" act actually is a violation of copyright (in that authors do not often own the copyright to their published work). I believe one possible solution to this problem is to devote greater attention in graduate education to discouraging this conduct.

A final remembrance from my term as editor was an idea that I never implemented but did seriously consider launching. Specifically, I have noticed that many times published works do not tell the full story of a research project. Generally, the published work is a sanitized summary that omits many of the important nuances and events that surround the actual conduct of the project. For a variety of reasons (concern with space/page limits, concern with the subjective character of these impressions), such side observations are not published. Yet, they are sometimes important for readers to know. For example, an author may feel that the data site was less than ideal for a variety of subjective reasons or that the resistance of an officer in a firm was what truly blocked the effectiveness of a change program. One solution to this problem is to allow authors an opportunity to provide a set of ancillary comments to an article. These comments could be archived on a journal's Web site and would receive only the most cursory editing (e.g., no names of principals or firms would be allowed for reasons of legal liability). An Ancillary Notes Section would allow the truly interested reader to learn more about the omitted details (including lengthy supplemental analyses and tables). These Ancillary Notes would provide an archival record of a more detailed report of a study and thereby outlive the author. Although an interested reader could always contact an author directly, the Ancillary Notes would provide a basis for a fuller conversation with the author on the specifics of a study.

I had thought this idea was of only marginal value until I saw the practice of adding Director's Notes to DVDs of motion pictures. The side comments that are provided alongside the film help to explain the "how and why" that surrounds a creation. Such information on the "how and why" of

published management articles might prove valuable to researchers who wish to understand the deeper rationale for a project and its findings in order to build on such work.

Electronic Submissions and Reviews: Reflections From a Recent Past Editor, 2000-2002

K. Michele Kacmar

As the ninth editor, I stood on very strong shoulders. Those who came before me built and passed on a respected and well-run journal. Thus, one of my goals was to do no harm. I wanted to continue to provide timely, constructive feedback to authors; keep the journal on its upward trajectory to top-tier status; and leave it better than I found it. Although I had many ideas for accomplishing these goals, I spent the first half of my editorship simply fighting fires.

The Firestorm

Fire 1: Finding an assistant. Following the announcement of my editorship in November 1998 with a start date of July 1, 1999, I spent 6 months setting up an office, screening and interviewing an assistant, and establishing a routine. Then, on July 1, 1999, the day we opened the door for business, my assistant resigned to pursue “the opportunity of a lifetime.” So a second search began, this time to find an assistant before I left on sabbatical. I located an MIS doctoral student who was tired of teaching and worked with her for 2 months before leaving on sabbatical.

As every editor knows, the time commitment is hefty. When my assistant realized that it was either the journal or her dissertation, she wisely opted to resign her position and finish her dissertation. So once again, I was without an assistant, but with the added twist of living more than 2,000 miles from the office. I knew that I could not recruit and train an assistant long distance, so I moved the office to my location in Las Vegas and became my own assistant.

Fire 2: Change in associate editors. My first associate editor (AE) was Rhonda Reger (University of Maryland), who served as the action editor on all macro submissions. To entice her to accept the job, I offered her the editorship of a special issue. She readily accepted the offer, selected the special issue published in 2000, and elected to have an open call for it. She received more than 80 papers and was dutifully working through them when the administration at her school changed—and along with it, the reward structure. Whereas the original administration valued and rewarded her work as an AE, the new administration did not. So she agreed to see through her special issue, but then retire as an AE. To help Rhonda survive her special issue and transition out of the AE role, I recruited Dave Ketchen to take over the macro submissions. Rhonda put her special issue to bed and quietly faded away. So by the end of Year 1, I had lost two assistants and one AE. It seemed that I was constantly starting over.

Fire 3: Elsevier acquisition. During Bob Vecchio’s term, JAI Press was sold to Elsevier; however, the actual transfer took place during my editorship. Although most editors working with a publisher have one issue manager, I had one per issue for the first seven issues. This was extremely frustrating because between the two of us, we had zero organizational memory. Astute readers may be able to see a sample of the problems that arose from the revolving door of issue managers if they compare the layouts of the issues during the first year of my term. Virtually every issue has a different look.

After the Storm

After these firestorms, I wanted to make sure that the next editor never had the same experiences. I am happy to say that even with all the problems I encountered during my editorship, editing the journal was one of the most rewarding experiences of my academic career. In the remainder of my reflections, I highlight some of the innovations I brought to the journal.

Technology. When I took over as editor, many of our competitors were moving toward electronic submissions and reviewing. The journal was still paper based, including submissions, reviews, and even the manuscript-tracking system. Clearly, moving to electronic submissions and reviewing would have prevented or alleviated some of the “firestorm” problems. So my first order of business was to develop an electronic infrastructure, starting with the Web site. I knew that if I could make articles more accessible to authors, they would be more inclined to include them in their papers. Having articles included in more papers would increase our citation counts, which are used to calculate journal rankings. Because of copyright issues, I was unable to post entire papers on our Web site but was given permission to post abstracts. This was a good starting point. Knowing what I wanted in a Web site, but knowing virtually nothing about how to create one, I turned to my resident computer genius, my husband Chuck. I described my vision to Chuck, and he implemented it. In addition to housing basic *Journal of Management* information such as journal statistics, the Web site included a search engine that allowed visitors to search for a title, author, or topic. By the end of my editorship, the Web site had more than 1.2 million hits. Even if only a fraction of the visitors found an article that they could use in their work, the Web site did its job.

I next automated the return of reviews. At the same time that I mailed a reviewer a paper, I sent an e-mail that a paper was on the way and attached the review sheet to that e-mail. Reviewers were asked to complete the review sheet and e-mail it back. This approach had many advantages: (a) reduced copying and mailing costs incurred by reviewers; (b) reduced mailing time, thus providing reviewers more time to complete their reviews; (c) provided me with a virtual office as I was able to receive reviews no matter where I was; (d) saved time and money by allowing me to ship reviews electronically to the associate editor; and (e) cut even more time off the review cycle by allowing me to correspond with the authors electronically.

With electronic reviews pouring in from all over the world, my next technological innovation was a manuscript-tracking database to keep track of them all. Pam Carter, my second assistant, built the first-generation database for me. Upon moving the office to Las Vegas, my husband and webmaster took on the additional role of database designer. I described what I wanted the database to do, and Chuck implemented it. The system was invaluable to me as I never got around to hiring a third assistant.

The final piece in the technological pie was implementing electronic submissions. From the beginning of my editorship, I had asked authors to submit an electronic copy of their submission on a disk with their hard copies. I used the disk version to test the electronic review process with the international board members. These folks were happy to see the change because the slow international mail service meant that by the time they received a paper in the mail, they had only a few days to review it. Authors were strongly encouraged to submit their papers electronically, and reviewers were strongly encouraged to receive the papers they were to review electronically. Although there were a few holdouts in both camps, the vast majority of manuscripts were handled electronically by the end of my term.

Other innovations. When I took over as editor, submissions were becoming heavily micro oriented. I wanted to change that to achieve the historical balance for which the journal had been known. To do this, I added a strategy AE (Rhonda, then Dave), who served as the action editor on all macro

submissions. The job included selecting reviewers and writing the letter. By the end of my term, Dave was handling nearly as many submissions as I was. With his encouragement, I took another step to add more macro flavor to the journal by publishing a special issue on the Resource-Based View. This was a reprise of the original special issue that was published in 1991, which houses the most cited article ever published in the journal.

Adding a Best Article Award to recognize the best paper published each year is another innovation that I hope will be enduring. The inaugural award (Zahra, Neubaum, & Huse, 2000) was presented at the 2001 SMA meetings. The ceremony was quite festive as one author's university held a formal reception and folks flew in from all across the nation to congratulate the winners. Daniel Feldman has continued this award in his term, and I am hopeful that other editors will do the same as it is important to celebrate the journal's success. Given that my editorship ended so recently, only time will tell if my contributions actually made a difference. However, I can confidently say that I fulfilled both of my goals as I did no harm and I left the journal better than I found it.

Status of and Challenges for the Journal: Today and Tomorrow, 2002-2005

Daniel C. Feldman

As 10th editor of the *Journal of Management*, I'd like to briefly discuss its recent status and future opportunities and challenges.

The State of the Journal

The *Journal of Management* has one of the fastest, if not the fastest, rates of increase in paper submissions of any major academic journal in our discipline. From 2002 to 2004, submissions increased from 300 per year to 450 per year. By 2005, it was approaching 600 per year. We receive submissions comparable to *AMR* and 50% more than *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes (OBHDP)*. So, clearly the journal is becoming a popular outlet for management researchers, not only in the United States but around the world.

In addition, the journal is now the only major journal in our discipline that publishes both empirical and theoretical articles, methodological articles, and micro as well as macro articles. Our submissions and publications are about 50/50 in terms of micro articles (Organizational Behavior, Human Relations) and macro articles (Organization and Management Theory, Business Policy and Strategy, Entrepreneurship). There are very few outlets for theory articles in our discipline, so in 2004, a special theory issue was introduced with more than 50 submissions for the first issue.

Our *Annual Reviews* (formerly *Yearly Reviews*) continue to be widely referenced and cited; some of the most heavily cited articles in our discipline appear in the *Annual Review* issues. At the beginning of my term, I changed the procedure for choosing *Annual Review* authors. Rather than soliciting authors, I opened up the process to allow authors to submit proposals for articles to be chosen competitively. In the past 2 years, I had 90 proposals for 18 slots. Democratizing the selection process can only increase the esteem in which these *Annual Review* articles are already held.

The journal is very selective, about a 10% acceptance rate. Roughly 10% of all papers are rejected without review, and another 66% are rejected after first review. Equally important, we have had one of the fastest average turnarounds in the discipline, 47 calendar days in 2004. Our shortest cycle was only 7 days, and our longest was 62 days. We had a very talented and dedicated set of senior associate

editors (Allen Amason and Carol Kulik), editorial board members, and ad hoc reviewers to make this high-quality and high-speed review process work.

In terms of content of *Journal of Management* articles, I tried to achieve two main goals. First, I wanted to publish articles that speak to the discipline as a whole, not just a collection of specialized articles that appeal to narrow niche groups. I tried to publish articles that have high impact across fields and that inform the research of a variety of scholars and disciplines. Second, I pushed authors to write in an accessible style and to convey complex ideas in clear ways. Our discipline has been rightfully criticized, at times, for being too jargon laden and fuzzy in its thinking. We can and must do a better job of being articulate and precise in presenting our ideas to our colleagues.

Future Prospects and Challenges

The Southern Management Association (SMA) adopted Sage as its publisher in 2005 and officially adopted *JOM* as the new logo since most people referred to the journal by that acronym. *JOM* now appears on the cover of each issue. Whereas financial considerations obviously played some role in the decision to change publishers, two other considerations were more paramount. First, we need to have more reliable and efficient production processes and distribution processes. At this point in its history, the journal needed to have close-to-zero-defect processes for producing it and ensuring that subscribers get their issues in a timely and predictable fashion. Having a U.S.-based publisher with extensive experience with academic journals should help achieve that goal. Second, more aggressive marketing of the journal to subscribers outside of the SMA membership was needed, and only strong institutional support from a publisher makes this activity possible.

Recently, we have been transitioning from a purely paper submission process to a primarily electronic submission and review process. The time has come to go entirely electronic. In addition, the journal might want to consider adopting a Web-based reviewing process whereby reviewers can download articles and submit reviews all online from a Web site. A major challenge that the journal will continue to face is keeping the review process developmental (an enduring characteristic throughout its history) at the same time the submission rate is soaring. When the journal gets to 600 submissions per year, this will require roughly 1,800 reviews for first submissions. Assuming each editorial board member does 8 reviews per year (roughly 1 every 6 weeks), we would need a board of 225 members—and that does not include the roughly 450 reviews needed for revise-and-resubmits (3×150). Although ad hoc reviewers continue to be major contributors to our mission, it would be a change of culture to go from a primarily board-member-driven review process to a primarily ad hoc reviewer-driven review process. Leading scholars in our discipline are already inundated with reviewing requests—and this is at a time when many universities appear to undervalue reviewing as a major component of annual performance review assessments. Besides increasing the size of the board, other options include going to two reviews per article and raising the reject-without-review ratio.

It is also time to have a stable editorial office and support staff. Historically, the journal has had to rely on the resources of the host institution to support secretarial, clerical, office, and information technology to its editors. When the journal was only getting 200 submissions per year, the strains on the editor and the local system, although onerous, were bearable with such help. As it approaches the 600-submissions-per-year mark, it is not clear that these temporary and ad hoc arrangements will continue to work so well. Although the editorship should certainly continue to rotate across colleges and universities, a more permanent home and a more permanent support staff for the processing of manuscripts may be warranted.

Another major challenge we face is keeping the journal's strong ties to SMA while building a stronger national and international presence. I cannot speak highly enough of the support I have received from SMA at each and every step of my editorship. All the SMA officers I have worked with have gone beyond

the call of duty to help whenever I have requested support. At the same time, if we want to build a stronger national and international presence, we also have to further expand the journal's reach. As one of the few "Yankee" editors with an overseas associate editor, I have been pushing to get more non-SMA members involved as authors, as editorial board members, and as action editors. Extending our reach, I believe, will actually strengthen our base with SMA and make us an even more valuable asset to our home sponsor.

In closing, let me add that serving as editor of the journal has been the most rewarding professional service activity of my career. The talented set of associate editors, editorial board members, ad hoc reviewers, and authors will enable the journal to continue to excel and meet the challenges of the next 30 years.

REFERENCES

- Adams, S. A., & Davis, K. 1986. Academy of Management Journal: The first decade. In D. A. Wren & J. A. Pearce III (Eds.), *Papers dedicated to the development of modern management. Academy of Management: Celebrating 100 Years of Modern Management and the 50th Anniversary of the Academy of Management*: 89-94. Academy of Management.
- Baden-Fuller, C., Ravazzolo, F., & Schweizer, T. 2000. Making and measuring reputations—The research ranking of European Business Schools. *Long Range Planning*, 33: 621-650.
- Baliga, B. R., & Hunt, J. G. 1988. An organizational life cycle approach to leadership. In J. G. Hunt, B. R. Baliga, H. P. Dachler, & C. A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Emerging leadership vistas*: 129-149. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Bedeian, A. G. 1996. Improving the journal review process: The question of ghostwriting. *American Psychologist*, 54: 1189.
- Bedeian, A. G. 2004. Peer review and the social construction of knowledge in the management discipline. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 3: 198-216.
- Beyer, J. M., Chanove, R. G., & Fox, W. B. 1995. The review process and the fate of manuscripts submitted to *AMJ*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38: 1219-1260.
- Blair, J. D., & Hunt, J. G. 1986. Getting inside the head of the management researcher one more time: Context-free and context-specific orientations in research. *Journal of Management*, 12: 147-166.
- Campbell, J. P. 1982. Editorial: Some remarks from the outgoing editor. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67: 691-700.
- Geary, J., Marriott, L., & Rowlinson, M. 2004. Journal rankings in business and management and the 2001 Research Assessment Exercise in the UK. *British Journal of Management*, 15: 95-141.
- Goodrick, E. 2000. From management as a vocation to management as a scientific activity: An institutional account of a paradigm shift. *Journal of Management*, 28: 649-668.
- Hunt, J. G. 1986a. Comments from the editor: The editor's swan song. *Journal of Management*, 12: 452-455.
- Hunt, J. G. 1986b. Editorial policy and instructions to authors. *Journal of Management*, 12: 596-inside back cover.
- Hunt, J. G. 2002. Born to be an editor: Tales of a right brain, defrocked engineer. In A. G. Bedeian (Ed.), *Management laureates*, vol. 6: 161-198. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
- Hunt, J. G., & Blair, J. D. 1987. Content, process and the Matthew Effect among management academics. *Journal of Management*, 13: 191-210.
- Kerr, S., Tolliver, J., & Petree, D. 1977. Manuscript characteristics which influence acceptance for management and social science journals. *Academy of Management Journal*, 20: 132-141.
- Kyvik, S. 2003. Changing trends in publishing behaviour among university faculty, 1980-2000. *Scientometrics*, 58: 35-48.
- Long, R. G., Bowers, W. P., Barnett, T., & White, M. C. 1998. Research productivity of graduates in management: Effects of academic origin and academic affiliation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41: 704-714.
- Martinko, M. J., Campbell, C. R., & Douglas, S. C. 2000. Bias in the social science publication process: Are there exceptions? *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 15: 1-18.
- Mowday, R. T. 1997. Celebrating 40 years of the *Academy of Management Journal*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40: 1400-1413.
- Pfeffer, J., Leong, A., & Strehl, K. 1977. Paradigm development and particularism: Journal publication in three scientific disciplines. *Social Forces*, 55: 938-951.

- Stahl, M. J., Leap, T. L., & Wei, Z. Z. 1988. Publications in leading management journals as a measure of institutional research productivity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31: 707-720.
- Sutter, M., & Kocher, M. 2004. Patterns of co-authorship among economics departments in the USA. *Applied Economics*, 36: 327-333.
- Tahai, A., & Meyer, M. J. 1999. A revealed preference study of management journals direct influences. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20: 279-296.
- Zahra, S., Neubaum, D., & Huse, M. 2000. Entrepreneurship in medium-sized companies: Exploring the effects of ownership and governance systems. *Journal of Management*, 26: 947-976.