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- Where did scientific journals originate, and what were they for?
- What is the status hierarchy for organizations journals?
- How is “impact” measured for journals today?
- How does the use of literature today differ from the golden era when I was in grad school, and people still visited libraries and read, and we walked through six feet of snow to seminars with Max Weber, and ideas still mattered?
- If you could redesign the manuscript review process at ASQ, how would it look?

**Where did scientific journals originate?**

*Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* (1665)

[http://rstl.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/1/1-22.toc](http://rstl.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/1/1-22.toc)

**Organizational scholars put ASQ at the top among journals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Pairwise win %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ASQ</td>
<td>90.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 AMJ</td>
<td>90.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 AMR</td>
<td>89.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Org Sci</td>
<td>88.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 SMJ</td>
<td>84.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 JAP</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Mgt Sci</td>
<td>82.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 J Mgt</td>
<td>82.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 OBHDP</td>
<td>78.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 ORM</td>
<td>74.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 JOB</td>
<td>72.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Pers Psych</td>
<td>71.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 JMS</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 ROB</td>
<td>70.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Org Studies</td>
<td>69.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even the AMJ Board likes ASQ best...

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Mentions</th>
<th>Article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Source: Bartunek et al., 2006

ASQ's impact factor has been relatively stable over time...

Impact factor 1997-2010
Although the denominator has gone down...

Articles published in ASQ per year

Citations by cohort have not shown an obvious trend up or down...

...but the other journals haveamped up their citation counts

Impact factor 1997-2010

Is this just “journal onanism”? 
Some journals are sketchier than others (e.g., JBE)

Cites in (2010) to items published in:
- 2009 = 393
- 2008 = 630
- 2007 = 485
- 2006 = 481
- 2005 = 422

Sum: 2411

Number of items published in:
- 2009 = 544
- 2008 = 365
- 2007 = 203
- 2006 = 192
- 2005 = 200

Sum: 1504

What’s the story?

- Sleazy self-citations by competitors?
  - Mostly not
- ASQ publishing weaker papers?
  - Definitely not!
  - ASQ still gets top honors for its compelling papers
    - E.g., OB Division “Outstanding Publication” for 2011, 2010, 2008, 2006...
- Changes in the ecology of journal publishing?
  - Yes:
    - More management scholars
    - More management journals
    - Different ways of engaging with published work

AOM membership has increased 50% in the past decade

The number of “Management” journals indexed by ISI has *doubled* since 2005
Scholars under 40 do not read print journals

Rising management scholars are web-enabled scholars

- Paper subscriptions to journals are an anachronism
- Scholars under 40 find articles online, not in their mailbox or in the library
  - But NB: The AoM’s 19,000+ members do receive 4 journals in the mail...
- The relevant unit of analysis today is the article, not the issue (or even the journal)
  - Cf. iTunes and “albums”
- To be cited, it helps to be read. To be read, it is essential to be discoverable via Google Scholar and EndNote

Why do we still have (printed) journals at all?

- **SSRN.com** (Social Science Research Network)
  - In operation for roughly 15 years
  - No peer review: ~ anything that is submitted is “published”
  - 292,656 full-text papers available for free download
  - 58,487 received in past 12 months
- **PloSone.org** (Public Library of Science)
  - Peer-reviewed, open-access, online science journal
  - Authors pay fee for publication of accepted articles
  - “Merit” is judged ex post via various metrics (downloads, usage, citations, …) rather than ex ante by editors
    - “PLoS ONE will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound. Judgments about the importance of any particular paper are then made after publication by the readership (who are the most qualified to determine what is of interest to them)”
MAYBE JOURNALS ARE NOT IRRELEVANT AFTER ALL…

- Seriously, who has time to read through 8200 unvetted articles on corporate governance?
- And if PLoS One (or Lady Gaga) are any indication, perhaps “number of downloads” is not an unerring indicator of quality
- A role for journals: a rock-solid, high-quality peer review process

HOW DOES THE REVIEW PROCESS WORK AT ASQ?

- Submitted manuscript goes to managing editor, who assigns to associate editor (AE) to handle based on content area
- AE determines whether to send manuscript out for review; if yes, chooses 3 reviewers with relevant expertise
  - Review is double-blind
  - Typically 2 reviewers from board; 1 from outside; often purposefully diverse in orientation
- With reviews in hand, AE makes judgment: reject, revise-and-resubmit, (provisional) accept
- All parties receive “blinded” reviews

WHAT ARE ASQ’S PUBLICATION STATS?

- In a typical year, ASQ receives 300 new manuscripts
  - 40% are desk-rejected
  - 50% are rejected after one round of review
  - 7% receive a “revise and resubmit”
  - 3% receive a “reject and resubmit”
- Of the papers that get an R&R
  - 33% are rejected after first revision
  - 14% are rejected after second revision
  - Rest typically accepted after first or second revision
- Of the papers that get a reject-and-resubmit
  - 82% get rejected upon re-review

WHAT WOULD THE IDEAL REVIEW PROCESS LOOK LIKE IF THE GOAL WERE…

- **Accuracy**: papers have a true intrinsic value; the goal of the review process is to identify those whose value is above a particular threshold
- **Impact**: the value of papers is uncertain ex ante; the goal of the review process is to identify those likely to be highly cited
- **Development**: the value of papers is altered by the review process itself; the goal of the review process is to identify promising papers and make them good enough to end up in print
- **Innovation**: papers exist to advance the state of the field through new methods, new findings, new insights, new theory; the goal of the review process is to distinguish the innovative from the mundane and the merely wrong
- **Keeping score**: papers are markers of achievement in the academic career of their author; the goal of the review process is to provide a reasonable judgment while minimizing the trauma to the author
- **Community**: papers are convening devices for a community of scholars; the goal of the review process is to inform and refine the taste and judgment of the participants in the scholarly enterprise