

APPENDIX 2

The Process of Review and Revision: From FTE1 to FTE3

“From the Editors” (FTEs) published in *The Academy of Management Review* (AMR) are solicited and handled by the Editor, in contrast to regular manuscripts that are mainly processed and evaluated by AEs. In principle, regular manuscripts are reviewed by specialists who are identified as peers of their authors, often supplemented by a reviewer who offers a non-specialist assessment. In contrast, in the case of FTEs, the Editor is not necessarily a “peer” of the author, in the sense of being knowledgeable about, or being attuned to, the conventions of the scholarly tradition that frame the preparation of the FTE (Symon, Cassell and Johnson, 2016)¹. The reviewing of FTEs is generally rather “light touch”, typically involving limited interaction with the Editor(s) and other AEs. The communications between the Editor, other members of the editorial team and the AE about FTEs would therefore normally yield little material for analysis. Unusually, in the present case, the process of preparing and reviewing the FTE was protracted and the correspondence was comparatively rich in content.

The task of presenting the process of evaluation has been challenging. It is testing to summarize and paraphrase correspondence that extends to over 60 pages. It is important to make the summary accessible (not too dense) as well as sufficiently complete to allay the very understandable concern that important elements might have been omitted or unduly compressed either for reasons of space or for dishonorable reasons. It is therefore unfortunate that the lack of cooperation from the Editor and other members of the editorial team has

¹ If a Senior Editor has been charged with selecting a referee for a regular submission addressing the themes of the FTE, it is unlikely, but not impossible, that s/he would have identified the Editor as an appropriate (peer) reviewer.

meant that the following account of the FTE's evaluation relies, by default rather than choice, on summaries and paraphrasing rather than verbatim quotes that readers could place in context if access to the full transcript of the correspondence had been granted.

FTE1

The initial draft of the FTE (FTE1) was prepared in response to the invitation of the AMR Editor. It was 47 pages long. Despite the absence of guidelines for the preparation of AMR FTEs, including any restriction on length², I was (apologetically) instructed to reduce the submitted FTE to 20 pages. I received no feedback on which elements were judged to be needlessly lengthy, wide of the mark or redundant. But I was informed that my piece presented a rather negative view of the journal (e.g. my reference to the "AMR Deficit"). The accuracy and currency of the data presented was also questioned, arguing that it could (should?) be reinterpreted to show the movement of the journal in a more positive direction, and by supporting this claim by reference to the many things that were being done to achieve greater outreach and promote diversity. My proposal to introduce quotas for board membership was challenged on the grounds that it would be uncomfortable for those selected on such a basis. The email from the Editor concluded by saying how pleased she was that I was preparing the FTE and was looking forward to receiving the revision.

² This only became evident when, in response to FTE1, the Editor explained that there are no guidelines for FTEs because only Editors and AEs write them – the implication being that AEs should be sufficiently well socialized into the conventions of AMR to know what they are, and how long (that is, short) they should be. Apparently, I should have asked questions to obtain clarity. In place of any further clarification of content, I was sent a link to the style guide for authors. In a later email, following my request for clarification of whether the 20 page limit was a recommendation made by the Editor or an AMR requirement, I was told that an Academy of Management document setting out responsibilities for Editors (which was not sent to me) notes (on p.8) that FTEs should be short. I can only assume that the Editor has not received, or had not read, this document prior to sending the email. I asked for sight of the document and for an explanation of what made 20 pages or the requirement for short FTEs so compelling. But I received only the repeated response that it was a requirement of the responsibilities for Editors document, and that this *had* been circulated to Editors but not AEs. It was accompanied by a fulsome apology.

In my response to this feedback, I noted that I was unable to find any guidelines for the content or length of FTEs. I also explained why I had not included statistics beyond June 2015 as these were not publicly accessible or verifiable when I prepared the draft³. I pointed out that my concerns about a deficit of critical work related not to geography (e.g. whether the author was based in the US/North America) but to the substance of their scholarship, although I noted an overlap between them as scholars trained in the US very rarely are exposed to variants of critical management studies (e.g. critical theory). Specifically, I made it clear that: “If authors based outside the US/North America are trained in the North American [Management] Paradigm...or are urged to shoehorn their work into it by those who are unaware of alternatives or ideologically hostile to them, then it does not matter much where they were trained or where they are currently based. The outcome will be more of the same, and so impede the pluralism / diversity that you call for in your FTE”. Finally, I expressed some doubts over whether I would be able to cut the FTE by over 50% *and* substantiate my argument, and so I invited suggestions for how I could strengthen and develop the FTE by building directly upon Ragins (2015).

The Editor replied by insisting that, despite the lack of guidelines about length, the FTE must be shortened to 20 pages. The Editor also repeated that substantive progress in the direction of diversity urged in my FTE had already been made at AMR, again referring to the large

³ Despite this explanation and my view, expressed in a later email, that its inclusion would be misleading and lack balance as it was “not a representative year in any sense”, the Editor continued to press the case for continuous updates of statistics, rather than accepting the range of dates that had defined by my initial submission, and agreeing that it was unreasonable for me to be continuously extending the period and revising the text to take account of such changes. Indeed, in a subsequent email, the earlier results for 2015 relating to non-US authors (by location, not training) provided by the Editor previously were themselves corrected, followed by the Editor’s view that their inclusion would send an appealing and potent message to prospective contributors. In an email a few days later, I again attempted to communicate my position, writing that “What I try to say – which some may find contentious and so it invites challenge – is that “low CMS submissions” is related to how AMR editors, authors and reviewers are predominantly trained in the “North American Paradigm”, and how work submitted to AMR is shoehorned to make it AMR-ready or publishable so that it fits within the worldview of that Paradigm – which is rather different from where authors are based...Hence the reference to *Paradigm*, not Place or Region.”

number of board members (“a third”) *employed* in non-US schools, whereas my focus, it will be recalled, was on where board members had received their *training*. There was, however, an acknowledgement that the dearth of CMS [critical management studies] articles appearing in AMR is probably attributable to non-geographic factors. The Editor also noted that the statistics that I provided were actually more flattering to AMR in terms of CMS submissions than those generated by the AMR office⁴. Finally, the Editor posed a series of questions about how the lack of CMS scholarship in AMR might be addressed – should there be more outreach? What is Hugh Willmott doing about it?

In terms of raising *my* profile at AMR, I believe that news of my appointment was well known across the CMS community, not only because it was unusual (and welcome) to have a CMS presence on the AMR board but also because I had posted a request to the critical management list-serv that referred directly to it. I communicated my view that, as well as engaging in outreach by undertaking editor panels and workshops, an important signal of AMR’s receptivity to heterodox, including CMS scholarship, was through the content of my FTE⁵.

In a further exchange of emails, I again requested guidance on where to cut the FTE while strengthening and developing its argument. In response, I received a number of comments to which I responded point by point. In some cases, I accepted suggestions (e.g. for clarification) but I resisted devoting more (precious!) space to a primer on CMS when any

⁴ This discrepancy was never explained, although I offered the suggestion that there may have been some connection between poor record-keeping and the rapid and unexpected departure of a member of staff from the office. I could have adopted the figures provided by the Editor to strengthen my case but could identify no defensible reason for doing so.

⁵ That is because, in its exemplification of CMS scholarship, my FTE could demonstrate, rather than merely announce, that AMR wanted to broadcast our voices, and was not satisfied simply with issuing calls for diversity and proclaiming inclusiveness.

interested reader could readily access key CMS texts (e.g. those listed in the FTE bibliography). I was told by the Editor that informing potential authors that AMR is not receptive to their work may be counterproductive in attracting submissions. To this, I replied that when accepting the position of AE, it was not my purpose to discourage authors but, rather, to diagnose the paucity of CMS contributions and “to change AMR so that it is more receptive to work conceived outside of the ‘North American Paradigm’, including CMS”. In the same email, the Editor made a number of comments and observations, such as identifying a member of the previous editorial team as a CMS specialist when, to my knowledge, s/he has no connection with CMS (e.g. attendance at CMS conferences, involvement in the critical management list-serv, membership of the CMS Division of the AoM, etc.). I received a further request to change (i.e. extend) the time period of my data beyond June 2015. In order to meet the production deadline for the next issue of the journal, I was given 7 days to resubmit the shortened version of my FTE. I was also reminded by the Editor that the editor is responsible for the final decision about what is published. A further two emails from the Editor provided statistics for papers for authors *employed* (not *trained*) outside of the US that had been published outside of my time frame. A few days before the deadline, I requested clarification of some statistical data and concluded my message by saying that “I look forward to receiving developmental feedback from yourself and other members of the editorial team”. I submitted a revised, 20 page FTE2 by the deadline. In FTE2, I further clarified the duration of my (unchanged) 10-year time frame and based my numbers on the US training of AMR authors, not their place of employment at the time when their manuscripts were accepted.

FTE2

In response to the shortened FTE, the Editor proposed , or required, a delay in its publication of 9 months, on the grounds that this would allow AEs who, I was informed were unavailable because they were attending conferences, to provide comments on it. [This surprised me as I imagined that reading and preparing comments on a comparatively brief paper would not be incompatible with conference attendance]. The Editor also provided a set of comments in which, despite the previously acknowledged lack of guidelines for FTEs, the primary purpose of FTEs was declared to be *encouraging authors and enabling them to develop their work*. This purpose was then set against a section of FTE2 where I deploy Weber's ideas on domination to analyze the editorial process that informs my assessment that it may be "overtly developmental but [is] operationally repressive". This drew a comment from the Editor to the effect that such claims are not encouraging for authors. The Editor again expressed concern about my characterization of the lack of heterodox, including critical, scholarship, in *AMR* as a "deficit". It was maintained that the FTE did not account for this lack and other comments again disregarded the distinction I had drawn between the geographical location authors and/or board members and the place of training.

Further objections to the FTE included the view that it failed to answer the question of why so few CMS manuscripts were submitted to *AMR*, despite my appointment as an AE. [In my view, FTE 2 does offer an explanation of the "AMR Deficit" in terms of the selection of the Editor, AEs and the composition of the editorial board, resulting in an institutional matrix that is unlikely to attract heterodox, especially CMS, submissions that result their publication. But this is something that readers of FTE2 can judge for themselves]. The Editor notes that, in 2016, 10% of the editorial board members listed CMS as a specialization. [This document is internal to *AMR* and is inaccessible to authors; and CMS was omitted from the list of key words required to be entered when submitting a paper to *AMR*.] The Editor also repeated

objections to the recommendation of quotas for the editorial board and AEs, arguing this time that such a proposal is needless as it fails to appreciate how authors learn about different paradigms as they progress in their careers. There is a repeated insistence that FTEs should educate readers (e.g. about CMS), and a repeated complaint that FTE2 presents a negative and inaccurate picture of AMR. It is also suggested that FTE2 reflects negatively on me as, the Editor claims, it is written from the position of an outsider while the author of the AE (me) occupies a privileged position as a member of the editorial team [Exactly why this reflects negatively rather than positively is unexplained]. It is also stated by the Editor that because FTEs are invited, they necessarily represent the views of the journal [FTEs are actually attributed to their authors, for what I regard as the sound reason that individual AEs have distinctive views that are not necessarily shared by other members of the editorial team]. Finally, the Editor repeats that the final decision about what is published in AMR is made by the Editor and reiterates that the FTE needs to have a constructive focus that educates AMR readers and develops its authors⁶.

I responded to the Editor's comments by first alluding to her own FTE, noting that "I had hoped that [her comments] would be developmental but they are almost entirely negative", and I was unable to resist adding that they tended to "confirm rather than transcend the Weberian analysis offered in my FTE!". I went on to write that I had imagined that FTEs would provide space and support for a variety of voices, yet "you are, it seems, effectively asking that I adopt *your* voice, or the single voice that you attribute to the journal". I added

⁶ A number of other concerns are flagged about comparatively minor issues such as reference to the results of a straw poll of 600-plus subscribers to the Critical Management list-serv asking its members to share their experience of submitting manuscripts to AMR and to comment on why comparatively little critical scholarship has appeared in AMR compared to other journals; the presentation of the data on Best Reviewer awards and the accusation that the data supporting the recognition of some internationalization of the editorial board as well as authors is buried in the footnotes of FTE (Mark 2); and a complaint that elements of my FTE, prepared in 7 days, failed to comply with the style guide, a number of which were attended to when preparing FTE (Mark 3).

that “If this is how *AMR* reviewers have dealt with the submission of heterodox (e.g. CMS) manuscripts, and the word has got around, then it is not so surprising that CMS scholars have shown a reluctance to send in their work!”; and I observed that my appointment to the position of AE and the appointment of other CMS scholars to the editorial board had clearly not been sufficient to improve the situation. Finally, I asked for clarification of whether stimulation of discussion of my concerns - notably a disconnect between a policy of diversity and inclusiveness and the paucity of heterodox, including CMS, submissions to *AMR* - is an appropriate subject for an FTE. I also asked the Editor to reconsider her position, as articulated in her comments on the FTE2, as “it would appear to be inconsistent with the stated objectives of the journal (as identified and endorsed in your [the Editor’s] FTE), and so potentially risks bringing the journal into disrepute”.

I followed up this initial response a few hours later by providing a detailed set of responses to the Editor’s comments. I began by noting that an FTE prepared by another AE had been circulated for comment only two months before the issue in which it was due to appear, and asked why four months was insufficient for my FTE. I observed that I had been thinking about the issues raised in my FTE since becoming a member of the *AMR* editorial board 13 years earlier. I noted that the process of preparing the FTE had started 9 months ago, and I could not understand why it would require another 9 months before it could appear. I had submitted FTE1 by the deadline set by her, but I was now being told that it had been extended by many months, and asked why this length of time was required for AEs to provide comments, and for me to revise the FTE. Finally, in response to the Editor’s view that my FTE was insufficiently positive and constructive, I noted that I had offered a number of constructive proposals for addressing the dearth of heterodox submissions to the journal. I also acknowledged that encouraging authors and helping them to develop their work is one

purpose of an FTE but I also suggested that this did not preclude other objectives, and asked on what authority they are limited to a single purpose.

With regard to the contents of FTE2, I requested that the Editor identify specific issues that she had with my Weberian analysis of the review process, commenting that “if we take Weber’s work seriously then this is exactly what we find in editorial processes (not least because they are secretive and closed to scrutiny)”. With regard to the “AMR Deficit”, I pointed out that the FTE explicitly acknowledges that the deficit of heterodox scholarship is not confined to AMR; and then asked the Editor to explain when it is not applicable to AMR. I also asked if she had a compelling critique of Weber to support her case. To the criticism that the FTE provides no answer to the question of why there are so few CMS submissions, I responded that the explanation offered is in terms of how AMR presents itself on the “demand side”, arguing that my analysis is “at least worth considering, rather than ignoring or dismissing”. In her feedback, the Editor had claimed that I had not checked my count of authors trained in the US. As I had indeed made precisely those checks, I asked for her corrections. With regard to the (10) responses to the survey of 600 members of the critical management list-serv (see note 6), the Editor considered these to be inadmissible as it was such a small sample, and that respondents were asked to comment on past experiences which did not have the benefit of recent internationalizing and diversifying initiatives. The Editor also claimed that I had reported 600 responses. In reply, I pointed out that I had never claimed to have received 600 responses, or claimed that the responses were a (representative) sample. Rather, I had stated clearly that it was a small response from some of the list-serv members who had direct experience of submitting their work to AMR. I added that the responses received were remarkably consistent; that I was presenting qualitative data that was at my disposal, and that I would willingly present the ten responses verbatim if space could

be made available. To the Editor's claim that prospective authors would find it encouraging to learn that so many AMR authors have international affiliations, I responded that I would not find this encouraging "if, on close inspection [this] did not represent heterodox scholarship". To the repeated claim that the purpose of FTEs is to provide authors with practical advice, not discourage them, I asked: why I would have agreed to join the AMR editorial board in 2003 and dedicated so much time to reviewing submissions "if I were not committed to the journal and if I were not keen to encourage the submission of heterodox scholarship to AMR". And I added that "I am especially intrigued to receive an answer to this question". I also again questioned the purpose of FTEs prepared by AEs "if [FTEs] are supposed to follow the script provided by the editor".

In response to the Editor's assertion that reviewers learn about different paradigms as they progress in their careers, and so are well equipped to evaluate heterodox scholarship, I observed that those working within NAMP pay close attention, and make reference in their work, to a very limited range of journals in which they are unlikely to encounter much heterodox scholarship; and that their proclaimed interest in learning about different paradigms is not confirmed by their absence from CMS sessions held at meetings of the AoM. When responding to the Editor's view that I prepared my FTE from the position of an outsider, I responded that I see myself "coming to the rescue of the journal by addressing a basic anomaly...Drawing attention to [the anomaly] is neither 'negative' nor 'inaccurate' but the beginning of raising awareness, offering a diagnosis and proposing a remedy" by "address[ing] the [structural] conditions of developing and supporting authors". I also asked again how someone who had been an editorial board member of AMR since 2003, and had published in AMR during that period, could credibly be identified as an outsider. When responding to the Editor's claim that my FTE would have a detrimental influence on authors,

I suggested that many potential authors would likely experience my FTE as “a breath of fresh air that at least attempts to deal with a key issue”, adding that “I have been appointed to do a job, including write an FTE, and I am doing it to the best of my ability. Do you have an issue with that?” More specifically, I asked the Editor to provide the basis of her criticism of elements of the FTE for being inaccurate and misleading and/or ascribing motives and assumptions (e.g. the claim that the international representation of authors was deliberately tucked away in a footnote; that I write as an outsider; and that my FTE would have a detrimental impact). In relation to the call for greater balance in the FTE, I asked if anyone has the ‘God’s eye view’ of the situation to determine what is balanced, and if the Editor expected that a variety of voices, which she calls for in her FTE, can be expected “to share, of conform to, the same view of what is ‘balanced’”.

When I received no answer to the points that I raised, I wrote to ask for a response but received an email referring to the initial set of comments that had been provided. As I continued to receive no reply to the concerns that I raised in response to the editor’s feedback on FTE Mark 2, I repeated my request on two further occasions. The first received a reply which referred to an email that lacked any reference to, or engagement with, these concerns. The second request was ignored.

Following my initial, lengthy response to the Editor’s feedback, I emailed a copy of FTE2 to my fellow AEs, asking them to provide comments on it. After receiving their agreement, I asked for comments that could help me to remove verbiage and tighten the text so as to permit the inclusion of material that would enable the nuancing and qualification of my central points, with regard to my diagnosis of, and proposed remedies for, what I had identified as an anomaly between AMR’s policy of diversity and inclusiveness and the

comparative dearth of heterodox, including critical, contributions to the journal. I also asked my fellow AEs to suggest additional suggestions for changes that might render AMR more open to, and supportive of, heterodox scholarship. The Editor immediately intervened by writing that I had sent my draft to the AEs without seeking her consent [I had actually indicated my intention to approach them prior to submitting FTE2 (see above) and had repeated this intent in my initial email responding to the Editor's feedback on FTE2]⁷. I can only imagine that I was supposed to interpret the suggestion that the AEs were too busy to comment, which turned out not to be the case, as an instruction not to seek feedback from them].

The Editor also asked that the AEs comments be circulated to all members of the editorial team, rather than shared with the author (me) and the Editor, adding that "I believe that we should pitch in on this as a group" (my paraphrasing), and again communicating that publication of my FTE could be extended (that is delayed) for 9 months, so that there was not rush to attend to it. In the event, I received comments from the AEs within 7 days. These ranged from a lengthy evaluation, a detailed set of comments embedded in the FTE document, to some briefer comments and some very brief, "Me Too" responses. A number of comments embedded by one AE in the FTE Mark 2 file were developmental in providing suggestions of how my editorial might be nuanced and refined. However, I received no support for dedicating my FTE to addressing the "demand side" of the submission and evaluation process. Elements of the lengthy response provided by one of the AEs, which was the first to be circulated, tended to be affirmed by other AEs whose comments, summarized below, broadly repeated those of the Editor, often using more colourful language:

⁷ The Editor later claimed that she had explicitly asked me not to send my FTE before granting her permission, but I can find no record of that request. If the restriction on publishing our correspondence is lifted, then this should come to light.

1. The piece confounds an expectation that it would offer advice to colleagues working in heterodox traditions on how to prepare their work for submission to AMR. It should focus upon the field of CMS and how to get more CMS papers into AMR
2. The analysis, as acknowledged in the FTE, does not apply to AMR specifically. The text, including the Weberian framing, is heavy handed, obnoxious, patronizing or incomprehensible, and makes well rehearsed criticisms of the editorial process in a biased way.
3. The FTE looks like no other that has appeared in AMR
4. The FTE will confuse readers as it mixes genres (editorial , review piece, etc.) with mixed messages.
5. The FTE contains sweeping generalizations, confounds categories, makes unsubstantiated claims (e.g. the piece is read as saying that AMR authors are unable to address relevant theories and topics)
6. The FTE fails to acknowledge the diversity and eclecticism of work, including North American scholarship, that appears in AMR, and which challenges conventional wisdom. More generally, it lacks nuance and proper contextualization. Comparison of AMR with other journals is considered unfair.
7. The FTE does not recognize the improvement of papers resulting from the editorial process in the vast majority of cases; and the claim that resistance to editorial process can result in less formulaic scholarship is deemed to be scurrilous.
8. The FTE fails to appreciate how the use of specialists (e.g. CMS) reviewers to evaluate specialist (e.g. CMS) papers is antithetical to the philosophy of AMR as it risks publishing work that lacks sufficiently broad appeal.

9. There are methodological norms, which does not mean that empirical work is uniform but there are methods which are “wrong” or “invalid” and also right and wrong ways to build theory, whereas the FTE suggests that nothing can ever be done incorrectly, yet that is not the case.
10. The critical evaluation of AMR indicates hostility to the journal and affirms an outsider status attributed to me.

Once my fellow AEs had circulated their comments, the Editor wrote to the editorial team to say that her reaction to both the initial and shortened versions of my FTE had been very similar, referring directly to comments circulated by AEs to support this evaluation. This was followed by the repetition of a number of points that I had challenged in earlier correspondence and, more specifically, in my detailed responses to feedback – such as the conflation of non-US based authors and authors who had not been trained in the US, and an insistence on including statistics that were outside of my time frame – that had gone unanswered. The Editor then rehearsed the view that the FTE should not be about the “AMR deficit”, but should instead focus on the education of readers and the encouragement of submissions from CMS authors. No alternative suggestions were made for making the “demand side” of AMR more appealing to heterodox scholars, and thereby assist in rectifying the dearth of CMS submissions. Instead of considering what might be gleaned from the analysis presented in the FTE, and what might be changed at AMR to achieve a better alignment of the contents of the journal with its stated mission, the analysis presented in FTE2 is dismissed for lacking any application to *AMR*. It is proposed that FTE2 might be submitted elsewhere, subject to correcting the shortcomings identified above (e.g. 1-10). Finally, on the basis of an anecdote drawn from a conversation with an unnamed CMS scholar at a conference, the Editor offered an alternative explanation of the dearth of CMS

submissions: they are so low because *AMR* is regarded as the establishment and publish in it would be a sell out⁸.

Having digested the comments received from the AEs and those of the Editor, I confirmed that I would resubmit my FTE by the original deadline, noting that it had already been delayed, and I once again asked for the Editor to reply to my queries and concerns relating to her feedback on FTE2 so that I could revise the piece effectively. With regard to the deadline, I received the response that even if I met the deadline, FTE3 would have to be read by other AEs, and there was a repetition of the intent to delay its publication by 9 months. With regard to the content of FTE2 and my request for a reply to my queries, the Editor selectively repeated comments received from the AEs to the effect that the FTE was disrespectful, patronising, made scurrilous and unsupported claims, was attacking and obnoxious, and that the language was completely improper as it would disaffect rather than enlighten *AMR* readers. There was no attempt to respond to my requests to answer my concerns but there was an apology for providing the above feedback, and a claim that the Editor had sought to avoid it, before noting that the second part of FTE2 – relating to the review process as a form of domination - had provoked such a reaction. It was again proposed that this could be published elsewhere and this was followed by yet another repetition – acknowledged as a repetition by the Editor – of the request that my FTE should educate readers about CMS, and that this focus would be more productive than seeking to respond to, and challenge, the feedback received from the AEs. The Editor concluded by

⁸ I acknowledge that the Editor had undertaken empirical research to generate an alternative explanation of the dearth of heterodox scholarship, including CMS, published in *AMR*. However, I declined to respond to the findings of this straw poll of one, which the Editor appeared to regard as sufficiently significant to report to the editorial team, and to accept uncritically. What it completely disregards is the substantial efforts of numerous CMS scholars, occasionally successful, to contribute to *AMR*, and to act as reviewers for all kinds of work submitted to the journal.

claiming to know how I felt about the situation and to understand it, a reference to my leadership and a request to collaborate with the Editor and AEs.

I responded that the Editor was mistaken about how I felt, writing that “I don’t know whether to laugh or to cry”. I noted that I had circulated my FTE in the same way that previous FTEs had been distributed amongst AEs, and that “I had hoped for developmental feedback but am used to the kind of (defensive) response that I received...Even so, I found some of the comments rather shocking given AMR policy”. I noted that previous FTEs had not been treated in the same way; and said that I would incorporate comments from the Editor and AEs that were constructive and developmental. I also reminded the Editor that it had been established that there are no guidelines for FTEs, and that I had now complied with the request to reduce the FTE in length, “so that there is no editorial basis for requiring that I write a different FTE”. Finally, I asked the Editor to specify precisely where my FTE was disrespectful, patronizing or made scurrilous and unsupported claims, or was attacking and obnoxious in ways that would alienate rather than educate “so that I can reflect on this and revise or remove accordingly”. Finally, I confirmed that I could submit the revised FTE (FTE3) by the original deadline, or a few days before if the Editor needed to take a final look at it. I also asked once more for her to reply to the queries and concerns that I had raised in my detailed responses to her feedback on FTE Mark 2 in order to ensure that my revision would have the benefit of that input.

The editor responded by repeating that FTEs should educate readers and support authors, and that the FTE was not publishable without revision, again laying out the option of publishing it elsewhere or revising it in line with the feedback received from the editorial team. The email attributes to me the view that I appeared to believe that the FTE required only minor

revisions. The Editor then refers to the descriptors (e.g. “disrespectful...obnoxious”) as the AEs’ words, not the Editor’s, and attributing to me the belief that they were the Editor’s comments. This misattribution is then deployed to decline my request to specify where these descriptors were relevant - a refusal that was supported by reference to the single set of comments received from an AE that did refer directly to specific passages in the text, and questioning whether I had read them (The more colourful comments were not embedded in the file received from the AE). I was then reminded that it had been me who asked the AEs for their comments, and it is claimed that readers of AMR would have had a similar response to FTE2 as the AEs. I was again reminded that publication of the FTE was the decision of the Editor and it was repeated that I had circumvented the normal process of feedback on FTEs by circulating my draft to AEs when I had been advised not to do so. The AEs had, it seems, been asked to see the next version of my FTE [in communications which were not copied to me]. Finally, I was instructed that the revised FTE should exclude the critique of the *AMR* editorial process.

I replied by saying that I would incorporate constructive feedback into my revised FTE, but asked the Editor if she regarded *all* the feedback received from AEs as helpful and defensible. I also stressed that “it would be incongruous to receive an orthodox FTE from a heterodox scholar”; and that if this were required, it “might unfortunately appear that you are seeking to suppress my FTE which can only bring *AMR* into disrepute”. I suggested that editorial restrictions are appropriate only “to require a remedy for where my FTE is judged to be unscholarly. If you disagree, please could you explain why?”. And I questioned why AEs were being allowed to review my FTE for a second time when this process had not been applied to drafts of other FTEs. I concluded by affirming that I would be able to prepare a

revised FTE within a few days so that it could be checked by the Editor by the original deadline.

FTE3

When preparing my FTE3, I composed a table (see Table 1) in which I responded to a summary of the AE's comments on FTE2. When circulating these responses in advance of my submission of FTE3, I noted that "I have expressed myself rather directly, so I hope that I have not caused offence", and I also wrote that "I will do my best to be scholarly in my tone as well as content without suppressing or losing my distinctive voice". I explained that I would be revising the version of FTE2 that contained the embedded comments provided by one of the AEs, and that I would use the Comment tool to show how his specific concerns had been addressed while also endeavouring to incorporate into FTE3 all my responses to the comments received by the Editor and AEs on FTE2. Finally, I made a series of points that I condense and paraphrase here:

- The FTE addresses an anomaly pointed out by a past editor of AMR (Art Brief), and so it says nothing particularly new but, arguably, it is important enough to be said again, and is echoed in a recent paper to be published by Steve Barley in ASQ
- It would be odd and disingenuous for a CMS scholar to prepare an orthodox FTE. The FTE addresses issues of domination which is typical of CMS scholarship, and is what I imagined was the purpose of my appointment as an AE.
- I have been a long-serving member of the AMR editorial board, so I trust that my commitment to the journal is not being questioned. I care about the anomaly

diagnosed in the FTE and believe that heterodox / critical scholarship is well placed to address and fix it. It is the “AMR deficit” that motivates my involvement with AMR and why I accepted the invitation to act as an AMR AE.

- I regard the FTE as an effective and credible way of showing heterodox/CMS scholars that their scholarship is indeed welcomed by AMR, rather than coopted or stifled.

The Editor’s response to my message repeated much of what had been communicated earlier, including the instruction to address the distinctive nature of CMS; to avoid criticism of the editorial process; and to submit FTE3 within 6 months when it would be circulated to the editorial team for comment. The email also noted that the essay (FTE2) had been “peer reviewed” by the editorial team, and repeated the descriptors (e.g. disrespectful, patronizing, scurrilous) attributed to the FTE before asserting (using italics) that FTEs represent the view of the journal, not just its author(s) [As noted earlier, FTEs are attributed to their authors]. Finally, it was noted by the Editor that I had circulated FTE2 to the critical management list-serv for feedback [which I had]; and that I had written in a previous email that if the FTE were not published, then it might “unfortunately appear that you are trying to suppress my FTE which can only bring AMR into disrepute” [which I had] but without any further comment. Finally, the hope was expressed that we could progress with the FTE could be made in a fruitful and responsible way.

I noticed that the email from the Editor summarized in the previous paragraph had copied all our earlier correspondence to the editorial team. I therefore raised this issue in my next email: “I am surprised that you shared our correspondence without the courtesy of asking me first? Was that an oversight?” I continued by noting that I could see little value in filling an FTE

with information [about CMS] that is already widely available, and suggested that a bibliography of relevant CMS sources, as proposed by the Editor, would suffice. I again pointed out that my FTE built upon numerous previous AMR FTEs, including those of the Editor, in a way that is consistent with the genre of AMR FTEs' I also observed that providing a primer on a particular scholarly tradition (e.g. CMS) is atypical of FTEs. I expressed my distress at the descriptors of my FTE provided by AEs being repeated and unchallenged by the Editor; and I stressed that it was not my intention to give offence or alienate. I asked once more for a reply from the Editor to the series of concerns and queries that I raised in response to her feedback on FTE2: "I have repeatedly raised a series of queries and points of clarification with you about your own comments on my draft but have not received feedback from you. I would be grateful if you could provide that. Otherwise, I fear that I will not properly grasp, or will fail to incorporate, the points that you raise". Finally, I indicated my intention to complete my revision well in advance of the original deadline, and anticipated that it would "satisfactorily address the scholarly concerns expressed by the AEs and yourself".

In the Editor's response, no reference was made to the circulation of correspondence to AEs without seeking my agreement. There was an insistence on a delay of 9 months on the publication of my FTE, subject to review by the AEs. On the issue of responding to the queries that I raised, it was claimed that the ensuing correspondence over the FTE had provided an answer to them (which, in my view, it had not]. It was also suggested that collectively the editorial team is charged with identifying solutions, and not just identifying problems. And there was a request that I reconsider my (negative) response to an earlier request to take a leadership role in editing a Special Topic Forum (STF) on CMS (see Table 1, point 16) , and asking me for potential editors for it.

My next email contained FTE3, explaining that responses to comments received were either in the margins of the text or at the end of the document; that the Notes had been reduced to 4; and that the 20 page restriction had been observed. It noted that the manuscript required some technical work (e.g. format, copy editing, etc) which I would undertake when dealing with anticipated suggestions for corrections and minor revisions. I noted that the piece had been completely reworked in order to address the comments received, including the request that more constructive proposals for remedying the anomaly addressed by the FTE, and I expressed a concern that this had likely resulted in some loss of content contained the previous version (FTE2). In direct response to concerns signaled by the descriptors “disrespectful... obnoxious”, I wrote that “I have gone through [the text] to identify and correct, or completely remove, any possible instances of such failings”. I then asked again for any remaining instances to be directly identified. In this email, I also referred to a couple of comments that I found very difficult to comprehend. The first is the claim that FTE2 argued that resisting editorial advice *necessarily* produces more reflective and challenging scholarship. I noted that I regarded this to be an outrageous claim. The second is the view that that FTE2 represented my fellow AEs as defenders of unitarist, uncritical normal science. I comment that, in the space occupied by an FTE, it is difficult to substantiate all claims and avoid generalizations, and that these shortcomings are to be found in every AMR FTE that I have read. Finally, I acknowledged that there may be elements of the FTE – such as the proposed use of quotas or the meaning of the AMR mission statement – which it may be difficult for the Editor to accept. I then asked that “you help me to improve what, as a heterodox scholar, I can offer as an FTE, rather than commending something that you may prefer me to produce”, before noting that AMR FTEs “are attributed to the author not to its editors, presumably in acknowledgement of editorial diversity”.

When responding to my revised FTE3, the Editor repeated many of the points made in earlier correspondence (e.g. the claim that FTEs are exclusively intended to provide help of a practical nature to authors and reviewers; that my FTE speaks on behalf of the editorial team; and no distinction is made between authors based outside the US and authors trained outside the US). FTE3 is considered to be adversarial in tone, and to inform readers that *AMR* is biased against CMS scholarship. It is held not to welcome diverse submissions, thereby placing *AMR* in an unattractive light; and it is asserted that FTE3 denigrates *AMR*, and therefore cannot be published..

My reply to this email took the form of addressing point-by-point the basis of the rejection of FTE3 provided by the Editor. Table 2 comprises the Editor's (necessarily) paraphrased comments, together with my responses. My email concluded by questioning the consistency of the rejection of the FTE with the mission of the journal, and asking the Editor if she would respond to a piece that I intended to prepare on editorial practice based on the process or evaluating the FTE (i.e. this *Speaking Out*):

“I would like to make one final observation of a general kind. Instead of reminding my fellow editors of the developmental philosophy of the journal, you have deployed their “adversarial” comments (I exclude those of the AE who sent me a set of tough but very helpful set of detailed comments] to avoid taking the “risk” of publishing my piece that does, at least, engage with the mission of “push[ing] the boundaries of our field forward”. We ask authors “to take risks in developing bold new ideas that transform our thinking” but we are apparently not willing to “risk” the publication of an FTE that offers some “new ideas” that challenge “our thinking” [this quote is from Editor's FTE]. One outcome of this risk-averse decision has been to exclude a voice that directly addresses the issue of how to realize the *AMR* mission - a concern earlier expressed by Brief in his 2003 FTE, so it is hardly new or incongruous for an FTE. Another outcome of your handling of my unacceptable FTE will be, I fear, to raise difficult questions about our commitment to the mission of the journal. Having served on the board of *AMR* since 2003, and having agreed to become an associate editor because I believe in its mission, I find this to be a distressing prospect. For this

reason, I have asked whether you will be willing to respond to the piece on editorial process that I will now prepare and seek to publish. I do hope that you will.”

At this point, there was a request from an AE that they no longer be copied in on the correspondence, and the Editor commented that she fully understood this request as they were being placed in an uncomfortable position. In my reply, I reminded the Editor that it was she who had initiated copying AEs in on the lengthy thread of our correspondence without seeking my agreement; and that I had not received an apology or explanation, but nonetheless had complied with her preference. I then asked why she was *now* asking me to exclude AEs from our correspondence. I received no answer to this.

In my reply to the Editor’s rejection email, I noted once again that I had been obliged to revise my FTE without the benefit of the Editor’s reply to the queries and concerns that I had raised, despite repeated requests, noting that “As your comments are the basis for finding FTE2 and FTE3 unacceptable, despite the strenuous efforts I have made to address the issues, I am asking you to respond in detail. The absence of any specific responses suggests that your criticisms cannot be supported when challenged, and so my FTE has been found unacceptable for reasons that, on inspection, so far lack justification. Indeed, I wonder how carefully you have read my last email as you continue to refer to ‘guidelines’ for FTEs that do not exist”. Finally, I reminded the Editor of my suggestion that she might wish to respond to an article on editorial process that I planned to prepare, and indicated that I hoped that a positive response would be forthcoming.

The reply from the Editor offered no response to my concerns about the circulation of our correspondence to AEs without my agreement. With regard to the lack of feedback on earlier queries and concerns raised, it was again repeated that previous emails had dealt with those,

revised FTE within a few days so that it could be checked by the Editor by the original deadline.

FTE3

When preparing my FTE3, I composed a table (see Table 1) in which I responded to a summary of the AE's comments on FTE2. When circulating these responses in advance of my submission of FTE3, I noted that "I have expressed myself rather directly, so I hope that I have not caused offence", and I also wrote that "I will do my best to be scholarly in my tone as well as content without suppressing or losing my distinctive voice". I explained that I would be revising the version of FTE2 that contained the embedded comments provided by one of the AEs, and that I would use the Comment tool to show how his specific concerns had been addressed while also endeavouring to incorporate into FTE3 all my responses to the comments received by the Editor and AEs on FTE2. Finally, I made a series of points that I condense and paraphrase here:

- The FTE addresses an anomaly pointed out by a past editor of AMR (Art Brief), and so it says nothing particularly new but, arguably, it is important enough to be said again, and is echoed in a recent paper to be published by Steve Barley in ASQ (**Barley, xxx**)
- It would be odd and disingenuous for a CMS scholar to prepare an orthodox FTE. The FTE addresses issues of domination which is typical of CMS scholarship, and is what I imagined was the purpose of my appointment as an AE.
- I have been a long-serving member of the AMR editorial board, so I trust that my commitment to the journal is not being questioned. I care about the anomaly

The response from the Editor repeated that my questions had already been answered in the extensive correspondence, or that they were irrelevant as they related to the critique element of the FTE, and rehearsed what an FTE with a focus on CMS would look like. She insisted that she would not respond to any questions about the guidelines for FTEs. There was no response to issues raised in previous emails, including the circulation of our extensive correspondence to other members of the editorial board without consultation. The email concludes with a request to let the Editor know whether I would be preparing a FTE on the terms set out by her. My response was that I would not be, adding that I would not repeat again why I considered it inappropriate for an FTE to be devoted to a primer on CMS. I added that “I believe that we should focus upon our mission and ensure that the contents of the journal are better aligned to it”. Finally, I asked whether the Editor would consider incorporating reference to the mission of the journal within the template letters used to communicate decisions to the authors of submissions to AMR. I received no response to this suggestion.

[To repeat, in the absence of agreement to provide a full transcript of my correspondence with the Editor and other members of the editorial board over the evaluation of my FTE, I have provided summaries and paraphrasing. I would be delighted if the decision to deny publication of the transcripts were reversed, thereby enabling readers to assess for themselves the adequacy of my digest of the contents of our exchanges.]

Table 1	
Editor (paraphrased and numbered)	AE/ Author (verbatim)
1. I am of the view that this FTE should	1. The two questions are, I think, directly

focus on the question posed in the title --
“What if our theory was (were) critical?”
-- rather than “Why doesn’t AMR publish
more CMS work?”

2. We don’t understand why there is a
paucity of CMS submissions. Speculation
about this can reduce submissions to the
journal

3. The critique of the editorial review
process is applicable to all journals, and
these issues can be can addressed by
adopting a developmental approach in
relation to prospective authors

connected. In order for theory [in AMR]
to be/come critical, it is necessary to
attract more, better submissions that are
currently being directed to, and published
in, other journals.

2. The basic problem is more deep-
seated. AMR is simply not publishing
much work – heterodox, not just CMS -
that is consistent with its espoused
mission. That is the focus of my FTE. It
is the anomaly. It is the deficit.

3. Collectively, you seem to be of the
view that the problem of few heterodox
/CMS submissions can be cracked by
urging those scholars to submit their
work. Many FTEs have suggested what
prospective authors might do to make
their work more appealing, but it has not
convinced heterodox / CMS scholars. I
do not think I could add to those helpful
suggestions in any substantive way. The
problem is, I believe, primarily a
structural one, not agential. If we are to
receive more CMS submissions in
particular, then the deficit has to be
addressed, not ignored or denied.

Yes, it does apply to all journals, as I
acknowledge. I can underscore that point
if it is not made sufficiently forcefully.

I agree that a developmental approach is
highly desirable. But it requires a
correction of the anomaly as well as
heterodox / CMS material to develop.

4. As and AE proposed, the critique element of the FTE could be published in another journals

4. It could but I think that misses the key point. The critique applies to AMR as well as to other journals. And it applies to AMR in a particular kind of way because AMR is a specific kind of journal.

Space permitting, I am happy to incorporate suggestions and corrections that are consistent with the purpose of the piece – that is, highlighting an anomaly and proposing practical remedies so that AMR practice matches its policy

5. I believe that an FTE on CMS is useful and could do two constructive and significant things. First, it could inform readers by providing a practical overview of what CMS is (and what it isn't). It could explain its development, assist readers in understanding its central concepts, provide a bibliography of key readings, and offer illustrations to demonstrate its contribution. It could also enable readers to appreciate how CMS is distinctive, identify different kinds of critical scholarship and forms of discourse. Such an FTE would be beneficial not only for AMR readers and authors but for those of other journals.

5. For anyone interested, there are now many ways of learning about CMS. The Editor's suggestion of proving a bibliography covers this concern. But the piece applies to heterodox work, not just CMS, which delivers on the purpose of the journal.

6. As pointed out by an AE, your FTE can make connections and avoid "insider/outsider distinctions" and polarized camps.

6. As someone who has been on the AMR editorial board since 2003 and given, I hope, good service, the insider/outsider distinction does not work for me.

<p>7. As all the AEs commented, your FTE could incentivize CMS scholars to submit their work by debunking the understanding that the journal is unreceptive to their work – a view that may have held in the past but is no longer the case.</p>	<p>7. Here again, the assumption is that the problem is agential – unenlightened heterodox / CMS scholars who need to be told that AMR is receptive to heterodox / CMS scholarship. I think this is mistaken and potentially insulting.</p>
<p>8. The FTE could draw attention to how the editorial team includes a well-known CMS scholar as well as a number of CMS scholars on its board.</p>	<p>8. The point is made in the piece. The key point is that this has not resulted in the submission of heterodox / CMS papers.</p>
<p>9. The FTE could note that a third of the AMR board is from outside the US (nearly twice the number since 2009!) and that 10% of our board lists critical management as an area of expertise on their university websites and research expertise forms.</p>	<p>9. If this information is not included – I think it probably is – then I am happy to insert it.</p> <p>However, as I point out in the piece, the geographical location of editorial board members is not the issue.</p>
<p>10. As many CMS scholars are European, the FTE could attract submissions by providing data that challenges the assumption that Americans alone publish in the journal.</p>	<p>10. I think there is an awareness of an increasing number of articles written by academics based outside of the US. That does not mean that the content of the journal has changed.</p>
<p>11. 65% of the peer-reviewed articles published in the journal in 2015 had authors or co-authors from outside the U.S.!! There is an upward trajectory of international authorship (46% in 2012, to</p>	<p>One swallow does not make a spring. We really need to look over a longer time period.</p> <p>See response to previous point.</p> <p>11. As I point out (in italics) the issue is not geographical but intellectual (or paradigmatic, if you prefer)</p>

37% in 2013, to 59% in 2014, to 65% in 2015. There is a continuation of this trend in 2017 – which is great. Not only does AMR publish articles by non-US authors but *most of what is published in the journal is now from authors / co-authors outside the US*. This information debunks entrenched beliefs about AMR and so can stimulate submissions.

12. Our journal is keen to attract CMS submissions and we are now in a position to evaluate them. Being critical of the review process will not encourage submissions and could also reduce interest in CMS scholarship which would be undesirable. Instead of a focus the “AMR deficit”, the FTE could positively encourage CMS submissions by informing readers about CMS .

13. When at a reception at the AoM, I talked to a board member who is CMS to better understand why there are so few CMS submissions to AMR. He said that AMR is the “establishment”, and that publishing in our journal would be a “sell out”. It is only the view of one individual but it offers an alternative explanation of the paucity of CMS submissions.

14. He also said that now is the time for CMS scholars to submit their work to AMR as there is a CMS specialist as an AE and a feminist diversity scholar as Editor.

So, unfortunately, saying that “*most of what is published in the journal is now from authors / co-authors outside the US*” does not dispel “entrenched beliefs” – which, in too many cases, are not “beliefs” but experiences.

12. Yes, I agree, but it is clearly insufficient to attract heterodox/CMS submissions. That is empirically the case, not speculation!

Simply urging heterodox/ CMS scholars to submit their work is unlikely to be persuasive, in my view.

Publishing my FTE might convince them that AMR has changed, or at least is changing. I circulated the FTE to the CMS list-serve and received very positive feedback which I would be happy to share.

13. I cannot imagine who you were talking to! But if that were the case, why would I have agreed to take on the associate editorship?

Most, perhaps all, of the heterodox/CMS scholars that I know would be delighted to have the opportunity to disseminate their work through AMR.

14. I agree about this. But it simply isn’t happening, so something else needs to be done. Exhortations are unlikely to have much impact without more radical change.

15. Now is the right time but an FTE that is backward looking (i.e. CMS is never published in AMR) rather than looking to the future (i.e. we want to publish CMS work) misses a chance to make a.

16. Having a Special Topic Forum (STF) on critical theory would be a possibility. Perhaps you can pull together a team of editors for such a forum? *STF on critical theory?* It is now almost 25 years since the last one (1992), so it should be possible to make a strong case for one to the incoming editor who is to be appointed at the end of the year. I will support this strongly as it would be positive for the journal and for the field. I would also indicate the journal's support for CMS authors. It is mad that only 2 CMS submissions were received in the first year of our editorial term. How can CMS papers be published if they are not submitted? A STF would help to educate readers and reviewers about CMS scholarship and the STF would be a great sequel to the FTE as it would provide an opening for publishing CMS work. This STF can also educate our readers and reviewers and be a wonderful follow-up to the FTE. So the FTE can be a practical way to educate our readers on CMS and the STF can open the door to publication. That would be thrilling!

17. I know that Hugh wants to retain the AMR Deficit/critique section in his FTE. I hope his mind will be changed after reading the feedback from AEs. If he doesn't then wouldn't the STF be a more fruitful way to create change? If the goal is to publish more CMS work in AMR, then it would appear that the STF is the way forward! That is something

15. Of course, AMR does publish some heterodox/CMS work! In the original version of my FTE [Mark 1], I drew heavily upon some of it. But there is not very much, which is an embarrassing anomaly, given the purpose of the journal.

16. It does not address my point about the anomaly / deficit. Something more radical and transformative is required if AMR is to deliver on its espoused purpose. If AMR is to deliver on its mission to challenge conventional wisdom, then heterodox scholarship should be at the heart of AMR, not treated as a 'specialist topic'

My FTE addresses this issue and hopefully communicates that it is a matter of concern – as Art Brief attempted to do in his FTE of a long time ago.

17. He still does! It would be surprising if a heterodox /critical scholar wrote a conventional FTE.

I suppose that I was appointed as a heterodox / critical voice. I hope that my responses above will persuade you that this voice should be respected and so enabled to speak to its concerns. It is

that we can do.	unfortunate that there seems to be an expectation that it should sing from an orthodox song sheet! And that expectation seems directly at odds with the espoused purpose of AMR which is an embarrassment.
-----------------	--

Table 2	
Editor's Comments (paraphrased)	Author / AE responses (verbatim)
1. The intention of FTEs is to provide authors and reviewers with practical help	You have confirmed that there is no AMR editorial policy on FTEs except for word length. Looking at FTEs over the decades, I believe that there is no basis for claiming that FTEs are primarily, let alone exclusively, concerned with providing authors (or even reviewers) with “practical advice”. On the

	<p>AMR website there is a page that lists recent Essays on Writing Theory [http://aom.org/Publications/AMR/From-the-Editor-Essays-on-Writing-Theory.aspx]. Of the essays listed, about half (at best) are concerned with providing practical advice. The others do all kinds of things. So, as far as I can tell, you are making up FTE policy as you go along to achieve some undeclared purpose.</p>
<p>2. Your FTE communicates to the reader that there is an AMR bias against CMS scholarship.</p>	<p>2. Where do I say that? I never use the term bias, nor would I as it presumes the occupancy of an objective standpoint.</p> <p>What I say is that much of what AMR publishes is not compliant with its mission (to “challenge conventional wisdom concerning all aspects of organizations and their role in society.”) It echoes what Brief says in his 2003 FTE. It would take more space than is available in an FTE to substantiate it - unsurprisingly Brief made no attempt to do so. But, space permitting, it could be done.</p>
<p>3. Your FTE unjustly denigrates the journal. Where? In what way? And why on earth would I do that? Yes, I do argue, as others have done, that there is some distance to travel before the AMR mission is fully reflected in what is published within it. But this is not to disparage the journal but, rather, to draw attention to a deficit and call for corrective action. In addition to simply “calling”, I offer a number of practical recommendations for consideration. Or are you saying that work published in AMR invariably, or even usually, “challenges conventional wisdom...society”?</p>	<p>3. My assessment is that much of what is published rarely steps outside versions of orthodoxy. In the long run, this conservatism will be the downfall of a journal that I care about and have dedicated a lot of time to serving. Building upon yesterday’s theories to theorise yesterday’s issues (yes, it is the same point made by Barley in his ASQ piece) is not a great way to push forward the boundaries.</p>
<p>4. Are you claiming that there is a trained incapacity amongst US scholars to address big issues and/or that they fail to read or cite European journals?</p>	<p>4. Not exactly. I refer to US-<i>trained</i> authors and those <i>trained</i> within the North American management paradigm. Geography is rather irrelevant, as I stress in the FTE, and I support my point with a number of references.</p>
<p>5. Submissions to a journal cannot be controlled by editors.</p>	<p>5. I disagree. Collectively, I believe that we have an editorial responsibility to develop</p>

	<p>editorial policy and practice that attracts (heterodox) scholarship that is most congruent with the mission of the journal. I made a number of proposals about this.</p>
<p>6. You claim that the culture of AMR gives a higher value to papers written by US authors.</p>	<p>6. I noted that the vast majority of “best papers” published <i>during the period that I was considering</i> were authored by US trained scholars. My focus was explicitly upon <i>best papers</i> – which I take to mean that they are considered the best by the Panel appointed to review the annual output. The dates I chose were over a much longer time span than the one you are seemingly cherry picking to suit your undeclared purpose. Its end date coincided with when I started to prepare my unacceptable FT – which was set by your timetable. It is, in my view, unreasonable to expect me to be continuously updating the numbers as the date of publication gets pushed back. How do you defend this? When reviewing for a journal like AMJ, do you expect authors continuously to update their data when revising their drafts?</p>
<p>7. Isn't it possible for scholars trained in NAMP to appreciate and derive insights from other perspectives?</p>	<p>7. My observation is that the traffic is largely one-way. I do not see North American trained scholars citing European journals frequently, so I have no reason to believe that they are reading them. Again, it is not difficult to demonstrate this point. By the way, the journal is <i>Organization</i> not <i>Organizations</i>. I wonder if you counted the number of non-US based journal articles compared to US-based journal articles that you cited in your (2015) “Developing Our Authors” FTE (do share this data!)? How do you account for this? Is it your view that journals based elsewhere have little or nothing of value to contribute to this topic? I wonder what kind of message this sends to prospective authors.</p>
<p>8. Your proposals do not reflect the view of the journal.</p>	<p>8. If AMR is open to multiple voices and appoints its editors to appreciate and support them, as you claim in your FTE, then it would be surprising to me if there were a single, homogeneous ‘view’ of the journal. You seem to be saying that there is such a unitary view, or policy, on the issue of quotas. If so, where is it?</p>

<p>9. The mission statement of AMR did not come from a previous editor (Art Brief) or me as incorrectly stated</p>	<p>9. If you check carefully you will see that I did not ‘state’ this. I made it clear that you (and Brief) were quoting the mission statement. It would be ridiculous to ascribe a mission statement to any individual. Will you revisit your assertion that it was a ‘misrepresentation’?</p>
<p>10. Your quote from the AoM Code of Conduct is taken out of context as it refers to educators, not to scholarship.</p>	<p>10. I take the term “educators’ to encompass our activities as scholars. Do you disagree? Is scholarship somehow separated or removed from our role as educators? If not, then your suggestion that I “distorted a quote (on ethics!) to fit the aim of your argument”, and have engaged in “selective citation”, sounds a bit desperate. And your contention that we need to be exemplary when it comes to representing others might seem rather sanctimonious. As an aside, do you consider that my work has been “accurately represented’ by you?</p>
<p>11. Comparisons made between AMR and Organizations (sic) are unjust.</p>	<p>11. On what grounds?</p>
<p>12. You are still omitting data</p>	<p>12. See point 6</p>
<p>13. The committee responsible for awarding the best paper for 2015 has only one US scholar.</p>	<p>13. I too have served on that Committee on a number of occasions. If there is a good reason to include information about the composition of the Committee during the period under consideration, I am happy to include it. I make no comment on its composition because, as far as I know, historical data on membership are not available. Or are they?</p>
<p>14. The assertions that you make present do not provide a balanced view of the journal</p>	<p>14. Which assertions exactly, and why do you refer to them as assertions? And who are you identifying as the authority on what a “balanced view” is.”? To my mind, balance implies a range of views that articulate different standpoints. So I am at a bit of a loss to understand why my view does not form part of this balance.</p>
<p>15. It is important that we solicit manuscripts from CMS authors.</p>	<p>15. We do indeed! And we also, in my view, need to reflect on why they are patently not submitting their work – and, in common with other heterodox scholars are submitting and publishing it elsewhere. But, apparently, this is a “conversation” that is taboo as a topic for an FTE.</p>

References

Barley, S. (2016), '60th Anniversary Essay: Ruminations on how we became a Mystery House and how we might Get Out', **Administrative Science Quarterly**, 61,1: 1-8

Ragins, B.R. (2015), 'Editor's Comments: Developing Our Authors', **Academy of Management Review**, 40,1: 1-8

Symon, G, Cassell, C and Johnson, P (2018), 'Evaluative Practices in Qualitative Management Research: A Critical Review', **International Journal of Management Reviews**, 20 (1). pp. 134-154.

