

FROM THE EDITORS

Reflections on the *AMJ* Associate Editor Role

In recent years I have been requiring my EMBA students to submit an end-of-semester paper in which they convey their thoughts about what they have learned from the course. They are asked to reflect on all aspects of how they experienced the course throughout the semester and to summarize what they have learned about management and managing, about themselves, and about themselves as managers. As this column is coming due when the end of the present *AMJ* editorial team's term is in sight, the timing is appropriate to make this an opportunity to do some reflective thinking of my own and to summarize what I have learned about editing, about myself, and about myself as an editor. I am writing this column to clarify what these three years have done *to* me and *for* me as a way of distilling my self-learning. Therefore, it involves considerably more self-disclosure than is typical in "From the Editors." Voyeurs—enjoy!

However, I hope my self-focus will not be construed as self-centeredness. I am also sharing this learning with readers curious about what it is like to be an associate editor. It may help scholars who submit to journals like *AMJ* to understand the people on the other side of the editorial process. It may also help candidates for editorial roles to weigh various aspects they may not have been aware of before deciding whether to "go for it" if invited to serve. These reflections are my own and I make no claim to represent others.

Accretion of Knowledge of Theory and Method

An *AMJ* associate editor gets to read well over a hundred submissions a year, plus three reviews of each submission. Many of the authors of these manuscripts are the stars of our field, as are even more of the reviewers. Reading a submission and then the reviews gives one the opportunity to learn how other minds can look at the same material and sometimes converge and sometimes see quite different things. An outstanding *AMJ* review can read like a tutorial on how to develop theory or how to apply a particular method or type of analysis. This has happened regarding topics with which I had not previously dealt, and I learned as much as the authors from the reviewers' feedback. Of course, this kind of learning is built into the process for the

reviewers, too, as they get to read the other reviewers' feedback to authors, as well as the editor's decision letter. That is one of the major rewards of reviewing. Multiply that a hundredfold and that is the associate editor's reward. This is one factor that has made serving as an associate editor a tremendously enriching academic experience for me.

Some reviewers stand out in my mind. I learned that I could rely on certain individuals for consistently outstanding reviews. They often do what I have come to call the "heavy lifting" on manuscripts they review. Because their reviews leave little unsaid, their thorough, conscientious work relieves me of the need to serve as a fourth reviewer. Furthermore, I have come to know them more intimately from their reviews. I have learned how they think and what their reviewing styles are. It is similar to the way you can recognize a Mozart concerto or a Duke Ellington suite you have not previously heard, or a painting by Cezanne or Georgia O'Keeffe that you have not seen before, because you have learned the artist's style. I discovered years ago that the same holds for some academics' writing styles, and now I know that experienced reviewers develop unique reviewing styles, too. I went out of my way at annual meetings to get acquainted with some of those whom I had not known personally prior to being associate editor. I include getting to know these exceptional people in my list of gains.

The associate editor role would be impossible to fill without the reviewers. The greatest source of stress upon assuming the role was the threat of having to handle manuscripts in unfamiliar areas describing methods and analyses that I had not mastered. The reviewers literally saved me from my own ignorance. *AMJ*'s reviewers are worthy of the highest kudos, and I wish there were some way of recognizing their enormous contributions to the community of management researchers beyond the awards ceremony at the annual Academy meeting. Writing this is my way of saying thank you for their indispensable help to me and for their incalculable contribution to the success of the entire enterprise.

Dispelling Ignorance

Several years ago, Greg Northcraft visited the Faculty of Management at Tel Aviv University and

presented on the *AMJ* reviewing and publication process at our OB seminar. By that time, I had published many articles in top-tier journals and had done a lot of reviewing for *AMJ*, as well as for other leading journals. I should have known how the publication process worked. Still, I learned new things from Greg's presentation. Particularly enlightening was his statement, "Reviewers do not make decisions—editors do." That terse sentence states so clearly what *should* have been obvious by that time to an experienced reviewer like me, but was not. I know I am not the only one who was under the mistaken impression that each reviewer has a "vote" on whether a submission gets accepted or not. I've heard reviewers complain about editors' decisions that were contrary to their recommendations. These reviewers seemed to think such decisions were somehow illegitimate. Their view simply reflects lack of knowledge about how the process works.

Among authors, particularly new authors, I suspect the ignorance is greater. However, the wording of many an editorial decision letter does not make clear *how* the decision got made or precisely *who* made it. For example, what is an author—even an experienced one—to think when an editor explains why a revision is not being accepted thus: "Reviewer 2 is still not convinced that the analysis you conducted is the most appropriate one for the kind of data you have." Does that mean the editor will not make a positive decision until Reviewer 2 approves? Does the author have to convince Reviewer 2? Is it decision by consensus or majority vote, or might the editor decide to accept the submission despite Reviewer 2's objections?

Greg's single sentence cleared that up for me, at least so far as *AMJ*'s editorial decision process was concerned. I have since used that sentence frequently and have seen a quiet, thoughtful reaction and a subtle change in the aperture of my interlocutor's eye, both indicating new insight. Therefore, I think there are a lot of authors out there, and probably some reviewers too, who do not know important aspects of how the process works. The *AMJ* editors' practice of using the words "my decision" and "I have decided" helps authors (and reviewers) know who makes the *AMJ* editorial decisions. Hopefully, the soon-to-be-added FAQ to the *AMJ* Web site will help disseminate information about the review process. However, I doubt it will help a certain type of author, described below.

Considering how hard it is even for veteran, top-notch researchers to get work accepted in top-tier journals, one would think that authors would take pains to get the easy things right. I was astonished at the proportion of submissions that did not meet

the basic requirements of the guidelines available to all in issues of the *Journal* and on the *AMJ* Web site. Moreover, we associate editors don't even get to see the worst offenders in these matters, who are included in the editor's "desk rejections"—the 10 to 20 percent of submissions that don't make it into the review process. Of course, people who don't read the guidelines or consult the Web site are unlikely to read "From the Editors" columns like this one. Therefore, I suppose this will continue to be a problem. Nevertheless, it amazes me every time anew that persons so intelligent and highly educated undermine their own interests by ignoring such obvious, easy-to-achieve "points" in their favor. Should our doctoral training include more emphasis on "publication smarts," a parallel to the "street smarts" acquired by those educated at Life University? Obviously, many of our students need such training if they are to go on to successful academic careers.

Procedural Justice in Practice

Considering *AMJ*'s low acceptance rate, I have had astonishingly few—fewer than the number of fingers on one hand—appeals from authors questioning my editorial decisions. None of these was formal or went beyond me to the editor. One occurred early in my term, and I realized that I had blundered. After consulting with the editor and my colleagues on the editorial team, I apologized for my mistake to the author in writing and then went out of my way to find him at the next annual meeting and apologized again. (Fortunately, the harm to this scholar was minor because a different top-tier journal accepted that submission.) The three or four other authors who have written back in response to rejection seemed to be satisfied with specific answers to the specific issues and questions they had raised. They always sent their e-mails to me with empty "copies-to" fields, and I always copied the editor in my responses to signal the authors that I had brought the matter to the editor's attention. I suspected that authors might hesitate to do so fearing I might retaliate for their having gone over my head. Yet, none of the handful ever went that far, and the editor never got involved, nor was there any need for his involvement. Why not?

AMJ has institutionalized in practice the principle that Jerry Greenberg has demonstrated so convincingly in his research on organizational justice, namely, that perceptions of procedural justice depend largely on the adequacy of the explanations provided for decisions that affect individuals' interests. Herein lies one of the major payoffs for the

painstakingly detailed developmental feedback rendered by our best reviewers and in our multiple-page decision letters. Disappointed authors get a full accounting of the reasons why their work has been rejected with far greater detail than that provided by other journals. Indeed, I have been very pleasantly surprised by the numerous thank you notes sent by authors whose submissions I have rejected. Cynics may attribute this to common courtesy or even to obsequiousness, but I do not. I think these are genuinely appreciative authors. They realize that tremendous effort—heck, it's very hard work!—has gone into those meticulous reviews, as well as into making that decision and rendering that rich feedback. Thus, they see the fairness inherent in the way we do it, even if the outcome displeases them.

Silence can easily be misinterpreted as satisfaction. I have not deluded myself into thinking that every author whose submission was rejected felt justly treated and that none retained some animosity and ill-feeling toward the reviewers and associate editor. However, it is my sense that there haven't been many of these. Perhaps a sample survey of authors assessing their perceptions of the *AMJ* review process and their satisfaction with it would be a worthwhile innovation. It would open up a channel of communication to replace guessing about these matters. My educated guess is that most come away from the process feeling that procedural justice has been served. A further thought about procedural justice is that it must also help that our decisions are usually prompt, certainly relative to most other journals'.

As a long-time reviewer, I did not have that sense of obligation to intensify the authors' feelings of procedural justice. I wrote my reviews as I saw the issues and just let the cards fall where they might. Doing it the *AMJ* way was the result of socialization, first by outgoing editor Greg Northcraft, during the transition to Tom Lee's editorial team. Greg supplied me with examples of decision letters, had me serve as guest editor on a couple of submissions, and provided feedback on my first drafts of my own decision letters. Then, as the new team was getting under way, Tom Lee constituted a model of fair play and courteous, supportive, developmental letter writing that served as an inspiring example of how to "do it right," that is, the *AMJ* way. For sure, this experience has changed my reviewing style forever. It has bled into my feedback style with students. It has made me a more developmental mentor, both more developmental than I was before and more developmental than I would have become without the *AMJ* editorial experience. Maybe I'm just a bit more just, too.

Overdoing It?

On occasion, someone expresses appreciation for all the work the associate editors do. However, a couple of individuals have made me wonder whether we overdo it. One, a frequent reviewer who himself has editing experience, suggested that I could invest less time and write shorter letters. Another was a colleague who, upon hearing a realistic description of the review and editorial effort that goes into every manuscript, said in so many words that our level of effort opens the door for exploitation. Frivolous people could exploit the reviewers and editors to obtain very valuable feedback, this colleague implied, and we were suckers for letting them do it. There is some truth in these observations. However, it is a sign of how thoroughly I have been socialized into *AMJ*'s norms that I would not now think of doing it any other way. If we are sometimes exploited by people who do not deserve our efforts, so be it. An undeserving author would be one who has not done his or her very best work before submitting it to *AMJ*. I am sure most authors *have* done their best and want and need the help that the reviewers and editors can provide. That is our *raison d'être*. In a sense, we are all members of a community that practices mutual aid for the common academic weal, and some of us get called on to serve more. I was fortunate to have been on the receiving end long enough and to have done well enough that I was called upon to serve for a spell. It is a privilege to *get* feedback from *AMJ*, and it is a privilege to *give* it. Many of our reviewers express this sentiment in letters accompanying their reviews with words like, "Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review for *AMJ*." Those few words seem to say it all. We don't overdo it—we do it right.

Some Surprises

Soon after assuming the associate editor role, I had to write my first rejection letter to a highly esteemed colleague. This was a person for whom I have tremendous respect, and one who has a better record of academic accomplishment than I have. Despite the fact that the reviewers had provided plenty of justification for rejection, I was fretting over how I could get up the gumption to reject this particular scholar's submission. After days of fretting and endless rephrasing, I finally hit "Alt S," and off my missive went on its irretrievable zip through cyberspace to the soon-to-be-outraged scholar whose masterpiece I had dared reject. I walked from my study to our living room, poured myself a drink, and told Nili, my wife, to expect the

sky to fall within 11 hours (the difference across time zones). A day went by and no response came. Then another day. At the end of the third day, I poured another round of drinks and announced to Nili that I now thought I would be able to do this job after all.

With time I got used to writing such letters to authors of all ranks, seniority, and qualities of reputation. However, it never got to be carefree routine. It always involved extra care and thought and a good measure of trepidation. As associate editor I never lost sight of the fact that, for many authors, the tremendous care and effort they had put into their work was a career investment. My decision could influence whether someone got a job, a raise, tenure, or a promotion. This is one reason I'm relieved that the associate editor's term is limited to three years and that soon I shall not be making these decisions any more. Frankly, two years would have been enough. Dan Ilgen must be made out of tempered steel to have borne the responsibilities of editing *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* for as many years as he did.

And there was a different kind of surprise. On occasion a mediocre (or worse) manuscript is submitted on which a senior scholar with an outstanding record of research accomplishment appears as second or third author. I am not surprised when all the anonymous reviewers recommend rejection. I am surprised that a scholar of this caliber has lent his or her name to such substandard work. Unlike book publishers, *AMJ* does not require authors to obtain the signatures of all their coauthors prior to review or publication. This has got me wondering whether the senior scholars involved always *know* their names are on these submissions. Assuming they do know, why in the world do they agree to it? Could their judgment be so different from the reviewers' and mine? Do they encourage their students or junior colleagues to submit manuscripts as a training exercise to get that famous *AMJ* developmental feedback from our reviewers and editors? Are they playing an odds game, thinking that if they submit frequently, even substandard work may get published owing to the vagaries and capriciousness of the reviewing process? Doing this would be a pretty safe bet, because submitters remain anonymous to all except their coauthors and the action editor and therefore have little to lose. Of course, I have no way of knowing which explanation is true. This remains a mystery that I shall take with me unresolved.

The Hardest Parts of the Job

The hardest aspect of journal editing is writing so many rejection letters. Prior to accepting the ap-

pointment, I consulted several colleagues who had served as associate editors for other journals. One, a long-time friend, recommended against accepting the offer. He said he would not himself do it again because of the onerous burden of writing so many rejection letters and possibly incurring the wrath and animosity of many colleagues. For sure, this is a major consideration. I'm glad I got that advice, because it is true: writing those letters is a burden. I am also glad I did not let it deter me. Nevertheless, I pass it along with the added proviso that this job is not for everybody, and now I gladly move on to other pursuits. After a respite, I'll probably continue doing my share of reviewing when called upon, but I shall be relieved that others will be making the decisions and signing off on them.

All rejection decisions are hard. Some are harder. It is harder when the author is an *AMJ* reviewer, or even a board member who consistently submits terrific reviews. The norm of reciprocity does not apply here.

It is still harder when the author is a friend or acquaintance with whom you have shared moments at meetings, or podiums at symposia, or food and drink, and whom you truly have come to like and respect. I have always sent rejections to such friends and acquaintances with a sense of regret for having taken the job and an irrepressible tinge of a sense of betrayal. The sociologists are right: it is very difficult to maintain the primacy of secondary over primary relationships. It's the second hardest aspect of the job.

The hardest is rejecting a revision, or worse, a second revision. I have carried some of these decisions around with me for days, mulling the pros and cons over and over and debating with myself over what the right decision is. The options are clear-cut—accept or reject—but the considerations rarely are. The authors, the reviewers, and the editor have invested so much work with the expectation that a publishable manuscript will result. They have “searched for a diamond in the rough,” as Maureen Ambrose, associate editor of the previous *AMJ* editorial team, described this process in several transition conversations. The editor and reviewers think they see potential, provide rich feedback with suggestions about how to actualize that potential, encourage revision, but then do not see the potential being fulfilled after a revision or two. Realizing that the diamond just isn't there and isn't going to develop, the editor then has to write the hardest kind of letter. Sure, we comfort the authors that they have benefited from the process and that the manuscript is now much better than it was when originally submitted and should now fare

well elsewhere. Nevertheless, how could we all not be frustrated by the negative outcome?

Editorial decision making is a delicate balancing act. The agony anticipated if ultimate rejection follows a revision (or two) is dangerous; it can lead an editor to adopt a higher original revise-and-resubmit threshold, with a resulting loss of some diamonds in the rough. Deciding where that threshold is and when to cut our losses are among the inescapable editorial judgments that I find hard to make.

A corollary of the above is insight that came to me as I was ruminating over one of these difficult decisions: Not every article I accept is going to be perfect. Nay, *none* of the articles I (or anyone else) accepts will be perfect. As a new editor, I harbored concern that readers would start to ask, "What kind of stuff have they begun publishing?!" Tom's words finally sunk in: "We are not in the business of rejecting manuscripts; we are in the business of accepting the best manuscripts." The best we can do is to encourage (push?) authors to bring a manuscript to as high a level as possible and then decide whether or not it is among the best *despite its imperfections*. Reflecting on that idea, it now seems obvious. However, I had to learn it. I suppose it was the sense of responsibility for maintaining the *Journal's* high standards that made me seek perfection in the beginning. Obviously, nobody's work is perfect (not even mine!). The problem is knowing where the proper cutoff is. How good is good enough to publish? New editors have to learn that, and it takes some time.

This may mean that your chances of acceptance are greater after a new team has been in place for a while. I know some researchers who hold onto manuscripts when an editorial team is about to be replaced, thinking that their chances will be better with the new team. I have not checked the statistics on, say, quarterly fluctuations in the acceptance rate over our three-year term. I doubt the numbers would mean much unless we had an independent measure of the fluctuations in the quality of the manuscripts submitted over that time span. My educated guess is that there is a learning curve for new editors, and it is closely related to a gradually and gently increasing leniency curve during, say, the first year. After that, the leniency curve probably levels off. This conclusion may be right and it may be wrong. It may be researchable.

If, in light of the above, you are now considering rushing to submit your current work before July 1, the date when new submissions will begin to be handled by a new team just beginning the trek up its own gently rising leniency curve—*don't!* First of all, I'm speaking for myself and not for other mem-

bers of the present team; therefore, generalization to other editors and teams is risky. Moreover, nothing written above justifies extrapolation to the *end* of a team's term. I'm not sure what happens to that leniency curve in the waning months and weeks of the term, or in that twilight period after July 1, when we will still be handling manuscripts already in the pipeline (those submitted prior to that date).

A Flaw in *AMJ's* Publication Policy

Since assuming the associate editor's role, I have been troubled by what I think is a major flaw in *AMJ's* publication policy. Say you have just published a theoretical article in the *Academy of Management Review* and you embark on empirical research to test your theory. You would know not to submit a paper reporting the outcomes of that empirical investigation to *AMJ* because, under *AMJ's* current norms, the journal would reject your work for not providing a novel theoretical contribution. This policy forces innovators to go elsewhere to get such empirical research published. It also encourages the development of one-time minitheories that serve as platforms for specific submissions but are never revisited. This policy has left a trail of one-shot theories that contribute little to the field's cumulative scientific endeavor. The difficulty this policy produces is especially evident when authors try to cram both some novel theory and some empirical research into a research note. This is a policy that needs reevaluation.

In a "From the Editors" column last year, I expressed my opinion favoring publication of replication research in *AMJ*. It aroused unanimous support from my colleagues on the editorial team, and I have heard no criticism of the views I expressed there from any other source (such as, for instance, the Academy of Management Journals Committee). I believe that if replications of previously published, theory-testing research are publishable in *AMJ*, then manuscripts reporting tests of theories published in our sister journal, *AMR*, should be publishable in *AMJ* too. As it stands now, such empirical tests are unwelcome at both journals, and we and our readers are losing these valuable contributions as a consequence of policies that simply do not add up to a sensible way of handling such work. Authors of such contributions must seek outlets other than those offered by the Academy of Management.

What I have in mind for publishing "empirical research without new theory" is similar to what I recommended for replication research: it need not be based on new theory never before published, but it should have novel *implications* for theory, prob-

ably best drawn out in the Discussion section of a manuscript. In most cases, the appropriate format for such research would be a research note; the full-scale article format may be appropriate for multiple-study research on theory recently published elsewhere.

The definition of “theoretical contribution” is fuzzy. It can mean new theory. It can mean extension or elaboration of existing theory. It can mean the first test of an untested theory. It can mean early (first or second) constructive replication of a test of a theory. It can mean a meta-analysis with theoretical implications. It can be not what *drove* a study but what *emerged* from its results and gets elaborated in the Discussion. If this liberal take on *AMJ*’s requirement for “theoretical contribution” is adopted, authors would not need to devise one-time theories to justify submission to *AMJ*. Watch *AMJ*’s Web site and this column for more on this issue.

Costs

The workload of an associate editor is overwhelming. My own research came to a virtual standstill during my term. Release time from some teaching helped, but being associate editor has dominated my time and my life. I envy colleagues who can maintain an active program of research while editing. I couldn’t. I’ve been mostly away from my desk at Tel Aviv University. I am much more productive when working in my private study at home, where I don’t have to answer the phone and other intrusions unless I really want to. This has severely limited my accessibility to my students, so they have paid a price, too. Other big costs have been hobbies and recreational reading. The only area in which I have been “productive” is in ending my term with more grandchildren than I began it with, an outcome made possible only because their births were not due to the investment of my own effort and time!

The one major exception to the long list of sacrifices has been vacations. Another chum who had served as associate editor of a leading journal and with whom I consulted before accepting the job warned me about the ceaseless workload: “You may go on vacation but the journal never does.” This is true. However, from the beginning Tom encouraged us to take vacation time off and facilitated our doing so by regulating the flow of manuscripts among us accordingly. This helped immensely; without the time off for vacation relief (without laptop, e-mail, or cell phone to make sure it’s really “off”), the endless flow of manuscripts

and reviews would certainly have been still harder to bear.

Gains

Besides the gains in knowledge and acquaintanceship summarized above, I have reaped other gains from being associate editor. I was surprised by my emotional reaction upon seeing, after many months of work, the first of the articles I had accepted appear in print in *AMJ*. I hope I don’t sound patronizing when I admit that it felt like the pride one gets in seeing a protégé’s accomplishment. I suppose that is natural because we actually do mentor many authors. The personal payoff is that, as editor, I also get a sense of accomplishment from seeing “my” authors’ articles published.

Tom’s invitation to join the team as an associate editor came as a total surprise. I never dreamed I would be offered such a position. It reminded me of my initial shock-response to having been accepted into the doctoral program in psychology at the University of Michigan: *They must have made a mistake!* Over the next several days it gradually sunk in that I had been called to the flag, that a great professional honor had been bestowed on me, that I was being enlisted for three years of very demanding service, that it would be irresponsible to my career and to my university to refuse the invitation, and that I might be underqualified for the job. Stress researchers call the latter feeling *subjective qualitative overload*. It was clear that accepting would entail dedicating most of my time and sacrificing my freedom to decide how to use that time for over three years. Worse, there was the danger that lapses of knowledge and errors of judgment could bring me to ruinous failure. Now that my term as associate editor is more than two-thirds over, and my worst-case scenario has not materialized, I do have a sense of accomplishment from having served the community. I think I have gained more than enough from having filled this role to compensate for the sacrifices it required. The biggest gain may be the boon to my academic self-efficacy. Experiencing editorial “enactive attainment” (as Bandura dubbed it) has strengthened my belief in my academic faculties.

Soon enough, I will be looking back at my time as an associate editor and gaining greater perspective. At that point, I expect that what Terry Mitchell calls the “rosy view” will kick in and I will reminisce about these three years retrospectively in more positive terms than I can summon up right now. The weight of several submissions with three completed reviews waiting for my decisions and a long, long pipeline with about three dozen manu-

scripts out awaiting their third reviews postpone my experiencing any celebratory relief. In short, I do not feel the time is right, or that I am ripe, to make a proper accounting of all the gains accrued from having served as associate editor. Also, it is hard to envisage a return to my previous academic life.

Some Thank You's

I'll keep it short and simple and leave out the sentimentality: working with Tom, Don, Sara, and Marshall has been pleasing and enriching. Tom has a subtle leadership style that I appreciate more and more as I get to know him better. His influence is quiet, steady, and deeply penetrating. He works his magic through a combination of clear, declarative statement, understatement, and silent example. How to describe what it is about him that awakens the willingness to work very hard "for him"? He never explicitly demands this hard work; rather, he commands it in ways of which I am not fully cognizant. To invoke a metaphor originated by my colleague Dalia Etzion, Tom penetrates below your radar detection capability. I also learned a lot from each of my fellow associate editors, none of whom I knew personally three years ago. I hope to maintain collegial and friendship relations with them all as we resume our other lives.

One of us will not soon be resuming a normal

life. Sara Rynes has been chosen to continue on as editor. Her appointment was a brilliant decision by the Journals Committee. Looking to the immediate future of the *Academy of Management Journal*, the major challenge I see facing Sara is to make an excellent journal even better. The torch is being passed to the hands of an exquisitely competent and dedicated scholar who will shepherd *AMJ* into the future with skill and imagination. Sara's unique combination of tough-mindedness and warm-heartedness has touched me deeply, and I know she will be a great editor.

The support of my successive deans, Shmuel Kandel and Shimon Benninga, was not easy for them to give, considering our university's budgetary difficulties, and it has been greatly appreciated. I could not have done this job without the help of Ariella Zucker, my able, resourceful, and dedicated secretary and editorial assistant. Finally, my wife, Nili, sacrificed a lot of time that we should have been spending together while I was closeted in my study for endless hours, days, weeks, and months for three years. My staunchest supporter, she ate too many dinners alone and spent too many weekends without me. It will be delightful to get back to the life we love sharing.

Dov Eden
Tel Aviv

Copyright of Academy of Management Journal is the property of Academy of Management and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.