

HOW TO PUBLISH AND NOT PERISH

A short guide for Phd students and new academics on getting your research into the right journal

Professor Adrian Wilkinson
Director, Centre for Work, Organisation and Wellbeing
Griffith Business School
Griffith University
170 Kessels Rd, Nathan campus
Queensland 4111, Australia
Email: Adrian.Wilkinson@griffith.edu.au

Introduction

In recent times 'publish or perish' has become the motto of academia. Appointment, tenure and promotion have become disproportionately dependent on achieving publication. Various national-level developments, such as the successive Research Assessment Exercises in Britain, New Zealand, Hong Kong and Australia, have sought to evaluate the research contribution of different departments/ groups. The rise of league tables for universities also put the pressure on research performance. The monetary and/ or status reward for achievement in this field has added fierce pressure on academics: they must juggle a variety of teaching, administrative and research commitments in order to publish well and to publish quickly and often. This is not entirely a new phenomenon. To a large extent the American system has long promoted a 'publish and perish' philosophy, and other countries have also begun to tread a similar route. So, publication becomes an individual as well as collective necessity (Berridge and Wilkinson 1999).

According to Oscar Wilde, *the only thing to do with good advice is to pass it on: it is never any use to oneself*. Whilst this author is conscious of not always having followed the processes of the advice provided in this article, following Wilde's dictum however and writing from the perspectives of having written (and had rejected) a wide array of papers over the years, and having acted variously as editor, critic, advisor, hander-out of tissues, editorial board member, Dean of Research, and referee, I hope this paper can provide some basic insights into the process.

Selecting where to publish

In many respects, research and publication is very much the international exchange currency of the academic world. Whilst most academics claim to be

effective teachers (and can provide student evaluation to support such claims), and few would admit to administrative incompetence, publication is the main area where individuals tend to be compared in terms of the quality and quantity of their record. Quality is the modern game: a heavy raft of potboiler work in lowly regarded journals is no compensation for work of high quality, published in the household name journals of a specific field or discipline (although that does not mean that non-big name journals do not publish work of high quality).

It is important to note that there are different publication patterns in different fields, so one needs to be clear on the reference points of the specific field. While many management scholars have turned to writing journal articles rather than books, in some fields the scholarly book remains very important, especially in the arts and social sciences where a monograph is the standard reference point.

Of course in this small essay we are assuming that you have a well-designed and interesting article that you want to report. You need to analyse the field or fields in which your article falls. Who will be interested in reading your work? Where do you wish to have an impact? As well as getting the right community, it is important to target a *good home* for your work. So you need to research the most suitable place to send your work: see where the key players publish and speak to senior research colleagues. Refereed journals are the gold standard today in the academic world, although these may not be read by practitioners or policy people – to reach that audience and reduce the impact gap where academic research does not influence the real world, requires a mixed dissemination strategy but that is another paper.....!

Your work will survive longer and have more chance of being known and cited if published in major journals. You have spent a lot of time – or years if it is a PhD – on your research and it would be a shame if it was not read because it was published in a journal which few in your field consult. But even among journals which double-blind referee all submissions, there is much variation in their status – since there is now a near-universal trend toward refereeing. As they say, all journals are refereed but some are more refereed than others. Within your field, there is often a recognised pecking-order, usually but not always, reflected in the journal ranking lists available (for business and management see www.Harzing.com, [The Association of Business School's \(ABS\) International Guide to Academic Journal Quality list](#) (UK), and the [Australian Business Deans Council \(ABDC\) list](#) for examples).

Beware too of list fetishism (Willmott 2011). Slavishly using a list does not make sense. As Willmott points out, lists can also stifle diversity and constrict scholarly innovation with the formation of a monoculture which is preoccupied with shoehorning research into a form, prized by elite, US-oriented journals.

But you also need to be aware of the research realities where you are. It is important to remember that promotion and recruitment panels are often staffed by non-discipline experts who use proxy measures of quality – they are unlikely to read the work and even if they did, would struggle to gauge the merit; hence journal lists are widely used.

The notion of lists being used is sometimes regarded with horror, but the old model of assessment often used volume alone as the overall gauge of success. There is a growing interest in measurement, but the keenness of universities to measure and evaluate is not matched by good measures in the arts and social sciences (notwithstanding the proliferation of G- and H-indexes used to evaluate research).

It is important to see your work in a broader perspective. There is a tendency for people too close to their work only to see its relevance in a narrow way. Remember that Albert Hirschman studied Nigerian railways and *why the Nigerian railways had performed so poorly in the face of competition from trucks*. His work was consequently not published in the Journal of Nigerian railways (*I am not sure that there is one...*), but as a book. His ideas, based on a model of 'exit voice' and 'loyalty', was influential in the social sciences with the interplay of the three concepts illuminating a wide range of economical, social and political phenomena from unions, schools, communism and so on.

More recently, Bunderson and Thompson (2009) studied the work of zookeepers in the USA but their work was not published in the International Journal of Zookeeping (*I'm not sure there is one of these either!*), but in the leading management journal *Administration Science Quarterly*. Using qualitative data from interviews, they developed hypotheses about the relationship between individuals and their work. The calling of zookeeping was a double-edged sword – both a source of transcendent meaning, identity and significance as well as of unbending duty, sacrifice and vigilance. While this model of work as a calling might not apply to all, they suggest it would apply in not-for-profit settings, public interest settings, or settings that require unique skills and economic sacrifices for a perceived public benefit, such as the arts, education, healthcare, the military, social welfare and public service.

It is worthwhile keeping an eye and ear out for new trends. A new editor can, for instance, be working hard to push up the standing of a journal. Long established journals can become complacent with tired editors and fall down the ranks. Equally, journal fashions can change with new editorial teams who may have a particular agenda. You should try to target the best journal which is realistic for your work. This will not always be an A* (4*) top ranked journal. But don't fool yourself in your selection of a journal when asking if this is the best place for your paper. Research carefully the internal characteristics of the

potential target journals for your article. It is worth reading several times, the journal's 'notes for contributors' or 'editorial policy'. Look for coded expressions which will give you a hint as to whether your article would suit. Also, talk to those with experience. Espoused editorial policy may not be the same as what happens in practice. It is important to research the journal – don't just rely on ranking lists and journal titles which can lead you to some odd outcomes: *The Journal of Human Resources*, a leading US journal, is not a management journal and does not consider management or personnel research; it publishes in the field of economics.

There are some internal clues which you can use interpretively in anticipating the reception which your article will receive at the referees' hands. Are all articles refereed largely, or solely among the Editorial Advisory Board (EAB) members? If the latter, you may be able to predict their preferences and prejudices. Is a list of referees published annually, say in the last issue of the year? Check the submission, revision and acceptance dates, if these are given on the articles: the overall pattern of revision and the delay times between these dates and the date of publication will give you an estimation of the severity of refereeing. A final point over refereeing which may influence your submission tactics is whether the process in a given journal is author-friendly or not. Since your article statistically is likely to be required to undergo revisions, this aspect is important. Most journals give full verbatim reports from referees, and the editor will offer advice on the best way forward in making revisions. Others may send enigmatic unhelpful statements, or even two contradictory referees' reports without any guidance. Again talking to academic colleagues who have published, reviewed, or been rejected for the journal is helpful. If you are to be rejected it is better to be rejected *quickly*...

Writing the article

Having identified the journal – and it is helpful to write for a specific journal rather than write a paper and think about a journal later – define carefully what subject you are trying to tackle in the article. Identify the central theme, and purposively eliminate extraneous detail, confusing or unnecessary themes, or discussion which clouds the central issue. Do not try to achieve too much in one article. Serious television programmes are said to treat only four or five topics in half an hour – even with the benefit of visual as well as verbal impact. If your readers spend an hour on your article, often you can only do yourself justice on one or two themes. If you are tackling a big issue or debate, that number of themes will probably be all you can focus on in one article. If it is a specialised point, you will need to concentrate closely in demonstrating its relevance. Most articles by inexperienced writers (and some by experienced authors) contain far too many themes. As a consequence, their articles can lack critical focus, or quality of development of any one theme. This is where

getting others to read your work is critical. Too many papers have dirty windows (Fulmer 2012) and the valuable findings are hidden amongst a 'hodge podge' of other material such that it is difficult to discern the distinctive value of your message.

Having a target journal will help you frame your paper. See what it has published in the last few years. See if you can find an angle for your piece. Maybe a recent paper has suggested we need more papers on topic Y, or there needs to be more work done in a particular context. Perhaps other authors, or the editor, are suggesting that the area needs more work from a particular theoretical perspective. You can join the journal 'conversation' by answering this call. Editors like pieces which fit with current debates within their journal, as it can take a debate further and help increase citations. If your paper is on a topic on which the journal has published several papers, make sure you show why yours is different AND significant by engaging with those papers.

At the very least you need to add a wrinkle to existing research. The main question an editor will ask is, "How does your paper make a contribution"? In other words, what is new in your work which will advance the field? Another way of thinking about this is identifying a gap in the literature or coming up with findings that are new or surprising. A theoretical dimension is important especially for leading journals and you need to USE theory not simply lean on it like a drunk on a lamp post.

Editors and referees are unimpressed by papers which ignore work published on the same topic in their journal. It is also worth remembering that someone who has written on the same topic is very likely to be a referee for your paper. They are likely to be seriously unimpressed if you have ignored their work and are now in the position of having to make a judgment on your paper.

Writing an article jointly with others can be enriching collaboration. Alternatively, it can be the end of a beautiful friendship. Writing an article is a potentially stressful and emotionally-taxing experience. Previously-agreed rules will never solve all problems, but they help greatly in avoiding disagreements. Take measures to agree on the following:

- Who is to be responsible for which parts of the work?
- What is the time schedule, and what steps are to be taken if slippage occurs?
- How are disagreements to be resolved?
- How are authors' names to be listed on the paper? Alphabetically, in relation to the extent of contribution, by seniority?

- Who is going to decide the future shape of your paper; negotiate and agree changes with the editor; communicate progress to all authors; proof read, etc.

If you are a PhD student, you should lead the papers and if possible, try and get at least one sole authored paper: it is your work, so don't feel obliged to put your supervisors' names on it. Equally, the publishing world is tough and you may think it is sensible to draw upon your supervisors' greater experience in these matters; again, there are different traditions in different disciplines.

If you are going to have an academic career you want to develop a reputation in specific areas so you become known for something. Being in a specific area also means you are spread a little less thinly. It thus becomes clearer what conferences you should go to and what networks you should build. If you do end up with a few projects, it is good to show that there is an intellectual coherence.

Do not rewrite and rewrite your paper forever. The journalistic maxim 'publish and be damned' becomes for academics, 'submit and be hopeful'. At some stage, the extent of improvement on each rewrite becomes less and less. Indeed you may well start to lose your original clarity of purpose. The changes you make may become so minor that they will have little or no effect on the quality of your article or the editorial decision whether to publish. The referees and the editor may want to address other matters altogether, and they may pull you away from your original message. Often, informed people who are not experts on the subject of the article are very useful readers who can help you clarify the arguments of the article. You can get too close to the subject and outsiders can have a sharper perspective on readability.

But you also need the very best expert criticism which you can get. Obtain comments from well-intentioned and analytical colleagues, seminar presentations and widely-published authors in your circle of friends and acquaintances. Don't be shy – it is much better to get constructive feedback from supportive colleagues early in the piece, than hide your work and get it butchered by reviewers who don't know you, especially if many of the problems could have been dealt with if you had been aware of them. Take your work and present it at internal seminars and then conferences, and at each stage take the opportunity to polish your paper.

Finally, you should not forget to provide signposts and landmarks for readers. Your abstract is key here: write it with care, picking out the article's themes and their treatment with clinical precision. Write the introduction to the article simply and logically, laying out the objectives and plan of exposition of the article in an accessible, attractive manner which grasps the attention, and

explains what is novel about your work and gives the key take away message. You are not writing a detective story with twists and a surprise murderer identified at the end: you need to set out your story from the start! Editors' desk-reject (that is, reject without sending out to referees) a good number of papers based on what they see in the first few pages. They also allocate referees (usually 2-3) on the basis of their initial scan, so make sure your abstract is spot on. Equally, you will know some editors' bad habits of reading the conclusion first: your conclusion should summarise lucidly – not looking desperate or exhausted with the effort of completing the article! The title is important too for if your paper is published, how will prospective readers find it? Make it easy for them.

After submission, ensure you receive an acknowledgment from the journal. Papers do get lost in the email and post. There are many sad stories of authors waiting months for reviews and upon contacting the journal, find that it was never received. Once your paper has been safely acknowledged as received, make a note as to the likely turnaround time. Most journals advertise this – often three months from submission to first review. If you have not heard from the journal by their advertised time, contact them to check (politely) where your paper is up to in the process. At the very least, this triggers a review of the status of your paper and may prompt the editor to send reminders. The best journals are often quick (in academic terms) with feedback, although are also more likely to require several rounds of refereeing and much more extensive rework. Remember never to submit to more than one journal at a time. Doing so is a no-no which will get you blacklisted.

Receiving comments on your paper

Having cast your bread upon the waters, you need to be in a philosophical mood when you receive comments from referees and the editor's letter.

The four main possible outcomes are:

- desk rejected;
- rejected after review;
- revise and resubmit (with minor or major revisions); or
- accepted.

Acceptance without review is very rare, and acceptance after a first review is not very common either. It is normal in all good quality journals for there to be extra work which needs to be done (or issues addressed) before your article is accepted for publication. Try to see this outcome as a constructive and positive challenge (the glass is half-full) , not a put-down. If you are operating at a high level, rejection is normal and a request to revise and resubmit is a VERY good outcome. Again, speak to colleagues with more experience. It is wrong to think

that the impressive long list of publications of Professor X has come without too much sweat. You may well find a story of pain and profanity behind the success, and many papers have had a long tour of duty before finding a good home – often not the same home as the one they were originally submitted to: rejection is normal, and even the best scholars experience this. As a general rule, if your work is not getting rejected, you are either a genius or you are not aiming high enough.

As an aside, if you have only had experience with conferences, the journal game is different, and much tougher. As a general rule, conferences aim to be inclusive: their model is to allow more papers which brings in the money and also to be homes for those developing their work and gaining experience. A single round of reviews is all that usually takes place. Journals are much more hard-nosed with many boasting of high reject rates – over 90% and several gruelling rounds of reviews, such that you can be in the system for two years before your paper is accepted/ rejected. In fact, it may be another further year before it appears in print after acceptance, although many journals are now making accepted papers available on the web prior to getting into print.

The refereeing process is hard work. As Rousseeuw (1991) notes:

“It is a commonly known and a constant source of frustration that even well-known refereed journals contain a large fraction of bad articles which are boring, repetitive, incorrect, redundant, and harmful to science in general. What is perhaps even worse, the same journals also stubbornly reject some brilliant and insightful articles (i.e., your own) for no good reason” (p. 41).

If your paper is rejected, you may need to come to a judgement about how far you wish to incorporate comments of the editor/ referees before you send it to another journal. This depends on how far you see these as generally valid comments, or whether you see them as specific to the particular journal you sent it to. It is not unknown to send an unrevised manuscript to a different journal which has a much more positive view, OR comes up with a completely different list of criticisms (there are elements of luck in the whole process). This is when you need the advice of more experienced colleagues. Some journals have horrendous rejection rates which may not indicate demerit in articles, but simply a shortage of space. Many of the rejections could validly merit publication elsewhere in reputable academic journals.

However, it is a risky practice, not to mention a little arrogant, to simply ignore all the referee comments and just roll the dice again. First, scholars have taken the time to read your work and give you feedback – is it really sensible to ignore that advice? Second, there is a reasonable chance that even if you send your paper to a different journal, it will find the at least one of the same referees. They will be *very, very, very* unimpressed that you have ignored the

work they have put in to help you improve your paper. Bill Starbuck (2006) formulated a famous golden rule that “**no reviewer is ever wrong**”! What he meant by this was not the reviewers are perfect - far from it - as he notes reviewers’ comments can reveal their ignorance or stupidity and some can appear to be arrogant, disrespectful, and even downright nasty (p. 97). Some reviews can seem like longer versions of Wolfgang Pauli’s comment – That is not right it is not even wrong.

But what Starbuck meant by this apparent absurdity was to draw attention to a more fundamental truth: that every editor and every reviewer is a sample from the population of potential readers.

Indeed, a reviewer may have read the manuscript more carefully than most readers read published articles, and nearly every reviewer reads through an entire manuscript instead of giving up in disgust or boredom after a few pages. My golden rule reminds me to look upon reviewers’ comments not as judgments about the value of my research or the quality of my writing, but as data about how readers might react to my manuscripts. If a reviewer interprets one of my statements in a different way than I intended, other readers, possibly many other readers, are likely to interpret this statement differently than I intended; so I should revise the statement to make such misinterpretations less likely. If a reviewer thinks that I made a methodological error, other readers, possibly many of them, are likely to think that I made this error; so I should revise my manuscript to explain why my methodology is appropriate. If a reviewer recommends that I cite literature that I deem irrelevant, other readers are likely to think that this literature is relevant; so I should explain why it is irrelevant.

In general, I should attend very carefully to the thoughts of anyone who may have read my words carefully. These are much more realistic data than the polite but superficial comments of close colleagues who may have read my manuscript hastily and who do not want to hurt my feelings. Good data about readers’ reactions are valuable and they can never be ‘wrong’. My golden rule does not assert that I should always follow reviewers’ advice. Absolutely not! Their advice derives from their interpretations of what they thought I was trying to say, which may not be what I actually intended to say (Starbuck 2006, pp. 98-99).

If the editor’s decision is encouraging, but requiring revisions, there is a skill to reading between the lines of the editor’s letter. Are there relatively minor revisions which need to be done, perhaps acknowledging the points of the referee(s)? Are quite substantial changes required? Or is a fundamental re-write of the paper effectively being demanded, which may essentially change

the original argument? With regard to the latter, you may feel that a different paper is being demanded and it is within your rights to correspond or talk with the editor over this. Editors are not always terribly specific (sometimes acting as postmen with a set of reviews) and may ask you merely to address the comments (perhaps varied and possibly contradictory!) of the referees. In such an instance you may wish to attend to all the points raised by Referee A but only points 1-7 of Referee B, say, arguing that points 8 and 9 are beyond the scope of this particular paper. You should write a full account to the editor of what you have done (or not done) and explain your rationale. It is best to write a note which goes through each point of all the referees AND the directions from the editor. It may not make sense for you to incorporate every single suggestion/ comment, but you must explain this to the editor. This will also help if, as usually happens, the manuscript is sent to the same referees again and they then make an additional list of suggestions! Most referees are positively intentioned, and react fairly to a list of the author's responses but they expect you to treat their comments seriously. Referees are not paid for reviewing and don't get much credit within their own university. They are doing it as an act of professional courtesy. Simply ignoring them is not a good idea, nor is a brief note which tells them you have attended to all the comments without explaining in your letter how this has been done. Letters of response often run to a few pages. Again, ask experienced colleagues to show you some examples of the letters you can receive and the type of responses expected; but be prepared to put in a lot of work, possibly over some months, on a revision.

It may take several rounds, but hopefully your paper is eventually accepted by your target journal. If not, one must not lose heart. You may need to go back to step one and rethink the most appropriate place to send your paper, the most effective emphasis to give it, or the quality of its argument and exposition. Here, you need the advice of experienced colleagues to support and guide you. But persistence is one of the main qualities that you need in the academic publishing world.

Conclusion

The purpose of this short paper is to shed some light on what can sometimes appear a rather uncertain world to an outsider. Moreover, we are emphasising that having spent perhaps several years researching a topic or issue, it pays also to put in some research on publication, and to develop a strategy as to its possible outlets. This does not guarantee publication. Death, taxes and rejections are the only certainties in academic life. Clearly, the substantive content of your research is important! We are assuming you have something original and different to say. However, a calculative approach may shift the odds in your favour. The gambling analogy is deliberate. There is an element

of lottery (or type 2 errors) in the publishing 'game'. Hopefully, the approach suggested should enable you to make the most of what you have written about your research, and in which you have invested so much time and psychic energy.

Bibliography

- Agre, P. 2002, *Networking on the Network: A Guide to Professional Skills for PhD Students*, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Adler, N. & Harzing, A-W. 2009, 'When knowledge wins: transcending the sense and nonsense of academic rankings', *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, vol. 8, pp. 72-95.
- Altman, Y. & Baruch, Y. 2008, 'Strategies for revising and resubmitting papers to refereed journals', *British Journal of Management*, vol. 19, pp. 89-101.
- Anguinis, H., Suárez-González, I., Lannelongue, G. & Joo, H. 2012, 'Scholarly impact revisited', *Academy of Management Perspectives*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 105 -132.
- Ashkanasy, N.M. 2007, 'Playing the citations game', *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 28, no. 6, pp. 643-814.
- Barley, S.R. 2006, 'When I write my masterpiece: thoughts on what makes a paper interesting', *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 16-20.
- Barush, Y., Sullivan, S.E. & Schepmyer, H.N. (eds) 2006, *Winning Reviews: A Guide for Evaluating Scholarly Writing*, Palgrave-Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Bedeian, A.G. 2003, 'The manuscript review process: the proper roles of authors, referees and editors', *Journal of Management Inquiry*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 331-339.
- Berridge, J. & Wilkinson, A. 1999, 'Publishing not perishing? A short guide to getting your research into the right journal', *The New Academic*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 16-20.
- Bedeian, A.G. 2004, 'Peer review and the social construction of knowledge in the management discipline', *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, vol. 3, pp. 198-216.
- Bland, C.J., Center, B.A., Finstad, D.A., Risbey, K.R. & Staples, J.G. 2005, 'A theoretical, practical, predictive model of faculty and department research productivity', *Academic Medicine*, vol. 80, pp. 225-237.
- Bodemer, N. & Ruggeri, A. 2012, 'Finding a good research question, in theory', *Science*, vol. 335, 23 March.
- Boyer, E. 1990, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco.
- Bunderson, J. & Thompson, J. 2009, 'The call of the wild', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, March, vol. 54, no.1, pp. 32-57.

- Bryman, A. 2006, 'Integrating quantitative and qualitative research: how is it done?', *Qualitative Research*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 97-113.
- Cassell, C. & Symon, G. 2012, *Qualitative organizational research: core methods and current challenges*, Sage, Los Angeles.
- Clark, T., & Wright, M. 2007, 'Reviewing journal rankings and revisiting peer reviews: editorial perspectives', *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 44, pp. 612–621.
- Conford, F.M. 1949, *Microcosmo-Graphia Academia: Being a Guide For the Young Academic Politician*, Bowes and Bowes, London.
- Daft, R.L. 1995, 'Why I recommend that your manuscript be rejected and what you can do about it', in L.L. Cummings & P.J. Frost (eds) *Publishing in the Organizational Sciences*, 2nd edn, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 164-182.
- Fulmer, I.S. 2012, 'Editors comments: The craft of writing theory articles – variety and similarity in *AMR*', *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 327-331.
- Gephart Jr., R.P. 2004, 'Qualitative research and the *Academy of Management Journal*', *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 454-462.
- Goshal, S. 2005, 'Bad management theories are destroying good practices' *Academy of Management Learning and Teaching*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 75-91.
- Hambrick, D. 2007, 'The field of management's devotion to theory: too much of a good thing', *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 1346-1352.
- Hirsch, J. E. 2005, 'An index to quantify an individual's scientific research output', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, vol. 102, no. 46, pp.16569-16572.
- Macdonald, S. & Kam, J. 2007, 'Ring-a-ring o' roses: quality journals gamesmanship in management studies', *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 44, pp. 640–655.
- Norrissa, M. & Oppenheim, C. 2007, 'Comparing alternatives to the Web of Science for coverage of the social sciences' literature', *Journal of Informetrics*, vol. 1, pp. 161–169.
- Podsakoff, P., MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, N. P. & Bachrach, D. G. 2008, 'Scholarly influence in the field of management: a bibliometric analysis of the determinants of university and author impact in the management literature in the past quarter century', *Journal of Management*, vol. 34, no. 4, available at <http://jom.sagepub.com/content/34/4/641.full.pdf+html>.
- Pratt, M.G. 2008, 'From the Editors: for the lack of a boilerplate: tips on writing up and reviewing qualitative research', *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 52, pp. 856-862.
- Public Policy Group, LSE 2011, *Maximizing the Impact of your Research: a Handbook for Social Scientists*, Consultation draft 3. LSE Public Policy

Group, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, UK,
available at
[http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/35758/1/Handbook_PDF_for_the_LSE_impact_b
log_April_2011.pdf](http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/35758/1/Handbook_PDF_for_the_LSE_impact_blog_April_2011.pdf).

Rousseuw, P. J. 1991, 'Why the wrong papers get published', *Chance: New Directions for Statistics and Computing*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 41–43.

Starbuck, W.H. 2005, 'How much better are the most prestigious journals? The statistics of academic publication', *Organisation Science*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 180-200.

Starbuck, W.H. 2006, *The Production of Knowledge: the Challenge of Social Science Research*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Stremersch, S., Verniers, I. & Verhoef, P.C. 2006, 'The quest for citations: drivers of article impact', ERIM Report Series Reference No. ERS-2006-061-MKT (Working Papers Series), available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1290950>.

Willmott, H. 2011, 'Listing perilously', *Organization*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 447-448.