

The Role of the Presenter:

The following are some ideas for how authors can get the audience engaged and excited about the paper. Most practices in the DON'T column are standard procedure and the suggestions may seem radical. However, the object should be a presentation that covers less but makes a compelling argument that the paper should be read.

DESCRIPTION	DO	DON'T
Purpose of Presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Present enough to tell the audience that the paper is worth a read and tell a good story.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Summarize of all sections of paper
Format & Timing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consider starting with the conclusion and then explain why you reached it.• Provide 1pg handout summarizing your contribution-key points as a takeaway.• Plan for 10 minutes - it is easier to expand than it is to cut things out.• Use fonts larger than 28 pt & no more than 10 slides.• Focus on your results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Save the punch line as a surprise ending.• Plan for 20 minutes in case there is extra time.• Use small fonts or too many overheads.• Overemphasize theory or methods.
Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Focus on what is interesting and new about what you have learned.• Try to start off with a real-world analogy/story.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Focus on why you decided to do the study.• Be too conceptual.
Audience Interaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Look people in the eye-talk to them.• Identify places for audience input.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Give a monologue describing research.
Theory	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• State the problem, why it is interesting, and what you add.• Explain what is new in this model over past contributions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Present a literature review of the area.• Explain every arrow in a complex figure.
Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provide an overview of why the measures are linked to the constructs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fully describe the sample measures, and validation of instruments.
Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Present what was significant. Explain what the data tell you.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Present a lot of tables with numbers
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Answer what we have learned and what needs to be done	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review each result and summarize what was significant.

The Role of the Discussant:

How can discussants integrate the ideas and, at the same time, encourage interaction with the audience?

- Try to identify shared constructs, linked findings, and contradictory results that emerge across papers.
- Try to identify on-going debates, themes, puzzles within the topic domain and how the group of papers contributes to them.
- DON'T do a standard stand-up 'reviewer' routine for each paper one at a time.

The Role of the Session Chair/Facilitator:

The role of Chairs/Facilitators is much more than just timekeeper. How can they organize and facilitate sessions to bring out audience participation?

In Preparation for the Session:

- Make sure every author, presenter and discussant gets copies of the papers.
- Contact the presenters in advance to make sure that they are all set for their presentations

During the Session:

- DON'T give the standard boilerplate about time, and take up too much time doing it.
- DO tell the presenters the rules before the session.
- DO start out with a few words about the subject matter of the session and how each paper will contribute toward exploring that research domain.
- Session chairs/facilitators must shut down inexperienced or unprepared presenters who do not conform to the prescribed time limits.
- Create an informal first-name atmosphere in the session to encourage discussion.

The Role of the Reviewer:

The overall quality of the Annual Meeting Program is reliance on the constructive and timely comments that the volunteer reviewers provide.

Setting the Tone of the Review:

- Please keep your comments constructive. If the problems you identify cannot be fixed, try to provide the authors with constructive ideas for how they might improve upon their submission as they develop their research. It is also important to try and identify the strengths of a manuscript to help the author(s) improve their work.
- One of the greatest services that reviewers perform is the development of the research of members who submit their work. Identify areas of weakness in a manuscript, but also provide specific guidance on how the authors might address the limitations you have noted. The more specificity you provide in your review, the more likely it is that the authors will benefit from your efforts.
- Authors deserve to be treated with respect, regardless of your evaluation of their work. Remember, you are representing the Southwest Academy of Management with your review and ultimately the Academy of Management.

Review Format:

- Provide a structured review by separating and numbering comments. Also, where appropriate, cite specific page numbers, passages, tables, and figures in your review.
- If you are uncertain about your comments in terms of some aspects of your review, please do your best to determine the accuracy of your position.
- Do not provide information in your review that reveals your identity and do not seek to discover the identity of the authors.
- A good review is typically 1 single-spaced page in length.

General Areas to Cover:

In addition to commenting on the theoretical development of a submission and the technical correctness of the methodology, you should also consider the overall value-added contribution the submission offers. Does the submission pass the so what test?

Specific Areas to Consider:

Introduction

- Is there a clear research question, with a solid motivation behind it?
- After reading the introduction, did you find yourself motivated to read further?

Theory

- Does the submission contain a well-developed and articulated theoretical framework?
- Are the core concepts of the submission clearly defined?
- Is the logic behind the hypotheses persuasive?
- Is extant literature appropriately reflected in the submission?
- Do the hypotheses or propositions logically flow from the theory?

Method (for empirical papers)

- Are the sample and variables appropriate for the hypotheses?
- Is the data collection method consistent with the analytical technique(s) applied?
- Does the study have internal and external validity?
- Are the analytical techniques appropriate and were they applied appropriately.

Results (for empirical papers)

- Are the results reported in an understandable way?
- Are there alternative explanations, and if so, are these adequately controlled for?

Contribution

- Does the submission make a value-added contribution to existing research?
- Does the submission stimulate thought or debate?
- Do the authors discuss the implications of the work for the scientific and practice community?

*These guidelines were from the OB Division Reviewer Guidelines which in turn were adapted from reviewer guidelines developed by Catherine Daily and Albert A. Cannella Jr. for the BPS Division, and for use in a BPS Professional Development Workshop on reviewing sponsored by AMR and AMJ.