Management and Organization Review
Editorial Statement and Reviewing Policies

EDITORIAL STATEMENT

Management and Organization Review (MOR) aims to be the premier journal for advancing indigenous management and organization research in China and all other transforming economies. MOR is a multidisciplinary journal rooted in the behavioral, social, and economic sciences underlying management research, broadly defined. MOR seeks to publish research from diverse social science disciplines, including international business, organizational behavior, organization theory, social psychology, sociology, cultural anthropology, political science, economics, strategic management, economic geography, development studies, innovation theories, public administration, urban planning, cross-cultural studies, and cognitive science.

The editors recognize that new insights emerge at the intersection of established theories and research methods. They also realize that many of the established theories were developed in western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic societies. Therefore, MOR aspires to attract manuscripts that complement such established theories with indigenous data and indigenous theories. Such papers must justify and discuss the contextual, cultural, and institutional applicability of testing established theories in the context of China or other transforming economies. MOR welcomes comparative studies in which comparison to advanced economies highlights unique indigenous aspects of transforming economies. MOR also seeks papers that observe actual indigenous phenomena and involve abductive reasoning and new insights to arrive at a novel understanding of phenomena that are new to the literature and contextually relevant to China or to other transforming economies. Papers published in MOR can focus on all types of organizations, such as firms, academic, educational, and cultural institutions, not-for-profits, governmental and nongovernmental organizations, and state-owned enterprises.

MOR is open to diverse and rigorously executed research methodologies, including qualitative research, surveys, archival and historical analyses, content analysis, laboratory and field experiments, simulations, and computational methods, as well as papers that synthesize or translate theories and empirical research that make research accessible to scholars outside disciplinary subfields.

When considering papers submitted to MOR, the Editors consider the following questions:

1. Is the paper intended for MOR (e.g., literature review is embedded in discourse related to MOR and shows understanding of up-to-date research published in MOR)?
2. Does it fall within the domain of MOR (e.g., contextually specific to China or other transforming economies)?
3. Is it forward looking? Does it offer fresh insights? Does it break new ground? Does it elucidate indigenous management theories outside disciplinary subfields?
4. Does the empirical analysis and methods satisfy rigorous requirements for scientific research, for example falsifiability, data transparency and replication criteria? One of the strengths of MOR is the methodological diversity of the journal, but different methods have different quality

mechanisms. For example, for historical methods replication is not relevant – traceability of evidence is.

Types of Submissions

Perspective papers. To enrich scholarly discourse and promote theoretical innovation, MOR will occasionally publish perspective papers that direct attention to new important phenomena or that redirect or shut down a line of research. The Editor-in-Chief oversees the review of perspective papers. Accepted perspective papers may be followed by one or more invited commentaries.

Dialogue, Debate, and Discussion. The goal of the Dialogue, Debate, and Discussion editorial area is to attract discourse that breaks ground at the crossroad of disciplinary exchanges on related topics, revisit past debates, and highlight important current issues in management and globalization. It features essays and interviews designed to stimulate and engage vibrant Dialogue, Debate, and Discussion between management scholars and practitioners.

Preapproved and preregistered study. MOR offers preapproval for studies, drawing on the model of registered reports in the natural and social sciences. Such practices advance science, so we wish to encourage them. For additional information, please see the 'Instructions for preapproval and preregistration'.

REVIEWING POLICIES

The MOR editorial team is committed to seeking the jewel in each submitted manuscript. They will engage the author(s) in a developmental process to feature the paper's ideas and findings. MOR invites authors to nominate the Senior Editor that best matches the domain of the paper submitted for consideration by MOR. In addition, MOR encourages authors to nominate up to four ad-hoc reviewers who are knowledgeable in the domain of their paper and do not have a conflict interest with the author(s) (e.g., family member, on same faculty, co-author, faculty supervisor, etc.).

The purpose of the reviewing policies is to ensure that research published in MOR satisfies falsifiability, data transparency, and replication criteria. For a comprehensive discussion of these goals, see Lewin et al. (2016) [doi: 10.1017/mor.2016.43]. In addition, MOR is a signatory to the Transparency and Openness Promotion (TOP) guidelines, which were adopted by over 850 scientific journals (Nosek et al., 2015).

Summary of MOR Reviewing Policies

- Hypothesis testing is not obligatory.
- Exploratory empirical tests in the pretext of hypothesis testing (HARKING) will be rejected.
- Statistical analysis must report and discuss positive, negative, or null findings *and* effect size.

- Post-hoc analysis is permitted if labeled as such for the purpose of exploring relationships that were not originally hypothesized.
- Avoid cutoff points for statistical significance. Report coefficient estimates and exact *p*-values or standard errors. Summary asterisks are acceptable as long as the actual *p*-values are reported.
- It is a requirement to report and confirm all data manipulations, all measures (variables), and all data exclusions (see https://osf.io/project/hadz3), including analyses of outliers.
- The MOR Special Issue on 'Doing Qualitative Research in Emerging Markets' establishes the new bar for evaluating qualitative studies.
- Before accepted papers are published in MOR, authors must deposit relevant materials and data, as specified by accepting editor, on the Open Science Framework (see https://osf.io/).

The guidelines that follow delineate the underlying principles of the MOR peer-review process:

1. Hypothesis testing is not a prerequisite. MOR welcomes papers that avoid framing research in the guise of hypothesis testing. MOR encourages, and will consider, exploratory research meant to identify and describe the phenomena of interest. However, hypothesis testing is appropriate when research involves confirmatory research or replications meant to test hypotheses generated from theory or reported in prior research.

2. The context of every paper published in MOR must be that of transforming economies (e.g., China, India, Latin America, Africa, and Eastern Europe, Russia and former Soviet Republics). Whenever appropriate, contextual studies in transforming economies should consider comparative implications for Chinese management research.

3. Empirical studies must motivate every research question by framing it within the extant literature. The objective is to convey the puzzle in the literature, a puzzle that the manuscript aims to solve (or at least elucidate). The literature review underlying the theory development should serve as a mini review and must demonstrate that the author is interpreting implications of cited papers. The discussion of empirical papers must convey summary conclusions about the empirical findings – including discussion of effect size in prior findings. If the cited paper does not report effect size, the literature review should draw appropriate implications. The empirical plan for investigating the focal research question and the discussion of the data for the study follows the theory development section.

4. MOR requires that statistical analyses present and discuss all findings including null findings. Report coefficient estimates alongside exact p-values. Arbitrary cutoff points (asterisks *) of significance should not be reported or referred to.

5. Authors are required to provide readers with a reasonable sense of how strongly an independent variable affects the dependent variable by including an explicit discussion of the effect size (extent of explained variance) and discuss alternative theoretical explanations. Comprehensive discussion of findings including competing or alternative theoretical explanations is foundational for advancing understanding and knowledge creation.

6. MOR encourages post-hoc analysis but expect authors to clearly distinguish between such analysis and exploratory hypothesis testing. Hypothesizing after results are known (HARKing) is an unacceptable practice that undermines rigorous scientific effort. When justified appropriately, post-hoc analysis can be important in exploring and testing hypotheses and new research questions that were not originally considered but that emerge from new insights during the analysis (e.g., because of unexpected null results, negative findings, or analysis of outlier data points).

7. Data, Research Materials, and Analytic Code. During the review process authors may be asked to provide the Senior Editor and reviewers with access to data and research materials (e.g., survey instruments, field notes), or analytic code (e.g., variable definitions, transformations, statistical procedures). These will be kept confidential, just like a submitted manuscript. Authors who foresee difficulty in complying with this policy must disclose it at the time of submission. The Open Science Framework allows authors to share instruments and data during the review process without compromising anonymity. (See https://help.osf.io/hc/en-us/articles/360019930333-Create-a-View-only-Link-for-a-Project)

Once an empirical paper or qualitative study has been accepted for publication in MOR, authors must deposit raw data, instruments (questionnaires, experimental materials, etc.), and statistical code/logs. This requirement satisfies Open Science transparency and allows scholars to replicate and extend them. Hazhir Rahmandad and Michael Shayne Gary (2020) provide a good example. See how they use a supplement to describe the instruments minutia (https://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/suppl/10.1287/orsc.2020.1405/suppl_file/orsc.2020.1405.sm1.pdf) and how they provide the materials necessary for replication (https://osf.io/mvr7t/?view_only=117340a36db54e54957921816fa59a0a).

MOR recognizes data, research materials, or analytic code as original intellectual contributions, which deserve recognition. All data, materials, or analytic code must be appropriately cited. Specifically, references for data sets and program code should include a persistent identifier, such as a Digital Object Identifier (DOI). Persistent identifiers, which ensure future access to published digital objects, are assigned to data sets by digital archives. For instance, authors who deposit their data or research materials with the Open Science Framework receive a DOI.

8. Qualitative studies. MOR encourages the submission of qualitative studies. Such studies must be clear about the research question of interest, methods, such as examination of archival

documents, interviews, informants, triangulation, and alternative or competing explanations for observed phenomena. Senior Editors knowledgeable with the requirements and nuances of qualitative studies will guide the review process of such papers.

9. Replication. Publishing replication studies or null findings is foundational for building cumulative knowledge about any phenomenon. MOR encourages the submission of replication studies using the same data or new data. Replication studies must be identified at the time of submission prior to the assignment of a Senior Editor who will guide the review of the paper. A replication paper must provide enough detail of the purpose of the replication and the importance and relevance of the findings, compared with those of the original study. Replication studies will undergo double-blind review, just like non-replication studies.

10. Authors are encouraged to review the standards available for many research applications from http://www.equator-network.org/ and use those that are relevant for the reported research applications.

11. Recognition of authors who share materials, data, and/or preregister their studies. 'If I have seen further, it is by standing on the shoulders of giants', wrote Isaac Newton. MOR recognizes that science is a collective effort (Lewin et al., 2016). Scholars build on the efforts of their predecessors and contemporaries: refining theories, testing predictions, and honing instruments. Benefiting from others' work requires access to it. That is why the scientific currency is a peer-reviewed publication – making one's work publicly available. Yet any journal article has length limitations, so it necessarily omits some information that may be useful for those who wish to build on its author's research. Because of the current replication crisis in the social sciences, in which the validity of much published research is questionable, fuller disclosure can bolster the public confidence in validity of empirical social science and renew trust in scientific findings. MOR recognizes authors' who deposited relevant materials in Open Science Framework (OSF) with badges that recognize exemplary scientific practices: openly sharing data, research materials, or preregistering the study. The badges will be featured prominently in the published article. Authors should request a unique Digital Object Identifier (DOI) for their data or research materials, so that they can be cited independently of the article.

Such badges, based on the principles of the Open Science Framework, have been introduced in similarly leading journals in other disciplines, such as the *Strategic Management Journal*, *Psychological Science*, and the *American Journal of Political Science*.

Open materials. We grant an Open Materials badge to authors who deposit their research materials in the Open Science Framework (OSF), which will also assign a DOI to the materials, so that they can be cited. The deposited materials should be as complete as possible, to allow an independent researcher to reproduce the reported methodology. Depending on the methodology, materials may include statistical code, questionnaires, interview questions, experimental procedures, and participant instructions (but not data). The criteria for Open Materials are here: https://osf.io/gc2g8/

Open data. Separately, we grant an Open Data badge to authors who deposit their data (and statistical code, if necessary) in such an open-access repository. Authors can satisfy this

requirement by depositing their entire dataset or by depositing a slice of it, as long as it allows an independent researcher to reproduce the reported results. If confidentiality is sought, authors may deposit a transformed dataset, as long as it allows reproduction of the reported results (Reiter, 2002). Depending on the methodology, deposited data may include quantitative and qualitative materials, but may not compromise the anonymity of participants or undermine promises of confidentiality. Often, it is easy to remove such identifying information from the dataset while preserving the ability of an independent researcher to reproduce the results. But if access to such identifying information is necessary to reproduce the reported results, then authors are not eligible for an open data badge.

If the data are statistical, authors are expected to deposit the code necessary to generate the results. Once the data and the code are available, authors may, but are not required to, assist others in using the deposited materials. Open Science Framework (OSF) will assign a DOI to the data, so that they can be cited. The criteria for Open Data are here: https://osf.io/g6u5k/

REFERENCES

Lewin, A. Y., Chiu, C.-Y., Fey, C. F., Levine, S. S., McDermott, G., Murmann, J. P., & Tsang, E. W. K. 2016. The critique of empirical social science: New policies at management and organization review. ***Management and Organization Review***, 12(4): 649–658.

Nosek, B. A., Alter, G., Banks, G. C., Borsboom, D., Bowman, S. D., Breckler, S. J., & Yarkoni, T. 2015. Promoting an open research culture. ***Science***, 348(6242), 1422– 1425. doi: 10.1126/science.aab2374

Reiter, J. P. 2002. Protecting confidentiality by releasing synthetic microdata. Technical Report, Institute of Statistics and Decision Sciences, Duke University.