
Gustavson School of Business

Faculty Publications

This is a post-print version of the following article:

Management policy and practice: a guide to writing for AMP

Roy Suddaby, William S. Schulze, Geoffrey Wood, Gideon Markman and Libby Weber

2023

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.0/>

The final publication is available at:

<https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2023.0283>

Citation for this paper:

Suddaby, R., Schultz, W. S., Wood, G., & Markman, G. (2023). Management policy and practice: a guide to writing for AMP. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 37(4), 287-390. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2023.0283>

Management Practice and Policy: A Guide to Writing for AMP

Roy Suddaby

University of Victoria, Washington State University, University of Liverpool, IAE

William S. Schultze

University of Utah

Geoffrey Wood

Western University

Gideon Markman

Colorado State University, USA
Audencia Business School, France
Gent University, Belgium

Libby Weber

University of California Irvine

Recently the *Academy of Management Perspectives* (AMP) issued a new mission statement to clarify the type of submissions that constitute an appropriate submission to this journal. The new mission statement confirms two important changes to the type of papers AMP will publish. First, AMP will publish papers that contribute to management practice and policy. Second, while AMP used to publish only conceptual papers, we are now interested in both conceptual and empirical papers, provided that they are evidence based and contribute to our understanding of management practice and/or policy.

The revised mission extends AMP's long-standing interest in publishing papers with 'real-world' impact. However, it now offers a clearer definition of the identity of the journal as well as a broader definition of the audiences with whom we seek to achieve our impact. The purpose of this From the Editors (FTE) is to elaborate the revised mission statement to help authors and reviewers understand the new mission of the journal. More specifically, we seek to offer a clear definition of what constitutes a contribution to management practice **and/or** policy and describe the type of papers that are most likely to achieve this standard.

We do so in three ways. First, in order to understand the motivation for the revised mission, we describe the historical evolution of the identity and mission of AMP. Second, in order to better understand 'real-world' impact and what a contribution to management practice and policy is, we review the collective wisdom of an esteemed group of Academy scholars who contributed to an Academy of Management Journal (AMJ) Special Forum on *Public Policy and the Public Interest: What if we Mattered More?* Finally, we distill those comments into a summary statement of the attributes of papers that are most likely to meet the standard of a contribution to management practice and policy.

The Core Mission of AMP

The mission of AMP has *always* been to serve as a bridge between academia and practice. The original name of AMP was the Academy of Management Executive (AME). The inaugural editor, W.

Warner Burke (1987: 5), declared that AME would disseminate rigorous academic research to “those who attempt to improve and manage organizations” and serve as a bridge “between what is *known* and what is *applied*”. Burke acknowledged that this aspiration of mediating the boundary between foundational and applied scholarship was challenging. Merging these two worlds, Burke noted, is “awkward to describe and explain”. Despite this, he noted, the mission “feels right”.

We agree with Editor Burke. The original mission of AME still “feels right” and the restated mission of AMP effectively echoes Burke’s aspiration. The ambition of this journal remains to serve as a bridge between academic research and management practice and policy. What *has* changed is the scope of stakeholders to whom we wish to speak. Instead of narrowly focusing on executives, AMP now seeks to take the theory and empirics produced in the Academy and make it relevant to “educators and their students, business writers, consultants, executives, policy makers, and other practitioners seeking innovative, evidence-based approaches for addressing timely and important management issues” (AMP, 2023).

This is a very broad mandate that embraces Ed Freeman’s (1984: 46) expansive definition of business stakeholders to include “any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of an organization’s objectives. AMP’s mandate, quite rightly, speaks to a broad and diverse audience. However, it is a mandate worthy of a journal with an impact factor of 8.9, a journal ranking of #31 in the category of Management and #26 in the category of Business, and a journal with a long history of communicating management research and theory to a broad audience of academics, practitioners, and policymakers.

We also agree with Editor Burke’s observation that bridging academic research and management policy and practice is difficult to describe. Despite the historical success of AMP, we still hear occasional expressions of confusion about the identity and the mission of the journal from authors and reviewers. The new mission statement seeks to address these concerns. However, a careful reading of this statement will quickly demonstrate that the essence of Burke’s original mission has not changed:

“The mission of the Academy of Management Perspectives (AMP) is to inform current and future “thought leaders” who, through their leadership, teaching, consulting, and/or other professional activities have the potential to influence management practice and policy”

AMP continues its role as a bridge between academic research and our various stakeholders, very broadly defined, who might use our research for *management practice and policy*.

We add emphasis to the latter part of this sentence because it appears that the confusion expressed by some is less with the core mission of the journal and more with the lack of clarity of what “management practice and policy” actually means. We commiserate with those confused by this term. As we demonstrate below, management policy was once a fundamental topic in management scholarship. Over time, however, policy has fallen into disuse in business research. In order to understand the mission of AMP, it is important to understand how and why the word policy disappeared from our scholarly discourse. More critically, we need to reacquaint ourselves with the construct of policy and return it to a position of central importance in the Academy and, more particularly, in this journal.

A Short History of Management Practice and Policy

The phrase managerial practice and policy has its roots in a famous review of US business schools commissioned by the Ford Foundation and conducted by two prominent economists, Robert Aaron Gordon and James Edwin Howell in 1959. The Gordon-Howell Report (1959) decried the lack of scientific rigor and theory in business schools. Too much management education, they observed, came from anecdotal evidence drawn from the somewhat limited experience of former and current business executives. To correct this, the authors recommended that business schools adopt a course on *business policy* as a capstone of the core curriculum. The course should draw from scientific research on effective administrative and managerial practices and give students “an opportunity to pull together what they have learned in the separate business fields and utilize this knowledge in the analysis of complex business problems” (Gordon & Howell, 1959, as cited in Trivedi, 2019: 6).

The template for this recommendation was a long-standing course titled Business Policy at Harvard Business School created in 1911 with a focus on how internal rules, management principles and standard operating procedures in some organizations created a competitive advantage based on efficiency and effectiveness in decision-making (Porter, 1980). Notably, the scope of the term policy, in its original formulation, was very broad and incorporated topic areas that would, today, be considered quite “micro” in orientation, including decision-making, human resource practices, micropolitics, and the management of groups and teams (Narayanan & Fahey, 1982; Casio, 2019). That definition of policy eschewed the somewhat artificial disciplinary distinctions between macro and micro used today. The core intent of the course on policy was the need to introduce evidence-based research into management education and research. Gordon and Howell’s recommendation quickly took hold and disseminated rapidly across business schools around the world. By the 1960s, capstone courses on Business Policy quickly dominated the landscape of management education.

Research on Business Policy quickly followed. Older members of the Academy will recall that when the Strategic Management Division Interest Group (STR) of the Academy began in 1971, its original name was Business Policy and Planning (BPP). The name held for nearly two decades. In 1993, the name changed to Business Policy and Strategy (BPS). It was only in 2017 that strategic management scholars erased the words “business policy” from the title of the division. Throughout this time, the term “business policy” was intentionally expansive and referred to a broad range of management principles and decision-making practices within organizations that included everything from resource allocation to implementing decisions and principles of organizing (Buchanan & O’Connell, 2006).

The decision to remove policy from research and teaching strategic management inspired considerable debate when it first occurred (See Schendel & Hatton, 1972; Bower, 1982), and is an ongoing discussion in the Academy. In 1994, the President of the Academy of Management, Don Hambrick, revisited the logic of abandoning policy in management research in his presidential address titled “What if the

Academy of Management Actually Mattered?” Hambrick decried the lack of relevance of much of our research. He (1994: 13) observed that “[e]ach August, we come to talk with each other; during the rest of the year we read each others' papers in our journals and write our own papers so that we may, in turn, have an audience the following August: an incestuous, closed loop”. Hambrick pointed to AME (AMP’s predecessor), as an opportunity to reinstate the relevance of management theory and research beyond the Academy by generating knowledge that contributes to practice and policy.

Despite Hambrick’s admonition, more than a decade later a group of Academy scholars reminded us of the lack of managerial policy and practice in our scholarship. In an editors’ Special Forum of the *Academy of Management Journal*, several leading scholars agreed that bringing management theory to bear on public, social and managerial policy will benefit society because management offers a unique perspective on social policy, insights that differ from the perspective of other disciplines most closely associated with public administration and policy, particularly law and economics.¹ The scholars also agreed that embracing the relevance and practical application of management research will not compromise our scholarship but, rather, will ultimately improve both the rigor and the relevance of our research.

What Managerial Policy and Practice Is

We reviewed the contents of the AMJ Special Forum with a view to distill the collective wisdom of the experts, and to articulate a clear statement of what management policy and practice means from the perspective of business scholarship. Our review reveals three key attributes of management research that contributes to management practice and policy. Such research is:

1. Motivated by *Phenomena* rather than a gap in theory. An ideal AMP paper is motivated by real world problems.
2. *Pragmatic* in intent, with a focus on providing evidence-based insights and solutions to real world problems, and,

3. is *Precise* in presentation, written in an accessible format that is transparently clear and understandable by an intelligent but non-expert reader.

We elaborate each of these essential characteristics and demonstrate how they contribute to an ideal AMP submission. Taken together, AMP papers should analyze challenges faced by organizational stakeholders, and offer them insights about the merits of the alternative forward facing paths they might take.

Phenomenal

Business scholars tend to motivate their research by identifying a gap in existing theory. This is particularly true of our top empirical and theoretical journals such as AMJ and AMR. While this approach has been very successful in advancing theory, it has also contributed to our lack of engagement with the world of practice. Using a gap in theory to structure our research creates two critical limitations in our scholarship.

First, it reduces the novelty of our research. By prioritizing existing theory, we become increasingly retrospective in our research orientation. Research motivated by filling a gap in theory may advance the original theory, but motivates researchers to view phenomena through a theoretical microscope, as opposed to the more telescopic view revealed when we examine a new phenomena that defies or contradicts existing theories. Gap spotting also encourages researchers to force empirical observations of phenomena into pre-existing categories. This logic works well for traditional science that analyzes universal, ontologically objective, stable phenomena – i.e. physicists who study the nature of matter. However, it does not work so well for social science, where the phenomena we study change over time due to a shifting environmental and competitive conditions, and the actors we study – managers, investors, customers, employees – change their behavior with shifts in the environment and in response to the knowledge that we produce. Privileging theory over careful observation of applied phenomena makes it harder for researchers to discover new theories (Suddaby, Hardy & Huy, 2011) that will enable us to engage with practice and policy.

Second, gap spotting makes us introspective. When we try to fill gaps in existing theory, we tend to focus on convenient empirics that illustrate the theoretical point we are trying to make. Too often, we chose

an empirical site because it offers easy access to rich data, or it provides the perfect illustration of the nuanced gap in theory that we have identified. As a result, our empirical contexts often reflect the somewhat privileged life that most management scholars experience – we study wine and whiskey, obscure (but trendy) topics, and various ways to get rich. However, as Joan Pearce (2005) observes, we do not see a lot of research on how we might eradicate poverty. Nor, as Mary Ann Glynow (2005) points out, do we see much research on how businesses treat the most marginalized members of society. We also tend to overlook the negative social consequences of business practices that emphasize efficiency over employee well-being or profit over social and environmental consequences. Management practice and policy demands that we pursue research driven by real-world problems instead of by a need “to satisfy our institutional reward systems and move us along the career ladder” (D’Aunno, 2005: 951).

AMP eschews gap spotting in both empirical research and theory. While motivating our research by gaps in existing theory does advance scientific knowledge in terms of empirical and theoretical rigor, if left unchecked, it can encourage academics to ignore important phenomena in the world. More critically, it encourages research that achieves statistical significance but has little impact on practice or the challenges facing society. AMP, by contrast, encourages scholarship that is significant both in a statistical sense and in a practical sense. An ideal AMP paper, thus, is one that is motivated by a phenomenon of importance to economic, organizational, social, or political processes.

Pragmatic

An ideal AMP paper creates *useful knowledge*. Useful knowledge *may* have immediate application, or prescribe solutions to complex problems, but this is not always the case. Studies of government policymakers show that the major use of social research “is not the application of specific data to specific decisions. Rather, government decision makers tend to use research indirectly, as a source of ideas, information and orientations to the world. Although the process is not easily discernible, over time it may have profound effects on policy. Even research that challenges current values and political feasibility is judged useful by decision makers”

(Weiss, 1977: 531). Thus, the utility of knowledge also depends on the quality of insights it may eventually generate, rather than the mere quality of the solutions it offers.

This, more enlightened understanding of useful knowledge is what we aspire to achieve at AMP. Our definition of useful research draws from a long history of pragmatism in the social sciences, most notably that of John Dewey who felt that the value of the facts produced in research depends largely on their practical consequences. Facts do not derive their value from statistical significance, but rather from their practical significance. Dewey's pragmatic maxim inspired a movement in social theory and philosophy that emphasizes embracing our research subjects as active participants in knowledge production rather than distant objects of study (Farjoun et al, 2015).

The expert panel of contributors to the AMJ Special Forum on policy also advocate for adopting a more pragmatic perspective in management research if we want to contribute to management practice and policy. Vanessa Urch Druskat advocates for action research, studies that occur as a partnership between researchers, subjects, and practitioners in a research design that brings together active experimentation with ongoing reflection and analysis as the best means of producing useful research. Martha Feldman, similarly, suggests that scholars must “enact” their research, pointing to William Ouchi's revolutionary project that so effectively demonstrated the pernicious effects of bureaucracy in US public education. Both Karl Weick (2005) and Andrew Pettigrew (2005) spoke in favor of enactment and the value of “learning by doing” in academic research, a phrase that traces directly back to Dewey's pragmatic maxim.

AMP encourages papers that adopt a philosophy of enlightened pragmatism. We seek papers that generate *useful* knowledge – studies that may not offer specific answers to immediate and narrow questions, but provide readers with evidence-based logics, concepts and perspectives that will spark new ways of understanding management practices and policies. Useful knowledge can appear in different forms. Typically, management research generates both theoretical knowledge, such as appears in the Academy of Management Review, and empirical knowledge such as appears in the Academy of Management Journal, and Discoveries.

All three journals publish articles that aspire to make a contribution to theory. AMP is interested in publishing papers that make a contribution to business practices and/or policy. Indeed, our core test of the pragmatic maxim in our evaluation of manuscripts is not whether a submission contributes to theory, but rather on whether a submission contributes to management practice or policy. An ideal AMP submission, therefore, is one that leverages insights gained from existing academic research that can help our readers to unpack complex organizational and social challenges, or that reframes taken-for-granted assumptions about management practice and policy (Markman & Wood, 2022). Exemplars of this type of publication in AMP include Pfeffer (1995) and DeNisi and Kluger (2000).

Precise

An ideal AMP paper should use language that is precise and free of jargon. One of the biggest obstacles to accessibility of our research is that we write in a coded language that often only our academic colleagues understand. If we want our knowledge to be useful, we must write in language and a format that an intelligent non-scholar can readily grasp. This does not mean that we should ‘dumb-down’ the content of our theory, methods or empirics. Nor does it mean that we abandon questions that are critical to our disciplines. What it does mean is that AMP authors must prepare their submissions using language and terminology that are accessible to AMP’s intended audiences. As a result, complex constructs must be unpacked, methods must be transparent, and the paper should express in detail the implications of theory or results.

There are many examples of academic journals with articles that express complex ideas crisply, succinctly and precisely with little loss of nuance, detail, or intellectual gravitas. *Harvard Business Review*, *Science*, and *Foreign Affairs* are three prominent examples of journals that have cultivated broad audiences with well-crafted articles that suffer little loss of precision. Clear concise prose has become a requirement in many of our related professions. The legal profession was an early adopter of the “plain language” movement dedicated to removing jargon, archaic Latin phrases and other forms of legalese from contracts, commercial

forms and even judicial decisions (Adler, 2012). There is no reason that we, as representatives of the management profession, should not aspire to do the same.

Simple language, when used with precision, can express complex ideas without jargon or terms of art. Precise language creates fewer errors in interpretation, it is more persuasive, but perhaps most importantly, it is more accessible and democratic in that broader swaths of society can read and understand our research. If we can communicate with precision, our ideas are more likely to travel and to be useful. An ideal AMP submission must be accessible to the motivated and intelligent, but non-expert, reader without compromising precision in meaning.

What an AMP Paper is, and what it is not

The lessons from of AMJ's Special Forum provide ample clarity on an exemplary AMP submission. It should be:

- Motivated by a significant Phenomenon,
- Pragmatic in theory, method and research question,
- Precise and accessible to multiple audiences.

Ultimately, an exemplary submission will create useful knowledge, knowledge with the potential to contribute to managerial practice or policy. Reviewers will assess papers within this broad framework, which, at its core, adopts an understanding of the unique nature of knowledge in our profession. Different professions have different *knowledge mandates* (Halliday, 1985). Medicine and engineering are professions based on a mandate of scientific knowledge, which uses objective data to describe the world the way it is. Law has a normative knowledge mandate, which describes the world the way it ought to be.

Business, however, is a syncretic profession that combines both ways of knowing. Our research is scientific and rests on empirical evidence. However, critics of management research observe that we have abandoned our professional commitment to normative knowledge (Ghoshal, 2005; Khurana, 2007; Bennis & O'Toole, 2005). As a result, much of our research is statistically significant, but lacks practical significance

or meaning (Mintzberg, 2004). Absent a normative basis to our knowledge, we abdicate our ability and our authority to speak to policy advisors, government officials and that broad category of stakeholders engaged in management and organization. An ideal AMP paper, therefore, is one that uses scientific knowledge and theory – i.e. our ability to understand the world the way it is – to reclaim our normative knowledge mandate and to make suggestions about the way the world might be.

This means that an exemplary AMP article is neither an essay nor an opinion piece. Essays privileges normative knowledge over evidence, while opinion pieces are by design purposively provocative, political or partisan. Opinion pieces also tend to lack both evidence and normative authority. The ideal AMP submission seeks to achieve our status as a syncretic profession by balancing our commitment to both scientifically generated objective knowledge and using that knowledge to make reasoned, thoughtful arguments about how we can use that knowledge for the betterment of humanity.

The careful reader will note that a typical AMP submission will share the basic structure of an article in AMR or AMJ. That is, we will consider both conceptual and empirical submissions. However, it will have a different emphasis. This will be most apparent in the implications section of an AMP paper. In AMR and AMJ, the implications section is, typically quite small and often provided as an afterthought at the end of the paper. In AMP the implications for management research and policy is THE central component of an AMP article. In contrast to AMR or AMJ, where the test is to provide a contribution to theory, the test of a successful AMP article is whether your theory or empirical research offers a contribution to management practice or policy. As such, the implications of your theory or argument for practice and policy in AMP should comprise a significant proportion of your submission, perhaps comprising a quarter or a third of your paper.

AMP has always published conceptual papers. The new mission, however, clarifies the type of conceptual paper that will meet the ideal standard for AMP. The critical distinction is that, while AMR publishes theoretical papers – i.e., papers that make a contribution to theory – AMP will publish conceptual

papers – i.e. papers that make a contribution to practice or policy. The terms theoretical and conceptual are often used interchangeably in management scholarship. This is incorrect. The terms are not synonyms and there is a long history of scholarship that explains how these terms are distinct, both in the social sciences (Imenda, 2014; Gilson & Goldberg, 2015; Cropanzo, 2009; Cresswell, 2003; Weick, 1989; Becker, 1988) and in other disciplines (Varpio, 2020; Rocco & Plakhotnik, 2009; Rocco, Plakhotnik & Silberman, 2022).

The distinction between theoretical papers and conceptual papers is clearly articulated. Theory papers describe “a set of interrelated constructs (concepts), definitions, and propositions that present a systematic view of phenomena by specifying relations among variables, with the purpose of explaining and predicting the phenomena.” (Kerlinger, 1979: 9). Conceptual papers, by contrast, “need not propose new theory at the construct level (Cropanzo, 2009), but rather they seek to bridge existing theories in interesting ways, link work across disciplines, provide multi-level insights and broaden the scope of our thinking”.

According to Jaakkola (2020), conceptual papers achieve the bridging role in four distinct ways and, therefore, reflect four different types of conceptual papers. First, some conceptual papers serve a *translation* function. They may translate existing empirical work into applications for practice. Or, they may infer policy implications out of a cluster of theory and empirical papers. In either case they are translating empirical and theoretical work into a conceptual framework that can be accessed and used by the reader.

Second, some conceptual papers may serve a *synthesizing* function. That is, they may take a series of prior theoretical articles or empirical studies and organize the findings into a figure, a diagram or some form of model that helps the interested but uninitiated reader grasp the essence of the prior research in an easily accessible way. Third, some conceptual papers serve an adaptation function. This type of conceptual paper can adapt findings from one domain (i.e. finance) to make it adaptable to another (government regulation). Alternatively, an adaptation paper can take findings from one level of analysis (i.e. micro-behavioral studies conducted at the individual level of analysis) and adapt them to another level of analysis (societal, organizational).

Finally, some conceptual papers serve a *differentiating* function. This form of conceptual paper typically uses empirical evidence or logic to demonstrate how some theories (i.e. agency theory, behavioral theory) may not translate well to certain empirical contexts or may not work in some practice or policy contexts. Typologies, often, provide an effective conceptual framework for differentiation because they distill complex empirical or theoretical arguments into easily digestible axis of differentiation (Fiss, 2011). Conceptual papers that focus on differences, thus, are very effective mechanisms for summarizing and communicating highly abstract theoretical claims or nuanced empirical findings to audiences interested in applying this knowledge.

AMP now publishes empirical research. Empirical articles may rely on qualitative or quantitative data, or on primary and secondary data sources, and are subject to the usual criterion employed when evaluating such research in other journals like AMJ or AMD. However, the nature of the research question, and the form of its presentation to readers, differs. Specifically, the empirical research we seek will explore the topics and questions described above—that is, it will address research questions that are significant, important, and pragmatic in character. As an example, articles that rely on empirical research to explore the efficacy and intended (and unintended) consequences of management practice and policy are welcome. Articles motivated by theoretical gaps are not.

Moreover, articles should present empirical material in a manner that is accessible to the intelligent motivated non-expert reader and free of the jargon, terminology, and complex language and logics that populates our research literatures. Our standards for evaluation of the quality of empirical research remains intact. As a result, authors may find it useful to submit conventional sample, methods, results, and robustness test sections as a *supplement* to their submission. When appropriate, AMP will publish these materials as an online supplement to the accepted article.

AMP will use empirical research to complement, support, and enrich the narrative offered by the author about the problem or phenomena they explore, as opposed to comprising the central contribution of

the study. Authors might also use case studies to illustrate and inform the issues and conclusions offered. Meanwhile, empirical studies can use empirical referents to identify attributes of the focal population—e.g., who is, and is not, vulnerable to the problems discussed—and describe the mechanisms and causal forces influencing them. *In short, AMP encourages evidence informed submissions with implications for management practice and policy.*

Many examples of the type of article AMP seeks appear in Table I, which lists highly cited articles from the journal. As the list illustrates, the application of rigorous research to applied management practice and policy has led to the publication of an astonishing range of very well received (and well-cited) research. Further, most of these articles either incorporate qualitative or empirical data or draw from existing empirical research. AMP's new mission thus builds on its heritage as a premier outlet for applied managerial research.

Insert Table I About Here

Conclusion

There is a growing clamour for increased relevance in management research. Our accreditation agencies are increasingly looking for measures of real-world impact in our research engagement (Cooper et al, 2014). Our Deans and business school critics, similarly, have a long history of asking for more evidence of impact in the communities we serve. Even our journals are beginning to categorize research publications by their contribution to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (Sianes et al, 2021). Yet, as any academic engaging in applied research is well aware, practice-orientated work is challenging to get placed in leading journals; academics are compelled to generate more 'useful' research, but doing so may ironically make it harder to meet institutional and systemic expectations of research excellence. That is why AMP is an ideal venue to address these concerns.

As we have demonstrated in this FTE, AMP is a journal intended to address the syncretic knowledge mandate of our profession by bridging the well established gap between management research and managerial

practice and policy. Sycreticism is a Greek term that means to bridge, to mix together or to interpenetrate different ways of knowing the world (Stewart & Shaw, 1994). Syncreticism is a term also used to capture the process of change that inevitably occurs when competing ways of understanding the world and different means of constructing that understanding of the world are combined. As such AMP provides a space for reconciling the gap between the varied stakeholders who use management knowledge. We welcome submissions that seek to fulfill the new mission of AMP.

To summarize, **What does AMP publish?** *We publish evidence-informed papers with implications for management practice and policy.* **What do we mean by management practice and policy?** *Management practice refers to research that addresses real-world issues with actionable outcomes. Policy refers to actionable decisions and principles that guide the behavior or governance of individuals, groups, organizations or societies.* **Why should you publish in AMP?** Two reasons: first, *you can economize on your research by refocusing or repurposing prior studies with an intent to elaborate their managerial policy or practice implications.* Second, *you can create higher impact for your research by speaking in a genre more accessible to multiple media and broader audiences.*

Our hope is that the renewed mission of AMP will encourage your submissions and that this editorial provides you with the information and context necessary to make your submission a success.

Table I: AMP's Highly Cited Papers

Author	Year	Title	Category
G Hofstede	1993	Cultural constraints in management theories	Academic
JB Barney	1995	Looking inside for competitive advantage	Practice
TH Cox & S Blake	1991	Managing cultural diversity	Practice
SA Kirkpatrick & EA Locke	1991	Leadership: do traits matter?	Practice
DW De Long & L Fahey	2000	Diagnosing cultural barriers to knowledge management	Practice
F Luthans	2002	Positive organizational behavior	Practice
CA O'Reilly III & ML Tushman	2013	Organizational ambidexterity: Past, present and future	Academic
SL Hart & MB Milstein	2003	Creating sustainable value	Practice
ML Barnett	2006	The keystone advantage: ecosystems and innovation	Practice
J Lorsch & J Young	1990	Pawns or potentates: The reality of corporate boards	Practice
DT Hall	1996	Protean careers of the 21st century	Practice
GT Savage, TW Nix & CJ Whitehead	1991	Strategies for assessing and managing stakeholders	Practice
PA Dacin, MT Dacin & M Matear	2010	Social entrepreneurship: Why we don't need a new theory	Academic
R Cropanzano & DE Bowen	2007	The management of organizational justice	Practice
RA Baron	2006	Opportunity recognition as pattern recognition	Academic
G Yukl	2012	Effective leadership behavior	Practice
MW Peng, SL Sun, & B Pinkham	2009	The institution-based view as a third leg for a strategy tripod	Practice
AM Townsend & SM DeMarie	1998	Virtual teams: Technology and the workplace of the future	Practice
MA Hitt, BW Keats & SM DeMarie	1998	Navigating in the new competitive landscape	Practice
WF Cascio	1993	Downsizing: What do we know? What have we learned?	Practice
DJ Teece	1994	The foundations of enterprise performance	Practice
G Robinson & K Dechant	1997	Building a business case for diversity	Practice
T Cox Jr	1991	The multicultural organization	Practice
J Pfeffer	1995	Sustainable competitive advantage through people	Practice
CG Brush, PG Greene & MM Hart	2001	From idea to advantage: The entrepreneurial challenge	Practice

References

- AMP [Academy of Management Perspectives] (2023). Mission Statement. Accessed online on 2023-09-27 at https://www.google.com/search?q=academy+of+management+perspectives+mission+statement&oeq=academ&gs_lcrp=EgZjaHJvbWUqBggBEEUYOzIGCAAQRrg5MgYIARBFgDsyBggCEEUYOzINCAMQABiDARixAxiABDINCAQQABiDARixAxiABDIQCAUQABiDARixAxiABDINCAAYQABiDARixAxiABDINCAcQABiDARixAxiABDIHCAgQABiABNIBCDUyNjdqMWoxqAIAsAIA&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8&bshu=rime/I
- Adler, P. (2012). The Plain Language Movement. Pp. 67-83 in Solan, L.M. & Tiersma, P.M. (Eds.), the Oxford Handbook of Language and Law. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Becker, H. S. (1998). Tricks of the trade: How to think about your research while you're doing it. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bennis, W. G., & O'Toole, J. (2005). How business schools have lost their way. Harvard Business Review, 83(5), 96-104.
- Bower, J. L. (1982). Business policy in the 1980s. Academy of Management Review, 7(4), 630-638.
- Buchanan, L. & O'Connell, A. (2006). A Brief History of Decision Making. Harvard Business Review, 84(1): 32.
- Burke, W. W. (1987). From the Editor. Academy of Management Executive, 1(1): 5.
- Cascio, W. F. (2019). Training trends: Macro, micro, and policy issues. Human Resource Management Review, 29(2), 284-297.
- Cooper, Stuart, Carole Parkes, and John Blewitt. "Can accreditation help a leopard change its spots? Social accountability and stakeholder engagement in business schools." Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal 27.2 (2014): 234-258.
- Creswell JW. The use of theory. In: Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. 2009:3rd ed. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications
- Cropanzano, R. (2009). Writing nonempirical articles for Journal of Management: General thoughts and suggestions. Journal of Management, 35(6), 1304-1311.
- D'Aunno, T. (2005). Management scholars and public policy: A bridge too far?. Academy of Management Journal, 48(6), 949-951.
- DeNisi, A.S. & Kluger, A.N. (2000). Feedback effectiveness: Can 360 degree appraisals be improved? Academy of Management Perspectives, 14(1): 129-139.
- Dewey, John. 1938. Logic: The Theory of Inquiry. New York: Henry Holt.

- Farjoun, M., Ansell, C., & Boin, A. (2015). PERSPECTIVE—Pragmatism in organization studies: Meeting the challenges of a dynamic and complex world. *Organization Science*, 26(6), 1787-1804.
- Feldman, M. S. (2005). Management and public management. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(6), 958-960.
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. New York: Pitman.
- Ghoshal, S. (2005). Bad management theories are destroying good management practices. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 4(1), 75-91.
- Gilson, L. L., & Goldberg, C. B. (2015). Editors' comment: So, what is a conceptual paper? *Group & Organization Management*, 40(2), 127-130.
- Gordon, R. A., & Howell, J. E. (1959). *Higher education for business*. Columbia University Press.
- Halliday, T. C. (1985). Knowledge mandates: collective influence by scientific, normative and syncretic professions. *British Journal of Sociology*, 421-447.
- Hambrick, D. C. (1994). What if the academy actually mattered?. *Academy of Management Review*, 19(1), 11-16.
- Huff, A. S., & Reger, R. K. (1987). A review of strategic process research. *Journal of Management*, 13(2), 211-236.
- Imenda, S. (2014). Is there a conceptual difference between theoretical and conceptual frameworks?. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 38(2), 185-195.
- Jaakkola, E. (2020). Designing conceptual articles: four approaches. *AMS Review*, 10: 18-26.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1979). *Behavioral research: A conceptual approach*. Philadelphia, PA: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, Inc.
- Khurana, R. 2007. *From higher aims to hired hands: The social transformation of American business schools and the unfulfilled promise of management as a profession*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Langley, A. (1999). Strategies for theorizing from process data. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(4), 691-710.
- Markman, G.D. & Wood, G. (2022). AMP's domain and how it complements other AOM journals. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 36; 1-5.
- Mintzberg, H. (2004). Managers Not MBSs. *Management Today*, 20(7), 10-13.
- Pearce, J.L. (2005). Organizational Scholarship and the Eradication of Global Poverty. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(6), 970-972.

- Petelin, R. (2010). Considering plain language: issues and initiatives. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 15(2), 205-216.
- Pfeffer, J. (1995). Producing sustainable competitive advantage through the effective management of people. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 9(1): 55-69.
- Porter, M.E. (1980). *Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analyzing Industries and Competitors*. New York: Free Press.
- Rocco, T. S., & Plakhotnik, M. S. (2009). Literature reviews, conceptual frameworks, and theoretical frameworks: Terms, functions, and distinctions. *Human Resource Development Review*, 8(1), 120-130.
- Rocco, T. S., Plakhotnik, M. S., & Silberman, D. (2022). Differentiating Between Conceptual and Theory Articles: Focus, Goals, and Approaches. *Human Resource Development Review*, 21(1), 113–140.
- Rynes, S. L., & Shapiro, D. L. (2005). Academy of Management Journal Editors' Forum: Public Policy and the Public Interest: What If We Mattered More? *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(6), 925-927.
- Schendel, D. E.; & Hatten, K. J. Business policy or strategic management: A view for an emerging discipline. In V. F. Mitchell, R. T. Barth, & F. H. Mitchell (Eds.), *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 1972.
- Sianes, A., Vega-Muñoz, A., Tirado-Valencia, P., & Ariza-Montes, A. (2022). Impact of the Sustainable Development Goals on the academic research agenda. A scientometric analysis. *PLoS One*, 17(3), e0265409.
- Suddaby, Roy, Cynthia Hardy, and Quy Nguyen Huy. "Introduction to special topic forum: Where are the new theories of organization?." *Academy of Management Review* 36.2 (2011): 236-246.
- Trivedi, J.H. 2019. *Fundamentals of Strategic Planning and Development*. Delhi, India: Redshine.
- Van de Ven, A. H., & Poole, M. S. (1990). Methods for studying innovation development in the Minnesota Innovation Research Program. *Organization Science*, 1(3), 313-335.
- Varpio, L., Paradis, E., Uijtdehaage, S., & Young, M. (2020). The distinctions between theory, theoretical framework, and conceptual framework. *Academic Medicine*, 95(7), 989-994.
- Von Glinow, M. A. (2005). Let us speak for those who cannot. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(6), 983-985.
- Weick, K. E. (1989). Theory construction as disciplined imagination. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 516-531.
- Weiss, C. H. (1977). Research for Policy's Sake: The Enlightenment Function of Social Research, *Policy Analysis*, 3(4): 531-545.

¹ The scholars who contributed to the Special Forum were Sara L. Rynes, Debra L. Shapiro, William Ouchi, Richard Riordan, Linda Lingle, Lyman Porter, Paul Adler, John Jermier, Jay B. Barney, Thomas D'Aunno, Vanessa U.

Druskat, Jane E. Dutton, Martha S. Feldman, Donald C. Hambrick, Michael A. Hitt, Steve Kelman, Jone L. Pearce, Andrew M. Pettigrew, Freek Vermeulen, Mary Ann von Glinow, and Karl E. Weick.