

March 20, 2016.

Scholarship Strategies Project: Final Report

Brian P. Reschke

Department of Organizational Leadership and Strategy

brianreschke@byu.edu

The following report evaluates my progress towards goals for scholarly development through February 2017.

GOAL PROGRESS

In the course of the Faculty Development Series, I set three goals for my scholarly development through the beginning of the Winter 2017 semester. As I review my progress towards each goal below, I identify ways that applied the scholarly strategies identified in my Faculty Development Plan. I also identify new insights gleaned from the experience of reviewing my progress, and I articulate plans for future productivity.

Goal: Submit a revised manuscript in response to a “revise and resubmit” decision

I am pleased to report that I met the goal of successfully returning my paper under first-round review at *Administrative Science Quarterly* to the reviewers. This proved more challenging than anticipated, especially as a major coauthor encountered some unexpected obstacles in the final stages of the revision. To work around this challenge, I proceeded to revise a section formerly allocated to this coauthor. This ultimately resulted in a new theoretical framework that outgrew the original article—I have since incorporated a revision of this framework in an invited article for *Journal of Management Inquiry*. This experience taught me the value of continuing to write, even when there are available excuses to forestall writing. Even if not incorporated in the intended piece, it may suggest paths for future research. This insight came in the process of preparing this report: I would like to apply this principle to early-stage projects that I have delayed “writing up” because the research design is still in flux.

Goal: Submit two additional manuscripts for publication

As mentioned, I submitted the first round of a manuscript to the *Journal of Management Inquiry* early this year. The article is part of an invited series that may involve dialogue with other series participants. Thus, I anticipate writing extensions to this manuscript in the coming months. This experience will help establish my research identity in the status literature. Unfortunately, I did not submit an additional manuscript per my goals. However, the goal did help me spend more time revising a past manuscript than I would have otherwise. Particularly, per my (citizenship) strategy to engage more with my colleagues, I workshopped this paper with members of my department writing circle. Though the feedback was about the front end of the paper—a section I highly anticipate revising as I get closer to submission—soliciting feedback on this section helped me consider the overall contribution of the paper. This made me realize that the activities dominating my time on this revision (new analyses) were probably outside the scope of this project, and that I would be better served by completing the paper with the results I have in hand—extending the analyses later as directed by reviewers.

I have learned from this experience that I still tend towards “perfect drafts” at the expense of number of submissions. Accordingly, I have revised my Faculty Development Plan to highlight the principle of “Always under Review” and “Furtherest along, First Out”, or FAFO. This was an insight stemming from a visit with my faculty mentor. Particularly, this means that I would like to have at least one paper under review at any given time. When I do not have a paper under review, I will prioritize the project closest to submission until I again have a paper under review (FAFO). This discipline will help me appropriately evaluate whether I can take on new projects.

One of the strategies I had identified in connection to this goal was to write to schedule daily for at least 30 minutes. I observe that I do much better at keeping with this program when I know there is a pending opportunity to share my writing with others. Presently, this has been around the time of submissions to conferences or journals, but I would like to create many more “intermediate” writing exhibition experiences for myself. Accordingly, I have revised my Faculty Development Plan to recognize this principle of always having a writing exhibition deadline in mind (whether a submission, conference, talk, or draft exchange). I have resumed participation in the department writing circle. This has helped my daily writing improve, though I see that the size of the group limits the frequency in which I can solicit feedback. My mentor and I have agreed to hold our own writing circle weekly moving forward. This should provide more frequent accountability. I am excited about the implications of these plans for my future productivity.

Goal: Submit two new, early-stage manuscripts for exhibition at major conferences

Pursuant to my goal to “feed my pipeline”, I submitted an rough manuscript reporting early results to the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management. The plan had been to submit a second project as well, but the intended coauthors and I were occupied with the manuscript that received the revise and resubmit described above. I see that timeliness in turning around papers after editor decisions is not only important for the focal paper, but also for fueling future research. I think the above principle of striving to always have a work under review will actually help me in identifying and developing new projects.

While I only partially met this goal, the manuscript I did submit was part of a symposium I organized around a research topic related to my future research stream. I identified participants through contacts I made at a small conference at INSEAD, Fontainebleu, France. This last week, I learned that the symposium was accepted by all three Academy divisions from which I sought sponsorship; I am very hopeful about the new collaborators that may come from participants and attendees of this session. I also hope this session helps me take a more proactive role in shaping a research conversation.