

THE ART AND SCIENCE OF MANUSCRIPT REVIEWING

Douglas J. Lincoln, Boise State University, College of Business and Economics,
1910 University Drive, Boise, ID 83725; (208) 426-3246

Bruce Stern, Portland State University, School of Business Administration,
P.O. Box 751, Portland, OR 97207; (503) 725-3702

Gary L. Karns, Seattle Pacific University, School of College of Business and Economics,
McKenna 212, Seattle, WA 98119 (206) 281-2948

Stuart Van Auken, Florida Gulf Coast University, College of Business, 10501 FGCU Blvd., South
Fort Meyers, FL 33965-6565 (941) 590-7382

The main purpose of this special session was to increase the reviewing abilities and skills of those marketing faculty currently serving or in the future serving as reviewers (Ad Hoc or full-time) for marketing education journals. High quality manuscript reviewing is the most important activity undertaken by our colleagues to help journals advance the body of marketing education. This faculty development session underscored this fact and facilitated the development of quality reviews. In addition, a significant portion of the Marketing Educators' Association's conference attendees serve as current *Journal of Marketing Education (JME)* and *Marketing Education Review (MER)* reviewers as well as manuscript authors.

SESSION BENEFITS

This special session provided the following benefits for its attendees: (1) fundamental training for those with little or no experience at reviewing manuscripts for "B" or "A" level marketing journals, (2) a retraining or refreshing of skills for current journal review board members, (3) insight into the review process for manuscript authors and submitters, and (4) intrinsic rewards to those reviewers in attendance who are already producing meaningful reviews.

SESSION COMPONENTS

Doug Lincoln and Bruce Stern, respective editors of the *JME* and *MER*, first gave a brief introduction of their journals and then presented a list and description of the criteria reviewers are asked to use when they evaluate manuscripts. These criteria are found in the *Guidelines for Reviewers* documents that were distributed to the audience. Evaluation criteria in common for the two journals included: overall contribution to the literature, conceptual rigor, appropriate use of existing literature, writing quality, and methodological rigor. The role of the guidelines and their criteria is to

establish reviewer expectations and help create consistency in judgment.

Doug and Bruce next presented characteristics of relatively strong versus weak manuscript reviews in terms of their ability to provide both the editors and manuscript authors with meaningful and useful feedback. The characteristics included: thoroughness in coverage of all evaluative criteria, explicitness, depth of explanation, recognition of missing literature, examples of needed improvements, review "tone," and objective versus subjective comments. Examples of actual reviews demonstrating these characteristics were next displayed in a dichotomous manner. A smaller set of manuscript author feedback on reviewer comments was shared to help demonstrate how the quality of these comments affects manuscript authors and their ability to improve their scholarly efforts.

Gary Karns (drawing on his reviewing experience for *JME*) and Stu Van Auken (drawing on his experience reviewing for *MER*) next presented information on how they prepare for and execute reviews. Their presentations included "How I do it" tips regarding both the philosophical and mechanical side of reviewing. The session concluded with questions and comments from the audience-from both the reviewer and author point of view.

Materials presented by the editors are available by e-mail contact. dlincoln@boisestate.edu and bruces@sba.pdx.edu