

## **Generative Curiosity: Guidelines for Authors and Reviewers**

We encourage all authors and reviewers to read “*Generative Curiosity: Introducing JMI’s Newest Section*” (Stackman and Hannah, 2017) for more details on the submission and review process, as well as the inaugural piece for the section, “Human-Animal Work: A Massive, Understudied Domain of Human Activity” (Hannah and Robertson, 2017).

### **What submissions is JMI seeking for *Generative Curiosity (GC)*?**

The answer to that question lies in the name of the new section: we want submissions that generate curiosity among readers.

### **What kinds of submissions will generate curiosity?**

Submissions should focus on an important issue in the world, and call for research to improve our understanding of it. To illustrate, the aforementioned paper on “Human-Animal Work” examines a phenomenon that involves millions of human workers, billions of dollars of economic impact, and trillions of animals. The second *GC* publication (Seidel, 2018) explains how distributed trust technologies such as blockchain call into question fundamental assumptions about the existence of organizations.

When evaluating whether the ideas in *GC* submissions are a good fit for the section, we use three criteria: *novelty, consequentiality, and fertility* (Stackman and Hannah, 2017). The ideas in a submission must be novel, consequential, and fertile in order for the submission to be published.

A *novel* submission should “...alert readers to something that has received little to no attention, or breathe new life into something seemingly tired or outdated or insufficiently studied” (p. 3).

A *consequential* submission should contain “...a call to action to improve the human condition within organizations and society” (p. 3).

A *fertile* submission should inspire action. We want *GC* submissions to be at the forefront of new streams of research and changes in management practice.

### **How will you determine whether submissions are novel, consequential, and fertile?**

The first step is to submit a brief initial submission, at most 750 words not including references and appendices. That submission should introduce the core idea of your paper and make a preliminary case for its novelty, consequentiality, and fertility. Editors will review the submission and will either (a) send it out for blind review or (b) return it to the authors with suggestions for next steps.

In the blind review process, we will strive to select at least one subject matter expert who will be well positioned to judge novelty. We ask our reviewers to take a developmental orientation, offering advice about how the authors can take the paper from the initial submission to an exemplary piece that is novel, consequential, and fertile.

The editors will then consider the blind reviews of initial submissions and decide if they should be considered further. Those that are chosen to proceed are, for all intents and purposes, conditionally accepted for publication. The editors will then work with the authors to help them craft a final submission to be published in JMI. Final submissions will be approximately 2,500 words long.

## **Can I contact the editors prior to my initial submission to discuss an idea?**

While we are happy to work with authors before the initial submission, we also require authors to have put some work into their ideas beforehand. At a minimum we expect authors to have reviewed relevant literature and discussed their *GC* idea with their colleagues before we hear from them. We also encourage authors to run their ideas past people who are not management scholars, because in our experience our non-work friends provide an excellent litmus test for whether the ideas matter to the world. If your academic colleagues and non-academic acquaintances both find an idea interesting, there's a good chance that you are on the right track.

If you have any other questions or suggestions about *Generative Curiosity*, please contact the editor Dave Hannah ([dhannah@sfu.ca](mailto:dhannah@sfu.ca)).

## **References**

Hannah, David R. and Robertson, Kirsten. (2017). Human-Animal Work: A massive, understudied domain of human activity. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 26(1) 116-118.

Seidel, M. D. L. (2018). Questioning Centralized Organizations in a Time of Distributed Trust. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 27(1), 40-44.

Stackman, R. W., & Hannah, D. R. (2017). Generative Curiosity: Introducing JMI's Newest Section. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 26(1), 112-115.