Publishing in the
Academy of Management Perspectives
## Advancement of Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Impact Factor</th>
<th>5-Year Impact Factor</th>
<th>Rank in Management Category</th>
<th>Rank in Business Category</th>
<th>Accept Rate</th>
<th>Total Downloads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.8%*</td>
<td>1,321,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>1,198,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>1,598,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>1,684,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>1,832,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>1,012,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>341,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mission

Academy of Management Perspectives's mission is to publish papers with policy implications based on management research. ...leverage management theory to understand contemporary behavioral, socioeconomic, and technological... implications for the public interest or relying on a strong evidence base of empirical findings to inform public policy.
1. critically assessing the impact of management theory and research on public policy;
2. summarizing empirical evidence to emphasize their policy implications;
3. identifying policy concerns that should motivate the development of new management theory and research; and/or
4. establishing a research agenda that informs public policy.
Features of an AMP contribution

• Is an authoritative exposition of a scholarly issue
• Compelling question motivated by observation of gaps (theory-practice, theory-theory, data-theory, policy-theory).
• Problem driven: why is this important? What we miss by not addressing?
• Challenges what we believe to be true
• Contributors are experts in the domain
• Implications: how do your arguments change the way we theorize, conduct empirical research, and ask questions?
What AMP is not?

• Straight reviews, hypothesis testing, empirical results, arm chair theorizing, diaries

• *But* can have elements of these to motivate the question, as supporting evidence, or as reflections
Good Writing

• Cogent, coherent, logical, internally consistent, non-jargon evidence-based arguments

• Aim for Flesch Reading Ease score of >50 (Plain English) or Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level of 10. Nobel Laureate Richard Feynman’s published lecture on the Heisenberg’s Uncertainty Principle has a grade level of 8. Times of London and New York Times are published at reading grade level 10. By statute (MIL-STD-38784, page 21) U.S. military documents readability grade level is 9.
### Type of Field, Field Characteristics, and Examples of Industrial Agglomeration, Clusters and Diversified Clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Characteristics</th>
<th>Industrial Agglomeration</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Diversified Clusters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Infrastructure, network and boundaries, status and hierarchies, shared meanings and practices</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic Settlement</td>
<td>Vertical</td>
<td>Hierarchical, Horizontal</td>
<td>Symbiotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction to new Actors</td>
<td>Transnational</td>
<td>Relational (constraining/ morphic)</td>
<td>Aligning (open to contestation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience to Shocks and Discontinuities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Challenge/Embrace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Field</td>
<td></td>
<td>Field - mix professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Examples**

- **Characters per Word**: 6.1 (Argentina)
- **Readability**
  - Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level: 18.3
  - Flesch Reading Ease: 1.2
  - Passive Sentences: 5.59%

Examples:

- **Wine (US)**
- **IT (Silicon Valley)**
- **Automotive (Stuttgart)**
- **Shoe (Northern Italy)**
- **Valve, Brasil**
Symposium Proposal

- Curated special issue
- Proposer obtains commitment from 6 to 10 authors to contribute full length papers around a research question/theme
- Key information
  - Research question (why interesting, why important)
  - Brief overview of the history/literature of the question supporting the value of the research question
  - Brief framework explaining how the individual papers fit together, the proposed individual contributions and the overall contribution
  - Commitment statement from each of the authors to submit
  - 1 to 2 page abstracts of each paper
  - Organizers may write an editorially reviewed introduction to frame the symposium
Paper Proposal

• Research question
• Motivation and intended contribution
• Why the perspectives format is suited to your question
• AMP *does* publish papers with data, systematic reviews or meta-analyses that cultivates developmental thought. The emphasis is not on the data or reviews but on the *non-obvious* implications for further theory development or empirical testing.
• Interested in discussions of policy/strategic implications
• Interested in emergent phenomenon for which there is little data or formal theory
Anatomy of a AMP Paper
The rapidly growing number of people who find work via online labor platforms are not employees, nor do they necessarily fit traditional conceptualizations of independent contractors, freelancers, or the self-employed. The ambiguous nature of their employment status and its implications for worker well-being have attracted substantial controversy, but to date most empirical research in this area has focused on the market efficiency of a single platform rather than on workers themselves and related human resource management issues. Research progress will require understanding how online labor platform work differs from other types of nonstandard employment arrangements, as well as critical differences across labor platform firms in how work and workers are managed. This paper proposes a conceptual classification framework to facilitate research on the attitudes, experiences, and outcomes of workers who use these platforms. We explore how labor platform firms’ operational choices shape how control is allocated across workers, clients, and the firm, and how they influence workers’ autonomy, incentives, and degree of economic dependence on the firm. Implications for theory development, research, and managing worker-firm relations are discussed.
Labor platform firms portray themselves as technology companies that provide opportunities for micro-entrepreneurs to have their own small service businesses with minimal start-up costs, but people who find work via these platforms are often characterized in the media as disempowered “instaservers.”

To date, however, labor platforms have drawn scholarly attention primarily from economics, operations, and information systems researchers concerned with the efficiency and optimization of digital service markets conceptualized as analogous to electronic auction markets for goods (e.g., Allon, 2012). Although platforms that offer in-person, location-dependent services share important features with remote labor firms, they are less likely to resemble open markets and are notably understudied. Research based in the HRM and organizational behavior (OB) disciplines has significant potential for shedding light on the likely outcomes of platform firm practices both for individual workers and the firm.

How traditional HRM concepts and theory should be applied to this novel and rapidly evolving employment arrangement is therefore an important question, and one whose answer will require understanding the diversity among both platform firms and platform workers.
highlight important research questions. We first define and describe the nature of online labor platform firms, and then show how their workforces fail to fit neatly into existing taxonomies of employment arrangements. We explore how platform firms’ structure and operational choices shape platform workers’ autonomy, their performance incentives, and their degree of economic dependence on the firm. Consequent implications for needed research on platform workers’ attitudes, management, and well-being are discussed.
ONLINE LABOR PLATFORMS AS A NOVEL FORM OF EMPLOYMENT ARRANGEMENT

We define online labor platforms as for-profit firms that use technology to facilitate the filling of immediate short-term service labor needs, either remotely or in person, with workers who are officially considered independent contractors. The underlying Most labor platform studies to date have examined only one platform, and depending on context and the authors’ academic discipline have referred to the people doing the work as freelancers (Kokkodis, Papadimitriou, & Ipeiroitis, 2015), entrepreneurs (Moreno & Terwiesch, 2014). As we show, however, none of these labels is a good fit for workers on all labor platforms. While both popular media and ac-

Adding to this confusion, firms such as Uber and MTurk are often discussed as part of the so-called peer-to-peer sharing economy (e.g., Cohen & Sundararajan, 2015; Hall & Krueger, 2015; Scheiber, 2014). Critics argue that this contradicts the everyday meaning of sharing because workers are paid and the firms are profit-seeking (Slee, 2015). The sharing economy also

Our ability to refine and extend management theory beyond full-time traditional employment requires acknowledging the heterogeneity of non-standard work (Connelly & Gallagher, 2004). Cappelli and Keller (2013) proposed a systematic taxonomy of employment arrangements that considers the parties involved in the work relationship, its contractual nature, and the sources and extent of control to form meaningfully distinguishable and useful categories. Online labor platform workers, however, do not necessarily correspond closely to any of the arrangements defined by Cappelli and Keller (2013), nor are platform firms simply labor market intermediaries like search firms (described in Bonet, Cannelli, & Hamori, 2013).

In sum, online labor platform firms are more than just venues for communication; they are important third parties to the relationship between the worker and client. Beyond the services they do or do not provide to mitigate risk for clients and for workers, platform firms make operational choices that determine how control is allocated across workers, clients, and the firm. Some firms adopt policies that
A FRAMEWORK FOR UNDERSTANDING LABOR PLATFORM WORKFORCES

In contrast to employees in prototypical hierarchical organizations, an independent worker in a classic market would own the key assets used, have the authority to decide how to do the work, and be rewarded according to performance, bearing risk in the case of weak performance and earning rewards for good performance (Williamson, 1991). But many organizations have hybrid governance forms and are neither pure hierarchies nor pure markets (Makadok & Coff, 2009). Labor platform workers may own some assets (e.g., a car or a personal computer), but the firm owns the key technology assets that regulate the work and client–worker interactions. All platform workers have some autonomy in terms of controlling their own scheduling, but the allocation of decision-making authority across workers, clients, and the firm varies substantially across platforms, as does the degree to which workers are compensated according to outputs or inputs.
Worker Autonomy and Incentives

Platform workers who have substantial autonomy to decide the nature, terms, and process of their labor are (close to) independent, and could be viewed as

Do workers have control over their work assignments or compensation? On some platforms, workers actively search among advertised projects

To what extent does the platform control client interactions and working conditions? Labor platform firms can and do encourage particular worker

Links among autonomy, performance evaluation, and incentives. As noted earlier, a key feature of platform work is the continual tracking of worker

The Worker’s Dependence on the Platform

The extent to which workers are dependent on a platform firm derives from their investment in the relationship and their (lack of) perceived alterna-

FIGURE 1
Classifying the Worker’s Relationship With the Platform Firm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>* Chooses or competes for more desirable tasks or outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>* Chooses or competes for less desirable tasks or outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH

There is a great deal of confusion about the nature of platform workforces, as evidenced by the lack of agreement over what to even label such workers.

Differences in Construct Meaning and Application

One challenge in extending organizational behavior and human resource management theory to online labor platform workforces is defining and clarifying the meaning of constructs. Bergman and that “flexibility” will be understood and experienced differently by minimum-wage employees and salaried professionals. The meaning of management

we discuss three examples: satisfaction and commitment, organizational support, and behavioral outcomes.

Satisfaction and commitment. It is necessary to consider platform workers’ relationship with the

Organizational support. Organizational support theory (OST) holds that leadership, human resource practices, and other contextual factors determine employees’ beliefs about the extent to which their

Behavioral outcomes. Employee turnover is a key HR outcome variable that has not previously been considered applicable to contracting arrangements
Future Research (page 194)

Key Questions for Future Research

Classifying platform workers in terms of their relationship with the platform firm suggests new research topics that merit study, as well as potential

Procedural justice and management by algorithm. Based on a meta-analysis of studies of nonstandard and temporary agency employees, Wilkin (2013) concluded that extending human resource practices to contingent workers would be likely to increase their satisfaction. There are inherent limitations, however, to the human resource practices that can be provided to online labor platform workers. But we propose that practices directed toward improving perceptions of procedural justice could offer substantial benefit to some types of platform workers and their firms, and that this merits empirical study.

Worker attitudes and firm outcomes. In applying OB/HR theory and research to this context, a fundamental question is whether, or which, platform firms have bottom-line reasons to care about workers’ perceptions of and reactions to firm policies and practices. Traditionally, firms are concerned with employee attitudes and morale because
Conclusions

• Not all award winning papers follow this structure but they should have the following elements in the contribution...

• Focused, research-relevant, and problem-driven question

• Deep understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the existing literature and phenomenon

• Forward looking toward research-relevant suggestions and policy implications where possible

• *Well* written in a style that is immediately accessible by a *scholarly* non-expert
Q&A
Roundtable Discussion

Of Potential Proposals
Individually complete the proposal form that has been handed out ½ hr

Get into groups of 5, select a scribe and facilitator; each author takes 3-5 minutes to present what they wrote in the form, highlighting its intended contribution

Roundtable discussion highlighting strengths and weaknesses of each proposal

Scribe and/or leader to report back key learnings of what an AMP contribution looks like
Discussion Questions

1. In what ways is the research question clear or unclear?
2. Do you agree with the intended contribution?
3. How is the intended contribution different from what we already know or care about?
4. What do you think is the intended audience and what should it be?
5. How do you think the audience will react to the idea (positive, negative, meh...)?
6. What are some suggestions to refine the idea (literatures to search, questions to ask, analytical or philosophical approach, etc.)?