

Yehuda Baruch, Alison M. Konrad, Herman Aguinis, and William H. Starbuck (Editors). **Opening the Black Box of Editorship**. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008, 328 pages, \$85.00 hardcover.

Reviewed by *Milton D. Hakel*, Ohio Eminent Scholar of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH.

This book passes the Hollenbeck Test—the editors have shaped what serves as a consensus on editorial practices in the organizational sciences. On its surface the book is about editing scientific journals, and thus it will immediately interest editors and potential editors. Beneath that surface, it is about a key juncture in the process through which knowledge becomes systematized, and thus it will also interest researchers, reviewers, and practitioners who create and consume useable knowledge.

The preface states the book's aim to be "(a) an academic scholarly work on the roles of editors and the processes of editorship in knowledge creation and dissemination, (b) a guide for editors and professional associations in charge of setting editorial policies for developing and maintaining high-quality editing processes, (c) a guide and realistic job preview for scholars who wish to become editors, and (d) an important socialization tool for all doctoral students and scholars who wish to learn the intricacies of the publishing process."

The inner workings of the editorial "black box" are revealed in 25 chapters by 29 authors. Four general and introductory chapters (Part I, described later) are followed by 10 in Part II that explore diverse facets of effective editorship: setting up (Kacmar) and managing (DeNisi) the peer review process, communicating with authors (Rynes), staffing the editorial board and securing ad hoc reviewers (Feldman), trust and ethical issues in editing (Shapiro & Bartunek), balancing the author's voice against the reviewer's and editor's omniscience (Bedeian), developing and directing the manuscript's contribution (Bergh) and serving as an activist editor (Jacobs), using technology to improve the editorial process (Kilduff), and moving a journal up the rankings (Hodgkinson). I wish I would have had access to the accumulated experience and wisdom conveyed in these chapters back when I joined the editorial board of *Personnel Psychology* in 1972 and especially when I became its editor in 1973.

In six chapters, Part III covers various types of journals and the contexts in which they operate: a top academic journal (Zedeck), a global journal (Tsoukas), a bridge journal (Welbourne), a new journal (Williams), an electronic journal (Forgues & Forray), and independent journals (Clark & Wright). I became the publisher of *Personnel Psychology* in 1984 and

would have found these chapters to be most helpful in considering how to preserve and enhance its social capital during my 20 years of service in that role.

Part IV situates the editorship within academic career patterns: Baruch reports survey findings from 53 current editors of academic refereed journals in management and the behavioral sciences in the English language. Kulik focuses on the motivating potential of the associate editor's role. Cascio describes the process used by the Academy of Management as a case study of how editors are selected. Eden provides guidance for authors who are seeking to navigate the review process successfully. Last, the four editors provide an epilogue that further explores four issues: the editor as an evaluator, the editor as a style coach, incremental and revolutionary change, and the editor's focus on accepting outstanding manuscripts. Had I been the editor of this volume, I would have put these chapters at the book's beginning. Baruch's chapter is an archetype for so many of the submissions that editors receive—soft data about interesting questions. It opens many topics and provides a mix of quantitative and qualitative findings, none of which can be resolved by the soft data that are reported. But all of these questions are explored more deeply in the chapters in Parts II and III. The other chapters in this section similarly introduce issues that are covered in Parts II and III.

Now for Part I, the general and introductory chapters. These are the most abstract and generalized contents of the volume, and had I been the editor I would have positioned them in the place of the current Part IV, due to my preference for working from the particular and concrete to the general and abstract. Konrad leads off with an essay on knowledge creation. Ryan addresses the many facets of service present in the editor's job. Barley offers "A Letter to Editors" that covers the ambassadorial, mentorship, and managerial aspects of editing. Hollenbeck provides a most interesting reflection on the editor's role in knowledge development, framed around the creation and the shifting of consensus. It is this last mentioned chapter, which actually appears as Chapter 2, that I regard as the best in the book and the one which justifies the purchase price. What I have called the "Hollenbeck Test" is for now a heuristic for editors, but the frames he describes could be more precisely formulated and then investigated, perhaps yielding practical insights into the sociology of consensus.

I would have liked to have seen more commentary and even outright speculation about the future of academic and scientific publishing. The consolidation of scholarly publishers into a few multinational corporations, the emergence of online publishing via Internet blogs, and the rise of information utilities (e.g., Google Scholar) are proceeding apace. Changes

in copyright laws are to be expected, and the creation and growth of the Public Library of Science with its specialized journals in medicine and biology presents a model that we might see emulated in the organizational sciences. Universities are now heavily involved in harvesting revenue from the intellectual property created through research and development, and what will make issues like all of those mentioned in this paragraph more interesting for editors in the organizational sciences are the inevitable tensions between motivations to collaborate versus to gain competitive advantages. And then there is the perennial problem of criteria—I would like to have seen a more critical appraisal of citation counts and impact factors. That said, the book well lives up to its aims, particularly the first and the third.

Specialization is one of the realities of our age, a reality that has enabled almost miraculous educational, economic, and technological advancements. At the same time and in the context of this book, specialization is lamentable because there is little in this volume that restricts its applicability to the organizational sciences. The issues and practices are generic, and we have much yet to learn about the creating and shifting of scientific consensus. Improving the accessibility and flow of useable knowledge is an urgent challenge for all researchers, reviewers, and practitioners.

Tammy Allen and Lillian Eby (Editors). **The Blackwell Handbook of Mentoring: A Multiple Perspectives Approach**. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2007, 520 pages, \$146.95 hardcover.

Reviewed by *William A. Gentry*, Senior Research Associate, Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, NC.

Edited by Allen and Eby, two of the leading experts in the field of mentoring from the discipline of industrial–organizational psychology, *The Blackwell Handbook of Mentoring: A Multiple Perspectives Approach* is appropriately titled. At the mention of the word mentoring, some may only think of formal mentoring programs in organizations. But there is more to mentoring than just the relationship between a high-potential employee/protégé and an older, more experienced mentor. The field of mentoring covers broad areas or domains, and the book specifically brings together the domains of youth mentoring (think Big Brother/Big Sister programs), student–faculty mentoring (like that found in any college or university undergraduate or graduate program), and workplace mentoring. The book has seven parts: introduction, theoretical approaches and methodological issues, naturally occurring mentoring relationships,