

ISM 6109 Mock Article Review Assignment

Your paper built upon DeSanctis's 1993 article on the individualistic and collective views of group support systems (GSS), exploring deception in the context of GSS and similar systems, the individualistic view of GSS design, and interpersonal deception theory (IDT). Overall, I found your paper and the studies it reports to be of great significance and importance to MIS in general and GSS research in particular, offering insights based on a lesser-cited article that deserves further attention. However, I feel there were sufficient issues with your paper to recommend you *revise and resubmit* it before it is accepted for publication.

As noted, I found your paper to be particularly insightful in its focus on DeSanctis's 1993 article. The individualistic and collective views of GSS she identified and that you built your studies around are often a point of tension in such groups, and researchers should certainly be exploring this tension further. Deception is a key element of this; your literature review paints a good picture of the state of research on deception and particularly of research that has used and expanded upon IDT. (I should note that I was relatively familiar with GSS research, but somewhat less so with DeSanctis's 1993 article and not at all with IDT.) I feel the studies you performed are appropriate explorations of deception within GSS and similar systems, comparing face-to-face and GSS-supported settings and testing the key variables of collocation, group member experience, and task complexity. Your discussion section also presents well the implications of your findings for research and design practice on GSS and similar systems.

Unfortunately, as mentioned earlier there were numerous issues with your paper that prohibit me from recommending its acceptance as-is. Many of these are issues with the flow, phrasing, and structure of the paper. I found many passages to be overly wordy, repetitive, or unnecessary; e.g. "compared to their peers working under group incentive schemes" on p. 10 is

unnecessary. I would encourage the improvement of clarity and phrasing throughout to tighten the paper, simplify wording, and improve flow; e.g. replace “some groups ... from each other” with “some groups were collocated and others were separated” on p. 10, and replace “from the very people they are lying to” with “for lying” at the bottom of p. 12). In addition, the structure of the literature review was a bit confusing. You began talking about deception quite early on (certainly by p. 9), but then “begin [your] discussion of deception” later in the review (p. 11); reordering these sections would make the structure clearer. Subheadings would also improve the review’s structure and break it up into smaller, more manageable chunks for readers. I would also footnote the parenthetical on p. 9, removing the awkwardness of two sets of parentheses.

In addition, there are a few grammar, spelling, and style issues throughout the paper. These include misplaced / extra commas (e.g. after “group performance” in para. 2 on p. 23), misspelled words (e.g. “purse” instead of “pursue” at the top of p. 9), and nonsensical phrases (e.g. “than did in the groups” on p. 21). There were also many misplaced or missing citations; they should be outside of quotes instead of inside them (see e.g. p. 4, 23), you need a page number for every quote (see e.g. the bottom of p. 27), every mention of DeSanctis’s 1993 article should include a citation (see e.g. pp. 5, 14, 23), and citations for GroupSystems and StrikeCom would help (on p. 15). In addition, consistency in whether you use “individualist” or “individualistic” would be appreciated; I would suggest that the latter makes sense in more cases. I also think “collocated” would be more descriptive than “proximate” or “same room” when discussing the results of your studies (starting on p. 17). Most of these issues could be addressed if the paper received one or more careful proofreads from skilled non-authors, such as colleagues at one of your institutions. I highly recommend and suggest such outside proofreads before resubmitting your paper; with revisions I feel it has a very good chance of being published.