

# Journal of Organizational Behavior Management

## Submission Guidelines

Manuscripts submitted to the journal may be reviewed for possible publication within one of the following journal sections. Authors submitting manuscripts to the journal must specify which of the below categories their submission best fits into for purposes of review and potential publication. Articles appearing in these sections reflect various research and practical aims and the review process for each section reflects these aims:

### ***Research Articles***

The *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management's* primary mission is to publish articles that promote scientific research in OBM. Scientific research methods and procedures permit researchers to identify and change selected independent variables expected to produce changes in dependent variables related to the performance of people in organizations and attribute changes in performance to the independent variable(s) by effectively controlling for potentially confounding variables. For example, eliminating confounding variables as potential causes of performance changes other than the independent variable(s) manipulated requires use of a comparison group, ABAB reversal and/or multiple baseline experimental designs. In addition to effective use of experimental designs, *Research Articles* should include evidence regarding the means by which integrity of each independent variable was assessed and must include evidence regarding the means by which each dependent variable was assessed and achieved. Therefore, papers that might qualify as *Research Articles* will undergo a full peer-review by as many as 5 scholars to ensure that they qualify as properly controlled studies of meaningful organizational applications. Controlled experimental analog-based assessments and examinations of behavioral processes that might lead to understanding of or account for relative success of organizational interventions under field conditions will also qualify as *Research Articles*. For example, the relative effects of differing levels of feedback frequency on individual or group performance, that might be impossible to assess in the field, might well be functionally related to performance within a work simulation or laboratory analog of an organizational task and its context. Experimentally sound replications and extensions of previous work are also acceptable as *Research Articles*. *Research Articles* are expected to range from 20-40 double-spaced pages, not including figures.

Checklist for reviewers:

- Clear description of problem and research literature
- Clear description of experimental methods
- Appropriate experimental design (e.g., Multiple baseline, reversal or other "single subject" design; appropriate group design)
- Clear demonstration of effect
- Reliability of dependent variable; integrity of independent variables is a strength
- Clear discussion of results

## **Research Reports**

Submissions for *Research Reports* require less detailed descriptions of background, methodology, or findings than *Research Articles*. *Research Reports* provide contributors with an outlet for interesting, scholarly, and potentially important contributions to the empirical foundations of OBM that, at the moment, simply cannot satisfy the criteria for full length *Research Articles*. Authors should adhere to a limit of 200 typed lines with the main text area (not including the title page, abstract, or references) with up to 3 tables or figures. The research report will be the primary outlet for the dataset published so the author must agree not to publish an extended version of the Report in another journal. *Research Reports* will undergo expedited peer review to assess applied significance, clarity of presentation, and reasonable data collection and analysis. Reviewers will not hold *Research Report* submissions to the same standards of experimental rigor required for *Research Articles*.

*Research Reports* describing follow-up data to a previously published project will also be considered for publication. In this case, authors should submit a report length treatment of the project wherein they briefly review and cite the originally published work (which could have been published in any peer-reviewed journal, not only in *JOBM*), clearly describe the procedures used to produce maintenance, and clearly describe and discuss the maintenance effects. When preparing a follow-up *Research Report*, authors should not resubmit originally published data in the same format as they were published. They can, however, report the mean levels of performance as reported in the original work, for purposes of comparison to the follow-up data.

If the efficacy of an OBM principle appears to be supported by otherwise reliable data in spite of experimental shortcomings such as a lack of an independent variable's integrity, high face validity of the variables might, nevertheless, be sufficient to support publication of the data. Pilot studies and studies that do not provide the full complement of controls required of *Research Articles* but still do provide insights important to OBM researchers and practitioners may be published as *Research Reports*.

Checklist for reviewers:

- 200 line main text area (not including title page, abstract, or references)
- Concise description of problem and brief overview of research literature, demonstrating applied significance
- Demonstration of effect (can be attained through a believable size of effect using an AB design, for example) worth examining in more controlled experiments
- Clear description of experimental methods
- Reliability of dependent variable
- Clear discussion of results
- Not held to the same rigorous standards as are *Research Articles*

## **Reports from the Field**

Data-based case studies that describe the application of OBM principles in organizational settings are valuable to the ongoing development of the field and for this reason; some of these will be published in a *Reports from the Field* section of the *Journal*. In many instances OBM researchers and practitioners cannot use field

experimental intervention designs required to qualify their study as a *Research Article*. At the same time, OBM researchers and practitioners may systematically implement OBM interventions that can be described in detail and, in some cases, partial or complete data regarding performance changes associated with the interventions may be collected and presented. Papers reviewed for potential publication in the *Reports from the Field* section will a) provide an adequate background on the applied problem encountered, b) describe the behavioral and practical considerations addressed to develop the reported intervention solution, c) describe the application program in sufficient detail that a person trained in OBM techniques could effectively replicate the procedures and data collection processes the authors used, and d) include an evaluation of the OBM solution including cost-benefit analyses and social validity data if available. Authors are also encouraged to offer advice to readers regarding how their work might be changed to satisfy requirements of a *Research Article* by other OBM researchers that might replicate the intervention within a field experimental design. Authors should adhere to a limit of 300 typed lines for the main text area (not including the title page, abstract, or references) with up to 3 tables or figures. *Reports from the Field* will be the primary outlet for the dataset published so the author should not publish an extended version of the Report in another journal. *Reports from the Field* will undergo expedited peer review to assess the contribution of the manuscript to OBM and clarity of presentation. Articles that claim proprietary OBM processes and thereby do not provide sufficient detail for replication will not be accepted as *Reports from the Field*.

Checklist for reviewers:

- 300 line main text area (not including title page, abstract, or references)
- Adequate background on the applied problem
- Description of the behavioral and practical considerations addressed to develop the reported intervention solution
- Description of the solution in sufficient detail that a person trained in OBM techniques could effectively replicate the procedures and data collection processes the authors used
- Experimental designs and dependent variable reliability are preferable but not necessary
- Evaluation of the OBM solution including cost-benefit analyses and social validity data if available

### ***Discussion Articles***

Manuscripts that develop foundations of behavior analysis or critically review a particular areas of research in OBM may be accepted as *Discussion Articles*. *Discussion Articles* will undergo full peer-review by up to 5 scholars. They will evaluate the merit of arguments made in the article and judge the usefulness of the perspective developed in the manuscript with respect to whether it is likely to advance research and/or practice of OBM. The *Journal's* Editors and/or members of the editorial board often solicit meaningful commentary on *Discussion Articles*.

## ***Comment Articles***

*Comment Articles* take the form of open letters to the readership addressing conceptual and methodological issues, new lines of research, sources of funding, historical issues and trivia, or address issues raised in previously published articles. Commentaries will typically be reviewed by the Editor and one Associate Editor. Commentaries will generally be limited to 100 lines of text.

## ***Book Reviews***

Many books are published each year of interest to the *Journal's* readership. Authors wishing to prepare a review of a book should contact the *Journal's* Editor to propose a *Book Review*. Reviews should contain the title of the book in the title and provide a full APA citation of the book before proceeding with their review. Reviews should be limited to 150 lines of text. *Book Reviews* will typically be reviewed by the Editor or Associate Editor to assure the review is compelling and provocative while offering a fair and justified evaluation of the book.

## ***A Note for Reviewers***

Reviewers will be asked to review a given manuscript by considering it for one of the above-described categories. In so doing, reviewers will be expected to use respectful language that fosters an environment of learning through constructive and positive feedback. Reviews not adhering to these standards of professionalism may not be included by the Action Editor for the manuscript. In addition, reviewers will be asked to clearly classify their disposition of the manuscript by assigning it to one of the following categories:

Accept as-is

Accept with revisions

Reject and Resubmit to *JOBM*

Reject/Submit elsewhere