

## EDITORIAL

The *Journal of Applied Psychology* (*JAP*) is a premier outlet for scholarship aimed at understanding work, employment, and organizational phenomena. It is the oldest, longest running (established in 1917) and largest (1,045 submissions, 81 published articles, and 1,547 pages in 2019) journal in our field. *JAP* is also one of the most influential publication outlets in industrial and organizational psychology, human resource management, and organizational behavior, based on the total number of citations and other indicators of scholarly impact (recognizing that these metrics are imperfect; see Landeira-Fernandez et al., 2013, and Paulus et al., 2018). In fact, a recent survey of over 500 members of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology found that *JAP* was perceived to be the most prestigious of 38 journals that publish scholarship relevant to industrial–organizational psychology (Highhouse et al., 2020). *JAP* also came out on top in terms of publishing research of relevance to individuals working in psychology departments, business schools, and applied settings. Taking an institutional perspective and focusing exclusively on business schools, Oh and Van Iddekinge (2020) confirmed that *JAP* is one of the most prestigious journals, reporting that nearly all (97%) business schools surveyed indicated that *JAP* was an A-level management journal that directly counts for promotion and tenure. In addition, the journal's longstanding reputation for publishing high-quality research makes it a "choice destination" for authors around the globe. In 2019, of all authors of articles submitted to the journal 53% reported an international (non-U.S.) country of residence.

In terms of scope, *JAP* features methodologically and conceptually rigorous applied research, as well as innovative theoretical and measurement-related papers, that moves our science in important new directions. Not only does research published in the journal advance scholarship in the area of industrial–organizational psychology and allied fields of inquiry but it also provides evidence-based guidance to help ensure the health, safety, and well-being of employees; improve human resource management systems such as selection, training, and performance management; promote fairness and inclusion in employment settings; and improve individual, leader, team, and organizational performance. Research published in the journal is relevant to public, private, and nonprofit organizations operating in a wide range of contexts and industries. Research published in the journal can inform public policy and legislative efforts aimed at improving employment conditions, supporting working families, and promoting social justice, among other things. The journal's dual emphasis on scientific rigor and application to real-world settings makes it unique in an increasingly crowded publishing landscape.

On January 1, 2020, my editorial team and I started handling submitted articles. In mid-April we initiated a Call for Papers on the COVID-19 Pandemic With Rapid Review, which has garnered tremendous traction. My leadership team includes 15 highly accomplished and respected associate editors from across the globe (Talya Bauer, *Portland State University*; Wendy Casper, *Univer-*

*sity of Texas at Arlington*; Daisy Chang, *Michigan State University*; Bryan Edwards, *Oklahoma State University*; Allison Gabriel, *University of Arizona*; Russ Johnson, *Michigan State University*; Astrid Homan, *University of Amsterdam*; Jenny Hoobler, *University of Pretoria*; Jonas Lang, *University of Ghent* and *University of Exeter*; Scott Morris, *Illinois Institute of Technology*; In-Sue Oh, *Temple University*; Fred Oswald, *Rice University*; Christopher Porter, *Indiana University*; Kristen Shockley, *University of Georgia*; and Gillian Yeo, *University of Western Australia*), along with an outstanding peer review coordinator (Jennifer Wood, *Michigan State University*). Our efforts are supported by 297 editorial board members and countless ad hoc reviewers. Outgoing editor Gilad Chen (*University of Maryland*) has been instrumental throughout the editorial transition, providing me with crucial institutional knowledge, sound advice, and friendship as I assume the role of editor. In the remainder of this editorial I discuss my vision, goals, and priorities for *JAP*, along with my plans for the future.

### The Importance of Context

It is impossible to write this editorial without recognizing that we are living in challenging times. Unprecedented changes in how, when, where, and with whom we work have occurred in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition to the threat to human life, the pandemic is expected to increase poverty and deepen preexisting inequalities for vulnerable groups such as women (United Nations, 2020) and individuals living in poorer countries (United Nations Development Programme, 2020). In the United States, the pandemic has disproportionately negatively affected racial and ethnic minority group members (<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/health-equity/race-ethnicity.html>). For example, in the United States infection and mortality rates are especially high among African Americans (Yancy, 2020). These sobering realities, along with the recent deaths of George Floyd, Ahmaud Arbery, and Breonna Taylor, and so many others, are vivid and wrenching reminders of longstanding social injustice and systematic racism, both in the United States and around the globe. When preparing my candidate statement and vision for the journal, a global pandemic and widespread social protest were the furthest thing from my mind. However, several aspects of my vision for *JAP* are highly relevant to the current context. This includes increasing representation and supporting diversity, as well as improving the translation of our science for the public good. Other elements of my vision for the journal include enhancing the review process and promoting open science.

### Increasing Representation and Supporting Diversity

Promoting participation in the journal and giving a voice to people from groups that are currently underrepresented in our field is important for both the culmination of knowledge and because it is a moral imperative. In addition to recruiting a team of associate editors that is diverse with respect to race, ethnicity, sex, age,

nationality, country of residence, and academic home (psychology, business), my team and I have assembled a diverse editorial board. Such efforts are important because they send a clear signal regarding what the journal values. I sincerely hope that having a diverse leadership team and editorial board will encourage scientists from underrepresented groups to submit to the journal. Further efforts to support diversity include a task force of associate editors who are preparing actionable recommendations related to outreach and inclusion at the journal. In addition, in response to recent reminders of racial injustice and systemic inequality, we initiated a Call for Papers for a special issue titled *Understanding Racism in the Workplace*. Former *JAP* associate editor Quinetta Roberson (*Michigan State University*) is the guest editor for this special issue, supported by an outstanding team of associate guest editors.

### Improving Translational Impact of Our Science for the Public Good

Now more than ever, we need to use our science for the public good and social change. My vision encompasses efforts to increase the practical impact of our findings outside the academy. In addition to leveraging the American Psychological Association's (APA) communications and publicity efforts, we are preparing to roll out a program where several articles per issue are identified that have high practical and/or social policy relevance. Brief translational summaries (including one- to two-sentence "teasers") will be prepared for these articles at the online-first stage. These translational summaries, along with suggestions for use (e.g., social media, professional websites, sharing with colleagues or clients, forwarding to institutional publicity offices), will be sent to the corresponding author. I will also share these summaries through various professional channels. Another way we are trying to increase the impact of our research for the public good is the Call for Papers on COVID-19 Pandemic With Rapid Review. This call was designed to facilitate the creation and dissemination of practical knowledge to help inform our understanding of how the pandemic is affecting work and employment. By offering rapid review and priority publication, we hope to provide organizational leaders and policymakers with "hot off the press" evidence-based research that can inform responses to the current pandemic, as well as future crisis events. It is my hope that efforts such as these will help reduce the science–practice gap, while also addressing concerns raised by scholar–practitioners that academic research is so focused on theory that it is often not useful for practice (Cucina et al., 2014; Hambrick, 2007).

### Enhancing the Review Process

I also plan to continue to strengthen and enhance the journal's current reviewing practices. My team and I are focusing on developmental reviewing (Ragins, 2015), and I selected associate editors based on their track records in this regard. As Ragins (2015) described, developmental reviewing means being kind but firm, and offering constructive feedback and suggestions for improvement, without inadvertently "hijacking" the author's ideas. A developmental approach to reviewing creates a positive experience for authors. As a result, authors are more likely to submit their best work to the journal and learn from the review process. Writing developmental reviews is also arguably more fulfilling for review-

ers and should elevate the quality of research in the field over time (Ragins, 2017). Modifications have already been made to the reviewer instruction information to emphasize the importance of developmental reviewing. The reviewer rating scale that associate editors use to rate reviews has also been revised accordingly. Finally, we realize that reviewers are the backbone of the scientific review process and that they provide a tremendous service to the journal. We have two teams of associate editors working to identify ways to both formally recognize outstanding reviewers and provide feedback to reviewers, especially those in the early career stage.

### Increasing Transparency and Promoting Open Science

There is momentum within both the APA and the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP) to increase the reproducibility, replicability, and transparency of our science. The APA now has an open science and methodology chair (currently held by Steve Kozlowski; *University of South Florida*) in an effort to help authors, reviewers, editors, and publication boards understand and develop best practices related to open science. The SIOP also has an Open Science and Practice Committee (initially led by Fred Oswald, *Rice University*, and Steven Rogelberg, *University of North Carolina at Charlotte*; now led by James Grand, *University of Maryland*) that is addressing similar issues within Division 14. Closer to home, my team and I have developed methodological reporting guidelines and checklists (<https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/features/apl-manuscript-checklist.pdf>) that we strongly encourage authors to use when preparing articles. The checklists extend the suggestions offered by Eby et al. (2020) and provide guidance for primary quantitative studies, meta-analyses, and qualitative or mixed methods research. Additional information can be found in the "manuscript submission" tab on the journal website. Other efforts to promote open science include greater use of online supplements and appendices, as well as encouraging authors to preregister research studies and make data and code publicly available, when feasible and appropriate. I also have a task force of associate editors working on other ideas to promote and support open science at the journal.

In closing, my team and I are looking forward to working closely with our editorial board members, ad hoc reviewers, and authors over the next 5 years. As you can see, we have many exciting initiatives under way. However, rest assured that we will not lose sight of the importance of providing expeditious and fair reviews for all research submitted to the journal. We will also remain steadfast in our commitment to publishing rigorous, high-quality science that is poised to make a difference (directly or indirectly) in the academy and beyond.

### References

- Cucina, J. M., Hayes, T. L., Walmsley, P. T., & Martin, N. R. (2014). It is time to get medieval on the overproduction of pseudosocial theory: How Bacon (1297) and Alhazen (1021) can save industrial–organizational psychology. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 7(3), 356–364. <https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12163>
- Eby, L. T., Shockley, K. M., Bauer, T. N., Edwards, B., Homan, A. C., Johnson, R., Lang, J. W. B., Morris, S. B., & Oswald, F. I. (2020). Methodological checklists for improving research quality and reporting consistency. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 13(1), 76–83. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2020.14>

- Hambrick, D. C. (2007). The field of management's devotion to theory: Too much of a good thing? *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(6), 1346–1352. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.28166119>
- Highhouse, S., Zickar, M. J., & Melick, S. R. (2020). Prestige and relevance of the scholarly journals: Impressions of SIOP members. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2020.2>
- Landeira-Fernandez, J., Ventura, D. F., & de Mello Cruz, A. P. (2013). *In medio stat virtus* [At the center of power]: Some thoughts about journal impact factor. *Psychology & Neuroscience*, 6(1), 1–2. <https://doi.org/10.3922/j.psns.2013.1.01>
- Oh, I.-S., & Van Iddekinge, C. (2020). I-O psychology and management journal prestige in business schools: Do institutional versus individual views differ? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 13, 307–311. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2020.58>
- Paulus, F. M., Cruz, N., & Krach, S. (2018). The impact factor fallacy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, Article 1487. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01487>
- Ragins, B. R. (2015). Editor's comments: Developing our authors. *Academy of Management Review*, 40(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2014.0477>
- Ragins, B. R. (2017). Editor's comments: Raising the bar for developmental reviewing. *Academy of Management Review*, 42(4), 573–576. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2017.0464>
- United Nations. (2020, April 9). *Policy brief: The impact of COVID-19 on women*. Retrieved from <https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2020/04/policy-brief-the-impact-of-covid-19-on-women>
- United Nations Development Programme. (2020, June). *Brief #2: Putting the UN framework for socio-economic response to COVID-19 into action: Insights*. United Nations. Retrieved from <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/brief-2-putting-un-framework-socio-economic-response-covid-19-action-insights-june-2020>
- Yancy, C. W. (2020). COVID-19 and African Americans. *JAMA*, 323(19), 1891–1892. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.6548>

Lillian T. Eby  
Department of Psychology, University of Georgia