

From IRIOP to the JOB Annual Review: The past and future of a venerable outlet

PAUL HARVEY^{1*}  AND MARIE DASBOROUGH² 

¹Peter T Paul College of Business and Economics, University of New Hampshire, Durham, New Hampshire, U.S.A.

²School of Business, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida, U.S.A.

Summary

As incoming co-editors, we introduce the 2017 International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (IRIOP) Annual Review Issue. We begin this editorial with a brief history of IRIOP, from its creation as a book series in 1986 to the present issue—its fifth as an annual *Journal of Organizational Behavior* publication. We also summarize several changes we will be implementing, including expanded page limits for submissions and a name change. Most importantly, we then introduce the six manuscripts that appear in this issue. These papers, selected by former editors Gerard Hodgkinson and Kevin Ford, carry on the tradition of high-quality, impactful reviews that IRIOP has published for the past 30 years. Copyright © 2017 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Keywords: review; IRIOP; I/O Psychology

As incoming editors, we are pleased to present the *Journal of Organizational Behavior's* 2017 *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (IRIOP) issue. This issue marks a new milestone for IRIOP as outgoing editors Gerard Hodgkinson and Kevin Ford, along with Editor-in-Chief Suzanne Masterson, have graciously entrusted us with guiding the annual review into its next chapter. We are honored to be given this responsibility and the opportunity to carry on the legacy of IRIOP.

Looking Back

We open the 2017 issue with a look back at IRIOP's history and trajectory from its beginnings as a book series in 1986. The series was founded by Sir Cary Cooper and Ivan Robertson to provide a forum for comprehensive, systematic and critical reviews of research from the fields of I/O Psychology and Organizational Behavior. Under their leadership, IRIOP became recognized as “the most authoritative and current guide to new developments and established knowledge” in these fields (Hodgkinson & Ford, 2014, p. S1).

Cooper and Robertson successfully led IRIOP into the new millennium, eventually selecting Gerard Hodgkinson and Kevin Ford to take over as editors beginning with the 2005 volume. Despite having never met in person,¹ Hodgkinson and Ford continued the upward trajectory of IRIOP in terms of readership, submissions and impact while holding true to its core principles. Having successfully (and unsuccessfully!) submitted manuscripts under their watch, we can personally attest to their rigor in ensuring that only impactful reviews consistent with IRIOP's goals were published.

One of the most significant evolutions in IRIOP's history occurred under the leadership of Hodgkinson and Ford when, in 2013, the series joined forces with *JOB*. Transitioning from a book series to an annual issue of *JOB* has

*Correspondence to: Paul Harvey, Peter T Paul College of Business and Economics, University of New Hampshire, Durham, New Hampshire 03824, U.S.A. E-mail: paul.harvey@unh.edu

¹As an amusing aside, even now after a highly successful 12-year run as co-editors, Drs. Hodgkinson and Ford have STILL never met in person!

increased the visibility and impact of IRIOP dramatically. To illustrate, at the time of this writing, the articles published in IRIOP's first *JOB* issue (2013) have been cited an average of 46.7 times each per Google Scholar. This represents a nearly four-fold increase in average citations over the articles published in its last volume as a book series (2012, average citations = 12.9).

The honor of being chosen to carry on this lineage is not something we take lightly. We owe a debt of gratitude to Drs. Cooper, Robertson, Hodgkinson and Ford for building IRIOP into the venerable outlet it is today.

Looking Forward

In their editorial introducing IRIOP to *JOB* and its readership, Hodgkinson and Ford (2013) discussed the importance of evolving in step with changes in the publication landscape and the academic environment. These dynamics continue to shift, and the responsibility for keeping pace now falls to us. In recognition of this, and in consultation with our predecessors, we have decided to implement three key changes to this annual issue.

First, we will be expanding the page limit for manuscripts from 40 pages to 50 pages (inclusive). This is the page limit *JOB* currently applies to standard submissions, and we hope that it will give authors more flexibility to develop the comprehensive reviews we seek to publish.

Second, we have begun testing a rolling submission model. For the foreseeable future, we will continue to set an annual deadline for submitting proposals. Submissions received by this date will receive priority in terms of placement in the publication queue. We will, however, evaluate proposals outside of this time frame on a case-by-case basis. Those that show strong potential will be peer reviewed and, if ultimately accepted for publication, will be included in the next available issue.

The third change has been the most difficult for us. After consultation with past editors, including co-founder Cary Cooper, we have collectively decided that it is time to give this annual review issue a new name. As our colleagues in the field of marketing often tell us, changing a successful "brand" like IRIOP is risky. Over the past 30 years, the IRIOP name has garnered substantial prestige and goodwill among scholars. Retention of the IRIOP name as an annual issue of *JOB*, however, has presented new branding challenges. Not the least of which is the issue's ungainly official title, "*Journal of Organizational Behavior International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology Annual Review Issue*." Being published in an international journal like *JOB* has also made the "International Review" nomenclature redundant.

In recognition of its status as a *JOB* publication, and in the interest of simplicity, the annual issue will be published as the "Journal of Organizational Behavior Annual Review" beginning with the 2018 issue. The focus, criteria and, most importantly, high standards of IRIOP will remain unchanged. Like the editors who came before us, we aim to publish only the highly influential, comprehensive reviews of OB and I/O Psychology research that IRIOP has provided for the past 30 years.

Overview of Articles in This Issue

Following successful completion of a rigorous two-stage blind review process, six papers were selected by the previous editors of IRIOP (Kevin Ford & Gerard Hodgkinson) for inclusion in this issue. These six papers address a wide variety of topics within the IOP and OB realm.

In the first paper, Dawkins, Tian, Newman, and Martin (2017) review the extant research on psychological ownership. Psychological ownership refers to the possessive feelings that some object is mine or ours (Van Dyne & Pierce, 2004). Within a workplace context, psychological ownership occurs when an employee feels that the organization, a job, a task or a product belongs to them. To date, the literature on psychological ownership lacks

consensus regarding conceptualization and measurement. Dawkins et al. (2017) aim to provide guidance based on their systematic review of the available literature. They provide a clear roadmap for future research on psychological ownership, covering both theoretical directions and methodological advances.

Next, Conroy, Henle, Shore, and Stelman (2017) review 25 years of literature on organizational identification. Although research often highlights the beneficial outcomes of this construct, Conroy et al. examine the “dark side” of identification. Phenomena such as over-identification and conflicting identification, along with outcomes such as resistance to change, unethical behavior and performance deficits are summarized. This review serves as an important reminder that many of the constructs we study, even seemingly desirable ones such as organizational identification, can take both favorable and unfavorable forms. As the authors explain, “where there is light, there is also dark.”

Continuing the theme of mixed results, Hall, Frink, and Buckley (2017) review and synthesize the literature on felt accountability, which refers to the perception that one’s actions will be evaluated by a salient audience. This review was certainly needed as the last review on this topic was back in the late 1990s, and there has been a pattern of mixed results emerging from empirical studies. Hall et al. (2017) make several suggestions for moving the field forward. Our favorite suggestion, for example, is that, because causal responsibility leads to accountability, the application of attribution theory to accountability research may be useful (see Martinko, Harvey, & Dasborough, 2011). The authors conclude that by refining our operationalizations and expanding our ontological foundations, we can enhance our understanding of this intriguing construct.

Accountability and attributions are also relevant in the context of corporate social responsibility. The next article by Gond, El Akremi, Swaen, and Babu (2017) reviews the literature on the psychological micro-foundations of corporate social responsibility. They adopt a person-centric perspective, focusing on prospective and incumbent employees, including job seekers, managers and executives. Their supplementary appendix lists many studies on underlying mechanisms, boundary conditions and outcomes of CSR at the individual level. This will be an excellent resource for new scholars who are interested in learning about CSR.

Moghimi, Zacher, Scheibe, and Van Yperen (2017) provide both a systematic review and a meta-analysis of the selection, optimization and compensation model. This model suggests that in situations where there are limited resource and high demands, individuals make use of action regulation strategies that help them use their resources in an optimal way. This model emerged from the lifespan developmental literature in 1990, and its relevance to the workplace context has since been demonstrated in numerous empirical studies. Moghimi et al. (2017) conclude from their review and meta-analysis that the selection, optimization and compensation model is a fruitful theory of action regulation at work, and that using such strategies has positive implications for both employees and organizations.

The final article in this issue also focuses on a specific model, the Categorization–Elaboration Model of contingencies in workgroup diversity effects. Using this model as a framework, Guillaume, Dawson, Otaye-Ebede, Woods, and West (2017) provide a review of variables moderating the effects of workplace diversity on social integration, performance and well-being outcomes. As the authors note, there is no shortage of studies on the impact of diversity on outcomes; however, there remains uncertainty over the contingency factors that impact these outcomes. Their review found support for the following moderators: strategy, unit design, HR practices, leadership, climate/culture and individual differences.

Conclusion

We thank outgoing editors Gerard Hodgkinson and Kevin Ford for their service to IRIOP over the years, and for the selection of these fine articles for inclusion in this issue. We also extend our gratitude to JOB Editor-in-Chief, Suzanne Masterson, and the Senior Editorial Assistant, Iris Poessé, who have helped us make the transition into the co-editor roles smoothly. As we move forward, we embrace the challenge of maintaining IRIOP’s position as the most authoritative and current guide to accumulated knowledge in Organizational Behavior and Industrial/Organizational Psychology.

Author biographies

Paul Harvey is an Associate Professor of Management at the University of New Hampshire Peter T. Paul College of Business and Economics. He has a PhD in Organizational Behavior from Florida State University. In addition to co-editing the JOB IRIOP/Annual Review, he serves as an Associate Editor for the journal. His research examines workplace perceptions and emotions...when his four-month old daughter Isabelle permits it.

Marie T. Dasborough is an Associate Professor in Management at the School of Business Administration, University of Miami. She received her Ph.D. from the University of Queensland Business School in Australia. Her research focuses on leadership, emotions, attributions, and teams. She co-edits the JOB IRIOP/Annual Review, plus serves on the editorial boards of JOB, LQ, and GOM. When she is not being a serious professor, she is a fun mom to two young children (Stephanie & Daniel).

References

- Conroy, S., Henle, C. A., Shore, L., & Stelman, S. (2017). Where there is light, there is dark: A review of the detrimental outcomes of high organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(2), 184–203.
- Dawkins, S., Tian, A. W., Newman, A., & Martin, A. (2017). Psychological ownership: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(2), 163–183.
- Gond, J. P., El Akremi, A., Swaen, V., & Babu, N. (2017). The psychological micro-foundations of corporate social responsibility: A person-centric systematic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(2), 225–246.
- Guillaume, Y. R., Dawson, J. F., Otaye-Ebede, L., Woods, S. A., & West, M. A. (2017). Harnessing demographic differences in organizations: What moderates the effects of workplace diversity? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(2), 276–303.
- Hall, A. T., Frink, D. D., & Buckley, M. R. (2017). An accountability account: A review and synthesis of the theoretical and empirical research on felt accountability. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(2), 204–224.
- Hodgkinson, G. P., & Ford, J. K. (2013). Change and continuity in the advancement of (scholarly) knowledge and its dissemination. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(S1), S1–S6.
- Hodgkinson, G. P., & Ford, J. K. (2014). Narrative, meta-analytic, and systematic reviews: What are the differences and why do they matter? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(S1), S1–S5.
- Martinko, M. J., Harvey, P., & Dasborough, M. T. (2011). Attribution theory in the organizational sciences: A case of unrealized potential. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(1), 144–149.
- Moghimi, D., Zacher, H., Scheibe, S., & Van Yperen, N. W. (2017). The selection, optimization, and compensation model in the work context: A systematic review and meta-analysis of two decades of research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(2), 247–275.
- Van Dyne, L., & Pierce, J. L. (2004). Psychological ownership and feelings of possession: Three field studies predicting employee attitudes and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(4), 439–459.