

Employee Performance and Engagement for Performance Improvement

Jeff M. Allen, PhD
Editor-in-Chief, PIQ

Arielle Turner
Editorial Assistant

This issue of *Performance Improvement Quarterly* contains three scholarly articles with a focus on job performance and a manuscript from the Associate Editor Publishing Series by John Turner, which is titled “All Manuscripts Must Have a Beginning, a Middle, and an End.”

The first refereed article, titled “Job Performance Analysis: Scientific Studies in the Main Journals of Management and Psychology from 2006 to 2015,” was written by Natasha Fogaça, Mariana Carolina Barbosa Rego, Mariane Cortat Campos Melo, Ladilucy Pereira Armond, and Francisco Antônio Coelho Jr. This article provides a review of job-performance studies for a 10-year time period. A shift in how job performance is defined is also addressed to provide a step toward job-performance construct comprehension.

The second refereed article, titled “Job Performance in the Learning Organization: The Mediating Impacts of Self-Efficacy and Work Engagement,” was written by Ji Hoon Song, Dae Seok Chai, Junhee Kim, and Sang Hoon Bae. The article takes a look inside Korean workforce institutions to examine structural relationships within the learning organization, culture, self-efficacy, work engagement, and job performance. Utilizing both structural equation modeling and the Sobel test, they discuss the positive impacts of learning-organization culture.

The final refereed article, titled “Queering Employee Engagement to Understand and Improve the Performance of Gay Male Law Enforcement Officers: A Phenomenological Exploration,” is by Joshua Collins and Tonette Rocco. The article examines a queered understanding of gay male law enforcement officers to improve performance and inclusion within the law enforcement workplace. The implications of this research

are discussed with a view toward promoting beneficial social interactions and positive perceptions within the workforce.

Finally, we here at *Performance Improvement Quarterly* still need our readers' involvement. The quality of any research journal is developed through the peer-review process. This is a critical area of growth for the journal as we finish up our 30th year of publication. More reviewers are needed! If you are a practitioner, we need your help in the review process. If you are a scholar-practitioner, we need your help. If you are a scholar, we need your help. The diverse perspective in our readership deserves a diversified perspective from our reviewers. The workload goal is two to three reviews per year. If you are interested, contact Arielle Turner (Arielle.Turner@unt.edu); she can answer all of your questions and get you started. First-timers are also welcome! We will mentor you. As a reviewer, you learn by doing while at the same time making a long-lasting contribution to your field.

Continuous Improvement

If you have any input or suggestions or want to be involved with *PIQ*, please contact any of listed below.

Jeff Allen, PhD
Editor-in-Chief, *PIQ*
University of North Texas Regents
Professor of Information
Science
Director, Center for Knowledge
Solutions
Cell: 940-453-9020
Work: 940-565-4918
Email: Jeff.Allen@unt.edu

Arielle Turner,
Editorial Assistant, *PIQ*
University of North Texas
Research Associate
Center for Knowledge Solutions
Cell: 940-767-5756
Work: 940-565-2093
Email: Arielle.Turner@unt.edu

John Turner, PhD
Associate Editor, *PIQ*
University of North Texas
Assistant Professor of Learning
Technologies
Cell: 940-453-9020
Work: 903-262-9302
Email: john.turner@unt.edu

Associate Editorial: All Manuscripts Must Have a Beginning, a Middle, and an End

John Turner, PhD
Associate Editor

We have noticed some common themes in manuscripts submitted to *PIQ* that need addressing. These themes have also been noticed at other high-profile journals and not just at *PIQ*. However, we wish to address these issues for the readers of *PIQ*. As members of the *PIQ* editorial team, it is partially our responsibility to educate our readers about the journal's expectations regarding the type and quality of manuscripts submitted for publication. In doing so, the editorial board will be providing a new section in the next few issues addressing these expectations.

One of the more common problems that we (the editorial board and reviewers of *PIQ*) have experienced is that the sections of submitted manuscripts were often incorrectly composed or had been completely disregarded and not included. One example of this is the unusual number of manuscripts submitted with only a Results section or only a Discussion section, but not both as required. In these particular manuscripts, the information in the section provided should have been carefully divided and structured to include both a Results and Discussion section. Every required section for a manuscript has its distinct purpose. By skipping one of these key sections, researchers are asking for their article to be rejected. Equally so, by not including the basic information required of each section, the researchers are also asking to be rejected.

This new Associate Editorial will briefly outline the journal's expectations as to the structure and content of each section included in a manuscript. This first editorial consists of a general overview of the fundamental components required for any empirical article along with a preview of some common reasons why manuscripts are rejected.

Components of Empirical Articles

A small bit of advice that I once received that seemed almost elementary at the time has rung true every time I explain the writing process to students. This advice is that every article should have a beginning, a middle, and an end. Yes, this seems elementary at first, but let's take a closer look. An article must present to the readers a viable problem that is worthy of being considered. In addition, the problem presented must be supported

and identified in the literature; the researcher needs to state why this problem is important to consider as well as who will benefit from addressing this problem at the current time. This Introduction is probably the most important section that a researcher will write. The Introduction will be the first section that readers comb through when they decide whether or not they are interested in this research and would continue reading further. The Introduction provides the beginning of the manuscript.

All manuscripts have both a Literature Review and a Methodology section. These two critical components position the research study into a context. The literature review identifies what is already known; provides a synthesis of past research; identifies hypotheses for quantitative studies, research questions for qualitative studies, and propositions for theoretical articles; and identifies how the study contributes to the chosen field of study (discipline). The Methodology section also places the research in context; it identifies to the readers which approved methodology will be used and which procedures will be incorporated, and specifies how these procedures will be implemented. This middle portion of the manuscripts gives the readers the context for the study.

Finally, the end includes the Results, Discussion, and Conclusion sections of the manuscript. Here the researcher will report the findings from the analysis, as identified in the Methodology section. Next, the researcher will interpret the meaning of these results in the Discussion section as they relate to the current study. This Discussion section also provides information related to how the findings are either supported or not supported by the literature, as presented earlier in the middle (literature review). In tying everything together—the beginning, the middle, and the end—the researcher provides a Conclusion describing what this all means to the field of study and whom these findings will affect the most. It is here that the researcher will also recommend future research and discuss alternative theoretical models that could also be considered. The Conclusion is the end-all section in that it incorporates the entire research study into one coherent section and expresses its pragmatic implications to the chosen field of study.

When in doubt consult the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (APA; 2010). The APA manual provides an outline and description of the main sections required in empirical manuscripts (see pages 23–40). These include the Title, Abstract, Introduction, Review of the Literature, Methodology, Results, Discussion, Conclusion, References, and Appendices. It is encouraged that all future researchers become familiar with these different components, their intended purpose, and the differences between one another.

Reasons for Rejection

Reasons for rejection typically involve incomplete or ill-formed research questions, lack of contribution to the literature or the discipline,

a poorly developed theoretical framework, methodological issues, or unclear writing (Ellinger, & Yang, 2011). In addition, Kilduff (2007) highlighted the top 10 reasons why papers are not sent out for review: incomplete literature review, practitioner papers, uninformed introduction, poor structure, wrong discipline, non-original contribution, uninvited resubmissions, improper article type for the journal, failure to follow formatting guidelines, and lack of theory.

One key important point to make before submitting any article for publication is that the submitted paper must be in its best version. As King (2000) highlighted:

There comes a point when you must judge what you've written and how well you wrote it. I don't believe a story or novel should be allowed outside the door of your study or writing room unless you feel confident that it's reasonably reader-friendly. (p. 196)

Similarly, Kilduff (2006) reiterated that "journal editors and reviewers should not be the first audience to whom your developing thoughts are exposed" (p. 252). Researchers should have their work reviewed by many peers; the final manuscript should be a composite of numerous revisions and edits from the initial draft. A researcher should not submit a draft without first having it reviewed by multiple peers, including those in a similar field of study.

Concluding Thoughts

In the next set of issues, this Associate Editorial will provide further details relating to required sections for manuscripts submitted to *PIQ* as well as providing details about what information needs to be in each. The next Associate Editorial will include information about the Introduction. Later Associate Editorials will include discussions relating to the Literature Review, Methodology, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion sections followed by an editorial briefly discussing APA formatting and the Reference section. We welcome your thoughts and comments as we are not only working toward improving the quality and reach of *PIQ*, but we are also setting out to achieve our goal of educating our readers (e.g., students, practitioners, scholars) as well as supporting the efforts of future researchers who plan to submit their manuscripts to *PIQ*.

References

- Ellinger, A.D., & Yang, B. (2011). Creating a whole from the parts: Qualities of good writing. In R.S. Tonette & T. Hatcher (Eds.), *The handbook of scholarly writing and publishing* (pp. 115–124). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kilduff, M. (2006). Publishing theory [Editor's Comments]. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 252-255. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2006.20208678>

- Kilduf, M. (2007). The top ten reasons why your paper might not be sent out for review [Editor's Comments]. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 700–702. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2007.25274943>
- King, S. (2000). *On writing: A memoir of the craft*. New York, NY: Scribner.
- American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: APA.