

## EDITORIAL

# Gathering the Diaspora: Aims and Visions for *Motivation Science*

Guido H. E. Gendolla  
University of Geneva

Rex A. Wright  
University of North Texas

We are honored to assume editorial responsibilities for *Motivation Science*. The journal is still new, having been founded only 2 years ago. It is dedicated to publishing top-quality research on variables and processes involved in the production of behavior. We take over as coeditors accompanied by a new editorial board composed of renowned experts from multiple relevant disciplines, including economics, education, management, neuroscience, political science, psychology, and sport science.

Before offering thoughts on *Motivation Science* and our period of editorial service, we would like to thank the journal's founding editor, Deborah Prentice, and interim editor, David Dunning, for their past work as well as their willingness to continue serving as members of the editorial board. We also would like to thank former editorial board members and external reviewers who helped launch the journal. Our core responsibility as new coeditors will be to continue the work of those who came before us, aiming to make *Motivation Science* a first-choice publication outlet for members of the motivation science community.

Moving beyond individuals, we are pleased to work with the American Psychological Association (APA)—a legacy publisher providing strong infrastructure and highly competent and experienced editorial assistance and support. We also are pleased to be associated with the Society for the Study of Motivation (SSM). The SSM started as an initiative to unite motivation researchers from diverse scientific disciplines under one organizational umbrella. An important aspect of the society's guiding strategy was to found and support publications devoted to the science of motivation. *Motivation Science* is the most recent publication product, with other products being the journal *Motivation and Emotion* and the edited series *Advances in Motivation Science*. We see developments associated with the SSM as providing an excellent, maybe even historical, opportunity to give the science of motivation the visibility and the status it deserves. In context of the SSM's broader publication effort, *Motivation Science* should not compete with other journals. Instead, it should complete the landscape of publication outlets, providing a unifying and highly visible publication organ.

### Journal Character

*Motivation Science* will continue to be multidisciplinary in character under our stewardship, publishing basic and applied contributions to the study of

---

Guido H. E. Gendolla, Geneva Motivation Lab, FPSE, Section of Psychology, University of Geneva, Switzerland; Rex A. Wright, Motivation Science Laboratory, Department of Psychology, University of North Texas.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Guido H. E. Gendolla, Geneva Motivation Lab, FPSE, Department of Psychology, University of Geneva, 40, Bd. du Pont d'Arve, CH-1211 Geneva 4, Switzerland. E-mail: [guido.gendolla@unige.ch](mailto:guido.gendolla@unige.ch)

motivation, broadly conceived. We take the expression “broadly conceived” seriously. As founding editor Deborah Prentice noted in her inaugural editorial, *Motivation Science* was conceived as a premier publication outlet for the full collection of investigators whose work addresses issues in motivation (Prentice, 2014). This collection is a diaspora of sort, including people housed in diverse university and other professional units, such as schools of business, education, law, neuroscience, psychology, social science, and sport science. *Motivation Science* can play a role in gathering this diaspora, fostering idea exchange and drawing attention to insights and research programs that otherwise might be isolated to particular groups. Of course, it is appropriate for investigators with focused (e.g., social or legal) motivational interests to publish in journals relevant to those interests. However, exclusive publication in focused journals impedes integration and advancement in the field of motivation as a whole. Broad areas of study need central repositories for cutting-edge ideas and findings, and we envision *Motivation Science* as being such a repository.

### Changes

Although we aim to continue work of those who came before us, we will do so following our own manners and visions. Some changes we have instated pertain to the editorial board and to the action editing of submitted manuscripts. Our board is new, including expert representation from the various fields this journal seeks to unite. Given the young age of *Motivation Science*, nomination of associate editors was premature. Alternatively, board members will occasionally serve as action editors for submissions that fall out of the center of the coeditors’ competences. The idea is to make action editor assignments for submissions that are especially well suited to board member competence. This procedure is intended to expedite manuscript processing and ensure that editorial decisions can be primarily based on expertise.

An additional change pertains to the character of papers we will consider. We have redefined the manuscript categories for new submissions, clarifying that we are looking for empirical and conceptual contributions in two formats: Articles and Brief Reports. The primary difference between these two formats is manuscript length. Articles allow full elaboration (2,500–7,000 words), whereas Brief Reports demand concision (up to 2,500 words). In both cases, preference will be given to contributions that suggest clear conclusions and have straightforward and substantive implications.

Final changes pertain to the speed of manuscript processing. Our goal is to provide feedback for authors as soon as possible, ideally within 40 days of submission. Assignment of some manuscripts to editorial board members for processing should help us meet this goal. Also toward this end, we have limited the time for external reviews to 21 days and committed to promptly desk reject manuscripts without external reviews if those submissions do not comply with the standards and criteria outlined in the journal’s mission, which are briefly summarized below and presented in more detail in the journal information on the *Motivation Science* homepage (<http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/mot/index.aspx?tab4>). We realize that desk rejections can be especially disappointing but also think that disappointing news should be conveyed quickly in order to give authors the chance to consider alternative outlets for their manuscripts without losing precious time.

### Target Submissions

So, what do we envision as target submissions? Regarding manuscripts reporting original research, we welcome both manuscripts reporting single studies and manuscripts reporting multiple studies. This will be true for Articles as well as Brief Reports. In both publication formats, preference will be given to manuscripts that present theory-driven research involving tests of clearly derived hypotheses. Findings should be straightforward and have substantive implications. We will be open to so-called newer approaches to statistical inference as well as older conventional ones, making judgments about analytic applications on a study-by-study basis.

Referring to criteria for conclusive results of original research contributions, we largely agree with the standards outlined by Wilkinson and the APA Task Force on Statistical Inference (1999). Specifically, we encourage authors to (a) plan their research in line with clearly articulated study goals; (b) adapt their research designs, procedures, and sampling methods to their articulated study goals; (c) formulate clear—ideally theory-based—hypotheses, including explanations of why effects should occur; and (d) apply the most powerful, focused, and thus minimally sufficient data analyses available to test these hypotheses. Replication studies are welcome so long as they address substantive motivation issues, are competently conducted, and provide conclusive results.

Concerning conceptual contributions, we welcome strong theoretical papers and literature reviews. Reviews can be qualitative, involving narrative descriptions of studies and findings, or quantitative, involving meta-analyses. Like original research submissions, conceptual submissions should suggest clear conclusions and have straightforward and substantive implications. We see debate as vital for the advancement of science and thus will consider publishing high-quality reactive commentaries to published work in the Conceptual Brief Report format. We will expect such commentaries to be framed constructively and to contain insights that are fresh and noteworthy.

### Summary

Summing up, we aim to continue the work of editors who came before us, following our own manners and visions. We encourage both empirical and conceptual contributions, framed as full-length Articles or Brief Reports. We will maintain the journal's multidisciplinary character and strive to process papers both competently and efficiently. One vision is for the journal to become a central repository for motivation research, drawing submissions from all areas of the motivation science community. Another vision is for the journal to play a role in drawing members of that community together, encouraging integration and advancing motivation as an independent and central area of scientific investigation.

### References

- Prentice, D. A. (2014). Editorial. *Motivation Science*, 1(Suppl.), 1–2. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h009985>
- Wilkinson, L. A., & the APA Task Force on Statistical Inference. (1999). Statistical methods in psychology journals: Guidelines and explanations. *American Psychologist*, 54, 594–604. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.54.8.594>