

EDITOR'S NOTE

With Volume 31, the *Journal* has changed its name to the *Journal of Collective Negotiations*. The *Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector* has developed a reputation as a quality journal in industrial and labor relations and management. This reputation is well documented in recent bibliographic studies [1, 2] which place the journal in rather impressive company. It is the hope of the editorial staff and the Editorial Advisory Board that we may build on the quality that Harry Kershen established in his tenure as Executive Editor. To improve the *Journal* two specific changes have been made. The change of the name to reflect a broadening of the editorial mission of the *Journal* and an increased emphasis on rigorous quality control.

To make the *Journal* a general interest management and labor relations journal is a bit of a risk. Many of the journals concerning labor-management relations have broadened their editorial scopes to cut across disciplines such as organizational behavior, jurisprudence, finance, and economics as well as industrial and labor relations. This move towards more general interest in all things labor makes intuitive sense because the field of industrial and labor relations has as its foundation a broad cross-section of academic disciplines. While continuing our focus on public sector collective bargaining and labor issues, the *Journal* will also be accepting for publication articles, book reviews, and comments that are of interest to a readership beyond those interested primarily in the public sector. In doing so, it is hoped that our loyal readers and contributors interested primarily in the public sector will continue their support for the *Journal*.

Beginning with Volume 30, the editorial policies of the *Journal* have changed to include a preliminary screening of articles by the Editor and in-house members of the Editorial Advisory Board. Those articles which are deemed to be within the editorial mission of the *Journal* and of merit are then subjected to a refereeing process. Persons both on the Editorial Advisory Board, and *ad hoc* referees are asked to review the article and make recommendations concerning the acceptability of the manuscript for inclusion in a future Volume and Number of the

Journal. In general, two referees will review the article, and a third referee will be queried if there is not a consensus reached with the first two referees. The process is a blind process, and quality of the article and its contribution to the literature are the standards used to determine the acceptability of the manuscript. Naturally, the process will evolve, and the refereeing process is dependent upon previous authors and experts in the area being willing to devote some of their valuable time to read and comment on the manuscripts.

Finally, I would like to thank the staff of the Baywood Publishing Company, our readers, and most of all our contributors for their loyalty and patience in this transition period as we were changing the name and the refereeing process. I know that some of the prolonged refereeing and production delays were trying, but those days are behind us, and it is sincerely hoped that we are embarking raising the *Journal* to new heights.

REFERENCES

1. A. McWilliams, D. Siegel and D. Van Fleet, "Scholarly Journals as Producers of Knowledge: Theory and Empirical Evidence Based on Data Envelopment Analysis," *Organizational Research Methods*, 8, pp. 185-201, 2005.
2. J. Johnson and P. M. Podsakoff, "Journal Influence in the Field of Management: An Analysis Using Salancik's Index in a Dependency Network," *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, pp. 1392-1407, 1994.

Dr. David Dilts
Executive Editor