



The Leadership Quarterly Yearly Review: Comprehensive and integrative perspectives on leadership research, theory, and methods

The Yearly Review issue of *The Leadership Quarterly* publishes high-quality, high-impact, state-of-the-science reviews across a diverse set of leadership topics. It has been an annual mainstay of the journal since the Yearly Review was introduced in 2000. The 2020 issue follows that tradition and aspires to extend and enhance contributions to leadership science. The process to publication involves a rigorous, peer-review system described in more detail in the following paragraph. The importance afforded to the Yearly Review issue is such that it appears as the first published issue in February for each volume of the journal.

There are a few features that make the Yearly Review distinct from regular issues of the journal. As the Yearly Review Editor, I am responsible for this category of articles in consultation with the Editor in Chief. A competitive call is published early each year for authors to submit a 10-page proposal, plus all end matter. Each proposal is first screened by me and the Editor in Chief. Proposals that are judged to be in scope and are sufficiently well-developed are sent out for review. Proposals receive detailed feedback from at least two reviewers for the authors to consider and address in their respective full manuscripts. Point-by-point responses to the reviewers' comments are required along with submission of the review manuscript. Invitation to submit a full manuscript does not guarantee eventual publication; however, the reviewers and I work in a constructive and developmental manner to enhance the publication potential of each manuscript. Typically, full manuscripts undergo at least two and typically more revisions before a final decision is made with regard to publication suitability in the Yearly Review. These articles take the form of narrative reviews, integrations, meta-analyses, and other formats related to the focal topic of leadership, broadly defined.

In terms of article scope, we seek to publish reviews on substantive areas of leadership theory and research, or to address relevant methodological issues. In particular, we seek to publish articles that have the potential to launch a new line of research, redirect existing research streams, propose concrete research agendas, or shut down areas of scholarship that are no longer relevant or have ceased making meaningful contributions to the field. What we do not typically publish in the Yearly Review are theory-development pieces into new areas of leadership science. Those types of papers should be submitted for review to the regular issue or a relevant special issue. Regardless of focus or approach, we strive for Yearly Review articles to be “pushing the envelope” in the respective area of leadership being reviewed. Authors are encouraged to take a stand, be provocative, and even stir some controversy, if needed.

The current issue comprises 13 articles that review relevant

leadership literature and forge directions for future researchers to build on. The lead article focuses on an important methodological topic by providing an introduction, review, and guidelines for conducting natural experiments in the leadership field (Jost Sieveke and Simone Santoni). Other articles in the issue include a review and critique of the “healthy leadership” literature (Cort Rudolph and colleagues) and examining the contemporary topic of leading teams in the digital age (Lindsay Larson and Leslie DeChurch), reviewing much of what is known on leadership and technology. Additional reviews include the topics of functional leadership in multi- and inter-team contexts (Dorothy Carter and colleagues); leader-follower transgressions and relationship repair and outcomes (Olga Epitropaki and colleagues); situation-trait approaches and situation-encoding schema in leader decision-making (Ryan Gottfredson and Christopher Reina); leadership in and of socio-political vanguards, also known as political fringe groups (Richard Marcy); examining what we know about the daily causes and consequences of leadership behaviors on what is called everyday leadership (Thomas Kelemen and colleagues); follower transformation as the foundation of transformational leadership theory (Nathapon Siangchokyo and colleagues); evolution-based dual strategies for understanding leadership in modern organizations (Kaylene McClanahan); leader-follower dyads (Kim Jayoung and colleagues); and leadership succession in business and political organizations (Bassam Farah and colleagues). The final article provides a review of the literature published during the third decade of *The Leadership Quarterly* (Kevin Lowe and colleagues) following an informal tradition that takes decennial perspectives on the accumulation of leadership science in the journal. It is a diverse and wide-ranging collection of article topics that will certainly stimulate – and possibly even provoke – your thinking about leadership research, theory, and methods. In keeping with the spirit of the journal and its international focus, the authorship teams in this volume represent multiple countries and continents.

In closing, on behalf of the authors and myself, many thanks to the reviewers for their constructive and developmental comments that ultimately improved every article in this issue. Looking ahead, I encourage future authors to consider submitting their proposals for future Yearly Review issues that consider timely and provocative leadership issues. In the meantime, I hope you enjoy reading the 2020 Yearly Review.

David V. Day
Claremont McKenna College, Claremont, CA 91711, USA
E-mail address: david.day@cmc.edu.