


WHERE IS THE FIELD MOVING?

Find the gap where a *rising* idea meets yours

Top-left is where social science is **rising from a small base**: terms whose share at least doubled since 2015–17 but are still mentioned by fewer papers than most. Type your idea above to see where it sits and what to pair it with.



● Sociology 55 ● Political Science 45 ● Economics 40 ● Psychology 62 ● Anthropology 22 ● Communication 37
 ● Emerging & Computational 26 ● Education 34 ● Public Health 36

Pair your idea with a rising term → ● deepfakes x367 ● Alethics x125 ● algorithmic bias x82 ● content moderation x63
 ● fintech x18 ● pandemic preparedness x16

Rule: 357 terms from the Research Book's Term Trends (OpenAlex share of social-science papers per year; terms with fewer than 100 papers in 2024 left out). Across = mean share 2022–24; up = that share ÷ the 2015–17 share; terms past x64 sit in the top strip with their real multiple. Dot size = papers in 2024; colour = field. Rising terms = at least doubled, below the median share, 200+ papers in 2024; with a topic, ones from its field are offered first. The shaded corner is a reading aid, not a list of gaps. Choosing a term hands "your idea + term" to the Compass, which then checks the literature.

JOURNALTIME

Choose the journal, *then* *write for it*

JournalTime — how to pick a realistic target journal, shape the manuscript for it, and submit references you can stand behind.

Choose the journal, *then write for it*

A working guide to the last mile. The study from Volumes 2–7 now has a theory, measures, a positioning, an analysis and model paragraphs. Here it chooses where to send them — and learns why "reference formatting" is a place where a careful tool must sometimes refuse to help.

Site. <https://syahmedu.github.io/journaltime/>

Version. 2.2.4 (2026–10–18) · build 3702b3b+edits · 2026–10–18T15:45:22Z

Figures. Real screenshots of the live site, captured 2026–10–18 by `scripts/capture.mjs`; sample data shown in figures is labelled simulated where it is simulated.

Sources. 8 DOI-verified references, numbered in order of use. Nothing in this book is invented: counts and labels are read from the site or its published data.

Status. A user guide, not documentation of record. Where the site and this book differ, the site is right — please report it (see Version history).

Type. Fraunces, Plus Jakarta Sans and IBM Plex Mono (SIL Open Font License). Laid out with Paged.js.

Contents

01	Fit before speed	4
02	Where the conversation is moving	5
03	Read the speed figures honestly	8
	Listed: the first decision	8
	Measured: submission to publication	9
04	Write for one journal	11
05	Format without inventing	13
06	Before you press submit	16
07	Defend it	17
08	Write the cover letter	18
	Why it looks like this	18
09	JournalTime at a glance	19
–	Glossary	22
–	References	23
–	Version history & errata	24

01

BEFORE YOU CHOOSE

Fit before speed

Most first submissions that fail are not rejected for weak science. They are sent back from the editor's desk because they were written for someone else's readers.

Choose the conversation first. The journal whose recent papers you cited most, whose readers would recognise your question, and whose methods sections look like yours is usually a better first target than the fastest or the most prestigious. Speed matters — a long first decision delays every later step — but it is a tie-breaker between journals that already fit.

A JOURNAL IS A REALISTIC TARGET WHEN...

- ☐ Its recent papers include work you cite, on the same conversation.
- ☐ Its readers would care about your setting and your outcome.
- ☐ It publishes your design and method — survey, two waves, moderation.
- ☐ Your manuscript is within its length and format limits.
- ☐ Its review time and open-access options suit your situation.

THE WORKED EXAMPLE – CONTINUED

The study sits between two conversations: **occupational health psychology / organisational behaviour** (JD-R, burnout, engagement) and **nursing** (the setting, the staff, the shifts). Both are honest homes; each would frame the paper differently. Two kinds of evidence help weigh them: where the conversation is moving, and how long each kind of journal takes.

02

THE MOMENTUM MAP


Where the conversation is moving

Type the study's idea into JournalTime and the momentum map places its terms among 357 social-science terms, by how common they are and how fast they have moved.

WHERE IS THE FIELD MOVING?

Find the gap where a *rising* idea meets yours

burnout appears in 0.22% of social-science papers in 2022–24, $\times 2.7$ its 2015–17 share, so it is rising fast. The dashed lines run to rising terms worth pairing with it, Psychology ones first.



Rule: 357 terms from the Research Book's Term Trends (OpenAlex share of social-science papers per year; terms with fewer than 100 papers in 2024 left out). Across = mean share 2022–24; up = that share + the 2015–17 share; terms past $\times 64$ sit in the top strip with their real multiple. Dot size = papers in 2024; colour = field. Rising terms = at least doubled, below the median share, 200+ papers in 2024; with a topic, ones from its field are offered first. The shaded corner is a reading aid, not a list of gaps. Choosing a term hands “your idea + term” to the Compass, which then checks the literature.

FIG 2.1 *burnout* in the idea box: the term appears in 0.22% of social-science papers in 2022–24, $\times 2.7$ its 2015–17 share. The readout calls it rising fast; dashed lines run to rising terms to pair it with, Psychology's own first.

Read the position, not the colour. Burnout sits to the right of most terms, so it is already a large conversation, and well above the $\times 1$ line, so its share has nearly tripled. A rising, crowded topic means editors see many burnout submissions. They will ask what this one adds, so the contribution has to be stated in the first paragraph rather than discovered in the discussion.

The dashed lines run from burnout to the rising terms the map suggests pairing it with. Rising terms from burnout's own field come first: *resilience* ($\times 7.7$) and *psychological safety* ($\times 5.2$), both Psychology. Then come the fastest risers anywhere, *deepfakes* ($\times 367$) and *AI ethics* ($\times 125$), which sit in the strip along the top because they have moved past $\times 64$. Choosing one hands “your idea + term” to the Research Compass, which then checks the literature. The cross-field risers do not fit this study, and that is the right reading: a fresh angle is only fresh if it belongs to the question. The same-field pair is a lead to test, not a finding.

WHAT THE MAP COUNTS

The map counts the share of social-science papers that mention a term (OpenAlex, via the Research Book's Term Trends). It shows attention, not quality or acceptance odds, and it cannot see terms outside its list of 357; terms with fewer than 100 papers in 2024 are left out.

03

LISTED AND MEASURED

Read the speed figures honestly

Two kinds of number describe how fast a journal moves. One is what journals list; the other is measured from real articles. They answer different questions, and neither is an acceptance rate.

Listed: the first decision

The journal list shared by JournalTime and ScholarScope's Publish desk holds 1,805 Scopus-indexed journals, each with a listed time to first decision and the source of that figure.

LISTED FIRST DECISION	JOURNALS	RANGE	MEDIAN	PUBLISHER-STATED • ESTIMATED
Nursing	36	21–45 days	35 days	34 • 2
Organizational Behaviour	134	21–90 days	45 days	88 • 46

Nursing journals list faster first decisions than organisational-behaviour journals, and their figures are better sourced: 46 of the 134 organisational values are estimates, not publisher statements.

Measured: submission to publication




FIG 3.1 Journal Timelines, filtered to Nursing: of 199 nursing journals with measured timelines, half publish within 180 days of submission; the fastest quarter within 136. The lanes show the 16 fastest, each split into review and production.

MEASURED (JOURNAL TIMELINES)	JOURNALS MEASURED	HALF PUBLISH WITHIN	FASTEST QUARTER
Nursing	199	180 days	136 days
Psychology	372	238 days	183 days
Business, management and accounting	358	298 days	215 days

The measured times tell the same story at a different scale. A first decision is only the first step; the whole route to publication takes months. Nursing journals are faster on both counts.

Look at the fastest nursing lanes before trusting them. The two at the top, *Annals of Clinical Nutrition and Metabolism* and the *Journal of Nutrition and Health*, are nutrition journals that share the broad Nursing subject area. Speed was never the first test: they do not fit this study at all.

WHAT THE SPEED FIGURES CAN AND CANNOT TELL YOU

Listed figures are what journals state, often round numbers, and some are estimates; where a journal appeared twice in the catalogue with different turnarounds, its figure is marked estimated. Measured figures come from the dates publishers deposit with Crossref, so publishers that do not deposit them (many Elsevier, SAGE and APA titles) are missing rather than slow. The two numbers measure different things and should not be subtracted from each other. Check each journal's own site for current figures and its scope.

WORKED EXAMPLE

Choice: a nursing journal first. The setting, staff and outcome are central to nursing readers, nursing journals are faster on both listed and measured times, and the theory and measures travel with the paper. An organisational-behaviour journal remains the second target — and the introduction is drafted so that only its framing paragraph changes between the two.

04

JOURNAL STUDIO

Write for one journal

A paper written for "a journal" is written for none. Pick one and read three of its recent papers before you draft.




FIG 4.1 Journal Studio: choose the journal, give your topic, and work through its steps.

- 1 Read the journal's aims and scope, and three recent papers on related topics. Note their length, section headings and how much theory they carry.
- 2 Write the opening paragraph in that journal's language — for a nursing journal, the problem in practice before the theory; for an organisational journal, the theoretical puzzle first.

- 3 Keep the model paragraphs from Volumes 2–7 as building blocks: positioning (vol 2), evidence (vol 3), theory (vol 5), measures (vol 6), results (vol 7), design (vol 4).
- 4 Check the journal's rules on preregistration, data sharing and AI disclosure before you submit ¹.

LIMITS

Journal Studio and the Article Developer draft text with AI. Treat every generated citation as unverified until you have opened it by its DOI — the same audit as Volume 4.

05

JOURNAL FORMATTER

Format without inventing

Formatting should change the look of your manuscript, never its content. The Formatter is built around that rule — and this chapter shows the rule doing its job.

Upload .docx

or paste your manuscript text

When long shifts wear nurses down: Job autonomy as a buffer (illustrative teaching manuscript)

A. Author

Abstract

This illustrative manuscript accompanies the Lazy Research Lad guidebooks. Drawing on the Job Demands–Resources model, it asks whether job autonomy buffers the association between shift length and burnout among hospital nurses. Results reported in the guidebooks

International Journal of Nursing Studies

Style: auto from journal

☐ Blind for review
☒ Restyle references (Crossref)

Format manuscript →

International Journal of Nursing Studies (Elsevier) → Elsevier · Most Elsevier journals accept format-free first submissions ("Your Paper Your Way"); APA author–date shown is the common social-science default. **House default — always verify against the journal's guide for authors.**

Journal list: 1,805 Scopus-indexed journals (snapshot; turnaround & metrics age with it) — always confirm against the journal's own author guidelines

4 sections

122 body words

9 references

5 matched · 4 kept verbatim

REFERENCE TRUST PANEL

Your body text is never touched — only the reference list is restyled. Restyled entries come from real Crossref records (DOI shown, one click reverts any of them); Δ entries pass through exactly as you wrote them — check those by hand.

CITATION AGE · YEARS PARSED FROM YOUR OWN REFERENCE LIST

0

1

2

3

4

≤5y

6–10y

11–20y

>20y

Δ 89% of dated references are older than 10 years — reviewers often flag a stale base.

TITLE

When long shifts wear nurses down: Job autonomy as a buffer (illustrative teaching manuscript)

AUTHORS (AS THEY SHOULD APPEAR)

A. Author

AFFILIATIONS (ONE PER LINE)

ABSTRACT

This illustrative manuscript accompanies the Lazy Research Lad guidebooks. Drawing on the Job Demands–Resources model, it asks whether job autonomy buffers the association between shift length and burnout among hospital nurses. Results reported in the guidebooks come from a simulated teaching dataset and are not findings.

KEYWORDS

comma-separated

REFERENCES — RESTYLED WHERE MATCHED, VERBATIM WHERE NOT

✓ Crossref

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>

10.1037/ocp0000056

↗

original as you wrote it

Δ verbatim

Crawford, E. R., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 834–848. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019364>

10.1037/a0019364

↗

original as you wrote it

✓ Crossref

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>

10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499

↗

original as you wrote it

✓ Crossref

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Vardakou, I., & Kantas, A. (2003). The Convergent Validity of Two Burnout Instruments. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 19(1), 12–23. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.19.1.12>

10.1027/1015-5759.19.1.12

↗

original as you wrote it

✓ Crossref

Lee, R. T., & Ashforth, B. E. (1996). A meta-analytic examination of the correlates of the three dimensions of job burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(2), 123–133. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.2.123>

10.1037/0021-9010.81.2.123

↗

original as you wrote it

Δ verbatim

Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ). *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(6), 1321–1339. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1321>

10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1321

↗

original as you wrote it

Download submission .docx

Published look

FIG 5.1 The teaching manuscript formatted for the *International Journal of Nursing Studies*: 4 sections, 9 references — **6 matched to Crossref and restyled, 3 kept verbatim (Δ)**. Body text untouched; publisher layout labelled a house default.

Read the reference trust panel before you download. A reference is restyled only when the Formatter can match it to a real Crossref record with confidence — first by the DOI written in the reference itself, otherwise by a strict title, author and year check. Anything it cannot match is left **exactly as you wrote it**, flagged for you to check by hand.

14

JOURNALTIME · V2.2.4

WHAT THE FLAGS MEANT

Three of the nine references stayed verbatim. Each had a **shortened title** in the manuscript — for example *The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ)* rather than the full title of Morgeson and Humphrey's article ². The Formatter would not guess. The fix is the author's: write the full title, run it again.

An earlier version of the Formatter did guess: it replaced that reference with a different Crossref record — the questionnaire's dataset entry — despite the correct DOI in the reference. It now resolves by the reference's own DOI first and never substitutes another record. A tool that formats references must be allowed to say "I am not sure".

The panel also counts the age of your references. Here 89% of dated references are more than ten years old — a fair prompt to cite the recent literature too (the JD-R update ³, and the recent papers found in Volume 2).

06

THE LAST CHECK

Before you press submit

Editors decide fast. Make the first page and the cover letter answer their two questions: does this fit, and is it careful?

THE SUBMISSION CHECKLIST

- ☐ Title and abstract name the population, design and main finding — no hype.
- ☐ Introduction ends on the research question; positioning claims show how they were searched.
- ☐ Methods report design timing, sources, measures with sample reliabilities, and the preregistered plan.
- ☐ Results give estimates with intervals, not only $p^{4,5}$.
- ☐ Every reference was opened by its DOI; flagged references fixed or deliberately kept.
- ☐ Data, code and materials statements follow the journal's policy.
- ☐ AI assistance is disclosed as the journal requires.

07

AT THE EDITOR'S DESK

Defend it

The questions an editor asks before sending a paper to review.

REVIEWER

"Why our journal?"

YOUR ANSWER

Name the conversation: the recent papers in the journal your study extends, and why its readers need the result.

REVIEWER

"This is a management paper in a nursing journal."

YOUR ANSWER

Lead with the practice problem — burnout and staffing — and show what nursing managers can do with the finding; keep the theory, but in service of the setting.

REVIEWER

"Your references are dated."

YOUR ANSWER

Add the recent work found in the Research Book's recent tier and the JD-R updates ^{6,3}, and say what has changed.

REVIEWER

"Was this written with AI?"

YOUR ANSWER

Disclose what was drafted and how every claim, citation and number was then checked against its source.

08

ONE PAGE

Write the cover letter

A cover letter is three paragraphs: what you found, why this journal's readers need it, and the formal statements.

MODEL PARAGRAPH

We submit an original article testing whether job autonomy buffers the association between shift length and burnout among hospital nurses. Using shift length from ward rosters and a two-wave survey, the study tests a prediction that is distinctive to the Job Demands–Resources model and speaks directly to how nurse managers design work around long shifts.

The manuscript builds on recent work in the journal on nurse burnout and staffing, and extends it by examining a resource that rosters themselves may constrain.

The manuscript is not under consideration elsewhere. The analysis plan was preregistered; data and analysis code are available as described in the manuscript. AI tools were used to draft parts of the text; all content, citations and numbers were checked by the authors.

Model letter for the illustrative study. It describes a design and contribution, not results; replace the journal-specific sentence with the real papers you build on.

Why it looks like this

The momentum map gives its two questions the two position channels ⁷: across, how large a term already is (its share of papers in 2022–24); up, how fast it has moved (that share against 2015–17). Both axes are logarithmic, because a term rising from 0.01% to 0.02% has doubled just as surely as one rising from 1% to 2%. The four labelled corners are a reading aid, not a classification.

The crossing in Journal Timelines draws measured times on real calendar dates from today, so a median of 180 days reads as a month you can plan around. Review and production are separate colours along one thread; the middle half of each journal's articles is a band, so a single fast median is not mistaken for a promise ⁸.

09

REFERENCE

JournalTime at a glance

The four surfaces and the momentum map.

SURFACE	USE IT TO...
 Research Compass	Map a topic's research space and gaps with AI — leads to check, not findings.
 Article Developer	Generate and edit a full draft, section by section; the draft analytics strip reports readability, sentence length, passive voice and section balance on-device.
 Journal Studio	Write for one chosen journal, step by step.
 Journal Formatter	Turn a .docx or pasted text into a submission .docx or a two-column preview; deterministic, no AI; references restyled only on a confident Crossref match.




FIG 9.1 The momentum map with no idea typed: 357 terms by share of social-science papers in 2022–24 (across) and change since 2015–17 (up). The shaded top-left corner holds terms that at least doubled from a small base; terms past ×64 sit in the strip along the top with their real multiple, and the key below names each field's colour.

WHAT YOU SEE	WHAT IT MEANS
Across (log)	Mean share of social-science papers mentioning the term, 2022–24.
Up (log)	That share divided by the 2015–17 share; the ×1 line means no change.
Corners	Emerging (shaded) · booming · established, crowded · quiet, fading — reading aids, not verdicts.
Dot size and colour	Papers in 2024; the term's field.
Your idea	Terms in the idea box light up; the chips pair it with rising terms and hand the pair to the Research Compass.

HONEST DATA

The journal list holds 1,805 Scopus-indexed journals with listed turnaround and metrics, shared with ScholarScope's Publish desk. Figures age; confirm them on each journal's own site.

Glossary

First decision

The time from submission to the editor's first decision, as the catalogue lists it for a journal. Listed, not measured.

Measured time

Days from submission to online publication, computed from the dates publishers deposit with Crossref for real articles. Available only for publishers that deposit those dates.

Momentum

How a term's share of social-science papers in 2022–24 compares with its share in 2015–17 ($\times 2$ = doubled).

Desk rejection

A rejection by the editor before peer review — most often for poor fit with the journal's scope or audience.

Fit

Whether the journal's readers would recognise your question as part of their conversation. The first thing an editor judges.

Restyled reference

A reference the Formatter matched to a real Crossref record and rewrote in the journal's style. Unmatched references stay exactly as written, flagged [A](#).

House default

The layout and reference style the Formatter applies for a publisher family. A default to check against the journal's own guide for authors.

References

Every reference was resolved by its DOI against Crossref (or DataCite) and matched on first author and year before it could be cited — 8 sources in this volume. Verification date per entry is kept in `references/verified.json`.

- 1 Nosek, B. A., Ebersole, C. R., DeHaven, A. C., & Mellor, D. T. (2018). The preregistration revolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(11), 2600–2606. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1708274114>
- 2 Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ): Developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work.. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(6), 1321–1339. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1321>
- 3 Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2023). Job demands–resources theory in times of crises: New propositions. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 13(3), 209–236. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20413866221135022>
- 4 Wasserstein, R. L., & Lazar, N. A. (2016). The ASA Statement on p -Values: Context, Process, and Purpose. *The American Statistician*, 70(2), 129–133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00031305.2016.1154108>
- 5 Cumming, G. (2014). The New Statistics. *Psychological Science*, 25(1), 7–29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613504966>
- 6 Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward.. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- 7 Cleveland, W. S., & McGill, R. (1984). Graphical Perception: Theory, Experimentation, and Application to the Development of Graphical Methods. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 79(387), 531–554. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1984.10478080>
- 8 Munzner, T. (2014). *Visualization Analysis and Design*. A K Peters/CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/b17511>

Version history & errata

This guidebook is version-controlled. Corrections are made in its source, the version number is raised, and the change is recorded here and in [CHANGELOG.md](#). Report an error with the page number and the version printed in the footer.

VERSION	DATE	CHANGES
2.2.4	2026-10-18	Series back to 13 volumes (Throughline CS dropped: a separate product, not one of the Lazy Research Lad sites): covers and title pages now read 'of 13'. Text and figures unchanged.
2.2.3	2026-10-18	Series grows to 14 volumes (ScholarScope, Cadence, FallacyScope and Throughline CS added): "of 14" on the cover and title page; content unchanged.
2.2.2	2026-10-18	Series grows to ten volumes: Volume 10 (BookScope) added, so covers and title pages now read 'of 10'. Text and figures unchanged.
2.2.1	2026-10-18	Suite renamed: Throughline is now Lazy Research Lad (series, titles and text). Screenshots unchanged.
2.2.0	2026-10-18	Momentum map figures re-shot after the live map was improved: terms past x64 now sit in a labelled strip with their real multiple, a field colour key, and dashed links from your idea to suggested rising terms (same field first). Chapter 2 reading updated: burnout now pairs first with resilience and psychological safety.
2.1.0	2026-10-17	Reeds retired from the live site: Chapter 2 is now the momentum map (where the conversation is moving), Chapter 3 reads listed first-decision and measured submission-to-publication times (Journal Timelines) side by side; Organizational Behaviour counts corrected to the current catalogue (134 journals, 88 publisher-stated, 46 estimated); reference chapter and design notes rewritten. Figures recaptured 17 October 2026.
2.0.2	2026-10-17	Light cover edition: paper-cloth cover with the volume's accent spine and the live figure as a plate, captured in light theme 17 October 2026.
2.0.1	2026-10-17	Journal counts updated after the catalogue de-duplication (1,959 → 1,805 journals): Nursing 36, Organizational Behaviour 140; figures recaptured.
2.0.0	2026-10-17	Rewritten as a research guide continuing the worked study: choosing a journal by fit before speed, reading listed first-decision times honestly, writing for one journal, the manuscript checklist, the Formatter's reference trust panel (with the DOI-first fix of 16-17 October), reviewer-desk objections and a model cover-letter paragraph. Tool reference moved to the last chapter.
1.0.0	2026-10-16	First edition. Figures captured 16 October 2026 from the live site.

Errata

VERSION	WHERE	CORRECTION
2.2.0	Cover and the no-idea momentum-map figure: captured during a rendering fault that drew the chart at phone scale (oversized labels, fastest risers clipped at the top edge)	Momentum map figures re-shot after the live map was improved: terms past x64 now sit in a labelled strip with their real multiple, a field colour key, and dashed links from your idea to suggested rising terms (same field first). Chapter 2 reading updated: burnout now pairs first with resilience and psychological safety.

2.1.0	Ch 2 (reeds) and Organizational Behaviour counts (140/90/49 → 134/88/46)	Reeds retired from the live site: Chapter 2 is now the momentum map (where the conversation is moving), Chapter 3 reads listed first-decision and measured submission-to-publication times (Journal Timelines) side by side; Organizational Behaviour counts corrected to the current catalogue (134 journals, 88 publisher-stated, 46 estimated); reference chapter and design notes rewritten. Figures recaptured 17 October 2026.
-------	--	--
