

A R T I C L E

POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR AND HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT RESEARCH

HERMAN AGUINIS
The George Washington University

SØREN H. JENSEN
Copenhagen Business School

SASCHA KRAUS
Free University of Bozen-Bolzano & University of Johannesburg

We identified policy implications of organizational behavior and human resource management (OBHRM) research based on reviewing 4,026 articles in 10 journals (2010–2019). We found that policy implications are underutilized and not part of OBHRM's zeitgeist because only 1.5% of articles (i.e., $n = 61$) included them, suggesting that OBHRM risks becoming societally irrelevant. Societal irrelevance may result in lower perceived value-added, less prestige and status compared to other fields that do offer implications for policy, and less support regarding research funding. However, we see potential for OBHRM research to make meaningful contributions to policy-making in the future because we uncovered several areas that do offer some policy implications, such as labor relations, leadership, training and development, justice and fairness, and diversity and inclusion. We offer a dual theory–policy research agenda focused on (a) designing empirical studies with policy-making goals in mind; (b) converting existing exploratory and explanatory research to prescriptive and normative research; (c) deriving policies from bodies of research rather than individual studies; and (d) creating policies based on integrating theories, fields, and levels of analysis. We hope our article will be a catalyst for the creation and implementation of research-based policies in OBHRM and other management subfields.

Policy-makers are regularly named as one of the targeted audiences of management research (Hitt, 2005). However, the majority of articles addressing policies have focused on macro management domains and theories (e.g., strategy, organization management theory, entrepreneurship) compared to the micro domains and theories of organizational behavior and human resource management (OBHRM). Accordingly, we ask the following questions: What specific OBHRM topical areas have been used to derive policy

implications, and which have not? How can we use the answer to this question to (a) offer advice to policy-makers and (b) create a dual theory–policy agenda for future research in OBHRM and other management subfields focused on creating implications for policy? Clearly, not all research is expected to make contributions to policy. However, if the vast majority of OBHRM research is unable to make contributions to policy-making at all, OBHRM risks becoming societally irrelevant. In turn, societal irrelevance may result in lower perceived value-added by internal (e.g., students, non-OBHRM researchers) and external (e.g., managers) stakeholders, less prestige and status compared to other management subfields that do offer implications for policy, and less

We thank Editor Gideon Markman, as well as two AMP anonymous reviewers, for highly constructive feedback that allowed us to improve our article in a substantial manner.

support from university and other decision-makers who control resources, including research funding, that are critical for the future sustainability of the field (e.g., doctoral program funding, faculty lines, curricular innovations and support).

Obviously, we are not the first to examine implications of OBHRM research. However, the focus to date has been mostly on implications specifically for practice (e.g., Bartunek & Rynes, 2010; Cascio & Aguinis, 2008), which center on how managers should act and design and implement organizational interventions. For example, Bartunek and Rynes (2010: 102) assessed implications for practice as “explicit statements that the findings suggested the value of implementing some type of activity or practice.”

As we embarked on our project, we realized that a clear and consensual definition of “policy” does not seem to exist. In fact, Colebatch, Hoppe, and Noordergraaf (2010: 12) concluded that “the term ‘policy’ conveys a sense of clarity and stability, but its exact meaning (and its implications for policy work) is not always clear.” Thus, establishing a definition of the construct policy was our initial and critical step. First, we located eight prominent existing definitions (i.e., Christensen, Andrews, Bower, Hamenesh, & Porter, 1982; Colebatch et al., 2010; Easton, 1953; Koontz & O’Donnell, 1968; Lasswell & Kaplan, 1970; Lowi, 1985; Palonen, 2003; Starbuck, 1966). Second, we identified eight definitions from dictionaries. Based on the definitions in the literature and those in the dictionaries, we extracted key attributes. From these attributes, we derived the following integrated conceptual definition of policy: *Governance principles that guide courses of action and behavior in organizations and societies.*

Our definition clarifies that policy implications are distinct from practice implications because policies guide practice (i.e., courses of action). In addition, we made a deliberate choice of referring to courses of action and behavior in general (e.g., individuals, groups, communities, industries). Moreover, our definition also subsumes organizational policies under a given set of conditions (e.g., absenteeism and working-from-home policies before, during, and after the COVID-19 pandemic), but also the behavior of people in broader societal contexts (e.g., equal opportunity policies, environmental and corporate social responsibility policies, anti-discrimination policies). As an example of an OBHRM-based policy, based on their empirical results Bamberger and Belogolovsky (2010: 989) offered the following:

rather than enforcing a policy of strict pay secrecy, managers might consider adopting a pay administration

policy of partial openness with the broad parameters of compensation (e.g., mean bonus associated with a given level of performance or performance improvement) made more transparent.

Consistent with our definition, this policy refers to a governance principle that guides courses of action about compensation practices and behavior (i.e., increased transparency) in organizations.

THE PRESENT STUDY

We believe there is an untapped opportunity to leverage OBHRM research to understand its implications for the public interest. Accordingly, we conducted a critical review of all 4,026 articles published in 10 journals (January 2010–December 2019) to identify policy implications of OBHRM research. As a result of our review and analysis, we make the following contributions. First, we discovered that only 1.5% (i.e., $n = 61$) of the total number of articles published in 10 management journals over the last decade included any type of OBHRM-based policy implications. This finding suggests that policy implications are underutilized and are not part of OBHRM’s zeitgeist. Thus, our article contributes to the collective aspiration of the field of management and professional organizations such as the Academy of Management (AOM) to have broader societal impact. Second, 30% of the implications we derived from the 61 articles fall under just three OBHRM topical areas: labor relations, leadership, and training and development. We also discovered that nine OBHRM areas did not include any policy implications at all (i.e., conflict styles, creativity, impression management, international human resource management, negotiation, person–situation fit, planning and succession, spirituality and religion, and stress and well-being). Thus, results point to the existence of policy implications in a handful of areas and many fruitful opportunities for future policy-oriented OBHRM research in additional ones that are clearly relevant for society (e.g., stress and well-being). Third, regarding their specific substance and content, we conducted an in-depth analysis of illustrative policy implications by classifying them, for example, in terms of the policy agents (e.g., human resources function, managers), beneficiaries (e.g., organizations, employees), immediacy of implementation (i.e., immediately implementable, implementable in the near future, implementable in the future), and degree of resource intensiveness (i.e., low, medium, high). Taken together, this information offers insights about the content and nature of the policy implications, as well as who can take which

concrete actions in various contexts and settings and who would benefit from them. An important feature of the substance and content of the policies we uncovered is that they are readily implementable across different types of organizations and industries and are also useful for governments.

Next, we describe the multistage processes we implemented to select journals, articles, and extract explicit and indirect policy implications. We then describe the substance and content of the policy implications we uncovered. Finally, we offer implications for policy-makers, a dual theory-policy research agenda, and the field of management.

IDENTIFYING OBHRM-BASED POLICIES: CRITICAL LITERATURE REVIEW

We conducted a critical literature review (Paré, Trudel, Jaana, & Kitsiou, 2015) of journals that publish OBHRM research to identify implications for policy-making. We were interested in current and contemporary policies and therefore focused on articles published from January 2010 through December 2019.

We implemented the following best-practice recommendations for conducting thorough, valid, and replicable literature reviews (as detailed by Aguinis, Ramani, & Alabduljader, 2018): Determining the scope of the review, selecting the journals, calibrating the source selection process, selecting sources, calibrating the content extraction process, and extracting the relevant content.

Review Scope and Journal and Article Selection

We focused on the following 10 journals: *Academy of Management Annals* (AMA), *Academy of Management Discoveries* (AMD), *Academy of Management Journal* (AMJ), *Academy of Management Learning and Education* (AMLE), *Academy of Management Perspectives* (AMP), *Academy of Management Review* (AMR), *Journal of Applied Psychology* (JAP), *Journal of Management* (JOM), *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* (OBHDP), and *Personnel Psychology* (PPsych). We selected these particular journals for the following reasons. First, we included all six journals published by AOM given its strategic direction to “be the premier global community for management and organization scholars and for advancing the impact of management and organization science on business and society” and to “advance knowledge creation and content dissemination for greater relevance and impact on a diverse set

of stakeholders and institutions” (Academy of Management, 2021a). Accordingly, research-based policy implications of articles published in AOM’s journals should be an important conduit to advance impact on business and society. Second, we included JAP, OBHDP, and PPsych as they are consistently considered to be among the most impactful and influential journals devoted specifically to OBHRM research based on their inclusion on some of the most popular journal lists (e.g., Highhouse, Zickar, & Melick, 2020). Third, to be inclusive, we also considered JOM because it publishes OBHRM research regularly and is also considered to be among the most impactful and influential general management journals (e.g., Connelly, 2021).

We used the Web of Science Core Collection to identify relevant articles from the 4,026 published in these 10 journals from January 2010 through December 2019. In Step 1, we used the following keywords: *policy, policies, regulations, norms, normative, rules, guides, and guidelines*. This resulted in 742 articles (out of the total of 4,026). In Step 2, we examined articles’ titles and abstracts and selected only those addressing OBHRM research. To minimize judgment calls on our part in terms of which articles addressed OBHRM versus other fields, we focused on research at the individual and team levels of analysis, which is the dominant focus in OBHRM research. This step resulted in 369 articles. In Step 3, we examined the full text of each of these 369 articles with the goal of retaining empirical studies and excluding purely conceptual works and narrative literature reviews, which resulted in 297 articles.¹ Table 1 includes a summary of results after each step, and Appendix A includes a detailed description of methodological procedures involved in each of these steps (e.g., coders, coding procedures, agreement indexes).

Identification of Explicit and Indirect Policy Implications

Next, Step 4 involved identifying articles with policy implications. As we began our review, we realized that there was a need to make a distinction between explicit and indirect policies. Articles classified as including *explicit* policy implications are those that specifically mention policy implications

¹ Although we excluded purely conceptual articles and narrative literature reviews, we retained all articles in AMR and AMA due to our interest in examining all journals published by the Academy of Management.

TABLE 1
Number of Articles in 10 Journals Including Policy Implications of Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Management Research (2010–2019)

Journal	Total Number of Articles (2010–2019)	Step 1: Articles Including Keywords Relevant to Policies	Step 2: Articles Focusing on OBHRM (i.e., Individual or Team Levels of Analysis)	Step 3: Articles Reporting Empirical Research	Step 4: Articles Including Explicit and Indirect Policy Implications
1. <i>Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes</i>	535	118	87	79	16
2. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>	876	168	66	55	13
3. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>	732	118	47	41	12
4. <i>Journal of Management</i>	643	99	60	45	11
5. <i>Personnel Psychology</i>	233	48	25	20	4
6. <i>Academy of Management Discoveries</i>	82	18	9	8	2
7. <i>Academy of Management Perspectives</i>	237	48	23	11	2
8. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>	283	58	27	23	1
9. <i>Academy of Management Annals</i>	153	28	15	9	0
10. <i>Academy of Management Learning and Education</i>	252	39	10	6	0
Total	4,026	742	369	297	61

Notes: Journals are listed in descending order based on the number of articles including OBHRM-based policy implications. Although in Step 3 we excluded purely conceptual articles and narrative literature reviews, we retained all articles in *Academy of Management Review* and *Academy of Management Annals* due to our interest in examining all journals published by the Academy of Management.

of the research described. The study by Bamberger and Belogolovsky (2010: 989) we mentioned earlier about compensation is a good illustration because it described a policy explicitly: “rather than enforcing a *policy of strict pay secrecy* [emphasis added], managers might consider adopting a pay administration policy of partial openness.” We identified 30 articles with explicit policy implications.

On the other hand, articles including *indirect* policy implications do not mention policies explicitly, but readers can derive policies from the discussion, implications, or conclusion sections. For example, Kark, Katz-Navon, and Delegach (2015: 1344) stated that “Organizations should implement training and development programs that enable managers to attain skills to enhance a promotion focus among their employees when safety initiative is warranted.” So, although Kark et al. (2015) did not explicitly mention the term “policy,” there is a statement concerning governance principles to guide courses of action and behavior. Extracting indirect policies implications required a multistage coding process involving all

three authors, and at the end of the process we identified 31 articles. Appendix A includes a description of the methodological procedures we implemented for identifying indirect policy implications (i.e., “Step 4: Articles Including Explicit and Indirect Policy Implications”).

SUBSTANCE AND CONTENT OF POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF OBHRM RESEARCH: JOURNALS AND TOPICAL AREAS

Number of Articles Including Policy Implications across Journals

As shown in Table 1, OBHDP published the highest number of articles with policy implications ($n = 16$). Next on the list are JAP with 13 articles, AMJ with 12, and JOM with 11. So, these four journals combined published 85% of all articles including policy implications. Then, there is a sharp drop to single digits to PPsych ($n = 4$), followed by AMD and AMP with just two articles each. AMR published

only one article with policy implications, while AMA and AMLE did not publish any from 2010 to 2019.

Content of Policy Implications across OBHRM Topical Areas

We were interested in uncovering which particular OBHRM topical areas have produced implications for policies. To address this issue, we used the 37 topical areas used by AMP to classify OBHRM manuscript submissions. When a manuscript is submitted to AMP for publication consideration, prospective authors need to designate the topics most closely aligned with their manuscript. As is the case for most journals, the editors use this information to assign reviewers with expertise in the domains addressed by the manuscript. Although there are different classifications of OBHRM topical areas (Cascio & Aguinis, 2008), we decided to use AMP's 37-category taxonomy because it is thorough and quite comprehensive. Appendix A includes the list of the 37 OBHRM topical areas as well as a description of the methodological procedures we used to classify implications into each (i.e., "Step 5: Classification of Policy Implications into OBHRM Topical Areas").

Table 2 shows results for the top-10 most popular areas in terms of the number of policy implications offered—those for which eight or more articles included policy implications. These are labor relations ($n = 26$), followed by leadership ($n = 20$) and training and development ($n = 16$). These were followed by justice and fairness ($n = 13$), diversity and inclusion ($n = 10$), interpersonal trust ($n = 10$), deviance and counterproductive behavior ($n = 9$), motivation ($n = 9$), citizenship behavior ($n = 8$), and rewards and incentives ($n = 8$).

To understand the specific content of policy implications, Table 2 includes examples pertaining to each of the areas. Please note that the majority of the OBHRM areas in Table 2 are interrelated empirically and conceptually and therefore are not mutually exclusive. For example, justice and fairness (area 4) is related to interpersonal trust (area 6), and rewards and incentives (area 10) (Lohaus & Habermann, 2019). As a second illustration, diversity and inclusion (area 5) is related to leadership (area 2) (Shore, Cleveland, & Sanchez, 2018). Accordingly, many of the implications are relevant for more than one area. For example, Eisenberger, Karagonlar, Stinglhamber, Neves, Becker, Gonzalez-Morales, and Steiger-Mueller (2010: 1100) noted that:

[A] supervisor's identification with the organization might be strengthened by institutionalized organizational socialization tactics that emphasize common in-group identity and by favorable human resource management policies... favorable human resource policies should increase [the] supervisor's desire to reciprocate through more effective supervision of employees. Thus, favorable treatment of supervisors should enhance both LMX [leader–member exchange] and SOE [supervisor's organizational embodiment], increasing subordinates' affective organizational commitment and performance.

This policy implication relates to several OBHRM areas, such as leadership, justice and fairness, and satisfaction and commitment.

Illustrations of Substance and Content of Policy Implications in the Three Most Popular Topical Areas

In addition to the illustrative policy implications included in Table 2, to further understand the substance and content of policies we conducted an in-depth examination of a selected set. Specifically, we selected three implications from each of the three most popular areas: labor relations, leadership, and training and development.

First, for each implication, similar to the analysis by Bartunek and Rynes (2010) regarding implications for practice, we examined the implications regarding (a) the importance of becoming more aware of a phenomenon, (b) the importance of learning or gaining additional knowledge in a particular area, and (c) taking action about the phenomenon. In addition, uniquely related to policy implications, for each implication we examined the (a) policy agents (e.g., human resources function, managers), (b) beneficiaries (e.g., organizations, employees), (c) immediacy of implementation (i.e., immediately implementable, implementable in the near future, implementable in the future), and (d) degree of resource intensiveness (i.e., low, medium, high).²

Results summarized in Table 3 show that all policy implications address becoming more aware, and most address learning. For example, regarding awareness, Nakashima, Daniels, and Laurin (2017) noted that temporal distance affects the extent to which people perceive a new policy as feasible versus desirable and in terms of its advantages and

² Our goal was not to conduct a detailed and systematic content analysis. Rather, our examination of selected policy implications illustrates their general substance and content.

TABLE 2
Number of Policy Implications Offered across Top 10 Most Popular OBHRM Topic Areas in Articles Published in 10 Journals Listed in Table 1 (2010–2019)

Topical Area	Number of Policy Implications Offered	Example Quotation
1. Labor relations	26	“There is a need for organizations to carefully monitor the social norms that have been established to ensure employees understand ... what is truly accepted by their organization, supervisor, and coworkers. It is important that managers understand that simply offering family-friendly benefits is not enough, particularly if employees perceive that others are not interested in utilizing the benefits. If managers want these benefits to be utilized, they need to create a work environment accepting of utilization behavior. To do so, they should monitor social norms with work groups and mitigate public disagreement when appropriate.” (Mandeville, Halbesleben, & Whitman (2016: 919)
2. Leadership	20	“Supervisor’s identification with the organization might be strengthened by institutionalized organizational socialization tactics that emphasize common in-group identity and by favorable human resource management policies ... favorable human resource policies should increase supervisor’s desire to reciprocate through more effective supervision of employees. Thus, favorable treatment of supervisors should enhance both LMX [leader-member exchange] and SOE [supervisor’s organizational embodiment], increasing subordinates’ affective organizational commitment and performance.” (Eisenberger et al., 2010: 1100)
3. Training and development	16	“Training programs can be designed to provide team managers with directions on how to implement HR policies ... these programs should be regularly available to leaders to aid them in ... HR decision making ... standard procedures can be summarized in guidelines ... Providing incentives to team managers ... can complement HR-related training ... Performance appraisals in relation to people development and ensuring compliance with HR policies set by the organization can be helpful.” (Pak & Kim, 2018: 2708)
4. Justice and fairness	13	“While the unidentifiability of the non-minority people harmed by AA [affirmative action] policies is not explicitly stated by the courts as a condition for the constitutionality of such policies, current practices ... are designed to meet the judicial standards set, for example, by the U.S. Supreme Court ... It seems, therefore, that current AA policies echo our experimental studies.” (Ritov & Zamir, 2014: 59)
5. Diversity and inclusion	10	“... although Whites who are relatively high on either MR [modern racism] or CRD [collective relative deprivation] form perceptions of White disadvantage in response to race-based AAPs [affirmative action policies], they do not form these perceptions in response to race-neutral EEO [equal employment opportunity] policies. Thus, use of race-neutral language that stresses giving all individuals an equal opportunity to succeed is also likely to reduce backlash to AAPs or EEO policies, at least in organizations with policies that can be described as race-neutral. For organizations with AAPs or EEO policies that cannot be described as race-neutral, our results offer insight into additional strategies for reducing Whites’ negative reactions to race-based policies. Specifically, we build on prior work by providing evidence that perceptions of White disadvantage are a common mechanism through which MR and CRD beliefs jointly influence perceptions of policy unfairness. As such, efforts to reduce perceptions of White disadvantage are likely to be an effective strategy for preventing Whites’ negative reactions to race-based AAPs, regardless of whether those reactions are driven by MR or CRD beliefs. This could be achieved, for example, by stressing that although the organization actively seeks minority applicants from one or more racial groups, hiring and promotion decisions are based on candidates’ qualifications, not their race.” (Shteynberg, Leslie, Knight, & Mayer, 2011: 11)
6. Interpersonal trust	10	“When COI [conflict of interest] disclosure is present, a critical caveat for policy makers and managers is that disclosures in a content-rich environment could end up enhancing trust in, and persuasiveness of, the advisor. This unintended consequence of COI disclosure makes recipients more susceptible to advisors’ biases and raises an ethical dilemma for managers: Encouraging COI disclosure could benefit the organization while retaining the appearance of giving relevant and important information to benefit consumers.” (Sah, Malaviya, & Thompson, 2018: 144)

TABLE 2
(Continued)

Topical Area	Number of Policy Implications Offered	Example Quotation
7. Deviance and counterproductive behavior	9	“Although leaders can be trained to reduce their usage of aggressive humor and hence reduce follower deviance, our research revealed both main and indirect effects of leader sense of humor on follower deviance even when aggressive humor is not taken into account. Therefore, we suggest that it is equally important to socialize employees to espouse the normative values in an organization and refrain from engaging in deviant behavior. One way to achieve this is by having a formal code of conduct for workplace interactions among colleagues.” (Yam, Christian, Wei, Liao, & Nai, 2018: 2018)
8. Motivation	9	“The study has implications for policymakers. For one, instead of encouraging more women to start high-technology firms, policymakers should identify the backgrounds, characteristics, and motivations of potential founders that are most aligned with technological success. Simply starting more firms is not a strong goal if those firms are destined to fail. It is imperative that policymakers encourage entrepreneurship for the right reasons. Supporting the creation of firms with a high likelihood of economic potential, such as jobs or revenue growth, could prove more useful to society. In addition, program and policy goals should match the aspirations of the founders. Research shows that women and men entrepreneurs have contrasting, yet similar, reasons for starting firms, it is not clear how these motivations differ when career path and mentoring are considered... The differences between founding rates and outcomes between women entrepreneurs from academia suggests that university administrators and policymakers should consider additional support for academic spinouts by women.” (Woolley, 2019: 283)
9. Citizenship behavior	8	“...our work suggests approach-oriented individuals may be particularly sensitive to being excluded from workplace events (e.g., meetings or social events). As such, organizations and employees may benefit by conducting self-awareness trainings or workshops for employees to raise awareness of their approach/avoidance tendencies and the consequences of being highly sensitive or insensitive to positive and negative stimuli. This may involve informing employees that they may be particularly sensitive (or insensitive) to exclusion, but also raising awareness that they be detecting ostracism when it may not be intentional (as ostracism may sometimes arise by mistake or from unintended slights).” (Ferris, Fatimah, Yan, Liang, Lian, & Brown, 2019: 148)
10. Rewards and incentives	8	“...the fact that... a substantial portion of the effect of pay secrecy on performance is mediated by performance-pay instrumentality perceptions among individuals with lower levels of tolerance for inequity suggests that organizations subscribing to a policy of pay secrecy should make additional efforts to help employees with lower levels of tolerance for inequity more accurately calibrate their instrumentality perceptions. For example, rather than enforcing a policy of strict pay secrecy, managers might consider adopting a pay administration policy of partial openness with the broad parameters of compensation (e.g., mean bonus associated with a given level of performance or performance improvement) made more transparent.” (Bamberger & Belogolovsky, 2010: 989)

Note: As explained in the main body of the article, most of the policy implications are relevant to more than one area.

disadvantages. An illustration regarding learning in the area of leadership is the policy provided by Koopman, Lanaj, and Scott (2016), who recommended that leaders who have the goal of enhancing the positive outcomes of employee organizational citizenship behavior would benefit from emphasizing learning and advancement rather than the severity of making errors and mistakes at work.

As mentioned earlier, most illustrative policy implications offer specific ways to take action. For example, regarding the general area of labor and

employee relations, Mainiero and Jones (2013) concluded that policies on workplace romance should specify the types of romances that are discouraged (e.g., direct-reporting supervisor–subordinate liaisons, and specific conflicts of interest), the types of romances that are acceptable (e.g., peers in different departments with unique career paths), and what specific actions management should take if an employee violates any of the policy’s terms.

Regarding policy agents (i.e., those leading the effort to create and implement the policy), the illustrations

TABLE 3
Illustrations of Substance and Content of Policies in the Three Most Popular Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Management Topical Areas

Topical Area and Policy Implications	Policy Content				Beneficiaries	Immediacy of Implementation	Resource Intensiveness
	Becoming Aware	Learning	Taking Action	Policy Agent			
<p>Labor relations</p> <p>“Policies on workplace romance should reflect the firm’s value system and general code of ethical conduct. At minimum, a policy should state...: (1) the types of romances that are discouraged (e.g., ... direct-reporting supervisor-subordinate liaisons...), (2) the types of romances that are acceptable (e.g., peers in different departments with unique career paths), and (3) the actions management will take if employees violate any of the terms of the policy.” (Mainiero & Jones, 2013: 196)</p> <p>“Official job descriptions and performance evaluation criteria frequently omit acting justly as a key managerial responsibility, and instead focus on technical aspects alone. Changing such elements can signal that acting justly is an effortful activity that requires time and attention, and that such investments are strategically relevant for the organization.” (Sherf, Venkataramani, & Gajendran, 2019: 490)</p> <p>“There is a need for organizations to carefully monitor the social norms that have been established to ensure employees understand... what is truly accepted by their organization, supervisor, and coworkers. It is important that managers understand that simply offering family-friendly benefits is not enough, particularly if employees perceive that others are not interested in utilizing the benefits. If managers want these benefits to be utilized, they need to create a work environment accepting of utilization behavior. To do so, they should monitor social norms with work groups and mitigate public disagreement when appropriate.” (Mandeville et al., 2016: 919)</p>	✓	✓	✓	All organizations	Employees	Immediately	Low (i.e., need to implement the policy)
<p>“Supervisor’s identification with the organization might be strengthened by institutionalized organizational socialization tactics that</p>	✓	✓	✓	All organizations, human resources	Organizations, managers, employees	In the near future	Medium (i.e., need to update performance management system)
<p>Leadership</p>	✓	✓	✓	All organizations, managers	Organizations, employees	In the near future	High (i.e., need to assess organizational culture and social norms)

TABLE 3
(Continued)

Topical Area and Policy Implications	Policy Content				Beneficiaries	Immediacy of Implementation	Resource Intensiveness
	Becoming Aware	Learning	Taking Action	Policy Agent			
<p>emphasize common in-group identity and by favorable human resource management policies ... favorable human resource policies should increase supervisor's desire to reciprocate through more effective supervision of employees. Thus, favorable treatment of supervisors should enhance both LMX [leader-member exchange] and SOE [supervisor's organizational embedment], increasing subordinates' affective organizational commitment and performance." (Eisenberger et al., 2010: 1100)</p> <p>"[There is a need to] implement policies and procedures that prime regulatory focus in employees. For example, leaders who want to enhance the benefits of OCB [organizational citizenship behavior] may want to induce a promotion focus in their employees by emphasizing learning and advancement, and avoid inducing a prevention focus by refraining from bringing attentions to the severity of making errors and mistakes at work." (Koopman et al., 2016: 428)</p> <p>"... temporal distance influences whether people attend more to a new restrictive policy's: (1) feasibility versus desirability, (2) cons versus pros, and (3) implications for the self vs. others ... there may be other reasons why trying to implement a restrictive policy in the near future may generate resistance. For instance, introducing a new policy to be implemented in the near future leaves stakeholders with little time to adapt, which they may find procedurally unfair ... there could be additional reasons why it may not be a good idea for leaders to spring a new restrictive policy on stakeholders." (Nakashima et al., 2017: 26)</p> <p><i>Training and Development</i></p> <p>"Given the inherent difficulties in attention that are associated with ADHD [attention deficit hyperactivity disorder], entrepreneurial</p>	✓	✓	✓	function, managers	Organizations, employees	In the near future	Medium (i.e., need to update performance management and rewards systems)
	✓		✓	All organizations	Organizations, other stakeholders	In the near future	Low (i.e., need to adapt to new policy)
	✓	✓	✓	Organizations devoted to learning and	Society, employees with ADHD, entrepreneurs	In the future	High (i.e., need to re-design training and

TABLE 3
(Continued)

Topical Area and Policy Implications	Policy Content				Resource Intensiveness
	Becoming Aware	Learning	Taking Action	Policy Agent	
<p>education programming should ... make ... instruction as applied and contextualized as possible ... 'traditional' teaching methods (e.g., lectures) ... are likely to be less effective ... than ... practical activities (e.g., project-based learning, interviews with actual entrepreneurs, etc.) ... Federal and state financing initiatives to pursue entrepreneurship could be made available to individuals with ADHD.. high school guidance counselors and college academic advisers ... will benefit from having knowledge about what supports work best for entrepreneurs with ADHD." (Antshel, 2018: 258)</p> <p>"Training programs can be designed to provide team managers with directions on how to implement HR policies ... these programs should be regularly available to leaders to aid them in ... HR decision making ... standard procedures can be summarized in guidelines ... Providing incentives to team managers ... can complement HR-related training ... Performance appraisals in relation to people development and ensuring compliance with HR policies set by the organization can be helpful." (Pak & Kim, 2018: 2708)</p> <p>"... what is much less common are training programs with the explicit goal of improving the level of fairness perceived by the workforce ... the utility of training aimed at increasing justice in the workplace might be further maximized by ... training that focuses not only on the normative criteria for justice, but also accountability processes ... justice training might ... [be] integrated into existing ethics training programs, which ... focus on key company values, ... resolving of ethical dilemmas via ethical principles, managing competing pressures that create ethical challenges, legal issues, and whistleblowing policies." (Rupp, Shao, Jones, & Liao, 2014: 181-182)</p>	✓	✓	✓	<p>teaching (e.g., high schools, colleges and universities), federal and state governments, human resources function</p> <p>All organizations, team leaders, human resources function</p> <p>All organizations, human resources function</p>	<p>development programs)</p> <p>Medium (i.e., need to update performance management and rewards systems)</p> <p>Medium (i.e., need to update training and development programs)</p>
				<p>Beneficiaries</p> <p>Organizations, employees</p> <p>Organizations, managers, employees</p>	<p>Immediacy of Implementation</p> <p>In the near future</p> <p>In the near future</p>

in Table 3 include organizations across industries but also managers and the human resources function. For example, in the area of training and development, the agents involved in leading and implementing policies about entrepreneurial education include high schools, colleges and universities, federal and state governments, and the human resources function (Antshel, 2018).

Beneficiaries of policies include mostly organizations and their employees. For example, in the labor relations area, a policy of using official job descriptions and performance evaluation criteria benefits both organizations and employees (Sherf et al., 2019), and so does offering family-friendly benefits (Mandeville et al., 2016).

Regarding the immediacy of implementation, Table 3 includes illustrations of policies that can be implemented immediately, as well as others that could be implemented in the future. For example, regarding training and development, guidelines regarding performance appraisals and the inclusion of people development objectives could be implemented in the near future—after the performance management system is updated (Pak & Kim, 2018).

Arguably, the extent to which a policy can be implemented immediately or not depends on its resource intensiveness. For example, as shown in Table 3, also in the area of training and development, training aimed at teaching employees about legal issues and whistleblowing policies can only take place after those training programs are first designed, and then implemented (Rupp et al., 2014).

DISCUSSION

In her AOM presidential address, Denise M. Rousseau (2006) asked whether “there is such a thing as evidence-based management.” We sought to answer the question of whether *there is such a thing as OBHRM-based policies*. Our examination of the 4,026 articles published in the past decade in 10 journals revealed that only 1.5% (i.e., 61) included OBHRM-based implications for policies. In terms of the total number of implications, this is a disappointing far cry from Nutley and Webb’s (2000) assertion that there is generally a good fit between policy-making and research through evidence-based policy-making. However, in spite of their low number, an encouraging finding about policies’ substance and content is that we uncovered the existence of a handful of policies in some OBHRM areas. Next, we describe implications for policy-makers, a dual theory–policy

research agenda for the future, and the field of management.

Implications for Policy-Makers

We readily acknowledge that policies are unlikely to be fully research-based. Rather, they are likely to be research-informed. For example, Daviter (2015: 498) noted that “while political and administrative organizations are understood as epistemologically closed systems, they rarely acquire the position of uncontested arbiters of policy knowledge.” Nevertheless, illustrations in Table 3 of the substance and content of implications for policy in the three most popular areas revealed that they are not just about becoming aware of a phenomenon or learning about it, but about taking action. Previous research on implications for practice revealed that the “most common type of advice in [implications for practice] sections was to ‘be aware’ of something” (Bartunek & Rynes, 2010: 111). In contrast, our results about implications for policies are encouraging because they are implementable; they benefit organizations, leaders, and employees; most of them can be put in place in the near future; and they do not require a large amount of resources.

In addition, regarding the substance and content of policy implications, illustrations in Table 2 show that many are implementable across different types of organizations and industries. In fact, many are relevant at the governmental level—particularly the legislative and executive branches. For legislative bodies (i.e., federal, provincial or state, or local levels), OBHRM-based policy implications can serve as input for future legislation.

We emphasize the need to consider specific contexts and settings. For example, 31 of the 61 articles including policy implications were based on research conducted in the United States (the next most popular countries were China with 4, Israel with 3, and South Korea with 2). Obviously, given constraints related to geographic, cultural, and political contexts, policy implications are seldom generalizable around the world. Overall, if there is an interest in implementing them, policy-makers can select the illustrative policies included in Tables 2 and 3 based on their appropriateness and applicability for their particular situations.

As just one example of the types of policies that can be implemented, consider the topic of deviance and counterproductive behavior. The recommendation is that policies regarding organizational deviance should be clear, visible, and formalized into a

code of conduct so that employees easily and clearly recognize the serious implications of wrongdoings. Furthermore, organizations should take steps to raise awareness of how harmful, seemingly minor deviant behaviors can be for the employees. A strict implementation of such a policy, which would be rather straightforward, would reduce organizational deviance substantially. However, this type of policy clearly depends on what an organization defines as “deviant behavior,” which would differ when considering, for example, a university compared to a federal law enforcement agency.

As a second example, consider the topic of motivation. The policy implication illustration in Table 2 addresses motivation at the micro level (i.e., motivation of individual entrepreneurs), but also considers issues at the macro level. The suggestion is that if the goal is to encourage women to start high-tech firms, policy-makers should identify the backgrounds, characteristics, and motivations of potential founders that are most aligned with technological success. Simply starting more firms is unlikely to yield a high success rate (Woolley, 2019). Policies should be more targeted and analytically driven so they motivate female entrepreneurs. One example is a policy that supports academic spinouts by women by ensuring that university administrators create special programs targeting female entrepreneurs, and that this is further backed by funding opportunities or tax reliefs. For this illustrative policy, its relative applicability will depend on the degree of gender equality of a particular cultural and national context.

Our identification of actionable policies as illustrated in Table 2 is encouraging. However, our review revealed that there is substantial variation in the way the policy implication is explicated, the specific location of the implication within the published article, and how much emphasis each article gives to those implications. This lack of standardization in how researchers describe policy implications in their articles makes it difficult for policy-makers to easily and quickly identify implications. In fact, as detailed in Appendix A, the process we had to implement to extract indirect implications for policy was quite laborious. Therefore, a suggestion for policy-makers is to partner with researchers and work collaboratively to search for and find implications for policies in published research.

Finally, implications included in Table 2 and Table 3 are similarly applicable to policy-makers in large public and private organizations. In addition, however, many of the policies are relevant for smaller firms. Consider an implication in the topic of

leadership. Eisenberger, Rockstuhl, Shoss, Wen, and Dulebohn (2019: 1100) suggested that

[A] supervisor’s identification with the organization might be strengthened by institutionalized organizational socialization tactics that emphasize common in-group identity ... and by favorable human resource management policies. In addition to increasing [the] supervisor’s organizational identification, favorable human resource policies should increase [the] supervisor’s desire to reciprocate through more effective supervision of employees.

Implications for a Dual Theory–Policy Research Agenda

Adler and Jermier (2005: 943) noted that “our research always has public policy *implications* [emphasis in the original].” However, our review revealed that policy implications are underutilized and not part of OBHRM’s zeitgeist. Although we did not conduct a formal comparison, policy seems more typical of macro domains including strategy (e.g., Acs, Audretsch, Lehmann, & Licht, 2016; Blake & Moschieri, 2017; Zahra & Covin, 1993). The question is: Why? We offer three possible and complementary reasons.

First, the perceived importance of OBHRM theories does not seem to be influenced by the extent to which they have implications for policy-making. For example, Miner (2003) assessed the perceived importance of 73 classic OB theories. Study participants were 71 established scholars (i.e., past presidents of AOM and past editors and editorial board members of AMJ and AMR) who had earned their doctoral degrees in organizational behavior (49%), industrial–organizational or social psychology (21%), or human resources or industrial relations (15%). On a scale of 1–7, the most important theories (i.e., mean score of 5.90 or higher) were goal-setting (5.97), expectancy theory (5.96), equity theory (5.93), and the theory of bureaucracy (5.90). We examined the 61 articles that included policy implications and found that none of these theories were among the most frequently used for generating those implications. Moreover, the theory of bureaucracy was not mentioned by any of the 61 articles. Goal-setting, expectancy, and equity theory were mentioned by only one article each. So, based on the opinion of established OBHRM scholars, a theory’s ability to produce policy implications does not seem to be a valuable attribute in terms of a theory’s importance.

Second, related to the point above, the typical training of doctoral students in OBHRM and related

fields does not include a consideration of policies (Tett, Walser, Brown, Simonet, & Tonidandel, 2013). Thus, it may be difficult for OBHRM researchers to design a study with implications for policy without sufficient training on what policies are and how they can be formulated and carried out.

Third, it seems that there is little motivation for OBHRM researchers to focus on policy implications given that this is not a requirement for publication in what are typically considered top journals. The pressure to publish in a selective set of prestigious journals has never been higher (Aguinis, Cummings, Ramani, & Cummings, 2020; Balkin, & Bresser, 2021; Bartunek, 2020; Rasheed & Priem, 2020). Unless journals encourage authors to address policy implications, authors will not be motivated to do so.

In terms of the future, we are not suggesting that policy implications should be part of all research. Clearly, there is room for basic research without direct and explicit policy implications. In addition, “policymakers and the public can be more certain of results from the more developed sciences” (Lodahl & Gordon, 1973: 196). Accordingly, theories in a nascent stage might not yet allow for clear policy implications. Still, we believe that the current rate of 1.5% of articles including policy implications could and should be improved—especially if OBHRM researchers have

the goal of having broader societal impact and “matter” (Hambrick, 1994). Further, strengthening the theory–policy link will enhance the credibility and trustworthiness of policies and therefore make our scholarship more applicable to a broader set of stakeholders, thereby increasing its impact. We offer six suggestions about what researchers can do in this regard, and Table 4 offers a summary.

First, future research could focus on designing empirical studies with policy-making goals in mind. This can be done by adopting the design-science approach proposed by Simon (1969), who highlighted the need to anticipate how research results could be used to improve organizations and society. Thus, in designing an empirical study, researchers can engage in a thought experiment to imagine that their study is complete and how results could be used for policy-making (Aguinis & Vandenberg, 2014). For example, Lieberman, Duke, and Amir (2019) investigated how incentive framing can harness the power of social norms in organizations. They included policies as a topic of interest and policy-makers as a target audience for their research in the very beginning of their article (i.e., Abstract and Introduction).

Second, future research could convert existing exploratory and explanatory research to prescriptive and normative research. This goal can be accomplished

TABLE 4
Dual Theory–Policy Research Agenda: Recommendations and Implementation Guidelines

Recommendations	Implementation Guidelines
1. Focus on designing empirical studies with policy-making goals in mind	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt a design-science approach by anticipating how research results could be used to improve organizations and society.
2. Convert existing exploratory and explanatory research to prescriptive and normative research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage in a thought experiment to imagine that your study is complete and how results could be used for policy-making. • Enhance the degree of prescriptiveness of a theory by transitioning from exploratory to preliminary, option, guideline, and standard.
3. Derive policies from bodies of research and theories rather than individual studies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and advance theories to the standard stage. • Use multiple sources of evidence, multiple replications, and possibly a meta-analysis that offers a quantitative synthesis of the existing empirical evidence.
4. Integrate multiple fields and levels of analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rely on systematic research agendas with a solid theoretic foundation rather than isolated studies.
5. Focus on topical areas of great organizational and societal importance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage in micro–macro collaborations with great potential in terms of producing useful theories and impactful implications for policies. • Derive policy implications from topical areas such as stress and well-being, which are timely and important across industries and types of organizations globally. • Derive policy implications from additional important topical areas including planning and succession, a key issue for family business and small business more generally, and international human resource management, clearly important regarding globalization.
6. Expand beneficiaries of policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Derive policy implications that benefit multiple stakeholders—organizations and their employees but also additional stakeholders such as the local communities surrounding the organization.

by enhancing the degree of prescriptiveness of a theory. As noted by Banks, Barnes, and Jiang (2021), theories can evolve from exploratory (i.e., indirect evidence exists), preliminary (i.e., novel direct evidence), option (i.e., direct evidence from multiple sources but alternative explanations are still plausible), guideline (i.e., direct evidence from multiple sources and alternative explanations are limited), and, finally, standard (i.e., direct evidence from multiple sources and a near consensus exists regarding the inferences). Thus, a dual theory–policy research agenda involves theory developments such that existing theories can advance to the standard stage.

Third, and directly related to our previous point, future research aimed at generating implications for policy is more likely to succeed when policies are derived from bodies of research and theories rather than individual studies. For results to be credible and trustworthy, and be prescriptive-ready, there is a need for multiple sources of evidence, multiple replications, and possibly a meta-analysis that offers a quantitative synthesis of the existing empirical evidence. Thus, future research is more likely to influence policies if it is based on systematic research agendas with a solid theoretical foundation rather than isolated studies offering only anecdotal evidence.

Fourth, future research aimed at creating effective policies will benefit from integrating multiple fields and levels of analysis (Hitt, Beamish, Jackson, & Mathieu, 2007). Stated differently, micro–macro collaborations have the greatest potential in terms of producing useful theories and impactful implications for policies. For example, Bullough, Renko, and Abdelzaher (2017) argued that to stimulate entrepreneurship among women, it is necessary to create programs at the societal level that target not only the behavioral aspects of entrepreneurship but also cultural frameworks and conditions, including educating on gender equality, women’s rights, and legal and economic freedom. This example illustrates that policies aimed at behaviors of individual entrepreneurs must address issues at the macro level of analysis as well.

Fifth, regarding topical areas, we were surprised by the lack of policy implications about several of the OBHRM topical areas, such as stress and well-being, which are timely and important across industries and types of organizations globally (Gabriel & Aguinis, 2022). In addition, the vast majority of companies worldwide are family firms (De Massis, Frattini, Majocchi, & Piscitello, 2018), but our review did not identify policy implications regarding planning and succession—a key issue for family business, and for

small business more generally. Similarly, despite the importance of internationalization in an increasingly connected world, our review did not yield policy implications for international human resource management. These specific topical areas seem to be good targets for future policy-based research with potential for substantial impact. Interestingly, some of the articles included in our review did not mention policy implications, but could have. For example, results reported by Zhou, Wang, Chang, Liu, Zhan, and Shi (2017) suggest that organizations could create policies that allow for flexible work schedules and permit telecommuting with the goal of improving employee task regulation. As another example, results reported by Quade, Greenbaum, and Petrenko (2017) hint at organizations’ need to create clearer policies about unethical behavior, and that such behavior will not be tolerated regardless of employees’ performance level. Thus, future research could also involve analyzing published research that did not include implications for policy making explicitly or indirectly, but nevertheless described results that could potentially be used for policy-making.

Finally, the illustrations included in Table 3 suggest that most policies are aimed at benefitting organizations and their employees. Thus, an additional fruitful direction for future research would involve understanding which policies can also benefit additional stakeholders (e.g., the local communities surrounding the organization).

Implications for the Field of Management

AOM was founded in 1936 and currently has about 20,000 members from nearly 120 nations (Academy of Management, 2021b). One of AOM’s strategic goals is to “be the premier global community for management and organization scholars and for advancing the impact of management and organization science on business and society worldwide” (Academy of Management, 2021a). This aspiration to advance the impact of management and organization science research has been mentioned repeatedly in multiple AOM presidential addresses (e.g., Adler, 2016; Bartunek, 2003; Coyle-Shapiro, 2021; Cummings, 2007; Glynn, 2019; Hambrick, 1994; Lee, 2009; McGahan, 2018; Pearce, 2004; Rousseau, 2006; Shapiro, 2017; Tsui, 2013; Van De Ven, 2002; Walsh, 2011). However, results summarized in Table 1 show that, relative to the others, AMJ is the only AOM journal that has published a significant number of articles with policy implications—although we emphasize that a total of only 16 articles from

2010 to 2019 leaves quite a bit of room for improvement. The other AOM journals published only two or no articles at all over that decade. Thus, given the paucity of articles addressing OBHRM policy implications in most AOM journals, our results uncovered a substantial challenge for a professional association whose strategic goal is to have broader impact at the societal level.

We see an important and hopeful change given that AMP recently revised its mission as “to publish papers with policy implications based on management research” (Academy of Management Perspectives, 2021). This is clearly a positive development given that we found only two AMP articles with OBHRM-based policy implications. Because of the journal’s new mission, we anticipate that AMP will lead the research-based policy landscape in the near future. In addition, we hope our definition of policies, given that a consensual definition does not seem to exist in the literature, will be useful for assessing future AMP submissions and providing developmental feedback to authors. We hope that this will be useful for authors targeting other AOM journals as well. For example, selective AMA articles, which are based on reviews, could include implications for policy. Similarly, selective AMLE articles could include implications for educational policies specifically.

Looking to the future, we offer the following additional suggestion. First, we reiterate that not all research has or should have direct implications for policy-making. For example, many studies aim at improving explanations of phenomena. Others adopt an inductive or abductive approach, which makes it difficult for results to be used in a prescriptive manner. However, journals that aspire to have an impact on policy-making could consider including an article section titled “Implications for Policy” in which those suggestions are made explicit. This section could include not only actual policies to be implemented but also suggestions about future theory–policy research that could be conducted to turn explanatory research and empirical results into recommendations for policy-making. Clearly, authors will be more motivated to address implications for policies if journals include incentives for doing so (Aguinis, Banks, Rogelberg, & Cascio, 2020).

Limitations

Our focus was on contemporary research and therefore we reviewed research published in the recent decade. We have no reason to believe that older OBHRM research devoted more attention to

policy implications; nevertheless, we do not know for sure. Similarly, we do not know whether older research addressing policy implications addressed a different set of topical areas compared to what we found and illustrated in Table 2—but, again, our interest was in the contemporary interface of topical areas and policies. Third, as noted in Appendix A, we made every effort to implement systematic, transparent, and replicable methodological choices and procedures—including our choice to use AMP’s OBHRM taxonomy based on 37 topical areas. We acknowledge that using different taxonomies may result in different topical area frequencies.

CONCLUSIONS

Our overall purpose was to facilitate the achievement of the lofty goal of “[leveraging] management theory to understand contemporary behavioral, socio-economic, and technological trends, highlighting their implications for the public interest or relying on a strong evidence base of empirical findings to inform public policy” (Academy of Management Perspectives, 2021). We first provided a definition of “policy” given that such a definition seems to be absent from the literature. Then, as summarized in Table 1, we uncovered that only 1.5% of articles published between 2010 and 2019 in 10 journals included OBHRM-based implications for policies. The glass-half-full description of our results is that, as illustrated in Tables 2 and 3, some policy implications do exist in a handful of OBHRM topical areas, including labor relations, leadership, training and development, justice and fairness, and diversity and inclusion. Moreover, as illustrated in Tables 2 and 3, many of the policy implications are implementable across different types of organizations and industries and are also useful for governments. An in-depth analysis of the content of illustrative policy implications provided information on the policies’ main agents and beneficiaries, as well as their immediacy of implementation and degree of resource intensiveness—information that can be used by policy-makers to decide on the appropriateness and applicability of the various policies we identified. We also outlined recommendations and implementation guidelines for producing research with policy implications. These include designing empirical studies with policy-makers’ goals in mind, converting existing exploratory and explanatory research to prescriptive and normative research, and deriving policies from bodies of research rather than individual studies, among other suggestions. Finally, an aspiration of the

management field is to have broader impact—as noted in addresses by several AOM presidents spanning decades. Clearly, in spite of the several “calls to action,” the current paucity of policy implications poses a challenge for a professional association whose strategic goal is to have broader impact at the societal level. On a more positive note, we anticipate that AMP will be able to fill this gap given its new mission to publish papers with policy implications based on management research. Policies based on research are needed today more than ever because some of the most pressing challenges in the 21st century are directly or indirectly related to management and organizations: conflict, discrimination, corruption, well-being, economic opportunity and equality, and climate change (Aguinis, 2020). We hope our article will be a catalyst for the creation and implementation of research-based policies in OBHRM and across management subfields.

REFERENCES

- Articles marked with * are identified as including policy implications.
- Academy of Management. 2021a. *About the Academy of Management*. Retrieved from <https://aom.org/about-aom>.
- Academy of Management. 2021b. *The history of the Academy of Management*. Retrieved from <https://aom.org/about-aom/history>.
- Academy of Management Perspectives. 2021. *Academy of Management Perspectives*. Retrieved from <https://journals.aom.org/journal/amp>.
- Acs, Z. J., Audretsch, D. B., Lehmann, E. E., & Licht, G. 2016. National systems of entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 46: 527–535.
- Adler, P., & Jermier, J. 2005. Developing a field with more soul: Standpoint theory and public policy research for management scholars. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48: 941–944.
- Adler, P. S. 2016. Our teaching mission. *Academy of Management Review*, 41: 185–195.
- Aguinis, H. 2020. *Theme: 20/20: Broadening our sight*. 80th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management. Retrieved from <https://aom.org/events/annual-meeting/past-annual-meetings/2020-broadening-our-sight>
- Aguinis, H., Banks, G. C., Rogelberg, S., & Cascio, W. F. 2020. Actionable recommendations for narrowing the science-practice gap in open science. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 158: 27–35.
- Aguinis, H., Cummings, C., Ramani, R. S., & Cummings, T. G. 2020. “An A is an A”: The new bottom line for valuing academic research. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 34: 135–154.
- Aguinis, H., Ramani, R. S., & Alabduljader, N. 2018. What you see is what you get? Enhancing methodological transparency in management research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 12: 83–110.
- Aguinis, H., & Vandenberg, R. J. 2014. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure: Improving research quality before data collection. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1: 569–595.
- *Antshel, K. M. 2018. Attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 32: 243–265.
- Balkin, D. B., & Bresser, R. 2021. Scholarly books as complementary contributions to “A’s”. *Academy of Management Perspectives*. doi: 10.5465/amp.2021.0001.
- *Bamberger, P., & Belogolovsky, E. 2010. The impact of pay secrecy on individual task performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 63: 965–996.
- Banks, G. C., Barnes, C. M., & Jiang, K. 2021. Changing the conversation on the science-practice gap: An adherence-based approach. *Journal of Management*, 47: 1347–1356.
- Bartunek, J. M. 2003. A dream for the academy. *Academy of Management Review*, 28: 198–203.
- Bartunek, J. M. 2020. What do, what did, and what should we do about “A”s? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 34: 164–169.
- Bartunek, J. M., & Rynes, S. L. 2010. The construction and contributions of “implications for practice”: What’s in them and what might they offer? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 9: 100–117.
- Blake, D. J., & Moschieri, C. 2017. Policy risk, strategic decisions and contagion effects: Firm-specific considerations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 38: 732–750.
- *Boh, W. F., & Wong, S.-S. 2015. Managers versus co-workers as referents: Comparing social influence effects on within-and outside-subsidiary knowledge sharing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 126: 1–17.
- *Bullough, A., Renko, M., & Abdelzaher, D. 2017. Women’s business ownership: Operating within the context of institutional and in-group collectivism. *Journal of Management*, 43: 2037–2064.
- *Butts, M. M., Casper, W. J., & Yang, T. S. 2013. How important are work–family support policies? A meta-analytic investigation of their effects on employee outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98: 1–25.

- Cascio, W. F., & Aguinis, H. 2008. Research in industrial and organizational psychology from 1963 to 2007: Changes, choices, and trends. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93: 1062–1081.
- *Chang, E. H., Milkman, K. L., Chugh, D., & Akinola, M. 2019. Diversity thresholds: How social norms, visibility, and scrutiny relate to group composition. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62: 144–171.
- *Chi, N.-W., Chang, H.-T., & Huang, H.-L. 2015. Can personality traits and daily positive mood buffer the harmful effects of daily negative mood on task performance and service sabotage? A self-control perspective. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 131: 1–15.
- Christensen, C. R., Andrews, K. R., Bower, J. L., Hame-nesh, G., & Porter, M. E. 1982. *Business policy: Text and cases* (5th ed.). Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Colebatch, H. K., Hoppe, R., & Noordegraaf, M. 2010. *Working for policy*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press.
- *Connelly, B. L. 2021. Welcoming the new team: Meritocracy at JOM. *Journal of Management*, 47: 7–10.
- Connelly, B. L., Haynes, K. T., Tihanyi, L., Gamache, D. L., & Devers, C. E. 2016. Minding the gap: Antecedents and consequences of top management-to-worker pay dispersion. *Journal of Management*, 42: 862–885.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A.-M. 2021. A year to remember: An extraordinary journey onto a promising path of inclusion and agility. *Academy of Management Review*, 46: 226–230.
- Cummings, T. G. 2007. Quest for an engaged academy. *Academy of Management Review*, 32: 355–360.
- *Dahling, J. J., Wiley, S., Fishman, Z. A., & Loihle, A. 2016. A stake in the fight: When do heterosexual employees resist organizational policies that deny marriage equality to LGB peers? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 132: 1–15.
- Daviter, F. 2015. The political use of knowledge in the policy process. *Policy Sciences*, 48: 491–505.
- De Massis, A., Frattini, F., Majocchi, A., & Piscitello, L. 2018. Family firms in the global economy: Toward a deeper understanding of internationalization determinants, processes, and outcomes. *Global Strategy Journal*, 8: 3–21.
- *Duguid, M. M., & Thomas-Hunt, M. C. 2015. Condoning stereotyping? How awareness of stereotyping prevalence impacts expression of stereotypes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100: 343–359.
- Easton, D. 1953. *The political system: An inquiry into the state of political science*. New York, NY: Knopf.
- *Eisenberger, R., Karagonlar, G., Stinglhamber, F., Neves, P., Becker, T. E., Gonzalez-Morales, M. G., & Steiger-Mueller, M. 2010. Leader–member exchange and affective organizational commitment: The contribution of supervisor’s organizational embodiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95: 1085–1103.
- *Eisenberger, R., Rockstuhl, T., Shoss, M. K., Wen, X., & Dulebohn, J. 2019. Is the employee–organization relationship dying or thriving? A temporal meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104: 1036–1057.
- *Ferris, D. L., Fatimah, S., Yan, M., Liang, L. H., Lian, H., & Brown, D. J. 2019. Being sensitive to positives has its negatives: An approach/avoidance perspective on reactivity to ostracism. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 152: 138–149.
- Gabriel, K. P., & Aguinis, H. 2022. How to prevent and combat employee burnout and create healthier workplaces during crises and beyond. *Business Horizons*, 65: 183–192.
- *Gajendran, R. S., Harrison, D. A., & Delaney-Klinger, K. 2015. Are telecommuters remotely good citizens? Unpacking telecommuting’s effects on performance via i-deals and job resources. *Personnel Psychology*, 68: 353–393.
- *Gino, F., Schweitzer, M. E., Mead, N. L., & Ariely, D. 2011. Unable to resist temptation: How self-control depletion promotes unethical behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 115: 191–203.
- Glynn, M. A. 2019. The mission of community and the promise of collective action. *Academy of Management Review*, 44: 244–253.
- *Gonzalez-Mulé, E., DeGeest, D. S., McCormick, B. W., Seong, J. Y., & Brown, K. G. 2014. Can we get some cooperation around here? The mediating role of group norms on the relationship between team personality and individual helping behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99: 988–999.
- *Guillaume, Y. R., Van Knippenberg, D., & Brodbeck, F. C. 2014. Nothing succeeds like moderation: A social self-regulation perspective on cultural dissimilarity and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57: 1284–1308.
- Hambrick, D. C. 1994. What if the academy actually mattered? *Academy of Management Review*, 19: 11–16.
- *Hamilton, R., Vohs, K. D., Sellier, A.-L., & Meyvis, T. 2011. Being of two minds: Switching mindsets exhausts self-regulatory resources. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 115: 13–24.
- Highhouse, S., Zickar, M. J., & Melick, S. R. 2020. Prestige and relevance of the scholarly journals: Impressions of SIOP members. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 13: 1–18.
- Hitt, M. A. 2005. Management theory and research: Potential contribution to public policy and public

- organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48: 963–966.
- Hitt, M. A., Beamish, P. W., Jackson, S. E., & Mathieu, J. E. 2007. Building theoretical and empirical bridges across levels: Multilevel research in management. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50: 1385–1399.
- *Hu, J., & Liden, R. C. 2011. Antecedents of team potency and team effectiveness: An examination of goal and process clarity and servant leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96: 851–862.
- *Huang, Y.-S. S., Greenbaum, R. L., Bonner, J. M., & Wang, C. S. 2019. Why sabotage customers who mistreat you? Activated hostility and subsequent devaluation of targets as a moral disengagement mechanism. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104: 495–510.
- *Hülshöger, U. R., Lang, J. W., Schewe, A. F., & Zijlstra, F. R. 2015. When regulating emotions at work pays off: A diary and an intervention study on emotion regulation and customer tips in service jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100: 263–277.
- *Jiang, Y., & Chen, C. C. 2018. Integrating knowledge activities for team innovation: Effects of transformational leadership. *Journal of Management*, 44: 1819–1847.
- *Johnson, M. D., Holley, E. C., Morgeson, F. P., LaBonar, D., & Stetzer, A. 2014. Outcomes of absence control initiatives: A quasi-experimental investigation into the effects of policy and perceptions. *Journal of Management*, 40: 1075–1097.
- *Joo, H., Aguinis, H., & Bradley, K. J. 2017. Not all non-normal distributions are created equal: Improved theoretical and measurement precision. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102: 1022–1053.
- *Kark, R., Katz-Navon, T., & Delegach, M. 2015. The dual effects of leading for safety: The mediating role of employee regulatory focus. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100: 1332–1348.
- *Katila, R., Thatchenkery, S., Christensen, M. Q., & Zenios, S. 2017. Is there a doctor in the house? Expert product users, organizational roles, and innovation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60: 2415–2437.
- *Kehoe, R. R., & Wright, P. M. 2013. The impact of high-performance human resource practices on employees' attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 39: 366–391.
- *Kim, B. J., & Rousseau, D. M. 2019. Internalizing capitalist norms: A grounded theory study of how North Korean escapees adapt to work. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 5: 171–200.
- *Kim, P. H., Cooper, C. D., Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. 2013. Repairing trust with individuals vs. groups. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 120: 1–14.
- *King, E. B., Mohr, J. J., Peddie, C. I., Jones, K. P., & Kendra, M. 2017. Predictors of identity management: An exploratory experience-sampling study of lesbian, gay, and bisexual workers. *Journal of Management*, 43: 476–502.
- Koontz, H., & O'Donnell, C. 1968. *Principles of management* (4th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- *Koopman, J., Lanaj, K., & Scott, B. A. 2016. Integrating the bright and dark sides of OCB: A daily investigation of the benefits and costs of helping others. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59: 414–435.
- Lasswell, H. D., & Kaplan, A. 1970. *Power and society*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lee, T. W. 2009. The management professor. *Academy of Management Review*, 34: 196–199.
- *Leslie, L. M., Manchester, C. F., Park, T.-Y., & Mehng, S. A. 2012. Flexible work practices: A source of career premiums or penalties? *Academy of Management Journal*, 55: 1407–1428.
- *Lian, H., Ferris, D. L., Morrison, R., & Brown, D. J. 2014. Blame it on the supervisor or the subordinate? Reciprocal relations between abusive supervision and organizational deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99: 651–664.
- *Lieberman, A., Duke, K. E., & Amir, O. 2019. How incentive framing can harness the power of social norms. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 151: 118–131.
- Lodahl, J. B., & Gordon, G. 1973. Differences between physical and social sciences in university graduate departments. *Research in Higher Education*, 1: 191–213.
- Lohaus, D., & Habermann, W. 2019. Presenteeism: A review and research directions. *Human Resource Management Review*, 29: 43–58.
- Lowi, T. J. 1985. The state in politics: The relation between policy and administration. In P. Selznick & R. G. Noll (Eds.), *Regulatory policy and the social sciences*: 67–105. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- *Mainiero, L. A., & Jones, K. J. 2013. Sexual harassment versus workplace romance: Social media spillover and textual harassment in the workplace. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 27: 187–203.
- *Mandeville, A., Halbesleben, J., & Whitman, M. 2016. Misalignment and misperception in preferences to utilize family-friendly benefits: Implications for benefit utilization and work–family conflict. *Personnel Psychology*, 69: 895–929.
- *Mawritz, M. B., Greenbaum, R. L., Butts, M. M., & Graham, K. A. 2017. I just can't control myself: A self-regulation perspective on the abuse of deviant employees. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60: 1482–1503.

- McGahan, A. M. 2018. Freedom in scholarship: Lessons from Atlanta. *Academy of Management Review*, 43: 173–178.
- Miner, J. B. 2003. The rated importance, scientific validity, and practical usefulness of organizational behavior theories: A quantitative review. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 2: 250–268.
- *Mitchell, M. S., & Ambrose, M. L. 2012. Employees' behavioral reactions to supervisor aggression: An examination of individual and situational factors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97: 1148–1170.
- *Nakashima, N. A., Daniels, D. P., & Laurin, K. 2017. It's about time: Divergent evaluations of restrictive policies in the near and distant future. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 142: 12–27.
- *Nguyen, H., Groth, M., & Johnson, A. 2016. When the going gets tough, the tough keep working: Impact of emotional labor on absenteeism. *Journal of Management*, 42: 615–643.
- *Nifadkar, S., Tsui, A. S., & Ashforth, B. E. 2012. The way you make me feel and behave: Supervisor-triggered newcomer affect and approach-avoidance behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55: 1146–1168.
- Nutley, S., & Webb, J. 2000. Evidence and the policy process. In H. Davies, S. Nutley, & P. Smith (Eds.), *What works? Evidence-based policy and practice in public services*: 13–41. Bristol, U.K.: Policy Press.
- *Pak, J., & Kim, S. 2018. Team manager's implementation, high performance work systems intensity, and performance: a multilevel investigation. *Journal of Management*, 44: 2690–2715.
- Palonen, K. 2003. Four times of politics: Policy, polity, politicking, and politicization. *Alternatives*, 28: 171–186.
- Paré, G., Trudel, M.-C., Jaana, M., & Kitsiou, S. 2015. Synthesizing information systems knowledge: A typology of literature reviews. *Information & Management*, 52: 183–199.
- Pearce, J. L. 2004. What do we know and how do we really know it? *Academy of Management Review*, 29: 175–179.
- *Pillemer, J., & Rothbard, N. P. 2018. Friends without benefits: Understanding the dark sides of workplace friendship. *Academy of Management Review*, 43: 635–660.
- Quade, M. J., Greenbaum, R. L., & Petrenko, O. V. 2017. "I don't want to be near you, unless ...": The interactive effect of unethical behavior and performance onto relationship conflict and workplace ostracism. *Personnel Psychology*, 70: 675–709.
- Rasheed, A. A., & Priem, R. L. 2020. "An A is an A": We have met the enemy, and he is us! *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 34: 155–163.
- *Ren, C. R., & Guo, C. 2011. Middle managers' strategic role in the corporate entrepreneurial process: Attention-based effects. *Journal of Management*, 37: 1586–1610.
- *Restubog, S. L. D., Scott, K. L., & Zagenczyk, T. J. 2011. When distress hits home: The role of contextual factors and psychological distress in predicting employees' responses to abusive supervision. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96: 713–729.
- *Ritov, I., & Zamir, E. 2014. Affirmative action and other group tradeoff policies: Identifiability of those adversely affected. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 125: 50–60.
- Rousseau, D. M. 2006. Is there such a thing as "evidence-based management"? *Academy of Management Review*, 31: 256–269.
- *Rupp, D. E., Shao, R., Jones, K. S., & Liao, H. 2014. The utility of a multifoci approach to the study of organizational justice: A meta-analytic investigation into the consideration of normative rules, moral accountability, bandwidth-fidelity, and social exchange. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 123: 159–185.
- *Ruttan, R. L., & Lucas, B. J. 2018. Cogs in the machine: The prioritization of money and self-dehumanization. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 149: 47–58.
- *Sah, S. 2019. Conflict of interest disclosure as a reminder of professional norms: Clients first! *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 154: 62–79.
- *Sah, S., Malaviya, P., & Thompson, D. 2018. Conflict of interest disclosure as an expertise cue: Differential effects due to automatic versus deliberative processing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 147: 127–146.
- *Schilpzand, P., Houston, L., & Cho, J. 2018. Not too tired to be proactive: Daily empowering leadership spurs next-morning employee proactivity as moderated by nightly sleep quality. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61: 2367–2387.
- Shapiro, D. L. 2017. Making the Academy full-voice meaningful. *Academy of Management Review*, 42: 165–173.
- *Shepherd, D. A., Patzelt, H., & Baron, R. A. 2013. "I care about nature, but ...": Disengaging values in assessing opportunities that cause harm. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56: 1251–1273.
- *Sherf, E. N., Venkataramani, V., & Gajendran, R. S. 2019. Too busy to be fair? The effect of workload and rewards on managers' justice rule adherence. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62: 469–502.
- Shore, L. M., Cleveland, J. N., & Sanchez, D. 2018. Inclusive workplaces: A review and model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 28: 176–189.

- *Shteynberg, G., Leslie, L. M., Knight, A. P., & Mayer, D. M. 2011. But affirmative action hurts us! Race-related beliefs shape perceptions of white disadvantage and policy unfairness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 115: 1–12.
- Simon, H. A. 1969. *The sciences of the artificial*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Starbuck, W. H. 1966. On teaching business policy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 9: 356–361.
- Tett, R., Walser, B., Brown, C., Simonet, D., & Tonidandel, S. 2013. The 2011 SIOP graduate program benchmarking survey part 3: Curriculum and competencies. *Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 50: 69–90.
- *Triana, M. C., Jayasinghe, M., Pieper, J. R., Delgado, D. M., & Li, M. 2019. Perceived workplace gender discrimination and employee consequences: A meta-analysis and complementary studies considering country context. *Journal of Management*, 45: 2419–2447.
- Tsui, A. S. 2013. On compassion in scholarship: Why should we care? *Academy of Management Review*, 38: 167–180.
- Van De Ven, A. H. 2002. Strategic directions for the Academy of Management: This academy is for you! *Academy of Management Review*, 27: 171–184.
- Walsh, J. P. 2011. Presidential address: Embracing the sacred in our secular scholarly world. *Academy of Management Review*, 36: 215–234.
- *Wang, C. S., Sivanathan, N., Narayanan, J., Ganegoda, D. B., Bauer, M., Bodenhausen, G. V., & Murnighan, K. J. O. B. 2011. Retribution and emotional regulation: The effects of time delay in angry economic interactions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 116: 46–54.
- *Whiteside, D. B., & Barclay, L. J. 2018. When wanting to be fair is not enough: The effects of depletion and self-appraisal gaps on fair behavior. *Journal of Management*, 44: 3311–3335.
- *Woolley, J. L. 2019. Gender, education, and occupation: How founder experiences influence firm outcomes. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 5: 266–290.
- *Yam, K. C., Christian, M. S., Wei, W., Liao, Z., & Nai, J. 2018. The mixed blessing of leader sense of humor: Examining costs and benefits. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61: 348–369.
- Zahra, S. A., & Covin, J. G. 1993. Business strategy, technology policy and firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14: 451–478.
- *Zattoni, A., Gnan, L., & Huse, M. 2015. Does family involvement influence firm performance? Exploring the mediating effects of board processes and tasks. *Journal of Management*, 41: 1214–1243.
- Zhou, L., Wang, M., Chang, C. H., Liu, S., Zhan, Y., & Shi, J. 2017. Commuting stress process and self-regulation at work: Moderating roles of daily task significance, family interference with work, and commuting means efficacy. *Personnel Psychology*, 70: 891–922.



Herman Aguinis (www.hermanaguinis.com) is the Avram Tucker Distinguished Scholar and chairperson of the Department of Management at the George Washington University School of Business. His research addresses the acquisition and deployment of talent in organizations and organizational research methods. He has published ten books and about 200 journal articles and is serving as the President of the Academy of Management (2021–2022).

Søren H. Jensen (shj.mpp@cbs.dk) is an associate professor at Copenhagen Business School. He received a PhD in strategy and management from Copenhagen Business School and has served on the board of governors of the Academy of Management. He conducts research in strategy and management.

Sascha Kraus (sascha.kraus@zfk.de) is a professor of management at the Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Italy, and Distinguished Visiting Professor (SARChI Entrepreneurship Education) at the University of Johannesburg, South Africa. He received his a doctorate in social and economic sciences from Klagenfurt University, Austria, and a PhD in industrial engineering and management from Helsinki University of Technology, Finland. His research focuses on entrepreneurship and innovation.



APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTION OF METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURES FOR SELECTING ARTICLES AND EXTRACTING POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Step 1: Articles Including Keywords Relevant to Policies

The goal of Step 1 was to identify articles that included any of the search keywords related to our definition of policies. To do so, we used the following keywords: policy, policies, regulations, norms, normative, rules, guides, or guidelines. This resulted in 742 articles out of the total of 4,026 published in the 10 journals from 2010–2019.

Step 2: Articles Focusing on OBHRM (i.e., Individual or Team Levels of Analysis)

The goal of Step 2 was to select articles that focused on OBHRM (i.e., research at the individual or team levels of analysis). To do so, we first created two randomly selected subgroups of 371 articles and the second and third coauthors independently examined the titles and abstracts of articles in one subgroup. Their task was to classify each article as (a) *keep* (articles that clearly focused on individuals or teams), (b) *discard* (articles that did not focus on individuals or teams), or (c) *keep temporarily for further discussion* (articles with an unclear or ambiguous focus). After each coauthor classified their 371 articles, they proceeded to classify each other's articles. There was disagreement regarding the classification of five articles, and this was resolved through discussion between the second and the third author. There were nine articles that fit into the third category (i.e., *keep for further discussion*), and they were classified consensually after a discussion involving all three authors. As an additional and final check, the first author examined the process and findings independently of the second and third authors for all 742 articles. This additional step did not lead to any changes. At the end of Step 2, we identified 369 articles that were directly relevant to OBHRM.

Step 3: Articles Reporting Empirical Research

The goal of Step 3 was to select articles that reported empirical research. To do so, we examined the full-text version of the 369 articles resulting from Step 2. First, we randomly selected two subgroups (184 and 185 articles, respectively), which were reviewed independently by the second and

third authors, respectively. Similar to Step 2, the two coders then examined the articles initially assigned to the other. There was a discrepancy in the classification of four articles, and this was resolved through discussion. Subsequently, the first author examined the process and findings for all 369 articles, independently of the two other authors. This additional step did not lead to any changes. At the end of Step 3, we retained the 297 articles that reported empirical research. Although we excluded purely conceptual articles and narrative literature reviews, we retained all articles in *Academy of Management Review* and *Academy of Management Annals* due to our interest in examining all journals published by the Academy of Management.

Step 4: Articles Including Explicit and Indirect Policy Implications

The goal of Step 4 was to extract explicit and indirect policy implications (as defined in the main body of our article). To do so, we first created three subgroups of 99 randomly selected articles each, which we assigned to each of the three authors. Then, before the main task, we conducted a pilot test by extracting policy implications from 10 randomly selected articles. There was disagreement regarding one article, which the first author classified as having an explicit policy implication but the other two authors classified as having indirect policy implications, and we resolved this through discussion (i.e., it was classified as an indirect policy implication because it did not contain the necessary elements to fit the criteria for an explicit implication). Then, after each author completed their batch of 99 articles, we proceeded to examine the two other batches independently so we could assess agreement. Because we had conducted a pilot test that allowed for calibration, this process did not result in any discrepancies. At the end of Step 4, we had 30 articles with explicit and 31 articles with indirect policy implications.

Step 5: Classification of Policy Implications into OBHRM Topical Areas

The final step involved classifying each of the policy implications using the following 37-category taxonomy of OBHRM topics as described in the main body of our article (in alphabetical order): career development; citizenship behavior; coaching and development; conflict management; conflict styles; creativity; decision-making; deviance

and counterproductive behavior; diversity and inclusion; empowerment; impression management; international human resource management; interpersonal communication; interpersonal trust; job designs, roles, and tasks; justice or fairness; labor relations; leadership; mood and emotions; motivation; negotiation; occupations, profession, and work; perception and attribution; performance management; personality and individual differences; person–situation fit; planning and succession; retention and separation; rewards and incentives; satisfaction and commitment; selection, staffing, and recruiting; spirituality

and religion; strategic human resource management; stress and well-being; training and development; turnover, absenteeism, and withdrawal; and work and family.

First, the second and third authors examined and classified policy implications in each of the 61 articles. Then, we compared their respective classifications and found a level of agreement of 95% and discrepancies were resolved through discussion. Finally, the first author examined the process and findings independently of the two coders, which did not result in any changes.