



## Let's Fix our Own Problem: Quelling the Irresponsible Research Perfect Storm

Herman Aguinis<sup>a</sup>, Estelle E. Archibold<sup>b</sup> and Darryl B. Rice<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>The George Washington University; <sup>b</sup>Case Western Reserve University; <sup>c</sup>Miami University

**ABSTRACT** We invoke the metaphor of the perfect storm and argue that several factors have converged to create what we label the *irresponsible research perfect storm*. Many of these issues can be fixed by applying management theories, but we argue this has not been done due to the existence of a *research-research gap*. Akin to the research-practice gap, the research-research gap is a disconnect between the research academics are producing and the research academics ourselves are using to manage our own business schools, journals, professional associations, and careers. Accordingly, we offer four sets of theory-based recommendations to quell this storm and narrow the research-research gap: (1) promote shared governance and accountability across stakeholder groups, (2) expand the definition of scholarly impact, (3) provide journal editors with relevant resources, and (4) strengthen the knowledge, skills, and abilities of current and future scholars.

**Keywords:** responsible research, credible research, useful research, higher education

### INTRODUCTION

*It is the year 2035. A vibrant and thriving management research community exists. This community is lauded for its scientific and social innovation, as well as its ability to utilize research to positively transform the practice of corporations, small businesses, public agencies, and educational institutions across the globe. We, management scholars and educators, are thriving in our growing interconnection with the evolving practice of organizations. A change has taken place in our universities, scientific*

*Address for reprints:* Herman Aguinis, Department of Management, The George Washington University School of Business, Funger Hall, Suite 311, 2201 G Street, NW, Washington, DC 20052, USA ([haguinis@gwu.edu](mailto:haguinis@gwu.edu)).

The second and third authors contributed equally.

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs](#) License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

*forums, and the production centres of our scholarship such as journals and research institutes. We are producing credible and useful scientific insights that serve the needs of an everchanging and increasingly globalized society as well as the expansion of our research imagination.*

We believe this imagined and highly desirable scenario is within our grasp. However, to get there, we first need to quell the *irresponsible research perfect storm* in our research ecosystem. To set the stage for describing what we conceptualize as the irresponsible research perfect storm, we refer to the blockbuster movie 'The Perfect Storm', which is about the crew of the fishing boat named the Andrea Gail. The movie begins with the crew returning home with an embarrassingly low amount of fish. This provokes the owner of the fishing company to make job termination threats to the Andrea Gail's Captain Bill Tyne, who in turn becomes determined to prove he is capable of delivering an impressive amount of fish. So, Captain Tyne convinces his crew to make one last trip before the winter season arrives, a decision that pays off because the crew catches an enormous amount of fish. However, as they were finishing up, the weather conditions rapidly worsened directly in the path back to the crew's hometown. Driven by financial incentives, the crew decides to sail back home through the storm. But, three different weather-related phenomena collided with each other and formed the perfect storm: warm air from a low-pressure system coming from one direction, a flow of cool and dry air generated by high-pressure from another direction, and tropical moisture provided by a tropical storm. As the crew sailed into the perfect storm, they were able to turn around. Unfortunately, the heroic effort was accomplished too late and the opportunity to escape the storm had passed. This perfect storm sank the Andrea Gail and the entire crew of six was lost to the sea.

We believe that the field of management is facing a similarly dangerous perfect storm, what we label the *irresponsible research perfect storm*. As eloquently described by Tsui and McKiernan (2022), there are several factors contributing to a disastrous outcome looming on the horizon and our research boat is at risk of sinking. What are the factors causing this perfect storm? Consider the following. First, a closed research ecosystem due to path-dependent processes has restricted scientific freedom (Tsui and McKiernan, 2022). Second, research is often not replicable (Open Science Collaboration, 2015) or useful (Sharma and Bansal, 2020) due to an alarming number of management scholars engaging in questionable research practices (e.g., *p*-hacking, outlier and control variable manipulation) (Banks et al., 2016; Bedeian et al., 2010; Suddaby, 2019). Third, a salient culture and reward system exists that pressures management scholars to predominantly and almost exclusively submit their manuscripts to a small number of 'A-journals' (Aguinis et al., 2020). Fourth, there are growing concerns about insufficient knowledge and training of scholars (Kreamer et al., 2021; Williams et al., 2021). Fifth, there are repeated yet unanswered calls to improve the quality and consistency of manuscript evaluations provided by journal editors and reviewers (Bedeian, 2003; Carpenter, 2009; Epstein, 1995; Lepak, 2009). Sixth, editorial leadership burnout is occurring more rapidly due to the increased workload (Barley, 2008). Seventh, many business school deans prioritize rankings over scholarship that is credible and relevant to multiple stakeholders (Anderson et al., 2021;

Thomas and Ambrosini, 2021). Eighth, there is a documented and troubling presence of cronyism, nepotism, and favouritism in academic publication decisions (Bailey et al., 2008; da Silva et al., 2019). And, the list goes on.

In a way, we believe that we, management scholars, are like the crew members of the Andrea Gail in the ‘The Perfect Storm’ movie: We see the factors creating the storm and deadly consequences unfolding right in front of our eyes. However, in contrast to the crew of the Andrea Gail who were unable to control weather-related phenomena, the irresponsible research perfect storm is not caused by natural forces outside of our control. The irresponsible research storm was caused, at least in part, by us. Therefore, this is *our problem*, not someone else’s (Rasheed and Priem, 2020). So, to achieve the desired future described in our opening vignette, we must proactively find our own solutions to quell this storm.

### **ADDRESSING THE RESEARCH-RESEARCH GAP**

How can we quell the irresponsible research perfect storm, precisely? For almost three decades, leaders in the field of management, including past Academy of Management (AOM) Presidents, have lamented the research-practice gap (e.g., Bartunek, 2003; Hambrick, 1994; Rousseau, 2006; Tsui, 2013). This is because most organizational decision makers (e.g., managers, policy makers) are not using the research that academics produce (Bansal et al., 2012; Rynes et al., 2007). Stated differently, the research-practice gap describes the disconnect between ‘the knowledge that academics are producing and the knowledge that practitioners are consuming’ (Cascio and Aguinis, 2008, p. 1062).

Tsui and McKiernan’s (2022) discussion of the importance of scientific freedom and scientific responsibility leads us to draw our attention to the existence of a different kind of gap that has not yet been acknowledged, a gap we label the *research-research* gap. We define the research-research gap as the disconnect between the knowledge that academics are producing and the knowledge that academics are using. In other words, beyond the scope of writing for publication purposes, *we do not seem to be using our own research in our own practices*. For example, consider the following illustrative questions: How many business school deans and department chairs are using our latest management and leadership research to effectively manage and lead their workgroups? How many of our professional organizations and journals are managed using our latest theories and research on organization and job design to structure journal operations? How many elected officers of our professional organizations are creating and implementing strategic plans based on our strategic planning theories and research? How many scholars are properly integrating the best and latest methodological practices into research design, measurement, and data analysis practices? And, just one more of many possible similar questions: How many university administrators are developing ways for scholars to disseminate their work to external stakeholders (e.g., managers, policy makers, alumni, media outlets) based on the latest theory and research on the meaning and measurement of scholarly impact? If we are brutally honest, the answer to most of these questions would probably range from

'very few' to 'almost none'. Hence our conclusion about the existence of an as-of-yet-unrecognized research-research gap.

There are numerous theories in strategy, management and organization theory, entrepreneurship, organizational behaviour, human resource management, as well as other management subfields, that are useful in allowing us to offer suggestions on how to quell the irresponsible research storm by narrowing the research-research gap. But, to help us organize this vast body of knowledge, we first discuss the need to address multiple stakeholders and multiple aspects of our research ecosystem simultaneously. Following a brief description of our overarching theoretical framework, we advance four sets of interrelated recommendations to help us address factors that cause the irresponsible research perfect storm.

## **A RESEARCH ECOSYSTEM THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

Enterprises have been historically regarded as 'collections of inter-organizational partners engaged in collective activities' (Purchase et al., 2011, p. 18). Thus, we conceptualize our *research ecosystem* as an enterprise because it includes a complex, diverse, and interconnected network of institutions, organizations, and organizational members that are engaged in producing management research. Tsui (2022) emphasized that the advancement of human knowledge for the benefit of all is one of the most critical outcomes of scientific freedom and scientific responsibility for the scientific community. However, there are institutional challenges that our research ecosystem has historically faced that prevent the realization of this vision. Because these challenges affect multiple components of the ecosystem simultaneously, it is unlikely that solutions will be effective unless we adopt a holistic approach.

A key tenet of strategic congruence theory is that success is more likely to be achieved when 'the corporate, business, and functional strategies of the firm are mutually consistent, with strategy at each organizational level appropriate to the firm's competitive arena and overall strategic aims' (Nilsson and Rapp, 2005, p. 47). Strategic congruence is largely based on the issue of fit. Fit is the extent to which internal operations among interconnected agents and components are aligned with the 'needs, demands, goals, objectives and/or structures' of the organizations themselves (Nadler and Tushman, 1980, p. 40), as well as societal needs and demands. Directly related to quelling the irresponsible research perfect storm, conceiving of the management research ecosystem as an enterprise means that strategic goals, objectives, and structures of interconnected constituent elements should be aligned and demonstrate high levels of fit. Therefore, our recommendations that follow involve different primarily targeted stakeholders, but all of them are part of our research ecosystem. Specifically, the first one addresses all internal and external stakeholders, the second one university administrators, the third journal editors, and the last one scholars. But, because all of these stakeholders are within the same research ecosystem, implementing each of the recommendations is likely to have positive ripple effects throughout the system and help quell the irresponsible research perfect storm by narrowing the research-research gap.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR QUELLING THE IRRESPONSIBLE RESEARCH PERFECT STORM

To expand on our earlier point, our research ecosystem theoretical framework suggests that the factors producing the irresponsible research storm are interrelated and involve many stakeholders – directly and indirectly. For example, many deans are motivated to improve their schools' rankings because this often has an impact on their own rewards, compensation, and visibility. Accordingly, those deans seek to establish promotion and reward systems for faculty that contribute positively to rankings such as using the *Financial Times* journal list to identify publications that count and those that don't (which, as another sign of the perfect storm, we find particularly troublesome because we seem to have outsourced the decision of which research counts and should be rewarded to journalists). In turn, using a journal list motivates faculty to publish only in those journals even if they must engage in questionable research practices intentionally or unintentionally. The end result is research that may not be credible or useful.

Before we describe our recommendations, we issue an important caveat. Given the rich theoretical landscape in the field management, we could have chosen many theories on which to base our recommendations. But, we focus on a handful of theories that seem particularly applicable and look forward to future recommendations relying on additional ones. In describing our recommendations, we follow a macro to micro sequence in terms of levels of analysis. Specifically, we start with issues more directly relevant to a macro level of analysis (e.g., universities, professional organizations) and end with the micro level (e.g., individual scholars). As a preview, we summarize the recommendations we discuss next in [Table I](#).

### **Recommendation 1: Promote Shared Vision and Accountability across Stakeholder Groups**

We draw on stakeholder collaboration theory (Gray and Wood, 1991; Savage et al., 2010) and governance theory (Amis et al., 2020; Tihanyi et al., 2014) to argue for the criticality of shared vision and accountability across stakeholder groups in the research ecosystem. These can be expressed in mission and vision statements and translated into action through specific policies. We readily acknowledge that achieving this type of strategic congruence will not be easy because it requires the coordinated action of multiple stakeholders who in some cases and at a particular point in time may not have similar priorities or objectives. However, this is certainly doable. An excellent example of a system that aims at accomplishing these goals is the Research Excellence Framework in the United Kingdom which has its critics but has included improvements over time (<https://www.ref.ac.uk>). Moreover, the success of the Responsible Research in Business & Management Movement (<https://www.rrbm.network/>) demonstrates that implementing our first recommendation may actually be within reach.

To support the goal of creating shared vision and accountability, we rely on stakeholder collaboration theory. Freeman and Reed (1983) argued that stakeholders should include 'any identifiable group or individual on which the organization is dependent for

Table I. Summary of recommendations for quelling the irresponsible research perfect storm by narrowing the research-research gap

<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Theoretical foundations</i>	<i>Primary targeted stakeholders</i>	<i>Implementation guidelines</i>
<p>Promote shared vision and accountability across stakeholder groups</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder collaboration theory</li> <li>Governance theory</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All internal and external stakeholder-research ecosystem</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Constitute a nonhierarchical governing body of representative leaders from universities, journals and publishers, businesses, policy-making-organizations, foundations, and professional organizations</li> <li>This governing body would be responsible for developing and updating the vision for the research ecosystem, ensure shared accountability among stakeholder groups, and establishing mechanisms for negotiating agendas and needs of stakeholder groups</li> </ul>
<p>Expand the definition of scholarly impact</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social information processing theory</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>University administrators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Business schools must understand key contemporary social needs and adopt a portfolio approach for rewarding rigorous and high-quality research addressing important and relevant societal issues (e.g., gender and social equity and inclusion, organizational sustainability)</li> <li>Use business school-level and department-level retention and tenure/promotion rates as measures of accountability to focus on faculty development and the impact of their scholarship instead of exclusively counting the number of A-journal articles</li> </ul>

(Continues)

Table I. (Continued)

<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Theoretical foundations</i>	<i>Primary targeted stakeholders</i>	<i>Implementation guidelines</i>
Provide journal editors with relevant resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation of resources theory</li> <li>• Work design theory</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Journal editors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement demand forecasting systems and allow journal editors to craft their jobs to make workload more manageable, slow the rate of editorial burnout, and allow them to provide timely and useful feedback to authors</li> <li>• Provide editors access to stress management interventions</li> </ul>
Strengthen the knowledge, skills and abilities of scholars	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goal-setting theory</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current and future scholars</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhance faculty goal-focused leadership skills</li> <li>• Develop a 'multimethod mindset' with the objective of integrating, not just stacking, methods as is done in mixed-methods research</li> </ul>

its continued survival', as well as the more inclusive conceptualization of stakeholders to include peripheral partners that are affected by the activities and decisions of the enterprise (p. 91). Collaborations among stakeholders in an ecosystem 'enables them to pool resources, capitalize on complementary capabilities, achieve economies of scale, and enhance innovativeness' (Savage et al., 2010, p. 21). In other words, collaboration among universities, journals and publishers, professional organizations, and policy-making bodies is required 'to solve "messy problems" that cannot typically be solved by an organization acting alone' (Savage et al., 2010, p. 21).

According to governance theory, governing bodies play an essential role in establishing shared vision among stakeholders, and determining how stakeholders negotiate decisions about pathways to success (Freedman and Reed, 1983; Tihanyi, et al., 2014). As such, we recommend that representative bodies of leaders from universities, journals and publishers, businesses, policy-making organizations, foundations, and professional organizations constitute a nonhierarchical governing body and convene quarterly. This governing body would be responsible for developing and updating a strategic vision for the research ecosystem, ensuring shared accountability among stakeholder groups, and establishing mechanisms for negotiating agendas and needs of stakeholder groups.

Finally, we emphasize 'representative' bodies of leaders to reinforce an ethic of inclusion among leadership groups across stakeholders. This approach facilitates more diverse voices being heard, which can create a higher level of social impact for a wider range of stakeholders.

## **Recommendation 2: Expand the Definition of Scholarly Impact**

Social information processing theory provides insights on why organizational members respond to salient negative and/or positive organizational cues because 'an individual's behavior is influenced by others and... individuals look to those around them for cues on appropriate ways to behave' (Salancik and Pfeffer, 1978, p. 333). At present, a dominant cue for signalling impactful scholarship is publishing in a small group of 'A-level' journals. In other words, our dominant environmental cue is the clear prioritization of A-journal articles given that so many deans reward publishing in A-journals, so many promotion and tenure decisions are made based on publishing in A-journals, and PhD students' employment aspects are commonly tied to whether or not they have A-publications (Aguinis et al., 2020). A focus on 'A journals' has some benefits such as the development of clear standards for promotion and tenure decisions. On the other hand, 'the practice of counting A-journal publications as the new bottom line for [assessing scholarly impact and] valuing academic research' (Aguinis et al., 2020, p. 136) compromises both scientific freedom and scientific responsibility by emphasizing one exclusive path to research excellence. Hence, if we wish to quell the irresponsible research perfect storm by addressing the issue of path-dependent processes in a closed research ecosystem (Tsui and McKiernan, 2022), we need to expand our conceptualization and measurement of scholarly impact.

Our first suggestion in this regard is for business schools to not focus exclusively on the issue of publication outlet and, instead, understand and reward rigorous and high-quality



research – particularly research addressing important societal issues. Specifically, a business school may wish to adopt a balanced portfolio of publication activities for evaluating faculty members for promotion or tenure. For example, a performance standard can involve a portfolio of conceptual, empirical, and practitioner articles to be promoted to associate professor with tenure – rather than, for example, ‘4 As’. In this case, the goal of at least one publication targeting a practitioner audience can motivate faculty to think of the societal relevance of their research. In addition, such an approach would open the door for more research on topics of relevance for managers and policy-makers (Responsible Research in Business and Management, 2022). We emphasize that we are not suggesting an exclusive emphasis on practitioner publications. Rather, a portfolio approach to publishing allows for an expansion of topics and methods to areas of critical societal importance generally referred to as ‘grand challenges’ such as social equity and inclusion, organizational sustainability and environmental and ecological issues, technological disruption, and global economic growth and stability, among others (e.g., Howard-Grenville, 2021).

Second, typical performance evaluations for department chairs and deans usually do not include explicit consequences for successfully or unsuccessfully hiring, retaining, and promoting faculty members despite research clearly documenting the detrimental effects of employee turnover (Hom et al., 2017). Similar to how graduation rates are used as a measure for university accountability (Gold and Albert, 2006), business schools can use tenure, promotion, and retention rates as a measure for college-level or departmental-level accountability. Low tenure rates reflect poorly on a business school’s ability to effectively recruit, hire, develop, and retain talent. Therefore, using tenure rates as a measure of accountability can help create a reward system for business school deans and department chairs: One that focuses on faculty development and the impact of their scholarship instead of simply counting the number of A-journal articles. This would serve as a salient institutional cue for colleges and departments taking ownership of their respective tenure rates, similar to how universities take ownership of their graduation rates.

### **Recommendation 3: Provide Journal Editors with Relevant Resources to Reduce Burnout**

According to conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989), when job demands exceed people’s resources, people pay a price in terms of emotional, cognitive, and physical cost, which results in burnout. Subsequently, to cope with burnout, people become more likely to overemphasize the avoidance of future resource loss and the conservation of remaining resources (Leiter, 1991). Thus, burnout needs to be taken seriously because it has many detrimental consequences for mental and physical health (Gabriel and Aguinis, 2022), and not surprisingly results in decreased job performance (Wright and Bonnet, 1997), reduced rational decision-making (Michailidis and Banks, 2016), and overall cognitive impairment (Deligkaris et al., 2014).

Every journal editor has a burnout point (Barley, 2008). Moreover, burnout obviously affects everyone – including authors. But with an ever-increasing number of manuscript submissions, editorial burnout is occurring at an accelerated rate, which

is particularly consequential given the editors' gatekeeping role. Accordingly, we have to confront the accelerated pace of editorial burnout as irresponsible research is more likely to be published under burned-out editors compared to highly attentive and psychologically engaged ones (Aguinis and Vaschetto, 2011). Indeed, becoming the editor of a well-regarded journal had traditionally been considered as a crowning moment in a senior scholar's career – usually a role reserved for those who were close to retirement so they would benefit from their expertise and connections in the field (e.g., ability to recruit associate editors and editorial board members). However, the contemporary demands and rewards of being a journal editor have made this job less desirable and editors can have an unexpectedly difficult time finding their successors. In other words, due to the demands of the position, the current bench for editors, and associate editors in particular, is not as deep as it used to be. Moreover, numerous editors themselves openly acknowledge that they are 'novices' not sufficiently equipped to do their job (Corley and Schinoff, 2017). As a vivid example, a newly appointed editor of a top management journal said the following: 'Sometimes I noticed that I sent off a letter, and my immediate reaction is, "Oh, thank goodness, phew, that was a really tough letter to write; it has been weighing on me for several days. So glad to get that off". And then within about 30 minutes after I got my celebratory coffee or something, I'm thinking, "Oh, God, did I make the right choice? Was that the right thing?"' (Corley and Schinoff, 2017, p. 4). We suggest that demand forecasting and stress management interventions are two kinds of relevant resources that can help slow the rate of editorial burnout resulting in cognitive overload and the need to 'cut corners' to conserve resources.

First, we suggest that journal editors be empowered to establish manuscript evaluation procedures in a manner that allows them to efficiently handle the number of submissions. Although untimely one-paragraph decision letters simply referring authors to reviewer comments are used to attribute blame to editors, more times than not, this is a supply versus demand problem that makes the job of a journal editor quite difficult. Stated differently, although many editors may wish to behave responsibly and support responsible research (Aguinis and Vaschetto, 2011), the challenge is the very high number of manuscript submissions. Solutions attempted by most journals such as increasing the number of associate editors do not seem to be working in many cases because of the shallow bench. As noted earlier, associate editors are less and less experienced (e.g., many of them are not even full professors), which creates challenges about their 'novice' status. Thus, there is a need for different solutions. For example, publishers and professional associations could partner with journal editors to implement demand forecasting systems, which predict the level of demand for a product or service for a given a time period (Archer, 1987). A demand forecast created annually to ensure the journal editor's editorial review board size is capable of efficiently handling the expected amount of journal submissions. Relatedly, we can rely on work design theories to allow editors to 'craft their jobs' in a way that they can handle the volume of submissions and provide timely and useful feedback to authors (Grant and Parker, 2009). The field of management would benefit from learning from some of the natural sciences, which publish journals that are older and receive many more submissions compared to the typical management journal: In 2021 *Nature* received

10,768 submissions (Nature, 2022) and *Science* received 11,515 (Science, 2022). In terms of how these journals allow editors to craft their jobs, as an example, *Science* has a Chief Scientific Editor, but also field-specific editors in charge of specific fields and domains.

Second, journal editors could also have access to stress management interventions. This can be accomplished via cognitive-behaviour training and/or mindfulness meditation groups. In cognitive-behavioural training, individuals learn how to develop active coping skills and change their thoughts and mindfulness meditation that helps to deal with stressful events and reduce tension (Tetrick and Winslow, 2015). Cognitive-behavioral training and mindfulness meditation groups are considered evidence-based recommendations that are helpful in preventing and combating job burnout (Gabriel and Aguinis, 2022). We emphasize that editors are unlikely to be able to ‘meditate away’ an unmanageable workload. As noted by Gabriel and Aguinis (2022), ‘stress management interventions can cause negative unintended consequences when implemented alone because employees feel they are being blamed for organization-level causes of their burnout and are in an untrusting environment’ (p. 1864). Nevertheless, our suggestion is based on theory and research that stress management interventions can help journal editors adapt to stressful situations and mitigate emotional exhaustion, which leads to less-than-ideal decision-making regarding manuscript acceptances and rejections.

#### **Recommendation 4: Strengthen the Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities of Scholars**

A core proposition of goal-setting theory is that when people set challenging and specific goals, it generally increases goal achievement (Locke and Latham, 1990). The concept of goal setting has long been considered important for understanding the motivational processes and behaviours that have a positive impact on performance (e.g., Colbert and Witt, 2009; Kim et al., 2018). Thus, setting goals specifically about scholars’ knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) can help mitigate the growing concerns about insufficient knowledge necessary to conduct and produce responsible research (Kreamer et al., 2021; Williams et al., 2021).

First, strengthening scholars’ KSAs begins in our doctoral programs. One way to ensure adequate training and mentoring for doctoral students is to hold faculty accountable for developing doctoral students as goal-focused leaders. Specifically, goal-focused leadership refers to ‘leadership that uses policies and practices to communicate organizational goals and align followers’ efforts with these goals’ (Colbert and Witt, 2009, p. 790). Faculty can use departmental practices and policies to communicate the targeted KSAs for doctoral students, such as updating their knowledge-production process, avoiding using questionable research practices (Banks et al., 2016), and teaching doctoral students the skill of scholarly writing (Caffarella and Barnett, 2000). Indeed, goal-focused leadership improves leader-member exchange and employee performance (Kim et al., 2018). Therefore, by positioning faculty of doctoral students as leaders and doctoral students as followers, implementing goal-focused leadership not only strengthens their KSAs, but also improves the interpersonal relationship between faculty and students. Of course, being able to implement this first recommendation

relies on the assumption that senior scholars have the necessary KSAs to develop their own research programmes and know how to develop young scholars. This issue is directly related to our second recommendation.

Second, we can strengthen KSAs of scholars by setting goals specifically related to the use of multiple research methods. For example, scholars who primarily conduct field work using surveys could set a goal to become proficient in conducting experimental research. Our suggestion is not to just learn how to conduct multimethod research as prescribed in research methods textbooks. Rather, we recommend using goal-setting to develop a 'multimethod mindset' with the objective of integrating, not just stacking, methods as is done in mixed-methods research. This approach also includes learning constructive replication methodology (Köhler and Cortina, 2021), which also helps mitigate the concern that our research is not sufficiently trustworthy (Open Science Collaboration, 2015).

Overall, given the increased complexity of management theory and methodology, more time and resources are required for acquiring the necessary KSAs as well as train others. Many other scientific fields extend training after graduate school to include a virtually mandatory post-hoc position before a researcher is deemed sufficiently competent to conduct research on their own. We have already seen that the typical doctoral program lasts more than just four years, which used to be the norm. Goal-setting can be a useful theory to update which KSAs, and when and how, should be acquired by future scholars.

## CONCLUSIONS

We sought to affirm and extend the important work of Tsui and McKiernan (2022). For this purpose, we argued that management scholars are like the crew members of the Andrea Gail in the 'The Perfect Storm' movie. We see the factors creating the perfect storm and its injurious consequences unfolding right in front of our eyes. But, in contrast to the crew of the Andrea Gail who were unable to control weather-related phenomena, the irresponsible research perfect storm is not caused by environmental forces outside of our control. Moreover, the irony does not escape us that we, management scholars, have created and tested numerous theories that we can put to use to fix what we think is our own problem. But, to do so, we need to narrow the research-research gap (i.e., scholars not putting to use the research ourselves are producing). Using a research ecosystem theoretical framework necessitates the active participation and engagement of internal and external stakeholders whose goals are congruent and aligned with a shared vision of producing credible and useful research. As a starting point, we offered four sets of theory-based recommendations and hope that many more will be offered and implemented by others in the future. We believe that doing so will prevent our research boat from sinking. Moreover, it will lead to credible and useful scientific insights that will result in higher levels of scientific freedom, responsibility, and impact in our efforts to meet the needs of an everchanging and increasingly globalized society.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank *Journal of Management Studies* Associate Editor Gideon Markman for highly constructive feedback on previous drafts. We also thank the PhD Project and Management Faculty of Color's Research Collaboration Initiative, which served as the impetus for initiating this project.

## REFERENCES

- Aguinis, H., Cummings, C., Ramani, R. S. and Cummings, T. G. (2020). ‘“An A is an A”: The new bottom line for valuing academic research’. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, **34**, 135–54.
- Aguinis, H. and Vaschetto, S. J. (2011). ‘Editorial responsibility: Managing the publishing process to do good and do well’. *Management and Organization Review*, **7**, 407–22.
- Amis, J., Barney, J., Mahoney, J. T. and Wang, H. (2020). ‘From the editors – Why we need a theory of stakeholder governance – and why this is a hard problem’. *Academy of Management Review*, **45**, 499–503.
- Anderson, V., Elliott, C. and Callahan, J. L. (2021). ‘Power, powerlessness, and journal ranking lists: The marginalization of fields of practice’. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, **20**, 89–107.
- Archer, B. (1987). ‘Demand forecasting and estimation’. In Ritchie, J. R. B. and Goeldner, C. R. (Eds), *Travel, Tourism and Hospitality Research*. New York: Wiley, 77–85.
- Bailey, C. D., Hermanson, D. R. and Louwers, T. J. (2008). ‘An examination of the peer review process in accounting journals’. *Journal of Accounting Education*, **26**, 55–72.
- Banks, G. C., O’Boyle, E. H., Pollack, J. M., White, C. D., Batchelor, J. H., Whelpley, C. E., Abston, K. A., Bennett, A. A. and Adkins, C. L. (2016). ‘Questions about questionable research practices in the field of management: A guest commentary’. *Journal of Management*, **42**, 5–20.
- Bansal, P., Bertels, S., Ewart, T., MacConnachie, P. and O’Brien, J. (2012). ‘Bridging the research–practice gap’. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, **26**, 73–92.
- Barley, S. R. (2008). ‘A letter to editors’. In Baruch, Y., Konrad, A., Aguinis, H. and Starbuck, W. (Eds), *Opening the Black Box of Editorship*. New York, NY: Palgrave-Macmillan, 39–48.
- Bartunek, J. M. (2003). ‘A dream for the academy’. *Academy of Management Review*, **28**, 198–203.
- Bedeian, A. G. (2003). ‘The manuscript review process: The proper roles of authors, referees, and editors’. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, **12**, 331–38.
- Bedeian, A. G., Taylor, S. G. and Miller, A. N. (2010). ‘Management science on the credibility bubble: Cardinal sins and various misdemeanors’. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, **9**, 715–25.
- Caffarella, R. S. and Barnett, B. G. (2000). ‘Teaching doctoral students to become scholarly writers: The importance of giving and receiving critiques’. *Studies in Higher Education*, **25**, 39–52.
- Carpenter, M. A. (2009). ‘Mentoring colleagues in the craft and spirit of peer review’. *Academy of Management Review*, **34**, 191–95.
- Cascio, W. F. and Aguinis, H. (2008). ‘Research in industrial and organizational psychology from 1963 to 2007: Changes, choices, and trends’. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **93**, 1062–81.
- Colbert, A. E. and Witt, L. A. (2009). ‘The role of goal-focused leadership in enabling the expression of conscientiousness’. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **94**, 790–96.
- Corley, K. G. and Schinoff, B. S. (2017). ‘Who, me? An inductive study of novice experts in the context of how editors come to understand theoretical contribution’. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, **31**, 4–27.
- da Silva, J. A. T., Katavić, V., Dobránszki, J., Al-Khatib, A. and Bornemann-Cimenti, H. (2019). ‘Establishing rules for ethicists and ethics organizations in academic publishing to avoid conflicts of interest, favoritism, cronyism and nepotism’. *KOME: An International Journal of Pure Communication Inquiry*, **7**, 110–25.
- Deligkaris, P., Panagopoulou, E., Montgomery, A. J. and Masoura, E. (2014). ‘Job burnout and cognitive functioning: A systematic review’. *Work & Stress*, **28**, 107–23.
- Epstein, S. (1995). ‘What can be done to improve the journal review process’. *American Psychologist*, **50**, 883–85.
- Freeman, R. E. and Reed, D. L. (1983). ‘Stockholders and stakeholders: A new perspective on corporate governance’. *California Management Review*, **25**, 88–106.
- Gabriel, K. P. and Aguinis, H. (2022). ‘How to prevent and combat employee burnout and create healthier workplaces during crises and beyond’. *Business Horizons*, **65**, 183–92.
- Gold, L. and Albert, L. (2006). ‘Graduation rates as a measure of college accountability’. *American Academic*, **2**, 89–106.
- Grant, A. M. and Parker, S. K. (2009). ‘Redesigning work design theories: The rise of relational and proactive perspectives’. *Academy of Management Annals*, **3**, 317–75.
- Gray, B. and Wood, D. J. (1991). ‘Collaborative alliances: Moving from practice to theory’. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, **27**, 3–22.
- Hambrick, D. C. (1994). ‘What if the academy actually mattered?’. *Academy of Management Review*, **19**, 11–16.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). ‘Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress’. *American Psychologist*, **44**, 513–24.

- Hom, P. W., Lee, T. W., Shaw, J. D. and Hausknecht, J. P. (2017). 'One hundred years of employee turnover theory and research'. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **102**, 530–45.
- Howard-Grenville, J. (2021). 'Grand challenges, Covid-19 and the future of organizational scholarship'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **58**, 254–58.
- Kim, D., Choi, D. and Vandenberghe, C. (2018). 'Goal-focused leadership, leader-member exchange, and task performance: The moderating effects of goal orientations and emotional exhaustion'. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, **33**, 645–60.
- Köhler, T. and Cortina, J. M. (2021). 'Play it again, Sam! An analysis of constructive replication in the organizational sciences'. *Journal of Management*, **47**, 488–518.
- Kremer, L. M., Albritton, B. H., Tonidandel, S. and Rogelberg, S. G. (2021). 'The use and misuse of organizational research methods "Best Practice" articles'. *Organizational Research Methods*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10944281211060706>
- Leiter, M. P. (1991). 'Coping patterns as predictors of burnout: The function of control and escapist coping patterns'. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **12**, 123–44.
- Lepak, D. (2009). 'What is good reviewing?'. *Academy of Management Review*, **34**, 375–81.
- Locke, E. A. and Latham, G. P. (1990). *A Theory of Goal Setting & Task Performance*. Hoboken, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Michailidis, E. and Banks, A. P. (2016). 'The relationship between burnout and risk-taking in workplace decision-making and decision-making style'. *Work & Stress*, **30**, 278–92.
- Nadler, D. A. and Tushman, M. L. (1980). 'A model for diagnosing organizational behavior'. *Organizational Dynamics*, **9**, 35–51.
- Nature. (2022). *Editorial Review and Processes*. Available at: <https://www.nature.com/nature/editorial-policies> (accessed 18 January 2022).
- Nilsson, F. and Rapp, B. (2005). *Understanding Competitive Advantage: The Importance of Strategic Congruence and Integrated Control*. New York: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Open Science Collaboration. (2015). 'Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science'. *Science*, **349**(6251), aac4716.
- Purchase, V., Parry, G., Valerdi, R., Nightingale, D. and Mills, J. (2011). 'Enterprise transformation: Why are we interested, what is it, and what are the challenges?'. *Journal of Enterprise Transformation*, **1**, 14–33.
- Rasheed, A. A. and Priem, R. L. (2020). "'An A is an A': We have met the enemy, and he is us!". *Academy of Management Perspectives*, **34**, 155–63.
- Responsible Research in Business & Management (2022). *Vision 2030*. Available at: <https://www.rrbm.network/position-paper/vision-2030/> (accessed 18 January 2022).
- Rousseau, D. M. (2006). 'Is there such a thing as "evidence-based management"?'. *Academy of Management Review*, **31**, 256–69.
- Rynes, S. L., Giluk, T. L. and Brown, K. G. (2007). 'The very separate worlds of academic and practitioner periodicals in human resource management: Implications for evidence-based management'. *Academy of Management Journal*, **50**, 987–1008.
- Salancik, G. and Pfeffer, J. (1978). 'A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **23**, 224–53.
- Savage, G. T., Bunn, M. D., Gray, B., Xiao, Q., Wang, S., Wilson, E. J. and Williams, E. S. (2010). 'Stakeholder collaboration: Implications for stakeholder theory and practice'. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **96**, 21–26.
- Science. (2022). *Journal Metrics*. Available at: <https://www.science.org/content/page/journal-metrics> (accessed 12 January 2022).
- Sharma, G. and Bansal, P. (2020). 'Cocreating rigorous and relevant knowledge'. *Academy of Management Journal*, **63**, 386–410.
- Suddaby, R. (2019). 'Objectivity and truth: The role of the essay in management scholarship'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **56**, 441–47.
- Tetrick, L. E. and Winslow, C. J. (2015). 'Workplace stress management interventions and health promotion'. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, **2**, 583–603.
- Thomas, L. and Ambrosini, V. (2021). 'The future role of the business school: A value cocreation perspective'. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, **20**, 249–69.
- Tihanyi, L., Graffin, S. and George, G. (2014). 'Rethinking governance in management research'. *Academy of Management Journal*, **57**, 1535–43.
- Tsui, A. S. (2013). '2012 Presidential Address – On compassion in scholarship: Why should we care?'. *Academy of Management Review*, **38**, 167–80.
- Tsui, A. S. (2022). 'From traditional research to responsible research: The necessity of scientific freedom and scientific responsibility for better societies'. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, **9**, 1–32.

- Tsui, A. S. and McKiernan, P. (2022). 'Understanding scientific freedom and scientific responsibility in business and management research'. *Journal of Management Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12816>
- Williams, L. J., Banks, G. C. and Vandenberg, R. J. (2021). 'ORM-CARMA virtual feature topics for advanced reviewer development'. *Organizational Research Methods*, **24**, 675–77.
- Wright, T. A. and Bonett, D. G. (1997). 'The contribution of burnout to work performance'. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **18**, 491–99.