responses of "Yes, and …," rather than silence, indifference, or "No, but …" (Leonard & Yorton, 2015).

References

Aguinis, H., Ramani, R. S., Campbell, P. K., Bernal-Turnes, P., Drewry, J. M., & Edgerton, B. T. (2017). Most frequently cited sources, articles, and authors in industrial-organizational psychology textbooks. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 10*(4), 507–557.

Anderson, V. (2017). Criteria for evaluating qualitative research. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 28*, 125–133. doi:10.1002/hrdq.21282

Leonard, K., & Yorton, T. (2015). *Yes, and: How improvisation reverses "no, but …"* New York: HarperCollins.

McLagan, P. A. (1989). Models for HRD practice. *Training and Development Journal, 41*(9), 49–59.

Werner, J. M. (2014). Human resource management and human resource development: Connecting the dots, or ships passing in the night? In R. F. Poell, T. Rocco, & G. Roth (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to human resource development* (pp. 89–98). New York: Routledge.

Werner, J. M. (2017a). *Human resource development/talent development* (7th ed.). Mason, OH: Cengage.

Werner, J. M. (2017b). Training from the perspective of human resource development and industrial and organizational psychology: Common past, parallel paths—going where? In K. G. Brown (Ed.), *Cambridge handbook of workplace training and employee development* (pp. 521–544). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Werner, J. M., & Bolino, M. C. (1997). Explaining U.S. Courts of Appeals decisions involving performance appraisal: Accuracy, fairness, and validation. *Personnel Psychology, 50*, 1–24. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1997.tb00898.x

Zientek, L. R., Werner, J. M., Campuzano, M. V., & Nimon, K. (in press). The use of Google Scholar for research and research dissemination. *New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*.

Not Another "Researcher-Centric" Index: A Cautionary Note

Zhenyu Yuan and Kenneth G. Brown
University of Iowa

In their focal article, Aguinis et al. (2017) conducted an empirical analysis of the most frequently cited sources, articles, and authors in industrial and organizational (I-O) psychology textbooks. The authors conclude that their "results are encouraging regarding the scientist–practitioner model" (p. 545). We disagree. Although we applaud the effort that went into this

Zhenyu Yuan, Department of Management and Organizations, University of Iowa; Kenneth G. Brown, Department of Management and Organizations, University of Iowa.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Zhenyu Yuan, University of Iowa, Department of Management and Organizations, 108 John Pappajohn Business Building, Iowa City, IA 52242. E-mail: zhenyu-yuan@uiowa.edu

https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2017.62 Published online by Cambridge University Press

research, we are concerned that the method used in the article, focusing on textbook citations, creates yet another "researcher-centric" index that will do nothing to address the research–practice gap. The problematic "researcher-centric" perspective manifests itself in several ways in the focal article, which we elaborate below.

Our biggest concern regarding the focal article is that researchers are the ones who write textbooks. In that vein, examining textbooks citations is very "researcher-centric," in that we are essentially asking ourselves whether we cite our own research.[1] Not surprisingly, we do. More problematically, by focusing on what we as researchers cite, we are losing sight of whether we are making any direct connections with practitioners. Rynes, Giluk, and Brown (2007) found that results deemed clear and robust by the research community received little coverage by practitioner and bridge journals. Importantly, the presence of non-academic publications in I-O psychology textbooks does not mean academic publications are being frequently referenced in non-academic publications. These are two separate things. The focal article is mainly concerned with the former, citations in textbooks, over the latter, citations to academic work in mainstream practitioner outlets. Although we agree it is useful to know to what extent a researcher's work is being cited in textbooks, we do not see it doing much to address whether our work is useful in day-to-day work environments. What we need to understand is what research practitioners read and what practitioners actually find useful in practice. In fact, Colbert, Rynes, and Brown (2005) found that only 2% of their study participants (members of the Society for Human Resource Management with significant management responsibility in HR) reported reading academic journals. Therefore, it is more important for the research community to find different ways to disseminate research findings to practitioners (Colbert et al., 2005) than to count how frequently our own work is cited in academic textbooks.

It is encouraging to see the authors of the I-O textbooks cite nonacademic publications, thus giving future I-O professionals some exposure to nonacademic sources. Yet still, we are reluctant to jump to the conclusion that "the divide may develop later, perhaps after graduates obtain employment as either practitioners or researchers" (Aguinis et al., 2017, p. 545). First, exposure via textbooks does not mean acceptance. For example, Caprar, Do, Rynes, and Bartunek (2016) showed that college students might not accept well-documented findings if the research findings threatened their positive self-regard. In fact, the essay that student subjects in that study found threatening was from one of the most robust findings in I-O

[1] We are aware that by using "we," we are embracing the identity of researchers, not practitioners, in this commentary.

https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2017.62 Published online by Cambridge University Press

psychology, which states that intelligence is a robust predictor of performance (Schmidt, 2009). Second, the content of I-O textbooks does not provide any information about the actual training methods that instructors use in the classroom, which are important for training effectiveness (Arthur, Bennett, Edens, & Bell, 2003). Worded perhaps too dramatically, how do we know that students are actually learning and retaining anything from the textbooks? Caprar et al. (2016) also stressed the importance of teaching methods in their discussion of students' acceptance of management research. For example, the same research finding may be better received if the instructor uses a more active and exploratory training method in class (Bell & Kozlowski, 2008). If we as instructors pay no attention to how we structure our class and instead just present our cumulative body of knowledge in a passive way, we may be responsible for sustaining students' preexisting beliefs about how the world works. The divide may have already been extant, if not grown larger, in our very own classrooms because instructors may not have as big of an impact on students' knowledge and beliefs as they would like.

Our last concern with the researcher-centric view has to do with how the authors compared I-O psychology programs against business programs. Although we acknowledge the ongoing discussion regarding the migration of some I-O psychologists to business schools (Aguinis, Bradley, & Brodersen, 2014), we are wondering whether emphasizing the distinct identities of the two parties is doing much to help us better understand the research–practice gap. As researchers, we claim an identity early on in our career, both from our training background (i.e., I-O psychologist or a management scholar) and from our research interests (e.g., leadership scholar or a team researcher). In other words, the discussion regarding the tension between I-O programs and business schools is understandable because it is closely related to researchers' identities. However, we are concerned that we may trip into our researcher-centric mindset if we are fixated on the tension between our narrowly defined identities. This may blind us to the fact that many practitioners do not care who did the research. In fact, a common practice in mainstream media is to cite the institution (a study from the University of Iowa) rather than the college and department of the scholar. Does a vice president of human resources spend time debating whether to use a finding based on whether the scholar is in psychology or management, or published in *Academy of Management Journal* or *Journal of Applied Psychology*? As it relates to research–practice issues, we need to adopt a broader lens. If both I-O psychology and business graduates (e.g., human resource management track) end up working in similar jobs, why do we limit our research to only I-O psychology textbooks and our discussion to the training of future I-O psychology professionals? Although it is important to understand the tension between different academic programs, we wish to highlight the fact that, from a practitioner's standpoint, they see us as a relatively undifferentiated research community.

https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2017.62 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Having detailed our concerns with the researcher-centric assumption underlying the focal article, we now turn to a brief discussion of what we contend is important for understanding the research–practice gap. First, we highlight the role of researchers' own mindsets in the ongoing discussion regarding the research–practice gap. We are not the first to point this out (Augier & March, 2007; Bartunek & Rynes, 2014; Bennis & O'Toole, 2005). Yet still, we have shown through our commentary how a researcher-centric worldview can push us even further from starting the real conversation and end up creating more researcher-centric indices that satisfy our needs for recognition but little else. Second, we need to move beyond citations to look at how we engage students and practitioners. Our focus here has been on student-centered teaching, emphasizing how we should as a field make sure students have hands-on opportunities to explore the connection between I-O psychology research and practice (Caprar et al., 2016). With current practitioners, we need to take on a relational mindset instead of a researcher-centered one and explore the different ways that we can forge meaningful connections with practitioners (Bartunek, 2007).

We should point out that the brevity of these suggestions by no means implies easy implementation. In fact, scholars have made the call for the research community to take on the research–practice gap as an important phenomenon in itself (Bartunek & Rynes, 2014). In other words, we should devote significant resources to researching this phenomenon in the hope to better understand it. In order to do that, we need to attend to the broader picture and reflect on our own role in the research–practice gap. In fact, Bartunek and Rynes (2014) astutely pointed out that "while some of the discussion is about academics in relation to practitioners, most of the discussion is actually about—and aimed at—other academics, and whether or not the other academics hold what the author considers the proper viewpoint" (p. 1188). Therefore, it is time that the research community be aware of our very own part in the research–practice gap. Instead of acting on our researcher-centric impulse to rely on some summary statistics, we need to remind ourselves that we are part of the reason for the tensions, dialectics, and paradox underlying the research–practice gap (Bartunek & Rynes, 2014). Another "researcher-centric" index that counts citations in I-O psychology textbooks is not going to do much. Instead, it may even push us further from practitioners.

References

Aguinis, H., Bradley, K. J., & Brodersen, A. (2014). Industrial–organizational psychologists in business schools: Brain drain or eye opener? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, *7*, 284–303.

Aguinis, H., Ramani, R. S., Campbell, P. K., Bernal-Turnes, P., Drewry, J. M., & Edgerton, B. T. (2017). Most frequently cited sources, articles, and authors in industrial-organizational psychology

https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2017.62 Published online by Cambridge University Press

textbooks: Implications for the science-practice divide, scholarly impact, and the future of the field. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 10*(4), 507–557.

Arthur Jr., W., Bennett Jr., W., Edens, P. S., & Bell, S. T. (2003). Effectiveness of training in organizations: A meta-analysis of design and evaluation features. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 234–245.

Augier, M., & March, J. G. (2007). The pursuit of relevance in management education. *California Management Review, 49*, 129–146.

Bartunek, J. M. (2007). Academic-practitioner collaboration need not require joint or relevant research: Toward a relational scholarship of integration. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*, 1323–1333.

Bartunek, J. M., & Rynes, S. L. (2014). Academics and practitioners are alike and unlike: The paradoxes of academic–practitioner relationships. *Journal of Management, 40*, 1181–1201.

Bell, B. S., & Kozlowski, S. W. (2008). Active learning: Effects of core training design elements on self-regulatory processes, learning, and adaptability. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 296–316.

Bennis, W. G., & O'Toole, J. (2005). How business schools lost their way. *Harvard Business Review, 83*, 96–104.

Caprar, D. V., Do, B., Rynes, S. L., & Bartunek, J. M. (2016). It's personal: An exploration of students' (non)acceptance of management research. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 15*, 207–231.

Colbert, A. E., Rynes, S. L., & Brown, K. G. (2005). Who believes us? Understanding managers' agreement with human resource research findings. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 41*, 304–325.

Rynes, S. L., Giluk, T. L., & 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.

Schmidt, F. L. (2009). Select on intelligence. In E. A. Locke (Ed.), *Handbook of principles of organizational behavior* (pp. 3–17). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.

The Wicked Problem of Scholarly Impact

Tara Behrend
George Washington University

Richard Landers
Old Dominion University

Academics sometimes forget that the purpose of a university is to *educate*: our students, our local communities, each other, and the world. Although each university is unique in its constituency, all share the charge to generate knowledge for the protection and benefit of the public good. The goal of an academic should be to beneficially impact society, broadly defined, with

Tara Behrend, George Washington University; Richard Landers, Old Dominion University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Tara Behrend, George Washington University, 600 21st St. NW, Washington, DC 20052. E-mail: tara.behrend@gmail.com, behrend@gwu.edu

https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2017.62 Published online by Cambridge University Press