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Abstract

Purpose: This article provides a general review of the debate over rigor and relevance in academia, specifically in the scientific field of management. It seeks to contribute to the body of literature while emphasizing instances where the gap between rigor and relevance has been bridged, along with the role of business schools.

Approach: This takes the approach of underscoring the most important works in the present literature regarding rigor and relevance, and then focusing on three points of emphasis: 1) role of business schools in the debate; 2) main points of contention; and 3) strongest examples of success in this field.

Findings: The most important findings in this work indicate that the debate surrounding relevance and rigor still persists and may also be reaching a breaking point where the two sides of the debate cannot reconcile. Various proposed solutions to the debate are available but meaningful action has yet to be taken.

Implications: The practical applications of this work are manifold. Scholars would have a clearer understanding of the environments in which their works are operating and practitioners would find academic works in management more accessible.

Value: This work provides a description of both the points of contention in the rigor vs. relevance debate and the points of successful unification of the two.
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Introduction

The debate between rigor and relevance in the study of management has gained considerable attention in recent years. In any field of study, questions concerning the accessibility of a scientific work must be handled. Scholars must decide whether to emphasize rigor, which includes scientific knowledge, theory and data, or to emphasize relevance, which focuses on practical examples, timeliness, and applicability to life outside of the academic arena. Academics in management and organizational studies have been able to develop diverse and advanced perspectives, theories and methodologies concerning business operations and management practices, but they have done so at a cost. If practitioners find that academic research in their field is not relevant, they will choose not to apply it. This presents a clear dilemma for scholars.

This conflict is nothing new. The purpose of the literature review is to first place the debate over rigor and relevance in a historical context, tracking its development from its inception. Once this is outlined, the review pays special attention to the contribution business schools have brought to the conflict and also examines various alternative points of view that have yet to be broadly considered in most of the literature. Then the findings concerning what steps would be best to take to ameliorate the dilemma of choosing rigor or relevance in scholarly work are presented.

Methodology

This literature review was conducted adhering to a specific set of guidelines. First, the EBSCOhost online research database was utilized as the main source for relevant articles and materials. This database offers the extensive wealth of sources needed to conduct such a literature review and its numerous customizable search features facilitate obtaining materials that were most pertinent to the topics of rigor and relevance. Using this database, three initial search terms were utilized to obtain the needed materials: “rigor,” “relevance,” and “rigor vs. relevance.” From these core terms, a series of combinations emerged, namely searches that added the terms “bridging,” “gap,” “conflict” and “debate.”

Furthermore, specific scientific journals were targeted when selecting the initial sample. Three prominent publications were first used as search criteria: the Academy of Management Journal, the Journal of Management Inquiry, and the Journal of Management Studies. These were chosen for the wealth of articles they possessed on the topic of the rigor-relevance conflict. To broaden the scope of the review, the sample was
subsequently expanded to represent more diversity. Accordingly, journals with the terms “management,” “organization,” “social” and “occupation” in their titles were included in the search. This is particularly necessary when collecting older sources. The first round of searches was meant to identify works from the past 10 years, so the results were limited to works from 2004–2014. Seventeen sources were collected from this period. For the purposes of comparing the most up-to-date works with earlier ones, a second round was conducted, restricting the results to only scholarly articles published before 2003. This yielded an additional 14 works. Ultimately, 31 works were included until saturation was met. The database was searched from June of 2013 to 2014.

**Literature perspectives**

One of the most important contributions of the Industrial Revolution was its role in bringing about the idea of viewing management as an area of formal scientific study. Frederick Taylor, the pioneer who first developed scientific management in the early twentieth century, was really the starting point of the debate between rigor and relevance. As soon as scholars started to follow Taylor’s lead and began examining organizations, businesses and management practices from a scientific point of view, it stands to reason that the theoretical framework of academics would come into conflict with the practical concerns of business figures.

Therefore during this period, the main causes of the debate between rigor and relevance were already visible. First, both the scientific observers and business practitioners believed that their points of view was the only valid ones. Observers felt their knowledge was more valuable, whereas practitioners pointed to their successful businesses and accumulated sums of money as signs of their superiority. In addition, both sides began to view each other with a strong sense of prejudice. As is common in any human interaction, people initially feel their way of life and their values are superior to those of any other culture. This is precisely the same phenomenon that was present in the conflict between observers and practitioners at the start of the twentieth century (Dearborn and Simon, 1958). Another area of disagreement was over the original accessibility of scientific texts. Many scientific studies were meant to only be read by other scholars so their findings were completely inaccessible to workers and managers. So long as this divide between practitioners and academics existed, managers were unable to incorporate rigorous scholarly findings in any practical way (Benbasat and Zmud, 1999).

Over time, the rigor-relevance gap emerged in other forms as well. For example, management leaders hired academic experts for advisory purposes, yet disagreements between
company heads and academic consultants were commonly observed. Managers would not listen to advice from economists, despite economists having specialized expert knowledge (Gordon, 1976). In addition, scholars also found that some managers willingly attempted to avoid the application of theories in their organizations (Mintzberg, 1977). Practitioners’ oftentimes felt that their knowledge in business was greater than that of any scholars, so they wanted to form decisions that were not influenced by any academic findings.

Later research brought some interesting developments to the conflict. In the 1990’s, more scholars examined the lack of relevance of academic materials and concluded that a significant gap existed (Benbasat and Zmud, 1999). Researchers also took more novel approaches in their studies of the phenomenon. For instance, the rigor-relevance gap was first studied using a systems approach. Specifically, each side of the conflict was investigated as a separate system and analyzed from this point of view (Luhmann, 1995). This attempted to show a conflict existed because the systematic goals of practitioners and academics were simply incompatible.

As works officially recognized the notions of rigor and relevance, they also focused on the possibility of unifying the two concepts together, as opposed to emphasizing the existence of a conflict. For instance, early works indicated that using theory in scientific management was a means to get effective results for an organization (Lewin, 1951). Here, the link between observers and practitioners was clear. The work of scholars was necessary for successful practice in business and this idea was further developed in later years. By the 1980’s, scholars came to claim that scientific studies must have data that explains what people were seeing in their respective fields (Thommas and Tymon, 1982). Scholars had an obligation to provide relevant information for practitioners. These early works highlighted that it was in the interests of both observers and practitioners to have open communication with one another.

Furthermore, scientific works attempted to find a balance that could bring about a sense of compromise between practitioners and observers. Two models are particularly noteworthy. First, the use of applied theory in this debate was an early attempt to reconcile rigor and relevance in the scientific study of organizations (Zmud, 1996). Advocates of applied theory stated that scientific knowledge should focus on being readily relatable to real scenarios and practices in business. Intangible but highly rigorous work was not imperative in the study of organizations.

A more detailed model came from advocates of the pragmatic science approach. Scholars supporting this school of thought developed a more elaborate matrix-style model that
would foster cooperation between proponents of rigor and relevance. The crux of the pragmatic science approach upheld that there was a possibility for researchers to produce findings that had both high rigor and high relevance (Neil, Herriot and Hodgkinson, 2001). Nevertheless, research in this area did not confirm if such cooperation was desirable; it only confirmed that it was possible.

**Recent works**

In the past 10 years, the academic body of knowledge on the rigor-relevance gap became richer and more diverse. Publications offered new conclusions and implemented different methodologies in their studies of the conflict. An important development was the advent of the idea that rigor and relevance were not two extremes that were mutually exclusive. In contrast, both could be attained at the same time and the present gap was not an inevitable burden that had to be accepted (Gulati, 2007). Another point of view reframed the rigor-relevance conflict. This perspective held that academic works were sufficiently relevant but the knowledge they held was simply not useful enough for practitioners. Greater relevance is not needed, so the knowledge in academic works must be transformed for practitioners to be more accepting of it (Markides, 2011).

On the other hand, works opposing collaboration between observers and practitioners still persist. Kieser and Leiner concluded that the bridge between rigor and relevance should not and cannot be crossed by present-day scholars (2009). Moreover, the systems approach has revealed new problems. For example, if observers and practitioners are observed as their own individual systems, then each system had a very distinct sense of speed. For observers, it is rewarding to conduct thorough and meticulous research. Speed is not a key point of emphasis. However, practitioners value speed as a key business skill. Managers are rewarded for taking risks and making quick decisions, so speed is of key importance for those with financial goals. Likewise, the two groups have different reward systems. Observers are motivated by the merit of their work, esteem from their peers and a sense of personal accomplishment. On the other hand, the main concern of practitioners is financial gain (Simon, 2004).

As a result of these two groups having these key fundamental differences, some scholars have arrived at the conclusion that they could never collaborate regardless of the rigor vs. relevance debate. According to Kieser and Leiner, when observers and practitioners are both viewed as systems through the systems approach, even more differences come to light. Any system operates based on its own rules, culture and procedures; successful interaction with another system would require deep changes at the systemic
level. In summary, because observers and practitioners are two different systems, they are and always have been entirely incompatible with one another (2009).

Aside from their conclusions, recent works have also grown more diverse because of the methods they have employed in their analyses. The rationale is that different ways of looking at a problem can yield different results. For example, Latusek and Vlaar's attempt to bridge the rigor-relevance chasm heavily used metaphors to explain how managers view job behaviors. The argument here is that metaphors can product both practical and theoretical knowledge, thereby eliminating the gap (Latusek and Vlaar, 2014). Likewise, Empson incorporates an autoethnography to explore the problem. As an academic who spent significant time with practitioners, Empson noted the existence of an identity conflict that emerged as a symptom of the rigor-relevance divide (2013).

Role of business schools

Amid the debate between observers and practitioners, business schools played a very interesting role in creating, continuing and addressing the issues of rigor and relevance. In the early twentieth century when business was still a fledgling field of study, new industrialists were seeking ways to legitimize their areas of work. Business was simply a newer field of study than other traditional sciences, so it faced a difficult battle in gaining acceptance as a valid area of study. The popular opinion at the turn of the century was that industrialists were doing nothing more than using the university system to their advantage rather than promoting serious scientific study (Peters, 2008).

As a response to these criticisms, business schools underwent sweeping changes to legitimize themselves as centers of education. Hence, the inception of rigor in academic writing in the areas of management and organizational theory came in the early decades of the twentieth century. Schools actively promoted greater scientific discussion and theorizing in hopes that the study of business would bring validation. However, schools pursued rigorous knowledge to such an extent that practical knowledge was given a much lower priority (Starkey et al., 2009). So the overcompensation of business schools to gain legitimacy through rigorous study did much to precipitate the modern conflict between rigor and relevance.

Many effects of the decisions of business schools to pursue more rigorous research can still be seen in academia today. Business schools play a very interesting role in the discussion over rigor and relevance. First, business schools for the most part have separated themselves from centers focused on serious scientific research. They still
have the stigma that they are simply places for business people to validate their exorbitant financial rewards. In other words, there is a vast disparity today between the importance attributed to business schools and the amount of knowledge, whether it is theoretical or practical, that they offer (Clark and Fincham, 2009). Even the most esteemed institutions, such as Harvard or Cambridge, have not escaped criticism.

This knowledge deficit has contributed to an enduring conflict today between those who practice business and those who study it. An anonymous dean of a prestigious business school in the United States stated that “as much as 80% of management research is irrelevant” (Simon, 2004). Clearly, the state of academic study at business schools is in a precarious position when the very people who represent them dispute their usefulness. Practitioners educated in business have also expressed dissatisfaction with the ways business schools handle the rigor-relevance debate (Porter and McKibbin, 1988). With students and educators of business schools alike expressing doubts about the relevance of the academic knowledge being produced concerning management and business practices, one has to conclude that business schools play a central part in prolonging and worsening the debate over rigor and relevance in modern academic study.

**Current points of contention**

The present-day argument over rigor and relevance revolves around a handful of key issues receiving a great deal of attention of scholars. Scholars today typically vehemently support only one strict viewpoint based on their own research. Naturally, researchers with different findings will debate the issue over and over again without attempting to reach a compromise unless further research is done. Therefore, much of the current discussion over rigor and relevance is at a standstill.

One of the most basic points of contention is over the very use of science in management. On the one hand, one school of scholars holds that educators in business fields focus too much on science. Proponents of this view believe a greater emphasis on practical work is necessary, but that the current system of study is flawed. The knowledge students learn throughout their education is too narrow to have any real value. People are overly specialized and can only use their knowledge to produce more academic works. The knowledge presented in schools has no value for use in the real world, so relevance becomes a virtual impossibility (Porter and McKibbin, 1988).

On the other hand, opposing scholars present arguments that actually defend the educational system. For them, the flaws are not in the system but in the people who
operate in it. They hold that educators misapply pertinent scientific information, making it all the more difficult for students to correctly apply anything they learn to other situations. One of the most common mistakes made by educators is a general over-reliance on case studies. Educators hope they can explain complex business ideas and theoretical concepts by presenting students with individual situations that students are supposed to draw conclusions from. Scholars argue that case studies alone provide limited knowledge and that students must be given access to theoretical knowledge first-hand (Pfeffer and Sutton, 2006).

Another accusation scholars from this camp make is that professors in business schools teach theories to their students that they themselves do not understand. Scholars worry that older educators do nothing more than regurgitate popular concepts that they had learned when they were students, despite the development of better or contradictory theories in later years. At times, educators even teach concepts that had been proven incorrect or outdated. For instance, scholars indicated that Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory of motivation was shown to be inaccurate as early as the 1970’s, yet it remains a staple of many introductory-level business courses (Pfeffer and Sutton, 2006).

Scholars in support of using science in management hold that education based on science is truly the soundest option (Pfeffer and Sutton, 2006). Actually, this science is applicable to real work done in modern businesses (Loewenstein, Thompson and Gentner, 2008). The problem is not in the science but rather in how educators are able to apply it. Based on this evidence, it seems best to rework how science is used in educational settings rather than opting to abandon it entirely.

The second area of debate revolves around the accessibility of scientific materials to practitioners working in business fields. Scientific research is generally intended for other scholars to review, validate and build on. As a result, scientists use language they are familiar with, even though it might manifest itself into a type of jargon which can be difficult to understand for other groups, namely practitioners. Other scholars also upheld the idea that science should remain distant from other groups for its own good. The argument is that science would gain legitimacy by being closed (Kieser and Leiner, 2009). Scientific research that is more distant is less open to bias and is therefore more objective and rational.

Scholars took this argument even further by indicating that even if practitioners wanted to access scientific data, they would be unable to. Using systems theory as a basis for their arguments, scholars argued that the systems of the observers and the
practitioners were distinct and therefore incompatible. Communication between the two systems would be impossible. As Kieser and Leiner state:

Communication elements of one system, such as science, cannot be authentically integrated into communication of other systems, such as the system of a business organization (Kieser and Leiner, 2009, p. 516).

Despite these arguments against the application of science in common business organizations, other voices from academia have also arisen in support of interweaving science and business together. Scientists in this school of thought have built upon a variety of theoretical bases. For example, scholars point to H. Simon as a traditional proponent of management as a science of the artificial. From this perspective, the body of knowledge related to management is not absolute, so any structures or systems present in the environment can be modified and adapted to suit a specific observer’s or practitioner’s needs (Simon, 1969). Later works also confirmed that the rigor-relevance gap was an “artificial” one (Gulati, 2007).

Likewise, extensive works connecting management science to the design perspective of social sciences complement this point of view. According to the design perspective, structures like those in the business world are artificially created by people and can thus be changed. This view does not refute the traditional systems theory; it simply says that the theory can be changed. People have designed the systems of science and business organizations so they can be redesigned as well. This perspective emphasizes the temporal nature of organizations and the ability of people to change structures and ways of thought. To bring about these changes hinted at by the design perspective, communication between different groups is imperative. Observers and practitioners must open up a dialog with one another to foster new viewpoints and structural changes (Romme, 2003).

The third prominent point of contention is concerned with the nature of cooperation between science and management. Some scholars completely oppose any interaction or collaboration between the two groups of observers and practitioners, while other academics hold that cooperation between the two is actually the most desirable outcome. Those who favor isolating the two groups from one another do not focus their arguments on reasons why cooperation is pernicious. Rather, most arguments are centered around the idea that productive cooperation is actually impossible to achieve.

This school of thought considers reconciliation between rigor and relevance to be a waste of scientific attention and resources. As Kieser and Leiner stated, “it is a false
hope to expect that collaborators from practice and science can jointly produce research” (2009). The implication is that observers and practitioners will be incapable of efficaciously coming together to create unified scientific research of any merit. Once again harkening to systems theory, researchers claim there are simply too many deep divisions between the two groups so that communication, knowledge transfer and joint reward for both are impossible to attain. From a theoretical perspective, scholars advocating positivism believe that every part of a system or environment can only have one specific role and use one specific method, and that dynamic change and fluidity are not really probable (van de Ven, 2007). Observers are meant to observe and practitioners are meant to practice, so assigning them new tasks through cooperation is simply not a possibility.

On the other side of this conflict, there are scholars who contend that cooperation is actually the best possible outcome for observers and practitioners alike. In other words, collaboration will lead to higher rigor and higher relevance in academic works. Researchers supporting this line of thought actually incorporate a wide diversity of theoretical perspectives in their arguments. For example, as a response to those scholars supporting a strictly positivist viewpoint, researchers have presented a model based on critical realism. This model stresses that there are many equally valid methods any player in a system can employ to achieve its aims. Accordingly, observers and practitioners can try new methods, such as cooperation, to gain something of value.

Critical realism emphasizes the benefits of using many different methods together (Rousseau et al., 2008). Combining different approaches in scientific study helps minimize errors and introduces new insights that would be impossible to obtain using just one research method. Therefore, diversification, experimentation and innovation in academic work should be undertaken. It is worthwhile to try things in different ways, such as having different groups cooperating together for the first time, because doing so will certainly yield useful results. In addition, scholars must also take into account the entire body of knowledge for a specific subject, rather than being content with examining a single study connected to an issue. Focusing on individual studies tends to yield improper conclusions, making data skewed, unreliable and irrelevant to practical applications (Denyer, Tranfield and Van Aken, 2008). Overall, scholars promoting cooperation between science and management prefer examining things from many different perspectives to create the clearest possible picture about a topic and advocate examining a wealth of knowledge in a subject area. Thus for them, cooperation seems like a valuable tool and it appears that combining different sources to create a larger body of knowledge is beneficial.
The final point of contention for present-day scholars concerns the dangers and rewards of cooperation. Scholars have to answer questions such as “What do we risk through cooperating with practitioners?” and “What are the possible rewards we can get from cooperation?”. Not surprisingly, one school of scholars focuses much of its attention on the pitfalls of cooperation between observers and practitioners. For them, it is much too risky and dangerous to open up scientific knowledge to other groups. As such, scientific study is meant to be isolated. Scholars consider that contact with other groups is seen as pernicious to the final result and should be avoided. The entire integrity of the work can be damaged (Kieser and Leiner, 2009). The dangers of cooperation far outweigh any possible benefits that may come from it, according to this school of thought.

In contrast, a noticeable segment of scholars hold that cooperation is beneficial to scientific study. Collaboration between groups can enhance the merits of academic work on a monumental level. Generally, some scholars indicate that the trend in scientific research is already geared toward greater collaboration between observers and practitioners, so it is already becoming more readily acceptable (Ariely, 2008). Cooperation has slowly been creeping into more current scientific works, so academics argue that is only proper to openly accept it.

The reasons for this increase in cooperation are manifold. More concerned parties are becoming aware of its benefits. For one, there is a greater desire among managers to have better knowledge they can use in their organizations that is supported by theory. For the most part, practitioners are accepting the notion that pursuing policies that are based on sound scientific research will be beneficial to their organizations.

The benefits for researchers are also stressed. The dissemination of scientific research makes it more visible to a wider audience. More people can access it, incorporate it and build upon it. So as more practitioners accept scientific data, its use will be more widely accepted. This is beneficial for scientists because it will help them obtain the sense of credibility they so strongly desire and will encourage them to look for more cooperation in future endeavors.

What is most beneficial, however, is that research will be open to more funding if it is more well-known and people become more familiar with it (Boyer, 1990). If there is a link between the level of cooperation in science and financial returns, researchers have a clear impetus to promote greater collaboration with practitioners. More visibility, esteem and funding all certainly point to better quality scientific results, so it is apparent that collaboration is a risk that certainly has its rewards.
Rigorous works with relevance

In the field of management, there have also been a handful of successful instances of scholarly works that have proven relevant. One such example of cooperation came when managers began focusing more on implementing policies that promoted procedural justice. In the later twentieth century, a string of studies was produced highlighting that procedural justice was actually effective in harnessing employee motivation and increasing productivity in the work place. As a result, managers slowly began focusing on having procedural justice implemented into their companies and offices. After seeing the positive results, this trend expanded and other managers followed suit (Hodgkinson and Rousseau, 2009).

Another example of scientific works that proved to be relevant involved the changing of hiring practices. Studies in the early twenty-first century indicated that traditional hiring practices, such as structured one-on-one interviews, were ineffective in finding the best candidate for a specific position. Over time, managers began changing their methods for interviewing job applicants and these newer methods actually helped companies select more productive and suitable candidates (Hodgkinson and Rousseau, 2009). Here, scientific findings allowed managers to incorporate research into interviews and managers were able to see positive outcomes as a result.

These examples notwithstanding, the greatest potential for success in terms of producing relevant scientific works lies, perhaps unsurprisingly, with schools of business and management. Several works indicate that changes employed at the educational level are needed to bring an effective solution to rigor-relevance discrepancies. One such recommendation indicates that doctoral programs in management are currently facing the problems of poorly qualified instructors and a declining number of students. These problems are enabling improperly instructed researchers to conduct research in ways that can worsen the rigor-relevance gap. Therefore, a proposed “full-cycle” approach could potentially rid schools of most of these problems by encouraging students to employ different tactics in their research that allow the application of both rigorous and relevant research elements. This approach could help schools recruit better students and educated their students in better ways as well (Polzer et al., 2009).

Other recommendations involve alterations to how research is conducted. Historical analysis of past publications by Palmer et al. yielded a set of characteristics that helped give works more relevance (2009). These traits included a micro-level focus, empirical research and direct data, such as interviews or personal observations. The potential relevance of micro-level works was echoed by Latusek and Vlaar, who held that studying
micro-behaviors can make research more accessible to business practitioners (2014). In addition, the importance of business schools is reemphasized. Works from authors who were active in the doctoral program of a management school proved to be more relevant (Palmer et al., 2009). Recommendations for institutional changes in schools to improve the education of students are expressed as well (Empson, 2013).

Conclusions on current state of debate

If observers and practitioners sincerely want to reduce the vast divide between the two groups, they both must take action. The burden on observers is to make sense of this very diverse base of groups and people working in management. The burden on practitioners is to correctly apply the scientific research to their organizations. Only then can real gains be made. Most of the recent literature shares the point of view that academics must examine problems that practitioners actually care about to gain more relevance without losing any rigor (Gulati, 2007). Moreover, another valuable conclusion gained from the recent literature is the need for action to be taken within business schools. It is evident that problems with instruction methods, students and research at the doctoral level can impact the ultimate attitude researchers have towards relevance and practicality. Therefore, changing institutional features in schools can permit these schools to conduct higher quality research that emphasizes both rigor and relevance.

Scholars have also developed a number of theories they propose that will reconcile the two groups and end the rigor vs. relevance debate. One suggestion is to publish studies specifically for people working in the field of management (Simon, 2004). If academics can formulate research in a way readily accessible to practitioners, this will remove a large hurdle partly responsible for the gap between rigor and relevance. In other words, scientists may have to produce alternate versions of their works that focus specifically on being relevant to managers, even though the original versions could very well have had a more rigorous emphasis.

Another option to pursue is encouraging business leaders to contact academics to allow a better flow of information between the two groups. Here, the onus lies on practitioners to implore observers to permit them to have some access to their knowledge. This will give both groups an opportunity to receive the appropriate level of rigor or relevance that they desire (Peters, 2008). Generally, deeper partnerships and greater joint training will reduce the divide that is evident today (Hodgkinson and Rousseau, 2009). It is imperative to encourage open communication between scientists and managers to ascend out of the quagmire presently seen. To entice the involved parties
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...to become open to cooperation, the parties must be made aware of the potential benefits they may gain. Accordingly, a final recommendation is to emphasize knowledge and language transfer between the two groups (Bessant et al., 2011).

In summary, it seems that scientists are now at a critical point in the development of scientific management. Throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, academics continued to develop findings that were more and more sophisticated, all the while building upon prior knowledge. However, just when scientific management was starting to advance, the rift between rigor and relevance emerged. Today the scientific community still stands in a period of conflicting viewpoints rather than one of cooperation and reconciliation. The rigor-relevance divide also has the potential to stifle further advances in the field and bring progress to a standstill. The present-day status of managerial studies is of monumental importance and no scholar should take this conflict between rigor and relevance lightly. The majority of researchers support cooperation to lessen the impact of this problem, but whether or not widespread success in this matter is feasible remains to be seen.
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