

Point/  
Counterpoint **Making a life in the organizational  
sciences: no one ever said it was going  
to be easy<sup>y</sup>**

在組織科學領域打拼：沒有人說這是件容易的事

GERALD R. FERRIS<sup>1\*</sup>, DAVID J. KETCHEN JR.<sup>2</sup>  
AND M. RONALD BUCKLEY<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Management, College of Business, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, U.S.A.*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Management, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama, U.S.A.*

<sup>3</sup>*Division of Management, Price College of Business, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, U.S.A.*

---

**Summary** A stimulating article by Glick et al. has provoked a number of responses in this journal. We contribute our opinions to this interchange because we think that the situation is not nearly as bleak as Glick et al. and others would have us believe. In order to corroborate our contentions, we report the results of a survey of accomplished organizational scientists that directly addresses a number of the issues over which we and Glick et al. disagree. Overall, we readily acknowledge that making a life in our field is challenging, as are most activities worth doing. However, we are confident that vast opportunities exist for nascent scholars, as well as for those established scholars who continue to direct their efforts toward generating knowledge within our field. Copyright © 2008 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

一篇由Glick等人撰寫的激勵人心的文章在本期刊中引起很多的回響。在這場交流中，我們提出我們的意見，因為我們認為情況並不像Glick等人，還有其他人讓我們覺得那麼悲觀。為了支持我們的主張，我們報告了一項對成就卓越的組織科學家的調查結果，這項調查直接涉及了我們和Glick等人存在分歧的若干問題。總的來說，我們很願意承認，在我們的領域中打拼是充滿挑戰的，如同大多數值得做的活動一樣。然而，我們有信心，對於新興學者以及那些繼續致力於在我們領域內產創造知識的資深學者來說，存在著廣大的機會。

## Introduction

“Your love is like bad medicine. Bad medicine is what I need.”  
Jon Bon Jovi, “Bad Medicine”

「你的愛就像不良藥物。不良藥物正是我所需要的。」 Jon Bon Jovi, 《不良藥物》

Sometimes patients need medicine that tastes bad when swallowed in order to restore them to a healthy state. Metaphorically, we believe that a dose of bad medicine is what the readers of the *Journal of Organizational Behavior* may need in order to better understand the realities of making a life in our profession. Glick, Miller, and Cardinal (2007) recently published an article making the case that in light of the serious problems within the organizational sciences today, it is unduly burdensome to develop a successful career as an organizational scientist. Like others who have commented on the article (i.e.,

Pfeffer, 2007; Rousseau, 2007; Sitkin, 2007), we see much to like and agree with in the Glick et al. presentation. For example, given the extended periods of time it sometimes takes for papers to navigate

---

\* Correspondence to: Gerald R. Ferris, Department of Management, College of Business, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306-1110, U.S.A. E-mail: [gferris@cob.fsu.edu](mailto:gferris@cob.fsu.edu)

†We appreciate the comments offered by Russell Crook, Jeremy Short, and Paul Spector on an earlier version of this paper.

Copyright © 2008 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

*Received 22 February 2008*

*Accepted 1 March 2008*

the peer review process, we believe that their suggestion of extending the probationary period before tenure holds substantial merit.

有時候，病人需要吞下味道不好的藥物以恢復健康狀態。我們認為，從比喻的角度來看，組織行為學報的讀者可能需要一劑“不良藥物”，以便更易理解在我們專業領域打拼的事實。Glick, Miller, 和 Cardinal (2007) 最近發表了一篇文章，闡述了在當今組織科學領域內存在的嚴重問題，認為發展成為一位成功的組織科學家的職業生涯過於繁重。像其他對該文章發表評論的人（例如，Pfeffer, 2007; Rousseau, 2007; Sitkin, 2007）一樣，我們在Glick等人的陳述中看到了很多值得喜歡和同意的地方。例如，考慮到論文有時需要很長時間才能通過同行評審過程，我們認為他們關於延長獲得終身教職前的試用期的建議具有重大的價值。

However, we disagree with the bleak portrayal of the field offered by Glick et al. (2007), and we fear that their overly pessimistic assertions could dissuade others from pursuing knowledge about organizations; a quest that we love, and that many other researchers find challenging, enjoyable, and satisfying. Whereas the commentaries by Pfeffer (2007), Rousseau (2007), and Sitkin (2007) have offered mostly minor tweaks to assertions made by Glick et al., below we describe a number of areas where we believe their ideas miss the mark and warrant serious rebuttal.

然而，我們不同意Glick等人（2007）所提供的該領域的悲觀描繪，我們擔心他們過於悲觀的主張可能會勸阻其他人探索有關組織的知識；這是一個我們熱愛的追求，並且許多其他研究者發現這是有挑戰性、令人愉快且令人滿意的。雖然Pfeffer（2007）、Rousseau（2007）和Sitkin（2007）的評論大多對Glick等人的主張提出了些許調整，在下面我們將描述幾個我們認為他們的想法未能命中要害並需要認真反駁的領域。

To provide some evidence related to our opinions, we conducted a survey of a group of accomplished organizational scholars. In particular, we distributed a web-based survey to the members of the *Journal of Organizational Behavior* editorial board. Out of 163 board members, 109 completed the survey (67 per cent). Among those respondents, 26 received their terminal degree since 2000, 45 received their terminal degree between 1990 and 1999, 23 received their terminal degree between 1980 and 1989, and 12 received their terminal degree before 1980 (two respondents declined to list their degree years). In terms of rank, the respondents include 53 full professors, 38 associate professors, and 17 assistant professors (one respondent declined to provide rank). Respondents work at a wide variety of public and private universities, and they live in a variety of different countries around the world.

為了提供一些與我們觀點相關的證據，我們對一群成就卓越的組織學者進行了調查。具體來說，我們向《組織行為學報》編輯委員會的成員分發了一份基於網絡的調查。在163名委員會成員中，有109人完成了調查（佔67%）。在這些回答者中，26人自2000年以來獲得了終極學位，45人在1990至1999年間獲得了終極學位，23人在1980至1989年間獲得了終極學位，12人在1980年之前獲得了終極學位（兩名回答者拒絕列出學位年份）。就職稱而言，回答者包括53名正教授、38名副教授和17名助理教授（一名回答者拒絕提供職稱）。回答者在世界各地的各種公立和私立大學工作，並居住在不同的國家。

## Paradigm Schmaradigm 典範又怎樣

There is no “organizational science.” What we know as the organizational sciences encompasses many different disciplines. As Mahoney (1985, p. 15) has stated, “The so-called organization sciences encompass scholarship in the more traditional social sciences of economics, sociology, psychology, political science, and related disciplines.” In comparison to these “mother disciplines,” our field is quite young and thus has experienced considerably less development. As a multidisciplinary field (cf. Zammuto & Connolly, 1984), typified by **different methodologies (e.g., qualitative and quantitative)**, **different levels of analysis** (e.g., individual, group, and organization), and different levels of paradigm development (e.g., sociology vs. economics), we must inevitably resign ourselves to the difficulties of achieving consensus.

「沒有所謂的“組織科學”。我們所知道的組織科學涵蓋了許多不同的學科。正如Mahoney（1985年，第15頁）所說，“所謂的組織科學包括經濟學、社會學、心理學、政治學及相關學科的更傳統社會科學的學術研究。”與這些“母學科”相比，我們的領域相當年輕，因此經歷的發展相對較少。作為一個多學科領域（參見Zammuto & Connolly, 1984），

以不同的方法論（例如，質性和量性）、不同的分析層次（例如，個人、團體和組織）和不同的典範發展水平（例如，社會學與經濟學）為特徵，我們必然要接受達成共識的困難。

Strong **paradigm development** is a characteristic of fields such as the physical sciences, where well-established principles and laws govern both relationships and activities. Although Pfeffer's (1993, 1995, 2007) points in favor of strong paradigm development are well taken, and noble in their own right, we are left with a field characterized, necessarily, by **weaker paradigm development**, and a resultant lack of consensus about important issues (e.g., Van Maanen, 1995a, 1995b).

堅實的典範發展是諸如物理科學這樣的領域的特徵，其中確立的原則和法則支配著關係和活動。雖然Pfeffer（1993年、1995年、2007年）支持堅實典範發展的觀點是恰當的，且本身具有高尚性，但我們所處的領域卻不得不以較弱的典範發展為特徵，因此導致了對重要問題（例如，Van Maanen, 1995a, 1995b）缺乏共識。

As a researcher, if what you desire is the certainty of two parts hydrogen and one part oxygen mixed together resulting in water, then the organizational sciences is not the field in which you belong. The interaction of two people, two organizations, or two work groups necessarily results in outcomes perhaps best described as difficult to predict. Because of the nascent and social nature of the organizational sciences, **we probably always will be sentenced to playing the role of “second fiddle” to physics, chemistry, and those disciplines that deal with predictable entities, and that have a significantly longer history of paradigm development.** Unless our counterparts in physics and chemistry suspend their scholarly pursuits for a few centuries, the development of paradigms in the organizational sciences will never catch up. It is the way it is!

作為一位研究者，如果你渴望的是兩份氫和一份氧混合後必定會產生水那樣的確定性，那麼組織科學並不是屬於你的領域。兩個人、兩個組織或兩個工作組的互動，其結果往往以難以預測為最佳描述。由於組織科學的新興性和社會性質，**我們可能總會被判定扮演物理學、化學以及那些處理可預測實體且擁有顯著更長典範發展歷史的學科的“第二小提琴”的角色。**除非我們在物理和化學領域的同行暫停他們的學術追求數個世紀，組織科學中的典範發展將永遠無法趕上。事情就是這樣！

As a field, we must unabashedly face the fact that we are neither physics nor chemistry, and we are never going to become physics or chemistry. Our research efforts only will yield maximum progress if

we can get past this immutable reality. We must remember that our questions are still important and can contribute significantly to the well-being of people, organizations, and society. We make important contributions to understanding organizations, and organizations represent a key influence in the life of every human being. **We need to stop hand wringing and apologizing for being organizational scientists**, and instead focus on pushing knowledge and applications in this field forward in meaningful ways. Perhaps the question that is really important and pivotal to this discussion is this: Has the lack of a strong paradigm hindered research contributions in the organizational sciences? We would argue it has not. Within a weak paradigm setting, Vroom (1964) developed his VIE (i.e., Valence, Instrumentality, Expectancy) theory of motivation, Locke (e.g., 1978) and his colleagues developed goal setting theory, and Salancik and Pfeffer (1974) developed their ideas on power in organizations. Within the area of strategic management, Porter (1980, 1985, 1990) has made significant contributions, in large part, because he stepped *outside* the confines of the economics paradigm within which he was trained. These represent just the tip of the iceberg. Important contributions have been made over time, and they continue to be made today, and will continue long after the current crop of organizational scholars loses their fecundity of imagination.

作為一個領域，我們必須坦然面對一個事實：我們既不是物理學也不是化學，我們也永遠不會成為物理學或化學。只有當我們能夠超越這一不變的事實，我們的研究努力才能取得最大的進展。我們必須記住，我們的問題仍然重要，並且能夠顯著地貢獻於人們、組織和社會的福祉。我們對理解組織做出了重要的貢獻，而組織在每個人的生活中都是一個關鍵的影響因素。**我們不要再手忙腳亂，要為想成為組織科學家而道歉**，而且，我們要專注於以有意義的方式推動這個領域的知識和應用前進。或許真正重要且對這一討論具有關鍵性的問題是：缺乏強大典範是否阻礙了組織科學中的研究貢獻？我們認為並非如此。在較弱的典範設定中，Vroom（1964年）發展了他的VIE（即價值、工具性、期望）動機理論，Locke（例如，1978年）和他的同事們發展了目標設定理論，Salancik和Pfeffer（1974年）發展了他們關於組織中權力的想法。在戰略管理領域，Porter（1980年、1985年、1990年）作出了重大貢獻，很大程度上是因為他跳出了他所受訓練的經濟學典範的局限。這些只是冰山一角。重要的貢獻已經隨著時間的推移而進行，並且今天仍在繼續進行，而且在當前一代組織學者的想像力豐饒性消失之後還會繼續進行。

The vast majority of our respondents appear to share many of our beliefs. As shown in Table 1, few respondents believe that the **soft paradigm nature** of our field has hindered their ability to publish their research. Of the 104 people that answered this question, only 1 said “to a great extent.” 2 respondents chose “to a strong extent.” The most popular response (selected by 50 respondents) was “not at all.” Similarly, only 4 respondents indicated that the state of paradigm development has influenced to a great extent the research questions they have investigated, while 41 indicated it has had no influence at all. This does not mean that the state of paradigm development is irrelevant to scholars. Indeed, the responses were quite mixed when we asked respondents to what extent they have thought about the issue of paradigm development. But apparently many of our fellow organizational researchers have been able to make significant contributions in spite of the weak paradigm nature of our field. **The paradigm issue is a reality** within whose confines we must learn to conduct our research pursuits.

我們的大多數受訪者似乎與我們持有相似的信念。如表1所示，很少有受訪者認為我們領域的軟典範性質阻礙了他們發表研究的能力。在回答這個問題的104人中，只有1人表示“在很大程度上”。2位受訪者選擇了“在較強程度上”。最受歡迎的回答（由50位受訪者選擇）是“完全不”。同樣，只有4位受訪者指出典範發展的狀態在很大程度上影響了他們研究的問題，而41位表示它根本沒有任何影響。這並不意味著典範發展的狀態對學者們是無關緊要的。事實上，當我們詢問受訪者在多大程度上考慮過典範發展問題時，回應相當混雜。但顯然，我們許多組織研究者的同事能夠在我們領域的軟典範性質下仍做出重大貢獻。典範問題是一個事實，我們必須學會在其限制下進行我們的研究追求。

Overall, the **weak paradigm** discussion has been engaging from a philosophical perspective and has yielded a series of entertaining articles, but the state of paradigm development in the organizational sciences does not appear to have been the great stumbling block many would have us believe. So, we say to all of our colleagues, “Paradigm schmaradigm!”

總的來說，從哲學的角度來看，薄弱典範的討論一直很吸引人，並且產生了一系列有趣的文章，但在組織科學中典範發展的狀態似乎並未成為許多人認為的那樣大的絆腳石。因此，我們對所有同事說，“典範又怎樣！”

## Journal Acceptance Rates: As Dismal as Advertised?

期刊接受率：是否如廣告中所描述的那般慘淡？

Glick et al. (2007) expressed a serious concern about the implications of journal acceptance rates. From their perspective, the approximate 10 per cent acceptance rate at leading organizational journals, such as the *Academy of Management Journal (AMJ)*, *Academy of Management Review (AMR)*, *Journal of Applied Psychology (JAP)*, and the *Journal of Organizational Behavior (JOB)*, stack the deck against the tenure prospects of nascent academics. The 10 per cent acceptance rate has become something of a mythic statistic in our field, and one that, we contend, has been misunderstood and has received far too much publicity. Indeed, we believe that the statistics actually demonstrate that any particular well-done paper has a strong probability of ultimately being accepted at one of our high-quality journals.

Glick等人(2007)對期刊接受率的影響表達了嚴重的擔憂。從他們的角度來看，領先的組織期刊，如管理學院期刊(AMJ)、管理學院評論(AMR)、應用心理學期刊(JAP)和組織行為學報(JOB)大約10%的接受率，對新興學者的終身職位前景構成了不利影響。10%的接受率在我們領域中已成為某種神話般的統計數據，我們認為，這一數據被誤解並受到了過多的關注。實際上，我們相信統計數據實際上表明，任何一篇做得好的文章最終都有很強的可能性被我們的高質量期刊接受。

**Desk reject rates** at *AMR* currently run at approximately 40 per cent, and 30 per cent at *AMJ*. We suspect that this may parallel the rates of other leading journals. This means that three or four out of ten papers that are submitted to *AMR* and *AMJ* do not match the journal's mission, are fatally flawed in an obvious manner, or overlap excessively with an author's prior work. Desk rejects are factored into

Table 1. Survey results ( $n = 109$ )<sup>a</sup>

*Compared to fields like physics and chemistry, the organization sciences are a soft paradigm field. To what extent has this level of paradigm development?*

	Not at All	To Some Extent	To a Moderate Extent	To a Strong Extent	To a Great Extent
1. Hindered your ability to publish your research?	50 (49%)	27 (26%)	23 (22%)	2 (2%)	1 (1%)
2. Influenced the research questions you have investigated?	41 (40%)	19 (19%)	21 (20%)	18 (17%)	4 (4%)
3. To what extent have you thought about the issue of paradigm development?	21 (20%)	36 (35%)	19 (18%)	16 (15%)	12 (11%)

Life in the Organizational Sciences

4. Which of these journals are considered to be 'top tier' in your department?

Academy of Management Journal	109 (100%)
Journal of Applied Psychology	107 (98%)
Academy of Management Review	106 (97%)
Administrative Science Quarterly	100 (92%)
Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes	85 (78%)
Strategic Management Journal	73 (67%)
Personnel Psychology	73 (67%)
Organization Science	60 (55%)
Journal of Organizational Behavior	38 (35%)
Journal of Management	34 (31%)

(For 7 other journals, fewer than 30% of respondents indicated that the journal is considered top tier)

5. Do you have any high quality, completed papers that you have given up trying to publish due to difficulties in the publication process?

Yes	How many?	No
	40 (37%)	
1		12
2		14
3		8
4		5
5		1
		69 (63%)

Life in the Organizational Sciences

*Think about the candidates that have been considered for tenure in the departments that you have belonged to in your career.*

6. *Have you ever observed any deserving candidate being turned down for tenure?*

Yes		41 (38%)
	<b>How many?</b>	
	1	15
	2	10
	3	5
	4	1
	5	2

*In your opinion, what were the reasons why deserving candidates were denied tenure? (check all that apply)*

Departmental politics	19
College politics	13
University politics	8
Gender or racial bias	2
Unreasonably high standards	18
Other reason	6
No	67 (62%)

Life in the Organizational Sciences

7. *Have you ever observed any undeserving candidate being granted tenure?*

Yes		77 (72%)
	<b>How many?</b>	
	1	24
	2	18
	3	10
	4	3
	5	4

*In your opinion, what were the reasons why undeserving candidates were granted tenure? (check all that apply)*

Departmental politics	38
College politics	25
University politics	13
Gender or racial bias	7
Unreasonably low standards	34
Other reason	9
No	30 (28%)

*To what extent do you agree with the following statements:*

	Not at All	To a Some Extent	To a Moderate Extent	To a Strong Extent	To a Great Extent
8. Universities typically make the right decisions in deciding tenure cases	1 (1%)	9 (8%)	47 (44%)	44 (44%)	3 (3%)

## Life in the Organizational Sciences

9. Tenure should be easier to achieve than it is at most universities today	56 (52%)	25 (23%)	18 (17%)	5 (5%)	3 (3%)
10. Tenure should be more difficult to achieve than it is at most universities today	52 (50%)	25 (24%)	13 (12%)	13 (12%)	2 (2%)

## 11. To what extent do you believe each of the following influences a person's level of success as a researcher in the organizational sciences?

	Not at All	To Some Extent	To a Moderate Extent	To a Strong Extent	To a Great Extent
<i>The prestige of the person's doctoral granting institution</i>	10 (9%)	42 (40%)	34 (32%)	17 (16%)	3 (3%)
<i>The professional status of the person's mentor</i>	10 (9%)	36 (33%)	19 (18%)	29 (27%)	14 (13%)
<i>Luck</i>	15 (14%)	50 (46%)	21 (19%)	17 (16%)	5 (5%)
<i>Hard work</i>	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	11 (10%)	44 (41%)	52 (48%)
<i>The quality of one's doctoral training</i>	0 (0%)	3 (3%)	19 (18%)	44 (41%)	40 (38%)
<i>The quality of colleagues in the department where the person works</i>	2 (2%)	25 (23%)	31 (29%)	34 (31%)	16 (15%)

## 12. Which of the following do you believe is the MOST important determinant of a person's level of success as a researcher in the organizational sciences?

<i>The prestige of the person's doctoral granting institution</i>	2 (2%)
<i>The professional status of the person's mentor</i>	9 (8%)
<i>Luck</i>	3 (3%)
<i>Hard work</i>	65 (60%)
<i>The quality of one's doctoral training</i>	25 (23%)
<i>The quality of colleagues in the department where the person works</i>	4 (4%)

<sup>a</sup>Some items do not total to 109 due to missing responses.

journal's acceptance rates. It seems fair to exclude desk rejects from our consideration of how likely high-quality papers are to be accepted. Of the papers that are sent out for review by a particular journal, roughly 14–17 per cent will be accepted (i.e.,  $.10/.70 \approx .143$ ;  $.10/.60 \approx .166$ ).

目前AMR的桌面拒絕率大約為40%，AMJ為30%。我們懷疑這可能與其他領先期刊的比率相似。這意味著在提交給AMR和AMJ的十篇論文中，有三到四篇不符合期刊的使命，明顯存在致命缺陷，或與作者先前的工作重疊過多。桌面拒絕被計入期刊的接受率中。對於高質量論文被接受的可能性，將桌面拒絕排除在外似乎是公平的。對於被某一期刊送出審查的論文，大約14–17%將被接受（即 $.10/.70 = .143$ ； $.10/.60 = .166$ ）。

Although 14–17 per cent still may seem discouraging, it is a whole lot better than 10 per cent (i.e., a 40–70 per cent increase, in fact!). We must next consider that there are multiple high-quality outlets to which most papers reasonably can be submitted. For example, depending on which research stream a paper targets, an empirical paper on an organizational behavior topic could be submitted to any number



of outlets, including *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *AMJ*, *JAP*, *JOB*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *Personnel Psychology (PP)*, *Organization Science (OS)*, and the *Journal of Management*. Furthermore, each time a paper is rejected, authors most likely will receive insights and directions that improve their chances of earning an acceptance at the next outlet.

雖然14-17%的接受率仍可能看起來令人氣餒，但實際上比10%（即增加了40-70%）要好得多！接下來我們必須考慮，大多數論文可以合理地出自不少高品質期刊。例如，根據論文針對的研究領域，一篇有關組織行為主題的實證論文可以提交到多個期刊，包括《行政科學季刊》、*AMJ*、*JAP*、*JOB*、《組織行為與人類決策過程》、《人事心理學》（*PP*）、《組織科學》（*OS*）和《管理學報》。此外，每當一篇論文被拒絕時，作者最有可能會收到深入的指導，這些指導將提高他們在下一個期刊獲得接受的機會。

Article submission to multiple journals after rejection considerably raises the odds of ultimate journal acceptance. Using the figure of .15 above, and a binomial distribution, if you submit to four journals, with  $p = .15$  each time, chances are nearly .50 (actually .4775) of success or acceptance. This is based on computing the probability of getting at least one acceptance out of four submissions. In this case, it is obvious that the odds of acceptance do, in fact, increase each time a paper is submitted. Additionally, because the paper most likely becomes improved over time, the chances are even better than the numbers might indicate. An example of that is an article (Spector & Jex, 1991) ultimately published in the *Journal of Applied Psychology*. This paper was rejected in order from *JAP*, *PP*, and the *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. The authors totally rewrote and refocused the paper, and submitted it once again to *JAP*, where it was accepted.

在被拒絕後將文章提交到多個期刊顯著提高了最終期刊接受的機率。使用上面的.15的數字，並且假設一個二項分佈，如果你提交四個期刊，每次的成功概率 $p$ 為.15，那麼成功或接受的機率幾乎為.50（實際為.4775）。這是基於計算四次提交中至少獲得一次接受的概率。在這種情況下，很明顯，每次提交論文後，接受的機率確實會增加。此外，由於文章隨時間可能越來越完善，成功的機會甚至可能比數字所示的還要好。一個例子是一篇文章（Spector & Jex, 1991年）最終在《應用心理學期刊》上發表。這篇文章按順序在*JAP*、*PP*和《職業與組織心理學期刊》被拒絕。作者完全重寫並重新聚焦文章，然後再次提交給*JAP*，這次被接受了。

For the sake of argument, let us assume (i.e., conservatively, in our opinion) that gaining insights from a rejection increases a paper's chances of acceptance by 5 per cent. As shown in Table 1, over 90 per cent of our respondents indicated that *AMJ*, *AMR*, *ASQ*, and *JAP* are considered "top tier" outlets at their institutions. Further, large majorities confer top-tier status on *OBHDP* (78 per cent) and *PP* (67 per cent) as well, and more than half do the same for *OS* (55 per cent). Let us suppose that a particular university considers four of the empirical journals mentioned above to be top-tier outlets. This implies that the authors of a good study would have chances of 14, 19, 24, and 29 per cent of earning acceptance letters as the paper worked through the four designated top-tier journals.

為了討論的目的，我們假設（保守而言）從拒稿中獲得的深入指導增加了文章接受的機會5%。如表1所示，有超過90%的受訪者均指出*AMJ*、*AMR*、*ASQ*和*JAP*在受訪者機構中被認為是「頂級」出版平台。此外，大多數人同樣認為*OBHDP*（78%）和*PP*（67%）是頂級出版平台，超過一半的人也同樣認為*OS*（55%）是頂級的。假設某個大學認為上述四個實證期刊是頂級出版平台，這意味著一項好的研究的作者在經過四個指定的頂級期刊後，有14%、19%、24%和29%的機會獲得接受通知。

Indeed, as Table 1 shows, there are nine journals that publish organizational behavior research which are considered top tier by at least 30 per cent of respondents' institutions. This situation provides nascent academics with a target rich environment for practicing their craft. The situation also makes clear that persistence in the publication process matters. Good examples in this regard are Buckley, Jackson, Bolino, Veres, and Feild (2007), Combs, Liu, Hall, and Ketchen (2006), and the aforementioned Spector and Jex (1991). These articles were rejected at three, two, and three journals, respectively, before they were accepted by very fine outlets (i.e., the first two at *Personnel Psychology* and the third at the *Journal of Applied Psychology*). Importantly, when the journal acceptance process is conceptualized in terms of acceptance rates, we oftentimes assume that a totally random outcome is associated with each paper. However, the reality is that some papers are going to be decidedly better

than others, so the odds of a quality paper being accepted are even higher. We believe that this is why experienced researchers have so few good papers they cannot publish.

實際上，如表1所示，有九個發表組織行為研究的期刊被至少30%的受訪者機構認為是頂級期刊。這種情況為新興學者提供了一個豐富的目標環境來實踐他們的技能。這種情況還清楚地表明，在出版過程中堅持不懈的重要性。在這方面的好例子包括Buckley, Jackson, Bolino, Veres, 和 Feild (2007), Combs, Liu, Hall, 和 Ketchen (2006), 以及前述的Spector和Jex (1991)。這些文章分別在被接受之前被三個、兩個和三個期刊拒絕，最終被非常優秀的出版平台接受（即前兩篇在《人事心理學》，第三篇在《應用心理學期刊》）。重要的是，當期刊接受過程被概念化為接受率時，我們常常假設每篇文章與隨機結果相關。然而，實際上有些論文將明顯優於其他論文，所以優質論文被接受的機率甚至更高。我們相信，這就是為什麼經驗豐富的研究人員很少有他們發不出去的好文章的原因。

Our estimates clearly illustrate, we believe, that the reality of the publication process within the organizational sciences is not nearly as bleak as others have suggested. To gain a broader variety of perspectives, we asked our respondents: “Do you have any high-quality, completed papers that you have given up trying to publish due to difficulties in the publication process?” Of the 109 responses received, 40 (37 per cent) said “yes.” The vast majority of these respondents reported that they possessed one or two papers in this category. A substantial majority of respondents (67, 63 per cent) indicated that they did not have any high-quality, completed papers that they have given up trying to publish due to difficulties in the publication process.

我們認為，我們的估計清楚地顯示，[組織科學內出版的過程事實上並不像其他人所講的那麼悲觀](#)。為了獲得更廣泛的觀點，我們問我們的受訪者：“你有沒有任何高品質的、已完成的論文，因為出版過程中的困難而放棄嘗試發表？”在收到的109個回答中，40個（37%）回答說“是”。這些受訪者中的絕大多數報告說他們擁有一到兩篇屬於這一類別的論文。大多數受訪者（67個，占63%）表示他們沒有任何高品質的、已完成的論文，因為出版過程中的困難而放棄嘗試發表。

Based on these results, an interesting question is “what should a researcher do if she/he is part of the minority that believes they have good projects that they cannot publish?” This question is particularly vital to junior faculty. We need to not only acknowledge but *emphasize* that assistant professors would be wise to execute more than one quality project per year, either alone or as part of research teams. Again, we cannot add the probabilities associated with different papers and conclude that an acceptance letter is inevitable if a person is an active researcher. However, given the statistics above, we would be

stunned if an assistant professor who writes three quality papers per year did not average one acceptance at a premier journal each year. This rate of production would yield a superb publication record, which undoubtedly would have positive tenure implications for the possessor at all but the most demanding of business schools.

基於這些結果，一個有趣的問題是“如果研究人員認為他們有好的項目但無法發表，他/她應該怎麼辦？”這個問題對於資淺的教師尤為重要。我們不僅需要承認，而且要強調，助理教授每年應執行一個以上的優質計畫（無論是單獨還是作為研究團隊的一部分）是明智的。同樣，我們不能將不同論文相關的概率相加，然後得出結論說，如果一個人是積極的研究者，接受信是不可避免的。然而，根據上述統計，如果一位助理教授每年撰寫三篇優質論文而且每年平均在一家頂級期刊上獲得一次接受，我們將會感到震驚。這種生產率將產生出色的發表記錄，這無疑會對持有者除了最苛刻的商學院之外的所有學院帶來積極的終身職位影響。

## “I Want to Be Like Weick” (With Apologies to Michael Jordan!)

「我想像Weick那樣」（向Michael Jordan致歉！）

How does one become “successful” in the organizational sciences? Mitchell (2007) suggested that mentoring is one obvious strategy related to career success, and other scholars have argued that the way we develop, train, and mentor our Ph.D. students in doctoral programs can explain a considerable amount about their subsequent career effectiveness, and particularly their capacity for developing and submitting research that ultimately is published (Ferris, Bowen, Treadway, Hochwarter, Hall, & Perrewe, 2006; Ferris, Perrewe, & Buckley, in press).

一個人如何在組織科學領域中「成功」？Mitchell（2007）建議，指導是與職業成功相關的一個明顯策略，其他學者則認為，我們在博士課程中如何發展、培訓和指導我們的博士學生，可以說明他們在後續職業上多方面的成效，特別是他們致力投稿，最終被發表的研究能力（Ferris, Bowen, Treadway, Hochwarter, Hall, & Perrewe, 2006; Ferris, Perrewe, & Buckley, 即將出版）。

There have been a spate of well-done studies published in our literature, which selectively have examined the predictors of career success for those who aspire to be organizational scientists (e.g., Cable & Murray, 1999; Gomez-Mejia & Balkin, 1992; Kirchmeyer, 2005; Long, Bowers, Barnett, & White, 1998; Miller, Glick, & Cardinal, 2005). What is made abundantly clear, through an examination of these studies, is that no single model that has been suggested fits well enough to exclude all of the other models proposed. Achieving success in the organizational sciences can best be described as **equifinality**; that is, there is not “one best way” to succeed, but instead, there are myriad different and likely successful career paths that can be selected.

我們的文獻中發表了一系列精心完成的研究，這些研究選擇性地檢視了那些渴望成為組織科學家的人的職業成功預測因素（例如，Cable & Murray, 1999; Gomez-Mejia & Balkin, 1992; Kirchmeyer, 2005; Long, Bowers, Barnett, & White, 1998; Miller, Glick, & Cardinal, 2005）。通過對這些研究的檢查，明確表明沒有一個單一模型適合得足以排除所有其他提出的模型。在組織科學領域取得成功最好被描述為**等終性（可以由各種不同手段達成；殊途但可同歸）**；也就是說，沒有「唯一最佳方式」可以成功，而是有無數不同且可能成功的職業道路**可以讓我們選擇**。

In our view, becoming a successful organizational scientist is not as easy as just obtaining an impressive-pedigree degree from a high-status university. Furthermore, working under a “superstar” mentor does not guarantee that a student will develop into a successful organizational scientist. We would wager that it is an unpredictable synergistic relationship among a number of different factors. The responses to our survey suggest that this is quite likely to be the case. As shown in Table 1, we asked respondents to rate the importance of six potential causes for success, which include the most frequently mentioned determinants from the literature, and also ones mentioned by Glick et al. (2007). Hard work and the quality of one’s doctoral training were tapped as important to a great extent or to a strong extent by a vast majority of respondents (89 and 79 per cent, respectively). Forty-six percent and 40 per cent of respondents described the quality of one’s colleagues and the status of one’s mentor, respectively, as important to a great extent or to a strong extent. The prestige of one’s doctoral granting

institution and luck were not seen by most respondents as major factors contributing to success in the organizational sciences. This array of findings suggests that success arises from a confluence of a variety of factors, and that some (e.g., hard work and the quality of one's doctoral training) are much more important than others (e.g., the prestige of one's doctoral granting institution and luck).

在我們看來，成為一位成功的組織科學家並不像從一所頂尖大學獲得崇高的學位那麼簡單。此外，師承一位「超級巨星」指導老師也不能保證學生將發展成為成功的組織科學家。我們敢打賭，這是多種不同因素之間不可預測的協同關係。我們的調查回應表明，情況很可能就是這樣。如表1所示，我們要求受訪者評估六種可能導致成功的原因的重要性，這些原因包括文獻中最常提到的決定因素，以及Glick等人（2007）提到的因素。努力工作和博士培訓的品質被絕大多數受訪者認為在很大程度上或強烈程度上很重要（分別為89%和79%）。46%和40%的受訪者分別描述同事的品質和導師的地位，在很大程度上或強烈程度上很重要。博士授予機構的聲望和運氣被大多數受訪者認為不是組織科學成功的主要因素。這一系列的發現表明，成功來自於多種因素的匯聚，其中一些（例如，努力工作和博士培訓的品質）比其他因素（例如，博士授予機構的聲望和運氣）更為重要。

However, an important point that needs to be made is this discussion: not every doctoral student/assistant professor aspires to be the next Karl Weick, nor does every student possess the scholarly tools necessary to be the next Karl Weick. In spite of this reality, there is ample room in our field for many different approaches and scholarly research contributions. It is important that students develop realistic and appropriate expectations in line with the talents, training, and potential that they possess. You do not have to “be like Weick” to make important research contributions and enjoy a successful career. As the comic strip *Calvin and Hobbes* ended, Calvin had some sage advice for the aspiring organizational scientist: “It’s a magical world, Hobbes, ol’ buddy, let’s go exploring!”

然而，需要提出的一個重要觀點是這個討論：不是每個博士生/助理教授都渴望成為下一個Karl Weick，也不是每個學生都擁有成為下一個Karl Weick所需的學術工具。儘管有這樣的事實，我們的領域有足夠的空間容納許多不同的方法和學術研究貢獻。重要的是，學生們應該根據他們擁有的才能、培訓和潛力，發展出實際和適當的期望。你不必「像Weick那樣」才能做出重要的研究貢獻並享受成功的職業生涯。正如漫畫《Calvin and Hobbes》的結尾，Calvin對有抱負的組織科學家给出了一些明智的建議：“這是一個神奇的世界，Hobbes，老朋友，讓我們去探索吧！”

## Tenure: A Multimillion Dollar Investment

終身教職：數百萬美元的投資

Glick et al. (2007) bemoan the difficulty of achieving tenure, given what they see as low acceptance rates at premier scholarly journals. Above, we argued that the publication process is not nearly as inhospitable as they have suggested. Absent from Glick et al.'s discussion is the fact that the granting of tenure is a major financial commitment on the part of a university and its stakeholders, including students, parents, alumni, and (in the case of public schools) taxpayers.

Glick等人(2007)對於取得終身教職的困難表示感嘆，他們認為一流學術期刊的接受率很低。上文中，我們提出，出版過程並不像他們認為的那樣不友好。Glick等人的討論中缺少的是，授予終身教職是大學及其利益相關者(包括學生、家長、校友，以及(在公立學校的情況下)納稅人的一項重大財務承諾的事實。

According to the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (2006), the average salary of an associate professor in organizational behavior is \$97,800. Based on a fringe benefit factor of 25 per cent (i.e., a conservative estimate), this equates to \$122,250 a year in direct and indirect compensation. If we assume an annual interest rate of 5 per cent, this means that tenure represents, in essence, a personal annuity with a base amount of nearly \$2.5 million that the university dedicates to a tenured associate professor ( $\$2,445,000 \times .05 \frac{1}{4} = \$122,500$ ). From a financial perspective, a university commits a seven-digit annuity to professors in exchange for their ongoing labor. Professors are entitled to collect on this annuity until retirement or death, except in the case of extreme academic or criminal malfeasance. We can only conclude that, given the large financial commitment involved on the part of a university and its stakeholders, earning tenure *should* be challenging!

根據美國高等商學院促進協會(2006年)的數據，組織行為學副教授的平均薪資為97,800美元。基於25%的附加福利因素(即保守估計)，這相當於每年122,250美元的直接和間接補償。如果我們假設年利率為5%，這意味著終身教職本質上代表一個基礎金額近250萬美元的個人年金，大學為終身副教授投入的資金( $2,445,000 \text{ 美元} \times 5\% = 122,500 \text{ 美元}$ )。從財務角度來看，大學承諾以七位數的年金與教授交換他們的持續勞動。教授有權領取這筆年金，直到退休或去世，除非出現極端的學術或刑事失當。我們只能得出這樣的結論：鑑於大學及其利益相關者需要做出巨大的財務承諾，獲得終身教職應該是具有挑戰性的！

We have all heard horror stories about academic tenure being denied to seemingly deserving scholars. This undoubtedly happens, but we contend that it is a relatively rare event. Further, a person that is denied tenure has a variety of recourses available, both inside the university and within the legal system. Our observation is that, in general, most tenure decisions reflect the correct outcome. At most universities, the tenure process involves a series of layers that mitigate the potential for inaccurate decisions and ensures due process for tenure candidates. As a result, we believe that the tenure process usually gets it right. Even when tenure is denied, this is rarely the end of an academic career. Typically, those denied tenure do not leave the field, but instead they find a position more congruent with their orientation toward teaching and scholarship. The world does not come to an end! An optimist would say that in many cases, **poor selection decisions are corrected by tenure votes**. We asked our survey respondents about whether they had ever observed deserving candidates being denied tenure. The Glick et al. (2007) projection would be that many qualified people are denied tenure, whereas our assessment is that in only a few cases does this happen. As can be seen in Table 1, the “No” responses substantially outweigh the “Yes” responses 62–38 per cent. Most people that selected “yes” indicated that they had seen one or two wrong denials of tenure. Although *any* such denials are cause for concern, observing one or two such incidents across one's career does not suggest that a systematic problem exists. When deserving candidates were denied, the two most frequently cited explanations were “Departmental Politics” and “Unreasonably High Standards.” Neither of these causes appears to be driven by journal acceptance rates; they are internal issues within the control of an individual institution.

我們都聽過關於有些幾乎可以獲得學術終身職位的學者卻被拒絕的震驚故事。這無疑是發生過的，但我們認為這是一個相對罕見的事件。此外，被拒絕終身職位的人有多種追索途徑可循，無論是在大學內部還是在法律體制內。

我們觀察到，一般來說，大多數終身職位決定反映了正確的結果。在大多數大學，終身職位過程涉及一系列層次，這些層次可以減少不準確決定的可能性並確保終身候選人的正當程序。因此，我們相信終身職位過程通常是正確的。即使終身職位被拒絕，這很少是學術生涯的終點。通常，被拒絕終身職位的人不會離開這個領域，而是找到一個更符合他們教學和學術取向的職位。世界不會因此結束！一個樂觀主義者會說，在許多情況下，不良的選擇決定會被終身職位投票糾正（師資試用期後，是否可獲得終身職位，必須經過投票，是一種對於當初錄用某師資可能是不當的補償功能）。我們詢問我們的調查受訪者是否曾觀察到應得的候選人被拒絕終身職位。Glick等人（2007）的預測是許多合格的人被拒絕終身職位，而我們的評估是只有少數情況下會發生這種情況。如表1所示，“否”回應大大超過了“是”回應，62-38%。選擇“是”的大多數人表明他們見過一到兩次錯誤的終身職位拒絕。雖然任何這樣的拒絕都值得關注，但在某人的職業生涯中觀察到一到兩個這樣的事件並不表明存在系統性問題。當應得的候選人被拒絕時，最常被引用的解釋是“部門政治”和“不合理的高標準”。這些原因似乎都不是由期刊接受率驅動的；它們是個別機構內部可控的問題。

We also asked respondents about another type of mistaken tenure decision—whether they had observed candidates being granted tenure who did not deserve it. In contrast to the 38 per cent of respondents that have observed wrongful denials of tenure, 72 per cent of respondents reported that undeserving candidates were awarded tenure in their departments. The two most frequently cited explanations were “Departmental Politics” and “Unreasonably Low Standards.” Overall, it appears as though there may be many more Type II errors in the tenure process (false negatives—granting tenure to those not deserving), than there are Type I errors (false positives—rejecting those who deserve tenure). Given the financial commitment represented by tenure, these Type II errors should be a major concern to university administrators and stakeholders in general.

我們還詢問了受訪者關於另一種錯誤的終身職位決定——他們是否觀察到不應該獲得終身職位的候選人被授予終身職位。與觀察到錯誤拒絕終身職位的38%的受訪者相比，72%的受訪者報告說，他們的部門中不應該獲得終身職位的候選人被授予了終身職位。最常被引用的解釋是“部門政治”和“不合理的低標準”。總的來看，終身職位過程中似乎可能有更多的II型錯誤（假陰性——授予不應得的人終身職位），而不是I型錯誤（假陽性——拒絕應得終身職位的人）。考慮到終身職位代表的財務承諾，這些II型錯誤應該成為大學管理者和普遍利益相關者的主要關切。

We also asked three questions intended to provide data on the perceptions of the overall fairness of the tenure system. We asked respondents to what extent they believe universities typically make the

right decisions on tenure. Nine percent indicated “not at all” or “to some extent,” while 47 per cent indicated to a strong or great extent. In response to whether tenure should be easier to achieve than it currently is, only 7 per cent selected to a strong or great extent. The majority of respondents (52 per cent) selected “not at all.” We also asked whether tenure should be more difficult to achieve than it is currently. Nearly half (49 per cent) indicated “not at all” and only 14 per cent selected to a strong or great extent. Juxtaposing the results for the latter two questions indicates that few respondents believe tenure should be either easier or harder to achieve than it currently is, and those that believe it should be harder outnumber those that believe it should be easier. Overall, far more respondents expressed satisfaction with the system as it now exists and operates than expressed dissatisfaction.

我們還提出了三個提供有關終身職位制度整體公正性感受數據的問題。我們詢問受訪者認為大學通常在終身職位的決策上是否做出了正確的決定。9%的受訪者表示「完全不是」或「在某種程度上」，而47%的受訪者表示「在很大程度上或非常大程度上」。對於終身職位是否應該比現在更容易獲得的問題，只有7%的人選擇「在很大程度上或非常大程度上」。大多數受訪者（52%）選擇了「完全不是」。我們還問了終身職位是否應該比現在更難獲得。近一半（49%）的人表示「完全不是」，只有14%的人選擇「在很大程度上或非常大程度上」。對比這兩個問題的結果表明，很少有受訪者認為終身職位應該比現在更容易或更難獲得，而且認為它應該更難的人數超過了認為它應該更容易的人數。總的來看，大多數的受訪者對現有並正在運行的制度表示滿意者，遠遠超過表示不滿的受訪者。

## Hard Work Is Your Friend, and Is Contagious

努力工作是你的朋友，且具有感染力

Do not eschew hard work. Sometimes we get lost in platitudes, prescriptions, hand wringing, and sermonizing about work. In contrast to Glick et al.’s (2007) emphasis on luck as a primary driver of scholarly outcomes, we contend that hard work is the cornerstone of success. As shown in Table 1, we asked respondents which of the six potential causes discussed above is the most important determinant of success. Hard work was selected by 65 respondents, whereas luck was selected by only 3. In other words, those who believe in the pre-eminence of luck are outnumbered by more than 20 to 1 by those that view hard work as pre-eminent.

不要回避努力工作。有時候我們會迷失在陳詞濫調、處方、焦慮和對工作的說教中。與Glick等人（2007）強調運氣是學術成果的主要驅動力相反，我們認為努力工作是成功的基石。如表1所示，我們問受訪者上述六個潛在成因中哪一個是成功的最重要決定因素。65位受訪者選擇了努力工作，而只有3位選擇了運氣。換句話說，相信運氣至上的人數被認為努力工作至上的人以超過20比1的比例超過。

These results support our contention that the most fortunate among us are those who find themselves surrounded by hardworking scholars; it rubs off on us and motivates us. It is not easy to achieve success, and no one gets success handed to them. However, it can be done! Do not shy away from hard work. The most successful contributors to the organizational sciences are individuals who have not eschewed hard work.

這些結果支持我們的觀點，即最幸運的人是那些發現自己被努力工作的學者所包圍的人；這種精神會感染我們並激勵我們。成功不容易實現，沒有人能輕易獲得成功。然而，這是可行的！不要害怕努力工作。在組織科學領域中最成功的貢獻者是那些沒有回避努力工作的人。

Look around your place of employment during the summer, or during breaks, or during weekends, or late at night, and take note of who is most likely present. It is those who work hard! We readily acknowledge that there are a number of brilliant individuals in the field, and that their inherent abilities provide them with a competitive advantage. However, they are vastly outnumbered by those who work hard and persevere through the publication process. One of our mentors always carried a round wooden disk with the word “TUIT” inscribed on it. He was quick to hand it to those whose approach to work/research was “I’ll do it when I get around to it.” The lesson sunk in and has persevered! Nascent organizational scholars please take note and dedicate yourself to a life of working hard. This approach will yield both professional and personal rewards.

在夏季、假期、周末或深夜，看看你的工作場所周圍，注意一下誰最有可能在場。那些努力工作的人！我們承認，在這個領域中有許多才華橫溢的個體，他們的固有能力為他們提供了競爭優勢。然而，那些努力工作並在發表(投稿)過程中堅持下來的人，遠遠超過他們。有位指導老師總是帶著一個刻有“TUIT”字樣的圓木片(to it. 或get around to it或just do it)。他總是迅速將其交給那些對工作/研究態度是“我找到時間就做”的人。這一課程深入人心，並得以持續！新進的組織學者要提醒自己，致力於辛勤工作的生活。如此將可為自己在職場或個人，得到回報。

## The Danger of Fear

### 恐懼的危險

One of the more powerful conclusions that has been reached within the organizational sciences, despite our lack of a strong paradigm, is that **beliefs and attributions influence outcomes** within organizations (e.g., Festinger, 1954). For example, all else being equal, a group is more likely to accomplish a goal if group members are confident about their abilities to reach the goal than if they are not. Rather than being paralyzed by worry about a probable failure, people within a confident group feel free to channel their energy and creativity toward completing the difficult tasks at hand.

在組織科學中，儘管缺乏強有力的典範，但已經得出的一個更為有力的結論是，**信念和歸究(原因)會影響組織內的結果**（例如，Festinger，1954年）。例如，在其他條件相同的情況下，如果群體成員對達成目標的能力感到自信，那麼該群體更有可能實現目標。與對可能失敗感到憂慮而陷入瘋狂不同，自信的群體中的人們感覺自由，可以將他們的能量和創造力用於完成手邊的困難任務。

Copyright © 2008 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

*J. Organiz. Behav.* 29, 741–753 (2008)

DOI: 10.1002/job

With bodies of research on concepts such as enactment, attributions, and confidence as our support, we worry about the behavioral implications of pessimistic (and perhaps borderline defeatist) positions expressed to nascent scholars just entering the research process. The threat/rigidity hypothesis tells us that if individuals view the process as fraught with threats, such people are likely to “freeze up” and not be capable of offering their most creative and insightful effort (Staw, Sandelands, & Dutton, 1981). Young organizational scholars who buy into Glick et al.’s notion that the publication deck is stacked against them are thus likely to act in rigid ways that actually do harm their chances of publishing. Importantly, the primary cause here is internal belief and a self-fulfilling prophecy, not some oppressive external reality.

憑藉對一些概念，例如：行動、**歸因(歸究原因)**和信心的研究，我們關注對剛進入研究過程的新生學者表達的悲觀（也許是邊緣的失敗，主義）立場的行為影響。威脅/僵化假設告訴我們，如果個人將過程視為充滿威脅，這些人很可能會“凍結”，無法提供他們最具創造力和洞察力的努力（Staw、Sandelands和Dutton，1981年）。那些認同Glick等人觀點，認為出版界對他們不利的年輕組織學者因此可能採取僵化的方式，實際上損害了他們發表論文的機會。重要的是，這裡的主要原因是內部信念和自我實現的預言，而不是一些壓迫性的外部事實。

Some of the best lessons for navigating a difficult and challenging career are learned at a young age. For example, as children, we are told that if confronted by a seemingly vicious dog, we should not run away in fear. Giving in to the threat/rigidity effect in this way will only result in a nasty bite. Instead, we should approach the dog with confidence, and demonstrate to the dog that we are not intimidated. This is a useful analogy for what we face as nascent organizational scholars. **Approaching a journal with fear is likely to bring about the nasty bite of a rejection letter. Approaching the journal with confidence allows one to author a paper that reflects one’s full talents and thereby has the best opportunity for success.** As President Franklin Delano Roosevelt told the citizens of the United States in his splendid Inaugural Address in 1933, “the only thing we have to fear is fear itself.” Fear leads to a flight reaction, and it is not a beneficial way to confront most difficult challenges or opportunities.

在應對艱難挑戰的職業生涯中學到的一些最好的教訓是在年輕時期學到的。例如，作為孩子，我們被告知，如果遇到一隻看似兇猛的狗，我們不應該因恐懼而逃跑。以這種方式屈服於威脅/僵化效應只會導致一個嚴重的咬傷。**相反，我們應該充滿信心地接近狗，向狗表明我們並不感到害怕。這對我們作為新進的（資淺的）組織學者所面臨的情況是一個有用的比喻。帶著恐懼接近期刊可能會帶來被退稿的嚴重後果。以信心接近期刊使人能夠撰寫一篇反映自己全部才華的論文，從而獲得最佳成功機會。**正如富蘭克林·德拉諾·羅斯福總統在1933年其出色的就職演說中告訴美國公民的那樣，“我們唯一需要擔心的就是恐懼本身。”恐懼導致了逃跑反應，這並不是應付大部分的困難挑戰或機遇有幫助的方式。

## Conclusion

Our purpose in this commentary was to offer some “bad medicine;” that is, ideas about our perceptions of the reality of the organizational sciences that may be distasteful to swallow for some, but that we hope can improve the health of the field. It is a challenging field, on that we wholeheartedly agree with Glick et al. (2007). However, making a life in the organizational sciences also is a very rewarding undertaking. Importantly, success in our field is not an impossible dream, and there is room in the field for legions of dedicated researchers, not just the few truly brilliant scholars.

我們在這篇評論中的目的是提供一些“不良藥物”，即我們對組織科學真實感知的一些想法，這些想法可能對一些人來說令人不快，但我們希望這些想法能促進該領域的健康。我們完全同意Glick等人（2007年）對這一挑戰性領域的看法。然而，從事組織科學也是一項非常有價值的事業。重要的是，我們領域的成功並不是一個不可能的夢想，而且在這個領域中存在著多數的專心研究者，而不只是少數的優秀學者。

We contend that it would be an example of the well known “**fundamental attribution error**” to blame most negative outcomes on bad luck or difficult circumstances. **Luck matters, but hard work matters a whole lot more.** We will cast our lot with Thomas Edison and his famous quote: “Genius is one percent inspiration and ninety-nine percent perspiration.” Looking to our future and the future of our students, hand wringing and lamenting will not enhance their careers, facilitate their success, nor increase our

knowledge base about organizations and people who operate within them. Instead, putting in the hard work it takes to be successful is what is required, thus, it may be beneficial to remind ourselves, our students and our prospective students of the famous Nike slogan—“**just do it.**”

我們認為，將大多數負面結果歸咎於壞運氣或困難環境是著名的“**基本歸因錯誤**”的一個例子。**運氣確實很重要，但辛勤工作更加重要。**我們會與托馬斯·愛迪生及其著名的名言站在一起：“**天才是一分靈感，九十九分汗水。**”展望我們的未來和我們學生的未來，嘆息和哀痛不會提高他們的職業生涯，也不會促進他們的成功，也不會增加我們的組織及組織中人們的知識。。相反，為了成功，需要付出辛勤的工作，因此，提醒我們自己、我們的學生和未來的學生，對大家有幫助的應該是著名的**耐克口號**——“**只管去做**”。

## Author biographies

Gerald R. Ferris is the Francis Eppes Professor of Management and Professor of Psychology at Florida State University. He received a Ph.D. in Business Administration from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He has research interests in the areas of social influence processes in human

Copyright © 2008 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

*J. Organiz. Behav.* 29, 741–753 (2008)

DOI: 10.1002/job

resources systems, and the role of reputation in organizations. Ferris is the author of numerous articles published in such journals as the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *Personnel Psychology*, *Academy of Management Journal*, and *Academy of Management Review*. He served as editor of the annual series, *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, from 1981–2003. Ferris has been the recipient of a number of distinctions and honors, and in 2001 was the recipient of the Heneman Career Achievement Award from the Human Resources Division of the Academy of Management.

David J. Ketchen, Jr. is the Lowder Eminent Scholar in Entrepreneurship and a Professor of Management at Auburn University. He earned his Ph.D. at the Pennsylvania State University. His research interests include entrepreneurship and franchising, methodological issues in organizational research, strategic supply chain management, and the determinants of superior organizational performance. He is currently an associate editor for the *Academy of Management Journal*. He has completed terms as an associate editor for the *Journal of Management*, *Organizational Research Methods*, *Journal of Operations Management*, and *Journal of International Business Studies*. His work has been published in journals such as the *Academy of Management Journal*, *Strategic Management Journal*, *Journal of Operations Management*, and *Journal of Management*, among others.

M. Ronald Buckley holds the JC Penney Company Chair of Business Leadership and is a Professor of Management and a Professor of Psychology in the Michael F. Price College of Business at the University of Oklahoma. He earned his Ph. D in Industrial/ Organizational Psychology from Auburn University. His research interests include, among others, work motivation, racial and gender issues in performance evaluation, business ethics, and organizational socialization. His work has been published in journals such as the *Academy of Management Review*, *Personnel Psychology*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, and the *Journal of Management*. The paradigm issue never frightened him much, and his professors were aware quite early in his graduate training that he would not be the next Karl Weick!

## References

- Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business. 2005–2006 salary survey. (2006) [http://www.aacsb.edu/knowledgeservices/home/SSExecSummary\\_05-06.pdf](http://www.aacsb.edu/knowledgeservices/home/SSExecSummary_05-06.pdf).
- Bckley, M. R., Jackson, K. E., Bolino, M. C., Veres, J. G., & Feild, H. S. (2007). The influence of relational demography on panel interview ratings: A field experiment. *Personnel Psychology*, *60*, 627–646.
- Cable, D. M., & Murray, B. (1999). Tournaments versus sponsored mobility as determinants of job search success. *Academy of Management Journal*, *42*, 439–449.
- Combs, J., Liu, Y., Grant, A., & Ketchen, D. (2006). How much do high performance work practices matter? A meta-analysis of their effects on organizational performance. *Personnel Psychology*, *59*, 501–528.
- Ferris, G. R., Bowen, M. G., Treadway, D. C., Hochwarter, W. A., Hall, A. T., & Perrewe, P. L. (2006). The assumed linearity of organizational phenomena: Implications for occupational stress and well-being. In P. L. Perrewé, & D. C. Ganster (Eds.), *Research in occupational stress and well-being* (Vol. 5, pp. 205–232). Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Ferris, G. R., Perrewe, P. L., & Buckley, M. R. (in press). Mentoring Ph.D. students within an apprenticeship framework. In: S. J. Armstrong, & C. Fukami (Eds.), *Handbook of management learning, education, and development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparisons. *Human Relations*, *7*, 117–132.
- Glick, W. H., Miller, C. C., & Cardinal, L. B. (2007). Making a life in the field of organization science. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *28*, 817–835. DOI: 10.1002/job.455
- Gomez-Mejia, L. R., & Balkin, D. B. (1992). Determinants of faculty pay: An agency theory perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, *35*, 921–955.

- Kirchmeyer, C. (2005). The effects of mentoring on academic careers over time: Testing performance and political perspectives. *Human Relations*, *58*, 637–660.
- Locke, E. A. (1978). The ubiquity of the technique of goal setting in theories of employee motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, *3*, 594–601.
- Long, R. G., Bowers, W. P., Barnett, T., & White, M. C. (1998). Research productivity of graduates in management: Effects of academic origin and academic affiliation. *Academy of Management Journal*, *41*, 704–714.
- Mahoney, T. A. (1985). Journal publishing and the organizations sciences: An analysis of exchanges. In L. L. Cummings, & P. J. Frost (Eds.), *Publishing in the organizational sciences*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- Miller, C. C., Glick, W. H., & Cardinal, L. B. (2005). The allocation of prestigious positions in organizational science: Accumulative advantage, sponsored mobility, and contest mobility. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *26*, 489–516.
- Mitchell, T. R. (2007). The academic life: Realistic changes needed for business school students and faculty. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *6*, 236–251.
- Pfeffer, J. (1993). Barriers to the advancement of organizational science: Paradigm development as a dependent variable. *Academy of Management Review*, *18*, 599–620.
- Pfeffer, J. (1995). Mortality, reproducibility, and the persistence of styles of theory. *Organization Science*, *6*, 681–691.
- Pfeffer, J. (2007). Truth's consequences. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *28*, 837–839. DOI: 10.1002/job.456
- Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive strategy*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Porter, M. E. (1985). *Comparative advantage*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Porter, M. E. (1990). *The competitive advantage of nations*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Rousseau, D. M. (2007). Standing out in the field of organization science. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *28*, 849–857. DOI: 10.1002/job.457
- Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1974). The bases and use of power in organizational decision making: The case of a university. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *19*, 453–473.
- Sitkin, S. B. (2007). Promoting a more generative and sustainable organizational science. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *28*, 841–848. DOI: 10.1002/job.458
- Spector, P. E., & Jex, S. M. (1991). Relations of job characteristics from multiple data sources with employee affect, absence, turnover intentions and health. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *76*, 46–53.
- Staw, B. M., Sandelands, L. E., & Dutton, J. E. (1981). Threat-rigidity effects in organizational behavior: A multi-level analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *2*, 378–397.
- Van Maanen, J. (1995a). Style as theory. *Organization Science*, *6*, 133–143.
- Van Maanen, J. (1995b). Fear and loathing in organization studies. *Organization Studies*, *6*, 687–692.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Zammuto, R. F., & Connolly, T. (1984). Coping with disciplinary fragmentation. *Organizational Behavior Teaching Review*, *9*, 30–32.