Introduction: Cycles, Seasons, and Service

Many of us observe and experience that the careers of management educators ebb and flow through various stages as our internal preferences and external demands change and evolve. This progression from one stage to another may take several forms. Early in a management educator’s career, the primary emphasis may be on basic research accomplishments or development of teaching capabilities. Later, the focus may shift to internal or external service, including administrative responsibilities within the academic institution with which the educator is affiliated, or external service that may include serving as an officer with a professional association or in an editorial capacity with a journal. Later, the individual may seek to return to a focus on research or shift emphasis to executive education, book writing, or even nonacademic pursuits. These cycles—or “seasons”—in an academic career have not been widely studied, although scholars of CEO and top management team dynamics have documented them to some extent. For example, Hambrick and Fukutomi (1991) theorize that CEO activities and focus evolve through the tenure of the executive based on knowledge, learning, external pressures, and other factors.

In this context Aguinis, De Bruin, Cunningham, Hall, Culpepper, and Gottfredson explore, in our Exemplary Contribution, careerwide research productivity of past editors of management journals. Bringing a novel and creative approach to their investigation, they offer competing hypotheses, based on learning and job burnout theories as well as autobiographical case studies. They confirm that research cycles—“waves”—fluctuate in a statistically significant pattern, reflecting the demands and toll journal editorship takes on editors’ own research productivity. One of the most important—and somewhat disheartening—findings is that, on average, it takes nearly a decade for editors’ research productivity to reach the pre-editorship level. Aguinis et al. do report that some editors actually buck this trend and are able to increase their research output post-editorship.

The research context of this article is of obvious interest to many of us who frequently wrestle with decisions about how to allocate our time. One of the obvious attractions of an academic career is the substantial autonomy it offers about what to do and when to do it. Yet, this sovereignty creates burdens and hard choices, as are clearly underscored in this contribution. This article is also of great interest because of its impressive combination of inductive and deductive reasoning. In particular, the inclusion of autobiographical case studies adds a richness and insight to the conceptual and theoretical foundation. In addition, the post hoc analysis shines a light on some of the more provocative and counterintuitive findings. This impressive methodological approach should not be a surprise to colleagues and students of Herman Aguinis. As a leading scholar of rigorous, creative, and insightful methodological approaches and former editor of Organizational Research Methods, Aguinis has made major contributions to our understanding of how methodological approaches can reveal—or obscure—important insights and findings.

In reflecting on this stimulating article, I am once again struck by an impressive and moving aspect of our Academy: Time after time, leading scholars, educators, and thought leaders take on roles of service and leadership in our professional organizations and journals despite the cost to them in terms of their other professional pursuits and personal obligations. It is a testament to our profession that our colleagues continuously engage in the “sustained volunteerism” (Ryan, 2008) documented here, and in so doing, honor the profession and make us proud to be part of it.
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