

Editorial: What Are Registered Reports and Why Are They Important to the Future of Human Resource Management Research?

Prof. Andrew R. Timming (corresponding author)
Professor of Human Resource Management
School of Management
RMIT University
Melbourne, VIC, 3000
Australia
E-mail: Andrew.Timming@rmit.edu.au

Prof. Elaine Farndale
Professor of Human Resource Management
School of Labor and Employment Relations
Penn State University
University Park, PA, 16802
U.S.A.

Prof. Pawan Budhwar
50th Anniversary Professor of International HRM
Head of Aston Business School
Aston University
Birmingham, B4 7EQ
U.K.

Prof. Geoffrey Wood
Dancap Private Equity Chair in Change and Innovation
Head of DAN Management
Western University
London, Ontario, N6A 5C2
Canada

8 April 2021

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors report no conflicts of interest.

Funding Statement: This research received no funding.

Data Availability Statement: No data were used in this manuscript.

Author Bios:

Andrew R. Timming is Professor of Human Resource Management at RMIT University in Australia. He holds a Ph.D. in Economic Sociology from the University of Cambridge. Professor Timming has published over 40 peer reviewed papers in journals such as *Human Relations*; *Human Resource Management Journal*; *Human Resource Management*; *Work, Employment & Society*; and the *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*. He is the Inaugural Registered Reports Editor at *Human Resource Management Journal* and Associate Editor at the *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. He researches mental illness in the workplace, suicide, employee selection, and employee voice.

Dr. Elaine Farndale is a professor of human resource management in the School of Labor and Employment Relations and is affiliated with the HR Studies Department at Tilburg University in the Netherlands. She holds a Ph.D. in Human Resource Management from Cranfield School of Management in the UK. Dr. Farndale's specialist areas of interest and research include: international and comparative HRM; the credibility, professionalism, and roles of the HR department; and HRM and organizational and employee outcomes. Elaine has presented papers at many international conferences and has published articles and chapters in both the practitioner and academic press, such as *Journal of International Business Studies*, *Journal of Management Studies*, *Journal of World Business*, *Sloan Management Review*, *Human Resource Management*, *Human Resource Management Journal*, and *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. Dr. Farndale has also worked previously as an HR specialist for several years.

Pawan Budhwar is 50th Anniversary Professor of International HRM at Aston Business School. He is also the Associate Pro-Vice Chancellor International, the Joint Director of Aston India Centre for Applied Research at Aston University and the Co-Editor-in-Chief of *British Journal of Management*. He received his PhD from Manchester Business School. He is the co-founder and first President of the Indian Academy of Management, an affiliate of AOM. Pawan has published over 120 articles in leading journals on topics related to people management, with a specific focus on India. He has also written and/or co-edited 21 books on HRM-related topics for different national and regional contexts. He is Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences, the Higher Education Academy, the British Academy of Management and the Indian Academy of Management, and chartered member of the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD).

Professor Geoffrey Wood is DanCap Chair of Innovation and Head of DAN Management at Western University in Canada, and Visiting Professor at Trinity College, Dublin. Previously, he served as Dean and Professor of International Business, at Essex Business School and before then as Professor of International Business at Warwick Business School, UK. He has authored/co-authored/edited eighteen books, and over one hundred and eighty articles in peer-reviewed journals. He has an h-index of 41, and an i10-index of 163. He holds honorary positions at Griffith and Monash University in Australia. Geoff's research interests centre on the relationship between institutional setting, corporate governance, firm finance, and firm level work and employment relations.

Abstract

Human Resource Management Journal is proud to offer a registered reports pathway to publication. A registered report is an innovative method of publication in which authors submit a research proposal for peer review prior to the collection and analysis of the data. At Stage 1, the Introduction, Literature Review, Theory, Hypotheses, and a detailed Research Methods Protocol are peer reviewed. If the paper is accepted “in principle” at this stage, the authors can then proceed to Stage 2, in which they collect and analyze the data according to the agreed protocol and write up the Results and Discussion sections of the study. The primary purpose of a registered report is to obviate the use of questionable research practices and insidious p-hacking. For this reason, only deductive (theory-testing) research is appropriate for this pathway to publication. Research published via a registered report is conceptually and methodologically robust, falsifiable, and less likely to fall victim to irreproducibility. This article explains what registered reports are, why they are good for scientific discovery, how the HRM field can benefit from offering this pathway to publication, and how HRM scholars can submit a registered report to *Human Resource Management Journal*.

Keywords: epistemology, falsification, irreproducibility, registered reports, replication crisis

1. INTRODUCTION

Human Resource Management Journal (HRMJ) is excited to announce that we have introduced a registered reports pathway for the submission of high-quality (predominantly quantitative) deductive research in the field of human resource management (HRM). The Center for Open Science (2021) reports that 277 academic journals—among them, for example, recognizable outlets such as *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, *Management and Organization Review*, and *The Leadership Quarterly*—now offer registered reports as an option for peer review. *HRMJ* is proud to be the first journal in the field of HRM to provide this pathway to publication.

The concept of a registered report needs no introduction amongst psychologists and natural scientists (Chambers, 2013; Nosek and Lakens, 2014; Chambers, 2019; Chambers and Tzavella, 2020), but it is likely that this unique approach to epistemology and method of publishing are foreign to many of us in HRM. The aim of this brief editorial is therefore to provide HRM researchers with a short “primer” on what registered reports are; why they are good for scientific discovery; how HRM, as a field of study, can benefit from offering this pathway to publication; and how HRM scholars can submit a registered report to *HRMJ*.

2. WHAT ARE REGISTERED REPORTS?

Registered reports represent a major disruptive force to widely established epistemologies and the traditional peer review process, which is too often based on an incentive structure that values statistical significance over and above non-significant findings (Hardwicke & Ioannidis, 2018). Registered reports offer a pathway to publication that bolsters credibility and transparency by ensuring that researchers cannot “fit” their empirical findings *post hoc* to their theory or hypotheses.

In short, a registered report is defined as a pathway to peer reviewed publication that involves the submission and review of the introduction, literature review, theory, hypotheses, and research methods protocol prior to data collection, analysis, and discussion of the results. The review process

for a registered report is divided into two stages. At Stage 1, researchers submit, in essence, the first half of a traditional paper. In it, they write an introduction, review the literature, articulate a theory and hypotheses, and set out a methodological plan for testing their hypotheses. Once the Stage 1 submission has been peer reviewed to the satisfaction of the editor and reviewers, the paper can be accepted “in principle,” at which point the researchers can move on to collect and analyze the data, according to the protocol agreed with the reviewers, and subsequently resubmit the full paper, with a discussion of the findings, at Stage 2. The only reason that a registered report can be rejected at Stage 2 is if the researchers fail to adhere to their research protocol as agreed, or they fail to adequately discuss the findings (although the expectation is that the latter failing will be addressed to the editor’s and reviewers’ satisfaction through multiple rounds of review at Stage 2). The global aim of adhering to this two-staged process is to enhance research quality and replicability (Soderberg et al., 2020).

One limitation in the application of registered reports within the social sciences is that it generally excludes most qualitative manuscripts, which constitute a sizeable portion of *HRMJ*’s total submissions and published articles. In theory, qualitative research can be deductive (Crotty & Crotty, 1998) and therefore qualitative researchers could potentially submit a manuscript under a registered reports pathway, but since the lion’s share of qualitative research is inductive and theory-building (Charmaz, 2014; Gioia, Corley, & Hamilton, 2013; Strauss & Corbin, 1997), a qualitative submission would be mostly not applicable. Similarly, research following an abductive cycle, given its pre-theoretical bent (Bamberger, 2018), would largely be inappropriate as a registered report submission. Nonetheless, *HRMJ* remains dedicated to publishing qualitative articles, as well as quantitative, through the regular submission process too.

A key strength of a registered report, as further elaborated upon here, is that it enables optimization of theory and methods via peer review prior to the collection of quantitative data, thus bolstering and ultimately reinforcing the integrity of the deductive research process, as we explain further.

3. WHY ARE REGISTERED REPORTS GOOD SCIENCE?

The traditional publication model—whereby researchers submit a full paper that presents an introduction, literature review, theory, hypotheses, methods, results, and discussion—suffers from a tendency toward any number of publication biases. Whether wittingly or not, researchers succumb to a set of questionable research practices (hereafter QRPs: Butler, Delaney, & Spoelstra, 2017; Fiedler & Schwarz, 2016; John, Loewenstein, & Prelec, 2012) that violate the integrity of the research process. QRPs have been described as “p-hacking” (Head, Holman, Lanfear, Kahn, & Jennions, 2016), whereby *post hoc* “tinkering” leads to statistically significant p-values. Examples of QRPs include: HARKing (Hypothesizing After the Results are Known), where datasets are trawled for statistically significant findings and the hypotheses are built up around them; selective reporting of hypotheses, whereby hypotheses are dropped in light of non-significance; data exclusion, whereby the sample size is reduced or altered in some way to produce statistically significant findings; and manipulation of control variables, whereby different configurations of covariates are added to multivariate models to produce the “right” results (see Banks et al., 2016 for a very good overview of QRPs). If indeed such practices fall short of outright research misconduct, they are certainly not far away from crossing that threshold.

Whatever the reasons underlying these QRPs and resultant publication biases—from perverse incentives (Barbour, 2015) to peer reviewers that are too eager to reject papers reporting null results (Landis, James, Lance, Pierce, & Rogelberg, 2014), registered reports offer an innovative and unhackable solution to the problem. If a detailed protocol of both theory and methods is peer reviewed and accepted “in principle” prior to data collection, then researchers avoid not only the temptation, but also the ability, to p-hack. The integrity of the deductive research process is thus preserved by virtue of the 2-staged review. Data cannot be excluded (other than by the criteria agreed in the methods protocol), hypotheses cannot be changed or “discovered,” and covariates cannot be manipulated *post hoc* when pursuing a registered reports pathway to publication.

Another strong feature of registered reports is that they are a useful tool in the fight against research irreproducibility (Bishop, 2019). The so-called replication crisis (Maxwell, Lau, & Howard, 2015; Shrout & Rodgers, 2018; Trafimow, 2018), whereby peer reviewed studies that have made truly landmark contributions in their respective fields have failed to replicate, has been particularly burdensome to the reputation of psychology generally, and to social psychology more specifically (Earp & Trafimow, 2015). To be sure, failure to replicate is not, in and of itself, an inherently “bad” outcome because it says something important about the falsifiability of a theory (Popper, 1959), but the very fact that key theories are failing to replicate (e.g., social priming: see Doyen, Klein, Pichon, & Cleeremans, 2012) is an indicator of possible QRPs and the need for change in terms of epistemological approach. In short, registered reports are more likely to nip weak theories in the bud compared to the traditional model of publication, which may perpetuate them because they are *en vogue*.

Klein et al.’s (2018) Many Labs 2 project (see also: Forsell et al., 2019), in which the replicability of twenty-eight key psychological studies were subjected to replication attempts across 125 samples, comprising over 15,000 participants across 36 countries, should serve as a stark warning bell for readers of *HRMJ*. The Many Labs 2 researchers (numbering several hundred research groups) found that only about half of the 28 studies whose methods they reproduced had replicable findings, the vast majority of which were found to have smaller effect sizes than originally reported. Given the debate around the psychologization of HRM as discussed in *HRMJ* (see Budd, 2020; Farndale, McDonnell, Scholarios, & Wilkinson, 2020; Godard, 2014, 2020; Kaufman, 2020; Troth & Guest, 2020), we should perhaps all pause to reflect on whether a similar replication crisis is brewing in our own disciplinary backyard.

4. HOW CAN HRM BENEFIT FROM REGISTERED REPORTS?

Large-scale replications of key studies in HRM have not, as yet, been conducted—much to our detriment. The reasons for this lack of replication vary, but they are likely a reflection of (1) an individual reluctance to spend precious research time “copying” others’ work, and (2) the demands of promotion committees for original research. Be that as it may, the past cannot be changed. If there

are some important studies in HRM that will ultimately fail to replicate, these will hopefully come out in the wash when large-scale replications are finally carried out. In the meantime, we face the urgent task of ensuring that the quantitative research we produce is of the highest quality, and registered reports offer us just that opportunity.

One research space in particular from which the whole field of HRM can benefit from the use of registered reports is in the area of the HRM-performance link studies (Bartram, Stanton, Leggat, Casimir, & Fraser, 2007; Becker & Gerhart, 1996; Delery & Doty, 1996; Guest, 1997, 2011; Huselid, 1995; Paauwe & Farndale, 2017; among many others). Huselid's (1995) landmark study is among one of the most cited in our field (+13,000 citations by early 2021). It set the tone for subsequent research into high performance/ high involvement work practices (e.g., see Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, Kalleberg, & Bailey, 2000; Boxall & Macky, 2009; Guthrie, 2001). Huselid's (1995) study found that HRM practices had a statistically significant impact on turnover, productivity, and firm performance. Over the last few decades, this finding has been supported time and time again by study after study, leading to a general consensus among scholars that HRM "adds value" to organizations, with key debates unfolding within that parameter. But one might question whether there is an inherent conflict of interest in HRM scholars researching the HRM-performance link: if we were to find no significant relationship between HRM and performance, then our *raison d'être* stands on very shaky ground indeed. Registered reports offer a pathway towards the truth, regardless of how unpalatable or reinforcing it may be.

Another area of research that is ripe for a robust, 2-stage deductive approach is the cross-national study of HRM, particularly in relation to potential variations in HRM practices. Researchers may enter this research domain with a set of pre-conceived notions pertaining to the expected degree of convergence and divergence of HRM practices between countries, often referred to as "best practice" or "best fit" HRM (Marchington & Grugulis, 2000). As such, they may (again, wittingly or unwittingly) seek out evidence that confirms their assumptions based on dominant institutional and cross-cultural theories, becoming hesitant when faced by non-confirmatory evidence. In the context

of a registered report, international HRM researchers will be forced to stake their theoretically grounded claims in the front half of the paper and, in the latter half, accept the results, come what may. Similarly, when an established relationship within a dominant country or culture is tested in an alternative context (Timming, 2010), it is often assumed that the same established relationship should also hold unless the context is studied as a moderator (Budhwar, Schuler, & Sparrow, 2009). This type of research question, addressed via a registered report, would provide an unadulterated view of the true nature of these cross-national dynamics.

Indeed, there is no shortage of research questions in HRM that could benefit from a registered reports approach. From the Cranet surveys assessing cross-national variation in HRM practices (Parry, Farndale, Brewster, and Morley, 2021) to the effect of workforce diversity on firm performance (Hubbard, 2004); from the effect of presenteeism and mental illness on individual performance (Hemp, 2004) to the use of artificial intelligence in predicting HRM outcomes (Malik, Budhwar, & Srikanth, 2020), the sky is the proverbial limit for registered reports at *HRMJ*.

5. HOW CAN I SUBMIT A REGISTERED REPORT?

Submitting a registered report to *HRMJ* is straightforward. We have already built in the Stage 1 and Stage 2 submission processes directly into Manuscript Central—our online submission system (to submit a manuscript, visit mc.manuscriptcentral.com/hrmj). But before authors submit at Stage 1, there are a few key steps that are worth considering. First, authors should contact *HRMJ*'s inaugural Registered Reports Editor, Professor Andrew R. Timming

(<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/17488583/registered-reports>,

Andrew.Timming@rmit.edu.au), to discuss the submission at an informal level. A brief discussion with the handling Editor can help shape the theory and methods protocol and perhaps identify other teams of researchers working on the proposed topic. It may also be worthwhile to open an account on the Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io>). This platform, designed and maintained by the non-profit Center for Open Science (<https://cos.io>), is an invaluable tool for the organization of registered reports and other forms of preregistered studies (Nosek, Ebersole, DeHaven, & Mellor, 2018). Researchers

can use the OSF as a private or public repository for their protocols, research instruments, manuscript drafts, and data, and best of all, registration is free. Lastly, researchers can benefit from reading previously published registered reports to get a “feel” for what the end product will look like (e.g., Przybylski & Weinstein, 2019).

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

HRMJ has always been at the cutting edge of research innovations that bring out the best in our contributors. Our goal throughout the years has been to challenge the *status quo* by continually pushing the boundaries of the HRM field into uncharted terrain. As a case in point, our Provocation and Review papers, alongside our robust debates around selected key HRM themes (e.g., Budd, 2020; Farndale, McDonnell, Scholarios, & Wilkinson, 2020; Godard, 2014, 2020; Kaufman, 2020; Troth & Guest, 2020), have re-shaped how many of us think about our discipline. We believe it is our duty to keep initiating new and meaningful features that can best serve the interests of our diverse community of readers, both scholarly and practitioner, the latter of whom depend on us for unbiased research to facilitate their organizational decision-making.

Our strong commitment to research excellence, broadly conceived, is clearly demonstrated by the fact that we subscribe to the very highest standards of practice, including the Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA, 2021), the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE, 2021), and the UN’s Principles for Responsible Management Education (PRME, 2021). In a further effort to tackle the threats of QRPs, p-hacking, and potential irreproducibility from rearing its ugly head in HRM research, we now offer this registered reports pathway to publication. The 2-stage pathway enables deductive researchers to receive invaluable feedback on their research design and research questions prior to data collection and analysis, thereby bolstering the overall quality and integrity of the results. Authors interested in pursuing this worthwhile pathway to publication are encouraged to get in touch directly with *HRMJ*’s Registered Reports Editor to discuss a potential submission (Andrew.Timming@rmit.edu.au). We are happy to welcome registered reports submissions alongside

all other types of more traditional studies, including high quality inductive and abductive qualitative research.

REFERENCES

- Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., Berg, P., Kalleberg, A. L., & Bailey, T. A. (2000). *Manufacturing advantage: Why high-performance work systems pay off*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Bamberger, P. A. (2018). AMD—Clarifying What We Are about and Where We Are Going. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 4(1), 1-10.
- Banks, G. C., O'Boyle Jr, E. H., Pollack, J. M., White, C. D., Batchelor, J. H., Whelpley, C. E., ... and Adkins, C. L. (2016). Questions about questionable research practices in the field of management: A guest commentary. *Journal of Management*, 42(1), 5-20.
- Barbour, V. (2015). Perverse incentives and perverse publishing practices. *Science Bulletin*, 60, 1225-1226.
- Bartram, T., Stanton, P., Leggat, S., Casimir, G., & Fraser, B. (2007). Lost in translation: exploring the link between HRM and performance in healthcare. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 17(1), 21-41.
- Becker, B., & Gerhart, B. (1996). The impact of human resource management on organizational performance: Progress and prospects. *Academy of management journal*, 39(4), 779-801.
- Bishop, D. (2019). Rein in the four horsemen of irreproducibility. *Nature*, 568(7753), 435-436.
- Boxall, P., & Macky, K. (2009). Research and theory on high-performance work systems: progressing the high-involvement stream. *Human resource management journal*, 19(1), 3-23.

- Budd, J. W. (2020). The psychologisation of employment relations, alternative models of the employment relationship, and the OB turn. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 30(1), 73-83.
- Budhwar, P., Schuler, R. S., Sparrow, P. (Eds) (2009). *Major Works in International Human Resource Management*, London: Sage. (4 Volumes).
- Butler, N., Delaney, H., & Spoelstra, S. (2017). The gray zone: Questionable research practices in the business school. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 16(1), 94-109.
- Center for Open Science. (2021). Registered Reports: Peer review before results are known to align scientific values and practices. <https://www.cos.io/initiatives/registered-reports>. [accessed 23 February 2021].
- Chambers, C. and Tzavella, L. (2020). Registered reports: Past, present and future. <https://doi.org/10.31222/osf.io/43298>.
- Chambers, C. (2019). What's next for registered reports? *Nature*, 573, 187-189.
- Chambers, C.D. (2013). Registered reports: a new publishing initiative at Cortex. *Cortex*, 49(3), 609-610.
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory*. London: Sage.
- COPE. (2021). Committee on Publication Ethics. <http://publicationethics.org>. [accessed 28 March 2021].

Crotty, M., & Crotty, M. F. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. London: Sage.

Delery, J. E., & Doty, D. H. (1996). Modes of theorizing in strategic human resource management: Tests of universalistic, contingency, and configurational performance predictions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 802-835.

DORA. (2021) Declaration on Research Assessment. <http://sfdora.org>. [accessed 28 March 2021].

Doyen, S., Klein, O., Pichon, C-L., & Cleeremans, A. (2012) Behavioral Priming: It's All in the Mind, but Whose Mind? *PLoS ONE* 7(1): e29081. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0029081>

Earp, B. D., & Trafimow, D. (2015). Replication, falsification, and the crisis of confidence in social psychology. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 621.

Farndale, E., McDonnell, A., Scholarios, D., & Wilkinson, A. (2020). The psychologisation conversation: An introduction. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 30(1), 32-33.

Fiedler, K., & Schwarz, N. (2016). Questionable research practices revisited. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 7(1), 45-52.

Forsell, E., Viganola, D., Pfeiffer, T., Almenberg, J., Wilson, B., Chen, Y., ... & Dreber, A. (2019). Predicting replication outcomes in the Many Labs 2 study. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 75, 102117.

- Gioia, D.A., Corley, K.G., & Hamilton, A.L. (2013). Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research: Notes on the Gioia methodology. *Organizational research methods*, 16(1), 15-31.
- Godard, J. (2014). The psychologisation of employment relations?. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 24(1), 1-18.
- Godard, J. (2020). Psychologisation revisited. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 30(1), 84-85.
- Guest, D. E. (2011). Human resource management and performance: still searching for some answers. *Human resource management journal*, 21(1), 3-13.
- Guest, D. E. (1997). Human resource management and performance: a review and research agenda. *International journal of human resource management*, 8(3), 263-276.
- Guthrie, J. P. (2001). High-involvement work practices, turnover, and productivity: Evidence from New Zealand. *Academy of management Journal*, 44(1), 180-190.
- Hardwicke, T.E., & Ioannidis, J.P. (2018). Mapping the universe of registered reports. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2(11), 793-796.
- Head, M. L., Holman, L., Lanfear, R., Kahn, A. T., & Jennions, M. D. (2015). The extent and consequences of p-hacking in science. *PLoS Biol*, 13(3), e1002106.
- Hemp, P. (2004). Presenteeism: at work-but out of it. *Harvard Business Review*, 82(10), 49-58.

- Hubbard, E. E. (2004). *The diversity scorecard: Evaluating the impact of diversity on organizational performance*. Burlington: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Huselid, M. A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. *Academy of management journal*, 38(3), 635-672.
- John, L. K., Loewenstein, G., & Prelec, D. (2012). Measuring the prevalence of questionable research practices with incentives for truth telling. *Psychological science*, 23(5), 524-532.
- Kaufman, B. E. (2020). The real problem: The deadly combination of psychologisation, scientism, and normative promotionalism takes strategic human resource management down a 30-year dead end. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 30(1), 49-72.
- Klein, R. A., Vianello, M., Hasselman, F., Adams, B. G., Adams Jr, R. B., Alper, S., ... & Sowden, W. (2018). Many Labs 2: Investigating variation in replicability across samples and settings. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 1(4), 443-490.
- Landis, R. S., James, L. R., Lance, C. E., Pierce, C. A., & Rogelberg, S. G. (2014). When is nothing something? Editorial for the null results special issue of *Journal of Business and Psychology*. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 29(2), 163-167.
- Malik, A., Budhwar, P., & Srikanth, N. R. (2020). Gig economy, 4IR and artificial intelligence: Rethinking strategic HRM. In *Human & Technological Resource Management (HTRM): New Insights into Revolution 4.0*. Emerald Publishing Limited.

- Marchington, M., & Grugulis, I. (2000). 'Best practice' human resource management: perfect opportunity or dangerous illusion?. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 11(6), 1104-1124.
- Maxwell, S. E., Lau, M. Y., & Howard, G. S. (2015). Is psychology suffering from a replication crisis? What does “failure to replicate” really mean?. *American Psychologist*, 70(6), 487.
- Nosek, B. A., Ebersole, C. R., DeHaven, A. C., & Mellor, D. T. (2018). The preregistration revolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(11), 2600-2606.
- Nosek, B.A. and Lakens, D. (2014) Registered Reports: A method to increase the credibility of published results. *Social Psychology*. 45(3): 137-141.
- Paauwe, J., & Farndale, E. (2017). *Strategy, HRM, and performance: A contextual approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parry, E., Farndale, E., Brewster, C., & Morley, M. (2021). Balancing rigour and relevance: the case for methodological pragmatism in conducting large-scale, multi-country, comparative management studies. *British Journal of Management*. 32(2): 273-282.
- Popper, K. (1959). *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. London: Hutchinson.
- PRME. (2021). Principles for Responsible Management Education. <https://unprme.org>. [accessed 28 March 2021].

- Przybylski, A. K., & Weinstein, N. (2019). Violent video game engagement is not associated with adolescents' aggressive behaviour: evidence from a registered report. *Royal Society Open Science*, 6(2), 171474.
- Shrout, P. E., & Rodgers, J. L. (2018). Psychology, science, and knowledge construction: Broadening perspectives from the replication crisis. *Annual review of psychology*, 69, 487-510.
- Soderberg, C.K.; Errington, T.M.; Schiavone, S.R.; Bottesini, J.G.; Singleton Thorn, F.; Zazire, S. ... Nosek, B.A. (2020). Initial Evidence of Research Quality of Registered Reports Compared to the Traditional Publishing Model. <https://doi.org/10.31222/osf.io/7x9vy>.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J.M. (1997). *Grounded theory in practice*. London: Sage.
- Timming, A. R. (2010). Cross-national variation in the determinants of job satisfaction: how far do our results “travel”? *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior*, 13(4), 525-545.
- Trafimow, D. (2018). An a priori solution to the replication crisis. *Philosophical Psychology*, 31(8), 1188-1214.
- Troth, A. C., & Guest, D. E. (2020). The case for psychology in human resource management research. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 30(1), 34-48.