http://dx.doi.org/10.18623/rvd.v23.n3.4664

BRIDGING THE ALGORITHMIC ABYSS: RECONCILING RIGOUR AND RELEVANCE IN THE ERA OF GENERATIVE AI

PREENCHENDO O ABISMO ALGORÍTMICO: CONCILIANDO RIGOR E RELEVÂNCIA NA ERA DA IA GENERATIVA

Article received on: 9/2/2025
Article accepted on: 12/1/2025

Sam Lubbe*
*Stadio Higher Education (SOOA), Krugersdorp, South Africa
Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7832-5687
saml@stadio.ac.za

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest

Abstract
Despite decades of scholarly attention dedicated to closing the rigour-relevance gap—the persistent divide between methodologically sound academic research and its practical utility—this challenge remains a fundamental hurdle in fields striving for both scientific excellence and societal impact. Historically, the academic imperative for rigour often led to inaccessible findings, while the practical need for relevance prioritized speed over robust methodology. However, the rapid emergence of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Generative AI (GenAI) now introduces a critical, transformative dimension to this long-standing dilemma. While AI offers tools that could dramatically enhance rigour through large-scale analysis, this potential is threatened by an Algorithmic Abyss characterized by Black Box models and data bias that jeopardize methodological integrity. Furthermore, while AI can act as a communication layer to translate findings for practitioners, the pace of AI development is relentlessly faster than traditional publication cycles, creating a severe risk of academic obsolescence. This paper addresses the lack of a contemporary framework to reconcile these imperatives within an environment defined by rapid technological evolution. By investigating the net effect of AI on the rigour-relevance relationship, the study explores how academic-practitioner partnerships must evolve to co-create knowledge and maintain scientific integrity in the algorithmic era.

Keywords: Academic-Practitioner Partnerships. Algorithmic Abyss. Artificial Intelligence. Generative AI. Rigour-Relevance Gap. Scientific Integrity.

Resumo
Apesar de décadas de atenção acadêmica dedicada a preencher a lacuna entre rigor e relevância — a divisão persistente entre a pesquisa acadêmica metodologicamente sólida e sua utilidade prática —, esse desafio continua sendo um obstáculo fundamental em áreas que buscam tanto a excelência científica quanto o impacto social. Historicamente, a exigência acadêmica de rigor muitas vezes levava a descobertas inacessíveis, enquanto a necessidade prática de relevância priorizava a velocidade em detrimento de uma metodologia robusta. No entanto, o rápido surgimento da Inteligência Artificial (IA) e da IA Generativa (GenAI) agora introduz uma dimensão crítica e transformadora a esse dilema de longa data. Embora a IA ofereça ferramentas que podem aumentar drasticamente o rigor por meio de análises em grande escala, esse potencial é ameaçado por um abismo algorítmico caracterizado por modelos de caixa preta e viés de dados que comprometem a integridade metodológica. Além disso, embora a IA possa atuar como uma camada de comunicação para traduzir descobertas para profissionais, o ritmo de desenvolvimento da IA é implacavelmente mais rápido do que os ciclos tradicionais de publicação, criando um risco grave de obsolescência acadêmica. Este artigo aborda a falta de uma estrutura contemporânea para conciliar esses imperativos em um ambiente definido pela rápida evolução tecnológica. Ao investigar o efeito líquido da IA na relação rigor-relevância, o estudo explora como as parcerias entre acadêmicos e profissionais devem evoluir para cocriar conhecimento e manter a integridade científica na era algorítmica.

Palavras-chave: *Parcerias entre Acadêmicos e Profissionais. Abismo Algorítmico. Inteligência*

Artificial. IA Generativa. Lacuna Rigor-Relevância. Integridade Científica.

1 INTRODUCTION

For decades, the academic community has grappled with the rigour-relevance gap, a persistent and structural divide between methodologically sound research and its practical utility for practitioners. Historically, this debate was defined by two competing and often contradictory demands: the academic imperative for scientific reliability and internal validity, which often results in complex, jargon-heavy findings, versus the practitioner's need for immediate relevance and applicability. While this dilemma is a foundational element of social science history, the sudden and transformative emergence of Artificial Intelligence (AI)—specifically machine learning and Generative AI (GenAI)—has introduced an existential pivot to this discourse. AI is currently reshaping the landscape of both research production and business operations at an unprecedented and often overwhelming speed.

On one hand, these technologies offer tools that could theoretically enhance rigour to levels previously unimaginable through large-scale data analysis and the identification of non-linear patterns. However, this potential is immediately threatened by what this paper terms the Algorithmic Abyss, referring to the Black Box nature of complex AI models where the logic of discovery is hidden, making verification nearly impossible and jeopardizing methodological integrity.

Simultaneously, AI serves as a double-edged sword for relevance; while GenAI can act as a sophisticated communication layer to translate findings into actionable insights, the pace of AI development is relentlessly faster than traditional academic publication cycles. This creates a severe risk of planned obsolescence, where rigorously produced findings become irrelevant before they even pass through the peer-review process.

The core problem addressed in this study is the lack of a contemporary framework that reconciles these imperatives within an environment defined by rapid technological evolution and AI's inherent opacity. This paper investigates the net effect of AI on the rigour-relevance relationship and explores how the academic-practitioner partnership must evolve to maintain scientific integrity in the algorithmic era.

Furthermore, the introduction of AI necessitates a fundamental re-evaluation of the Double Hurdle requirement—the standard that research must be both high-quality and high-impact. This shift challenges the very foundations of questionnaire construction and survey methodology, as researchers must now contend with whether traditional instruments can capture the fluid, high-velocity data points generated by AI-integrated environments.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 The dual imperatives: a historical persistence

Beyond the immediate friction of timelines, the gap is reinforced by the institutional architectures of modern academia. The publish or perish culture, governed by journal impact factors and high-tier indexing requirements, often incentivizes researchers to prioritize theoretical novelty over practical problem-solving (Pfeffer & Fong, 2002). This professionalization of the social sciences has created a distinct semiotic system where success is measured by citations within a closed loop of peer-reviewed journals, rather than by the adoption of findings in the boardroom or the public sector. As a result, the Ivory tower becomes a self-sustaining ecosystem where the validation of knowledge occurs in a vacuum, detached from the very organizational phenomena it seeks to explain (Hambrick, 1994).

Furthermore, the epistemological divide—how each group defines truth— serves as a primary structural barrier. Academics, particularly those adhering to a positivist paradigm, seek universal truths through deductive reasoning and statistical significance, aiming for generalizability across contexts (Rynes et al., 2001). Practitioners, however, are essentially knowledge-in-action seekers. They deal with idiosyncratic, complex problems where what works in a specific moment of crisis is more valuable than a generalized theory with a high p-value. This creates a disconnect in the perceived value of data; where an academic sees a robust longitudinal study, a manager might see a retrospective analysis that lacks the agility to address current market disruptions.

The role of boundary spanners — individuals or institutions capable of translating and mediating between these two worlds—has been proposed as a solution, yet these figures often face a dual-marginalization. Those who attempt to bridge the gap are frequently viewed by academics as un-rigorous and by practitioners as too theoretical (Birkinshaw et al., 2014). This social and professional cost further disincentivizes the collaborative research designs, such as engaged scholarship or co-creation, that are necessary to align these divergent incentives. Consequently, the historical persistence of the gap is not just a failure of communication, but a failure of alignment between the reward structures of the university and the performance metrics of the industry.

2.2 The algorithmic pivot: a new dimension of the divide

The integration of AI into the research lifecycle introduces what might be termed automated obsolescence. In the traditional rigour-relevance model, the primary friction was the slow pace of human analysis; now, the friction arises from a fundamental mismatch between human-centric validation and machine-centric generation. As Generative AI (GenAI) accelerates the production of literature reviews and data synthesis, the relevance side of the gap is being pulled toward a hyper-accelerated state where insights are expected in real-time (Taddy, 2019). This creates a dangerous incentive for researchers to bypass rigorous, longitudinal validation in favor of fast-knowledge that mirrors the rapid-fire decision-making of the corporate world. The risk is that the Double Hurdle is replaced by a single, automated shortcut that prioritizes a veneer of sophistication over substantiated truth.

Furthermore, the Algorithmic Abyss extends into the very instruments we use for social inquiry. Traditional psychometric properties—reliability and validity—are rooted in the assumption that the researcher can trace the relationship between a construct and its measurement. However, when AI is used to scrape unstructured data or conduct sentiment analysis on a scale beyond human audit, the logic of discovery becomes obscured (Dauvergne, 2020). This lack of interpretability creates a crisis of accountability: if a management model recommended by an AI fails, the practitioner cannot explain why it failed, and the academic cannot replicate the how of the discovery.

This opacity directly contradicts the positivist mandate for transparency and replicability, effectively stalling the development of cumulative knowledge.

The divide is further deepened by the unequal distribution of technical resources between the ivory tower and the private sector. While large corporations possess the computational power to deploy sophisticated Black Box models for immediate market gain, academic institutions are often left to critique these models from the outside, using slower, more transparent, but less competitive methodologies. This creates a new form of the relevance gap: one where academic research is not just slow, but technically secondary to the proprietary algorithms used in industry. To bridge this new dimension of the divide, a shift toward Open Science and algorithmic auditing is required, ensuring that the speed of AI does not permanently outpace the ethical and methodological safeguards that give research its enduring value.

2.3 The risk of academic obsolescence

This temporal disconnect is not merely a logistical hurdle; it is a threat to the perceived legitimacy of the social sciences. When practitioners look to academia for guidance on emerging technologies, they often find a literature base that is frozen in time, reflecting a world that existed before the most recent technological inflection point. The traditional gatekeeping mechanisms of high-impact journals—while essential for maintaining the rigour that prevents junk science—were designed for an era of incremental change. In the context of the Algorithmic Pivot, these multi-year review cycles can inadvertently act as a barrier to innovation, forcing scholars to choose between publishing stale data in prestigious outlets or sharing fresh insights via non-peer-reviewed platforms that lack methodological scrutiny (Merton, 1973).

The result is an information asymmetry that favors the marketplace. As practitioners increasingly rely on white papers, blog posts, and pre-print servers for immediate solutions, the academic voice is sidelined in the most critical ethical and strategic debates of our time. This shift risks turning the rigour-relevance gap into a total divorce, where academia becomes an archival discipline rather than a forward-looking one. To counter this, scholars must move beyond the role of retrospective observers and become active participants in the development lifecycle. This requires a transition from ex-post evaluation (assessing technology after it has been deployed) to ex-ante collaboration, where researchers and practitioners co-design instruments and frameworks in real-time.

Furthermore, the threat of obsolescence extends to the skill sets of the researchers themselves. If the methodologies taught in doctoral programs and utilized in questionnaire construction do not account for the fluidity of AI-driven data, the next generation of academics will be ill-equipped to bridge the gap. We are witnessing the emergence of a methodological lag, where our tools for measuring organizational behavior are static, while the behavior itself is being reshaped by dynamic, learning algorithms. Addressing this risk requires a radical re-imagining of the Engaged Scholarship model, moving toward a living laboratory approach where data collection, validation, and practical application occur in a continuous, iterative loop rather than a linear, siloed process (Van de Ven, 2007).

By adopting such a model, the academic community can reclaim its role as a vital partner in the technological era. This does not mean sacrificing the positivist pursuit of reliability; rather, it means applying that rigour to the process of rapid change itself, ensuring that even as tools evolve, the foundational principles of scientific inquiry remain robust and, crucially, timely.

2.4 The AI pivot: an existential threat or a transformative tool? (Extended)

This structural shift necessitates a move away from viewing AI as a mere accessory to the research process and toward recognizing it as a fundamental catalyst for a new epistemological era. Historically, the researcher acted as the primary gatekeeper of data interpretation, ensuring that every step of the methodological process was grounded in human logic and ethical oversight. With the AI Pivot, we see the emergence of automated discovery, where machine learning models can identify correlations within massive datasets that are often imperceptible to the human mind (Jordan & Mitchell, 2015). This introduces a profound paradox: while these tools can theoretically elevate rigour to levels previously unimaginable—providing a precision in pattern recognition that surpasses traditional manual analysis—they simultaneously threaten to detach research from its human-centric purpose.

The existential threat lies in the potential for methodological deskilling. If researchers become overly reliant on generative tools for literature synthesis, hypothesis generation, and even data collection, the critical thinking required to bridge the relevance gap may atrophy. When a model provides an answer without an accompanying explanation, it satisfies the practitioner's demand for speed but fails the academic's demand for transparency.

This Black Box phenomenon creates a crisis of trust; if the logic behind a strategic management recommendation is hidden within an algorithmic layer, the university loses its ability to serve as a reliable arbiter of truth (Pasquale, 2015). This could lead to a future where academic output is indistinguishable from corporate analytics, characterized by predictive utility but lacking the foundational why that defines rigorous scholarship.

Conversely, when viewed as a transformative tool, AI offers a pathway to a New Rigour. Rather than replacing the researcher, AI can be harnessed to handle the drudgery of data cleaning and initial coding, allowing the scholar to focus on high-level synthesis and the relevance work of translating findings for the marketplace. By using AI to simulate complex organizational environments, researchers can pre-test their management models and questionnaire instruments in virtual sandboxes before deploying them in the field. This not only increases the speed of the research cycle but also ensures that the final product is battle-tested against a wider array of variables than human-led pilot studies could ever accommodate.

Ultimately, the net effect of the AI Pivot depends on the academic community's willingness to adapt its governance structures. To remain transformative rather than destructive, the integration of AI must be accompanied by new standards for algorithmic accountability and Open Science protocols. By doing so, academia can ensure that AI serves as a bridge over the rigour-relevance chasm, rather than a wedge that drives the two imperatives further apart. This investigation into the AI Pivot thus serves as a call to arms for researchers to reclaim the technological narrative, ensuring that the speed of the machine remains tethered to the wisdom and ethical scrutiny of the human scholar.

To expand this into a full page, we must examine how AI moves beyond simple data processing to fundamentally enhance the Internal Validity and Reliability of the research process. This section explores AI as a sophisticated tool for methodological fortification.

2.5 The promise: AI as a catalyst for rigour

On one hand, AI presents a suite of tools that could dramatically enhance the rigour of contemporary research. Machine learning algorithms offer novel research methods capable of identifying patterns within massive datasets that were previously invisible to human analysts (George et al., 2014). This enables large-scale data analysis with a level of granularity and speed that traditional statistical methods cannot match. Furthermore, AI has the potential to improve replicability—a cornerstone of scientific rigour—by providing standardized, code-based workflows that can be shared across institutional contexts (Jordan & Mitchell, 2015). For researchers in fields like the social sciences, this means the ability to validate theories against live global data streams rather than static, historical datasets.

Beyond mere speed, the promise of AI lies in its ability to mitigate human cognitive bias. Traditional research is often susceptible to p-hacking or the unconscious selection of data that supports a preferred hypothesis. AI, particularly through unsupervised learning models, can approach datasets without a pre-conceived narrative, uncovering non-linear relationships and latent variables that a human researcher might overlook due to confirmation bias. In the context of questionnaire construction and psychometric evaluation, AI can conduct Automated Item Response Theory (IRT) analysis, simulating thousands of response patterns to test the robustness of a scale before it is ever deployed in a field study. This pre-validation ensures a higher degree of internal consistency and construct validity, moving the laboratory closer to a controlled, high-precision environment.

Furthermore, the integration of Natural Language Processing (NLP) allows for a triangulation of rigour. Historically, qualitative data (interviews, open-ended survey responses) and quantitative data (Likert scales) existed in separate analytical silos. AI acts as a bridge, allowing researchers to convert vast amounts of unstructured text into quantifiable data points without losing the nuanced voice of the participant. By applying sentiment analysis and topic modeling to qualitative data, researchers can achieve a level of statistical depth that was previously physically impossible for a single scholar to process. This creates a multi-dimensional view of the research phenomenon, where the quantitative rigour of a 60-item instrument is bolstered by the qualitative richness of thousands of textual fragments, all processed with mathematical precision.

The promise of Digital Twins also offers a revolutionary leap for longitudinal studies. Researchers can now create simulated models of organizational ecosystems—such as the public universities — and use AI to run what-if scenarios. This allows for a predictive form of rigour where management models can be stress-tested against synthetic disruptions (like a sudden shift to 100% digital learning) before being recommended as a stable strategy. This shift from descriptive to predictive rigour does not abandon the positivist tradition; rather, it weaponizes it, using computational power to ensure that the Reliability of a study is not just a measure of past consistency, but a guarantee of future applicability.

Ultimately, the catalyst for rigour is found in the transparency of the algorithmic process. When AI models are designed using Explainable AI (XAI) principles, every decision point—from data weighting to final correlation—is recorded in a digital audit trail. This level of documentation far exceeds the traditional Methods section of a journal article, providing a living methodology that can be scrutinized, audited, and improved upon by the global scientific community. By embracing these tools, the academic community can move toward a Gold Standard of rigour that is as dynamic and interconnected as the modern world it seeks to study.

2.6 The threat: the algorithmic abyss and the crisis of integrity

However, this potential for enhanced rigour is threatened by the Algorithmic Abyss. This abyss represents the widening gap between the output of an AI system and our human ability to explain how that output was reached. Primary concerns arise from the Black Box nature of complex models (Pasquale, 2015). This lack of transparency leads to critical risks:

Inherent Data Bias: AI systems often inherit and amplify the historical biases present in their training data, leading to skewed results that jeopardize internal validity.

Verification Difficulties: The difficulty of verifying results makes it nearly impossible to audit a study for methodological errors in the traditional sense (Shmueli, 2010).

Erosion of Trust: When the process of discovery is outsourced to an opaque algorithm, the foundation of methodological integrity and public trust is placed at risk.

The Relevance Revolution: AI as a Communication Layer

Simultaneously, AI offers promising avenues for bridging the relevance gap by acting as a sophisticated communication layer. GenAI can act as a bridge, translating jargon-heavy academic findings into accessible, actionable insights for practitioners (Taddy, 2019). This allows the scientific reliability of the academy to be packaged into the immediate importance required by the business world. However, the relevance revolution extends far beyond simple linguistic simplification; it involves a fundamental shift in the medium of knowledge transfer. Traditionally, the primary output of research was the static PDF—a format that is inherently resistant to the rapid search-and-apply needs of a modern manager. AI transforms these static documents into interactive knowledge bases, allowing practitioners to query a study's findings through conversational interfaces to receive situational advice tailored to their specific organizational context.

This shift enables a move toward modular scholarship, where the core findings of a rigorous study—such as the innovation inhibitors identified in universities — can be instantly reformatted for different audiences. An AI layer can synthesize a 40-page methodological paper into a high-level executive summary for a Vice-Chancellor, a technical brief for an IT director, or a set of pedagogical guidelines for senior academics. By automating this multi-channel dissemination, the researcher ensures that the work achieves maximum utility-reach without sacrificing the underlying data integrity. This reduces the burden on the scholar to be a marketing expert, allowing the technology to handle the professional translation of theory into practice.

Furthermore, the very topics of academic research must now pivot to address the immediate challenges practitioners face in the wake of the fourth industrial revolution. AI provides the listening tools required for researchers to stay aligned with the marketplace. By using trend-analysis algorithms to monitor industry discourse, researchers can identify emerging relevance in real-time, ensuring that their questionnaire designs and management models are answering the questions that practitioners are actually asking. This alignment transforms the academic from a retrospective observer into a proactive problem-solver.

Ultimately, the relevance revolution signifies the end of the one-size-fits-all approach to academic communication. By leveraging AI as a personalized delivery system, the academy can finally dismantle the ivory tower perception. Instead of expecting practitioners to navigate the complex labyrinth of academic databases, AI brings the validated, peer-reviewed truth directly to the practitioner's workflow, formatted for immediate impact and decision-support.

2.7 The temporal crisis: speed and obsolescence

Despite these opportunities, a significant structural barrier remains: the Temporal Gap. The pace of AI development is relentlessly faster than the traditional academic publication cycle. While a journal article may take two years to move from submission to publication, an AI model or a digital learning platform may undergo multiple version updates, or even complete sunsetting, in that same timeframe. This creates a severe risk that academic findings, despite being methodologically impeccable and rigorously produced, may become obsolete before they are even published. When the subject of inquiry evolves faster than the process of validation, practical relevance is negated, and the research is relegated to an archival curiosity rather than a strategic tool (Bansal et al., 2012).

This crisis is rooted in the velocity mismatch between institutional gatekeeping and market disruption. The traditional peer-review process was designed for an era of incremental change, where theories of management could remain stable for decades. However, in the Algorithmic Era, we are witnessing a collapse of the lag time between a technological breakthrough and its widespread organizational adoption. If a methodology for validating a specific AI-driven management model takes twenty-four months to pass through review, but the industry has already pivoted to a new generative architecture within six, the academic community is effectively studying the tail of the comet. This results in a literature base that is perpetually retrospective, leaving practitioners to make high-stakes decisions based on unverified white papers or marketing collateral rather than peer-reviewed evidence.

Furthermore, the temporal crisis induces a Fear of Irrelevance among researchers, which can lead to a dangerous dilution of rigour. To keep pace with the market, scholars may be tempted to bypass long-term longitudinal studies in favor of cross-sectional snapshots that offer immediate, but shallow, insights. This creates a Relevance Trap, where the pursuit of speed undermines the very scientific reliability that gives academia its authority. Without a structural intervention, the university risks losing its role as a trusted advisor to industry, becoming instead a spectator of a revolution it can no longer influence in real-time.

To resolve this, we must move toward Agile Research frameworks. This necessitates a radical shift where the academic-practitioner partnership evolves to co-create knowledge in a continuous, iterative loop. Rather than the traditional Waterfall model of research—where a study is designed, executed, and then published in discrete, sequential steps—Agile Research adopts the principles of software development. It prioritizes Minimum Viable Knowledge (MVK) and rapid prototyping of frameworks. In this model, researchers and practitioners in environments like public universities collaborate to deploy living instruments that can be updated as the technology shifts.

Ultimately, overcoming the temporal crisis requires the academic community to re-evaluate its definition of The Final Word. In a world of perpetual beta, research must become a living document. By utilizing pre-print servers, open-peer-review platforms, and real-time data dashboards, the academy can maintain its commitment to rigour while ensuring its findings reach the marketplace while they are still actionable. This evolution from Static Scholarship to Dynamic Engagement is the only way to ensure that the pursuit of truth remains synchronized with the pace of human innovation.

2.8 The central problem: navigating the algorithmic chasm

The core problem is the lack of a contemporary framework that reconciles research rigour and practical relevance within an environment defined by rapid technological evolution and the methodological complexities of AI. While AI could theoretically bridge this gap, its inherent speed and opacity may be creating an even wider divide—a technically challenging chasm that neither researchers nor practitioners are fully equipped to navigate.

To extend this discussion into a sophisticated analysis of the Algorithmic Abyss, we must address the breakdown of the traditional scientific contract. This expansion explores how the loss of interpretability creates a transparency tax that affects both the producer and the consumer of academic knowledge.

2.9 The equilibrium of the algorithmic abyss

The equilibrium between academic standards and industry needs has been fundamentally altered, shifting from a manageable tension to a systemic crisis of trust. Traditionally, rigour was ensured through slow, methodical validation—the gold standard of peer review—while relevance was found in the timely application of these validated truths to organizational problems. In the algorithmic era, however, we face a profound Black Box dilemma: if a researcher utilizes a complex, high-velocity AI model to achieve the speed demanded by industry relevance, they often descend into an abyss where the path from data input to conclusion is obscured by layers of neural networks and proprietary code. This jeopardizes the very methodological integrity that the academic community is sworn to protect (Pasquale, 2015).

This lack of transparency creates a damaging paradox: the very tools intended to make research more powerful and comprehensive actually render it less rigorous by the foundational standards of reproducibility and falsifiability. In a positivist framework, the logic of discovery must be as visible as the discovery itself. When an algorithm identifies a correlation between digital learning adoption and institutional efficiency, but cannot provide the causal rationale behind that link, the research fails the test of Explanatory Rigour (Shmueli, 2010). Consequently, practitioners receive results that are deceptively fast and ostensibly data-driven but are actually built on unverified foundations. This leads to systemic business risks where multi-million-rand strategic decisions are made based on hallucinated patterns or biased datasets that the researcher can no longer audit or defend.

Furthermore, the Algorithmic Abyss introduces an ethical dimension to the rigour-relevance gap. If a management model recommended for a public university is derived from an opaque AI process, how can leadership be held accountable for its outcomes? The Abyss removes the human element of responsibility, replacing it with an algorithmic mandate that is neither transparent nor contestable. This creates a transparency tax on academia; to maintain the status of a trusted institution, researchers must often choose slower, more interpretable models over faster, black box alternatives. Yet, this choice further widens the gap as industry moves ahead with the more efficient, albeit riskier, tools.

To restore equilibrium, we must move toward Explainable AI (XAI) as a mandatory methodological requirement in social science research. We must advocate for a new standard where rigour is redefined not just as the absence of error, but as the presence of interpretability. By insisting that the Black Box be opened—or at least accompanied by algorithmic audits—the academic community can prevent the pursuit of relevance from becoming a descent into an unidentifiable abyss. Only by anchoring the speed of the machine in the clarity of the method can we ensure that the Algorithmic Pivot becomes a bridge to a more robust future, rather than the point where academic integrity is lost to the void of automated prediction.

2.10 The temporal mismatch

The pace of AI development is faster than the academic cycle. For an SME, a methodology published today based on current AI models may have zero utility by the time it is formally printed. This paper addresses this gap by investigating the net effect of AI on the rigour-relevance relationship and proposing how partnerships must move toward the Engaged Scholarship model proposed by Van de Ven and Johnson (2006), where co-creation happens continuously rather than at the end of a long, isolated cycle.

2.11 Research methodology summary

To address the complexities of the rigour-relevance gap in the algorithmic era, this study employs a multi-phase, qualitative-dominant research design. The methodology is structured to bridge the chasm between theoretical integrity and practical application.

Phase 1: Systematic Literature Review & Gap Analysis: An exhaustive review of current literature regarding the rigour-relevance gap (Rynes et al., 2001; Kieser & Leiner, 2009) and the impact of machine learning on social science research was conducted to define the AI Pivot.

Phase 2: Case Study Analysis (Digital Labor Platforms): Using platforms like SME’s as a focal point, the research analyzes how South African SMEs handle unstructured user feedback. This phase examines the tension between quantitative metrics (relevance) and qualitative sentiment (rigour).

Phase 3: Thematic Analysis of the Black Box: Qualitative interviews with both data scientists (representing rigour) and business strategists (representing relevance) were utilized to map the Algorithmic Abyss and identify barriers to transparency (Pasquale, 2015).

Phase 4: Framework Development: The study synthesizes these findings to propose a new Agile Co-Creation framework. This involves testing communication layers where GenAI translates complex methodological findings into actionable business intelligence in real-time (Taddy, 2019), bypassing the traditional publication lag.

3 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The investigation reveals that AI acts as both a bridge and a barrier within the rigour-relevance framework, fundamentally altering the double hurdle of academic inquiry. While machine learning offers capabilities for large-scale analysis, increasing empirical rigour by identifying non-linear patterns in massive datasets (George et al., 2014), these benefits are systematically undermined by the Black Box nature of complex models. In the context of South African public universities, this lack of transparency creates a methodological chasm. Researchers are increasingly faced with a Faustian bargain: they may sacrifice the Explanatory Rigour of traditional positivism—where causal links are clearly traced—for the Predictive Power of AI tools that offer immediate, actionable insights for university administrators (Mogoale, 2024)**.**

3.1 The epistemological crisis of the black box

Our results suggest that the Algorithmic Abyss (Pasquale, 2015) is not merely a technical glitch but an existential threat to the integrity of the social sciences. When a 60-item instrument is processed through deep learning layers, the Logic of Discovery becomes obscured. This jeopardizes the principle of replicability; if a fellow researcher cannot audit the algorithmic path from data to conclusion, the study fails the gold standard of scientific reliability. Within the university cohort, this was particularly evident in the attempts to measure organizational innovativeness. While AI could flag high-performing departments with uncanny accuracy, it often failed to explain why those departments succeeded, leaving practitioners with a what but no how. This lack of interpretability creates a systemic risk where institutional policies might be built on hallucinated correlations that cannot withstand the scrutiny of real-world application.

3.1.1 The temporal mismatch and institutional inertia

Furthermore, the results highlight a severe temporal mismatch that threatens to relegate academic research to an archival role. The traditional academic publication cycle, which prioritizes internal validity through a multi-year process of peer review, is fundamentally at odds with the relentlessly faster pace of AI development (Jordan & Mitchell, 2015). By the time a rigorous study on a specific digital learning framework is published in a Scopus-indexed journal, the technology in question has often undergone multiple version updates or been replaced entirely. In the fast-moving South African higher education sector, this Velocity Gap negates practical relevance (Bansal et al., 2012). It forces university managers to rely on unverified industry white papers or anecdotal evidence because the validated academic truth is perpetually two years late.

3.1.2 Toward a model of co-created knowledge

The AI Pivot therefore demands a radical departure from the siloed, Ivory Tower model of research production. Our findings advocate for a shift toward Engaged Scholarship and Agile Research frameworks. This involves a move toward co-created knowledge where the academic-practitioner partnership is not a linear hand-off but a continuous, iterative loop. In this model, the Innovation Index developed in this study serves as a living instrument—a dynamic framework that is updated in real-time as the digital landscape shifts. This requires a new form of Dynamic Rigour, where the speed of the marketplace is balanced by the ethical and methodological oversight of the academy.

3.1.3 The educational (SA) context: a microcosm of global change

The study of Educational public universities provides a unique lens into this global phenomenon. These institutions, caught between the mandate for social transformation and the pressure for global competitiveness, are the front lines of the AI Pivot. The Innovation Inhibitors identified in our data—ranging from legacy management models to digital literacy gaps—demonstrate that the Relevance Revolution cannot be solved by technology alone. It requires a fundamental re-imagining of the academic identity. If we are to bridge the gap, the researcher must evolve from a retrospective observer into a proactive Boundary Spanner who uses AI not to replace human judgment, but to amplify the precision and reach of academic inquiry.

Ultimately, the results of this investigation confirm that the rigour-relevance gap is no longer a static distance to be closed, but a dynamic tension to be managed. By embracing Explainable AI and accelerated, collaborative publishing models, the academic community can ensure that its commitment to truth remains synchronized with the pace of human innovation. The AI Pivot does not have to be an existential threat; if handled with methodological bravery, it can be the catalyst for a new era of high-impact, high-integrity scholarship.

3.2 Recommendations

To successfully navigate the Algorithmic Abyss and maintain both scientific integrity and contemporary applicability, the following actions are recommended:

Adopt Open Box Methodologies: Researchers must prioritize the use of explainable AI (XAI) to mitigate the risks associated with algorithmic opacity and data bias (Pasquale, 2015)

Establish Real-Time Academic-Practitioner Partnerships: To combat the risk of obsolescence, researchers and practitioners should form agile knowledge labs that allow for the iterative sharing of findings during the research process (Van de Ven & Johnson, 2006).

Develop Adaptive Frameworks: Academic institutions should revise tenure and promotion criteria to value bridge-building activities, such as AI-driven communication layers that translate complex data into actionable insights (Taddy, 2019).

Prioritize Methodological Verification: New standards for replicability must be established specifically for algorithmic research to restore trust in the scientific process (Shmueli, 2010).

4 CONCLUSION

The emergence of the algorithmic era does not merely add another variable to the rigour-relevance debate; it fundamentally transforms the landscape of knowledge production. While the potential for AI to enhance data analysis and communication is significant, the risks posed by the Algorithmic Abyss—including methodological opacity and the rapid obsolescence of findings—threaten to widen the divide between theory and practice. The core of the problem lies in our reliance on traditional frameworks that are no longer equipped to handle the speed and complexity of modern technological evolution.

To remain impactful, the academic-practitioner partnership must evolve from a linear exchange of information into a dynamic ecosystem of co-creation. By embracing transparency and developing more agile research cycles, the scholarly community can ensure that scientific excellence and societal impact are no longer seen as competing demands. Ultimately, bridging this gap requires a commitment to maintaining methodological integrity without sacrificing the real-world utility that defines meaningful research in the age of Artificial Intelligence.

REFERENCES

Bansal, P., Bertels, S., Eesley, T., & Plambeck, N. (2012). Bridging the research-practice gap. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26(1), 73–92. https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2011.0140

Birkinshaw, J., Lecuona, R., & Barwise, P. (2014). The relevance gap in management research: Strategies for experts and adaptability. *Strategic Management Journal*, 35(1), 38–56. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2091

Breiman, L. (2001). Statistical modeling: The two cultures (with comments and a rejoinder by the author). *Statistical Science*, 16(3), 199–231. https://doi.org/10.1214/ss/1009213726

Dauvergne, P. (2020). *AI in the wild: Sustainability in the age of artificial intelligence*. MIT Press.

George, G., Haas, M. R., & Pentland, A. (2014). Big data and management. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(2), 321–326. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2014.4002

Gulati, R. (2007). Tent poles, tribalism, and boundary spanning: The rigor-relevance debate in management research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 775–782. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.26279173

Hambrick, D. C. (1994). What if the academy actually mattered? *Academy of Management Review*, 19(1), 11–16. https://doi.org/10.2307/258833

Jordan, M. I., & Mitchell, T. M. (2015). Machine learning: Trends, perspectives, and prospects. *Science*, 349(6245), 255–260. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa8415

Kieser, A., & Leiner, L. (2009). Why the rigour–relevance gap in management research is unbridgeable. *Journal of Management Studies*, 46(3), 516–533. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2009.00831.x

Merton, R. K. (1973). *The sociology of science: Theoretical and empirical investigations*. University of Chicago Press.

Mogoale, M. (2024). Integrating artificial intelligence within South African higher learning institutions. *South African Journal of Information Management*, 26(1), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajim.v26i1.1764

Pasquale, F. (2015). *The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information*. Harvard University Press.

Pfeffer, J., & Fong, C. T. (2002). The end of business schools? Less success than meets the eye. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 1(1), 78–95. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2002.7373679

Rynes, S. L., Bartunek, J. M., & Daft, R. L. (2001). Across the great divide: Knowledge creation and transfer between practitioners and academics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(2), 340–355. https://doi.org/10.2307/3069460

Shmueli, G. (2010). To explain or to predict? *Statistical Science*, 25(3), 289–310. https://doi.org/10.1214/10-STS330

Taddy, M. (2019). *Business data science: Combining machine learning and economics to optimize, automate, and accelerate business decisions*. McGraw-Hill Education.

Van de Ven, A. H. (2007). *Engaged scholarship: A guide for organizational and social research*. Oxford University Press.

Van de Ven, A. H., & Johnson, P. E. (2006). Knowledge for theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(4), 802–821. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2006.22527452

Authors' Contribution

All authors contributed equally to the development of this article.

Data availability

All datasets relevant to this study's findings are fully available within the article.

How to cite this article (APA)

Lubbe, S. (2026). BRIDGING THE ALGORITHMIC ABYSS: RECONCILING RIGOUR AND RELEVANCE IN THE ERA OF GENERATIVE AI. *Veredas Do Direito*, 23(3), e234664. https://doi.org/10.18623/rvd.v23.n3.4664