11/14/2017

Measuring and Achieving Scholarly Impact

A Report from the Academy of Management's Practice Theme Committee

By

Usha C. V. Haley, Product Champion

Melanie C. Page

Tyrone S. Pitsis

José Luis Rivas

Kuo Frank Yu

Correspondence: Usha Haley, Professor of Management, West Virginia University, College of Business & Economics, PO Box 6025, 1601 University Ave., Morgantown, WV 26506-6025, Phone: 1-304-293-7948, Email: usha.haley@mail.wvu.edu

The authors thank Gayle Baugh, Pamela Barr, and Peter Bamberger, sequential liaisons from the AOM's Board of Governors to the Practice Theme Committee, and Lucy Leety-Wheeler, the AOM's Governance Coordinator, for their feedback, comments, advice, and help.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

The narrative contestation over the demonstration, valuation, and assessment of scholarly impact, coupled with growing concerns over diminished relevance of management scholarship to practice, has assumed great importance and relevance for all the Academy of Management's (AOM's) members. The Practice Theme Committee (PTC) proposed an AOM Strategic Doing project to achieve the following outcomes under the strategic intent of Professional Impact: 1) engaging our colleagues and relevant stakeholders in reflexive consideration and conversation about the meaning and sensemaking of scholarly impact and for whom, followed by conversation that broadens current measurements of impact beyond articles, citations, or media mentions; 2) drawing on the findings of an all-Academy survey and knowledge-dissemination workshops to identify resources in which the AOM may invest to address members' research, teaching, and training needs to achieve scholarly impact. Simply stated, this project aims to provide the AOM's leadership and members with both a mirror and window to comprehend better the complex, pluralistic nature of scholarly impact, including how the AOM's direct stakeholders (members) and indirect stakeholders (e.g., governments, university administrators, managers, and policymakers) value and comprehend this impact. We hope that through the knowledge this project has produced, the AOM will move to the global forefront of understanding and driving responses to the impact agenda.

The project consisted of two interrelated parts: a qualitative study and quantitative survey on scholarly impact, and their meaning to the AOM's various constituencies. Specifically, our findings deal with how the AOM's membership defines and measures scholarly impact and identifies key external constituencies. In this fashion, we hope to achieve a clearer, more comprehensive and less contaminated definition of scholarly impact than any currently available, with implications for the field's future development.

As an All-Academy Committee, the PTC is charged to "raise the visibility of management practice as an important professional focus within the Academy of Management" and to "encourage the Academy to become exposed to and provide exposure for application-oriented professional-development opportunities." With this report, we suggest ways that the AOM's scholars, academic institutions and regulatory bodies can measure the impact of research in societal context; we also hope to identify avenues for more practice-relevant scholarship that would enhance research, put knowledge into action, and achieve scholarly impact. The project

highlights our field's broader role and social mission, including its place in the ecosystem of economic, political, and social ideas and actions.

We define scholarly impact as an "auditable or recordable occasion of influence" arising out of research. Charting academics' and researchers' influence in ways other than peer-reviewed publications becomes much more difficult and requires significant investments of time and effort. Indeed, despite a flurry of articles on the subject, scant data exist on what the AOM's members regard as scholarly impact and how they should measure it. Yet, between a third and two-fifths of all research originates from the social sciences, and external stakeholders have insisted ever more strongly that scholars need to conduct more research that matters to practice. Though scientific merit such as rigor continues to play a role, academic quality, and its twin, academic productivity, no longer appear to constitute sufficient factors. This report provides measures that the AOM, business schools, regulatory bodies, and other interested constituencies may use to develop more valid and reliable measures of scholarly impact.

We adopted a preliminary, qualitative approach to understanding scholarly impact before engaging with any larger scale, quantitative study: We assumed that a more grounded understanding of the meaning of scholarly impact would enhance the value of a quantitative, survey approach. Specifically, we began through open-ended, in-depth interviews with 30 of the AOM's members. **Table 1** identifies the project's team members who contributed to developing this qualitative understanding. The team includes seven Fellows of the Academy of Management (AOM) (Professors Cary Cooper, Thomas Cummings, William Guth, Ian Mitroff, Karlene Roberts, Howard Thomas, and Anne Tsui), two former Presidents of the AOM (Professors Thomas Cummings and Anne Tsui), the founding chair of the Business Policy and Strategy (BPS) division (Professor Guth), a founder of Organizations and the Natural Environment (ONE) (Professor Mitroff), and former chairs of the Management Education Development (MED) division (Professor Cooper), Research Methods (RM) division (Professor Boje), Managerial and Organizational Cognition (MOC) division (Professor Ashkanasy) and Management Consulting (MC) division (Professor Bonnet). Team members have published in and edited the major academically oriented Management journals including *Academy of Management Review, Academy of Management Journal, Administrative Science Quarterly, Strategic Management Journal, Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *Organization Science*, *Management Science*, *Organization Studies*, *Journal of International Business Studies*, *Journal of Management Studies, Journal of Organizational Behavior,* and *Journal of*

Applied Psychology. Team members have also published in practitioner-related outlets such as the *Harvard Business Review* and *California Management Review*, have written op-eds and scholarly as well as best-selling books, and have had wide reach beyond academics through their research.

Though proposed by the Practice Theme Committee (PTC), the project's team spans the AOM's myriad divisions and interest groups, including but not limited to: BPS, Critical Management Studies (CMS), Entrepreneurship (ENT), Human Resources (HR), International Management (IM), MOC, Management Consulting (MC), MED, Management Spirituality and Religion (MSR), Organization Development and Change (ODC), Organization and Management Theory (OMT), Organizational Behavior (OB), ONE, RM, and Social Issues in Management (SIM). The teams cover all the AOM's geographic regions of membership (including North America, Asia, South America, Australia/NZ, UK/Europe, and Africa) and include several members with senior administrative experience in these regions.

The qualitative study and subsequent all-Academy survey explored how the AOM's various constituencies (including faculty, administrators, and regulators) view measures of external impact. Simple counting rarely provides useful information; instead, understanding which people within which networks are driving conversations can give insights on reaching target audiences. These data can also help to identify differing signals of impact or combinations of interests -- for example, to niche research communities or to reach wider publics. We also ascertained the independence of different measures through statistical approaches. In this qualitative part, to identify the stakeholders on which management scholars might want to have an impact and the types of influence desired, we built on the preliminary conceptual approach that the AOM Board of Governors' Professional Impact Strategic Committee developed in 2014-2015. We used this qualitative understanding and the teams' narratives of scholarly impact to build a survey that we distributed to the AOM's members.

The next section provides an overview of the survey's main results. The ensuing section discusses some of the qualitative and quantitative analyses that we undertook. Institutions, history, and past strategic investments influence concerns about scholarly impact, and these characteristics differ across the major regions from which the AOM draws its membership. Our results show that despite many similarities, members defined several aspects of scholarly impact differently across geographic regions; consequently, a single framework may not apply

globally. The final section presents recommendations to the AOM and business schools for measuring and achieving scholarly impact. **Appendix 1** presents the electronic survey that we distributed to a random sample of the AOM's members. **Appendix 2** provides some regional analysis of differences and similarities in the results for North America, Latin America, Africa/Middle East, Asia, Europe, and Oceania.

II. Overview of Survey Results

The survey went through two reviews at the level of the Board of Governors and had a response rate of 19% (700 responses out of 3750 surveys sent). This section covers demographics, audiences for research, scholarly indicators of impact, scholars' impact on practice, scholars' impact on government policy, impact of inter-disciplinary research, institutional support for scholarly impact, perceived validity of journal rankings and journal lists, and the influence of Management research.

1. Demographics: The results show that respondents came from all 15 ranks in academia that we had identified, with the top five as:

- Assistant Professor (US)/Lecturer (UK) 21%
- Associate Professor (US)/Senior Lecturer (UK) 19%
- PhD/Graduate Student 19%
- Full Professor (US)/Reader (UK) 15%
- Chaired Full Professor (US)/Professor (UK) 10%

The geographic breakdown of the sample spanned all 10 identified regions with the top five as:

- North America 57%
- EU and UK 27%
- Asia 8%
- Oceania 4%
- South America 1%

Because of the sparse number of respondents from some areas, for regional statistical analyses, we collapsed some of the data into regional groupings based on historical and

geographic ties. Specifically: (1) Central America/South America/Caribbean–12 (1+10+1); (2) Africa/Middle East–15 (3+12); (3) Eastern Europe/EU/UK -193 (6+187); (4) Asia–55; (5) Oceania–29; (6) North America – 394

2. Audiences for Research: The average of the importance of 12 audiences for academic research on a five-point scale from Very Unimportant to Very Important, ranged from a low of 3.29 (lower management and non-managerial employees in companies) to a high of 4.48 (other academics in Management). The average of the top-five audiences for academic research were:

- Other academics in Management 4.48
- Top management and decision makers in companies 4.26
- Government and policymakers 4.08
- Other academics in the Social Sciences 4.06
- Students 4.0

3. Scholarly Indicators of Impact: The average of the importance of 24 indicators of scholarly impact on a five-point scale from Very Unimportant to Very Important, ranged from a low of 3.26 (scholarly articles in lower-ranked or unranked journals) to a high of 4.49 (scholarly articles in top-tier journals). The average of the top-five indicators of scholarly impact were:

- Scholarly articles in top-tier journals 4.49
- Scholarly citations to research 4.21
- Scholarly books 3.94
- Competitive research grants 3.93
- Articles in practitioner-oriented/industry publications 3.88

4. Scholars' Impact on Practice: The AOM's membership identified the importance for calculations of scholarly impact to include the extent to which a scholar's work has affected or changed business practices. About 54% considered impact on practice as either strongly important (31%) or intensely important (23%); only 7% of the membership viewed impact on practice as not at all important as a component of scholarly impact.

5. Scholars' Impact on Government Policy: The AOM's membership identified the importance for calculations of scholarly impact to include the extent to which a scholar's work has affected

or changed government policy. About 46% considered impact on government policy as either strongly important (27%) or intensely important (19%); only 10% of the membership viewed impact on government policy as not at all important as a component of scholarly impact.

6. Impact of Inter-Disciplinary Research: The AOM's membership identified if they viewed inter-disciplinary research that combines or draws substantially on two or more disciplines or fields of study (including but not limited to economics, psychology, political science, or sociology) as having greater scholarly impact than research that draws on only one discipline or field of study. About 59% viewed inter-disciplinary research as probably more impactful (31%) or definitely more impactful (28%) than research that draws on one discipline; only 4% of the membership viewed inter-disciplinary research as definitely not more important than research drawing on one discipline.

7. Institutional Support for Scholarly Impact: The AOM's membership identified the ways in which institutions support the pursuit of scholarly impact. Institutions were seen overwhelmingly as strongly considering publications in top-tier journals, with other activities receiving far less, if any, support. The average of the importance of 8 indicators of institutional support on a five-point scale from Very Unimportant to Very Important, ranged from a low of 2.32 (strongly considering consulting activities) to a high of 4.54 (strongly considering publications in top-tier journals). The average of the top-five indicators of institutional support for the pursuit of scholarly impact were:

- Strongly considering publications in top-tier journals 4.54
- Strongly considering scholarly citations to research 3.76
- Strongly considering the obtaining of research grants 3.64
- Strongly considering published books 3.07
- Strongly considering publications in practitioner journals 2.84

The AOM's membership also presented their views on whether the institutions at which they worked supported their own pursuit of activities that they personally believed had importance for scholarly impact. Most (47%) said sometimes. About 38% of the AOM's members said the institution supported their pursuit of activities for scholarly impact almost every time (27%) or every time (11%). About 16% of the AOM's membership indicated their institutions almost never supported (13%) or never supported (3%) their pursuit of activities that they believed were important for scholarly impact.

8. Perceived Validity of Journal Rankings and Journal Lists: The AOM's membership was asked if journal rankings or journal lists (e.g., Impact figures in Thomson Reuters' Journal Citation Reports or Financial Times 50) reflected scholarly impact. The majority of the AOM's members (60%) indicated that rankings and lists probably did not (20%), definitely did not (8%), or might or might not (32%) reflect scholarly impact. A minority (about 41%) indicated that rankings and lists definitely reflected (7%) or probably reflected (34%) scholarly impact.

9. Influence of Management Research: The AOM's membership indicated how influential they thought Management research had been. Generally, the membership thought that Management research had been somewhat influential, but the greatest influence had been on other Management academics including what they currently research and will research and teach. The average of the importance of 8 avenues for Management research's influence on a five-point scale from Very Unimportant to Very Important, ranged from a low of 2.36 (labor-management relations) to a high of 3.91 (Management theorizing). The average of the top five indicators of scholarly impact were:

- Management theorizing 3.91
- Teaching 3.63
- Future research practice 3.59
- Management policy and practice in large enterprises 2.84
- Students' career decisions 2.64

III. Data & Analysis (by Usha Haley & Melanie Page)

1. Qualitative Data & Analysis

The first stage included an internal, open-ended survey of 20 impactful and historically-influential AOM members. The respondents were members of the team identified in **Table 1**. Professor Haley subsequently conducted in-depth, semi-structured, personal interviews with 10 of these team members, including all members that the AOM's Board of Governors identified as having substantial importance regarding measuring scholarly impact. All personal interviews were conducted by phone or over Skype and interviewees verified written transcripts for accuracy of content; most interviews lasted 45 minutes to an hour. The Board of Governors chose the interviewees on the basis of their perceived impact on the field of Management through very high citations, leadership roles in the Academy (e.g., President, Division Head,

Academy Fellow), leadership roles in their institutions (e.g., Deans, Provosts), leadership roles as editors of major journals (e.g., *Academy of Management Journal*, *Strategic Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*), leadership roles in regulatory bodies (e.g., AACSB, REF), etc..

The qualitative data were coded for specific information on what could and should constitute measures of scholarly impact, as well as for suggestions for the AOM on possible avenues to increase the discipline's impact. The results show persistent themes of high concern from senior scholars regarding the measures that institutions use to gauge scholarly impact, effects on career development, Management research's value, and societal benefits. Manual and automated coding (Leximancer) revealed that the interviews fell into several broad categories as identified in **Table 2**, which also highlights key points from each interview. Most of the scholars stated that the present system of faculty evaluation and business-school rankings had led to an over-reliance on techniques, methodologies, and what journal editors may find acceptable. Some scholars identified that these developments in evaluations and rankings had led to "junk science", journals as "incestuous outlets for career-aspiring management academics", with a corresponding under-reliance on ideas, community and society, and excessive "balkanization" as Management scholars became "angels dancing on a pin head" with limited societal impact. Some scholars raised concerns about the universal applicability and acceptance abroad of deficient US faculty-evaluation standards and research approaches that diminish scholarly impact. One scholar categorized the spread of US research standards globally as amounting to "imperialism" and a form of "colonialism", with a lack of regard to context.

A. Journal Impact Factors as a Gauge of Influence: Despite their wide-spread use in faculty evaluations, 50% of the sample (5 interviewees) indicated that Impact Factors (e.g., Clarivate Analytics and Scopus), do not indicate scholarly impact, journal quality, and influence, but general acceptance. Indeed, academic and institutional reliance on impact factors has led to an overemphasis on narrowly-focused and funneled research that may interest other management academics, but not external constituencies. Forty percent of the sample (4 interviewees) did not address the issue or respond, and 10% of the sample (1 interviewee) saw Impact Factors as flawed, but important measures of scholarly impact.

B. Journal Articles & Rankings: Though acknowledging that journal rankings pervade business schools, 70% of the sample (7 interviewees) communicated that the higher-ranked the journal, the less likely that the journals' articles would be interesting or applicable to the real world.

Thirty percent of the sample (3 interviewees) saw journal rankings as playing favorable roles in business schools as they provide avenues to measure stature and to focus debate.

C. Books & Consulting/Government Reports: Books, especially monographs, provide greater depth and broader influence avenues for research; as such, 60% of the sample (6 interviewees) favored the inclusion of books in faculty evaluations of research. Thirty percent of the sample (3 interviewees) had no response on books, and 10% (1 interviewee) provided information on how books were incorporated into existing evaluations.

D. Better Measures of Scholarly Impact: One hundred percent of the sample (10 interviews) agreed that Management needed more complex measures of scholarly impact which included external constituents and practical influence on both business and government policy. However, interestingly, few agreed on what better measures would replace those in existence. Forty percent (4 interviewees) specifically mentioned the AOM's project on scholarly impact and the survey of members as a very promising start on building alternative measures to journal rankings and citations.

E. Big Problems: The overarching problems that the interviews identified included: Academic researchers focusing on journal editors' preferences to get published, rather than on impactful and meaningful research (60%, 6 interviewees); inability to incorporate non-US knowledge of practice, and relations, and not just publishable research, into the stock of Management knowledge (10%); need for greater emphasis on teaching effectiveness (10%); and, differences in Business School's and the rest of the University's purposes and focus (10%). The interviewees in Asia and Europe also saw a troubling isomorphism among measures of scholarly impact adopted by local universities and US universities, which they saw as harmful to doing impactful research, and, as ignoring local talent, history, context and strategic investments.

F. Faculty Evaluations: Sixty percent (6 interviewees) communicated that current evaluation procedures tend to push faculty to publish in a limited number of journals with little attention to influence or true impact. These interviewees also saw a need for true reform in evaluation processes to where senior faculty, administrators, and regulatory institutions nurture and develop, rather than stunt, scholarly impact. Forty percent (4 interviews) indicated that different criteria should have emphases at different stages of an academics' careers, with full professors spending significant proportions of their time cultivating external influence.

G. Recommendations for the AOM: Recommendations for the AOM ranged from highly specific actions on journals and articles in them (20%); to the opportunity for the Board of Governor's to provide strategic direction for the field (60%); to broader environmental issues including AACSB accreditation (10%). The final section (**Section IV**) outlines the complete list of recommendations.

2. Survey Data & Analysis

The Academy of Management (AOM) electronically distributed the survey we created to 3750 random members. Seven hundred respondents took the survey for a 19% response rate. [1]

A. General Findings: This subsection explores the major findings of the survey. The subsequent subsections analyze differences across ranks and by global regions. All significant results in the reports are at $p < .05$.

i. Audiences: **Table 3** presents descriptive statistics on important audiences for academic research. Overall, respondents viewed all the identified audiences as important, with *labor* and *media* on the lower end, and *top management in companies* and other *Management academics* on the high end. On the open-ended question of other important audiences for academic research, many respondents communicated that they saw the list of audiences on the survey as comprehensive and well thought out. A few suggested consulting firms, all business owners, entrepreneurs, funders, international researchers, academics outside management or social sciences, and high-school students.

ii. Indicators of Scholarly Impact: **Table 4** presents descriptive statistics on indicators of scholarly impact. Overall, respondents saw all the indicators as above neutral. The lowest indicators were *memberships on corporate boards*, *lower-tiered journal articles*, and *altmetrics*. *Top-tiered journal articles* had the highest ranking, followed by *scholarly citations*. A repeated measures

[1] Despite our best efforts, there was a typo on the scale for Qs. 5 where an ordinal-scale category was repeated twice; 3 respondents contacted us within a few hours of the survey's distribution to alert us to the problem. We immediately corrected the issue, but not before we received 147 responses. We ran 24 t-tests and χ^2 analyses to examine patterns of responses in the affected category, as well as did comparisons with other questions. We concluded that the few number of statistical differences (about 2%) were due to sampling error. Overall, we made no adjustment for experiment-wise error rate, even though we undertook quite a few analyses: this is an exploratory, first study of its kind and not a confirmatory, hypothesis-driven study. More details are available from the authors on request.

test between *top-tiered* and *lower tiered* showed that *top tiered publications* were far more important (4.49 vs. 3.26). On the open-ended question of other important indicators, respondents listed actual changes to practice, use of research in practice, dissemination in a variety of outlets, classroom use, and student success. Several expressed frustrations over the reliance on top-tiered journal articles to measure impact as evidenced in these two quotes: "Any practical impact is important as this is management – not natural sciences. The academic, theoretical discussion currently taking place in the major journals have no impact whatsoever, but nobody dares to admit that. It is like the emperor's new clothes…So my answer is that anything that is beneficial to society, people or organizations should be a measure of impact, rather than being part of the discussion in the major journals. We have been reframing practices, routines, knowledge, etc. for many years, but it has led nowhere". Similarly, a second respondent wrote: "Do we save lives? Do we help companies not die? Do we save jobs? If so these are the impacts. If not, and I suspect we don't, impact is just citation-based and self-referenced within Academia".

iii. Change in Business Practices: **Table 5** presents descriptive statistics on whether scholarly impact should include extent of changes on business practices. Respondents saw this indicator as above moderately important with a mean of 3.50 (n = 577). 23.4% of the respondents saw the effecting of change in business as intensely important for scholarly impact. Only 6.6% selected not at all important on this question.

iv. Change in Government Policy: **Table 6** presents descriptive statistics on whether scholarly impact should include extent of changes on government policy. Respondents saw this indicator as above moderately important with a mean of 3.29 (n = 577). 18.5% selected intensely important. Only 9.7% selected not at all important on this question.

v. Interdisciplinary Research: **Table 7** presents descriptive statistics on whether inter-disciplinary research has more impact than single-discipline research. Respondents indicated probably yes with a mean of 3.72 (n = 577). 27.6% of the respondents selected definitely yes on this question. Only 3.5% selected definitely not.

vi. University Support: **Table 8** presents descriptive statistics on the avenues for scholarly impact that institutions supported for tenure and promotion. The highest-rated item was by strongly considering *top-tiered journal articles* in tenure and promotion decisions (only 1.7% strongly disagreed with this statement, and 58.6% strongly agreed) followed by considering *scholarly citations* (4.3% strongly disagreed, and 24.3% strongly agreed) and *grants* (5.4% strongly

disagreed, and 20.3% strongly agreed). The lowest-rated item was through considering *consulting activities* (28.3% strongly disagreed, and 4.4% strongly agreed) or *media coverage* (17% strongly disagreed, and 2.1% strongly agreed) as part of tenure or promotion evaluations. Relatively little agreement existed on giving *monetary awards for publishing in top tiered journals* as support (26.4% strongly disagreed, and 13.3% strongly agreed). **Table 9** identifies how respondents felt about their universities supporting their pursuits of scholarly impact. The mean was 3.31 (n=570), indicating respondents felt sometimes their universities supported their efforts to pursue scholarly impact. A small number of the respondents (2.5%) stated their university never supported their efforts; 10.9% said their university always supported their efforts.

vii. Impact Figures & Journal Rankings: **Table 10** presents descriptive statistics on if respondents thought that impact figures and journal-ranking lists captured scholarly impact. Given their pervasiveness in faculty evaluations, the respondents' ambivalence appears striking.
The mean was 3.10 (n = 570), just above neutral. 8.2 % selected definitely not on this question, and 6.5% selected definitely yes.

viii. Management Research's Influence: **Table 11** presents descriptive statistics on perceptions of the influence of Management research. With means for 5 of the 8 spheres of research influence as under 3 (neutral), most of the respondents saw Management research as only slightly influential and below neutral in regard to *government policy* (mean 2.54), *management practice* (mean 2.84 for large, and 2.41 for small enterprises), *labor-management relations* (mean 2.36) and *students' career decisions* (mean 2.64). The highest-ranked spheres of influence which respondents saw as somewhat influential and above neutral included *management theorizing* (mean 3.91), *teaching* (mean 3.63), and *future research practice* (3.59).

ix. Ideal Measures of Scholarly Impact: For this open-ended question, many answers came down on the side of *using many factors together to gauge scholarly impact*, rather than a singular focus on top-tiered journal publications. For example, one respondent stated, "A-lists are meaningless"; another suggested. "A combination of publications, citations, speeches, etc. not one single measure, but a measure that acknowledges different types of research output". A

secondary theme dealt with lack of impact and influence on business, policy, and practice. As one respondent stated, “At least do no harm”.

B. Perceptions of Scholarly Impact by Rank: The respondents consisted of 145 assistant professors, 130 associate professors, 163 full or named professors, 19 deans, 5 research professors and 10 practice professors (combined in analyses), 27 adjunct professors, 131 graduate students and post-docs, 53 people in business or government, 17 unemployed, emeritus, and other. If a respondent identified in two categories, we assigned him or her to the category we assumed as the primary role. For example, if a respondent identified as a business person and also an adjunct, we assumed she or he was working full-time in a business, and teaching a class as an adjunct based on that full-time position. If a respondent identified as dean and full professor, we chose their higher-ranked position of dean. We examined by rank the importance of each avenue for scholarly impact. Our analysis showed a career-academic tendency against more-applied, practice, and teaching-related outputs of scholarly impact as opposed to business persons, doctoral students, and administrators.

Our $\chi 2$ analysis indicated as important and significant *industry publications*, *consulting*, *executive teaching*, and *practitioner-oriented books*: all showed a similar pattern in that fewer associate and full professors than expected chose the “Very Important” category and more than expected adjunct, research/practice and business/government respondents chose that category. *Executive teaching* displayed the same pattern, but applied only to associates and business/government respondents. *Practitioner-oriented books* also displayed the same pattern, but only for associates and business/government respondents (and to a lesser degree to research/practice and adjuncts).

Similar findings emerged when looking at mean score differences (by a series of one-way ANOVAs, followed by Tukey’s HSD tests if the overall F value was significant): again, differences arose by rank on *industry publications*, *consulting*, *executive teaching*, and *practitioner-oriented books*. Additional differences arose on *memberships on corporate boards*, *appearance on course lists*, *op-eds*, *scholarly books*, and *textbooks*. Tukey’s post-hoc analyses tests showed that assistant (3.82), associate (3.71) and full professors (3.73) rated *industry publications* lower than did business/government people (4.34). Similarly, assistant (3.56), associate (3.41) and full professors (3.43) rated *consulting* lower than business/government persons (4.12), and adjuncts (4.30); and, associates and fulls also rated it lower than graduate students/post-docs (3.84). Associates (3.43) and fulls (3.54) rated *executive teaching* as less

important than business/government persons (4.14). Associates (3.12) rated *memberships on corporate boards* lower than adjuncts (3.95). Assistants (3.64), associates (3.51) and fulls (3.61) rated *practitioner books* lower than business/government persons (4.31). Similarly, assistants (3.23), associates (3.45) and fulls (3.56) rated *textbooks* lower than business/government people (4.06).

Initial Tukey's tests for *appearance on course lists*, *scholarly books*, and *op-eds* revealed no significant pairwise differences; consequently, we looked for patterns in the significant mean differences for these tests by Fisher's LSD. As a less-stringent test than Tukey's, more pairwise differences end up significant in Fisher's than Tukey's, which readers should keep in mind when interpreting results. We found that deans (4.0) viewed *course lists* as more important than assistant professors (3.35) and research/practice professors (3.15); full professors (3.6) saw *appearance on course lists* as more important than assistant professors. Assistant professors (3.25) rated *op-eds* lower than graduate students/post-docs (3.5). Full professors (4.10), adjuncts (4.3), and business/government people (4.18) rated *scholarly books* higher than assistant professors (3.78). These differences probably indicate the unfavored position of *books*, *course lists*, and *op-eds* in academic evaluations for tenure.

We found no significant rank differences on importance of *top-tiered journal publications*: all groups rated this avenue as above 4.13 (above 4.4 except for other, unemployed, and emeritus categories; a cap existed at 4.5). Similarly, no group differences emerged for *lower-tiered journal publications*; all groups rated above 2.9 (with a cap at 3.6).

C. Perceptions of Scholarly Impact by Region: Our sample consisted of: 3 respondents from Africa and 12 from the Middle East (combined in analyses); 55 from Asia; 1 from Central America,10 from South America and 1 from the Caribbean (combined in analyses, noted as Latin America); 6 from Eastern Europe and 187 from the EU or UK (combined in analyses as Europe); 394 from North America (the USA and Canada); and, 29 from Oceania (including Australia and New Zealand).

i. Isomorphism: Several similarities in measuring scholarly impact existed across the regions, reinforcing the isomorphism that the qualitative data and personal interviews had indicated was happening globally. Statistical tests revealed no differences across region on the importance of any of the *audiences* for scholarly research (**Table 3** provides global, all-inclusive descriptive statistics). Similarly, no significant differences emerged across global regions in the importance of changing *business practices* (**Table 5** provides global descriptive statistics) or *government*

policy (**Table 6** provides global descriptive statistics) for scholarly impact. No significant regional differences emerged on the importance of *interdisciplinary research* (**Table 7** provides global descriptive statistics) or in feeling their *university supports them in their pursuits of scholarly activity* (**Table 9** provides global descriptive statistics).

However, significant regional differences also emerged and were generally further explored with Tukey's HSD test.

ii. Indicators of Scholarly Impact: Regional differences emerged on the importance of *lower-tiered journals*, *industry publications*, *invited keynotes*, *invited public speeches*, and *book chapters* (**Table 4** provides global descriptive statistics). For all analyses, lower scores reflect less importance. For *lower- tiered journals*: Europe scored lower than North America (3.04 vs. 3.36); for *industry publications*, Europe scored lower than North America (3.69 vs. 3.95); for *invited public speeches*, Europe (3.95) scored higher than North America (3.58) and Latin America (2.92); and, Europe scored higher than Latin America on *invited keynotes* (3.94 vs. 3.17). Thus, Europeans appear to put less importance on *lower-tiered journals* and *industry publications*, but higher importance on *invited speeches* than did North America and/or respondents from Latin America. For *book chapters*, the Tukey's HSD comparisons showed no significant regional differences; thus, we looked at this variable using Fisher's LSD analyses, and found that Europeans (3.37) were lower than Latin America (4), Africa/Middle East (4.08), and North America (3.57).

iii. Impact Figures and Journal Rankings: On the question regarding *impact figures* and *journal rankings* as reflecting scholarly impact (**Table 10** provides global descriptive statistics North Americans (3.09) and Europeans (2.94) scored significantly lower than Asians (3.68) by Tukey's HSD tests. Low scores reflect views that rankings do not reflect scholarly impact.

iv. Influence of Management Research: On the question regarding how *influential management research has been on various constituents* (**Table 11** provides global descriptive statistics), we found that by Fisher's LSD tests, for *influencing government policy*, Europe scored lower than Africa (2.55 vs. 3.08) and North America scored lower than Asia (2.46 vs. 2.76), where low scores reflect less influence.

v. University Support for Scholarly Impact: Statistical tests revealed that Universities' support in pursuing scholarly impact varied significantly by region on *monetary rewards* (**Table 8** provides global descriptive statistics). North America (2.29) was seen as less likely to give *monetary rewards* than Latin America (3.67); Europe (2.92) was less likely to give *monetary rewards* than

North America and Asia (3.64); North America scored lower than Asia; and, Oceania (3.43) was less likely to give *monetary rewards* than Latin America. On the question of considering *consulting* in promotion or tenure decisions, we found that North America (2.20) was less likely to do this than Asia (2.77). Finally, on the question of considering *research grants* in promotion or tenure decisions, Africa (3.42) and Asia (3.45) were less likely to consider these than Oceania (4.57); Europe (4.06) was more likely to consider *research grants* than Asia or North America (3.39).

Appendix 2 highlights the most important audiences and indicators of scholarly impact for North America (the United States and Canada), Latin America (Central America, South America, and the Caribbean), Africa/Middle East, Asia, Europe (Eastern Europe, the European Union, and the United Kingdom), and Oceania (including Australia and New Zealand). Overwhelmingly, regions identified *other Management academics* as the important audience for research; and, *articles in top-tier journals* as the most important indicator of scholarly impact. For more information on the analyses for these regions and others, please contact the authors.

IV. Developmental Recommendations for Scholarly Impact (by Usha Haley)

The section categorizes themes that emerged from the qualitative interviews (outlined in **Table 2**), many buttressed by survey respondents' comments. Overall, to measure and to achieve scholarly impact, this study reinforced a need to develop composite measures of scholarly impact, to reduce the excessive focus of the field on methodologies and techniques, to increase value placed on the development of ideas important to external constituencies, and to introduce more applications of theories to practice. As one scholar stated: "The Academy [of Management] can do a lot. [Support of this project] shows that the current Board is trying to fight the tradition of the *status quo*. The Academy has been so successful. Attendance at our annual meetings is the highest among any professional association. So, we have also become a victim of our own success, and there is little incentive to change. We are now criticized for our lack of relevance – and the Board sees that." Specific themes to measure and to increase scholarly impact follow.

1. Broaden Measures of Scholarly Impact

Many lauded the AOM's efforts to broaden awareness of scholarly-impact measures. As one scholar stated, "The AOM should continue to do what it seems to be doing with this project. It sounds like it is trying to broaden the meaning of impact beyond pure citations and provide

mechanisms for support of other activities... Through this project the AOM shows that it is aware of concerns and issues and is ready to examine them." Some indicated aligning scholarly-impact figures with the field's mission: ""I see this project as very encouraging. We need to look at our mission – and include the applied and professional parts. This [integration] needs to be reflected in our journals, and in [accepting] published research in books…" Others brought up publishers' practices and calculations that shape impact figures. "Maybe AOM could do something about publications and calculating impact factors. There is something obviously not going well in publishing. Once an article is published, one cannot do anything more with it, cannot distribute it freely, cannot use the data. The profit motives of the publishing industry have affected our profession and prevent us from participating freely in the scholar conversation."

2. Broaden Participation, but Reduce Balkanization

Several brought up the need to increase broad participation of ideas. As one scholar stated, "I would advise that we widen our zone of participation outside technical specialists in academic fields to people actually on the firing line. Our ideas take years to come to fruition, but if you do not participate with real people it is useless. You need partnering relationships…We have a schizophrenic system that has failed… Students leave here trying to fit into narrow little blocks to get a job. The practice is rooted in the Academy of Management placement system." Others stated, ""The areas of interest at SMS and AOM are also becoming narrower and narrower. We have balkanized interest groups... [we have become] like angels dancing on a pin head. Look at all the OB and IO interest groups. This balkanization serves as a barrier to scholarship. The impact of our research is on a very narrow segment. My recommendation to the AOM is let us not get too balkanized. There are too many Interest Groups. The AOM is too bloody large. It's like a pharma convention. It has become a meat market for younger people to sell their wares to potential employers."

3. Increase Assessment Weights for Practical Impact in Journals

Several scholars argued for shifting the AOM major journals' charge to increase the weight given to practical impact when assessing scholarly contributions. An unnatural "schizophrenia" appeared to characterize journal publications, with some dealing exclusively with methodology, and others exclusively on broader impact. One scholar stated, "It would be wonderful if AOM changed the focus of their journals to encourage people to do more meaningful research that could make a real contribution to practice and policy in business and government, and avoid the

trap of being an incestuous outlet for career-aspiring management academics… In my opinion, AMJ needs to refocus its' energies and judge articles not only on their scholarly contribution and methodology, but on the impact it makes to policy and practice. It is orientated too much to other aspiring, tenure-seeking academics rather than its' impact in the real world of policy and practice. Being able to analyze data via the most sophisticated statistical techniques should not be the primary objective of any journal; it should be what contribution it makes to business, society and policy". The scholars made several specific recommendations on journals, including:

- "I would like to see AOM journals require a major section of an article on implications for government and business policy and practice."
- AOM journals should ask: "To what problems in the social and business world does our research contribute to understanding? What is the importance of the research problem being studied? What is the substantive [rather than methodological] contribution?"
- "I would make a requirement for academic evaluation that all academic journal articles also have an accompanying 500-700 op-ed [like] essay. This essay would be written for a lay audience where the authors explain why their research matters to managers."

4. Invest in Translating Research for Dissemination

Some scholars argued for the AOM's investment in developing more innovative and institutionalized ways of translating research for further dissemination by the business press or popular media. As one scholar noted, "Our research world remains relatively insulated. We need to take a far more active approach to closing the gap between research and practice. It cannot be up to the individual researcher to do so. This seems like an important function the Academy of Management might take on." The scholar made some specific recommendations on dissemination: "The AOM needs to think about creating a portal to have an impact on teaching and practice, to reach managers...We are taking small steps – AMJ has developed a website in which researchers talk about their work, and the new Discoveries journal is using multimedia to bring their papers to life. The model might be the 'white papers' that you see on the websites of some consulting firms."

5. Initiate Consortia with other Academies

Some scholars identified overarching agencies, such as AACSB, as unfavorably influencing measures of scholarly impact through artificial journal rankings. They advocated for other

business-related consortia to shift ways in which Business Schools collectively, and not just management academics, evaluate business scholars' impact. As some scholars argued:

- "The weight of routines and material practices at the university level is significant. The Academy of Management could have an effect on how impact is defined, perhaps showing how concepts of impact can expand beyond those routines (citations, impact factors, and numbers of articles). We need to act collectively with other academic organizations in Marketing, Finance, Operations, Accounting, and others, if this is our goal, however. Something more systemic is likely required."
- "One gets tenure and promotion with high citations, relatively good teaching, and no impact on the management profession. Some people leap across and actually have some impact. But, we have no incentives as deans to encourage these people… Questions we should ask [for promotion and tenure] are: What have you done that is an interesting area of research? Where do you see this going? How do you develop as a career academic? But, we have an isomorphism of accreditation agencies which reinforce and mandate the P&T system."

6. Build Impact-Evaluation Groups

As one scholar stated, "The [quest for scholarly impact] cannot be carried out by one means alone. It has to be repeated and widespread." Specific measures may include forming overarching groups that can evaluate broader impact and honoring academics who pursue other avenues than the *status quo*. Specifically, as one scholar stated:

- "We need the right peer group to evaluate measures like op-eds and blogs. Currently, we have too few people who can do it, so you have to reach out to experts. Most academic institutions would never set that up. But, outside acceptance is important. Stephen Gould, Henry Mintzberg can do it. They are exceptions. You can find these exceptions at top schools such as HBS.. with the peer group [and confidence] to engage in fairy tales… Perhaps …intellectual shamans and others can serve as a peer group for evaluating different types of writing. It could be a subgroup of the Academy, even."
- "One [avenue to gauge external impact] is to give an award for these kinds of activities, perhaps for the best op-ed in Management."

7. Change Reward Structures

As one scholar remarked, “the incentive systems are not aligned [to do impactful scholarship]. Until you get tenure, you produce in high- quality journals. There is no incentive to do impactful research. There is no incentive to do inter-disciplinary research even after tenure.” Another reiterated: “Our evaluation systems are imperiling external impact and incentivizing the wrong behaviors.” Others highlighted the influence of tenure and promotion criteria: “People orient their work towards what gets tenure. So, in the field of Management, we tend not to research real-life problems, do not work enough with governments, and do not publish in vehicles that influence business policy and practice or government policy and practice…We do have vehicles that reach managers, but these do not count for much in the academic evaluation of an individual’s research record…How do you make an impact if your promotion is based on 4* publications which are designed for other academics rather than business or government or NGOs?” Some argued for different weights placed at different stages of academic careers: “From Assistant to Associate, I would place 100% weight on writing articles for top-ranked journals. From Associate to Full Professor a greater proportion of the evaluation, perhaps 50%, should be paid to activities that may impact practice.”

8. Provide Mentoring

Some scholars argued for new role models in academics. As one stated, “Public advocacy is important. But our advice for new scholars is on how to play the journal-ranking game, not how to make a difference. This is a big mistake.” Senior scholars could play a big role in increasing scholarly impact. Another scholar stated: “Senior people, after getting tenure, should concentrate doing and mentoring the value-added of their work on policy and practice. Our senior professors should lead the way. Stop obsessing with publishing in 4* journals. Senior professors should encourage junior faculty to publish books, write for practitioner-oriented journals, etc.. But, people do not want to muddy the water.” Another scholar argued for different strengths that senior scholars may bring in other regions of the world. “The AOM should look at seniority in a different way in the US and other countries. Senior European faculty may not be trained in American ways of publishing research, but they have good ideas. Also, these faculty have been trained in their own language, French, or whatever. They do not have the same research and writing style as in the US. Some local researchers are never translated into English. References and citations become an issue. We lose a lot.”

Table 1

Team Members of the Academy of Management's Strategic Doing Project

Team 1 – Meaning & Constituencies of Scholarly Impact - Name	Employer Affiliation (at beginning of project)
José Ernesto Amorós	ESADE Business School, Mexico
Neal Ashkanasy	University of Queensland, Australia
Frédérique Alexandre-Bailly	ESCP Europe Business School, France
David Boje	New Mexico State University
Marc Bonnet	University of Lyon, France
Cary Cooper	Manchester Business School, UK
Thomas Cummings	University of Southern California
Usha Haley	West Virginia University
Christine Quinn Trank	Vanderbilt University
Ian Mitroff	University of Southern California & University of California Berkeley
Carlos Osorio	Adolfo Ibanez School of Management, Chile
Tyrone Pitsis	Leeds University, UK
José Luis Rivas	ITAM Business School, Mexico
Karlene Roberts	University of California Berkeley
Howard Thomas	Singapore Management University, Singapore
Maria José Tonelli	Fundacao Getulio Vargas (FGV), Brazil
Anne Tsui	University of Notre Dame & Arizona State University
Kuo Frank Yu	City University Hong Kong, Hong Kong

Team 2 – Disseminating Knowledge to Non-Academics - Name	Employer Affiliation (at beginning of project)
Jyoti Bachani	St. Mary's College
Christof Backhaus	Newcastle University, UK
Melanie Cohen	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Chris Dembek	University of Melbourne, Australia
Kathryn Goldman Schuyler	Alliant International University
William Guth	New York University
Thomas Mierzwa	University of Maryland University College
Miguel Olivas-Lujan	Clarion University of Pennsylvania
Fedor Ovchinnikov	Center for Evolutionary Leadership
René Pellissier	University of the Western Cape and University of Pretoria, Africa
Isaias Ruiz	ITESM, San Luis Potosi, Mexico

Table 2. Personal Interviews on Measuring Scholarly Impact[i]

Name	Impact Factors & Citations	Journal Articles & Rankings	Books & Reports	Better Measures	Faculty Evaluations	Big Problems	Recommendations for AOM
Scholar 1 (UK)	"Thomson Reuters Impact factors are less important for me as a measure of research impact than "how has my research influenced government policy in my country or business community""?	"A major downside to our focus on 4*publications [is] they tend to be very technical, and not problem focused. They make an incremental contribution, but, in the most part, have little impact. They are far too idiosyncratic to appeal to broader audiences…Across all the Academy journals in any year, probably only 2 or 3 articles may make any real impact. These journals and their research is mostly focused on other academics."	"We do not value books, which can be used to develop ideas with real implications, and therefore have the potential for broader impact… Most importantly, books are very important for a policy and business focus and impact… One of the great contributions of books is the ability to explore a topic in depth. It is not telegraphic as so many journal articles are, where the implications for policy or practice are rarely explored… Unfortunately, books are not taken seriously	"We should be encouraging applied research, and not just 4* journal standards. Although science in the real world is far more sloppy and less controllable, the impact benefits are much greater… Being an editor of a journal is not impact. The question to be asked is how has your research affected business policy and practice or changed government policy and practice? Economics is the most successful social science when it comes to influencing policy, and we can learn a great deal from them…We have a real dilemma in the social sciences generally. We are concerned about a lack of influence on policy, yet A+ journal articles cannot be the only thing we do and value. Publications in magazines and	"People orient their work towards what gets tenure. So, in the field of Management, we tend not to research real-life problems, do not work enough with governments, and do not publish in vehicles that influence business policy and practice or government policy and practice…We do have vehicles that reach managers, but these do not count for much in the academic evaluation of an individual's research record. Even HBR would be evaluated less strongly than a 4* journal. Yet, it has the potential to influence business policy and practice… How do you make an impact if your promotion is based on 4* publications which are designed for other academics	"Our aim should be doing research that influences business policy and practice and government policy and practice. But, overwhelmingly our focus is on incremental, highly-technical research, which doesn't translate easily into impact…We do not do enough as academics to have impact…In my experience, very few academics talk to governments and change government policy…Even our practitioner journals, HBR, CMR, tend on balance to influence practice rather than policy. So,	"The US model of publishing has become very influential globally. It would be wonderful if AOM changed the focus of their journals to encourage people to do more meaningful research that could make a real contribution to practice and policy in business and government, and avoid the trap of being an incestuous outlet for career-aspiring Management academics… In my opinion, AMJ needs to refocus its energies and judge articles not only on their scholarly contribution and methodology, but on the impact it makes to policy and practice. It is orientated too much to other aspiring, tenure-seeking academics rather than its impact in the real world of policy and practice. Being able to analyse data via the

			in promotion and tenure, but their contribution is invaluable."	newspapers should count as well… If you look at our Academy articles, the implications for changing government policy or even business policy and practice is very limited, although in recent years we are developing some AOM journals that may deliver the impact agenda in the future. For real impact, we must influence policy, both governmental and in business strategy."	rather than business or government or NGOs?... Senior people after getting tenure should concentrate doing and mentoring the value-added of their work on policy and practice. Our senior professors should lead the way. Stop obsessing with publishing in 4* journals. Senior professors should encourage junior faculty to publish books, write for practitioner-oriented journals, etc. But, people do not want to muddy the water."	a 2x2 matrix can help enable good business practice, but this influence, in my view, tends to be transitory… Influencing governments is very important. We have become too focused on methodology – and not so much on is there a real-life problem that needs resolution. We should be asking: what is the best research we can do under the circumstances to influence policy or practice?"	most sophisticated statistical techniques should not be the primary objective of any journal; it should be what contribution it makes to business, society and policy… I would like to see AOM journals require a major section of an article on implications for government and business policy and practice."
Scholar 2 (USA)	"Citations, including Thomson Reuter's Impact factors, are absolutely not a measure of impact.	"Publishing in A plus journals has of course increased in importance. B-Schools have to compete on the same criteria. They bend to citation indices. They can count	"Books would win hands down for impact on practice. Almost no managers that I know read our journal articles,	"We can use proxy measures…Citations are a proxy measure but they are subject to abuse…do not measure impact on practice…	"From Assistant to Associate, I would place 100% weight on writing articles for top-ranked journals. From Associate to Full Professor a greater	"The link between scholarly research and practice is unattended to. Economists say that this is not a	"The AOM should continue to do what it seems to be doing with this project. It sounds like it is trying to broaden the meaning of impact beyond pure citations and provide

	They should be labelled for what they are – measures of citations. Labelling them as Impact is an abuse of the English language."	citations and you do not have to be too smart to do this. B-Schools are saying the better we do on citations, the better we are. I don't think too many in the market are paying attention."	but all read books that can impact management and practice…can help in the development of applied theories…can also help other academics to improve the ability of theories to predict experience."	[Appropriate] measures include not just citations but also key note speeches, expert-witness testimonies and the like. But B-Schools have locked into impact as scholarly research. Not many practitioners read our research and I do not think even many academics do."	proportion of the evaluation, perhaps 50%, should be paid to activities that may impact practice."	B-School issue. They say that there is a built-in incentive within the system for consultants and managers to read scholarly articles and to translate them. But, no one I know sees an incentive in doing this translation. So, the chasm between practice and theory building/testing is getting wider."	mechanisms for support of other activities. Other than what you are doing [Usha], and these activities [PTC], I do not see much change in AOM presentations. I do not see more practitioners showing up to listen to AOM presentations. But, through this project the AOM shows that it is aware of concerns and issues and is ready to examine them. However, real commitment to doing something [to change the *status quo*] is yet to be seen at this point."
Scholar 3 (USA)	"No [I do not think Thomson Reuters Impact figures are an adequate measure of impact]. A particular journal's impact factor is not a measure of impact… The incentive system at the university level has an impact on journals... If universities	"Individuals and universities seek to establish reputation, certainly, but use counts in top journals as the primary indicator. Universities incentivize people not to do long-term projects with potential for impact, but emphasize "do-able" incremental projects—ones with probably certain results. I don't know many people who don't know of or haven't used the term	"Books are incredibly important, yet faculty members, especially junior faculty, are discouraged from writing books. Yet, some of the richest theoretical ideas come from books. Books give a researcher room to explore	"We have impact through our students and through our teaching. That can be good and bad. There are ideas in textbooks that are sticky, but not necessarily that well supported in research, but still, our influence in the classroom matters…We influence our students through core concepts and theories that we cover [and that they later use]."	"Our evaluation systems are imperiling external impact and incentivizing the wrong behaviors. I do not believe in a system of promotion and tenure in which we've lost sight of why concepts such as academic freedom and tenure even exist. The ideal is…the purpose of higher education	"In education, we are becoming keenly aware of the impact of high-stakes measurement systems at every level. At the K-12 level the concern is that the focus on test scores may in the long run undermine the goal of creating a love of learning. I	"I have recommended that the AOM establish a website for teaching. The AOM needs to think about creating a portal to have an impact on teaching and practice, to reach managers. We find ways to talk directly about theory and research in creative ways, to make our theories accessible to students and practitioners. In this way, we make our ideas comprehensible

	want their faculty to publish in journals with high impact factors, journals need high impact factors to attract submissions. This can create incentives for journal editors to attempt to manipulate the impact factor by virtue of the types of papers they might publish, and some authors have reported pressure to cite the journal in revisions. Then to counter this perception, editors may not recommend citation of an important paper when it clearly should be. Both are perversions that do not serve development	"quick hit." That's not exactly a code term for "impact.""	new theory or explore particular contexts in complex ways. Books written for practitioner audiences can potentially have incredible impact, but I can't imagine those actually getting counted in any but the most incidental way….Textbooks remain an important part of education, particularly at the undergraduate level. Some can be slow to adopt new research, and can retain material that may no longer be useful. They also tend to downplay differences and paradigmatic diversity. Still, to the extent that a textbook creates a strong narrative, that story can influence		institutions as "conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole" (AAUP 1940). It is not clear how our numbers of articles, journal rankings, citations and other metrics used to demonstrate individual impact and university reputation quite reach this "common good" ideal. In fact, the quantification process has choked impact. It is [an] almost classic goal displacement…Even within departments, numbers of citations and the impact factor of journals in which faculty members publish are now important to promotion and tenure decisions, rather than peer faculty review of the research… For faculty evaluations we need to ask, does	see the decision by universities to use a narrow measurement of impact (citation rates, numbers of publications, and journal impact factors) as having narrowed our concept of impact and how to achieve it. At the same time, it has created other negative side effects in the broader system of teaching and research."	and even inspiring. We are taking small steps – AMJ has developed a website in which researchers talk about their work, and the new Discoveries journal is using multimedia to bring their papers to life. But our research world remains relatively insulated. We need to take a far more active approach to closing the gap between research and practice. It cannot be up to the individual researcher to do so. This seems like an important function the Academy of Management might take on. I would love to see that happen. The model might be the "white papers" that you see on the websites of some consulting firms. The Academy has done a good job of promoting certain high-profile papers to the press. I think something more permanent in the way of outreach would be terrific… The weight of routines and material practices at the university level is significant. The

	of good research."		student perspectives after they leave school, even if details might be lost. This puts a burden on textbook authors and faculty adopters, but that reality should guide their choices. The importance also asks us to hold publishers to care about the ideal of long-term impact."		the instructor bring the most recent research into the classroom? Does the instructor inspire application of theories and concepts? We tend to look at behaviors that affect student attention discrete learning outcomes, and ask students to judge satisfaction with the instructor. We need to ask has the student become more motivated to learn in the long run? Our metrics and "learning outcomes" orientation may be a factor that focuses instructors on short-term performance that is measurable at the end of a class."		Academy of Management could have an effect on how impact is defined, perhaps showing how concepts of impact can expand beyond those routines (citations, impact factors, and numbers of articles). We need to act collectively with other academic organizations in Marketing, Finance, Operations, Accounting and others if this is our goal, however. Something more systemic is likely required. "
Scholar 4 (USA)		"AACSB should get out of outcome assessment. AACSB accreditation efforts have resulted in ranking of journals which is bad and hurts the production of new ideas… New ideas are not generated in ranked journals which are unreadable. You cannot reach people		"Scholarly impact should deal with reaching real corporations and real people who need our help. Scholarly impact is not a new way of measuring error variance…All vehicles mentioned [in AOM survey] for scholarly impact are important. Teaching in EMBA	"When I evaluate professors for full, I get 3 types of packages: First, Type A with really high-level, ranked journal publications, great teaching and great service. Second, Type B packages with few journals, not well cited, but great	"AACSB outcome assessment has done to academia what has been done to doctors and nurses. Too much paperwork and everyone is obsessed with being either	"I would advise that we widen our zone of participation outside technical specialists in academic fields to people actually on the firing line. Our ideas take years to come to fruition, but if you do not participate with real people it is useless. You need partnering

		through esoteric language. ASQ started as a readable journal with lay people contributing and changed as it became more prestigious."		programs should not deal with regurgitating old familiar models – but, translating complex materials for professionals is important."	impact with books, testimonies, associations, speeches, so they made a huge impact. Type B is equally important. Third, Type C with no impact in journals or socio-economic space. This is the sad case. Type A and Type B should be equally positioned in any evaluation."	reaccredited or being sued. Students are not a key priority in any institution… In terms of targets of influence, I would rank them as: 1) corporations 2) governments 3) NGOs and government organizations 4) students and 5) lastly academics… So many things are wrong with this system. Working with real people should be the most important vehicle, and the least important should be refereed journal articles..."	relationships…We have a schizophrenic system that has failed…Public advocacy is important. But our advice for new scholars is on how to play the journal-ranking game not how to make a difference. This is a big mistake. Students leave here trying to fit into narrow little blocks to get a job. The practice is rooted in the Academy of Management placement system."
Scholar 5 (France)	"To do impactful research, one should have an eye on the relationship between the will to change things and how	"A-plus journals have increased in importance and this is both good and bad. There is an increasing isomorphism in what is published. This raises the standards of debate		"I used and argued for multiple criteria to evaluate academic research. These criteria included not just research issues. On research, I would typically look at publications, but also	"When evaluating faculty, one has to balance between senior faculty with the confidence and [established] habits of publishing and junior faculty with fresh ideas. But, in	"Scholarly society has become a bit more open, and there are many efforts for Europeans and Asians to come into the	"I am not sure about what AOM could do about the impact of business schools compared to AACSB which has views on B-school strategy. Maybe, AOM could do something about

	our actions impact reality. These issues should impact performance appraisal – not just results in terms of publications and impact factors."	and discussion. But the bad is there is not much diversity. Qualifications of what constitutes an A-plus journal has also become an issue. Publications have become a game. For example, the Journal of Business Ethics has many issues in a year, making it a reachable target and a highly-ranked journal. Ideas and community have become less important."		the ability to translate the publications for managers – the dissemination of that research. Did they have another version of the paper for a business journal for example? Did they make presentations of their ideas to professional congresses and give speeches to professionals? What are their academic networks, scientific associations and responsibility for communities? So, I look at the Quality of Publications + the Quality of Dissemination. Within the research, I look at more than just where the paper was published. What are the papers about? What position did they take? I look at the way in which the research takes in context elements. Ideas are more important than methodology. Reality is important…For impactful research, colleagues should be able to develop ideas that can be	Europe, the junior faculty have become socialized in the American way of publishing. Young scholars know how to publish. They know the tricks. In Europe, senior faculty of 50 or 60 have not been trained in the American way of publishing. The AOM should look at seniority in a different way in the US and other countries. Senior European faculty may not be trained in American ways of publishing research, but they have good ideas. Also, these faculty have been trained in their own language, French or whatever. They do not have the same research and writing style as in the US. Some local researchers are never translated into English. References and citations become an issue. We lose a lot."	game. But, it is still an American game. Some communities can get included in the American game. For example, EURAM has a call for papers modelled on the AOM, dates, peer review, pages, etc. It has taken its conference to the level of the American game. EGOS is similar… This is not easy. It is difficult to play the same relational game – who is important, who is to be cited."	publications and calculating impact factors. There is something obviously not going well in publishing. Once an article is published, one cannot do anything more with it, cannot distribute it freely, cannot use the data. The profit motives of the publishing industry have affected our profession and prevent us from participating freely in the scholar conversation… This is a very good idea to include European colleges in this AOM survey. We have a different view point as we try to keep pace."

				implemented in companies – not just methodologies. The ideas should have an impact on business life."			
Scholar 6 (Singapore)	"Rankings funnel people into a citation game. Citations are important. But, there is a real market for more applied research. But that is not as highly regarded as the top journals as they don't [translate directly] into rankings."	"Yes, A-plus journals have increased in importance. [Business School] Deans say well I need to get programs ranked… [Concentrating on A journals] is not the way to develop scholarship…Younger people are being pushed into publishing in A journals – but the [research] focus has become narrower and narrower…We measure impact by number of articles in A journals – but this is minimal impact. We must have 2000 [recent] abstracts on methodology alone…Editorial policies have stifled scholarly impact. Editorial policies are so narrow. JMS is far more eclectic than AMJ or AMR. [Scholars and editors] put a paper in a template, so intensely boring. Most of these papers are cures for insomnia."	"Books are important for scholarly impact – not textbooks which should be examined in pedagogical context. [Books] allow one to posit a new view. These books do not necessarily have to be scholarly monographs. JC Spender did that with his doctoral dissertation on industry recipes. Rumelt did so as well. Consulting reports etc. are important if they have longer time horizons as they show application."	"Scholarship is about working out the incentives to do impactful research. But, there are no incentives to do inter-disciplinary research… To measure impact, we have to go beyond citation measures and impact factors of journals. We could use several alternative measures: 1) Downloads, such as at Researchgate. Does anyone read the bloody thing? 2) We could also look at downloads and reads on SSRN. In Finance and Economics, these measures count as much as a B+/A- journal…To measure scholarly impact, we should ask: Has any of this research been published in applied journals? Have the researchers had any impact on organizations? If they provide download [statistics], who is	"One gets tenure and promotion with high citations, relatively good teaching and no impact on the management profession. Some people leap across and actually have some impact. But, we have no incentives as deans to encourage these people… Questions we should ask [for promotion and tenure] are: What have you done that is an interesting area of research? Where do you see this going? How do you develop as a career academic? But, we have an isomorphism of accreditation agencies which reinforce and mandate the P&T system."	"Some people become Deans because they get paid more. Then they become more conservative. Business schools have become less about management education and more about being a cash cow. We are illegitimate in research profiles at universities… We pursue rankings. As Rakesh Khurana indicated we are all subject to the "tyranny of the rankings". Rankings such as FT and UT Dallas push towards ROIs and [short-term] profits from research…	"The areas of interest at SMS and AOM are also becoming narrower and narrower. We have balkanized interest groups...[we have become] like angels dancing on a pin head. Look at all the OB and IO interest groups. This balkanization serves as a barrier to scholarship. The impact of our research is on a very narrow segment. My recommendation to the AOM is let us not get too balkanized. There are too many Interest Groups. The AOM is too bloody large. It's like a pharma convention. It has become a meat market for younger people to sell their wares to potential employers. The incentive systems are not aligned [to do impactful scholarship]. Until you get tenure you produce in high-

				downloading their articles? Who is citing their work? Is it just other academics? We need to ask how is the research used? Who is looking? Let us list the top 50 management thinkers: do they have impact and why?...We need to count research grants [which are more interdisciplinary]."		Outside the USA, many academics are no way close to publishing in an A journal, but they are good at management education. We need to include these indicators as well. US schools have engaged in imperialism and colonialism – this is the best way [they say] without looking at the context and culture that generates good managers. The US and the West is not the norm. We are supposed to be global educators."	quality journals. There is no incentive to do impactful research. There is no incentive to do inter-disciplinary research even after tenure. The journals are too narrow."
Scholar 7 (Australia)	"Thomson Reuters is important to ascertain scholarly impact. In Australia, we also pay attention to Scopus. [Our Univesity] Authors'	"A-plus journals have become more important, first because they establish the reputation of the school for research. Second, because you can attract faculty confident that they can publish at that level…Australia uses a much wider list than		"The focus is external in Australia. You cannot have an academic career here if you do not have an international focus. You have to travel. You have to develop and maintain an international profile…Grant money is an indication of	"Citations are the major measure of scholarly impact – for an academic it is important that other academics pay attention. But, industry contacts, industry roles and teaching should also play an important part in evaluations.		"For the AOM, they should know that for countries like Australia and New Zealand, the international impact we have is all important. A profile at the Academy is very important for an Australian academic. Some look at EGOS and European academic

	statistics is an internal measure we use… We also have the ARC-sponsored ERA (Excellence in Research in Australia) for evaluation – for management, not based on citation data…but on peer evaluation of publications. But, if you publish in a high-ranking journal, your research is evaluated more favorably… Impact factors are not ideal measurements and they can be improved. There is subjectivity. They are flawed. And, there is selectivity. I have been cited as an example of how not to do research. My	many in the US. [Our university] has dropped its own list and adopted the ABDC (Australian Business Dean's Council list) as one of our faculty chaired the committee… [Our Business School] also has an in-house star-plus list and we give $15,000 of research funding for any article published on that list. The money goes into a research fund. The usual suspects are on that list plus JOB, JAP. We also have a star list which is the other A and A-plus journals in ABDC – for that we give $6000 and $10,000 respectively for an article. [A competing] Business School gives $45,000 research funding for any article published in the FT45"		having external impact. You have two types of Australian Research Council grants – basic and applied. Basic grants are quite difficult to get, but applied grants are done with industry contacts and, once a substantial cash contribution is secured, are much easier… We may not need new measures of scholarly impact. Google Scholar is becoming more sophisticated. It's my first port of call. It helps if an academic gets a Google Scholar profile. Harzing's Publish or Perish was good too but has been seriously wounded by Google Scholar's decision not to include a discipline identifier."	…In Australia, the more senior the position, the higher the expectations of scholarly impact. For the highest level, Professor, you would be expected to have success with top-tier journals and grant-writing success… External impact is demonstrated through getting grant money and more. For Associate Professor and Professor positions you have to demonstrate extensive external impact. There are cases where faculty got promotion to the full Professor level through showing impact at the government or society level."		organizations, and others like me, at the AOM."

	opinion pieces have been cited to bolster others' opinions…But citations and impact factors are the best we have at the moment."						
Scholar 8 (USA)	"Yes, we use some of that [Thomson Reuters impact factors]. But, it is possible to have a high impact factor and not be considered an A journal. The Journal of Management with a very high impact is such an example. We do not consider it an A journal, but just under an A. We have discussed this. Historically, we do not see this as a mainstream journal."	"We debate these lists as a faculty. A lot of thought and discussion goes into it."	"We do not have a lot of books coming out of [our Business School]. But purely academic books count. Warren Bennis's book would not count and would be seen as textbook. We would count academic press books such as Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press."	"My ideal measure of scholarly impact would be some combination of citations among academics and notoriety in a larger audience. Herman Aguinis wrote an article where he looked at Google citations [mentions] as a measure of scholarly impact. But the Google citations were to the applied and not to the academic articles. So some combination of Google mentions, outer impact and academic citations would provide a [better] measure of scholarly impact."	"To get tenure, you need A publications and we have lists developed by the departments. We are looking to see if you have carved out a niche in the area. …We are discipline based, so you can publish only in Psych journals for example and get tenure in our Management department. For tenure to full, we want discipline-based and management research which is more applied. Yes, it is mostly about publications but you also have to [have the ability] to teach – we are a private school. We have lists of A journals for every department and subunit. In our department,	"We have a debate going around in schools – we look like a discipline but we are a professional school. We have worked our way into a corner and I see no good coming out of this. We forget we are a professional school… We [at the AOM] are global. Other countries are looking like us – that is the sad part. We are embedded [in a system] – a business school within a university with different purposes. We are forced to play along with	"I see this project as very encouraging. We need to look at our mission – and include the applied and professional parts. This [integration] needs to be reflected in our journals, and in [accepting] published research in books…"

					Strategy/OT and OB/Micro have 2 lists. The obvious ones are included, ASQ, AMJ, AMR, for example. We consider publications in a small list of elite journals."	that game. The medical and engineering schools do not have the same pressures. They are regulated. They do not have university [administrators] telling them what to do. Our stakeholders [on the other hand] can be anyone."	
Scholar 9 (USA)		"Some journal articles are very important… Most research [that we publish in academic journals] is hack research with simple-minded problems that have no consequence, done by simple-minded people who otherwise would not be employed, talking to similarly simple-minded people."	"Books are important."	"There is no perfect measure of impact…For better measures of scholarly impact you need a different type of thinking. I would count op-eds, letters to the editor, blogs. But, if you try to include them, you will get jealousy, condescension, put downs, etc. People will say you are "not a serious academic"… Consulting is very important… Consulting is applied research. Of course, there is hack consulting, but there is also hack research."	"For tenure, you have to abide by traditional criteria or you cannot get through the faculty…The Academy does not really value the ability and willingness to communicate to a wider public. To become a public intellectual, you generally have to endure ridicule, hostility, and jealousy. I would keep working towards becoming a public intellectual if you have the desire, but I'd stay	"To want to be a public intellectual, there has to be something in a person's history that marks them out for it. It is part of their character, their DNA. But, academics are so fearful; they are the most fearful people, so afraid of sticking out and of doing something different... Most people do not go through grad school	"We need the right peer group to evaluate measures like op-eds and blogs. Currently, we have too few people who can do it, so you have to reach out to experts. Most academic institutions would never set that up. But, outside acceptance is important. Stephen Gould, Henry Mintzberg can do it. They are exceptions. You can find these exceptions at top schools such as HBS. At Oxbridge you have the peer group [and confidence] to engage in fairy tales…One

					relatively quiet until you get tenure. Otherwise you arouse too much hatred and suspicion. To make it in the Academy you have to do so through the established processes. And, that's what most people will ever do. They will also be hostile to those who communicate to wider publics and write legibly and intelligently. If you do not follow established models, you will be spit out of the Academy…However, I would make a requirement for academic evaluation that all academic journal articles also have an accompanying 500-700 op-ed [like] essay. This essay would be written for a lay audience where the authors explain why their research matters to managers. If I founded a business school, it would be founded on that	with a mentor who has been both a public intellectual and an internationally accepted scholar. Their role models are very narrow and specialized… Everyone who has broken out has faced difficulties."	thing the AOM can do is to give an award for these kinds of activities, perhaps for the best op-ed in Management…Perhaps …intellectual shamans and others can serve as a peer group for evaluating different types of writing. It could be a subgroup of the Academy, even. These people have taken risks and broken out. The [quest for scholarly impact] cannot be carried out by one means alone. It has to be repeated and widespread."

					principle. Every bit of academic research would also have an accompanying op-ed explaining the significance of what the authors have done for a lay audience. "		
Scholar 10 (USA)	"We tend to know which are the real top journals. These are not based on the Impact Factor. Impact Factor is very artificial – it is artificially constructed from citation patterns. Top journals are more about the importance of ideas."	"A plus journals have decreased in importance for the world. No one in the business world cares about our journals or our research. Even people in the field do not seem to care. Most seem to care about is the appearance of good scholarship… I have a subjective list [of A plus journals] which includes ASQ, AMJ, JAP, and SMJ, etc., all of which have rigorously done research. But only 5 percent of the research published in these journals is interesting – the rest is model refinement rather than a better explanation of the phenomena. But, currently 90 percent deals with theory and only 10 percent with phenomena. What happened to the	"Books are important to report a large-scale project or research with multiple studies and samples. Journals take a very incremental approach to research. So much of what we see in these journals is a futile exercise of manipulating raw data with irrelevant ideas."	"Many young scholars receive the advice to follow the requirements and not worry about pursuing true science. They can do that after they receive tenure. However, by the time someone passes tenure it is too late to change their research habit or approach. We need to change the front end, not after 6-10 years of doing research that is neither science nor important. At that point, there is no reason to change…"	"I agree with [Aguinis, Shapiro, et al.] that a well-rounded portfolio approach should be taken for evaluating. Not every piece of research can be published in a top-quality journal. Research published in second-tier journals and B+ journals can also be meaningful… Any evaluation for a tenure promotion should include an actual reading of the papers and asking the referees to comment on the content and importance of the ideas. To what problems in the social and business world does our research contribute to understanding?	"Our system does not encourage good or useful science. We value expedience: Do what it takes to publish in journals. Tackle problems that are popular with journals and editors. This research does not call attention to social problems… Much [of our published research] would not fit the criteria of sound science. It does not aim at solving problems important to society and the knowledge has	"The Academy [of Management] can do a lot. [Support of this project] shows that the current Board is trying to fight the tradition of the *status quo*. The Academy has been so successful. Attendance at our annual meetings is the highest among any professional association. So, we have also become a victim of our own success, and there is little incentive to change. We are now criticized for our lack of relevance – and the Board sees that."

		phenomena we were supposed to be studying?... We assume that all articles in top journals are of the highest quality; these articles are closer to the truth and have fewer errors. The data show that these assumptions are not correct…there is not a clear standard of quality or rigor."			What is the importance of the research problem being studied? What is the substantive contribution?"	unknown reliability without estimating errors in inference, and the problem of under-determination. Most of our published work in recent years advances the personal preferences of authors or reviewers. When science does not meet the minimum criteria of integrity and epistemic values, it is considered 'junk science'."	

[i] All semi-structured interviews were conducted by Usha Haley by phone or over Skype; most interviews lasted 45 minutes to an hour. Interviewees were chosen by the Academy of Management's Board of Governors on the basis of their perceived impact on the field of Management including through very high citations, leadership roles in the Academy (e.g., President, Division Head, Academy Fellow), leadership roles in their institutions (e.g., Deans, Provosts), leadership roles as editors of major journals (e.g., *Academy of Management Journal*, *Strategic Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Learning & Education*), leadership roles in regulatory bodies (e.g., AACSB, REF), etc.

Table 3

Qs 3: Important Audiences for Academic Research

(Low 1 – High 5)

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Top management in cos.	4.26	.948
Middle management in cos.	3.82	.989
Lower management & non-managers in cos.	3.29	1.108
Management academics	4.48	.808
Social Science academics	4.06	.861
Students	4.00	.936
Media	3.53	1.007
Government & policy makers	4.08	.945
Industry assoc.	3.69	.952
NGOs	3.70	.941
Labor	3.41	1.047
Society	3.89	.976
N = 642		

Table 4

Qs. 5: Indicators of Scholarly Impact (Low 1 – High 5)

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Scholarly articles in top-tiered journals	4.49	.812
Scholarly articles in lower-tiered journals	3.26	1.005
Articles in practitioner & industry publications	3.88	.900
Media coverage of research	3.72	.913
Scholarly citations to research	4.21	.888
Search-engine mentions	3.46	1.092
Consulting	3.64	1.008
Invited Keynotes	3.78	.917
Conference presentations	3.71	.963
Direct regulatory influence	3.75	.979
Invited public speeches	3.68	.955
Executive teaching	3.70	1.022
Corporate & government board memberships	3.32	1.073
Appearance on course reading lists	3.59	.999
Academic journal editorial boards	3.85	1.028
Op-Eds, documentaries, media publications	3.47	.998
Scholarly books	3.94	.863
Practitioner-oriented books	3.72	.954
Textbooks	3.55	1.004
Book chapters	3.54	.958
Competitive research grants	3.93	.940
Article downloads	3.75	1.021
Awards & honors for research	3.82	1.024
Altmetrics	3.34	1.002
N = 582		

Table 5

Q7: Importance of Extent to which a Scholar's Work has Affected or Changed Business Practices for Calculating Scholarly Impact

	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Not at all important	6.6	6.6
Somewhat important	14.7	21.3
Moderately important	23.9	45.2
Strongly important	31.4	76.6
Intensely important	23.4	100.0
Total	100.0	
N = 577		

Table 6

Q8: Importance of Extent to which a Scholar's Work has Affected or Changed Government Policy for Calculating Scholarly Impact

	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Not at all important	9.7	9.7
Somewhat important	15.6	25.3
Moderately important	29.6	54.9
Strongly important	26.5	81.5
Intensely important	18.5	100.0
Total	100.0	
N = 577		

Table 7

Q9: Does Inter-disciplinary Research have Greater Scholarly Impact than Single-field or Single-discipline Research?

		Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Definitely not	3.5	3.5
	Probably not	7.1	10.6
	Might or might not	31.4	41.9
	Probably yes	30.5	72.4
	Definitely yes	27.6	100.0
	Total	100.0	
	N = 577		

Table 8

Q. 10: To What Extent does your University/Institute/Organization Support the Following Avenues for Tenure & Promotion (Low 1 – High 5)

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Strongly considers publications in top-tier journals	4.54	.889
Gives monetary rewards for publications in top-tier journals	2.66	1.485
Strongly considers publications in practitioner journals	2.84	1.154
Strongly considers consulting activities	2.32	1.239
Strongly considers media coverage, testimonies & outreach	2.55	1.091
Strongly considers obtaining research grants	3.64	1.151
Strongly considers scholarly citations to research	3.76	1.129
Strongly considers published books	3.07	1.168
N = 570		

Table 9

Q. 11: Does your University/Institute/Organization Support Your Pursuing Scholarly Impact?

		Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Never	2.5	2.5
	Almost never	12.6	15.1
	Sometimes	47.0	62.1
	Almost every time	27.0	89.1
	Every time	10.9	100.0
	Total	100.0	
	N = 570		

Table 10

Q. 12: Do Impact Figures or Journal Lists reflect Scholarly Impact?

		Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Definitely not	8.2	8.2
	Probably not	19.8	28.1
	Might or might not	31.9	60.0
	Probably yes	33.5	93.5
	Definitely yes	6.5	100.0
	Total	100.0	
	N = 570		

Table 11

Q. 13: Gauging the Extent of Management Research's Influence

(Low 1 – High 5)

	Mean	Std. Deviation
On government policy	2.54	.900
On management policy and practice in large enterprises in my country	2.84	.975
On management policy and practice in SMEs in my country	2.41	.993
On labor-management relations in my country	2.36	.940
On management theorizing	3.91	.974
On future research practice	3.59	1.009
On teaching	3.63	.936
On my students' career decisions	2.64	1.101
N=560		

[Please note that the web view of this survey on Survey Monkey will look different]

MEASURING SCHOLARLY IMPACT SURVEY©

Dear Academy Member,

Invitation to Participate in a Survey on the Changing Nature of Scholarly Impact

Greetings. We are writing with a request: Would you be willing to take a survey that will help the Academy of Management to understand the issues that members are facing regarding scholarly impact? We are seeking feedback from a group of randomly selected members, including you, as part of an Academy initiative in which we are evaluating how we can respond strategically to changes in the profession. Your participation is vital for ensuring that the results accurately represent the thoughts and opinions of our members around the world.

The survey deals with how scholarly impact is understood and valued by the Academy's direct and indirect stakeholders. Our plan is to use the results of the survey to improve the Academy's resources for supporting research, teaching, and engagement with practice.

Please participate in the anonymous survey by clicking on the button below:

There are a total of 14 questions, and the survey should take less than 10 minutes to complete. Please complete the survey in one sitting as partial responses will not be saved. You can only take this survey once. The survey will be active for four (4) weeks and will close at midnight (EST) on *Thursday, November 17, 2016.*

Please do not forward the survey link to anyone. Your answers are strictly confidential and anonymous. The Academy of Management reserves all rights to the survey and data, and a full report of the results will be made available to members.

For technical and general questions on the survey, please contact survey@aom.org. For substantive questions on the survey and its use, please contact Professor Usha Haley, Project Champion.
Thank you again for your valuable time and input!

Usha C. V. Haley, PhD
Project Champion, Measuring Scholarly Impact
Practice Theme Committee Co-Chair
usha.haley@mail.wvu.edu
Phone: 1-304-293-7948

Q1 Please identify your current primary job title and level. Please check as many as may apply:

- ❑ Assistant Professor (US equivalent)/Lecturer (UK equivalent)
- ❑ Associate Professor (US equivalent)/Senior Lecturer (UK equivalent)
- ❑ Full Professor (US equivalent)/Reader (UK equivalent)
- ❑ Chaired Full Professor (US equivalent)/Professor (UK equivalent)
- ❑ Professor Emeritus (any rank)
- ❑ Dean/Associate Dean
- ❑ Adjunct/Part-time/Visiting University Professor (any rank)
- ❑ Research Professor (limited or no teaching expectations)
- ❑ Practice/Teaching Professor (limited or no research expectations)
- ❑ Businessperson/Consultant
- ❑ Government Employee
- ❑ PhD/Graduate Student
- ❑ Postdoctoral Researcher
- ❑ Unemployed
- ❑ Other Academic Rank (please specifiy) _____

Q2 In which region of the world are you primarily based? Please choose one:

- ❍ Africa
- ❍ Asia
- ❍ Central America
- ❍ Eastern Europe
- ❍ European Union and the UK
- ❍ Middle East
- ❍ North America
- ❍ Oceania
- ❍ South America
- ❍ The Caribbean

Q3 Please rank each of the following audiences for academic research in terms of importance.

1 = Very Unimportant, 2 = Unimportant, 3 = Neither Important nor Unimportant, 4 = Important, 5 = Very Important.

_____ Top management and decision makers in companies
_____ Middle management in companies
_____ Lower management and non-managerial employees in companies
_____ Other academics in Management
_____ Other academics in the Social Sciences
_____ Students
_____ Media
_____ Government/policy makers
_____ Industry associations
_____ Non-governmental organizations
_____ Labor organizations
_____ Society as a whole

Q4 What other audiences, if any, would you consider important for academic research? Please write your answer below.

For the questions below, "scholarly impact" refers to an auditable or recordable occasion of influence arising out of research.

Q5 In general, please evaluate each of the following indicators of scholarly impact in terms of importance.

1 = Very Unimportant, 2 = Unimportant, 3 = Neither Important nor Unimportant, 4 = Important, 5 = Very Important.

_____ Scholarly articles in top-tier journals
_____ Scholarly articles in lower-ranked or unranked journals
_____ Articles in practitioner-oriented/industry publications
_____ Media use/coverage of research expertise
_____ Scholarly citations to research (e.g., in Web of Science, Google Scholar)
_____ Search-engine mentions (e.g., on Google, Yahoo)
_____ Consulting for business or government
_____ Invited keynote talks
_____ Presentations at academic conferences
_____ Direct regulatory influence (e.g., testimonies, legislative citations, expert witness)
_____ Invited public speeches
_____ Executive teaching
_____ Corporate or government board memberships
_____ Appearance on course reading lists
_____ Academic journals' editorial board memberships
_____ Op-eds, documentaries, media publications (e.g., in newspapers, blogs)
_____ Scholarly books
_____ Practitioner-oriented books
_____ Textbooks
_____ Book chapters
_____ Competitive research grants (e.g., NSF)
_____ Article downloads (e.g., through SSRN, publisher websites)
_____ Awards and honors for research
_____ Altmetrics (e.g., Researchgate RG scores)

Q6 What other indicators of scholarly impact do you see as important? Please write your answer below.

Q7 In your opinion, how important is it for calculations of scholarly impact to include the extent to which a scholar's work has affected or changed business practices? Choose one:

- ❍ Not at all important
- ❍ Somewhat important
- ❍ Moderately important
- ❍ Strongly important
- ❍ Intensely important

Q8 In your opinion, how important is it for calculations of scholarly impact to include the extent to which a scholar's work has affected or changed government policy? Choose one:

- ❍ Not at all important
- ❍ Somewhat important
- ❍ Moderately important
- ❍ Strongly important
- ❍ Intensely important

Q9 In your opinion, does inter-disciplinary research that combines or draws substantially on two or more disciplines or fields of study (including but not limited to economics, psychology, political science or sociology) have greater scholarly impact than research that draws on only one discipline or field of study? Choose one response:

- ❍ Definitely not
- ❍ Probably not
- ❍ Might or might not
- ❍ Probably yes
- ❍ Definitely yes

Q10 In which of the following ways does the university/institute/organization for which you work support pursuing scholarly impact? Please rank each of the following:

1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.

_____ Through strongly considering publications in top-tier journals in tenure/promotion/evaluation decisions.
_____ By giving a monetary reward for publications in top-tier journals.
_____ Through strongly considering publications in practitioner journals in tenure/promotion/evaluation decisions.
_____ Through strongly considering consulting activities in tenure/promotion/evaluation decisions.
_____ Through strongly considering media coverage/testimonies/outreach in promotion/tenure/evaluation decisions.
_____ Through strongly considering the obtaining of research grants in promotion/tenure/evaluation decisions.
_____ Through strongly considering scholarly citations to research in promotion/tenure/evaluation decisions.
_____ Through strongly considering published books in tenure/promotion/evaluation decisions.

Q11 In your opinion, does your university/institute/organization support you in your pursuit of the activities you believe are important for scholarly impact? Choose one:

- ❍ Never
- ❍ Almost never
- ❍ Sometimes
- ❍ Almost every time
- ❍ Every time

Q12 In your opinion, do journal rankings or journal lists reflect scholarly impact (e.g., Impact figures in Thomson Reuters' Journal Citation Reports or Financial Times 50)? Choose one response:

- ❍ Definitely not
- ❍ Probably not
- ❍ Might or might not
- ❍ Probably yes
- ❍ Definitely yes

Q13 In your opinion, how much influence has management research had? Please rank each of the following:

1= Not at all Influential, 2 = Slightly Influential, 3 = Somewhat Influential, 4 = Very Influential, 5 = Extremely Influential.

_____ Government policy
_____ Management policy and practice in large enterprises in my country
_____ Management policy and practice in small and medium size enterprises in my country
_____ Labor-management relations in my country
_____ Management theorizing
_____ Future research practice
_____ Teaching
_____ My students' career decisions

Q14 What do you believe an ideal measure of scholarly impact should include? Please write your answer below.

Thank you for your time! For technical and general questions on the survey, please contact survey@aom.org. For substantive questions on the survey and its use, please contact Professor Usha Haley, Project Champion and Practice Theme Committee co-Chair, at usha.haley@mail.wvu.edu or voice 1-304-293-7948.

Appendix 2: Regional Differences in Scholarly Impact

Focus on the USA & Canada (by Usha Haley)

Table 12. Audiences for Academic Research: USA & Canada
N = 360

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Top management in cos.	1	5	4.22	.988
Middle management in cos.	1	5	3.81	.995
Lower management in cos.	1	5	3.26	1.120
Management academics	1	5	4.51	.779
Social Science academics	1	5	4.06	.854
Students	1	5	3.98	.971
Media	1	5	3.51	1.001
Govt. policymakers	1	5	4.04	.965
Industry associations	1	5	3.64	.974
NGOs	1	5	3.64	.978
Labor	1	5	3.35	1.100
Society	1	5	3.80	1.008

US and Canadian survey respondents took a broad view of audiences for their research, viewing every listed audience for academic research as above neutral; additionally, *management academics*, *top management in companies*, *social-science academics*, and *government policy makers* were seen as very important audiences for academic research.

Table 13. Indicators of Scholarly Impact: USA & Canada

N = 329

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Articles in top-tier journals	1	5	4.50	.808
Articles in lower-ranked journals	1	5	3.36	.969
Articles in practitioner publications	1	5	3.95	.861
Media coverage	1	5	3.69	.925
Scholarly citations	1	5	4.21	.899
Search-engine mentions	1	5	3.38	1.115
Consulting	1	5	3.61	1.030
Keynotes	1	5	3.71	.907
Academic conference presentations	1	5	3.76	.938
Regulatory influence	1	5	3.80	.988
Invited public speeches	1	5	3.58	.960
Executive teaching	1	5	3.65	1.034
Corporate or govt boards	1	5	3.28	1.057
Course reading lists	1	5	3.60	1.007
Journal editorial boards	1	5	3.86	1.030
Op-eds	1	5	3.43	1.013
Scholarly books	1	5	4.01	.837
Practitioner books	1	5	3.78	.952
Textbooks	1	5	3.50	1.030
Book chapters	1	5	3.57	.970
Competitive research grants	1	5	3.93	.954
Article downloads	1	5	3.81	.986
Awards	1	5	3.88	1.011
Altmetrics	1	5	3.28	1.000

US and Canadian survey respondents took a broad view of indicators of scholarly impact, viewing every listed indicator as above neutral; additionally, *articles in top-tier journals*, *scholarly citations*, and *scholarly books* were seen as very important indicators of scholarly impact.

Table 14. Indicators of University Support for Scholarly Impact: USA & Canada

N = 321

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Publications in top-tier journals	1	5	4.50	.962
Monetary rewards	1	5	2.29	1.328
Publications in practitioner journals	1	5	2.84	1.159
Consulting	1	5	2.20	1.249
Media coverage	1	5	2.49	1.090
Research grants	1	5	3.39	1.173
Scholarly citations	1	5	3.79	1.066
Books	1	5	3.06	1.218

US and Canadian survey respondents indicated strong agreement on only one indicator of the university's support of scholarly impact -- that of strongly considering *publications in top-tier journals*. Other indicators either got no support or middling support. Additionally, the respondents indicated that universities only sometimes supported their own efforts to pursue scholarly impact (mean 3.36 on a scale of 1 min to 5 max). Presumably, this university support was forthcoming mostly in the respondents' pursuit of journal articles in top-tier publications. The respondents were essentially neutral (mean 3.09 on a scale of 1 min to 5 max) on impact figures and journal rankings as adequate indicators of scholarly impact; yet, universities mostly base their faculty evaluations on these figures and rankings.

Focus on Central America, South America & the Caribbean (by José Luis Rivas)

I. OVERVIEW

After Southeast Asia, Latin America is the second most important emerging region globally with an aggregated gross domestic product similar to China and three times that of India (World Bank 2008). It represents 14% of the world's land mass but only 8% of the world's population (Nicholls-Nixon, Davila Castilla, Sanchez Garcia & Rivera Pesquera, 2011).

The region has high levels of corruption and informal business activities as well as a high level of macroeconomic volatility. It offers an abundance of natural resources as well as a low level of qualified labor. Latin America has long been a world leader in socio-economic inequality which has reinforced hierarchies and thwarted efforts to promote education and investment in human capital (Schneider, 2009).

Results from the scholarly-impact survey partially reflect the arguments above; of the 698 individuals surveyed for this project only 11 (1.56%) came from this region; The number of attendees at AOM conferences from Latin American countries remains low with Brazil probably being the only outlier. Most business schools in the region are practitioner based and few of them have institutionalized research programs. Exchange-rate volatility, the shortage of research grants as well as the scarcity of senior research faculty tend to keep world-class scholars away from the region.

Let us now turn to the similarities and differences between Latin America and other world regions:

1) Key audiences:
   No significant differences here; respondents cite top managers and other academics in management as 'very important' and other academics in the social sciences, students, policy makers, industry associations, unions and NGOs as 'important'.

2) Indicators:
   Differences here are: i) Research grants were regarded as very important instead of important and ii) Board memberships were regarded as important. As in the global sample, indicators rated as very important were: top journals, and cite metrics. Rated as important we have: lower ranked journals, industry publications, media coverage of research expertise, articles in practitioner oriented publications, presentations at academic conferences, regulatory influence, executive teaching, appearances in course reading lists, editorial board memberships, scholarly and practitioner books, textbooks, book chapters, research awards and article downloads.

3) Include capacity to influence business practices:
   The difference is that most respondents rated this as moderately important instead of strongly/intensely important.

4) Include capacity to influence government policy:
   Difference is that most respondents rated this as moderately important instead of moderately/strongly important.

5) Interdisciplinary research has more impact than research drawing from one discipline:
   Similar results; most respondents answered, 'probably yes'.

6) How does your organization support scholarly impact?
   Differences are that i) Monetary rewards was rated as 'strongly agree' and ii) Practitioner journals was rated as 'agree'. Similar results for most other choices; top journals in promotion decisions as 'strongly agree' and research grants, scholarly citations and published books rated as 'agree'.

7) Does your organization support the pursuit of activities important for scholarly impact?
   Similar results; most respondents answered, 'almost every time / every time'.

8) Do journal lists reflect scholarly impact?
   Slight difference: In Latin America, most respondents (58%) answered 'probably/definitely yes'. In the global sample results for these two categories it was 38%.

9) Degree of influence that management research has had
   Difference comes from the 'teaching category'. Whereas in the global sample 42% of respondent recognized that management research has been very influential for teaching, in Latin America 75% recognize it as very influential. Other categories receive similar results; management theorizing and future research are the categories marked as 'very influential'.

   I am omitting the rest of the questions since there are no clear patterns of preference; results in Latin America are similar to those of the global survey.

II. CONTEXTUAL DATA

Latin America has two broad types of business schools; the practitioner based where most full-time faculty are former consultants /practitioners who asides from their teaching will do consulting and write business cases. The second one is the research based where most faculty have PhDs and are mostly devoted to research and teaching. Hence, I interviewed two deans that represent this typology; Rafael Gomez-Nava from IPADE and Francisco Perez-Gonzalez from ITAM. Both business schools are based in Mexico City and have high visibility within the Latin American business school rankings. Below are the main differences regarding the survey.

1) Key audiences:

Differences: Francisco (ITAM) sees policy makers as a key audience. Rafael (IPADE) favors industry associations, media and students. Both agree on top managers and other academics as additional key audiences.

2) Indicators:

Differences: Francisco rated as 'very important': presentations at academic conferences, direct regulatory influence and editorial board memberships. Rafael chose practitioner publications, keynote talks and non-academic books as additional very important indicators. Interestingly, Rafael placed academic cites in the 'important' category while Francisco chose the 'very important' one. Both agree that top journals and executive education are very important.

In terms of the capacity to influence business practices and government policy, both deans agree that these are very important objectives.

Regarding incentives for academic impact, Francisco regards as very important to consider top journal publications for promotion decisions and Rafael rates as very important economic incentives and practitioner publications. Both agree on considering book publications for promotion decisions.

When asked about an ideal measure of academic impact, Francisco mentions that flexibility is key; different faculty profiles should be able to 'fit'. Rafael would like to include in this ideal measure the voice of practitioners and alumni.

Concerning important stakeholders for academic impact in Latin America, Rafael mentioned that entrepreneurs should be regarded as an important group. Francisco mentioned the importance of government, business groups and families as important stakeholders.

Finally, when asked about recent developments that could potentially shape the measurement of academic impact in Latin America, Francisco indicated that the research component is growing in the region probably due to the interest of being accredited by international organizations. Rafael on the other hand, perceives there is a growing concern for the link between ethics /CSR and corruption due to recent bribery scandals in Brazil, Argentina and Mexico.

III. IMPLICATIONS

Business schools in Latin America seem to be slowly moving towards a more research based model but the importance of practitioners, entrepreneurs, families, government and industry associations remains crucial. Academics in the region do not have the status that they enjoy in Europe or the US. There is a popular saying in Spanish; *"someone who knows works"* and because society in this region does not understand that management research can be important for changing business practices and improving the quality of business education this lower level status of academics in the region will probably take time to evolve.

Institutional weakness and macro-economic volatility have created a vicious cycle that fuels a slow pace of change. An ideal measure of academic impact for the region should then consider practitioner and government policy maker issues /concerns.

REFERENCES

Nicholls-Nixon, C. L., Castilla, J. A. D., Garcia, J. S., & Pesquera, M. R. (2011). Latin America management research: Review, synthesis, and extension. ***Journal of Management*****,** *37*(4), 1178-1227.

Schneider, B. R. (2009). Hierarchical market economies and varieties of capitalism in Latin America. ***Journal of Latin American Studies*****,** *41*(03), 553-575.

World Bank. (2008). World development report. Washington, DC: Author

Focus on Africa/Middle East, Asia, Europe, and Oceania (by Usha Haley)

Table 15. Very Important Audiences for Research (A) & Very Important Indicators of Scholarly Impact (I) for Africa & the Middle East

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
A: Top management in companies	14	3	5	4.43	.852
A: Management academics	14	1	5	4.29	1.437
A: Social Science academics	14	1	5	4.14	1.231
A Students	14	2	5	4.14	.864
A: Govt. policymakers	14	3	5	4.50	.650
A: NGOs	14	3	5	4.07	.475
A: Society	14	3	5	4.43	.756
I: Articles in top-tier journals	12	4	5	4.83	.389
I: Articles in practitioner publications	12	3	5	4.33	.778
I: Scholarly citations	12	2	5	4.50	.905
I: Consulting	12	3	5	4.17	.937
I: Keynotes	12	1	5	4.00	1.206
I: Academic conference presentations	12	3	5	4.25	.754
I: Executive teaching	12	2	5	4.00	.953
I: Course reading lists	12	2	5	4.08	.900
I: Scholarly books	12	4	5	4.67	.492
I: Practitioner books	12	3	5	4.25	.754
I: Textbooks	12	3	5	4.33	.651
I: Book chapters	12	3	5	4.08	.669
I: Competitive research grants	12	2	5	4.25	.965
I: Article downloads	12	2	5	4.25	.866
I: Awards	12	1	5	4.00	1.206

Survey respondents from Africa and the Middle East considered several audiences (A) for scholarly research as highly important (4 and above on a 5-point scale), and several indicators of scholarly impact (I) as highly important (4 and above on a 5-point scale). These respondents indicated that *government policy makers* served as the most important audience, and *articles in top-tier journals* provided the most important indicator of scholarly impact.

Table 16. Very Important Audiences for Research (A) & Very Important Indicators of Scholarly Impact (I) for Asia

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
A: Top management in companies	50	1	5	4.50	.839
A: Middle management in companies	50	1	5	4.08	1.027
A: Management academics	50	3	5	4.50	.614
A: Social Science academics	50	1	5	4.08	.877
A: Govt. policymakers	50	1	5	4.06	.913
A: Society	50	1	5	4.08	.900
I: Articles in top-tier journals	47	1	5	4.57	.744
I: Articles in practitioner publications	47	1	5	4.00	.956
I: Scholarly citations	47	3	5	4.36	.673
I: Journal editorial boards	47	1	5	4.11	.866
I: Competitive research grants	47	1	5	4.00	.885

Survey respondents from Asia considered several audiences for scholarly research (A) as highly important (4 and above on a 5-point scale), and several indicators of scholarly impact (I) as highly important (4 and above on a 5-point scale). These respondents indicated a tie between *other Management academics* and *top management in companies* as the most important audience, and *articles in top-tier journals* as the most important indicator of scholarly impact.

Table 17. Very Important Audiences for Research (A) & Very Important Indicators of Scholarly Impact (I) for Europe (including Eastern Europe, the EU, and the UK)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
A: Top management in companies	181	1	5	4.22	.927
A: Management academics	181	1	5	4.40	.874
A: Social Science academics	181	1	5	4.08	.853
A: Students	181	1	5	4.01	.894
A: Govt. policymakers	181	1	5	4.10	.952
I: Articles in top-tier journals	159	1	5	4.43	.853
I: Scholarly citations	159	1	5	4.09	.937

Survey respondents from Europe considered several audiences for scholarly research (A) as highly important (4 and above on a 5-point scale), and only 2 indicators of scholarly impact (I) as highly important (4 and above on a 5-point scale). These respondents indicated *other Management academics* served as the most important audience, and *articles in top-tier journals* provided the most important indicator of scholarly impact.

Table 18. Very Important Audiences for Research (A) & Very Important Indicators of Scholarly Impact (I) for Oceania (including Australia & New Zealand)

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
A: Top management in companies	25	2	5	4.44	.768
A: Middle management in companies	25	2	5	4.04	.611
A: Management academics	25	4	5	4.56	.507
A: Social Science academics	25	2	5	4.04	.841
A: Students	25	3	5	4.32	.690
A: Govt. policymakers	25	2	5	4.28	.792
A: Industry associations	25	2	5	4.08	.759
A: Society	25	2	5	4.04	.676
I: Articles in top-tier journals	23	2	5	4.30	.974
I: Scholarly citations	23	2	5	4.35	.775
I: Scholarly book	23	1	5	4.00	.905
I: Competitive research grants	23	2	5	4.04	.825

Survey respondents from Oceania considered several audiences for scholarly research (A) as highly important (4 and above on a 5-point scale), and several indicators of scholarly impact (I) as highly important (4 and above on a 5-point scale). These respondents indicated that *other Management academics* served as the most important audience, and *scholarly citations* provided the most important indicator of scholarly impact.