Learning and Education Strategies for Scholarly Impact:

Influencing Regulation, Policy and Society through Research

Guest Editors:

Usha C. V. Haley, *Wichita State University*
Sir Cary L. Cooper, *University of Manchester*
Andrew J. Hoffman, *University of Michigan*
Tyrone S. Pitsis, *Durham University*
Danna Greenberg, *Babson College*

Initial submissions should be received by May 31, 2021
Scheduled for Publication: September 2022

CALL FOR PAPERS

We define scholarly impact as an "auditable or recordable occasion of influence" arising out of research (Haley, Page, Pitsis, Rivas and Yu, 2017); this special issue will explore influence through research on communities that include not just scholars, but also other external and internal stakeholders such as regulators, policymakers, managers, students and society at large. For over a decade, researchers have argued for engaged scholarship (see Van de Ven, 2007; Van de Ven and Johnson, 2006). Regulators and grant-bestowing organizations have similarly underlined a social need for research that engages with broader audiences beyond academic confines (e.g., AACSB's Assessment and Impact conferences; National Science Foundation's broader impacts; UK's Research Excellence Framework impact case studies) Yet, few academics accept that their roles and identities include informing the general public (Besley and Nesbit, 2013); concurrently, academics rarely feature in public discourse (Hoffman, 2016). Theorists have argued that impactful research requires dialogue, praxis, and reflexivity (MacIntosh, Beech, Bartunek, Mason, Cooke and Denyer, 2017) – and we encourage all three modes. We see articles in the special issue, as contributing to perceptual change of what makes for impactful scholarship, encouraging knowledge-infused change in academic environments, and critically self-questioning our roles as academics in society. We feel that scholarly impact constitutes a critical issue for the field of management, and for business schools generally, and one deserving of serious research at the institutional/regulatory, processual and individual levels. In this fashion, and through this *AMLE* special issue, we hope to look towards the future with actionable recommendations for academics, administrators, policymakers, students and managers, as well as to draw on the past to provide frameworks, theories and best practices.

Concepts of organizational effectiveness influenced by institutional and regulatory factors underly many assumptions on encouraging scholarly impact. Some have argued that management educators misappropriated concepts of intellectually robust and relevant research and education, thereby contributing to intellectual stasis in business education and research (Khurana and Spender, 2012). These theorists have contended that business schools have institutionalized research models of narrow scope and methodological rigor to produce a plethora of management literature and PhDs, but with little capacity or desire to inform regulators, the general public or professional managers (Hambrick, 1994; Mintzberg, 2004; Polzer, Gulati, Khurana and Tushman, 2009). Following Simon (1967), many have viewed scholarly impact as a design problem to encourage cross-disciplinary, relevant research; yet, as these theorists have also noted, discipline-trained faculty, and a dearth of committed practitioners in academia, have hampered effective business-school design. Prescriptions on effective design for scholarly impact span business schools' accreditation criteria (e.g., AACSB, 2012), measurement issues (e.g., Aguinis, Shapiro, Antonacopoulou, and Cummings, 2014; *BizEd*, 2018; Haley, 2018), and societal efforts at classifying and obtaining state funding (e.g., the UK's Research Excellence Framework in place since 2004). Academic essays in management journals have elaborated on conditions spawning rigor vs. relevance (e.g., Gulati, 2007). Simultaneously, despite the global acceptance of US business schools' standards (see Haley et. al, 2017), other theorists have rejected generic approaches to measuring and ascertaining impact: as complex organizations, business schools operate within unique social, legal, economic and technological environments that fashion their activities and potentials, especially across national environments (Spender, 1992). Relations between institutional fields might facilitate or hinder scholarly impact with mutual dependence and power imbalances affecting outcomes in contrary ways (Furnari, 2016). Indeed, though generally ignored in our theories, competing institutional logics (Zhu, Rooney and Phillips, 2016) causal complexity, and a configuration of attributes (Misangyi, Greckhamer, Furnari, Fiss, Crilly and Aguilera, 2017) may influence and shape scholarly impact.

Focusing on process, other theorists have argued that competing global, cultural scripts may lead to ostensibly similar but intrinsically different impact (Haley and Haley, 2016), contradicting notions that identical, normatively-sanctioned ideas increase homogeneous organizational strategies, forms and practices (Meyer and Rowan, 1977). Some theorists have viewed knowledge transfers between organizations as rule-based translations that correspond to institutional conditions, but also change them, resulting in new distributions of power (Czarniawska and Joerges, 1996; Rovik, 2016). Despite readily available data that invalidates widely-used measures such as journal impact factors, academic institutions continue to use them (see Callaway, 2016). Others focused on how management ideas circulate and transform (Greenwood, Oliver, Suddaby and Sahlin-Andersson, 2008), enhancing relevance for practitioners and impact for academics (Bartunek and Rynes, 2010; Sandberg and Tsoukas, 2011). In these theories, academics and other stakeholders actively translate concepts in complex networks for impact. Local translation of what constitutes global scholarly impact may lead to diverse structures, routines and practices such as for the Balanced Scorecard (Madsen, 2014) and international auditing standards (Mennicken, 2008). Thus, scholarly impact may differ in essence globally, bolstered by political processes.

Personal identity may shape pursuit and reach of scholarly impact. Bedeian (1996) identified research-intensive publications as one indicator of career success that leads to desirable outcomes such as high salary and status, affecting academics' career paths (Kraimer, Greco,

Seibert and Sargent, forthcoming). Postcolonial and critical approaches draw on concepts such as mimicry to shed light on management educators' and scholars' identities around the world as business schools globalize. Kothiyal, Bell and Clark (2018) discussed how the English language's dominance, and pressures to conform to global research norms of ranked journals, shaped scholars' identities in Indian business schools. Hybrid organizational forms may disrupt established processes, mold alternate global identities, contribute to scholarly engagement and yield diverse measures of scholarly impact. For pedagogy, threshold, integrative concepts in management (Wright and Gilmore, 2012; Wright and Hibbert, 2015), such as opportunity costs in economics (Davies and Mangan, 2007), can broaden scholarly impact on education by causing students to "see things in a new way" and by transforming learning processes (Lucas and Mladenovic, 2007). Identifying these threshold concepts in management through transdisciplinary research (i.e., by enabling inputs and scoping across scientific and non-scientific communities to address systemic, holistic challenges), and interdisciplinary research (i.e., by analyzing, synthesizing and harmonizing links between disciplines for coordinated, coherent wholes), could thereby yield pedagogical returns for management educators and contribute to sustainable, scholarly impact. Additionally, making and implementing strategic decisions in a complex, global economy requires practical wisdom; yet, business researchers rarely analyze which stakeholders benefit or lose from streams and methods of research or how they may transmit normative concepts to students (see Clegg, Jarvis and Pitsis, 2013).

By exploring these and related themes, we hope for this special issue to have relevance not just for management academics, but also for other disciplines in business and the social sciences. In addition to theoretical and empirical analysis, articles should explore implications for stakeholders such as university administrators, students, regulators, accreditation agencies, grant-bestowing agencies and career management: i.e., articles should aim not just for historical analysis and critique, but also for future influence in policy debates through including focus on the relevance of findings for future trajectories of influence as well as on concrete, implementable, policy recommendations.

In conclusion, this special issue aims for renewed theory-driven research on implementable strategies for scholarly impact, and for the development of conceptual models for external impact. We also call for more empirical research in the area. Such research would likely have important implications for what we study, how we engage in research, and how we disseminate and teach new knowledge. Indeed, one can argue scholarly impact is, at its core, an issue of what we do as management scholars and educators. Such an issue contributes to *AMLE*'s mission of management learning and education by publishing theory, empirical research, case studies, reviews, critiques, and resources to address the processes that lead to scholarly impact as defined by the Academy of Management's membership. Additionally, the special issue would explicitly incorporate business schools' institutional environments, administration and effects on stakeholders, including other businesses, governments, accreditation agencies, and society at large.

 In sum, this special issue aims to portray the art, science, ecology and exploratory nature of impactful research, draw on the recommendations from the Academy of Management's 2017 report on scholarly impact, provide case studies of the most interesting, impactful research, and elaborate on the interactive processes for creating value for research that includes wider

stakeholder bases, in a manner hitherto unexplored. We believe such an issue also has the potential to impact regulation and policy on research (including through the AACSB, REF, PBRF, NSF, etc.)

Possible Topics:

1. How do institutional, processual, narrative or identity theories explain the business of measuring impact? What recommendations arise from findings?

2. In which contexts do established metrics for measuring impact in the scholarly community (such as citation counts and journal rankings) provide effective measures of impact? In which contexts do emerging metrics for measuring impact in broader, nonacademic communities (such as Altmetrics and ImpactStory) prove more effective and when? How may reward structures including tenure and promotion include both sets of metrics?

3. Which theories explain and provide recommendations for effective knowledge exchange and knowledge translation? How have these theories been implemented, if at all?

4. What critiques of impact exist and how may they inform academics, administrators and policymakers? What do postcolonial or critical theories contribute to explanations of scholarly impact? What caveats do these theories highlight and what recommendations stem from them?

5. How do approaches and measures of impact differ cross-nationally? What can we learn from differing approaches and experiences? What costs and benefits attend different approaches and for whom?

6. How do social constructions of scholarly impact arise and how may they be shaped?

7. Which institutional environments aid in developing pluralistic impact measures and how successful are they?

8. Which theoretical frameworks assist in building and assessing impactful relationships between academia, science and policy?

9. How do institutional environments or organizational processes affect career paths for impactful research?

10. Which factors affect decisionmakers' (e.g., policymakers, managers) uses of academic research?

11. How do educational policies and regulatory environments affect impactful research?

12. What empirically measured costs and benefits attend research-assessment exercises?

13. What risks and rewards attend co-creating research with academics and practitioners? How can reward structures facilitate and encourage effective transdisciplinary collaborations? What constrains this restructuring?

14. What institutional value does social media provide in creating impact? What social costs and benefits does this avenue for dissemination create?

15. What gender and other population differences such as ethnic diversity exist in metrics such as citations, and in strategies for and attainment of impact?

16. Surveys done by the National Science Foundation indicate that segments of the population do not know what science does or how they do it; given this finding, does the scientific research we do as scholars need new roles and new audiences in society? What indicators of impact should university administrators support and why? Who benefits from our dominant modes of research production and assessment and how?

17. How does transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary research affect students' learning environments? Should university administrators structure learning environments to facilitate such transmissions of research to students and how?

18. How may the design and structure of business schools and universities contribute to impactful research and education that includes external and internal stakeholders beyond career academics?

References

AACSB (2012) *Impact of Research A Guide for Business Schools. Insights from the AACSB International Impact of Research Exploratory Study*, Tampa, Florida.

Aguinis, H., Shapiro, D. L., Antonacopoulou, E. P., & Cummings, T. G. (2014). Scholarly impact: A pluralist conceptualization. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 13(4), 623-639.

Bartunek, J. M., & Rynes, S. L. (2010). The construction and contributions of "implications for practice": What's in them and what might they offer? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 9(1), 100-117.

Bedeian, A. (1996) Lessons learned along the way: Twelve suggestions for optimizing career success. In Frost, P. J. and Taylor, M., *Rhythms in Academic Life: Personal Accounts of Careers in Academia*, 3-9, Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA.

Besley, J. & Nisbet, M. (2013) "How scientists view the public, the media and the political process," *Public Understanding of Science*, 22(6), 644-659.

BizEd (2018) The essence of scholarly impact, March/April, XVII(2), 10-11.

Callaway, E. (2016). Publishing elite turns against impact factor. *Nature*, 535(7611), 210-211.

Clegg, S. R., Jarvis, W. P., & Pitsis, T. S. (2013). Making strategy matter: Social theory, knowledge interests and business education. *Business History*, 55(7), 1247-1264.

Czarniawska, B. and Joerges, B. (1996). Travels of ideas. In Czarniawska, B. and Sevon, G. (eds), *Translating Organizational Change*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 13–48.

Davies, P., & Mangan, J. (2007). Threshold concepts and the integration of understanding in economics. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(6), 711-726.

Furnari, S. (2016) Institutional fields as linked arenas: Inter-field resource dependence, institutional work and institutional change, *Human Relations, (69)3*, 551-580.

Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Suddaby, R., and Sahlin-Andersson (2008) *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*, Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA.

Gulati, R. (2007). Tent poles, tribalism, and boundary spanning: The rigor-relevance debate in management research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), 775-782.

Haley, U. C. V. (2018) Beyond Impact Factors: an Academy of Management report on measuring scholarly impact, Impact of Social Sciences Blog, London School of Economics, http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2018/03/02/beyond-impact-factors-an-academy-of-management-report-on-measuring-scholarly-impact/

Haley, U. C. V., & Haley, G. T. (2016). Think local, act global: A call to recognize competing, cultural scripts. *Management and Organization Review*, 12(1), 205-216.

Haley, U.C.V. Page, M.C., Pitsis, T.S., Rivas, J.Y., & Yu, K.F. (2017) Measuring and achieving scholarly impact: A report from the Academy of Management's Practice Theme Committee, Academy of Management, Briar Cliff, New York, http://aom.org/About-AOM/StrategicPlan/Scholarly-Impact-Report.aspx?terms=measuring%20and%20achieving%20scholarly%20impact

Hambrick, D. C. (1994). What if the Academy actually mattered? *Academy of Management Review*, *19*(1), 11-16.

Hoffman, A. (2016) Academia's emerging crisis of relevance and the consequent role of the engaged scholar, *Journal of Change Management, 16(2)*, 77-96.

Kothiyal, N., Bell, E. & Clarke, C. (2018) Moving beyond mimicry: Creating hybrid spaces in Indian business schools, *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 17(2), 1-18.

Kraimer, M., Greco, L., Seibert, S., & Sargent, L. (forthcoming) An investigation of academic career success: The new tempo of academic life. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*.

Khurana, R., & Spender, J. C. (2012). Herbert A. Simon on what ails business schools: More than 'a problem in organizational design'. *Journal of Management Studies*, *49*(3), 619-639.

Lucas, U., & Mladenovic, R. (2007). The potential of threshold concepts: an emerging framework for educational research and practice. *London Review of Education*, *5*(3), 237-248.

MacIntosh, R., Beech, N., Bartunek, J., Mason, K., Cooke, B., & Denyer, D. (2017). Impact and management research: Exploring relationships between temporality, dialogue, reflexivity and praxis. *British Journal of Management*, *28*(1), 3-13.

Madsen, D. O. (2014). How do managers encounter fashionable management concepts? A study of balanced scorecard adopters in Scandinavia. *International Journal of Management Concepts and Philosophy*, *8*(4), 249-267.

Mennicken, A. (2008). Connecting worlds: The translation of international auditing standards into post-Soviet audit practice. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, *33*(4-5), 384-414.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, *83*(2), 340-363.

Mintzberg, H. (2004). *Managers, not MBAs: A Hard Look at the Soft Practice of Managing and Management Development*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers: San Francisco.

Misangyi, V. F., Greckhamer, T., Furnari, S., Fiss, P. C., Crilly, D., & Aguilera, R. (2017). Embracing causal complexity: The emergence of a neo-configurational perspective. *Journal of Management*, *43*(1), 255-282.

Polzer, J. T., Gulati, R., Khurana, R., & Tushman, M. L. (2009). Crossing boundaries to increase relevance in organizational research. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *18*(4), 280-286.

Røvik, K. A. (2016). Knowledge transfer as translation: Review and elements of an instrumental theory. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *18*(3), 290-310.

Sandberg, J., & Tsoukas, H. (2011). Grasping the logic of practice: Theorizing through practical rationality. *Academy of Management Review*, *36*(2), 338-360.

Simon, H. A. (1967). The business school a problem in organizational design. *Journal of Management Studies*, *4*(1), 1-16.

Spender, J. C. (1992). Limits to learning from the West: How Western management advice may prove limited in Eastern Europe. *The International Executive*, *34*(5), 389-413.

Van de Ven, A. H. (2007). *Engaged Scholarship: A Guide for Organizational and Social Research*. Oxford University Press on Demand.

Van de Ven, A. H., & Johnson, P. E. (2006). Knowledge for theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, *31*(4), 802-821.

Wright, A. L., & Gilmore, A. (2012). Threshold concepts and conceptions: Student learning in introductory management courses. *Journal of Management Education*, *36*(5), 614-635.

Wright, A. L., & Hibbert, P. (2015). Threshold concepts in theory and practice. *Journal of Management Education*, *39*(4), 443-451.

Zhu, Y., Rooney, D., & Phillips, N. (2016). Practice-based wisdom theory for integrating institutional logics: A new model for social entrepreneurship learning and education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *15*(3), 607-625.