Responsible Research Project Budapest Meeting – DRAFT4 (with corrections from Matthew Wood, Peter McKiernan, Thomas Dyllick, and Franklin Allen)
January 27, 2016, Wednesday, 8:30 am – 12:00 noon
Budapest, Hungary at the EFMD Deans and Directors General meeting location
Sofitel Chain Bridge Board Room
Hosted by Matthew Wood

Attendees: Franklin Allen, Thomas Dyllick, Bill Glick, Peter McKiernan, Dan Leclair, Katrin Muff, Howard Thomas, Anne Tsui, Matthew Wood, Xiaobo Wu

Key Outcomes of the Budapest Meeting

1. Delphi survey: The group agreed to continue with round 2 of the survey of team members and authors. The group agreed to not conduct a Delphi with non-academic groups. We will rely on existing resources (e.g., World Economic Forum reports, United Nations sustainable development goals), and other resources in identifying the grand challenges from the perspectives of business (large and small, old and new) and non-business (NGO, government) groups.

2. Project team, especially accounting scholars and US deans: Franklin Allen will continue to help in this effort. We hope to add a few US deans to the team in the near future. We also agreed that we should try to add leading scholars in economics and information systems areas if possible.

3. Position paper: We must try to have a complete draft of the position paper before the summer, ideally by early June. We will develop an outline of the paper in the Miami meeting on Jan 31. (See page 5 for suggestions on an outline of the paper).

4. Grand challenge special issue in leading journals: Members of the disciplines will elicit, by the end of May 2016, at least one top journal's commitment to develop a grand challenge special issue. Team members could use the AMJ Call for Papers as an example in their discussion with the editors of leading journals. Franklin Allen will identify and approach the editors of a top finance and a top accounting journal. Anne will ask Mary Jo Bitner to work on Marketing, Chris Tang to work on OM, Jerry Davis to work on ASQ and if possible SMJ. Anne will approach AMJ's new editor for a more focused grand challenge topic, e.g., inequality in organizations. (Anne already has talked with the new editor and gained commitment.)

5. Institutional support and roles of team members: We received favorable expression of formal support from AACSB. Dan will follow up with a formal statement, with provisions (e.g., website for the project, budget, marketing, etc.).

Minutes

I.   Welcome and general discussion

This is the second Responsible Research Project team meeting. Nine members and one guest were in attendance. This was Franklin Allen and Peter McKiernan's first team meeting and our special guest was Bill Glick, dean of Rice University, and chair of AACSB Board.

Matthew Wood welcomed everyone and reflected on the purpose of the project. He said that he first heard of this research-practice gap problem thirteen years ago. The conversation continued over the years and nothing has been done. In fact, it has gotten worse. Most deans would agree that this is a problem but no one seems to have the solution. This project is timely and he hoped that we can find a way out of this morass. Franklin Allen said that the competition to publish in the A journals by scholars in the developing economies is intense and it is extremely difficult given the 95% rejection rate of top journals. China is becoming the largest economy in the world but researchers in China are unprepared to conduct independent research and are still imitating the US research model. Africa is another example. It has many important questions, but these are not of interest to the top journals. There is a great need for these regions to have their own A journals. Xiaobo Wu said that in China, there are two types of faculty and two types of research. One type consists mostly of scholars trained in the West. They write papers for the A journals, but their work does not contribute knowledge to Chinese managers. The second consists mostly of domestically trained scholars. They write papers (mostly in Chinese journals) and books that are more useful for managers. As a dean, he has to take care both the professors who play the publishing game and the professors who help the school's relevance for society. Xiaobo further mentioned the CEEMAN - a group of over 200 Eastern European business schools in 50 countries that have followed their own paths in developing management education and research. (Peter McKiernan followed up that it is not quite true. He was involved in accrediting Schools for CEEMAN. Many of their faculty members come to the EURAM meetings and want the same thing as their colleagues in the West…publishing in A grade journals!).

Peter McKiernan echoed the problem and lamented on the waste of young talents. Peter also emphasized the trend toward homogenization, and the importance of variety among business schools. Bill Glick agreed and discussed the role of business schools for society, and how the career paths of young academics being rigidly defined by publications in a narrow set of journals. It is a very knotty problem and we need to separate the cause from the symptom. Is the research-practice gap a symptom or a cause? Anne suggested that the gap is the result and the publication in A journal might be the cause. Bill asked how this journal list idea came about. Howard Thomas said that the idea of A journals was a social construction by scholars before the rankings. Later, bibliometric made it possible to quantify the journal positions (e.g., citations). The ranking agencies further reinforced the need for ranked journals in the school rankings. Anne Tsui emphasized our common motivation to strengthen the mission of business schools to develop knowledge and to direct our research to address problems important for business and for society. She expressed the confidence in the potential success of this project given the commitment of this team of leading scholars, along with the support of AACSB and EFMD.

II.   Review of project status

Anne reported that Marshall Fischer of Wharton has left the team. We will miss his contribution but fortunately we still have two members for the operations management area. The deans of two

top Chinese business schools joined, Hongbin Cai from the Guanghua School of Management, Peking University, and Xiongwen Lu of Fudan University School of Management. Bernard Yeung from National University of Singapore business school also joined. Dan LeClair discussed the progress in recruiting US deans. He reported that Ira Solomon, Dean of Tulane University's business school (and who is also an accounting scholar) might join the project. Meanwhile, Dan has made arrangements for him and Anne to meet Bill Boulding of Duke, Rich Lyons of UC Berkeley, and Sri Zaheer of the Carlson School of Management at Minnesota in Miami. Sri will be joining the team meeting on Sunday, Jan 31.

Franklin said that many leading accounting scholars have a University of Chicago perspective, and, most are still fairly conservative. He will contact an accounting scholar at Yale University.

Howard asked if we have covered all the disciplines of the business school. What about information systems, economics? We agreed that we should make efforts to include leading scholars in these disciplines, including one or two economists on our project team.

Anne mentioned that business schools' research faculty probably fall roughly into three groups, about 20% sympathetic to the vision of responsible research, 20% oppose (they prefer the status quo), and 60% in between. Most of the 60% are probably junior scholars (assistants and associates) and they will follow the lead of the senior scholars and the school's evaluation system. The 20% sympathetic to the responsible research initiative would include scholars like Jeff Pfeffer, Don Hambrick, Jim Walsh, and Henry Mintzberg. They are important opinion leaders who have publicly discussed the problems of management education and research and have called for changes. Anne mentioned Joseph Stiglitz's work on income inequality. Is it possible to seek his support? (Franklin said Stiglitz was his advisor). Xiaobo Wu said that there are some innovation studies scholars who have done excellent work that is useful for industry. Howard said we may consider inviting them to be our "maverick members". We will further discuss how to enlist their support to our project.

III.   Institutional Support

Bill Glick expressed that the vision of this project is consistent with the mission of AACSB in helping business schools to think more deeply and broadly about contributing to society (beyond business). He is optimistic that AACSB will provide formal support to the project. Anne expressed the following wishes in terms of support from both AACSB and EFMD.

1. A formal statement of AACSB/EFMD support to the "Responsible Research Initiative". In turn, the "Responsible Research Initiative" could state publicly, in writing or in presentations, that it has the support of AACSB and EFMD. (EFMD already expressed formal support since fall 2014).
2. One or more colleagues from AACSB/EFMD participate as members of the project team, like Dan LeClair and Matthew Wood.
3. Both will provide a space on their websites and related technical support to host the "position paper" and associated dissemination, communication, pledging and blogging activities.
4. Both organizations will provide support to the implementation activities, such as convening or meetings with deans, associate deans for research, department heads, and journal editors, ranking publishers, media, and other change levers to discuss the position paper, identifying

"model" schools that are engaging in responsible research, host meetings of the project teams, etc.

5. Continue their own organization's respective commitment to the "new vision for business schools", encouraging schools toward differentiation and contribution to the wellbeing of society, beyond business.

Dan and Matthew responded that this is reasonable. Dan added that we might develop a dedicated website for RRI with links to AACSB and EFMD. He further said that this should include a budget to support project-related activities including travel support for project team members. On behalf of the project team, Anne expressed great thanks to Dan, Matthew and Bill.

We discussed the possibility of other institutional groups as potential supporters, e.g., Global Compact, GRLI, WBCSD or the World Economic Forum. Dan encouraged us to keep in focus that the major mover is the academic team of scholars. Others can be supporters but they should not drive the agenda. We may consider a category "Institutional support members", along with the "Scholar members" and "Dean members" of the Responsible Project Initiative team.

IV.   Delphi on business school research

Peter briefly explained the purpose of Delphi – which is to pool the opinions of experts on a topic of ambiguous nature with potentially divergent views. The first round is to elicit responses to a set of open-ended questions. The second round seeks to obtain consensus on the most important ideas synthesized from the round 1 responses. As of January 19, 2016, we have 16 participants from each of the project team and the author groups. This is above 80% in both groups. The results on the problems largely confirmed what we know from current writings on the subject but the list of suggested solutions has some new ideas. The list of grand challenges reflects problems in society along the line of United Nation's sustainable development goals. The summary of the results needs to be verified by the other two members of the Delphi Task Force, Franklin and Dave Reibstein. We hope to conduct the second round by mid February.

We discussed the idea of conducting additional Dephi surveys to pull the opinions of non-academic groups (e.g., executives of business and non-profit organizations and government), especially on the grand challenges facing business and non-business sectors in the future 20 years. Thomas Dyllick said that we could identify the challenges for the business sector from the annual publications of WEF (e.g., Global Risk Report). Howard Thomas said that we have the opinions from the supply side through the Delphi (and published papers). We can rely on available sources for opinions from the demand side. Anne mentioned United Nation's 17 SDGs as a good list to consider from society's point of view. It is unclear that a Delphi would provide new information. Further, identifying a representative sample of non-academic opinion leaders might be a challenge. Given that most of these existing lists came from extensive work, they are good resources to identify grand challenges from the perspective of non-academic groups. We agreed not conduct a Delphi with non-academic groups.

Katrin Muff asked about the process to identify the solutions to the problems. She suggested that in addition to developing approaches to solutions from an analysis of the existing problems, we might engage in a visioning exercise to help us imagine a desirable future. What would a

business school that engages in responsible research look like in 20 years and what should we be doing to get there? Anne asked if the solutions from the Delphi would be useful. She said that it is a starting point but there might be other solutions that may emerge through a visioning exercise. Anne will discuss this idea with the team (the primary writers of the position paper) at the Miami meeting.

V.   The position paper

The lead writers, Jerry Davis and Gerry George, will be at the Miami meeting. Thomas and Peter have offered to help writing portions of the paper. Howard said that we should have the paper drafted as soon as possible so that discussions with different groups can begin. Both Dan and Mathew encouraged us to have a first draft by early summer, possibly by June and we can meet at the next EFMD meeting in Rome on June 12-14 to discuss the draft. Dan asked if we want to meet in Boston at the AACSB conference on April 4 and 5, 2016. Howard, Matthew, Gerry and Dan will be at the Boston meeting. It might be possible for the East Coast team members to participate.

Peter asked about the "problem" that the paper should address. Anne responded that we had agreed after the August 2015 Vancouver meeting to focus on the research-practice gap (relevance). The *Strategic Management Journal* is now leading the way to increase the reliability of knowledge by asking for DA-RT (Data availability, replicability, and transparency) in paper submissions. Anne believed that if relevance is the primary goal, scholars will pay attention to reliable knowledge because of the policy and practice implications. In other words, relevance will drive quality in research.

It was emphasized that the paper should begin with a clear problem statement. Then, there should be a discussion of the systemic nature of the problem, which should help in identifying the key levers, and solutions. Thomas Dyllick followed up after the meeting with an email to Anne with the following suggestion for an outline of the position paper.
a) What are the challenges for business school research? (External demands and the question of relevance, summarized in the results from Delphi chapter 1)
b) What does the "iron cage" of research relevance look like? (A look inside the research system or: what is the structure of our systemic trap? A bit of institutional theory and Anthony Giddens' theory of structuration should be of help here.)
c) How to move the research system towards societal relevance. (Levers, strategies and actions)

VI.   Grand challenge special issue

The position paper will include a list of grand challenges to guide future research. The *AMJ* special issue on grand challenges is a good test of the response of authors. It received more than 170 submissions, probably the best response among all previous *AMJ* special issues. Matthew asked if we could have a list of leading journals in the various disciplines. Howard, Dan and Matthew urged us to start talking with editors of the leading journals in the various disciplines as soon as possible. Anne said that we should aim to have, by June, a list of journals with tentative commitment to develop this grand challenge special issue. Franklin asked for the call for papers for the *AMJ* grand challenge issue (Anne has sent it to him). He will try to convince one leading

finance journal (and if possible accounting) to develop a special issue. Anne will talk with Mary Jo for Marketing and Chris Tang for OM. Anne said that Jerry Davis has expressed a willingness to convince the next ASQ editor, and we should approach *SMJ* also. Having one or two journals from each discipline publishing an issue on grand challenges within a two to three year period would send a strong signal about the changing direction or focus of business school research. This should attract the attention of both business and media.

VII. Next steps and action plan

1. Anne will summarize the Budapest meeting notes and share that with the participants of the Miami meeting on Jan 31.
2. The Miami meeting on Jan 31 should aim to develop an outline of position paper and writing plan with the goal of a complete first draft by early June 2016.
3. Franklin and Dave will verify the summary of the Delphi responses by the end of the first week of February so that Anne and Peter can design the round 2 Delphi to start in mid Feb.
4. Thomas will identify a list of grand challenges for businesses by analyzing recent issues of the WEF report by mid February.
5. Franklin will recruit senior accounting scholars (within the next two months if possible). All team members should make efforts to add leading scholars in economics and information systems to our project team.
6. Various members (Franklin, Mary Jo, Anne, Chris) of the disciplines will have elicited one journal's commitment (even if tentative) to develop a grand challenge special issue, by the end of May 2016.
7. Dan will follow up with a formal support statement from AACSB to RRI.
8. Anne will ask the team for their availability to meet in either Boston (most likely April 3 Sunday) or Rome (most likely June 11, Saturday). (Katrin offered to facilitate the visioning exercise in Boston. Anne will discuss this with the team in the Miami meeting).

We thanked all attendees for their time and contribution, especially Matthew for hosting the meeting. The meeting ended at 12:15 pm.