

**IFSAM 2021 webinar series on management research evaluation**  
**Chat of the First Webinar with Journal Editors, Scholarly Associations' Leaders**  
**and University Administrators**

January 29, 2021

Online Webinar

**15:10:35**      **From Xavier Castaner** : Welcome, Lilian. Glad seeing you with us, you might want to bring the Brazilian perspective later in the Q&A part

**15:11:00**      **From Lilian Outtes Wanderley** : Thank you.

**15:44:19**      **From Dhan Raj Chalise, FoM, Tribhuvan University** : Good evening all distinguished and participants

**15:45:20**      **From Xavier Castaner** : Welcome, Dhan Raj Chalise, glad to see more participants from Nepal. Greetings to our friends from the Nepalese AoM

**15:46:16**      **From Madeleine Barrows BAM** : Do journal lists inevitably lead to homogeneity of cultures of scholarship? Perhaps through a self-reinforcing circle of ensuring that new entrants compare (which slides too easily to 'looks like') the existing incumbents. Are they therefore working against the well known benefits of pluralism and diversity? Following on from that - we know there are huge problems from an EDI perspective with the way that 'handy proxies' for quality of research (i.e. journal rankings) are used in promotion decisions especially.

**15:48:26**      **From Herman Aguinis** : This is the typical consequence of using a "journal list." There are some positive, but also several negative consequences of using journal lists: Aguinis, H., Cummings, C., Ramani, R. S., & Cummings, T. G. 2020. "An A is an A:" The new bottom line for valuing academic research. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 34(1): 135-154.  
<https://journals.aom.org/doi/10.5465/amp.2017.0193>

**15:49:03**      **From Moses Acquah** : Good morning/afternoon/evening to everyone. I would like to ask a question to all the speakers. How do we determine relevance of a paper? How do we determine impact to society? Why is the FT50 list of journal only North America (particularly US) and European journals?

**15:50:53**      **From Greg Bamber** : Moses, and Madeleine from BAM ask important questions. Herman makes a great point too. Also the "FT50" list of journals seems idiosyncratic and seems to preference the most established journals and some fields, but accord a low priority to other fields e.g. there is only 1 HR journal included, even though the importance of this field has been especially obvious in this pandemic. Why limit the FT list to only 50 journals? Why not an FT100 or an FT200? The big ideas and grand challenges seem to be considered to a greater extent in books or some other journals that are not in the FT list. Certain of the FT50 journals appear to have little direct practical impact on society and in so far as they are read, they are read by only relatively few academics, and not by practitioners! Cheers, Greg Bamber, Director, International Consortium for Research in Employment & Work (iCREW), Centre for Global Business, Monash Business School, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

- 15:51:00** From **Herman Aguinis** : Great question, Moses! We need to (a) define the construct (e.g., relevance, impact), and then (b) measure it based on this definition. Different definitions of relevance (and measures) are likely to co-exist across universities and countries.
- 15:54:26** From **Wafa Khlif** : Good all moment of the day! I'm just wondering why not having one list of International Accepted Scientific Journals without any ranking! What would be the side effect of having it?
- 15:56:02** From **Wafa Khlif** : We also should rethink the BLIND peer review, may be!
- 15:56:15** From **avandev** : Why homogenize knowledge with one global ranking? Why not advance diversity with different locally-chosen rankings - perhaps by each scholarly association affiliated with IFSAM?
- 15:57:03** From **Zoogah** : I was thinking exactly as Avandev points out.
- 15:57:16** From **Zoogah** : You could even make it relative or proportional
- 15:58:13** From **Xavier Castaner** : Thanks so much for all the questions & suggestions. Trish and I will select some in the Q&A for general discussion. Please keep on sharing your thoughts. The chat is also recorded and we will draw from it
- 15:58:39** From **Wafa Khlif** : Currently having a voice in major journals depends on individual network and relations among the journals' senior editors. We believe journals should have platforms to engage in more consultations and debates in academic communities
- 16:00:12** From **Wafa Khlif** : Journals are focused on "production" of "quality" papers and they play no role in ensuring/mediating public exchanges/debates around the submissions which are the life blood of academic work. Journals withdraw papers from public arenas during the publication process and after publication provide no space for continued discussions and eventually revisions, if deemed necessary by the authors. This leads to what has been termed as "bleeding during revisions and death upon publication".
- 16:00:27** From **Moses Acquah** : Good observation from Avandev and David. The ranking systems have created the homogenization of knowledge published in journals. The world is diverse and experience different challenges so their research focus must be different.
- 16:08:17** From **Jerry Davis** : RRBM website: <https://www.rrbm.network/>
- A short blog post about what's at stake: <https://www.rrbm.network/toward-better-measures-of-the-societal-impact-of-research-our-biggest-challenge-bill-glick-jerry-davis/>
- 16:13:00** From **mccar** : Research What v Research Why : <https://itdependsblog.blogspot.com/2018/01/why-do-you-do-academic-research.html>
- 16:13:31** From **Ke Cao** : As a new faculty, I was surprised to see that contents in university level Annual Report of Activities are sort of overwhelming yet comprehensive and diverse. I hope in practice all activities matter for tenure and promotion. Wondered to what extent our problems/concerns are discipline specific? I.e, any social science discipline is doing better than ours?
- 16:14:24** From **Madeleine Barrows BAM** : Practical question - is there a deadline / closing date for the survey please? I'm being asked.

**16:15:16 From Herman Aguinis :** Great points, Jerry! All measures can potentially be "gameable." So, one way to deal with this is to use MANY instead of just one live-or-die metric/journal list/number: Aguinis, H., Shapiro, D. L., Antonacopoulou, E., & Cummings, T. G. 2014. Scholarly impact: A pluralist conceptualization. Academy of Management Learning and Education, 13(4): 623-639. <http://www.hermanaguinis.com/pubs.html>

**16:17:28 From Madeleine Barrows BAM :** Another side effect we're seeing from rankings in a difficult job market is that submissions are increasing exponentially - often not of good quality - there is a thought that perhaps people in some parts of the world are benefitting from claiming an article 'under review' or even just 'submitted' to a high ranking journal. It's a huge waste of everyone's time, esp the Editors.

**16:18:27 From mccar :** All rankings (like models) are wrong, but some are useful. But useful to who and in what way?

**16:19:23 From Jerome Caby :** Don't forget that rankings (FT or other) are not only about creating « slaves », it's also an « insurance » system for faculty towards (too) powerful deans or universities for their own careers. It doesn't mean that we should not think about improvements but that we should do it very carefully

**16:20:11 From Bill Glick :** Students, employers and funders will use whatever rankings are available. Our challenge is to help develop better metrics to assess the societal impact of our research so that these metrics can be incorporated in the rankings. Rankings will not disappear, we have an opportunity to improve them. Thanks to Andrew for opening the discussion.

**16:20:50 From Herman Aguinis :** Great points, Bill! This is OUR problem. We need to work collectively to fix it.

**16:21:24 From Zhen TANG :** China is undergoing a transition from quantity to quality of academic publication. We are looking forward to having a very effective and operable quality evaluation method.

**16:28:14 From Ke Cao :** re the van de van comment, surprised to know that FT has been bought by Nikkei Asia. not sure to what extent Japan universities use FT 50 list.

**16:28:19 From Andrew Jack :** the [www.ft.com/ft50](http://www.ft.com/ft50) survey is still open, but would appreciate input in the next week or so

**16:31:07 From DLEV :** I think what we have is a very powerful data point for Zuckerman's notion of middle status conformance. The very elite institutions don't rely on lists and have the confidence (irrogance) to rely on subjective judgment while the vast bulk of institutions that aspire to elite status rely on more mechanistic evaluation. As Andrew gently suggests the fault to a large degree is the way the list has been appropriated and used.

**16:31:18 From Herman Aguinis :** There is no such thing as THE validity of a measure. Validity is determined by how it is used. A measure may be valid for one purpose but not for another.

**16:33:23 From Herman Aguinis :** Also regarding the validity of measures, we should be mindful of the UNIT OF ANALYSIS. A measure that may be valid to evaluate articles may not be valid to evaluate journals, individual researchers, and universities.

**16:33:35 From Wilfred Mijnhardt (RSM-EUR-NL) :** At RSM we have a "equivalence principle" for publishing, which states that disciplinary (non core) journals are valued as much as

journals in the field of management (core journals). This is respectful for scholars who publish in management and their mother discipline.

**16:34:12**      **From Herman Aguinis** : Also, a performance measure may be useful for administrative purposes, but not developmental (i.e., feedback) purposes or vice versa.

**16:34:48**      **From Herman Aguinis** : Measuring research performance for professors is not different than measuring any type of performance for any type of job. We need to define the success factors and then measure them.

**16:35:26**      **From Herman Aguinis** : I apologize for referring to our work again, but this book addresses these issues in detail: <https://www.amazon.com/gp/product/1119557658>

**16:35:46**      **From Gerardine Doyle** : Regarding Phylis question of researcher integrity, there is much to be learnt from the medical journals where prior to publication, each researcher must declare which aspects of the research they were engaged in e.g. research design, data collection, data analysis etc. This process help to ensure real engagement of each researcher in the journey of the publication.

**16:37:23**      **From Phylis Lan Lin (藍采風)** : Thank you, Gerardine.

**16:37:59**      **From Jerry Davis** : We might consider 3 "metrics" for the FT: (1) research quality, based on the journal's observance of best practices in review process; (2) relevance, based on the potential usefulness of the work [e.g., for achieving the SDGs]; (3) impact, how has the work been taken up in the world beyond academia.

**16:38:02**      **From Wilfred Mijnhardt (RSM-EUR-NL)** : And principles of Open Science values key process values and engagement as much as classic input-output measures that we currently use in the research evaluations.

**16:40:18**      **From Prakash Kr. Gautam Nepal** : Dear all, would you please answer how the researchers from underdeveloped country/economy can get platform in good matrix journals as many principles in such background cannot fit exactly what researchers' society/publication look for?

**16:41:18**      **From Anna Grandori** : Devising more balanced measures is certainly wise, but a bigger problem is that journals are overloaded with functions - especially HR evaluation and knowledge growth are very different functions - what about a higher separation between the institutions and metrics for the two purposes?

**16:41:57**      **From baba** : Is there any way to get a copy of the chats? They are very illuminating

**16:42:14**      **From Bill Glick** : FT might consider regional rankings with different weighting of metrics.

**16:42:17**      **From Xavier Castaner** : Yes, we will post it in our website

**16:42:19**      **From Andrew Jack** : Some FT resources: [www.ft.com/rbe](http://www.ft.com/rbe)

**16:42:40**      **From Andrew Jack** : SDGs mapping <https://www.ft.com/content/6b499b5b-76fc-4fee-9684-f8055e52c46e>

**16:43:05**      **From Andrew Jack** : Wider impact <https://www.ft.com/content/5953739c-3b94-11ea-b84f-a62c46f39bc2>

- 16:43:20** From **Andrew Jack** : relevance <https://www.ft.com/content/b921209d-4b5b-4b51-ae93-971d458b6e4a>
- 16:43:34** From **Andrew Jack** : curriculum <https://www.ft.com/content/a973a6bf-85a7-44d5-83c0-2c05b4c50ef4>
- 16:43:50** From **Andrew Jack** : student social impact projects <https://www.ft.com/content/44d2227a-4852-43ef-b123-94ef138ab843>
- 16:44:05** From **Wilfred Mijnhardt (RSM-EUR-NL)** : For an indication of how our research relates to SDG's see this RSM dashboard, where all 75 K articles of this century in FT50 and UTD lists are mapped to SDG's: <https://rsmmetrics.nl/sustainable-development-goals/triple-crown-sdg>
- 16:44:07** From **Ke Cao** : perhaps good management scholarship in, say, French, German, too that don't appear in FT. many dimensions in "western"
- 16:44:14** From **Andrew Jack** : wider notions of impact <https://www.ft.com/content/b6bcfa02-ef37-11e9-ad1e-4367d8281195>
- 16:46:42** From **Jerry Davis** : Andrew hinted at the idea of a hackathon. Might it make sense to convene a more sustained dialogue to test out different measurement approaches? An interesting exemplar: <https://www.fragilefamilieschallenge.org/>
- 16:47:18** From **Andrew Jack** : thoughts would be welcome to respbus@ft.com
- 16:54:41** From **Bill Glick** : Herman, how can we get performance measurement experts to tackle the problem of measuring the credibility and usefulness of research with big data?
- 16:55:23** From **Herman Aguinis** : Yes, Glick--great points!!
- 16:55:36** From **Jerry Davis** : I wonder if any of us would be willing to say "Here are the actual metrics the FT should use, to address all the many issues raised today"? The FT has a problem to solve -- how can we help them out?
- 16:56:42** From **Silke Machold** : @Bill Glick There is some work done on altmetrics which uses big data to provide indicators of impact on policy, for example
- 16:57:05** From **Herman Aguinis** : Suggestions on what metrics FT can use. Our modest proposals: (1) <http://www.hermanaguinis.com/AMLE2014.pdf> and (2) <http://hermanaguinis.com/IJCHMimpact.pdf>
- 16:58:40** From **Herman Aguinis** : "Ungovernable" :-)
- 16:58:46** From **Wilfred Mijnhardt (RSM-EUR-NL)** : Talking about diversity in publishing: see this recent launched list of Chinese language management journals. Cabells and AMBA launch list of most impactful Chinese language management journals <https://blog.cabells.com/2020/12/16/cabells-and-amba-launch-list-of-most-impactful-chinese-language-management-journals/>
- 16:59:11** From **Silke Machold** : Unfortunately, in the UK we do not have tenure....
- 16:59:11** From **Bill Glick** : I'm aware of some of the altmetrics research, but please send me any references. One study found no relation between altmetrics and the UK's REFs, which I think is a good criterion.
- 16:59:54** From **mccar** : The question is: How can we help society?

- 17:00:01**      **From Madeleine Barrows BAM :** Thank you for an excellent event - particularly to Andrew Jack for his willingness to engage with these fundamental issues of concern to our global community.
- 17:00:07**      **From Herman Aguinis :** On Altmetrics for measuring scholarly impact:  
<http://www.hermanaguinis.com/AMP2012.pdf> and  
<http://www.hermanaguinis.com/AMLE2014.pdf>
- 17:00:13**      **From Anna Grandori :** YES, Henrich, the issue is how the juniors can survive and develop better
- 17:00:17**      **From mccar :** Great session. Thank you.
- 17:00:44**      **From Herman Aguinis :** Thank you Xavier and IFSAM. Great session! And, thank you Andrew Jack!
- 17:00:54**      **From Dhruva Gautam :** Thanks all for this great session
- 17:01:13**      **From baba :** Very useful webinar. Look forward to the next one. Thanks
- 17:01:13**      **From Andrew Jack :** would very much welcome further thoughts notably on definitions (relevance, impact etc); metrics; approaches, and wider submissions on how we can practically proceed (feasible for schools, journals, FT etc) [respbus@ft.com](mailto:respbus@ft.com)
- 17:01:22**      **From Sandro.Castaldo :** Thank you Xavier, Andrew, Herman, Henrich, Zhen, Alessandro, Trish, Jerry and all the participants. Thank a lot
- 17:01:28**      **From Zhen TANG :** Great session. Thank you, thank you Xavier and IFSAM!
- 17:01:28**      **From Lilian Outtes Wanderley :** Thank you all very much. IFSAM and Andrew.
- 17:01:31**      **From Zoogah :** Thanks to all.
- 17:01:32**      **From Phylis Lan Lin (藍采風) :** Zhen: My We Chat address: phylis1966. Let's connect with each other.
- 17:01:33**      **From IB :** highly stimulating session. thanks to panelists and to all colleagues for their written contributions
- 17:01:39**      **From alessandrozattoni :** Thanks IFSAM and all of you for the insightful comments.
- 17:02:02**      **From IB :** thanks Wavier. very much. excellent initiative
- 17:02:23**      **From Phylis Lan Lin (藍采風) :** Great discussion
- 17:02:29**      **From Phylis Lan Lin (藍采風) :** Thanks
- 17:03:08**      **From Dhan Raj Chalise, FoM, TU :** Thank you organizer for such a enlightening session.
- 17:04:17**      **From Giambattista Dagnino :** Thanks!!
- 17:05:19**      **From Greg Bamber :** Thanks for the v important & interesting talk at the IFSAM webinar. Cheers. Greg Bamber, Director, International Consortium for Research in Employment & Work (iCREW), Monash Business School, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia; Visiting Prof., Newcastle Uni. & Nottingham Trent Uni., UK
- 17:05:33**      **From Sandro.Castaldo :** thank you

**17:14:53**      **From Nicholas Oregan :** Each school will have a different business model. Any thoughts on evaluating research centres?

**17:16:28**      **From Herman Aguinis :** I have to go to another meeting. Thank you everyone for a fabulous session. LOTS of food for thought!

**17:17:44**      **From Bill Glick :** please send a copy of chat to participants.

**17:18:21**      **From Silke Machold :** I will also need to go, I will post some of the work on altmetrics on the RRBM blog

**17:20:57**      **From Nicholas Oregan :** Thank you

**17:21:23**      **From Lara Penco :** Thank you!