Editorial: How to Develop a Strong Research Culture

Adam Lindgreen, Copenhagen Business School and University of Pretoria's Gordon Institute of Business Science[1,2]

C. Anthony Di Benedetto, Fox School of Business, Temple University[3]

Constant Pieters, Copenhagen Business School[4]

[1] Adam Lindgreen, Department of Marketing, Copenhagen Business School, Solbjerg Plads 3, 2000 Frederiksberg C, Denmark and University of Pretoria's Gordon Institute of Business Science, 26 Melville Road, Illovo, Johannesburg, South Africa. E-mail: adli.marktg@cbs.dk.

[2] All authors contributed equally.

[3] C. Anthony Di Benedetto, Fox School of Business, Alter Hall 523, 1801 Liacouras Walk, Philadelphia, PA 19122-6083, USA. E-mail: tonyd@temple.edu.

[4] Constant Pieters, Department of Marketing, Copenhagen Business School, Solbjerg Plads 3, 2000 Frederiksberg C, Denmark. E-mail: cpi.marktg@cbs.dk.

ABSTRACT

The business school of today is operating in a highly challenging and competitive environment. The leading business schools have a successful research culture, and a solid sense of academic citizenship. To navigate in the current environment, business schools seek ways in which they can build, or maintain, a strong research culture, so that they can achieve research objectives, solidify their research contributions, attract leading academics and doctoral students, and be poised for success in the future. In this editorial, we apply the procedure for organizational change, first outlined by Kurt Lewin (1951). We discuss the three steps of this procedure as applied to the research culture setting: (1) recognize a need to change ('unfreeze') current behaviors; (2) move to the desired behavioral level, and (3) reinforce ('freeze') behavior at the new level by instituting appropriate celebrations and providing rewards and recognitions for successful attainment.

Keywords:academic citizenship, research culture.

1. INTRODUCTION

The success of a business school, or any academic department thereof, will depend on its academic citizenship, which is the cornerstone of the school's research culture. In the challenging and competitive environment of today, many business schools are seeking ways to build or maintain a strong research culture, so as to achieve the rewards and renown associated with being a high-quality research institution. It is not, however, immediately obvious how school administrators should proceed; each case will be different, and every school will have its own strong points and weaknesses. Establishing and strengthening a research culture will not be a one-size-fits-all solution. However, with an understanding of the fundamentals of a strong research culture, and with some consideration of how those fundamentals can be achieved, a business school can devise a game plan for achieving a research culture that will reap long-term rewards.

Years ago, the noted psychologist Kurt Lewin proposed a procedure for organizational change, which has come to be known as the three-step model of change (Lewin, 1951). Briefly, the steps include: (1) 'unfreezing' the current behavioral level by recognizing the need to change and the importance of changing, (2) moving to the desired behavioral level, and (3) 'freezing' or reinforcing behavior at the new level by instituting appropriate celebrations and providing rewards and recognitions for successful attainment. We propose this three-step model as a guide to developing and executing the game plan, which will result in a successful, healthy research culture that is driven and held together by academic citizenship.

The remainder of this editorial is organized as follows. The next section initializes the first step by addressing the growing importance of a strong research culture. Following sections will outline specific actions that can be taken to improve academic citizenship across several dimensions (second step), which is central to a robust research culture, and actions that can be used to freeze the research culture in place and ensure its longevity (third step).

2. FIRST STEP: RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF A STRONG RESEARCH CULTURE

The first step in Lewin's model reflects the need to establish a strong(er) research culture. As noted in the introduction, without a strong research culture in place, it will be difficult for a business school to attain its research strategy. A plan must be in place to ensure a stream of publications in the highest ranked and most prestigious journals (according to the Academic Journal Guide [AJG] or similar journal rankings).

A plan to stimulate a healthy research culture requires that everyone in the school or department is on board, and thus includes a sincere commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. The school or department can ensure, for example, that committee members, visiting and adjunct professors, and guest speakers reflect diversity, for example in terms of age, gender, nationality, and seniority, but also in terms of ideas (e.g., research interests). Whereas smaller-size committees could be headed by a single faculty member, bigger-size committees that per regulation are chaired by the head of the business school or department certainly should reflect the diversity of available talent. Input from different points of view promises new ideas and fosters support among the whole faculty. Business schools may require faculty to participate in interactive teaching sessions in the diversity, equity, and inclusion domain. A working group dedicated to identifying opportunities for improvement can be assembled. Positive change in the direction of diversity, equity, and inclusion in business school research culture is then recognized and rewarded.

We now turn to specific initatives that reflect a recognition of the importance of research culture, and that are instrumental in the change process to a strong(er) research culture.

2.1. Hiring and Retaining Faculty with High Research (and Teaching and Outreach) Potential

If business schools or departments wish to foster a research culture, they should hire and retain faculty with a focus on research quality and a high research potential; teaching and outreach potential obviously also are important considerations. To accomplish that, the business school should have a clear and realistic definition of research quality (Lindgreen, Di Benedetto, & Brodie, 2021). To judge any given journal, accepted journal ranking lists may be used, especially the list that the business school uses, such as the AJG ranking; alternatively, national lists (such as those adopted by German, Australian, or Scandinavian business schools) can also be employed. Today, business schools use different article-level metrics including citations, field-weighted citation impact, and Altmetrics. It is also possible to use different author-level metrics for evaluating a person's research quality including, for example, scholarly output, journal count, and journal category count, different indices (i.e., h-index, D-index, L-index, C score, i10 value). Peer and aspirant business schools may be identified, and their research outputs established as targets. Beyond metrics, the research quality of an individual publication or research stream can be assessed in terms of contribution to theory, method, and/or practice. Quality also suggests accountability to the research community and to society in general; hallmarks of accountability include access to open data, replicability of research results, full disclosure of methods and results, pre-registration, research ethicality, and so on.

2.2. Providing Appropriate Research Budgets

Business schools will have various methods for allocating research budgets to faculty, and of course those will be constrained by fiscal realities (so sometimes the expected amount must be reduced due to lack of funds).

Tenure-track assistant professors have limited experiences and are embedded in small networks. Thus, to facilitate these professors' research activities, the department could arrange for a fixed yearly research budget (say, €5,000 or $5,000). Such a research budget would be an important strength when the department goes to an annual conference (e.g., American Marketing Association) to hire good Ph.D. graduates as its new tenure-track assistant professors.

In contrast, for associate professors and full professors, one method for allocating research budgets would be to tie research budgets to publications in the highest-level journals. This can be accomplished directly (a certain sum of money is placed into faculty members' research accounts per, say, A+ or A journal articles, divided equally among authors in the business school) or indirectly (an A+ or A journal article is rewarded by a certain number of merit points, which translate into either a yearly stipend added to the research account or an increase in the faculty member's base pay). In cases where senior faculty publish with junior faculty who have not previously published in A+ or A journals, the business school could decide, for example, that the junior faculty member gets the full sum of money, while the junior faculty divide the same sum of money among themselves. In another method, research budgets may be allocated to 'research scholars', who are faculty members who have been awarded that title and can retain it as long as they stay research active. The choice of A+ or A journals will depend on the specific list(s) used by the business school, such as the AJG list, the FT 50 list, or the UTD 24 list.

To encourage engagement in funding application, the business school can decide that all incoming funding is sent back to the successful department, which in turn can decide that all or at least some of the associated overhead is placed into the research accounts of those faculty members who applied successfully for funding (Lindgreen, Di Benedetto, Verdich, Vanhamme, Venkatraman, Pattinson, Clarke, & Khan, 2019).

2.3. Developing Personal Research Plans

Faculty members should be required to develop a realistic research plan, detailing one-year, three-year, or even five-year research objectives, and present this plan as part of their annual review. The following are topics that could be discussed in the research plan: last year's research publications and funding applications and those publications and applications planned for the next years to come; Ph.D. research supervision; research communication and visibility; national and internationally recognition as an expert within the faculty member's research discipline(s); and research contributions to societally relevant and impactful agendas. This could also include research funding applications, which this editorial discusses later. In cases where a faculty member is working with a mentor, the mentor should discuss the research plan, provide guidance, and sign off on the research plan. The head of business school or the department will provide feedback on these research plans as part of the annual review, and can meet with faculty members informally inbetween reviews when necessary.

2.4. Developing Personal Research Funding Plans

The annual review of faculty may also contain a detailed plan for their proposed research-funding applications over the next three to five years. This plan ensures that faculty consider their research-funding strategies, and that such strategies become a part of recruitment and promotion decisions. Faculty members may consult with their mentors, reviewing research plans, and discussing implications for funding applications. It is a good idea for any faculty member considering writing a big funding application to a prominent institution to work with an experienced mentor. This mentor need not be within the faculty member's department, but should have experience with funding writing, reviewing, and assessment, and/or with the targeted funding agency. Keep in mind that the mentor's role is not simply to consult on specific research projects; the mentor is a sounding board and source of support for any pertinent research-related issues. Early-career faculty members can, for example, discuss research funding strategy, as well as optimizing the research project to use most efficiently available resources. Some senior faculty may have sufficient funding so that they can team up with early-career colleagues and help support their research projects financially (Lindgreen, Palmer, Vanhamme, & Beverland, 2003).

2.5. Creating Mentoring Plans

Faculty members should be able to work with a mentor, that is, a senior person who may be within the faculty member's own department but equally may be from a complementary research area. Today, activities that faculty members engage in are succinctly described as research, teaching, outreach, and service. To be successful, each of these activities must be kept in balance, and prioritized correctly—and this is challenging, as the activities most often are running in parallel, all are time demanding, and any one activity can become overwhelming as deadlines approach (Lindgreen & Di Benedetto, 2020). Thus, mentors would be expected to provide advice and suggestions, which may be research-related but may also involve broader issues (such as career progress, work-life balance, stress of an academic career, and so forth). Mentor and mentee can jointly decide on their own specific objectives. Senior faculty should be prepared to serve as mentors if asked, as it would be viewed as a contribution to academic citizenship. The mentor system is designed to create a "safe space" for faculty to grow.

2.6. Organizing Seminars on Research and Research Funding

Visiting scholars with strong research records can be invited to present their most current research at the department's annual research-seminar series. When a department is organized around smaller-size research communities that often are acting as 'isolated islands', an annual research-seminar series is particularly helpful to facilitate a strong research culture across the entire department. In practice, for example, before the beginning of a new academic year, the head of the department could ask each the leaders of the department's research communities which visiting scholars (or online speakers) they would like to invite during the next twelve months. After consultation with their community colleagues, the leaders inform the head of the department about the choice of visiting scholars/online speakers. A list of next year's visiting scholars/online speakers and the day of their seminars is sent to the department. Subsequently, the (leaders of the) communities are responsible for organizing the seminars and—in the case of visiting scholars—talks with individual faculty members who can be from any of the research communities. At the end of the academic year, the list of that academic year's seminars is posted on the department's homepage.

In addition to current research, visitors may speak on topics such as writing skills for journal articles, research-based teaching, or other educational issues or career insights. These seminars provide evidence of new research ideas and may stimulate faculty to pursue new research paths of their own. Visiting scholars will meet the faculty, and learn about their research interests, as some opportunities for collaboration may be identified. The visitors may also be invited to comment on the writing process itself, as further inspiration: what is their strategy for coming up with strong research ideas, what do they do when they get discouraged, how do they stay productive, how many hours per week do they devote to research, and so on. As part of their visit, these scholars can meet or be paired with faculty members with similar research interests, and the scholars can provide insights to early-career academics on either research or funding-application issues. Probably the single most important opportunity of hosting visiting scholars is the opportunity for networking and, ultimately, joint research or funding collaboration.

The school may also organize speakers from the school's Research Office on such topics as writing research-funding applications, identifying appropriate funding institutions, and so forth. Thus, faculty get assistance in obtaining funding, and the department's funding coordinator can assess likely success of funding applications or identify good matches between a faculty member's research topic and the correct funding agency to approach. Seminars can focus on helping early-career faculty, who have trouble obtaining funding, and providing insights to improve the probabilities of the funding applications. Experienced faculty with a strong track record can discuss their own experiences: how did they develop and refine research ideas, how did they overcome discouragement after a funding-proposal rejection, how did they re-motivate after a dry period, how did they change their work (or relaxation) habits to improve productivity, how did they achieve work-life balance, and so on.

2.7. Organizing More Informal Activities

Brown-bag seminars are similar to the above seminars, and may involve visiting scholars, but would also be open to the business school's faculty and doctoral students, giving them the opportunity to present their work in a friendly environment, and to get ideas for improvement. Brown-bag seminars are a good way for faculty to get feedback on their research projects at early stages, so the research projects can be refined before data collection and presentation at an outside conference or colloquium. In addition to presenting early-stage research, presenters can get useful feedback on how they may obtain funding for their project, and what journals might be appropriate targets for their research. Audience members should play an appropriate academic scholarship role, by providing constructive criticism to help their colleagues improve. One or two attendees who work in a related research area may be chosen as opponents or discussants: they would be expected to ask challenging questions that would help the presenter identify solution(s) or improvement(s). This could be particularly useful for doctoral candidates in the form of an (annual) informal or formal 'Ph.D. day,' which involves the whole faculty (and even external guests) in doctoral research.

Another more informal activity would be the formation of one or more writing clubs among research-active faculty. These clubs would focus on funding applications, and there may be many of these in each department depending on the range of research interests being pursued. Leading scholars may be invited to visit the school (this may be part of a pre-planned research presentation or event such as an annual research camp at the business school or in the area) and attend writing club meetings. Opportunities for fruitful collaboration may emerge from such visits. There are several benefits to an informal writing club. Club members can help a faculty member decide whether it is worth devoting time and effort to a funding application, based on their own experience. Club members may offer to partner with early-stage faculty members and help them co-author the funding application, even for a small-scale seed money grant to get the research started. Furthermore, club members can discuss issues such as research topics identified as high priority by research agencies, strategies for investing newly obtained funds, or opportunities for collaboration with industry practitioners.

2.8. Translating Research into Teaching and Societal Value

It is important that the business school prioritizes translational research. Academic research should not only be published in the highest-level journals journals; it should also be useful in educational delivery in undergraduate and graduate programs (Lindgreen, Di Benedetto, Brodie, & Naude, 2020a), and should provide guidance to business practitioners and to society in general (Lindgreen, Di Benedetto, Evald, Clarke, Bjørn-Andersen, & Lambert, 2021). Faculty members are expected to contribute to education by incorporating their research into the classroom, particularly for graduate courses, in order to transform the research meaningfully to benefit students and practitioners. Students will benefit greatly from faculty who can bring their subject-matter knowledge into the classroom. It could be a good idea for departments to support and honor faculty who successfully integrate their research into their courses. The concepts of service dominant (S-D) logic can be used, as we have previously mentioned (Lindgreen, Di Benedetto, Brodie, & Naude, 2020a), with faculty acting as the 'provider' and students acting as the 'consumer'. In accordance with S-D logic, faculty members present value propositions while students co-create value. Dissemination of knowledge in presentations to industry, publications in practitioner magazines, participation in popular media, and so forward fosters societal value of research (Lindgreen, Di Benedetto, Evald, Clarke, Bjørn-Andersen, & Lambert, 2021). Faculty who can integrate their research in the teaching and who can bridge the gap between research and practice will ensure that students benefit from the new research insights.

2.9. Summary: Checklist of Activities to Stimulate a Research Culture

Achieving a desired research culture will require activity on many fronts, and scarce human and financial resources will need to be allocated efficiently. To summarize and expand on the above points, a checklist of activites would include the following:

- Carefully consider current and future research needs when filling faculty lines. Hiring and retention policy should focus on identifying faculty with high research (and teaching and outreach) potential, not only at the junior level but also for senior, chaired, or funded positions.
- Senior faculty's responsibilities will include leadership and mentorship activity.
- Activities in the school or department such as research seminars reflect a culture in which research is valued.
- All faculty will be expected to participate in school- or department research-related activities to share knowledge and resources, to consider colleagues as potential research partners, and to translate research into teaching and societal value.
- Professionalism and efficiency will be expected from everyone across the business school and supported (for example, by providing creative space and time allocation for research activities).

3. SECOND STEP: MOVING TO A STRONG RESEARCH CULTURE THROUGH ACADEMIC CITIZENSHIP

Step two in Lewin's model is to undertake the activities needed to move to the higher-level objective. As stated in the introduction, in order for a business school to realize its research strategy, it must build and support a strong research culture and activities related to it; the foundation of such a culture is the academic citizenship of the faculty.

All faculty members are expected to be active and willing participants in developing and implementing the business school's research strategy and evaluating performance according to appropriate metrics. This kind of academic citizenship can take several forms, and expectations may vary according to the faculty member's seniority. Activities can include providing advice to the business school or department regarding governance issues; mentoring junior colleagues; organizing or participating in school-wide or department-wide seminars; participating in faculty recruitment and assessment; or sharing useful information from their external networks (identifying a colleague at another school with a similar research interest, for example). Inviting others to work together on a research project or funding application, participation in peer reviews of colleagues' teaching, and offering to provide informal 'friendly' reviews of manuscripts, are other effective academic scholarship activities. Faculty members participating in national or global conferences, serving on government committees, or making media appearances as subject matter experts, or otherwise bringing recognition to the business school. Once a business school has attained a strong enough reputation in terms of academic excellence, it may become a magnet for other academics, who are looking to work with like-minded colleagues. For example, senior faculty with solid research careers may want to join and use the research culture as a catalyst to start centers in their research area.

To elaborate on the above, the following sections explore the role of various components of academic citizenship: ambassadorship, collegiality, engagement, integrity, and scholarship.

3.1. Ambassadorship

The key to ambassadorship is for faculty to communicate and promote the results of academic research to society, making it meaningful for the target audiences. There are many ways by which faculty members can serve as ambassadors to the local, national, or international community. Faculty can engage with leading companies, organizations, and industry associations, as well as government institutions, to show the relevance and application of their research findings. As an example, the Product Development and Management Association (PDMA) has frequently conducted studies of best practices in product innovation and development, most recently in 2021 (Knudsen, von Zedtwitz, Griffin, & Barczak, 2023). These are surveys of hundreds of companies worldwide, highlighting major implications for the practitioner community (for example, what innovation-related strategies and activities separate the ‘best’ from the ‘rest’?).

Faculty members also play a visible boundary-spanning role in the media. The department’s homepage and that of the business school are great ways of showcasing faculty’s achievements in research, teaching, and outreach. The same is the case for LinkedIn pages (for individual faculty, as well as for the department and the business school; and, along the same lines, one could consider a regular newsletter to be sent out to interested scholars and practitioners). Faculty may be called upon by media reporters to speak as experts on topics related to the national or local economy, marketing trends, or innovative new products. Many faculty members will have research interests and areas of expertise that align with newsworthy topics of interest to society; and these are also ambassadorship opportunities. Such media interviews represent their business school and university and help maintain visibility for their institution.

Example: Two of the authors of this editorial serve as editors-in-chief of *Industrial Marketing Management*. As part of this job, they seek to promote and be ambassadors for the best in business-to-business and industrial marketing. Ways of doing that include the following initiatives, among others:

- Having an annual *Industrial Marketing Management Summit*, which aims to bring leading scholars together to discuss issues, trends, and developments within the business-to-business and industrial marketing field.
- Publishing special issues of the journal that explore emerging ideas.
- Publishing a series of “How to” editorials aiming to enrich research practice and to offer advice to early- and mid-career faculty.
- Setting up a new section of the journal aiming to serve its managerial constituency by fostering academic-practitioner collaboration and by encouraging research projects that design specific solutions to managerial challenges.
- Setting up a new section of the journal aiming to develop new knowledge and enhancing interdisciplinary collaborations by broadening the field of business-to-business marketing.

- Reaching out to the journal's community for ideas and suggestions on how to improve the quality of business-to-business and industrial marketing.
- Considering diversity when inviting faculty to be reviewers, to sit on the editorial review board, or to take up more senior positions with the journal.

3.2. Collegiality

Academic citizenship is dependent on a collegial atmosphere. The business school is a collective of individuals, and to prosper, active and motivated contributions from all faculty members is needed. There are many activities that need to be performed for the business school to function smoothly, but for which the individual receives little or no immediate reward. Some of these activities are outward facing (reviewing manuscripts submitted for publication or funding, editing journals and books, serving on academic organizations or boards, etc.), while other activities are within the walls of the business school (serving on merit or tenure committees, managing a seminar series or colloquium, advising on research strategy, developing frameworks for teaching recognition, etc.). In some cases, other activities may be required on a more ad hoc or informal basis (serving as a mentor for a junior colleague, providing an informal 'friendly' review of a manuscript, evaluating talented new graduates as potential research hires, or promoting better curriculum design). If a collegial atmosphere pervades the business school, faculty members will be motivated to take the initiative to lead (or at least assist with) these vital activities despite the occasionally limited compensation.

Example: A business school can only attain, and hold onto, a reputation as a leading research institution if it has a healthy doctoral program, thus, engagement with doctoral students is of critical importance. Many activities related to the upkeep of a doctoral program require buy-in from faculty members who understand the need to invest time and effort into this program. Key activities include:

- Onboarding doctoral students: selecting the most promising students, introducing students to the doctoral program, and discussing the doctoral program and its milestones. For example, central to the success of any relationship in academia is openness and honesty, as well as respect for the variety of skills, abilities, and roles different researchers can play. A relationship builds on mutual trust, and that can be enhanced by not only collaborating on research projects, but also socializing together.
- Engaging with doctoral students: developing original research ideas, writing funding applications that could lead to a post-doc opportunity, writing and revising manuscripts,

collaborating with practitioners to help doctoral students getting access to data and to demonstrate that their research has societal relevance and impact, converting research into classroom teaching, making the research translational, etc. It is also necessary, say, every second month to follow up more formally on how doctoral students and their supervisors are getting on with the doctoral program and how they are getting along with each other. Doing this will help to rectify a situation that otherwise could develop into an unfortunate direction.

- Preparing the doctoral student for post-graduation: introducing doctoral students to people and research centers that faculty members are part of, assembling an effective application dossier, starting the academic career, developing the first new research stream post-dissertation, planning a strategy for the lifelong research journey, etc.
- Taking part in research-stimulating activities: inviting visiting scholars from other business schools to attend brown-bag seminars and manuscript-development workshops, preparing doctoral students to present their research to faculty and invited guests to gain feedback and to network, etc.
- Taking part in other activities that support the doctoral program and its students: meeting with doctoral students and their supervisors, implementing and monitoring a formal checklist for progress at various stages in the doctoral program, placing doctoral students at research institutions nationally and worldwide, serving administrative roles such as Ph.D. coordinator and or placement officer, etc.

3.3. Engagement

Beyond an environment of collegiality, active faculty engagement is also a requirement: engagement with students, with other faculty inside and outside the business school, and with society in general. At a minimum, engagement expects mental and physical presence. For example, many business schools expect doctoral students to live at most a short trip from campus whenever possible, and to be taking a full load of doctoral-level courses, such that they literally and figuratively always engage with the doctoral program. The reason for such a policy is quite simple: early-career faculty have little experience in research, teaching, and outreach, and they do not yet have their own networks for support and collaboration. Instead, doctoral students need to be around the business school to benefit from more senior faculty members' support and collaboration; for example, senior faculty are expected to be part of relevant international research networks. Beyond physical presence, engagement expects that faculty members will actively dialogue with their counterparts: faculty members are willing and interested in listening to the perspectives of all parties, and they understand that all parties benefit from this engagement as a result.

Example: As an illustration, one of the authors of this editorial is a lecturer in an Executive Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) program, designed for executives and senior managers and with a focus on translational, practical academic research. The program, based at the Fox School of Business (Temple University, Philadelphia, United States) is part-time and attracts participants from all over the United States and around the world. Most students reside out of town and visit Philadelphia for six long-weekend residencies (Friday to Sunday) per year, so some students potentially could feel a lack of presence with the program. However, the program is set up to ensure a sense of faculty and cohort support. Students all stay at a quality hotel and develop a sense of camaraderie both in the classroom and at DBA receptions. In between physical visits to campus, virtual 'bridge sessions' in the evening and active participation on discussion boards are a part of every course. Some Saturday morning sessions are devoted to informal student presentations in front of faculty and a small group of cohorts, in a friendly and relaxed atmosphere designed to provide insight and guidance. Importantly, each student is immediately assigned a faculty mentor; and these mentors guide the students through their research progress during their course work and may eventually become the students' senior dissertation advisers. Thus, even in a doctoral program, which is designed for senior managers who are doing part-time schoolwork on top of their high-level corporate jobs, every effort is made to keep the students connected with the program and to maintain a strong link with the student's mentor and other faculty.

3.4. Integrity

An important aspect of academic citizenship is a commitment of all faculty members to maintaining integrity and consistently acting according to all written and unwritten ethical standards, both within their institution and to the academic world in general. It is the responsibility of faculty members to call out any perceived breach of ethical standards, and to discuss integrity-related issues so that the correct course of action is taken.

An immediate example is how faculty handle cases of plagiarism and other student-related ethical issues. As mentor to doctoral students, the dissertation advisers should provide guidelines on ethical behavior, and of course set a good example themselves. Cases of student plagiarism, data falsification, *p*-hacking, and so on may still occur despite the adviser's best efforts, and once identified, appropriate action should be taken swiftly. Some of the ethical guidelines may not be as intuitive as the above: a dissertation adviser may devote a lecture or an office visit to the topics of double-submitting, manuscript 'slicing and dicing', and similar issues so that the doctoral student is familiar with publishing expectations (and the real career risks of not abiding by ethical standards). Internally, faculty should uphold the highest standards of research ethicality, also when working with external scholars. Externally, faculty who serve as reviewers and in particular editors will occasionally find plagiarism when reviewing submitted manuscripts for publication; the editor serves as the front line to root out plagiarism and take the correct action (at a minimum, immediately rejecting the manuscript).

Example: In the above-mentioned Executive DBA program, one of the authors of this editorial devotes one day of residency to the topic of 'dissemination of business research,' that is, the publishing process. Prior to this class, students play the role of reviewers and are asked to write reviews of a typical manuscript assigned by the instructor. This assignment is to start the discussion of what the review process looks like from 'inside the black box'. During the residency, the instructor and the students discuss topics such as how to choose the target journal, how to avoid first-time-author mistakes, how to reply to reviewer concerns, and so forth (LaPlaca, Lindgreen, & Vanhamme, 2018; LaPlaca, Lindgreen, Vanhamme, & Di Benedetto, 2018). With regard to integrity, much time is spent on the topics of plagiarism and self-plagiarism, simultaneous submission to multiple journals, proper deductive research based on conceptual (model) development versus *p*-hacking, and strategies and issues pertaining to programmatic research (Covin & McMullen, 2019). Students emerge from their doctoral coursework with a solid understanding of academic ethics as well as guidance in developing a strategy for their research careers.

3.5. Scholarship

Finally, academic citizenship includes a responsibility to promote scholarship at the highest level. A manuscript submitted to a journal is published if it is felt to have made a significant incremental contribution to theory; thus, advancement of academia rests on the credibility of research findings. Publications, experience, relevant consulting, and so on, in turn, provide credibility to faculty in the classroom. Hence, it is of utmost importance that the highest standards are applied when assessing research or teaching credibility. It is therefore implied that academic citizenship is obliged to question consistently and reconsider research concepts and methodologies, such that these factors will constantly improve through time.

Consider the evolution of a theoretical research stream, such as in product innovation. Early models may have had a smaller number of independent variables, and some of these variables may have been measured in rudimentary fashion. Quantitative results may have been obtained through simple analyses. Through time, the conceptual model may broaden to include more independent variables, and the operationalization of the constructs to measure the variables may be improved. Product quality or product success, once measured using one-item scales, may now use multiple items to reflect better the reality involved in these constructs. Further, more sophisticated model structures and statistical tools may be used to obtain deeper insights. It was Newton who said that he saw further by 'standing on the shoulders of giants'; similarly, we constantly refine theory by building on the works of those who have gone before and making steady improvements.

Example: It has been our experience that students in doctoral programs cannot always tell what a sufficient contribution to literature is. Senior advisers may say that "a good dissertation is a done dissertation," but that does not really provide much guidance for the student. In the DBA class discussed above, the instructor provides models from a series of articles on the product-success literature, starting from an early publication in the 1980s and going through to the present day (innovation is an effective topic to use in a class of students with markedly different research interests, as the topic is a provocative and newsworthy subject, and most students have interest and opinions on new products). The instructor shows how the earliest models are expanded in terms of greater conceptual scope and improved operationalization, yet the later models often have the same basic structure as the earlier models. Later authors were able to make incremental yet significant improvements (adding new direct or moderating effects to improve explanatory ability, for example). Thus, as the research area grows from infancy to maturity, a parallel growth is seen in conceptualization. A lesson here for students is that a new research initiative does not need to be a disruptive new literature stream that 'boils the ocean'; it may be sufficient to ask what is good about the current literature stream and what is missing, or what findings are equivocal so far. That can lead to an incremental contribution which nonetheless is significant; this is a topic for the student to take up with the faculty adviser.

2.3. Summary: Checklist of Academic Citizenship Activities to Foster a Research Culture

The following checklist summarizes and expands the abovementioned points, focusing on academic citizenship activities:

- Commit to all components of academic citizenship: ambassadorship, collegiality, engagement, integrity, and scholarship.

- Establish a healthy research environment for doctoral students and junior faculty: establish strong doctoral student-supervisor relationships; encourage and possibly reward in some way mentorship behavior by senior research faculty; provide junior colleagues with practice and informal feedback; and offer assistance such as research-funding writing workshops or writing support for manuscript revision. This, of course, requires that that all parties contribute to such activities.
- Share the load of administration, yet consider protecting the most research-active faculty by assigning them, if possible, fewer administrative or teaching commitments.
- Stimulate research-engagement and citizenship by senior colleagues to benefit the whole department. For example, senior academics may apply for funding that allows them to launch large research programs to which capable and willing junior academics can contribute by undertaking research projects under the guidance of the senior academics and, later, in equal collaboration.

4. THIRD STEP: FREEZING A STRONG RESEARCH CULTURE

In this section, we consider the last stage of Lewin's change model: how to freeze the strong research culture so it can be sustained. The key to maintaining a strong research culture is providing desirable outcomes and rewards for the participating faculty members, in the form of awards, celebrations, promotions, appointments, and so on in recognition of their achievement and effort.

4.1. Celebrating Successful Outcomes of Research Culture

The 'coin of the realm' at any academic research institution is high-visibility research success: publishing in top journals, obtaining research funding from prestigious institutions, launching a groundbreaking book, or successfully funding and launching a center of research excellence, among others. These achievements should be recognized and publicized. Top publications should be rewarded in terms of tenure, promotion, and/or merit-based research budget or salary increases, in accordance with the business school's hiring, promotion, and remuneration policies. Articles in top journals or books with prestigious publishers, as well as other research-related achievements such as successful organization of a research conference and/or editorship of a journal or special issue, should be publicized, for example, in the appropriate business school online newsletter. In cases of translational research, or the establishment of an exciting new center of research excellence, the university's marketing communications office should prepare press releases to get wider media attention.

4.2. Celebrating Research Culture Itself

Enjoyable and informal annual research awards ceremonies can honor the best research contributions of the past year, best work done by junior faculty or doctoral students, and so on. The most productive faculty members may receive a financial award and/or a plaque in recognition of their research contributions. Publication in the top journals (according to the journal evaluation metrics used by the business school) will be rewarded most highly, as this brings the greatest impact and visibility to the business school. Other events where faculty come together to celebrate include inaugural lectures and Ph.D. defenses. A celebration of a lifetime of research leadership can be organized in very special cases to honor retiring faculty members, to which their former doctoral students are invited to come and pay tribute. Additional celebration and recognition can focus on faculty members who put extraordinary effort into academic citizenship activities that stimulate the overall research culture in the department (e.g., administration, mentorship) or school.

4.3. Appointing an Advisory Board on Research Strategy

An advisory board consisting of top-publishing senior faculty members from the department should be appointed to assist the department chair in developing a sound research strategy. Issues that such a board should discuss include (Lindgreen, Di Benedetto, Brodie, & Naudé, 2020b):

- What are important research problems that are of practical and academic interest and create future research opportunities?
- Do we have the capability to initiate an identified research stream, or do we need to hire new faculty?
- Do centers of research excellence support the department research strategy and that of the business school?
- Do we have the leadership to build an international network of researchers who continue to embrace research opportunities and to broaden the stream of research?
- Have we put a process in place to sustain leadership and innovation by appointing senior faculty to initiate and lead identified research streams—and do we distribute leadership

that will lead empowerment to propagate new research initiatives and to keep the momentum in the research stream?

- Have we set up a platform to consolidate knowledge?
- Does our research get recognized and accepted by journals and other scholars, amongst other external stakeholders?
- Do we have the courage to embrace broader challenges in our discipline or, more drastically, reinvent ourselves by identifying new important research problems and thus initiating new research streams?

4.4. Appointing a Research-Funding Coordinator

To strengthen the research culture further, the department chair may establish a research-funding coordinator, whose responsibility is to support high-quality funding applications. The funding coordinator complements the business school's central research office by providing information and know-how to applicants to facilitate their search for funding opportunities. The funding coordinator can also be central in developing and offering training and advice on how to develop a successful funding proposal. These efforts can take the form of a dedicated program for early-career faculty, or tailored recommendations for developing budgets and managing obtained funding. The funding coordinator would be compensated in some way for undertaking the following duties (Lindgreen, Di Benedetto, Verdich, Vanhamme, Venkatraman, Pattinson, Clarke, & Khan, 2019):

- Chairing research-funding committee meetings.
- Being the liaison with the business school's research office.
- Partnering with the department chair in developing a funding strategy.
- Being the contact person regarding funding issues for faculty and administration.
- Organizing peer review of funding applications.
- Reaching out to peer and aspirant business schools to develop research alliances.
- Organizing seminars and informal brown bag presentations focused on research funding issues.
- Assessing research funding opportunities from industry for specific projects.

4.5. Recognizing Funding Applicants

Previously, the editorial discussed how to tie research budgets to publications in the highest-level journals. Along the same lines, the department chair may provide work hours to faculty who are writing funding applications, especially if the department has had little success in receiving funding. In contrast, buy-out time for the funding holder usually is part of the funding. Research funding can be considered as a criterion in the promotion decision, as well as in merit awards and other personnel reviews (for example, a successful funding application from a leading research agency might be considered equivalent to an A-level publication in a merit decision). To prioritize the research focus and encourage funding application, early-career faculty may be given time to work on funding application development (this may be done on a meritorious basis, where quality of topic and rationale for the research are assessed first). Ultimately, a successful funding application should result in one or more published articles: a policy could be initiated where a certain amount of money (up to a maximum available amount) may be added to the research account of the faculty member whose funding resulted in at least one publication in a high-ranked journal. This research money can in turn facilitate new funding applications to fund follow-up studies.

4.6. Summary: Checklist of Considerations to Maintain a Research Culture

The following checklist summarizes and expands the abovementioned points, focusing on how to sustain a research culture:

- Consider and reward research performance and potential not only for faculty hiring, but also for promotion.
- Consider the establishment of coordination (e.g., research advisory board, funding coordinator) to sustain a research culture.
- Recognize and celebrate extraordinary academic citizenship, research culture and its outcomes, internally and externally to the school or department.

5. CONCLUSIONS

This editorial discussed ways in which business schools can build, or maintain, a strong research culture, so that they can achieve research objectives, solidify their research contributions, attract leading academics and doctoral students, and be poised for success in the future. We applied Lewin's (1951) model for organizational change: (1) unfreeze current behaviors by recognizing the need to change; (2) moving to the desired behavioral level, and (3) freezing behavior at the new level by instituting appropriate celebrations and providing rewards for successful attainment.

For the first step in building a strong research culture, we suggested that the focus be on hiring faculty with high research potential, providing appropriate research budgets, developing a personal research plan, developing a personal research funding plan, creating a mentoring plan, organizing research seminars, organizing more informal activities, and translating research into teaching and societal value, among others.

For the second step, we argued that the research culture should be supported by strong academic citizenship, and we discussed five foundations of academic citizenship: ambassadorship, collegiality, engagement, integrity, and scholarship.

Finally, for the third step, we suggested that the focus be on celebrating successful outcomes of research culture, celebrating research culture itself, appointing an advisory board on research strategy, appointing a research-funding coordinator, and recognizing funding applicants.

To conclude this editorial, we would like to discuss more broadly how to govern the research culture/academic citizenship 'ecosystem' across faculty members at different career stages. A very different contribution to research culture and academic citizenship is expected from junior vs. senior faculty members. We suggest to consider the following four elements: rules, structures, norms, and incentives.

5.1. Rules

Many business schools seek to capture in various frameworks the activities that faculty should be engaged in, for example, research, education, funding, academic citizenship, and dissemination. It then becomes transparent what is expected from faculty at different levels in terms of—for the purpose of this editorial—academic citizenship. At the annual performance development reviews, this again facilitates a discussion between faculty and the head of the business school about how faculty have performed over the past year in terms of attending and organizing seminars, promoting an open and inspiring research culture, being mentor to more junior faculty, reviewing journal manuscripts and funding applications, engaging in peer-review teaching, undertaking larger administrative roles, sitting on business school boards, representing the school, showing willingness to take on tasks that benefit the school, serving on public committees, and so on.

The breadth and depth of academic citizenship activities will depend on faculty's seniority: for more senior faculty, the expection not only is to engage in a variety activities that contribute to research culture, but also to undertake significant academic citizenship activities to a larger extent (e.g., being a mentor for an early career colleague is not done the same way for a senior faculty member as it is for a mid-career colleague). When faculty do not deliver on their academic citizenship obligations, this might affect their chances of being promoted.

5.2. Structures

There are different structures to support academic citizenship. One way is to set up more informal smaller-size research communities that each develop guidelines for how they want to interact and collaborate. Having clear expectations of behaviors and attitidues help to build a positive research culture in which faculty are willing to share positive and negative experiences in their research, teaching, and outreach activities. It is a strong, but important, signal to send when a senior faculty member stands up and tells about regularly having manuscripts rejected for publication at top journals. More junior faculty then learn that having manuscripts rejected is part of being an academic. Interactions and collaborations among faculty will help to reduce stress and anxiety. It is important to appreciate that the research community will need to find the necessary time and space to get together, as otherwise the the community becomes nothing but a name.

The business school could ensure that its different research communities learn from each other, for examply by sharing the communities' vision and response to the business school's general strategy. Such vision-and-response documents would discuss issues such as the following:

- What is the research community?
- Which faculty members participate?
- Which projects (research, education, outreach) do faculty members pursue?
- With which stakeholders does the research community collaborate?
- What topics does the research community address?
- In which interdisciplinary activities does the research community engage?
- What societal relevance and impact does the research community have?

5.3. Norms

A business school's professors should especially be seen as role models in promoting a strong research culture. They are in a unique position to do so: not only do the have years of successful experience in research, teaching, and outreach, but they also have tenured positions meaning that they can afford to engage in academic citizenship activities. Together with the business school's other leadership—the dean and the heads of department—professors will live the business school's research culture. The senior faculty are role models to junior academics and doctoral students, not just as research collaborators and dissertation committee members, but in less formal ways as well. In some cases, a junior person may have accepted a tenure-track position at a university specifically to work with a well-known academic, leaving no doubt as to the importance of the latter's responsibility as a role model. Senior faculty who continue to write articles and books, and continually improve their research-based teaching, are inspirational in their commitment to to junior colleagues and the academic profession more generally. A senior person provides informal guidance and mentorship to their early- and mid-career colleagues: they will have more experience dealing with editors and reviewers, for example, and may offer guidance on a revise-and-resubmit strategy for a junior colleague. Building a research culture takes time and much effort. Who better to provide inspiration to stay committed and devoted to research at the highest level than the most senior people who have had success in the past, know the level of commitment required, and continue to perform at this level and to lead by example?

5.4. Incentives

The head of the business school can incentivize faculty in various ways. For example, cases of extraordinary academic citizenship could lead to a salary bonus, and this would be an important element of assessing an application for promotion. It is important that all types of academic citizenship activities are considered. Some activities such as, for example, journal editorship or serving on public committees are more sought after by faculty, but the business school also needs less visible activities, such as, mentoring junior faculty or sitting on a business-school board. Another way of incentivizing senior academics' engagement in academic citizenship would be to give the leader of a research community a formal role, accompanied with the right to direct the community's research endeavors, set up research collaboration with external partners, conduct annual performance development reviews, and decide over a financial budget, among others.

Additionally, expectations of senior faculty can change through time, and incentives can be applied to facilitate desired change. For example, the business school head may target a renowned academic in a specific high-growth research area, with the intention of setting up a research institute. The senior person's responsibility would be to attract funding, work with current faculty researchers, and identify and attract junior academics to join the institute. Initially, during the institute's startup, incentives (such as merit pay increases or increased research budget) may be tied to number or amount of research grants obtained, number of A or

A+ articles published by the institute, or level of success in attracting new junior faculty or doctoral students. Once the institute has grown in terms of personnel and funding support, the objective would be to keep it producing at a high level. Thus, after the initial period, incentives could focus on successful renewed funding from research agencies, number of doctoral students placed at top universities, attracting mid-career researchers well-known in the research area, organizing and playing a leadership role in high-profile research conferences that promote the school as an international leader in that research area, consistent publication in the top journals, and so forth. Finally, if the research results have translational (business or societal) implications, gaining favorable publicity in the national or international media for the business school can also be incentivized.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank their current and former colleagues for insightful discussions on research culture and academic citizenship, especially Gülen Sarial Abi, Felix Eggers, and Michel van der Borgh.

REFERENCES

Covin, J.G. & McMullen, J.S. (2019), "Programmatic research and the case for designing and publishing from rich, multifaceted datasets: issues and recommendations," *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 101, pp. 40–46.

Knudsen, M.P., von Zedtwitz, M., Griffin, A., & Barczak, G. (2023), "Best practices in new product development and innovation: results from PDMA's 2021 global survey," *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, in press.

Lewin, K. (1951), *Field Theory in Social Science*, New York, NY: Harper & Row.

LaPlaca, P., Lindgreen, A., & Vanhamme, J. (2018), "How to write really good articles for premier academic journals," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 68, pp. 202–209.

LaPlaca, P., Lindgreen, A., Vanhamme, J., & Di Benedetto, C.A. (2018), "How to revise, and revise really well, for premier academic journals," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 72, pp. 174–180.

Lindgreen, A. & Di Benedetto, C.A. (2020), "Editorial: How to balance like an academic," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 88, pp. A1–A5.

Lindgreen, A., Di Benedetto, C.A., & Brodie, R.J. (2021), "Editorial: Research quality: what it is, and how to achieve it," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 99, pp. A13–A19.

Lindgreen, A., Di Benedetto, C.A., Brodie, R.J., & Naudé, P. (2020a), "Editorial: How to translate great research into great teaching," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 85, pp. 1–6.

Lindgreen, A., Di Benedetto, C.A., Brodie, R.J., & Naudé, P. (2020b), "Editorial: How to build great research groups," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 81, pp. 1–13.

Lindgreen, A., Di Benedetto, C.A., Evald, M.R., Clarke, A.H., Bjørn-Andersen, N., & Lambert, D. (2021), "Editorial: How to define, identify, and measure societal value," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 97, pp. A1–A13.

Lindgreen, A., Di Benedetto, C.A., Verdich, C., Vanhamme, J., Venkatraman, V., Pattinson, S., Clarke, A.H., & Khan, Z. (2019), "How to write really good research funding applications," *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 77, pp. 232–239.

Lindgreen, A., Palmer, R., Vanhamme, J., & Beverland, M.B. (2003), "Finding and choosing a supervisor," *The Marketing Review*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 147–166.