

Business Policy and Strategy Division Membership Survey



March 2001

Table of Contents

Survey background and summary.....	3
Survey results	7
Background information	7
Opinions on the BPS Division	11
Comments: Valuable services of BPS.....	12
Comments: BPS areas of future progress	15
Field of strategic management	18
Strategic management research.....	20
Comments: Significance of strategic management research	25
Strategic management teaching.....	28
Comments: Maintaining vitality of business school education.....	29

BUSINESS POLICY AND STRATEGY DIVISION MEMBER SURVEY

This report is divided into two sections. The first, immediately below, provides an overview and summary of results for the recent BPS survey. The second, beginning on page 5, provides the survey and detailed results.

DIVISION SURVEY BACKGROUND & SUMMARY

For the purposes of the five-year review, the Division developed a survey based on the questions provided by the Academy, but modified to suit the needs of the Division. The survey was created in an iterative process with contributions from four members of the BPS Executive Committee as well as six non-Executive Committee members of the Division. The objectives of the survey were to provide 1) an overview of the division, its composition, and member attitudes towards the BPS division, 2) feedback on Division member services and resources, 3) BPS members' relationship with other Academy divisions, 4) the direction of the business policy and strategy field, including professional concerns like research and teaching, and 5) data for a SWOT analysis of the Division.

The survey was created in multiple electronic formats in an attempt to maximize response rate, offer convenience to responders, and conserve Division resources by avoiding postage expenses. The formats included Microsoft Word, Adobe Acrobat (.pdf), and an Internet website. Notification was sent out via email to all BPS members in early December 2000. The survey was also posted prominently on the BPS Website. Members had the option of returning the survey either online (the preferred method), by email, by fax, or by mail. A reminder was sent out on December 14th, and again on January 9th. In total, 534 individual surveys were returned, 18% of the BPS membership. Of these, 24 were returned by email, 13 by fax, 2 by mail, and the remainder, 495, online.

The respondents were well balanced in terms of career stage with 19% students, 30% assistant professors, 23% associates, and 18% full professors. The responses also reflect the increasing internationalization of the BPS Division with more than 20% of responses coming from outside of North America. The average survey respondent was 42 years old and has been a member of the Division for 7.3 years. Interestingly, 48% of participants have been members of BPS for less than five years, suggesting Division success in attracting new members.

Most of the respondents consider BPS their "home" division (61.1%). However, there is a substantial minority of BPS members (33.2%) that consider BPS as their "secondary" division. Participation of BPS members in other divisions is not randomly distributed. The data show that four divisions account for the bulk of BPS member participation in other divisions. These divisions are: Organization and Management Theory (36% of BPS members), International Management (32% of BPS members), Entrepreneurship (24% of BPS members), and Technology and Innovation Management (24% of BPS members). In terms of member overlap it would seem that most of BPS interdivisional activities should be targeted at these divisions.

According to respondents their leading reasons for membership in the Division were research interests, opportunity to make contact with BPS scholars, and shared teaching interests. Overall, there appears to be a high degree of satisfaction with the Division's program at the annual meeting. The data also indicated that in the future members would like to see even greater internationalization of the Division and greater outreach and involvement of members from less prestigious schools.

Respondents indicated that scholars/researchers were the most important constituents of the strategic management field followed by practitioners, students, and public policy officials. However, in terms of the effectiveness with which the strategic management field served constituents the data revealed that public policy officials and practitioners lagged behind researchers and students. In fact, respondents highlight a discrepancy between the importance of practitioner constituents and the effectiveness with which they are served.

In the area of research, respondents stated that organization theory was the discipline relied on most heavily in their research followed by economics and sociology. Over the next five years, however, respondents felt that economics would make the most important contributions to strategic management followed by organization theory, and sociology respectively. Respondents indicated that they were engaged in wide variety of research areas with some of the most common being the knowledge-based view, resource-based view/dynamic capabilities, and alliances and networks. Respondents indicated that these areas would continue to be important over the next five years along with research in digital/internet strategy areas.

On the teaching front several interesting trends emerged. Respondents utilize experiential exercises, have class projects with real companies, developed a course web page, and have altered their courses due to technology. Interestingly, the data on these items are not overwhelming but for each of these items the modal response was the end point of the scale, *strongly agree*. The data also revealed that courses are longer than eight weeks in duration suggesting that the movement to short course modules is not widespread among respondents.

SWOT ANALYSIS

a. Strengths

The BPS Division has grown significantly in the last five years, and continues to receive more submissions for the annual meeting than any other division. This demonstrates the strength and vitality of BPS, though increasing efforts must be made to facilitate communication among members as the Division grows larger. Respondents in the survey commented favorably on the value of the annual meeting, the quality of research presented there, and the benefits of the pre-conference activities. The review system provides one of the strongest services in giving authors an opportunity to develop ideas and improve working papers. The relatively new services of the BPS Net and Website have done much to respond to the needs of members, and the teaching materials available on the Web have been welcomed by faculty of the division.

b. Weaknesses

Many members who responded to the survey still find the BPS Division too centered on the U.S. and Canada. Requests have been made for international representation in its leadership, its reviewer base, and its research concentration. It has also been suggested that AOM meetings be held outside of the U.S. or Canada. It is thought that this would not only give better representation to the “international” members, but also that it would expand the vision of the Division and advance BPS research.

Some members still consider the Division to be elitist and exclusionary. Many feel that there is little access to the Division or to representation in the AOM meetings if they are not at the center of the research base, or if they are from smaller, less “prestigious” schools.

The Division is seen to be too removed from practitioner concerns, and needs to find ways to integrate its theoretical research with the needs of the business community.

Many members expressed a desire to create more opportunities for interdivisional activities. This was also seen as a way to broaden the scope of the Division.

Many members expressed dissatisfaction with some of our journals and suggested the possibility of increasing publication outlets. Also suggested was the possibility of starting another journal, perhaps in electronic form.

c. Opportunities

The BPS Website offers perhaps the best forum for growth and improvement in the Division and its services. Some of the suggestions from members were:

- produce an e-journal
- publish papers online following the annual meeting
- add more teaching materials, including syllabi and powerpoint presentations
- better publicize the syllabi exchange
- create a working paper archive
- provide more forums for idea exchange for scholars working on similar topics
- provide a place for practitioners to post their research needs

The Division can also turn some of its weaknesses into opportunities. For example, many members suggested looking outside the United States to draw new insights from other nations’ approaches. A few members suggested holding the Annual Meeting outside the U.S. or Canada. Other members urged the Division to hold smaller, BPS or topic-specific meetings in addition to the Annual Meeting. A solution that simultaneously addresses two member concerns is for the Division to hold one of these more focused meetings outside the U.S. or Canada.

d. Threats

It is of concern that BPS could grow too large to effectively communicate as a group. BPS also occupies a precarious position in its relation to other disciplines. Some members see it as an applied research, and think the Division is moving too far into the arena of theoretical research. From this point of view BPS is losing its value and mission. On the other end of the spectrum, there is also concern that because the Division is seen as less “academic,” it needs to strengthen and emphasize its pure research base. The challenge seems to be for the Division to reach out to practitioners while maintaining academic rigor.

Another concern is the perception of BPS as elitist and parochial. Many urged the Division to widen its scope to include “paradigm shifting ideas,” alternate or qualitative areas of research, non-traditional and interdisciplinary approaches. If this continues, BPS could lose its currency and the ability to promote and encourage the most groundbreaking research and teaching techniques.

BUSINESS POLICY AND STRATEGY DIVISION MEMBERSHIP SURVEY 2001 AND RESULTS

I. Background Information

- 1) How long have you been a member of the BPS Division? (n=512)
Mean = 7.3 years; Std. dev. = 5.8 years; Range = 0 - 35 years
 (note: 48.4% have been members of BPS for 5 years or less).

- 2) Please identify your division memberships in order of their importance (n=512):

Members of **Business Policy & Strategy** Division rank BPS as:

- Primary or 'home' division = 61.1%
- Second most important division = 33.2%

Members of **Business Policy & Strategy** Division that also participates on other memberships:

- Org. & Mgmt. Theory = 36.3%
- International Mgmt. = 31.6%
- Entrepreneurship = 24.4%
- Technology & Innov. Mgmt. = 24.0%
- Managerial & Org. Cognition = 10.7%
- Research Methods = 9.4%
- Org. Development & Change = 7.0%
- Social Issues in Mgmt. = 6.4%
- Organizational Behavior = 5.9%
- Mgmt. Educ. & Dev. = 5.5%
- Orgs. & Natural Environment = 4.9%
- Health Care Mgmt. = 4.7%
- Mgmt. Consulting = 3.5%
- Operations Mgmt. = 3.3%
- Human Resources = 3.3%
- Management History = 2.3%
- Org. Com. & Info. Systems = 2.0%
- Public & Non-Profit Sector = 1.8%
- Conflict Mgmt. = 1.4%
- Mgmt., Spirituality & Religion = 1.4%
- Careers = 1.0%
- Gender & Diversity in Orgs. = 1.0%

- 3) Primary occupational information (n=530):

University based occupation (n=504 or 95% of total):

- Graduate student = 19.4%
- Visiting or non-tenure track professor/instructor = 4.2%
- Assistant professor = 30.2%
- Associate professor = 22.6%
- Full professor = 18.3%

Non University based occupation (n=26 or 5% of total):

Private corporation	= 1.5%
Consulting firm	= 2.5%
Government organization/entity	= 0.6%
Non-profit organization	= 0.4%
Other	= 0.4%

4) University based BPS Members have primary affiliation as follows (n=467):

a. departmental affiliation:

- Management	= 75.8%
- Strategic Management & Bus. Policy	= 6.2%
- Business Administration	= 3.9%
- Organization Studies	= 3.9%
- Economics	= 2.1%
- International Business/Management	= 1.3%
- IT, Operation Mgt., Computer system	= 1.3%
- Health Care/Service Management	= 1.3%
- Entrepreneurship/Innovation/Tech.	= 1.1%
- Marketing	= 1.1%
- Other	= 2.0%

b. programs offered:

- Undergraduate	= 489
- Masters	= 434
- Doctoral	= 270

5) The location of BPS members' primary occupation (n=524):

- Africa	= 0.4%
- Asia	= 3.4%
- Australia/New Zealand	= 1.9%
- Europe	= 14.1%
- North America	= 79.8%
- South America	= 0.4%

6) Age (n=511):

Mean = 42 years old; Std. dev. = 9.5 years; Range = 23 - 74 years old

Age group categories:

- Under 30 years	= 10%
- Between 31 and 35 years	= 19%
- Between 36 and 40 years	= 22%
- Between 41 and 45 years	= 17%
- Between 46 and 50 years	= 13%
- Between 51 and 60 years	= 15%
- Over 60 years	= 4%

7) Gender (n=514):

- Male = 75%
- Female = 25%

8) Rank order for the three most important reasons for membership in the BPS Division:Leading reasons for membership in BPS:

- | | |
|--|----------------------------|
| 1. Research interests | = 79% rank 1 st |
| 2. Developing contacts with BPS scholars | = 57% rank 2 nd |
| 3. Teaching interests | = 43% rank 3 rd |

Rank 1: Percent choosing as #1 reason for membership (n=512):

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| 1. Research interests | = 75% |
| 2. Teaching interests | = 10% |
| 3. Developing contacts with BPS scholars | = <u>8%</u> |
| 4. Other | = 7% |

Rank 2: Percent choosing as #2 reason for membership (n=497):

- | | |
|--|--------------|
| 1. Developing contacts with BPS scholars | = 42% |
| 2. Teaching interests | = 29% |
| 3. Research interests | = <u>18%</u> |
| 4. Other | = 11% |

Rank 3: Percent choosing as #3 reason for membership (n=394):

- | | |
|--|--------------|
| 1. Teaching interests | = 29% |
| 2. Developing contacts with BPS scholars | = 27% |
| 3. Tradition (always been a member) | = 12% |
| 3. Social activities | = <u>12%</u> |
| 4. Other | = 20% |

Other reasons for membership in BPS:

- Tradition = 107 responses
- Learn about practitioner concerns = 100 responses
- Social activities = 89 responses
- Learn career management strategies = 84 responses
- Other = 11 responses

9) BPS Division Activities

A. Over the past five years, *how many times* have you:

- Attended an Academy meeting (n=496)
 - o *Mean = 2.8 times; Std. dev. = 1.8 times; Range = 0 - 6 times*
- Attended a BPS Division Pre-conference event, workshop, or consortium (n=417)
 - o *Mean = 1.3 times; Std. dev. = 1.8 times; Range = 0 - 6 times*

- Dropped by the BPS Social Hour (n=414)
 - o *Mean = 1.6 times; Std. dev. = 1.6 times; Range = 0 - 6 times*
- Served on a BPS Division committee or taskforce (n=340)
 - o *Mean = 0.3 times; Std. dev. = 0.9 times; Range = 0 - 6 times*
- Served as a BPS reviewer (n=415)
 - o *Mean = 1.8 times; Std. dev. = 2.0 times; Range = 0 - 23 times*

B. Over the past five years how many presentations/symposia have you participated in? (n=523):

- None = 33%
- 1-2 = 23%
- 3-5 = 26%
- 6-9 = 12%
- more than 9 = 6%

C. Are you a subscriber to BPS-Net? (n=512):

- o 50% say YES
- o 50% say NO

D. Over the past six months, frequency visiting the BPS web page (n=527):

- o None = 45%
- o 1-2 visits = 35%
- o 3-5 visits = 15%
- o 6 or more = 5%

E. Preferred means of obtaining information from the BPS division:

- Regular mail = 301 responses
- E-mail = 502 responses
- Visit to BPS web page = 519 responses

F. With your current computer setup, can you?:

- Receive and send e-mail = 524 responses say YES
- Receive and send e-mail attachments such as BPS newsletter or papers? = 523 responses say YES
- Visit the BPS web page? = 524 responses say YES
- Download information from a web page? = 514 responses say YES

G. Software preference for transfer of electronic documents (e.g. BPS newsletter, papers for review). Check more than one if applicable.

- * Adobe Acrobat (.pdf) = 70 responses say this software as a preference.

II. Opinions on the BPS Division

1) Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the BPS Division, using the 1–5 scale below.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

- a. The Division's Pre-Conference and Professional Development activities provide members with a valuable service.
 ○ *Mean = 3.9; Std. dev. = 0.89 (mode=4, 35% of 489 responses)*
- b. The Division newsletter provides me with valuable information.
 ○ *Mean = 3.5; Std. dev. = 0.97 (mode=4, 37.5% of 504 responses)*
- c. It seems that other divisions have more to offer their members.
 ○ *Mean = 2.7; Std. dev. = 0.99 (mode=3, 47% of 497 responses)*
- d. Overall, I am satisfied with my Division membership.
 ○ *Mean = 3.7; Std. dev. = 0.94 (mode=4, 44% of 509 responses)*
- e. The Division's leaders are very responsive to members' concerns and interests.
 ○ *Mean = 3.3; Std. dev. = 0.88 (mode=3, 53% of 483 responses)*
- f. I have a clear understanding about how to get involved in Division activities.
 ○ *Mean = 2.95; Std. dev. = 1.20 (mode=2, 27% of 506 responses)*
- g. Generally speaking, the Division's program at the annual meeting is both interesting and useful to me.
 ○ *Mean = 3.7; Std. dev. = 1.62 (mode=4, 42% of 495 responses)*
- h. Access to the Division's leadership positions (e.g. program chair, division chair, newsletter editor, etc.) is controlled by a self-perpetuating elite group.
 ○ *Mean = 3.3; Std. dev. = 1.09 (mode=3, 43% of 494 responses)*
- i. The division should increase its international outreach.
 ○ *Mean = 3.7; Std. dev. = 1.01 (mode=3, 35.5% of 499 responses)*
- j. The division should expand and improve the BPS web site.
 ○ *Mean = 3.5; Std. dev. = 0.90 (mode=3, 53% of 485 responses)*
- k. The division should increase interdivisional activities.
 ○ *Mean = 3.7; Std. dev. = 1.63 (mode=3, 39% of 491 responses)*
- l. The BPS web page should have a bulletin board for member dialog and exchange.
 ○ *Mean = 3.35; Std. dev. = 1.04 (mode=3, 42% of 484 responses)*

Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions about the BPS Division.

2) What are the most valuable services that the BPS Division provides you:

The following categories were determined through the responses to this question. There were 301 total responses, but many people mentioned more than one service of the Division that they found valuable. Effort was made to categorize responses as closely as possible to actual wording. Percentages are taken out of total number of respondents (301), and rounded up. Below this summary are sample responses for each category, and some which did not fit into any particular category or were otherwise noteworthy.

Contact and exchange with other scholars	88	29%
The Annual Meeting	75	25%
Access to new research	70	23%
BPS-Net and Webpage	45	15%
General information (such as event listings, general awareness of BPS, etc.)	36	12%
Forum to present own research	23	8%
Newsletter	22	7%
Teaching materials and development services	22	7%
Pre-convention activities	14	5%
Inspiration (for research, motivation to complete work)	11	4%
New member and didn't know much about services	9	3%
Access to being reviewed and to reviewing	8	3%
Career information and advancement	8	3%
Social hour	7	2%
Publications	3	1%
Access to data	2	1%

Contact and exchange with other scholars:

- A forum for presenting and exchanging research ideas. A sense of community.
- A sense of belonging
- An opportunity to be involved with like professionals
- Networking with other scholars and being informed about activities in the division and about other scholars

The Annual Meeting

- Great sessions at the meetings and an opportunity to network with colleagues
- Organization of meetings facilitates contacts to members shows world standards in research
- Attending sessions at the academy meetings
- Annual meeting presentations, symposia, business meeting, and awards

Access to new research

- An opportunity to discuss the future research issues affecting strategy.
- Information on current research and emerging issues. networks of people
- The most valuable service is the forum for me to observe discourse about strategy research.
- A resource base on BPS body of knowledge.

BPS-Net and Website

- Exposure to the emerging areas of research in strategy. Discussion of relevant teaching and research issues on BPSnet
- Meeting sessions, website services (particularly teaching materials and support)
- information provided on website serves as contact catalyst research information (literature)
- the conversation via listserve

General information (such as event listings, general awareness of BPS, etc.)

- Newsletters on new journals and up-coming conferences
- Learning about the field beyond what's going on at my school.
- Not much, the web pages, job listings
- Professional news and information.

Forum to present own research

- Support of PDW workshops; forum for publishing papers
- An early outlet for my own and others' research.
- A place to have my work reviewed and presented. Attending the presentations at the annual meetings and listening to others' ideas is also an important service.
- Outlet for research, bps-net, social activities

Newsletter

- BPS newsletter and other forms of communication, including division meetings & socials.
- Newsletter and intellectual debate

Teaching materials and development services

- I am most interested in the current streams of research and new ideas for teaching
- Those hints applicable to the teaching of Strategic Management, as well as the opportunity to exchange ideas with BPS scholars at Annual Meetings.
- Additional information about teaching Strategic Management internationally
- Course syllabus, reference lists

Pre-convention activities

- Since I am currently a Ph.D. candidate the meeting and consortiums are of utmost importance so I can meet people and exchange ideas. BPS net is also extremely valuable.
- Going through the trouble to arrange the AOM program each year. Actually, the doctoral consortium that I attend in 1981 or so is still the AOM event with which I am most impressed

Inspiration (for research, motivation to complete work)

- Currency with the field with regard to research. Reviewing and submitting papers provides a great opportunity to develop ideas and improve working papers.
- Basically not a whole lot. Go to the Academy to catch up with friends and use the Academy deadline as a forcing mechanism to finish papers before the Holidays.

New member and didn't know much about services

- I am a new member so I don't really know. Everyone was very friendly and helpful at the annual meeting and I'm glad I attended BPS meetings.
- In addition to working full time as a business manager, I began a scholar–practitioner Ph.D. program in OD last June. I joined the Academy of Management then, and attended the Toronto meetings. However, I haven't done much else yet.

Access to being reviewed and to reviewing

- Experience in the review process, contacts with researchers
- The Academy program. Initial reviews of my research ideas. Contact with colleagues.

Career information and advancement

- Information on jobs, professional skill development
- As a graduate student, BPS functions as a market maker to match faculty with similar interests and help facilitate (informally) the job market search.

Social hour

- Annual Conference Program Social Hour
- Social activities and presentations at meetings

Publications

- Research capabilities and access to research journals
- I don't find much value in the Division. It's my teaching/research area, but I subscribe to AOM for the journals.

Access to data

- Interacting with colleagues, recruiting data
- Access to research data and scholarly forums

Below are some responses that did not fit easily into any category, or were otherwise noteworthy.

- Professional affiliation, I guess it is my research and teaching home. However, it is a large division and often too competitive for me to get a paper accepted at the conference.
- The point of most conferences is to present DRAFT papers for review – and hence feedback. However, Academy members seem to have been cheating and sending 'finished' pieces already being also submitted to journals. In recognition of this seemingly common although unscholarly behavior, the Academy now officially accepts joint submissions. Combined with the strictly enforced rejection of 2/3 of the submissions, the AOM conference is no longer a place where the less well published can learn, but has become a forum for the better published scholars can be further praised and honored through the publication (in its 'Best Paper Proceeding') of a very small number of journal–quality submissions likely to soon appear in print anyway...Is this really what the membership expects of an annual conference? It's a good thing that you're taking the time to ask – but will you be allowed to change anything?
- Interesting sessions at Academy where research crosses practice (except for the self–serving consulting sales pitches by academics pining to be big name consultants).

- Research and teaching information. It is especially important for people outside the US with few possibilities to attend every year the Academy Meeting.
- Information on upcoming events – although I have not been able to attend any during recent years as a European.
- The program is always so good at the Academy. I always attend several BPS session. I particularly have enjoyed the interdivisional sessions – symposiums, etc.
- None. It is an academic artifact that doesn't appear to serve the people who are out in the real world developing strategy and policy in the trenches of the complex business environment. I think it should be jointly run by practitioners who have a better idea of what is needed from research, not just academics who 'dabble' in consulting and don't have a clear perspective of the management and leadership grind in the changing world.
- Currently the division does not provide many valuable services to me. As a former academic and current CEO of a \$40 million Corporation, there is hardly anything provided that I can apply at my company.
- The BPS article listings by major strategic topic has been a very good resource for me.
- I have just finished teaching the capstone undergraduate Policy & Strategy course at our university for the first time. Therefore, my primary concern right now is access to a variety of teaching ideas. I prefer to use both cases and experiential exercises when I teach, but find that most published teaching resources in strategic management heavily emphasize cases. Therefore, I was delighted recently to find a few ideas for experiential exercises on the BPS web–page, which I will use next year.

3) In the next five years I would like to see BPS make progress in the following areas:

Responses to this question were varied and difficult to quantify. There were 237 respondents to the question. Categories of unanimous opinion are summarized below, in order of importance. (First being most frequently expressed). Selected comments/suggestions on The BPS Mission, Career Development and Mentoring, Conferences, Member Services, Research, Teaching, and other noteworthy comments/suggestions are listed below this section. Some comments/suggestions may be cross-listed.

International Outreach

The Division should become more international. This includes having international representation in its leadership, its reviewer base, its research concentration, and holding the AMA meeting outside of the U.S. or Canada.

(67 respondents, or 28%)

- More international board members
- Stronger acceptance of non-American perspectives in teaching and research
- 'De-americanize' review of papers and admission of articles in journals
- The academy: recognize that there is a world outside the US
- Make some sort of real attempt to take an international perspective
- More international participation, both on the program and as reviewers, etc.
- Conferences held elsewhere than the USA

- Internationalization, please

Elitism and Access

The Division should develop better outreach. Many respondents used the term “elitist” when describing either the division or the leadership of the Division. Others mentioned feeling excluded, and many respondents felt that the smaller less “prestigious” schools had little representation in the division. (49 respondents, or 21%)

- More member involvement. Inducements to get members involved
- Become a less elitist and more inclusive group
- Getting more people involved in the upper echelons, not just as session chairs
- More activities for scholars from smaller schools, who have fewer opportunities to interact
- Create a friendly and more congenial environment. Drop the elitist attitude
- Get more people from schools that are less often represented on the board

Practitioner-oriented and relevance

The Division should become more aware of practitioner concerns and how to make its research findings relevant and useful outside the “ivory tower”. (34 respondents, or 14%)

- Become more practical rather than acting as an outlet for many individuals' dissertation topics
- Encourage the interchange between practitioners and researchers
- 'Bridging with practitioners' should become less talk and more reality
- Develop closer working relationships with business practitioners
- Reduce the focus on research methodology while increasing research relevance
- Place more value on applied research; less for arcane quantitative arguments

Interdisciplinary and interdivisional activities

The division should relate more with other divisions within the Academy, or with other disciplines. More joint presentations at the AMA meeting were also suggested. (30 respondents, or 13%)

- More interdivisional sessions
- Cross-disciplinary interaction of related fields of study
- Multidisciplinary research
- Interacting with other divisions such as MOC or OT or IM
- More cross-divisional work with OMT/ONE/TIM especially
- Doing more with the MH, Careers, & RM Divisions

BPS Mission

- BPS is more and more at the intersection of particular contexts such as international business, international entrepreneurship, and family business that should be exploited to a greater extent
- Dropping policy out of the division name
- Emphasizing the ethical and social aspects of strategic choices
- Emphasize entrepreneurship as part of strategy (even though there's technically an entrepreneurship division)
- Enter into the public policy debate arena
- More speakers from economics or sociological disciplines

Career Development and Mentoring

- Continue to promote doctoral student scholarship and professional development
- Gather information on what level of publishing is occurring for assistants in the field to help them with going for tenure
- Help students on the job market
- Foster more interaction among members--especially junior and senior faculty
- More support to doctoral programs & students
- Promoting and supporting members in their careers towards the employers (universities)
- Provide more career guidance for young scholars

Conferences

- More interdivisional sessions
- Organize or sponsor mini-conferences on specific topics
- More professional workshops
- Sponsor case teaching conferences, with NACRA & SCR
- International location of AOM conference
- Less presentations and more poster sessions at meetings

Member Services

- More teaching content on the web site
- Add a second high quality outlet for strategic research (e.g., another SMJ)
- Find system to make all conference papers available before or after the conference online or on CD ROM
- Get the web site in order. more work can be done.
- On-line publishing
- Start another Strategy Journal--possibly electronic
- Support or sponsor another journal revolving around strategic management (academic-orientation)
- Allocate resources to the website, including syllabi and working paper archives
- More publicity for syllabus exchange via web site (under-used). Also, start PowerPoint exchange via web site, similar to current syllabus exchange.
- Push towards improving the quality of other strategy journals, other than SMJ
- An internet connection similar to Marketing's ELMAR (Peter Palij – Columbia)

Research

- Case method, historical & single case studies
- Examine the impact of international regimes on corporate behavior & vice versa
- More avenues to exchange ideas with other scholars working on similar topics
- Better understanding of intangible strategic resources (culture, information, knowledge, reputation, vision, etc.)
- Emphasize entrepreneurship as part of strategy (even though there's technically an entrepreneurship division)
- Less fad-ish, more scientific outlook on management and strategy issues
- More 'downward' focus -- more on Business (& Operational) Strategy (less on Corp. / M&A), more on Domestic (& Local) relationships (less Globalism), more on Medium-sized (and Small) Businesses (less on MNCs & M-forms)
- More support for non-traditional research areas (emerging economies in Asia, African economies, linkages between strategy and environment and social issues)

Teaching

- Include teaching sessions as part of regular program
- More workshops on distance learning for BPS
- More recognition of the importance of teaching
- More strongly focus on teaching and teaching materials
- Promote faculty having business experience
- Help bridge the gap between research and teaching in strategy
- Information on translating theory to practical classroom exercises

Noteworthy Comments

- I would like to see more substantive attention paid to case writers and case writing. I have many colleagues asking for information on case teaching techniques. I believe more regular formal coverage of this material -- not necessarily in paper sessions, rather in the form of teaching seminars, would be useful. Case teaching is such a large part of teaching BPS and we do little in the academy to help our members develop in this pedagogy.
- To RESIST the temptation to become more practitioner oriented/friendly (like SMS is doing). We need to continue to have a research forum.
- Maybe start a distinguished speaker series, like IM and OMT?
- Gain more control over SMS (I KNOW it's a separate organization) & SMJ, which is a disgrace -- nowhere near the quality it should be.
- I am a happy member, but maybe more well organized symposia like the one with the BPS pioneer women. It was wonderful. More insightful than regular paper sessions (which, of course, we also need).
- Perhaps more specialized, focused meetings with fewer attendees (in between national meetings).
- Break down parochial views of strategy (e.g., OMT is much more accepting of novel or paradigm shifting ideas--I generally elect to send my BEST work there and send INCREMENTAL work to BPS)
- There is a chilling effect around women's participation in strategy in general, including BPS. This is evidenced by the lack of women's participation in BPS, by the competitive posturing evident in BPS events (I feel like I'm watching a sports game during presentations -- excessive competition - what's that about?), and in current strategy research topic areas.
- Improving performance of discussants. I recommend an 'Outstanding Discussant' award, comparable to current 'Outstanding Reviewer' award.
- Generally speaking, I believe the BPS field has done less than it should to help practitioners and researchers appreciate the importance of the external environment and how to predict its effects on strategy in turbulent environments such as we now have. Two leading texts used in more than half of all strategy classes don't even include material on this subject. This is a grave and foolish omission.
- Division seems more cold, distant, formal, PC, careerist, larger, less playful, less open, and less intellectually curious than other divisions. I realize this is negative, yet still it points a direction. In Selznik's terms, this seems to be organization as dispensable tool, not as beloved institution.

III. The Field of Strategic Management

- 1) To what extent do you consider the following groups significant constituents of the strategic management field? Please allocate 100 points *in total* to show their relative importance.

* Students

- *Mean = 21.5%; Std. dev. = 13.3%*
- * Managers/practitioners
 - *Mean = 31.1%; Std. dev. = 16.2%*
- * Scholars/researchers
 - *Mean = 42.9%; Std. dev. = 27.4%*
- * Public policy officials
 - *Mean = 13.7%; Std. dev. = 12.5%*
- * Other _____
 - *Mean = 9.1%; Std. dev. = 8.1%*

2) Please use the following scale to indicate how effective the field of strategic management has been at serving the following constituencies.

Highly ineffective	Average			Highly effective
1	2	3	4	5
* Students				
○ <i>Mean = 3.45; Std. dev. = 1.03 (mode=4, 37% of 454 responses)</i>				
* Practitioners/managers				
○ <i>Mean = 2.88; Std. dev. = 0.99 (mode=3, 40% of 452 responses)</i>				
* Scholars/researchers				
○ <i>Mean = 4.11; Std. dev. = 0.8 (mode=4, 51% of 459 responses)</i>				
* Public policy officials				
○ <i>Mean = 2.39; Std. dev. = 1.76 (mode=2, 36% of 406 responses)</i>				
* Other _____				
○ <i>Mean = 2.56; Std. dev. = 0.96 (mode=3, 50% of 16 responses)</i>				

3) Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on the field of strategic management, using the scale below.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

- a. The field of strategic management has succeeded in studying problems and issues that are of significance and truly matter.
 - *Mean = 3.7; Std. dev. = 1.40 (mode=4, 45% of 505 responses)*

- b. Conceptual work has made a greater contribution to the development of the strategy field than empirical work.
 - *Mean = 3.2; Std. dev. = 1.16 (mode=4, 31% of 507 responses)*
- c. Strategic management has established itself as a distinct academic discipline.
 - *Mean = 3.8; Std. dev. = 2.16 (mode=4, 38% of 506 responses)*
- d. Strategic management research is very responsive to the needs of practitioners.
 - *Mean = 2.7; Std. dev. = 1.08 (mode=2, 33% of 505 responses)*
- e. Given the growth of corporate universities and private training organizations, strategy researchers should conduct more applied research.
 - *Mean = 3.7; Std. dev. = 1.79 (mode=5, 30% of 505 responses)*
- f. It is important for strategic management research to inform managerial practice.
 - *Mean = 4.4; Std. dev. = 1.46 (mode=5, 52% of 503 responses)*

IV. Strategic Management Research

1) Top 5 major areas of research interest

Rank 1 (670 responses):

1. Knowledge-based view	= 7.2%	(Theoretical Perspectives group)
2. Resource-based/dynamic capabilities	= 5.8%	(Theoretical Perspectives group)
3. New Venture Strategy	= 4.9%	(Strategy Content group)
5. Business-Level	= 4.3%	(Strategy Content group)
5. Alliances and networks	= <u>4.3%</u>	(Strategy Content group)
TOTAL "Top 5" for Rank 1	= 26.5%	

Rank 2 (594 responses):

1. Resource-based/dynamic capabilities	= 7.4%	(Theoretical Perspectives group)
3. Alliances and networks	= 5.1%	(Strategy Content group)
3. Decision processes	= 5.1%	(Strategy Process group)
4. Knowledge-based view	= 4.0%	(Theoretical Perspectives group)
5. Strategic vision/mission/goals	= 3.7%	(Strategy Process group)
5. Organizational Design	= <u>3.7%</u>	(Strategy Process group)
TOTAL "Top 5" for Rank 2	= 29.0%	

Rank 3 (499 responses):

1. Knowledge-based view	= 5.6%	(Theoretical Perspectives group)
2. Resource-based/sustainability view	= 4.4%	(Theoretical Perspectives group)
3. Multinational Strategy	= 4.2%	(Strategy Content group)
4. Alliances and networks	= 4.0%	(Strategy Content group)
5. Organizational Design	= <u>3.8%</u>	(Strategy Process group)
TOTAL "Top 5" for Rank 3	= 22.0%	

Rank 4 (430 responses):

1. Resource-based/dynamic capabilities	= 5.3%	(Theoretical Perspectives group)
2. Transaction Cost	= 4.2%	(Theoretical Perspectives group)
4. Decision processes	= 4.0%	(Strategy Process group)
4. Organizational Design	= 4.0%	(Strategy Process group)
5. Knowledge-based view	= 3.7%	(Theoretical Perspectives group)
5. Corporate-Level Strategy	= 3.7%	(Strategy Implementation Process group)
5. International Strategy	= <u>3.7%</u>	(Strategy Implementation Process group)
TOTAL "Top 5" for Rank 4	= 28.6%	

Rank 5 (357 responses):

1. Knowledge-based view	= 5.3%	(Theoretical Perspectives group)
2. Alliances and networks	= 4.8%	(Strategy Content group)
4. Resource-based/dynamic capabilities	= 4.5%	(Theoretical Perspectives group)
4. Board of Directors	= 4.5%	(Corporate Governance group)
5. Business-Level Strategy	= 3.9%	(Strategy Implementation Process group)
5. Political/Behavioral factors	= <u>3.9%</u>	(Strategy Process group)
TOTAL "Top 5" for Rank 5	= 26.9%	

Group areas of research:

* Strategy Content	= 33%
* Theoretical Perspectives	= 21%
* Strategy Implementation Process	= 17%
* Strategy Process	= 17%
* Upper Echelons	= 7%
* Corporate Governance	= <u>5%</u>
TOTAL	= 100%

2) Top 5 topic areas that people believe will have the most influence on strategy research over next five years

Rank 1 (561 responses):

1. Knowledge-based view	= 12.7%	(Theoretical Perspectives group)
2. Resource-based/dynamic capabilities	= 9.3%	(Theoretical Perspectives group)
3. Alliances and networks	= 6.4%	(Strategy Content group)
4. Digital/internet strategy	= 6.2%	(Strategy Content group)
5. New Venture Strategy	= <u>5.2%</u>	(Strategy Content group)
TOTAL "Top 5" for Rank 1	= 39.8%	

Rank 2 (508 responses):

1. Knowledge-based view	= 10.2%	(Theoretical Perspectives group)
2. Resource-based/dynamic capabilities	= 7.7%	(Theoretical Perspectives group)
3. Digital/internet strategy	= 5.7%	(Strategy Content group)
4. Managing internet strategy	= 4.9%	(Strategy Implementation Process group)
5. Alliances and networks	= <u>4.3%</u>	(Strategy Content group)
TOTAL "Top 5" for Rank 2	= 32.8%	

Rank 3 (447 responses):

1. Knowledge-based view	= 7.2%	(Theoretical Perspectives group)
2. Resource-based/dynamic capabilities	= 5.4%	(Theoretical Perspectives group)
3. Alliances and networks	= 5.1%	(Strategy Content group)
4. International strategy	= 4.5%	(Strategy Implementation Process group)
5. Resource-based/sustainability view	= <u>4.0%</u>	(Theoretical Perspectives group)
TOTAL "Top 5" for Rank 3	= 26.5%	

Rank 4 (354 responses):

1. Managing strategic alliances	= 5.9%	(Strategy Implementation Process group)
2. International strategy	= 4.8%	(Strategy Implementation Process group)
3. Knowledge-based view	= 4.5%	(Theoretical Perspectives group)
4. Managing internet strategy	= 4.2%	(Strategy Implementation Process group)
5. Resource-based/dynamic capabilities	= <u>4.0%</u>	(Theoretical Perspectives group)
TOTAL "Top 5" for Rank 4	= 23.4%	

Rank 5 (297 responses):

1. Managing internet strategy	= 7.4%	(Strategy Implementation Process group)
2. Digital/internet strategy	= 6.7%	(Strategy Content group)
3. Knowledge-based view	= 5.1%	(Theoretical Perspectives group)
4. Managing New Ventures	= 4.0%	(Strategy Implementation Process group)
5. Resource-based/dynamic capabilities	= <u>3.7%</u>	(Theoretical Perspectives group)
TOTAL "Top 5" for Rank 5	= 26.9%	

Group areas of research:

* Strategy Content	= 33%
* Strategy Implementation Process	= 23%
* Theoretical Perspectives	= 23%
* Strategy Process	= 12%
* Upper Echelons	= 5%
* Corporate Governance	= 4%
TOTAL	= 100%

3) Top 3 disciplines that people rely on most heavily in their research:

Rank 1 (505 responses):

1. Organization Theory	= 39.4%
2. Economics	= 26.7%
3. Sociology	= <u>6.5%</u>
TOTAL "Top 3" for Rank 1	= 72.6%

Rank 2 (493 responses):

1. Organization Theory	= 25.2%
2. Economics	= 18.9%
3. Sociology	= <u>16.8%</u>
TOTAL "Top 3" for Rank 2	= 60.9%

Rank 3 (418 responses):

1. Sociology	= 17.0%
2. Economics	= 16.0%
3. Organization Theory	= <u>14.6%</u>
TOTAL "Top 3" for Rank 3	= 47.6%

- 4) Top 3 disciplines that people believe will make the most important contributions to the field of strategic management over the next five years (431 responses):

Rank 1 (474 responses):

1. Economics	= 23.8%
2. Organization Theory	= 21.1%
3. Sociology	= <u>12.9%</u>
TOTAL "Top 3" for Rank 1	= 57.8%

Rank 2 (455 responses):

1. Organization Theory	= 19.6%
2. Economics	= 16.7%
3. Sociology	= <u>15.2%</u>
TOTAL "Top 3" for Rank 2	= 51.5%

Rank 3 (364 responses):

1. Organization Theory	= 16.8%
2. Economics	= 14.8%
3. Sociology	= <u>10.4%</u>
TOTAL "Top 3" for Rank 3	= 42.0%

- 5) The primary outlets for people scholarly activities (Please allocate 100 points *in total* to indicate the relative importance.)

*Textbooks

- *Mean = 18.9%; Std. dev. = 20.2% (n=139)*

*Research books and monographs

- *Mean = 20.3%; Std. dev. = 18.7% (n=217)*

*Trade books

- *Mean = 11.9%; Std. dev. = 15.2% (n=78)*

*Cases

- Mean = 19.7%; Std. dev. = 20.3% (n=212)

*Academic oriented research articles (e.g. *Academy of Management J.*; *Strategic Management J.*)

- Mean = 61.2%; Std. dev. = 29.4% (n=398)

*Practitioner oriented research articles (e.g. *Academy of Management Executive*; *HBR*)

- Mean = 20.3%; Std. dev. = 18.7% (n=316)

6) Rank of the **five** journals that have the most impact in the field of strategic management.Rank 1 (n=524):

1. Strategic Management Journal	= 49%
2. Harvard Business Review	= 13%
3. Academy of Management Journal	= 12%
4. Administrative Science Quarterly	= 8%
5. Academy of Management Review	= <u>8%</u>
TOTAL "Top 5" for Rank 1	= 90%

Rank 2 (n=527):

1. Academy of Management Journal	= 26%
2. Strategic Management Journal	= 17%
3. Academy of Management Review	= 16%
4. Harvard Business Review	= 11%
5. Administrative Science Quarterly	= <u>8%</u>
TOTAL "Top 5" for Rank 2	= 78%

Rank 3 (n=494):

1. Academy of Management Review	= 19%
2. Academy of Management Journal	= 17%
3. Strategic Management Journal	= 11%
4. Harvard Business Review	= 11%
5. Administrative Science Quarterly	= <u>10%</u>
TOTAL "Top 5" for Rank 3	= 68%

Rank 4 (n=446):

1. Administrative Science Quarterly	= 15%
2. Academy of Management Review	= 13%
3. Organization Science	= 12%
5. Harvard Business Review	= 10%
5. Academy of Management Journal	= <u>10%</u>
TOTAL "Top 5" for Rank 4	= 60%

Rank 5 (n=416):

1. Organization Science	= 11%
-------------------------	-------

2. Harvard Business Review	= 10%
3. Academy of Management Review	= 9%
4. Administrative Science Quarterly	= 9%
5. California Management Review	= <u>8%</u>
TOTAL "Top 5" for Rank 5	= 47%

7) What does strategic management research need to do in the future to increase its significance and standing?

There were a total of 243 respondents to this question. Responses are organized into General research, Practice, Journals, Interdisciplinary studies, International, and Other concerns.

General research

- Converge upon a few sound, coherent, well tested theoretical foundations.
- Cross-level research is necessary for the field of strategy. Holding on to empirical methodologies and analytical approaches developed for individual level analysis will hinder our ability to progress the field.
- Demonstrate consistency with present organization environments.
- Do cross-level research on the connection between psychological/social dynamics and the strategy field /strategy dependent variables
- Ensure that it is based on sound logic and well conceived studies; but also that there is legitimacy for non-incremental work in new areas. Use our ability to appeal to practitioners in our favor.
- Establish and maintain rigorous standards as to reliability and validity of measurement and the empirical testing of theoretical models (i.e., abstract economic mathematical models). More carefully use inferential statistics rather than broad generalizations based on small convenience samples (i.e., greater care in external validity issues).
- Even as your survey show, strategic management research seems to be carried out in a compartmentalized fashion, and little boundary spanning or multidisciplinary research occurs. Instead of fostering exclusivity, editors and researcher should seek out and support research that focuses on pressing currently understood boundaries or going beyond them.
- More in depth single cases. This will increase the legitimacy of researchers opinions among the world out there. Statistical aggregations of events are too distant from real life to be able to grasp its multidimensional nuances and to be able to provide data to highlight the underlying mechanisms that researchers are trying to reveal when pursuing to understand strategic issues
- Not duplicate research that has been done in other fields. I am quite distressed to see 'event studies' becoming a fad in strategic research. Event studies, which are a principal methodology in accounting research, are really not based on explanatory theories and usually have total explanatory power of less than 15%. Also, I have recently seen accounting behavioral research from the early 1980's resurrected as original studies in SMJ in the last 3 years. Strategic research should focus on questions important to society as well as to business firms. For instance, how have firms remained so successful over the last 10 years? How is that different than the 1980's ?
- Open itself to the dedication of journal space to the replication of studies to provide more confidence in the findings of published research, a la Daft (1988). Greater application to management practice must also be sought, and our journals should provide that link.
- Primarily needs to move from us each trying to impress each other with new metaphors for things to actually empirically testing all the things we have been thinking up

- Strategy research needs replication studies badly. Most of our theory stands on flimsy empirical evidence that is often idiosyncratic to samples. Many important studies may stand up to replication. Instead, we focus too much on what's unique and tweaking or extending existing theory rather than testing existing theory with multiple samples. Second, strategy research focuses way too much on getting significant results with very large samples. The sample sizes in many studies are getting so large it's a joke. Of course, you can find significance with $n=1200$ observations but what's the practical value of theory that explains little variance of anything that matters. We're quickly becoming the field that whispers significant nothings in your ear!
- The language of research findings needs to become understandable to practitioners (it is not an accident that porter and Mintzberg are so popular!)

Practice

- increase amount of relevant, empirical research by not making every empirical piece be a test of grand theory--greatly increases amount of time to write-up research, makes research often pompous and silly (right now everybody wastes a lot of time trying to make individual research projects sound more important than they are) 2. People who can do empirical research but don't really understand how businesses work shouldn't be faculty.
- Don't give too much weight to current practices and practitioners' experiences/opinions.
- Find more outlets for practitioner-near research – serious, rigorous research, but readable to practitioners like HBR. I am afraid neither SMJ nor AMJ are read by many practitioners any more.
- Focus more on problems that provide real-life managers information that they can actually apply to their jobs. Much of what is written is esoteric and methodology-bound that few managers see how they can use it--and they are correct to feel that way. we need to stop writing for the theorists who are interested in very narrow issues.
- get real – stop thinking about getting published and focus more on the value of the research. Stay with stuff that needs answers, not things that look like 'good research'. Business professors really aren't like other schools/profs and we should stop trying to be like them and in general, be more business-like.
- I new to academia, but have worked as a strategic planner and implementer or mergers and acquisitions. From my view, most line/staff managers have little awareness of strategic issues, and generally think tactically. I believe there is a great opportunity to develop more inclusive techniques of strategy development. That is, I would like to work to get strategy out of the confines of the senior management board room and integrate it into a much larger constituency of managers.

Journals

- A secondary journal that competes with SMJ directly
- Get a real journal – SMJ is a joke (and I have published there)
- --Improve review process at SMJ, which should be our 1st choice outlet. (Turnaround time on the first round of reviews for a recent article I submitted was 15 MONTHS--and yielded only 1 review of 1/2 of a page. Follow-up process on articles could also be
- Increase the number of outlets for publication and focus on practitioner oriented topics.
- Need a new and better managed journal to substitute SMJ
- Understand that there's a world out there that is not US-centered. Just look at the list of 'strategy' journals listed above! Journals such as JIBS and JIM do a better job of reaching out to non-US colleagues and incorporating non-US-centric approaches.

Interdisciplinary studies

- Greater integration with other divisions at the Academy of Management
- incorporate new areas like chaos theory, literary theory, spiritual approach
- Removing gatekeepers so strat mgt research can become a cross-disciplinary field, or at least that journals can take an active role regarding cross-desi publications
- security analysis have a lot of knowledge and insights about industries and firms that could be valuable and could broaden the field.
- To look at the foundations of competitive advantage and social structure surrounding competition, with help of psychology, sociology, biology, and modeling.

International

- Understand that there's a world out there that is not US-centered. Just look at the list of 'strategy' journals listed above! Journals such as JIBS and JIM do a better job of reaching out to non-US colleagues and incorporating non-US-centric approaches.
- Become more international or cross-cultural in approach, look at emerging countries and cultures, b) Both become closer to the practitioner and develop a multidisciplinary theory of business success.

Other

- Make a case in the media and to policy makers that we have something important to add (not just as consultants)
- Make the case with policymakers that management matters for public policy.
- Show that it does matter to performance – that CEOs who follow our prescriptions will outperform those who remain ignorant of them.
- Strategy needs to focus on the intersection of public/governmental policy and private corporate behavior both at the national and international level.
- A broader perspective of where strategic management is practiced including not-for-profit, small business, and governmental agencies.
- In a Management Science editorial (1987?), Martin Shubik pleaded for the development of what he called (following an Anglican-Episcopal metaphor, a 'low-church game theory'. Personally, I've heeded the call to some degree by working on the theoretical side of building and analysing strategic scenarios. Furthermore, the OR/MS connection with strategy has remained largely unexplored – partly because of the light-hearted but not necessarily constructive digs incrementalists and chaos proponents have been dishing out against formal or quantitative analysis.

V. Strategic Management Teaching

1) Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on teaching, using the scale below. As a reference, use an MBA strategic management course or the closest equivalent that you teach.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

a. I have students engage in projects with real companies.

- *Mean = 3.9; Std. dev. = 1.36 (mode=5, 47% of 449 responses)*

b. I use the web often during class sessions.

- *Mean = 2.9; Std. dev. = 1.41 (mode=2, 22% of 449 responses)*

c. I use experiential exercises.

- *Mean = 3.6; Std. dev. = 1.34 (mode=5, 33% of 448 responses)*

d. I have a web page for my course and use it to distribute materials and/or exchange information.

- *Mean = 3.7; Std. dev. = 1.54 (mode=5, 47% of 212 responses)*

e. My course has changed substantially in the last five years because of technology.

- *Mean = 3.8; Std. dev. = 1.15 (mode=5, 37% of 440 responses)*

f. BPS should have more workshops and sessions that focus on teaching.

- *Mean = 3.7; Std. dev. = 1.17 (mode=5, 31% of 449 responses)*

g. Compared to five years ago I spend more time teaching executive education.

- *Mean = 3.0; Std. dev. = 1.4 (mode=3, 33% of 427 responses)*

h. With the growth in corporate universities the traditional MBA degree will become less important.

- *Mean = 2.8; Std. dev. = 1.27 (mode=2 & 4, both with 24% of 449 responses)*

i. Over the next five years I expect to be involved in a course where a substantial portion of it is offered over the web.

- *Mean = 3.4; Std. dev. = 1.31 (mode=4, 27% of 448 responses)*

j. Term lengths for courses that I teach are 8 weeks or less.

- *Mean = 2.2; Std. dev. = 2.48 (mode=1, 53% of 447 responses)*

k. Business schools need to do a better job in establishing partnerships with corporate universities.

- *Mean = 3.5; Std. dev. = 1.26 (mode=4, 27% of 450 responses)*

2) Please share your comments on how business schools can maintain their vitality in management education in light of the growth in corporate universities and private training organizations.

There were 202 respondents to this question. Selected responses are listed below.

- Probably offer non-degree certificate programs.
- *Adopt a real case study approach where students in corporate universities can study their own company using the concepts and tools of strategic mgmt.
- Develop strong ties with corporations 2. teach business the way business does business, not according to the pleasures of theoretical pursuits. Faculty sabbaticals should be spent working in a corporation to get a reality check. 3. Adopt a variant of the e-business model– get down their high horse and compete with private and commercial providers. 4. Adopt the e-business model
- A Bachelor of Science and MBA are different from corporate universities and training (or at least they should be). The breadth and scope of the knowledge and skills for an academic degree should be much greater. Corporate universities and training serve a necessary and distinct function for businesses. There are certainly many jobs that could be performed by people trained by a corporation. However, preparation for a career requires broader training, skills and knowledge. The tug and lure for business schools to become more 'training-like' in their approaches to education is undeniable, but it is a slippery slope. Once we quantify the knowledge and skills necessary to 'train' someone for a specific job category (a short-term approach) there will be private companies who can supply the product faster and at a lower cost.
- Again, become relevant. Having just concluded team-teaching a senior-level strategy capstone, my opinion is that the available instructional materials in this area are dull, uninteresting, and unengaging for students... let alone for the individuals who have to teach this stuff.
- Business schools should actively promote 'executive-in-residence' programs, executive-researcher 'brownbags,' researcher-alumni interactions, researcher-recruiter interactions, researcher-public policy interactions
- Corporate universities pose no serious threat to top-tier b-schools.
- Do cutting edge research that develops theory drawing on real life contexts – need to combine relevance with theoretical depth and insight. Note that your list of the domain is revealing – no reference to technology other than e-commerce. No reference to complexity theory, institutional theory, organizational learning, innovation. These are all crucial areas of strategic management.
- Engage in partnerships and alliances as would any for-profit institution. Plan for and measure the success of your program in more progressive ways – not saying just abandon traditional measures just yet.
- ensure strategy remains a core part of the AACSB (or IAME) curriculum for grad and undergrad student. Perhaps offer workshops to corp. universities/private training orgs. using the Ph.D. of faculty as the selling point.
- get a lot smarter on teaching and REALLY reward good teachers; require researchers to teach and value teaching; use the classroom more as a laboratory tool to explore problems; value managerial judgment and wisdom, not just correlation exercises
- Get closer to the core competencies of the school: a socialization incubator for lifetime networking (thus up socialization) and a reputation for putting out a quality product (not always true, but has to be case in future). The latter implies closer work with recruiters and working courses better toward their needs.
- Get staff with practical experience!!! When asked to recommend someone for a position at a major university, I asked whether a terminally degreed practitioner with some publication would be considered, I was told that practical experience was not a factor in the hiring decision. I refused to recommend my

colleague under these circumstances, but cannot help but wonder what are student going to learn from a professor who has never actually practiced what he/she preaches???? Many of my colleagues share this view.

- How do you get into the corporations that have the training programs in the first place? It seems you gain access to the corporation through the branding provided by a top–notch university education.
- I believe that business schools must continue to teach classical strategy, allow their students to learn with out a paycheck at risk, and improve the way they teach. Internet courses are not the answer, perhaps an alternative, but the one–on–one interaction with an experienced professor is irreplaceable. We should encourage our teaching professionals to consult, take leaves of absences, etc. to gain the experience they need to fill the need of the corporate classroom.
- I believe we must maintain our advantage in research as the engine for our legitimacy.
- I completely agree with the recommendations in the book 'Gravy Training' by Stuart Crainer and Des Dearlove. Please take a look at it.
- I think we have to be clear regarding our purpose. I want to do original research and teach students. I think these other outlets are meeting a need best addressed outside of a university. I don't want customers. Any of us could make A LOT of money doing training and consulting. Yet, we have chosen the academy. We need to be true to the academy and incredible tradition we are part of.

Thank you for your participation in this survey.

If you would like to receive a copy of the report please provide either an e–mail address or other contact information.
