



Mckiernan, Peter (2007) History of the British Academy of Management 1986-2007. In: British Academy of Management Conference 2007. British Academy of Management, London. ,

This version is available at <https://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/64128/>

Strathprints is designed to allow users to access the research output of the University of Strathclyde. Unless otherwise explicitly stated on the manuscript, Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Please check the manuscript for details of any other licences that may have been applied. You may not engage in further distribution of the material for any profitmaking activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute both the url (<https://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/>) and the content of this paper for research or private study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge.

Any correspondence concerning this service should be sent to the Strathprints administrator: strathprints@strath.ac.uk

History of the British Academy of Management

Preface

This project started as a set of scribbles to aid a failing memory. At BAM's inaugural conference at Warwick in 1986, Peter Grinyer (St Andrews) presented the early results that we had developed from our 'Sharpbender' project. After getting the taste for BAM, I have attended every conference since then. I joined Council in 1995/96 and enjoyed my experiences on the Research Committee and as Chair and President from 2001 to 2006. In particular, I was impressed by the commitment, hard work and great humour of many fine colleagues working for the Academy on a voluntary basis. Some are no longer with us and I have dedicated the history to the memory of two close and dear colleagues of ours in BAM, Tony Beasley and Richard Whipp.

Not all was plain sailing. With a discriminating audience and little, continuous archival data, the history project was to be an onerous task. In an attempt to triangulate the data, I asked over 30 influential BAM stalwarts for their recollections of events in an electronic survey over the summer of 2007. They supplied a rich collection of material and invaluable support and encouragement for which I am grateful. Though, it seems that I am not the only one around with a fading memory!

Among those who helped directly, I would like to thank Swapnesh Masrani, Clare Saunders, Cary Cooper, Andrew Pettigrew, Andrew Thomson, Derek Pugh, David Otley, David Wilson, Roger Mansfield, Gerry Johnson, David Parker, Graham Hooley, Richard Thorpe, Mark Easterby-Smith, Gerard Hodgkinson, Chris Huxham, Sue Cartwright, Ian Clarke, Jacky Holloway, Alan Murray, Alan McKinlay, Alan Williams, John Burgoyne, Howard Thomas and Joan Pierce.

The script comes with a warning: all the errors, omissions and misrepresentations are my own. If you ask Stony Stratford (anon), you will find out that there are plenty of these. Please let me know of such foibles and I shall correct them for a future edition.

Peter McKiernan
Dean, BAM Fellows College
St Andrews
August 2007

Pre History

Twenty-one years is a long time in the academic world of UK business and management. Ten thousand academics attended the 2007 Academy of Management (AoM) conference in Philadelphia, with British scholars among the largest of international groupings. The British Academy of Management (BAM) social evening was crowned as one of the best on the circuit, with hundreds of international guests snaking around the corridors waiting to gain entry. But a couple of decades before, the British presence at the 1985 AoM conference in San Diego amounted a handful of scholars. One afternoon, they clustered around a hotel pool for drinks. Among them, Cary Cooper and Andrew Pettigrew, who were regular attendees at the AoM, lamented the lack of a multidisciplinary association in the UK, where folks could share ideas from their respective disciplines. Cary recalls:

"Wasn't it pathetic that we had to meet around a pool in San Diego and share, from our respective disciplines, our ideas for research etc?"

The group challenged Cary that, if he felt so strongly about it, he should make it happen. They returned to the UK and, after a short gestation period, BAM was born in 1986, exactly 50 years after the AoM was formed in the Quadrangle Club in Chicago. Cary was its first President and Andrew was its first Chairman.

Clearly, the founders had choices. They could have organised as a European Division of AoM or grown their influence within the European Institute for Advanced Studies in Management (EIASM) that was set up in Brussels in 1971 to foster "the education and development of European Management scholars, scientists and teachers". In fact, the 'first hour' faculty of EIASM included prominent UK academics like John Child, Anthony Hopwood, Howard Thomas and Andrew Pettigrew; so there was an existing developmental platform. Moreover, many international orientated UK scholars at the time were locked into North American networks and had poor continental connections. So why establish a **British Academy of Management**?

Several features of the UK Higher Education context favoured the development of BAM since the 1960s. First, business and management courses and programmes in UK universities had grown rapidly since the early 1970s. This growth was paralleled later in the 1970s and the early 1980s from within the polytechnic sector, where there had been no strong research path ways and limited research cultures, but a strong

commitment to the undergraduate provision of business studies. Such demand side growth had not been matched by the supply of suitably qualified research staff. Initial appointments had come from staff trained in elite US business schools, as was the case in many European business schools, or in single disciplinary schools in the UK in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The second and third generations of faculty were trained largely on doctoral programmes in the UK, where Manchester Business School had a good reputation. There were doubts about the quality of other programmes and, consequently, about some of the folk coming out of them. Hence, there was pressure in the sector for more homogeneity and control.

Second, although business and management academics represented between 30 and 40% of the social science population, they received only about 10% of the associated funding from the then Economic and Social Science Research Council (ESRC). Besides these restrictions on the volume of funds, their flow was about to be redirected by significant changes in research funding policy about to impact upon the sector with the first research assessment exercise in 1987. Third, consultants and trainers, linking the subject strongly with practice, had hijacked the Association of Teachers of Management (ATM), a body set up earlier to bring together and represent UK business and management academics. In the absence of a national, multi disciplinary body, business school faculty relied on their sub discipline and functional societies, that had been established for some time, (e.g., industrial relations-BUIRA, 1950; marketing-CIM, 1911; operational research-ORS, 1953 and accounting and finance-BAA, 1947) for their academic professional identity.

Fourth, as the European and UK traditions of management research grew during the 1970s and 1980s, international reputations in general management were built on world- wide exposure and, in the main, this meant acceptance at the Academy of Management (AoM), which was a costly exercise. There was no equivalent stage in the European theatre. Moreover, the Americans still dominated the management research scene in volume terms. There was a feeling that UK academics, with their increasing confidence in social science affairs, should start to 'punch above their weight' and become recognised more fully. Finally, though the Journal of Management Studies- (founded by Griggor McClelland at Oxford in 1963)- had become an internationally respected by the mid 1980s, there were limited other outlets for this growing body of UK research.

Hence, labour supply, funding restrictions and flows, research prominence and exposure, and limited journal outlets created sufficient pressure in the UK system for the formation of a separate national academy of management.

The Academy was founded in 1986 and the original aims were:

- To encourage the sharing and development of a research knowledge base for all management disciplines.
- To act as a forum for the various disciplines in management and to encourage the development of an integrated body of knowledge commensurate with management as a profession.
- To encourage and promote disciplinary research and collaboration amongst the various management disciplines.
- To further the development of management education in the UK.

Filling the Void

On returning to UMIST after San Diego in 1985, Cary Cooper called together senior UK Professors of Management including Andrew Pettigrew, Roger Mansfield, Andrew Thomson, David Otley, Enid Mumford, David Weir and Derek Pugh. They met several times in the autumn of 1985 and drew up the outline for the new academy. Each approached their respective business schools for start-up funding of £1000 to help partly support the first conference (see below). The founding principle was that the academy would focus on *management research* and not teaching or consultancy. The objective was to raise the UK research game and to be a voice for the training and development of research students and faculty. Andrew Pettigrew, the inaugural chair recalls:

"It was felt that the British Academy of Management could help to establish at a national level a body where people could reaffirm and build their confidences and help with the next generation of management scholars".

The main challenges for this embryonic organisation were to set up a constitution and good governance through a strong executive committee.

Its first task was to organise the inaugural conference at the University of Warwick in 1987. With over 200 delegates, the conference had an immediate impact:

- a) Internationally, with a visit from the then President of AoM, Richard Steers and a future President, Bill Starbuck;
- b) Developmentally, with active participation from many young researchers who were to take up senior positions in the Academy later- David Wilson, Richard Whipp, Ken Starkey and Peter McKiernan;
- c) Representatively, with most major business schools supporting the initiative e.g., London Business School (LBS), with folk like Chris Voss (operations management) and Paul Marsh (finance), functioning as track chairs (though it seems that LBS were rather insistent later on having a global focus than on nurturing any national institutional presence).

Besides this first conference, these early times were marked by efforts to link BAM to related bodies like CUMS (now the Association of Business School-ABS), ATM and the Economic and Social Science Research Council (ESRC). The latter started life as the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) but rumour has it that the British Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher, could not countenance the words *social* and *science* together in the same sentence!

BAM made an immediate impact on several fronts. First, the broader profiling of UK management research began its slow, inexorable progress on the international stage at the early conference in front of delegates from continental Europe and the USA. Second, AoM recognised BAM as one of its first affiliate academies from European shores¹, inviting the new organisation to the discussion table at its annual conferences. Third, as membership was growing relatively quickly, BAM became one of the first European organisations to found the International Federation of Scholarly Associations of Management (IFSAM), with Cary as its treasurer. Fourth, as an organisation for research driven academics and run by them, BAM succeeded in providing a counter weight to the practice led philosophy adopted by ATM. Fifth, with the new central funding changes and the impact of the first Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) about to hit the community, BAM was readied as a representative voice for management academics to populate future RAE committees and to act as a lobby to funding bodies. Its full

¹ EGOS was an affiliate at an early stage, also.

representation and impact was to come later. Finally, BAM proved to be a supportive forum for teachers in the then polytechnic sector, in which many had little previous research experience. BAM's workshops helped them in crafting research proposals and in writing journal articles. But as Andrew Thomson recalls, the ride was not always smooth:

"While it [BAM] was generally welcomed, it cannot be said that it had a major impact on the UK and international academic communities in the first five years i.e., attendances at the conferences were quite small, although always respectable and increasing in the early days, and there were relatively few international attendees".

Dilemmas of Growth

Early membership figures ranged around the 200 to 300 mark and were restricted mainly to social science based management departments in traditional universities and the major business schools, whose research ambitions were similar to BAM's central objective. There were fears in some quarters that members trained in OB would dominate proceedings but these fears failed to materialise. However, with such an influential membership group, the Executive's action focussed on its search for legitimacy. In particular, it began to engage seriously with poignant issues of the day with leading initiatives and institutions like the Management Charter Initiative (MCI) -see below, and the ESRC. In fact, the ESRC Teaching Fellowship Scheme, launched in 1990, was an important route into BAM for many scholars (e.g., Jacky Holloway and Tony Beasley) who became active role holders later. The benefits of a structured development programme, with time for research as well as teaching, and the support of a cohort of peers were valued greatly by participants and not lost on the Executive's future thinking.

BAM crossed swords with the MCI in late 1991. The MCI had been a controversial force in the restructuring of management education in the UK after the Handy and Constable/McCormick Reports of 1987 and the setting up of the National Council for Vocational Qualifications in 1986. BAM provided its critique of the MCI. It praised the creation of a three tier system of qualification related to a managers' levels of responsibility, the focus on all managers rather than simply high flyers, the building of the network of institutions and the generation of the capacity for greater professionalism. But the Academy challenged the emphasis of assessment over learning, the lack of clarity on standards and the low benchmark for the standards, the inadequate recognition of the role of knowledge and understanding and the general organisation of the MCI.

This clash of academe with professional management sparked a debate over the issue of research 'relevance', which was to come to a head in BAM's dealings with the ESRC.

BAM Presidents (University at time of occupation)
1986-1990: Cary Cooper (UMIST)
1991-1993: Andrew Pettigrew (Warwick)
1994-1999: Andrew Thompson (OU)
2000-2004: Cary Cooper (UMIST)
2005-2006: Peter McKiernan (St-Andrews)
2006-2007: Mark Easterby-Smith (Lancaster)
2007-2008: Richard (Thorpe Leeds)

Fights over Funding

In 1988/89, seventy-six proposals were submitted to the ESRC by researchers in business and management studies. This was the largest from any discipline. But only nine grants were awarded - a success rate of only 12%. This compared with those in economics, politics and sociology of 48%, 40% and 36% respectively. Excluding research centres, the total amount of funds granted to management was £367,000 compared with £722,000 in linguistics and £710,000 in economics. In May 1990, the BAM Executive reported on a recent visit of Howard Newby of the ESRC to their meeting, when four issues were debated:

- Current funding and success rates of management research proposals
- The involvement of management scholars on various ESRC committees
- The refereeing of management research proposals
- The development of new research initiatives from the management research community

A sub group of the BAM executive consisting of Andrew Pettigrew as chair, Peter Buckley, Richard Butler, Barbara Lewis, David Otley and Robin Wensley was created to debate and manage this agenda. Dealing with the ESRC was a slow process but the team persevered. By February 1992, BAM asked harder questions of the ESRC, in particular, why were there only 2 or 3 management specialists on the 20-member grant giving board when they represented the largest constituency? Further, it

sought feedback on the rejected applications and was told that these were given only with the permission of the referee. But the lively dialogue bore fruit and BAM discovered that:

- The ESRC perceived management submissions to be weaker in presentation and methodology than other social science disciplines
- The issue of 'relevance' was important but the concept of 'relevance' had not been debated fully
- The ESRC did not have a sufficient number of referees nor suitably qualified referees for management research
- The ESRC criteria of 'basic' or 'strategic' was not a suitable taxonomy for much of management research

Systematic training in management research was still in need of improvement and the lack of an overarching management paradigm with which to integrate the rich and diverse offerings in the field restricted the impact of initiatives at the time. But BAM argued strongly against judgements by the ESRC based upon inappropriate criteria (e.g., as in economics), for an enhancement of the management database, for a short list of qualified reviewers and for increased liaison between the two bodies.

On the back of the recent RAE exercise that confirmed the scale of the sector (2000 active researchers, 6000 publications, 86 departments, £20m research income), the dialogue began to work. By June 1993, the ESRC had recognised the low level of support that it had given to management research proposals and promised a review of its procedures and the elimination of any bias. But that was only a part of the solution. The standards of submission had to be improved to allay any perceptions held within the ESRC about relative quality. The Academy reacted quickly and established a research policy working party and a Directors of Research (DoR) network convened by Gerry Johnson. It focussed the 1993 annual conference on the 'Crafting of Management Research' (with a research design track running from beginning to end) and explored the market for specialist workshops for 'rookie management researchers' under Colin Eden and Arthur Francis. In addition, it collaborated actively with the ESRC Commission on Management Research by supplying several of the BAM Council as members (Christine Edwards, Arthur Francis, Andrew Pettigrew and Andrew Thomson) together with a detailed, written submission.

George's Commission

George Bain chaired the Commission and presented its findings to the first BAM DoR network meeting at LBS, where Derek Pugh and Gerry Johnson welcomed the 78 delegates in February 1994. The Commission made 12 recommendations, directed both at the ESRC and at business schools, researchers and HEFCs. Most of these were accepted later by the ESRC. The BAM chair, with the full support of Council, wrote to support the Report's recommendations with enthusiasm. In particular, the establishment of a Management Research Forum (MRF)², coupling research providers with users. BAM saw it as 'vital that users were represented by the most senior persons possible from industry, commerce and the public sector' and not the usual group of old lags with little interest in research activity. But BAM DoRs were concerned about its role, credibility and acceptance of its chairmanship and the risk that it would be dominated by an elite group of academics.

Earlier, BAM had set up a Research Policy Sub Committee (RPSC) under Gerry Johnson to coordinate action towards the achievement of its central goal. Now, the RPSC was instructed to harness its resources and gain active support in the community for the Report's findings and to advise the management committee on immediate policy actions. Despite this, two of the Report's recommendations to the ESRC provoked discontent and there was further disquiet about the Report's tone and inclusiveness. First, in spite of the impact of the earlier Management Teaching Fellowship Scheme, the new Fellowship Scheme recommendation, designed to bring young blood into the profession, was denied funding by the ESRC. Second, the criteria of 'relevance' were insufficiently defined, especially with regard to the construction of research proposals. To whom should the research be relevant? What should it be relevant for? Would the criteria of 'relevance' be broadly drawn to include wider social, political, gender and international

² John Baker of National Power chaired the MRF eventually and its first Director was Trudi Coe of the Institute of Management. BAM's Research and Policy group were active in suggesting names for membership and issues for discussion. The MRF's first meeting took place some 2 years later in London in 1996 but there was a general feeling within the academy that it had not been useful and, despite the MRF's offer to hold 5 regional workshops, there appeared to be a lack of ownership and concern over the slow pace of activities. BAM harboured doubts that such an organisation could meet the needs of both providers and users of research and that a bottom up approach might be better. It was suggested that the MRF unify with the MCI, but BAM Council frowned upon this as lacking in credibility.

perspectives? Controversy raged in the Academy concerning whether such utilitarian decisions were to mask an ideology of 'managerialism'. Moreover, would the freedom of management scholars to undertake research based upon alternative, post modern, critical paradigms be compromised?

Critics within BAM claimed that the Report had not addressed the issue of transparency of ESRC procedures well enough to promote change and that it had taken an elitist view of research, whereas many of BAM's DoRs were from the new university community. They were concerned about the volume and direction of funding under the recommendations and looked to the Academy for help in promoting co-funding between old and new universities and for collaborative submissions. By late 1994, the influence of members from the new sector was being felt at the research heart of the organisation.

These arguments, driven by the definitional uncertainty within the Commission's Report and the ESRC, and the rapid population of the Academy by researchers from the new Universities after 1992, were to persist among the Council and DoR network throughout the 1990s. Eventually, they were to challenge the whole mission and strategy of the organisation.

New for Old

The decision by John Major's Conservative government in 1992 to grant university status to former polytechnics, central institutions and colleges of higher education swelled the membership of the Academy overnight. Without an established research culture in the host institutions, most of these new members looked to BAM to provide new skills, provide grant getting know-how and help with publications. The more traditional research based philosophy of the Academy, manifest in its inaugural objectives and strategy, came under pressure to provide for a large demand from a non-traditional sector that it had neither anticipated nor had the capacity to fill in the short run. Clearly, the early teachings on the management of change would be tested in the debates, products and the clashes of philosophies that followed.

The ESRC engagement and the setting up of the DoR network had fostered the debate on research direction and how best to establish the research cultures of BAM and its management. More important, after two research assessment exercises, traditional institutions had developed

their learning and the new institutions were keen to borrow their knowledge on how to position for the next one in 1996. At the first DoR meeting in February 1992, Gerry Johnson and John Hassard were charged with the development of the DoR body. For the next two years, the DoRs met and debated and, as expected, failed to agree on the purpose of management research, what appropriate standards should be applied and what the basis of funding should be. There were four schools of thought:

- *Academic research* for management, shared by many in the old universities and in the ESRC, where the constituency is seen as the management community
- *Applied research*, shared by many in the new universities, where the constituency was seen as managers and organisations i.e., it is the job of management research to be of direct 'relevance' to managers, to address issues that managers see as important, to undertake it in ways that managers see as 'relevant' and to report it in ways which are understandable to, and capable of action by, managers. Here, little emphasis is placed on building and developing a body of theory, which may be seen as arcane or irrelevant.
- *Double hurdle*, whereby management research must address both issues of academic rigour and practical 'relevance' with good research being tested explicitly on both criteria.
- *Critical Theory*, whereby the role of management research is not for managers but is the critique of management. Here, it is not accepted as given that academic research is beneficial to management. What is seen as important is the study of the phenomenon of management as part of social theory and as a social critique.

This diversity of opinion, though a challenge to BAM's initial objectives, helped to re-shape the orientation of both strategy and structure of the Academy and, eventually, led to an 'official' party line. This was influenced greatly by the work of Council members Ken Starkey and David Tranfield, captured in their 1998 article in the *British Journal of Management*. Their suggestion was to 'position management research within the social sciences in a way equivalent to the position of engineering in the physical sciences or medicine in the biological sciences i.e., that management research was transdisciplinary and had to be informed by practice as well as concepts and theories'. The authors had ensured that this view was embodied already in BAM's strategic re-appraisal at Harrogate in November of 1997. With minor amendments, it has endured ever since.

BAM Chairs	
(University at time of occupation)	
1986 - 1990:	Andrew Pettigrew (Warwick)
1991- 1993:	Andrew Thompson (OU)
1994 - 1996:	Roger Mansfield (Cardiff)
1996 - 1997:	David Wilson (Aston)
1998- 2000:	Richard Whipp (Cardiff)
2001- 2003:	Peter McKiernan (St Andrews)
2004	: Mark Easterby- Smith (Lancaster)
2005	: Richard Thorpe (Leeds)
2006	: Susan Cartwright (Manchester)
2007	: Chris Huxham (Strathclyde)

Managing the Management Academy

In its early days, the management of the Academy belonged in an amateur era. From the mid 1980s to the early 1990s, the membership level was too low to subscribe to full time secretarial or administrative support and much was expected *pro bono* of chairs and their institutions (Warwick, Cardiff, the Open University) in terms of resourcing. Certainly sterling service was provided in some cases but, at times, inefficiencies inevitably crept in e.g., the distribution of meeting papers was often untimely. In addition, much energy was absorbed in administering activities related to the organisation of the annual conference leaving little for other activities. However, BAM tried to improve things by committing funds to support the key office bearer. Limited funding of £6000 for 70 days work was made available to Cardiff in 1993 to support Roger Mansfield (as chair), but the appointment was locked into Cardiff's employment conditions and not to any central BAM facility. Still, BAM officers had to try and provide the formal infrastructure as they operated as the meeting secretaries e.g., Richard Thorpe began to produce full minutes from 1995 onwards. In 1995, BAM Council agreed the appointment a full time administrator at Aston to support the incoming chair, David Wilson, again with local institutional conditions being applied. But despite some improvements, administrative inefficiencies continued to damage the system. Chairs during this time, in particular Thomson, Mansfield and Wilson, required huge energy and commitment to accomplish BAM tasks with minimal back up support. As Andrew Thomson recalls:

"But it [BAM] was still run in a relatively amateurish way, i.e. the annual conference was run by a committee at the host institution, the secretarial work was carried out from the Chairman's institution, and there was no serious system of elections for committee or other posts".

This nomadic life of the BAM office and the lack of a central filing system meant that outgoing chairpersons packaged the relevant chattels and sent them on to the institution of the new chair. In several cases, this delivery arrived minus key papers and important minutes rendering organisational learning hesitant. The household effects moved from Warwick to the OU to Cardiff to Aston, back to Cardiff and on to St Andrews in little more than a decade, before they found a permanent home in 2002 at the London head quarters. Consequently, the records eventually delivered to HQ were patchy and were far from comprehensive³.

During the 1990s, BAM's ability to become pro-active was constrained by the inefficiencies of these office exchanges and by the varying quality of the support offered by each institution and the capability of some of the administrative staff appointed. Indeed, many chairs held senior appointments in their own institutions and could commit only limited time and effort to BAM's growing activity. Moreso, not all of these institutions wanted to support the academy fully. Honest attempts were made to tinker with the structure to improve efficiency. For example, Roger Mansfield introduced a slimmed down management committee with day-to-day operational responsibilities and a separate, larger Council for governance responsibility, in late 1993. The sub committees (Training and Networking, Publications, Fellows, Conference, Finance and Membership, Research Policy) were to report directly to the management committee. Despite several changes in strategy, a similar structure has remained in place to the present day. However, though these structural changes eased some of the operational issues, central office support was still restricted and affected BAM's ability to organise membership services as often and as well as it would have liked.

<p style="text-align: center;">BAM Vice Chairs (University at time of occupation)</p>
--

³ If readers have little gems of evidence, e.g. old Newsletters, minutes etc. please consider donating them to BAM's HQ, so we can try and to reconstitute a straight run of material since the founding.

1989-1990	: Susan Birley (Imperial)
1990-1993	: Roger Mansfield (Cardiff)
1994-1996	: David Wilson (Aston)
1997-1999	: Richard Whipp (Cardiff)
	Peter McKiernan (St Andrews)
2000- 2002:	Peter McKiernan (St Andrews)
2003	: Mark Easterby-Smith (Lancaster)
2004	: Richard Thorpe (Manchester Metropolitan)
2005	: Susan Cartwright (Manchester)
2006	: Chris Huxham (Strathclyde)
2007	: Ian Clarke (Lancaster)

Besides taking a stand on external issues and forming a DoR network, BAM developed a number of successful member services during the 1990s, notwithstanding its central administrative problems.

Conferences

Early in the 1990s, BAM struggled to find adequate conference venues, paper quality was patchy and attendance was low. As the decade progressed, there was a growth in both domestic and international attendance, especially from Europe and the Commonwealth, and stricter rules were developed for paper presentation. The Conference sub committee began to tie conferences down up to three years ahead and to sort out local financing agreements and underwriting. Key issues revolved around passing the organisational baton from one group of organisers to another whilst retaining the learning within the system. At this time, it was observed that the conferences were more about social interaction than about the discussion of serious research. Indeed, they would be remembered for the quality of their after dinner entertainment as much as for their plenary speakers. Combining consistently high academic quality with the fun factor became a priority by the late 1990s.

BAM's First Workshop

The first BAM Workshop was held on 5th January 1989 entitled 'Organisation and Strategic Decision Making' at Bradford Management Centre, University of Bradford. It had 69 participants who came from England, Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland, Brazil, US, China and France. It was organised by Richard Butler, Richard Pike and John Sharp.

Training and Doctoral Workshops

Training courses and workshops were funded initially by the central BAM funds but were expected to become self-sustaining thereafter. They were established as early as January 1989 when Richard Butler, Richard Pike and John Sharp hosted BAM's first workshop entitled 'Organisation and Strategic Decision-Making' at Bradford. Thereafter, such events became well established in the annual calendar and were held at various regional locations to secure inclusion and broader representation. Nonetheless, like the secretariat, much of this activity relied on the gifting of local resources by host organisations and much hard work from volunteer Council members like Colin Eden, Arthur Francis, Derek Pugh, Richard Thorpe and Gerry Johnson. Clearly, BAM's ability to create more product offerings of this type were restricted by the lack of permanent central office support; as late as February 1996, Council noted that more workshops on advanced research, research training, new PhD supervision and policy had been planned but would not take place until after the appointment of an administrator.

One of the founding aims of BAM was to facilitate the training of PhD students. Up until 1994/95, doctoral seminars and workshops had taken place on a rather ad hoc basis. But the training sub committee, led by Colin Eden and Arthur Francis and assisted by Richard Thorpe, Mark Easterby Smith, Jacky Holloway, Paul Frost and Elizabeth Chell embarked on an annual training agenda and published this in advance. As Richard Thorpe recalls, even with an administrator appointed at Aston in 1996, such visioning was curbed by inefficiencies:

"...we had began to publish an annual programme and it was only with the disappointment concerning the level of support offered by the office that the enthusiasm for training dipped for a couple of years, until we could put in place better support structures and develop a more regular routine of activities and events".

But BAM's growing links with the ESRC (see above) and its closer involvement with the Training Board through membership (Mark Easterby-Smith, Richard Thorpe and now Chris Huxham) meant that doctoral support remained a key policy issue. Indeed, from the early years, a regular feature of the annual conference was the doctoral symposium, which, by 1997, had begun to receive funding from the research council through their training and development activity scheme.

By 2004, this was consolidated further through a Research Development Scheme that secured funding for a much longer period and one which provided better planning and linkage to the Advanced Institute of Management (AIM). This proved a real commitment to capacity building, and offered the opportunity to use top researchers in their fields. Between 1999 and 2003, the focus of doctoral training shifted markedly to supporting and improving the programmes for and building an informal network of students, which was developed and managed by Janet Ilieva at MMU before the set up of the London HQ when Joep Cornelissen oversaw doctoral development.

Fellows

Inspired by the AoM and modelled on the British Psychological Society, BAM decided to found a Fellows group as early as 1993 with Cary Cooper in the vanguard. The sub committee commissioned to decide on the nominations and the conditions was made up of Peter Buckley, John Child, David Otley, Andrew Pettigrew, John Saunders, Andrew Thomson, Chris Voss and Alan Williams. Interestingly, with minor alterations, the conditions they developed remain the same today. A cohort of inaugural Fellows⁴ was appointed from the UK and, soon, North American scholars (e.g., Chris Argyris, Randall Schuler, Denise Rousseau) and Honorary Fellows were added to the list. In the late 1990s, the Fellows group lost some of its impetus and the contribution of the Academy to the Fellows and vice versa was limited administrative support and record keeping. Its rejuvenation had to wait until the London HQ was well established in 2005 and BAM would provide the infrastructure to grow and develop the group once more.

BAM's House Journal

⁴ The first Fellows appointed were George Bain, Peter Buckley, John Burgoyne, Cary Cooper, Gordon Foxall, Nigel Nicholson, David Otley, Andrew Pettigrew, John Saunders, John Storey, Howard Thomas, Andrew Thomson, Chris Voss and Alan Williams.

The British Journal of Management was launched in early 1990. It was published by John Wiley and had 4 issues per year each running into 64 pages. The General Editor was David Otley and Associate Editors were: John Burgoyne, John McGee, Roy Payne, Nigel Piercy, and Roy Rothwell.

Journal

From the outset, BAM's founders intended to start a new, peer-reviewed journal to disseminate research. Cary Cooper had been chair of one of the AoM divisions that had its own journal and he suggested that BAM do the same. Cary chaired a small group from Council who interviewed several publishing companies for a five-year contract. This proved to be a very smart move as every five years since then, BAM has been able to negotiate a better financial deal. John Wiley won the first contract. The British Journal of Management (BJM) was launched in early 1990 and had 4 issues running into 64 pages. The General Editor was David Otley and the Associate Editors were John Burgoyne, John McGee, Roy Payne, Nigel Piercy and Roy Rothwell. It intended to receive articles from a full range of business and management disciplines and to be multi and inter disciplinary in nature. Its circulation grew steadily although, like its parent organisation, it was helped only by the secretarial support available to the editors in their host departments. Only on the negotiation of the second 5-year contract were sufficient resources available to support a more solid office infrastructure.

Despite the need for such a journal in the UK, it was tough at first to get good articles across the full range of general management topics e.g., in accounting and finance, and marketing. Many initial articles were through invitation as part of capacity building. These were supplemented by some of the key conference papers until a steady stream of submissions began to emerge (about 60 p.a.). David Otley carried a great deal of the original burden single-handedly. Interestingly, policy initiation and development were delegated to him from Council and this process has not changed throughout BAM's history so far. Since the journal was included in the cost of membership, which, in turn, was tied to the attendance fee at the annual conference, there was not a serious problem in finding subscriptions, especially as membership grew. The wide spread of articles, expected in a general management journal, drew some early criticism. But the main concerns were with the lack of marketing in the US by Wiley that limited distribution to a key market and the cost of each copy, which amounted to £20 of a £35 subscription, and left little else to run the academy on.

By 1994, the stream of papers had fallen slightly to around 50 p.a. but the quality had improved greatly and this was supported by an improvement in the quality of work in the conference streams. The year also marked the end of the first five-year contract and after inviting 8 publishers to submit proposals, BAM decided to switch its allegiance to Blackwells. David Otley was re-appointed as Editor at the end of his five-year stint as he had been involved heavily in the process of appointing the new publishers (Blackwells) and to provide continuity for the transition. Then, he discovered that BAM had no procedures for the appointment of a new Editor. Concerned with the development of these processes and in finding a suitable successor, he stayed in post until 1999 when he handed over to a second General Editor, Gerard Hodgkinson.

On several occasions throughout the 1990s, Council discussed the possibility of a practitioner journal, or a mix of such articles with more academic ones, and even one with translations of key articles. Each time, the door opened to a long debate and then found no unanimity to progress as policy. The debate opened up again in the mid 2000s to the cries of 'déjà vu' from the old stagers.

Journal Editors

(University at time of occupation)

British Journal of Management

- David Otley, Lancaster (1991 to 1998)
- Gerard Hodgkinson, Leeds (1999-2006)
- Rolf van Dick, Johann Wolfgang Goethe (2007- present)

International Journal of Management Research

- Steve Armstrong, Hull and Adrian Wilkinson, Griffith (2004- present)

In addition to the BJM, the early Councils were keen to improve communication around the academic community in the UK. A Newsletter was started at the suggestion of Andrew Thomson in the late 1980s and he became its editor for the first few issues until Derek Pugh took the reins. The paper grew in influence, swapping stories on institutions, RAE worries, training and doctoral programme events, DoR networks, member's perceptions and general news. But members waited anxiously to read the satirical 'Private Eye' like investigations of Stony Stratford on the back page, in case they figured, usually embarrassingly, in despatches. The Bradford team of Peter Buckley, Richard Butler and David Weir took over as editors in 1992/93 and handed the task swiftly to their colleagues across the Pennines in Greater Manchester in Tony Berry, Graham Sewell and Heather Hoplf.

They held sway until 1998. Council's instructed Editors to stand on their own with minimal financial support and so the new team generated additional revenues from the introduction of advertisements and managed to reduce printing costs. As well as the introduction of book reviews, a significant feature of this era were the many discussion papers published in the Newsletter for wider membership commentary on the pressing issues of the day e.g., by Gerry Johnson, Colin Eden and Arthur Francis. But in due course, the regularity of newsletter publication fell victim to a lack of central office facilities as well as the slow move towards new technology in both production and output. The last editions were produced at Aston under the editorship of David Parker and his team.

BAM Newsletter Editors

(University at time of occupation)

1987-1991 Derek Pugh (OU)
1992-1993 Kate Prescott, Peter Buckley, Richard Butler and David Weir (Bradford)
1994-1998 Tony Berry (MBS), Graham Sewell (UMIST) and Heather Höpfl (Bolton Institute)

1999-2000	Jacky Holloway and Geoff Mallory (OU)
2001- 2003	Graham Hooley (Aston), David Parker (Cranfield) and Liz Blackford (Aston)
2003 -2005	David Parker (Cranfield) and Liz Blackford (Aston)

Bumpy Path to a New World

By the late 1990s, the academy had travelled a long and winding road. It earned impact at a macro level and was able to converse with major stakeholders in UK Higher Education on an equal footing. It had developed a range of services for members and produced a successful journal. But there was no question that the administrative machinery was creaking and limiting future development. Two significant events triggered Councils action and propelled BAM into its professional era.

In November 1996, David Wilson took over the chair and Gerry Gannon was appointed as Treasurer. Council turned its attention to Wilson's strategy paper that had started to audit BAM's internal and external activities; in true 'double hurdle' mode, it separated these into scholarly or applied forming a two by two matrix. Council embarked on a thorough investigation of each cell and even considered appointing four vice chairs to champion them. This activity forced Council to examine its constitution and aims. Members considered the initial aims to be too broad for policy development and called for more focus and accountability for performance against the aims. In particular, it was felt that although the internal activities had developed at a faster pace than the external ones, they were unlikely to sustain the academy in their present form. If left unaltered and unsupported, they may lead to an erosion of membership through disillusionment. In addition, Council felt that, despite progress and influence in external affairs, BAM was behaving in a reactive manner and failing to set agendas e.g. on the ESRC Initiatives, the Dearing Report or upcoming RAE exercises. And, of course, there were the 'relevance' criteria that BAM had yet to influence. To make matters worse, all of this external work fell on the shoulders of the President alone.

There followed a concerted effort by the part time administrator, Diane McBeth, to bring all records up to date so the academy could begin planning ahead with the Management group carrying out the policy decisions of its Council - a separation of design from implementation that had yet to occur. First, however, it needed a strategy covering the

medium term, accompanied by an overt financial plan covering both the tactical and the strategic. The strategy had to acknowledge that its activity in the applied cells had been limited to date and as well as new products (e.g., a more applied journal) - a change in mind set would be needed before BAM could advance further into those cells.

Hence, on the 11th of November 1997, 17 Council members participated in a 'strategy away day' at the Crown Hotel in Harrogate to discuss the future of these internal and external options. There was general agreement that BAM was not serving its members as well as it could and it needed a stronger public face for management research and education. The formal aims were not seen as useful in describing what BAM stood for as far as external agencies were concerned. Council agreed that BAM's role was to develop and assist in:

'The creation of management knowledge through research and its dissemination through teaching and application'.

BAM's policy towards research had been stated clearly in the Starkey and Tranfield paper (op cit) but the addition of teaching was a departure from the vision of the founding fathers. Council agreed that teaching (or research dissemination in its more general sense) could not be isolated from research as the one informed the other. Thus, it was agreed that BAM should take an active role in the teaching of management and it decided to try and claim a share of this territory from the Association of MBAs (AMBA) and the Association of Business Schools (ABS). The latter had already warmed to such an approach in discussion with their head, Chris Greensted. At the least, this stake should cover the territory at the Masters and Doctoral levels by research.

Besides examining its aims and introducing teaching into its remit, Council were concerned that BAM was not providing sufficient member benefits and committed itself to expanding both the membership base and the benefits offered to it. Europe would be a key target market with the European Group for Organisation Studies (EGOS) and European Foundation for Management development (EFMD) as a bridgehead. Council members, with clearly defined roles, would be expected to become accountable for task delivery, to be more accessible, to do more and work harder and support the Chair (Wilson) and the two new Vice Chairs (Whipp on research affairs and government bodies and McKiernan on membership benefits and international relations) and secretary (Thorpe) in delivering this new agenda.

Living at the Edge

But before pressure could be brought to enact this promising strategy, disaster struck. BAM was no stranger to administrative inadequacy (see above) but the latest event triggered a new desire for professional management. Early in 1998, Council discovered that few of BAM's bills over the last 2 years had been paid and that the accounts were in a shambles. The treasurer had disappeared temporarily. An emergency meeting demanded explanations and appointed a qualified new treasurer in Tony Beasley. Cary Cooper was brought back for a further term as President to oversee the recovery and the implementation of the strategic initiatives.

Once Tony had pieced together the finances, Council discovered that BAM was not in the desperate shape that was first thought, but financial systems and processes had to take a leap forward in sophistication. Tony, together with Lesley Plowman at Cardiff, worked tirelessly to put the books and records back in order over the next few years. They introduced new systems and processes and, consequently, Council's governance improved considerably as more consistent figures were presented systematically with a full financial commentary.

In the autumn of 1998, David Wilson's experience as a BAM chair enabled him to progress onto the European stage with his appointment to the Council of EGOS. Later, as its President, he was to oversee its development into a major European academy. Richard Whipp took over as the new chair of BAM and, ironically, while in this position, he helped to set up the European Academy of Management (EURAM)⁵ in 2000 which was to become EGOS's companion and competitor at the European level.

⁵ Richard's vice chair at BAM, Peter McKiernan, became EURAM's VP in 2001 and President in 2007. At the dawn of the new millennium, it was BAM alumni (David and Peter) that represented European affairs at the AoM annual meetings of affiliate societies. Years earlier, BAM had helped found IFSAM through Cary Cooper and, with

The Academy had lived 'close to the edge' and this experience accelerated its move to professionalise all parts of its activities behind a robust development strategy. This professionalisation phase occurred in two parts - the period up to the Cardiff conference in 2001 and the period thereafter.

From reactive to proactive

The 1990s had witnessed many successes in external influence but many of these were reactive and depended on individual networks. By 1999, BAM recognised the opportunity to take the lead in the setting of national agendas and policy on business and management research. In parallel, the new executive team (Cary Cooper, Richard Whipp, Peter McKiernan, Tony Beasley, Richard Thorpe⁶) set about installing new systems and processes within the office side of the Academy and developing the members services to new heights.

This external and internal focus drove the new strategy that Richard and Peter drew up around Ansoff's (1965) original two by two matrix on products and markets. The ambition of phase one was to expand the membership base but, to accomplish this, the executive team had first to concentrate on getting services and products right for our existing members. Such actions included the production of a regular and professional in house magazine (completed by Jacky Holloway and Geoff Mallory), the forward planning over 4 years for the conference agenda (undertaken initially by Sue Cox), the development of a comprehensive membership pack on joining, the signing of memoranda of agreement and the sharing of member benefits with other Academies (e.g., ANZAM, AoM, IAM, EURAM) and the formation of SIGs (see below). Phase two involved a major membership recruitment drive in the home market through the use of existing members in their home institutions, the creation of new membership categories (e.g., retired), the use of BAM's 24 overseas members as recruiters in their home markets and policy changes which demanded that all attendees at BAM events and workshops became members. Such an expansive strategy put increasing pressure on

BAM Fellows Graham Hooley and John Saunders later to become Presidents of EMAC, the academy has a distinguished record of international institution building.

⁶ In a tragedy for the Academy, both Richard Whipp and Tony Beasley were taken from us at an early age. I have dedicated this history to their memory as generous and wonderful men whose selfless input helped us reach our ambitions.

the temporary office at Cardiff but this was absorbed professionally and run tightly by Lesley Plowman.

Not all of the above initiatives were successful (e.g., management of the discounting scheme with other Academies proved tough to implement and a planned conference jointly with the Western Division of the AoM failed to materialise) but the forward thrust created helped BAM heighten its national and international profile. BAM was now being asked for its views and advice by a range of organisations interested in management research and education (e.g., ESRC, Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council - EPSRC, Academy of Learned Societies for the Social Science - ALSISS, British Academy - BA, Department of Trade and Industry - DTI, Cabinet Office and the Quality Assurance Agency - QAA). Improving the professional image with such institutions necessitated a team approach with council members Ken Starkey, David Tranfield, Elizabeth Chell, Paul Jeffcutt and Mark Easterby-Smith, Les Worrall (PR) and Graham Hooley (International Affairs) reinforcing the core executive team and playing lead roles.

BAM's influence was growing at the Higher Education Funding Council, as it supplied eminent names for the 2001 RAE, where Cary Cooper and David Otley were to chair the management and accounting committees respectively. In addition, many of those appointed to serve on the RAE committees were drawn from those nominated by BAM. The DoR network began to run seminars on preparation for the RAE. Further, BAM was instrumental in furbishing the ESRC with themes for its 5-year policy. Ken Starkey provided BAM's evidence and critiqued the ESRC for its broad-brush themes and important omissions e.g., the links between organisational performance and national performance, entrepreneurship, risk, innovation and European perspectives. To stimulate more influence of this kind, Cary set up a media and policy sub group to project BAM's message and position to more external agencies. This success on domestic shores soon spread to the international stage.

International Recognition at Last

In 2000, Anthony Hopwood (Oxford) was the President of EIASM and invited several European scholars to Brussels to discuss the founding of a new European Academy of Management. This was partly in response to rumours that the AoM had international ambitions and partly because EIASM's portfolio consisted of functional specialist academies and there was a felt need for a general academy. Robin Wensley, Richard

Whittington, Richard Whipp and Peter McKiernan were involved at an early stage. It was with great pride that, once the new academy was inaugurated, much of its developmental base, structure and policy and even early strategy was adapted from BAM, as our European colleagues viewed it as one of the most successful national academies in Europe at that time. There were two effects. First, BAM's international strategy, as debated at Harrogate⁷ in 1997, had begun to develop a new thrust that was noticed by academic colleagues abroad. Second, and because of this, Richard restructured the executive so that the VC focussed solely upon international affairs, leaving the chair and the President to focus entirely upon influencing national policy at home. By 1999, even the Academy of Management Review's Presidential address by Bill Starbuck referred to BAM's progress and the signing of the memoranda between the two Academies.

Breakthroughs on the Domestic Scene

One of the significant changes to BAM's domestic structure occurred in 1999 with the formation of Special Interest Groups (SIGs). The AoM was structured into subject divisions and Mark Easterby-Smith argued for subject groupings as BAM's membership grew. The aim of the SIGs was to encourage greater member participation, to provide a more diverse range of activities for members, to connect the specialised functional areas and to improve theory through its links with practice. Tony Berry, Chris Huxham and Jacky Holloway helped the core executive to launch the initiative. BAM would pump prime their funding and arrange for a presence at the annual conference. SIGs were to differ from AoM's divisions both structurally, as academy activities would take place outside the SIGs as well as within them, and in terms of focus, as they would centre generally on interdisciplinary topics rather than established disciplinary areas. The SIG's performance would be evaluated against specific criteria so that their role in the long-term development of BAM would be monitored. The first prototype SIG was Management Consultancy but Learning and Knowledge, Interorganisational Relations, Performance Management, Philosophy of Management, Critical Management, Creativity and Creative Industries and E-Business soon joined them. Eventually, the SIG structure proved a fruitful way to

⁷ Ironically, in these discussions at Harrogate, Wilson, Whipp and McKiernan suggested that BAM should aspire to become a European Academy of Management and scribbled the letters EURAM on the final wrap up slides.

organise BAM's internal and conference activities and, with regional events and workshops, offered richer benefits for the membership.

SIGs also provided new opportunities for less experienced academics to play active roles in the Academy, reflecting grass roots concerns and the need for innovative transdisciplinary themes. As the SIGs grew, more women members were able to find a direct route to Council and before long BAM had its first female Chair in Susan Cartwright in 2006, followed by its second, Chris Huxham, in 2007.

BAM Special Interest Groups

Special Interest Group	Established	Current Status	Current Chair/Convener
Corporate Social Responsibility	May 2006	Start up	Alan Murray
eBusiness and eGovernment	August 2001 relaunched January September 2004/	Full	Feng Li
Entrepreneurship and Innovation	September 1998	Full	Ossie Jones
Foresight and Organisational Becoming	September 2003	Full	Brad Mackay / Swapnesh Masrani
Gender in Management	November 2003	Full	Adelina Broadbridge
Human Resource Management	July 2004	Full	Katie Truss
Identity	May 2004	Full	Nic Beech
Inter-Organisational Relations	December 1999	Full	Paul Hibbert
Knowledge and Learning	September 2000	Full	David Spicer
Management Consultancy	September 1999	Full	Tony Berry
Organisational Psychology	November 2006	Start-up	Jon Billsberry
Performance Management	May 2000	Full	Jacky Holloway
Research Methodology	November 2004	Full	Catherine Cassell
Retail and Marketing	August 2003	Full	Andrew Newman
Strategy as Practice	August 2004	Full	Mirela Schwartz
Transformation Change and Organisation Development	January 2007	Start-up	Ashley Braganza

Hiccups

Just as success was arriving on the domestic and international scenes, BAM found a spanner in the works. The forward planning on conferences was interrupted by a last minute cancellation from a host institution. Richard Whipp shouldered the challenge and asked colleagues at Cardiff to host the annual conference at very short notice. Even with their best efforts (and they worked hard), things did not go as well as they had expected. It was a nadir for BAM and drained the energy from the executive team that had strived to project the professional image and influence on the domestic and international scene. BAM drew breath. The Executive pulled together and reflected upon its options, including the 'unthinkable' ones.

Clearly, there was too much at stake with the current RAE in process, and negotiations with the ESRC and the Cabinet Office over the new Advanced Institute of Management (AIM) at a critical stage. But apathy and low enthusiasm among its membership, reinforced by the results of the 2001 RAE, meant that the going got harder.

BAM needed to re think. Richard Whipp had come to the end of his tenure as chair and Peter McKiernan took over, with Mark Easterby-Smith and Richard Thorpe as VCs. With the irrepressible verve of Cary behind them, they instituted a whole raft of reforms. Operating by monthly videoconference linkages from St Andrews to Lancaster and Manchester over the old JANET network, and supported by Swapnesh Masrani as Secretarial Assistant, they re-engaged with the professionalisation phase of the Academy.

Alan Murray had been brought in as the new Treasurer and he introduced stronger financial controls, business modelling and banking arrangements. Mark inspired the SIGs to form the backbone of future conferences, in reviewing and stream management as well as providing a testing ground for potential candidates for the BAM Council. The executive team initiated longer term planning for conferences and coupled this with a policy to bring conferences in house and control quality and finances more closely so BAM would not get the hiccups again. St Andrews in 2004 was the transitional year and Oxford in 2005 was to be the first full control model. The impact of this change financially was to boost the bank balance by over £100k per annum and allow BAM to build up a level of financial reserves that prompted concern over its charitable status but allowed it to better fund other activities such as the doctoral programmes, the SIGs and the Fellows College.

BAM Treasurers

1986- 1996: Stephen Longdon

1997- 1999: Gerry Gannon

1999- 2002: Tony Beasley

2002- 2007: Alan Murray

Richard Thorpe took over from Mark Easterby-Smith at the ESRC to foster the connections to ensure that BAM remained close to the capacity building agenda. The relationship with the ESRC became much tighter and BAM was able to provide the ESRC with names of suitable academics across the disciplines that would be well placed to fill important national roles such as reviewers or panel members or chairs. Yet again, these initiatives required more and more service support that could not be supplied by the nomadic office facility.

Meeting in Manchester in 2002, Council made the path breaking decision to appoint a permanent secretary and to locate to offices shared with the Association of Business Schools (ABS), in King's Cross, London. Clare Saunders began the long task of re-locating, re-filing and re-organising BAM into a professionally administered body. ABS, under Jonathan Slack, supported BAM's move well and supplied sophisticated IT platforms that allowed the Academy to handle the growing membership base. The offices provided fully serviced meeting rooms that BAM had had to beg from university hosts previously. Slowly, BAM moved out of the 'amateur' stage and, with the appointment of further clerical and administrative staff behind specific initiatives, it was able to offer more and better services to members. These included the revival of the Fellows College, the developmental workshops and the growth of the publishing operations - all of which were ideas from the 1990s that stuttered due to lack of back up support. This policy was advanced further in 2007 when BAM took the keys to new premises that incorporated a 'drop in' facility for members who could use the office facilities while in central London.

The new team departed radically from previous structures in their proposals for management succession in the Academy. Since its inception, BAM had Presidents and Chairpersons in position for 3 years before re-election. There was little continuity between these positions. Strong debates at the Harrogate conference in 2003 concluded with BAM adopting another AoM initiative with VCs being elected for one year and

automatically becoming deputy chair, chair, vice president and then president over a five-year tenure. Peter was the last three-year chair and Mark took over in 2004 as the first successor to the new system. Richard Thorpe followed Mark in 2005 and continued the professionalising agenda. Clearly, the system has allowed more participation in the major offices of BAM and brought fresh energy into each post but the rotation has presented some problems for cognate organisations e.g., ABS, where relationship building needs the continuity of long term partnering.

Until this time, Council membership had been largely the prerogative of professor; now, members began to stand and be elected from all points on the research life course. All took on an active role. New executive members who began to travel the new route to Presidency (Sue Cartwright, Chris Huxham, Ian Clarke and Tim Clarke) have carried forward and accelerated the speed of change, with the continued and extensive input from Alan Murray as treasurer, and have ensured that the influence of the Academy has continued to grow. By 2007, the Executive was meeting 10 times a year.

With HQ support BAM has been able to accomplish much more. SIGs became more embedded in the structure of the academy, and procedures for supporting and managing them became more routine under the stewardship of first Jacky Holloway and then Adelina Broadbridge. The DoR network had waned after the successful accomplishment of AIM and the ESRC's Evolution of Business Knowledge Programme, as its original remit was no longer required. However, in 2004, it was re-launched with Chris Huxham as convenor and with the new title DoRN and with a remit to support Directors of Research. Later that year, in conjunction with ABS, Richard Thorpe launched the first DoRN training programme, managed from 2005 to 2007 by David Tranfield.

From 2004 to 2007, formal links to AIM were established with, for example, Gerry Johnson initiating the Research Conversations at the doctoral symposium at the annual conference. In 2005, BAM, advised by Chris Huxham, and AIM, under Robin Wensley's guidance, conceived a joint plan for integrated "life course" research training and both parties attracted funding in the first round of the ESRC's Researcher Development Initiative (RDI). Importantly, BAM's funding included provision for a part time administrator to run all of its training

programmes. In 2005, Richard Thorpe initiated a dialogue with Sir Alan Wilson, Director General of Higher Education, and the ESRC on capacity building involving AIM, the Foundation for Management Education (FME) and ABS. This resulted in a proposal to the ESRC on the impact of demographic changes on the sector. By 2007, such initiatives became routine with a second ESRC RDI proposal approved. BAM took the lead in constructing a comprehensive matrix of support together with leading organisations such as AIM, FME, ABS and the Higher Education Authority. **BAM had come of age and established itself as a proactive influencer in national affairs.**

Changing faces at the BJM

With the devolved policy on editorial and a separate regional office, the journal was sheltered from the dysfunctions suffered by the centre and progressed strongly. Its first editorial change occurred in 1999 with David Otley stepping down to be replaced by one of his Associate Editors, Gerard Hodgkinson. At this time the issue was receiving some 75 articles p.a. In his first editorial, Gerard wrote:

"My chief aim is to continue the development of the journal into a truly international outlet...In practice, this means that our editorial policies must evolve so as to ensure that the BJM not only attracts the best offerings from within the UK but is also considered an outlet of choice for scholars from other countries throughout the world."

He set about internationalising the editorial board with the appointment of Martin Kilduff in the US who was charged explicitly with expanding the title there. Celeste Wilderom was given a similar role in Europe. Their successful work expanded the number of submissions from these areas in an era of increasing competition from other outlets. In addition, Gerard was intent on moving the BJM up the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) and, after a three year successful evaluation period from 1999 to 2002, the journal appeared with an impact factor of 0.746 in 2003, placing it 31 of 67 management journals. The next year, it popped out at 1.483 and rose to 14th place. By the end of 2004, the number of scripts submitted had doubled, foreign submissions had overtaken UK ones in percentage terms, a series of special issues (which replaced the old conference issues) on leading topics had been produced and the rejection rate had climbed significantly.

Hence, substantive changes were made in refereeing that promoted an increased emphasis on theoretical and methodological rigour. Further,

with the increased number of submissions (up from 75 in 1999 to 150 in 2006), the editors kept the page lengths and the number of issues the same. Effectively, this tactic helped increase actual and perceptual quality. Coupled with this quality enhancement came a professional support office run by Liam Irwin at Leeds. With Liam, came a number of specialist software packages to handle the rapid growth in author dialogue and submission. Liam liaised closely with Blackwell Publishers, who supported the production and office sides accurately and generously and ensured that the BJM was marketed well in the US and other key foreign markets. BAM's infamous AoM receptions were a subtle form of such marketing but followed up rapidly with personalised calls to non-member attendees. Like David Otley before him, Gerard Hodgkinson's was persuaded to stay beyond his term of office to secure the good standing of the journal⁸. In 2006, BAM embarked on the search for a third Editor and appointed its first international scholar in Rolf van Dick in 2007.

The success of the BJM was joined by BAM's acquisition of the International Journal of Management Reviews (IJMR). Cary Cooper and Alan Pearson had been the first editors but the journal had lost its way and circulation was falling rapidly by 2003. Cary suggested to Blackwells that it be transferred into the BAM stable where the growing membership database would welcome the new product and halt the decline. At the AoM meeting in Seattle later in the year, Peter McKiernan bought a 50% stake for BAM. Stephen Armstrong and Adrian Wilkinson were installed as new editors and, after re-branding and policy changes, including the tightening of the reviewing process, managed to shift the journal up the SSCI to 26th place from 71 entries, in 2006 with an impact factor of 1.111.

The Impact endures...

At the onset of its 21st birthday, the professionalisation stage continues unabated with the central office, under Clare Saunder's direction, driving and supporting more diverse activities. This experienced team of Linda Wheeler (Deputy Manager), Beatriz Castel Arles (Events and Administration Officer), Shelley Willson (Finance Officer), Juliet Tewungwa (DoRN/SIG Administrator), has provided an accomplished administration for BAM's role holders who can now concentrate fully on political representation and capacity and network building externally, and

⁸ For further details of the re-positioning of the BJM under Gerard's editorship see Hodgkinson, G.P. (in press), 'Moving Up the Rankings', in Y. Baruch, A. Konrad, H. Aquinis and W.H. Starbuck (Eds.), 'Opening the Black Box of Editorship', Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

strategy implementation and role succession internally. In addition, the central team have helped create a richer array of member benefits delivered with a high quality of service. In particular, the annual BAM social evening at AoM, which began in Seattle in 2003, has continued to thrive as a way of bringing all the international members of AoM together and helped profile the BAM as one of the most **progressive and professional national academies in the world.**

