**Vesting B2B Research with Relevance and Rigor through Appropriate Research Questions and Methods**

**Spiros Gounaris**

Research in the business to business context has contracted relative to other fields of Marketing, like for example the studying of the consumer behaviour. This is a worrying trend given the importance of the B2B context for any economy as B2B transactions represent the majority of the exchanges in an economy. Apparently a variety of reasons account for this and Scheer (*'Three challenging trends for marketing strategy and B2B Doctoral Education'*) identifies three very relevant ones: The need to work closely with one or often many more companies to generate the data that are necessary to answer many (if not most) of the questions that are relevant to the context; the need to recruit researchers who have excellent analytical and computational skills, often at the expense of other softer skills or a solid background in marketing; and the need to reconsider and revise our views on the impact the studies on B2B have for the practicing managers. With regards to the latter, improving the overall quality and the rigour of the research efforts in the B2B context is also a major challenge. Ritter's contribution (*'Engaging in engaged B2B scholarship: Relevance squared'*) provides an excellent roadmap to ensure that future research initiatives come with a solid potential to generate not only relevant but also rigorous studies while addressing fascinating questions.

Having said this, one could probably add to this the roadmap an additional issue: the use of the methods and the research design approaches. During the last 15 years or so, a polarisation for either modelling (often referred to as 'quantitative') or experimentation (often referred to as 'behavioural') has prevailed. Experimentation is mainly used to study consumer behaviour, and it would be tough to consider how this sort of research could be employed in the B2B context. Yet, the managerial behaviour is also an important condition to consider when

studying various phenomena in the B2B. Alas, modelling, by relying almost exclusively on secondary or objective measures and data, also cannot capture this important parameter of managers' attitudes, perceptions and behavioural patterns. At the same time, research outputs relying on qualitative data, which can provide a deeper insight and allow the researcher to delve into a specific phenomenon, is very uncommon to make it to the more prestigious journals. The same is also true for survey data, which many prestigious journals, for their quirk reasons, have already ostracised and denounced them. This leaves researchers in the context with very few options, if any, making thus their ambitions and research projects probably less creative and perspicacious but not necessarily more relevant. Revisiting this polarised paradigm in research design will allow, for example, to address some of the directions Wathne and Fjeldstad identify in their contribution (*'Where do we go from here? The future of B2B Governance Research'*) and shed some much-needed light on questions such as whether the business and value generation model different B2B organisations have, warrants a fresh conceptualisation of our present views and the theories we employ to explain relationships management and governance. Tackling this and other pertinent questions Wathne and Fjeldstad ask carries the potential for some impactful research in the field.