

Futures of Construction Management Research

Rebeen Rashid Mahmud

(Civil Engineer)

ID : 9821

Introduction:

Construction management (CM) has gained international recognition since the 1970s and has a growing academic community. Construction management research (CMR) has evolved from primarily research consultancy activities to attracting significant funding for research. CMR has partially strayed from its engineering-focused roots to participate in business, management, economics, and social sciences. In the construction industry, CMR stands for management and organizational research. However, current developments in national economies and academic organizations are altering the terrain of CMR, and colleges are generally undergoing change. Higher competition for student recruitment has led to a stronger focus on national and international rankings, putting pressure on scholars to market their work and publish in specific fields. The global economic crisis has reordered research funding priorities and hindered the growth of the construction industry. This work explores the future of CMR, building on Harty and Leiringer's work and analyzing new patterns that could impact the CMR community. It builds on discussions in mainstream management circles and related subfields like supply chain management and project management strategic. The aim is to consider the consequences of new trends and contribute to the ongoing conversation about the future paths of CMR. The essay aims to contribute to the ongoing conversation on the nature, function, and future of academia in CMR.

Construction Management:

Construction Management (CMR) is a field that has evolved over time, with its roots in the engineering domain. The “engineering paradigm” has dominated CMR, focusing on knowledge creation through scientific methods. However, the definition of CMR has expanded, and it is now a diverse field with people from various backgrounds who may disagree on ontological and epistemological issues related to the tools and outcomes of their work. Despite ongoing discussions about methodological diversity, CMR has become a more comprehensive approach to construction management. The vast and diverse knowledge base in Computer-Machine Research (CMR) is based on various methodologies with conflicting theoretical foundations. Despite this, many CM scholars form recognizable organizations like research groups, divisions, departments, schools, and faculties. They are also united by a system of social relations, such as refereeing, co-authorship, visiting professorships, external examinations, committee membership, panels, international conferences, and events. This creates a setting with distinct co-evolving logics that reflect the organization, consistency, interests, and formation of its

participants over time. CMR can be seen as a setting with distinct co-evolving logics reflecting the organization, consistency, interests, and formation of its participants over time. Hence, while the phrase "construction management" may not have a universally accepted definition, CMR may be thought of as a distinct academic area with a membership that is relatively easy to define and a set of social dynamics.

Conceptualizing the Field

Whitley's definition of academic fields emphasizes the importance of social organizations of scholars in knowledge creation and innovation, centered on a reputational system that recognizes contributions. The academic sector is not dependent on methodological coherence or differentiation between pure and applied knowledge, but on networks centered on creativity and bureaucratic processes. Three major dynamics impacting the academic sector include "networks," which create field cohesiveness and reputational recognition within elites. Excessive coherence can limit the ability to add new information. Knowledge creation processes are crucial, but there is a conflict between conforming to norms and exploring originality. Field membership in research is heavily influenced by academic networks and university institutions, which influence the subject's dynamics and composition. Institutional dynamics, such as interdisciplinary projects, preferred funders, and research output commoditization, partially support the reputational system and impose bureaucratic control over academics. Outliers like research institutes can create tension between the field and institution, affecting freedom to explore new concepts. Academics must maintain their reputation and adhere to regulations, while external participants value the work. This can lead to a range of opinions on the role and value of the academic community, from long-term theoretical research to immediate problem-solving. The research dynamics in CMR are influenced by institutional and network dynamics, with high-profile businessmen often being "research friendly" in research environments. University plans for research income are often revised to align with funding or governmental goals, which significantly impact the formation, advancement, and survival of the profession. A tripartite framework of field level dynamics is created, combining network, institutional, and external forms of control. Credibility is essential for academic soundness and relevance, but processes for granting it vary. This framework helps understand how reputational recognition and credibility are acquired, recognizing both internal and external constraints. It focuses on research evaluation, publication, conflict between teaching and research, and the constantly changing impact agenda.

Examining the CMR Field Publishing and Research Assessment

Dynamics

Academic reputation is influenced by peer review and knowledge structuring, with citation indices and journal rankings becoming increasingly important for determining reputational legality. Universities use these metrics to establish prestige and institutional quality, based on perceived journal quality, citations, and time-related metrics. Thomson Reuters' "Journal Citation Reports" remains a prominent metric in most nations. The perception of academic authority influences institutional developments, such as the global spread of assessments of "research excellence" based on publications. These evaluations significantly influence state funding distribution and university ranking activities. Major funding organizations, particularly national research councils, place significant importance on publications and citation indexes in national evaluations. The increasing pressure on writers has led to compensation schemes that force writers to publish in specific publications, resulting in a university system where decisions about external funding, appointment, promotion, and compensation are closely tied to publications, citations, and impact factors. This development may be more in line with strict bureaucratic control than with the freedom to explore new concepts and prospects. The reputation-based disciplinary architecture in Computer and Information Science (CM) is complex due to diverse epistemological and ontological viewpoints, study themes, and theoretical underpinnings. Maintaining a homogenous knowledge base in CM has proven challenging. Computer Medicine (CM) scholars face a disadvantage due to the lack of extensive referential networks typical of established academic subjects in CM. This makes it difficult for them to maintain high institutional credibility and publish in the discipline. To overcome this, they should consider publishing in ranked journals and attending conferences in mainstream domains like engineering, management, and organization. However, this approach requires adjustments to presentation, methodology, and content. The field-level CMR network's coherence may be at risk as successful individuals interact with other fields.

Future Scenarios for the CMR Community:

Construction management faces challenges that cannot be fully explained by business and academic priorities. Academics are often referred to as "playing the game" in response to these demands, but are adept at collaborating with businesses, obtaining funding, and establishing relationships with research funders and industry partners. They position their research in larger settings, such as enterprises and research bodies, and play multiple games in stakeholder arenas. However, debates focus on individual professors' predicaments and potential structural hazards, suggesting a premature shift towards impact and relevance may deviate from academic research's epistemic domains. The study suggests that overly focusing on the opposite could alienate Computer-Mediated Reputation Management (CM) scholars from their graduate market and empirical context. Instead of individual-level approaches, the study extrapolates dynamics from a CM field perspective, including funding pressures, external emphasis on impact, and changing construction sector landscapes. The methodology is based on intuitive logics, generating four possible future narratives for the evolution of CMR, including hybridization, retrenchment, disappearance, and convergence. The essay emphasizes considering the variety of possible possibilities and not claiming novelty or originality of activities.

