

Editorial

Tony Murphy

Editor-in-Chief, DBS Business Review
Academic Dean, Dublin Business School
Dublin, Ireland

© Tony Murphy. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>.

Welcome to the fifth issue of the DBS Business Review, and the last to be guest-edited by me. Five years on from its first issue, the DBS Business Review finds itself at a watershed moment. It is appropriate, at this time, to stop, reflect and consider the future direction of the journal. Before addressing some of these larger questions, it is important to note some personnel changes since the fourth issue. Matt Kelleher, the managing editor, has moved from DBS to UCC Library, and has been replaced at the helm of the DBS Library and Business Review by Trevor Haugh. The Business Review is also saying goodbye to Research Librarian Tiernan O'Sullivan, who was a leading participant in putting this fifth issue together, and is moving on to A&L Goodbody's Knowledge CentreLibrary. Shepherding this issue to publication will be one of his final acts with DBS library. Trevor and Tiernan were joined in putting together the issue by Digital Literacy Librarian Amy Fitzpatrick, who also worked on the fourth issue, and Information Skills and Research Manager Aoife Murphy who is a welcome addition. I would like to thank Trevor and the whole team for their hard work in bringing this issue forward and to wish Matt and Tiernan all the best in their new roles.

The fourth issue of the DBS Business Review was focussed on student-faculty partnerships in research, with each article having a student as either the sole author or as a co-author. This fifth issue sees a return to focus on the multidisciplinary, non-cognate and cross fertilisation aspects of the journal's scope. It is also welcoming to see contributions from industry experts and practitioners, which is another focus of the journal's scope. The research articles in this issue focus primarily on change and its impact. The topics covered range from the study of changes in processes in vastly different industries, through to assessing the impact of regulatory change in compliance assurance and of decisions on branding in the sports nutrition market. The issue closes with a note for researchers on the analysis of categorical data.

Three of the articles in this issue discuss processes in very different disciplines from very different perspectives. Nikith Muralidhar's contribution offers a comparative study of image processing algorithms as a mechanism to improve defect testing in cast components, whereas James Fair considers changes to the process of making films and Kevin Stevenson explores a therapeutic approach to the counselling process. Each article highlights specific techniques-- convolutional neural networks and support vector classifiers, virtual production and the propeller model approach--

and explores the implications of using these techniques on processes. Despite looking at different areas, each article looks at what happens when practitioners take a technique for achieving a desired result and either add, adapt or draw out flaws that can be improved. Either way, the motivation is the same; improvement and enhancement of process to achieve better results. For Muralidhar, the enhancement is automation over a manual process to detect flaws; with Fair, the improvement involves using technology to re-create a quality output in a much more cost effective manner, therefore, lowering financial barriers for practitioners. Stevenson explores applying theory to practise to see if it has the desired enhancement for the client.

Articles from Della Hunter and Denise Louvet look less to the drivers of change and are more focussed on the implications or not of change. Hunter, in her investigation into diversity and compliance, sought to discover the extent to which regulatory changes relating to diversity were being reflected in compliance programmes. Here, the emphasis is not on driving change but rather discovering whether change has had the desired effect. Likewise, Louvet investigates whether the decision to adopt brand equity and pursue a strong brand has the desired effect in the highly competitive sports nutrition market.

To conclude, this fifth issue offers some advice for researchers in the shape of a research note from Emma Beacom, who highlights the importance for researchers on considering the assumptions of binary logistic regression, a useful statistical analysis method, before applying it to the data. The inclusion of a research note is a new development for the Business Review and is an example of a number of different ideas about what direction the journal should take.

As it arrives at its five-year, five-issue milestone, it is appropriate to ask what is in the future for the DBS Business Review? The title suggests a discipline focus, but, as is the case with the Dublin Business School, the Business Review is quite broad in its scope. Contributions from faculty and students and national and international academics are covered in the scope, as are industry experts and practitioners and such phrases as “dismantle disciplinary boundaries,” “cross fertilisation” and “non-cognate disciplines.” This broad subject scope is to be expected, given that DBS’s disciplines range from arts and creative media to data analytics to marketing to psychoanalytic psychotherapy, and many more in between. DBS also proudly and unashamedly promotes its industry focussed credentials, with its primary strategic objective being to create work-ready graduates. The emphasis on industry experts and practitioners in the DBS Business Review’s scope is, therefore, to be expected.

During its brief publication history, the Business Review has had a broad remit and defining a distinct identity is among the questions the journal team and the next editor will be considering in the coming months. Many of these questions may also have relevance for any open access, peer reviewed academic journal. In their recent editorial for Information Polity, Ruijter & Piotrowski (2022) highlighted five major challenges for academic journals the first of which is (Open) Access versus Economic Sustainability, where they highlight the difficulty of viable open access. The DBS Business Review does have a sustainable model. Open access publishing is built into the fabric of the DBS Library. Much of the work required and the cost of

publishing the Business Review is included as part of what the DBS Library does, and so is not overly reliant on goodwill, as tends to be the case with open access publishing. This approach begs the question, should open access publishing be another pillar of the standard work of an academic library, no less important than collection management? There is certainly a developing interest in promoting this by providers of education to the next generation of information and library professionals. An example of this can be found in The Open Librarianship module on the Msc in Information and Library Management in DBS.

Having a viable and sustainable foundation allows for the Business Review team to look to other potential changes. Managing Editor Trevor Haugh has started to scope out potential policy, process and personnel changes that have emerged from a comparison of the Business Review with other equivalent open access journals. Some of those changes, especially in terms of the personnel, are required before changes to content and editorial direction can be considered. However, I am going to take advantage of this being my final stint as guest editor to offer some suggestions for editorial direction.

DBS has made a specific commitment to celebrate practical and applied research, which is in line with its overall strategic objectives. This issue of the Business Review reflects that focus, with all of the articles investigating some form of practical application. There may be value in the Business Review making practical research a prerequisite for all future submissions. DBS stages an annual Practical and Applied Research Conference (PARC) each May, which offers the potential for a number of submissions in this vein., Submissions to the conference have helped form connections between DBS and the exciting research conducted across these different disciplines. This volume of the journal features articles by two experts who presented at the event. The benefit of these connections might prompt the editorial team to consider moving the Business Review from an annual to a semi-annual publication, resources and budget allowing.

DBS offers a wide range of topics and disciplines and to narrow the disciplines covered by the Business Review beyond those disciplines offered in DBS would not make sense. The Business Review should continue to offer a potential route to publication for all staff, students and associates of DBS. Similarly, it is a noted aspect of the Business Review that its issues tend to contain a mix of contributions from DBS faculty and students and academics and practitioners from other institutions and industries. This coming together of faculty and students from DBS and beyond, with industry professionals should be encouraged. If there is a common thread through the different disciplines and subjects, however, it is a need to survive and thrive in a business environment. Therefore, while I would discourage the Business Review from overly narrowing its subject breadth, I would encourage it to seek out and prioritise practical research that addresses the challenges and opportunities found in the business environment, regardless of subject.

The inclusion of a research note was a welcome addition to this issue of the Business Review. I would encourage additional pieces that advise, support and help

guide the practice and business of research. Possibly the editorial team could consider a section of the journal given over to such submissions.

It is challenging and scary to close doors and limit opportunities, however, there is also danger in trying to be everything to everyone. A clearly defined focus for the Business Review team and a clear message to contributors and readers of what the Business Review means will, I believe, pay dividends for the journal in the future in ensuring that it carves out its own valued relevance in the increasingly crowded space of open access academic publications.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone who I have worked with on the past two issues of the DBS Business Review for all their help, support and tolerance. I look forward to remaining part of the Business Review team as a reader, a reviewer and, possibly, a contributor.

References

Ruijter, E., & Piotrowski, S. (2022) 'Editorial: The Grand Challenges for Academic Journals', *Information Polity*, 27(4), pp. 421–423. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3233/IP-229016>