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2006 Academy of Management Annual Meeting
Atlanta, Georgia - August 11-16, 2006
Knowledge, Action and the Public Concern

http://meetings.aomonline.org/2006/

---

Is your email address correct at the Academy of Management website? It's up to you to maintain a correct email address to receive timely information.

http://www.aomonline.org/

---

Since September 2005 IMD-L, the Academy of Management International Management Division's Discussion Forum, has moved to a new address: IMD-L@AOMLISTS.PACE.EDU From now on messages will come to you from this new email address and to post to the list you must use this new email address. This virtual community is now on a new server with the latest software to enhance safety and aesthetics. As a subscriber you can manage the format of your mail, join/leave this group, or send messages readily at: http://aomlists.pace.edu/archives/imd-l.html To make sure mail from the new list does not end up in your Junk Email folder you might consider adding the list name IMD-L@AOMLISTS.PACE.EDU or domain aomlists.pace.edu to the white list in your preferred email client.
Inaugural Message from Eleanor Westney, International Management Division Chair

Professor Dunning is Emeritus Professor of International Business at the University of Reading, U.K., and State of New Jersey Emeritus Professor of International Business at Rutgers University, New Jersey, U.S.A. He is Chairman of the Graduate Centre of International Business at the University of Reading. Professor Dunning is currently Senior Economic Adviser to the Director of the Division on Transnational corporations and Investment of UNCTAD in Geneva. Further on Prof. Dunning:
http://www.unhistory.org/iac_res/dunning.htm

The Next Real Issues of International Business
- Poverty / Development
- Climate Change / Environment
- Technology / Services
- Terrorism / Security
- Aging / Health

These are exciting and challenging times for international business (IB) scholars. This is for two main reasons. The first is that a whole new set of issues, most of which are part and parcel of our emerging global economy, are demanding closer attention by teachers and researchers from each of the disciplines making up IB. In this short comment, I shall identify just five of these, viz. poverty and development, climate change and the environment, services and technological advances, terrorism and security, and an aging population and health. Each of these topics has been
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Evolving Topics
given relatively little attention in mainstream IB writings over the past two decades. It is imperative that each issue is placed at the forefront of research agendas over the next two decades. Each of these issues is, I believe, viewed as part of the “big” question posed by the advent of globalization.

That is

“How can society benefit from the advantages of the increasing cross border interconnectivity of people and organizations, and the reconfiguration and upgrading of national and global institutions, while at the same time, accepting and, where appropriate, encouraging the cultural and ideological mores and special traditions which local communities, interest groups and individuals wish to cherish and preserve?”

The second challenge concerns the mind set change required of all IB scholars which, I believe, is necessary if our field of research is to make a useful and acknowledged contribution to tackling these five (and other) issues. Essentially, this involves, first adopting a multidimensional approach and second on better integrating the technical/scientific paradigms of the determinants and effects of the cross-border operations of corporations with the appropriate institutional/humanistic paradigms. Let me explain by illustrating with reference to (what I call) the four I's of IB research. See the diagram of THE FOUR I’s on the preceding page.

The first I challenges IB scholars to acknowledge that the contemporary emphasis on resources, capabilities and markets (RCM) to explain the prosperity and growth of corporations and countries, (and particularly that of multinational enterprises (MNEs)) is inadequate without an appreciation of the role of both formal and informal incentive structures, and enforcement mechanisms, underpinning their access, creation and deployment. This focus of institutions is all the more critical when considering the cross border activities of corporations, simply because the values and belief systems on which they are based not only differ between countries, but are, (generally speaking and unlike knowledge and information (the key ingredients of 21st century RCMs)) less mobile across national boundaries.

The second I is to identify those parts of the five issues, – and that of the big question, - where IB qua IB scholarship can make a distinctive contribution. This will most certainly vary according to the issue being examined. It is likely, for example, to be more significant in the case of poverty/development than in ageing/health.

The third I reflects the need of IB (and other) scholars to adopt an interdisciplinary approach to tackling the five issues. In principle this should not be a problem as IB is quintessentially an amalgam of a number of related branches of learning. Yet, all too often, our mindsets are uni-disciplinary. We tend to think and write as (for example) economists, strategic management scholars, organizational theorists, financial analysts, and business historians. This is understandable as most of us have been trained in one particular line of enquiry. But the 21st century insists we broaden our intellectual horizons, and it is here where the need for interdisciplinary and collaborative research enters the picture. Continued next page
The fourth I emphasises the need for IB scholars to appreciate that the five issues identified can only be effectively tackled by a cooperative effort of each and all of the stakeholders upgrading the global economy. This requires a continual and effective interface between the goals, concerns and proposed solutions, articulated not only by corporations and governments – the traditional constituents and current focus of interest of IB researchers, - but by a range of disparate non-government organisations and interest groups, and of supranational entities. Nowhere is this being more clearly demonstrated than in the pursuance of poverty alleviation and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.

I wish I had the time to further develop these thoughts, but overriding and influencing the four Is identified is a fifth viz. ideology, which the Random House Dictionary defines as the body of doctrine, myth, belief, etc. that guides an individual, social movement, institution or class or large group. Like it or not, each of the disciplines comprising IB, must acknowledge that the traditional objectives and values assumed to influence human behaviour (be these demonstrated at an individual, corporate, or government level) are changing. Economists in particular, however much they may assert that their methodologies or techniques of solving a particular problem involving the use of scarce resources are value free, cannot make that assumption about the utility functions of individuals, firms and communities, nor indeed about the independence between these functions and the means of achieving them. Globalization, as it exposes cross-country differences in cultural and ideological mores, is forcing us to reappraise the nature and content of such concepts as efficiency, stakeholder capitalism, risk management, market failure, corporate social responsibility, economic development, public goods and social capital. It is surely incumbent on IB scholars to review their mind sets, and to focus their attention on making a real and lasting contribution to tackling those issues within their intellectual domain, which are viewed by so many people as critical to the planet’s future health and sustainable development.

Announcing the Second Biannual Gallup Leadership Institute Summit

The Biannual Gallup Leadership Institute Summit will be held in Washington, D.C. at Gallup World Headquarters, on the dates of October 7th - 9th, 2006, focusing on the acceleration of positive forms of leadership development. The summit objective is to produce original views and ground-breaking insights for future theory, research, and practice to learn what accelerates positive leadership development at all levels of organizations and all types of individuals, groups, and cultures.

Special presentation of the First Award for the Clifton Prize for Strengths-Based Leadership: Amount $250,000.

A call for papers will be announced shortly.

Symposium Organizers:
Bruce J. Avolio, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Clifton Chair in Leadership, Director of the Gallup Leadership Institute
Fred Luthans, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, George Holmes Distinguished Professor of Management
Jim Clifton, CEO, Gallup Organization
Connie Rath, Dean of Gallup University

Contact: Craig Crossley < ccrossley2@unl.edu >, Gallup Leadership Institute, University of Nebraska - Lincoln
Nominations are sought for election to the International Management Division’s Executive Council. The winner of the election will serve for a 5 year term, beginning with the position of Program Chair Elect/PDW Chair in 2006-07, Program Chair, Division Chair Elect, Division Chair and Past Division Chair.

Election Process:

One person will be nominated from the IM Membership at large while the second candidate will be nominated by the current EC members. Elections between the two candidates will take place from April 15 and May 15 electronically through a new Academy-wide process being instituted in the spring of 2006 for all divisions. A notice will be sent out to all current IM Division members announcing the election and the deadline for voting.

Results of the election will be announced at the Members Meeting at the Academy of Management Annual Conference in Atlanta in August.

Nominating Procedure:

Anyone who is a current member of the IM Division can be nominated as a candidate in the election. However, candidates must receive at least 5 nominations to be placed on the ballot. You can therefore self-nominate, but must get at least 4 of your colleagues to also send in your name as a nominee. Nominations should include the name and affiliation of the nominee as well as a statement regarding the nominee's qualifications for the position and confirmation of his or her willingness to serve if elected. Please see section below on “Candidate Qualifications” for more details.

The Division relies on volunteer efforts of our members so we encourage you to participate in these important nomination and election processes.

Candidate Qualifications:

Anyone who is a current IM member can serve on the EC. However, the membership generally votes for individuals with a strong publication, service, and/or scholarly record. Candidates must be able to commit to a five-year term of office and nominations are encouraged for individuals residing outside of the United States. We would like our EC to reflect the diversity inherent in our division membership.

Consideration will be given to the candidate’s past contributions to the division, their ability to work effectively on a team, as well as their future potential contributions to the division, including their ability to meet the requirements of the position such as running the PDW program, organizing the IM Division Program, and effectively managing the operations of the Division.

All nominations must be sent via email by April 1 to:
Schon Beechler, International Management Division Past Chair
Schon.Beechler@Gmail.Com
Nearly all of you know by now that this spring the IM Division must submit to the Academy of Management Board of Governors its Five-Year report, setting out the activities and achievements of the Division over the past five years, and demonstrating to the Board that the Division provides enough value to its members that it should be allowed to continue to operate for the next five years. Those of you who don’t know about this Five-Year Report obviously haven’t been receiving my emails on the subject, and have missed an opportunity to make your views known, probably because you have an erroneous or outdated email address in your Academy membership listing. Please do go into the Academy website and correct it; we do promise not to fill your in-box with too many communications.

Once the Board formally accepts and approves the report, we shall post it on the Division website. The Academy prescribes in great detail what the report has to cover (the required table of contents alone covers four pages). I don’t imagine any but the most devoted print addicts will care to read the full report. (For those of you actually do read it and who wonder why the concluding section is a SWOT analysis, the answer is that the Academy makes us do it.) There is, however, one element of the report-production process that is potentially very interesting and valuable: the membership survey. In addition to a standard set of questions that the Academy requires every Division to ask, we have been able to add questions of particular relevance to our Division. For example, we have been very interested in the overlap in membership with the AIB, and we learned that over half of our respondents (54%) belong to AIB as well as the IMD. We also wanted to know what the IMD could do to serve you better, and 160 of you took the time to make suggestions for us. We shall be studying them carefully, and shall take them to heart. We shall provide you with a detailed summary of these once we have done our analysis, and the suggestions themselves will be part of the final report. I should note that the Bret Hilton of the Academy provided wonderful IT support, turning our questionnaire into a Web-based survey that was both easy to fill out and attractive to the respondent.

The Academy states that if a Division that fails to reach a 15% response rate to its survey, “the Board will look for a demonstration of good faith on the part of the division as reflected in multiple attempts to generate responses”. Our Division can feel a collective sense of pride in the fact that with only one email soliciting responses and a second one reinforcing that plea, we had 804 of our 2597 members respond to the survey. **This is a stellar response rate of 31.4%**. The entire Executive Council is deeply grateful to you for this. I should be honest enough to admit that as yet we have not had a chance to do an analysis of the data, and it may be the case that this overwhelming response is due to profound dissatisfaction with the EC and the Division – but even this will be valuable information for us, and we shall do our best to respond.

One shortcoming of the Division’s leadership is revealed even by a quick reading of the results: we are not doing an adequate job of drawing in the members of the Division who would like to be more involved in IMD activities. To the question, “If given the opportunity, would you like to be more involved in IM Division activities?” 530 of you (68%) responded with a “yes”. Of course, the fact that the survey was necessarily anonymous means that we cannot follow up individually with those of you who responded positively, but we have been put on notice that we need to find more systematic ways of drawing our members into IMD activities, from committee membership to roles in the Annual Programme. We shall work hard on this, and I welcome any suggestions you might have on how to do this.

One of the most time-consuming ways in which you can serve the Division, of course, is on the Executive Council, and there is a call for nominations for this year’s election in this edition of the Newsletter and on the IMD website. Please do think of colleagues who would do a good job on the various tasks of the EC members (specifically, serving sequentially as PDW Chair, Programme Chair, Chair-Elect, Chair, and Past Chair), and if you yourself would like to take on this job, please do not hesitate to nominate yourself.

We shall be reporting the details of the survey in this Newsletter, and obtaining more feedback from you at the Annual Meeting. Once again, however, let me express out appreciation to all of you who took the time to fill out the survey. The response rate alone makes the Division look very good!

There is one more note I should like to add. Mark Lennon is stepping down from the position of Division Webmaster, the architect and guardian of the IMD Website. He has done sterling work in the last couple of years, but as his doctoral programme reaches its most demanding phase, he has to hand it on. Charles Wankel has agreed to take on this task. We thank Mark for his contribution to the Division, and welcome Charles to his new role.
AoM 2006 meeting website: http://meetings.aomonline.org/2006/

Never Attended an Annual Meeting?

Proceedings Information

The 2006 Conference Best Paper Proceedings will be published on a CD-ROM that will be distributed to all conference participants at the Atlanta, 2006 Conference. It will include 250-word abstracts of all papers and symposia presented at the conference. In addition, it will include shortened versions of the “Best Papers” (approximately 10%) that have been accepted for inclusion in the program. Those papers chosen for publication in the Proceedings will need to be shortened to a 6-page format (publication of papers at their full length would preclude subsequent journal publication).

Notification of Status of Submission
Submitters will be notified by March 31st regarding the status of their submission.

Accommodation Information

The Academy has blocked out rooms at all three venues for meeting attendees and their families. The housing website will open in March of 2006. Please make your reservation early as the rooms are limited and will sell out quickly.

Booking a hotel room in the AOM room blocks at any of the Annual Meeting conference hotels is an important way to support the Academy and help keep meeting costs as low as possible. Staying “within the block” is also more convenient and helps you stay connected with the informal activities and networking opportunities during the meeting.

AOM recognizes that you have a number of options when securing hotel accommodations for the Annual Meeting. We would like you to understand that the Academy has made a major commitment to the headquarters hotels in order to secure a large block of quality hotel rooms at competitive prices and have access to prime meeting space for program activities.

The Academy of Management is legally bound to fill the guest room blocks. Not to do so has severe financial implications for the Academy and affects its negotiations and your costs for future conventions.

Atlanta Visitor and Entertainment Information:

Coming from Outside the USA?
See: http://travel.state.gov/visa/visa_1750.html

Job Placement Service Website:
http://apps.aomonline.org/Placement/

Asia Academy of Management

AAoM Webpage: www.cuhk.edu.hk/baf/asia-aom

Members receive the official journal, Asia Pacific Journal of Management.

FIFTH AAoM CONFERENCE - CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS
Theme: Asian Management: Convergence and Divergence
Venue: Tokyo, Japan December 19-21, 2006
Hosted by Waseda University

Deadline of submission: May 31, 2006

For questions concerning paper submission, please contact:
Prof. Kazuhiro Asakawa
Graduate School of Business Administration, Keio University
Email address: asakawa@kbs.keio.ac.jp
The IM Division will be organizing 11 PDWs and co-sponsoring 17 PDWs organized by various AOM divisions and interest groups. We will also be hosting a PDW Reception and organizing an outdoor adventure event.

Description of IMD PDWs

IMD Doctoral Student Consortium
Organizer: Mary Zellmer-Bruhn, U. of Minnesota
Professional development workshop for advanced doctoral students interested in international management research. The consortium will provide opportunity for structured discussion and informal interaction between doctoral students and a diverse panel of faculty from around the world, on the themes of research, thesis writing and career development. One session will be devoted to thesis development, where doctoral student participants will have an opportunity to present and discuss their research in progress, in small groups. To apply, email Mary Zellmer-Bruhn at mzellmer-bruhn@csom.umn.edu with a nomination letter from advisor, 1-pg CV & 1-pg description of dissertation.

IMD Junior Faculty Consortium
Organizer: Mike Peng, University of Texas at Dallas
The consortium provides opportunity for structured discussion and informal interaction between early-career faculty and a panel of senior faculty from around the world, on the themes of research, teaching and career development. It is an excellent forum for exchanging ideas and tips about research and teaching, as well as for expanding one's academic network. A significant part of the consortium will be devoted to paper development, where junior faculty will have the opportunity to present and discuss their papers or research proposals, in small groups. To apply, email Mike Peng at mikepeng@utdallas.edu with a 2-pg CV and a 1-pg career statement.

IMD Paper Development Workshop
Organizer: Jennifer Spencer, George Washington U.
The International Management Division recognizes that many of its members from non US-based institutions encounter challenges in framing their research for a largely US-based audience. This PDW is intended to offer a professional development opportunity for scholars living and working outside of the United States. Non-US researchers with mixed reviews on their AOM paper submissions will be invited to attend a two-hour paper development workshop in which established researchers will help them to evaluate and revise their papers. It is hoped that this will aid them in future submissions to the AOM conference, as well as AOM-style journals.

Interactive Teaching Methods in International Management
Chairs: Gerhard Apfelthaler, FH Joanneum; Julia Gluesing, Wayne State U.; and Malika Richards, Pennsylania State U.
This PDW will highlight several interactive teaching methods which have been used successfully in International Management. Presenters will share their experiences with didactic elements such as: - Role Plays (e. g. "Ecotonos") - Simulations (e. g. "Randomia") - Experiential Exercises(e. g. "Diversity Icebreaker", "I, pencil") and many other methods (e. g. "BaFa BaFa", "Starbilly", "Vending Machines", "Comics and Cartoons"). In the PDW, participants will be able to familiarize themselves with the learning objectives of these approaches and how they can be implemented in International Management classes for creating an optimal learning experience. Selected simulations will be tried out with participants. In addition, the PDW is also designed to be a breeding ground for new ideas which are contributed by all participants. Pre-registration is required. Contact Gerhard Apfelthaler at gerhard.apfelthaler@fh-joanneum.at or Julia Gluesing at j.gluesing@wayne.edu

Next Generation Global Talent Management: Insights from McKinsey & Company
Organizer: Matthew David Guthridge, McKinsey & Company
An interactive PDW for those interested in issues on Global Talent Management. Discussions on how to manage a company's talent to deliver real business value will be based on the latest insights from McKinsey and Company's global research on talent management. Specific questions and issues that will be addressed include: (1) How should 'talent' be defined, operationalized and identified? (2) How can firms create a specific talent management strategy? (3) How must the mindsets and capabilities of senior leaders, line managers and HR change to support next generation talent management? Pre-registration is not necessary but encouraged. Email Matthew Guthridge at matthew_guthridge@mckinsey.com
Bringing External Innovation Inside
Chairs: Julian Birkinshaw and Felipe Monteiro, London Business School
In this PDW, we will discuss recent theoretical and empirical work dealing with the challenge of bringing external innovation inside. In an open innovation environment (Chesbrough, 2003), although a firm's own research efforts play an important role in innovation, it also needs to reach outside its own boundaries and view the world as a global canvas dotted with pockets of knowledge (Doz, Santos, Williamson, 2001). There is vast empirical evidence through patent activity that firms are increasingly accessing external technologies on a global basis (e.g. Arora, Fosfuri & Gambardella, 2004; Hagedoorn, 2002). In this PDW we will focus on presenting fine-grained analyses of how they do it and whether or not firms are really profiting from external innovation. Some of the questions we will attempt to answer in this PDW are: What are the best approaches to sensing valuable external knowledge from around the world? How should firms manage the challenge of "discontinuous" innovation, in which the new technologies or capabilities they need lie beyond their traditional boundaries? What internal systems can be put in place to better handle "dissonant" information that challenges the existing orthodoxies and norms inside the firm? How can firms profit from external innovation? What sort of business models should they put in place to ensure that they capture some of the value created in their broader business ecosystem?

New Directions in International Entry Mode Research
Chairs: Keith D. Brouthers, King's College London and Jean-Francois Hennart, Tilburg U.
International entry mode research has been a "hot" research topic for the past 30 years. Research has tended to focus on several well acknowledged theoretical frameworks, but has explored other theoretical lenses as well. Studies have included a wide variety of industries, home and host countries, and have explored a large number of mode types. The question confronting research scholars is where to go from here? Do we really need more entry mode research? What issues still need to be explored? What theories will help us gain further understanding? What types of data are needed and how should they be applied? These questions need to be addressed to help further our understanding of international mode choice. In this workshop we will discuss new directions for international entry mode research which we believe will lead to new insights into mode choice and help further our understanding of how managers can make better mode choice decisions.

Business in Developing Countries: Interaction between Local Institutional and Global Economic Dynamics
Organizer: Sergio Janczak, U. of Western Ontario
This PDW will discuss the ways MNCs that conduct business in developing countries have coped with local issues (economic, cultural, ethical, and environmental). We will explore existing and new theories that will help to better explain the strategic decision-making process of such companies. The discussions will include the differences of Western corporate economic logic built around technical and economic legitimacy, the integration of specialized resources, and an abstract intellectual epistemology. A comparison between Institutional Theory and Theory of Resources will also be explored.

Doing Business Research in Emerging Economies
Organizer: Joan D. Penner-Hahn, Wayne State U.
Research in strategy and international business has often been criticized for being too US or Euro-centric. This PDW brings together a panel of researchers who have done strategic management and/or international business studies focusing on emerging economies. The focus of the PDW will be on the availability and collection of data for these studies. These researchers have done survey based and archival research studies as well as case studies situated in China, Brazil, India, Lithuania and Hungary. The panelists will discuss their experiences in their country contexts and then participate in a roundtable discussion with the audience.

Doing High Impact Research on China
Chair: Chao Chen, Rutgers U.
International research of organization and management has so far been primarily focused on testing the generalizability of existing theories developed in Western countries, especially in the U.S. This PDW aims at going further by exploring ways of utilizing the context of China for theory advancement. Instead of or in addition to using China for validating existing theories, we will discuss using the China context as an opportunity to ask new research questions and develop new concepts and theories. This PDW will be highly interactive with panelists and participants working together to identify major areas of China-related research and explore new perspectives, new conceptual frameworks, and new theoretical models. Participants are encouraged to bring original research questions that are promising to push existing knowledge significantly further and more importantly, to generate new knowledge. The panel consists of scholars with Chinese and Non Chinese cultural backgrounds who have been active in doing China related research on macro- multinational and strategic issues and micro-organizational behavior and human resources issues.
Strategies for Collecting Data Overseas

Organizers: Vikas Anand and Mahendra Joshi, U. of Arkansas

Interested in learning how to overcome the challenges of international data collection? This PDW will focus on the challenges researchers face in collecting data overseas. The following will be addressed: (1) The importance and mechanics of collecting data globally; (2) The challenges researchers encounter in collecting international data; (3) Issues faced by participants in their plans to collect data from overseas and ways to overcome them. Pre-registration is required. Email CV, research interests & a statement on how this PDW will benefit you to Mahendra Joshi at mjoshi@walton.uark.edu

IM Division is co-sponsoring the following 18 PDWs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Lead Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advances in Competitive Advantage: Building-blocks and Future of Resource-based View</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders: The Keys to Effective Strategy and Performance Measurement</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Power Of Richness II: Exploring Qualitative Research Methods</td>
<td>BPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of the Logic and Rationale of Hierarchical Linear Modeling with Substantive Applications</td>
<td>RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods and Design for International Management Research</td>
<td>RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Equation Modeling with LISREL</td>
<td>RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods for Integrating Moderation and Mediation</td>
<td>RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-Theoretic Analysis Using QCA and Fs/QCA</td>
<td>RM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography, Networks, and Innovation</td>
<td>TIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Virtual Teams For Global Innovation And New Product Development</td>
<td>MED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood and beyond: organization, institutions and strategies in the globalizing film industry</td>
<td>OMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Thinking, Local Operations: Teaching Sustainability Across Cultures And In Emerging Economies</td>
<td>ONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Networks: The Fabric of Socially-Sustainable Value Creation</td>
<td>ONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring Issues Concerning Global/International Consulting</td>
<td>MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polar Winds to Tropical Breezes: Developing Training Modules for Women Managers and Entrepreneurs</td>
<td>ITC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Through Images Of The Multinational Firm</td>
<td>CMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Practice Action Research Community (Sparc) Workshop</td>
<td>PTC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although Hawaii was a beautiful place to meet, it was a nightmare for the AOM business office. Consequently, the actuals shown below for Hawaii are preliminary. I know we are missing some AV costs and they did not take money from the endowment account to fund two of our awards. Hence the endowment account and award figures are larger than anticipated. The recent increases in interest rates was good for the endowment funds as we received 3.5% interest for 2005 versus the 3% for 2004.

Revenues reflect payments for workshops and IMD’s contribution for 2004. Although they have been invoiced, we have yet to receive the 2005 donations from IMD and Booz Allen. As this appears to be a trend, I adjusted the 2007 budget to reflect the 2006 payments from IMD and Booz Allen. Their sponsorships are due to expire in 2006. However Northwestern University has generously offered to sponsor the Junior Faculty and Doctoral Consortia. They will be donating $3500/year beginning in 2006.

As of February 4, our membership had declined to 2593 from the July 2005 number of 2610. Hence I continue to forecast conservative numbers for the future as most of our income is based on the number of members.

Note: In 2006, the Doug Nigh Award will not be given out as it is being reevaluated. In 2007, money spent on annual meeting activities is cut due to lack of sponsors.

Hope you all have a good school year and I look forward to seeing you in Atlanta.

Financial Status Report
First Quarter 2006
OPERATING ACCOUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>2216</td>
<td>2403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry-Forward</td>
<td>7997</td>
<td>2713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>19310</td>
<td>20444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL AOM FUNDS</td>
<td>27307</td>
<td>23157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE</td>
<td>2225</td>
<td>8500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting Activities</td>
<td>19195</td>
<td>19675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>2369</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Year Review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Contribution</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Expenses</td>
<td>3255</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>26819</td>
<td>22196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALANCE</td>
<td>2713</td>
<td>9461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowments</td>
<td>27,734</td>
<td>46,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The MBA curriculum is full of required courses, leaving few options for students to choose electives. In recent years, business ethics has been pushed into the agenda of required courses as these issues gained exposure from international scandals. We asked two Rollins College professors (one executive in residence) to comment on the relative importance of teaching ethics versus law to international managers. Below is their respective answers for which we seek thoughtful and reasoned responses for future publications of the IMD newsletter.

**The Case for Business Law**

**Allen H. Kupetz**  
Executive in Residence  
Rollins College  
Crummer Graduate School of Business

Nobel Prize-winning economist Milton Friedman (1970) argued, "There is one and only one social responsibility of business – to use its resources and engage in activities designed to increase its profits so long as it stays within the rules of the game, which is to say, engage in open and free competition without deception or fraud."

Similarly, Ehrlich (2005) asserts, “An ethical manager behaves no differently than one who follows the law and is concerned for the long term profitability of his business.”

I agree. If we choose to teach ethics, whose ethics will we teach? If you try to teach that it is unethical for Ford Motors to continue to build SUVs (Sports Utility Vehicles) because they have poor fuel efficiency, which therefore harms the environment, someone else could teach that it is unethical to deprive parents of a sturdy vehicle that is far more likely to keep their children alive in the event of an accident. Ford should decide whether or not to sell SUVs based on the long-term profitability to the company, not the ethical flavor of the day. If it is unethical to sell SUVs, some could argue it is unethical to sell any product that pollutes. Maybe Ford could start selling ice cream cones – until someone argues it is unethical to be in a business that could contribute to childhood obesity.

If instead we train future managers that Ford should build products that its customers want and need, that Ford should follow the letter and spirit of US laws and regulations and those in the countries where they do business, and that Ford’s MBA-trained managers should hire lawyers to help ensure compliance, then we are serving our students and their eventual shareholders well. Don’t get me wrong – ethics matter. Ethical managers – all things being equal – are better than unethical managers. But since we can’t whose ethics to teach, we should instead teach the law.

If Ford engages in practices that are legal but unethical, the customer will quickly know this via the Internet. Kathie Lee Gifford found that out the hard way when she sold clothes made legally in sweat shops in Latin America, just as Nike did when we saw the appalling conditions in the factories that their vendors used in Indonesia. Some consumers stopped buying these products, so the MBA-trained manager quickly realized the importance of ethics. Acting ethically in this case increased shareholder value, but we didn’t need to teach them that in school. The problem is that one can argue subjectively what an ethical manager is, but a law-abiding manager is an absolute.

**The Case for Business Ethics**

**Dr. James P. Johnson, Ph.D.**  
Associate Professor of International Business  
Rollins College  
Crummer Graduate School of Business

I beg to differ. The USA is a country of 50 states and additional territories, with sometimes conflicting state laws, and federal laws that are not always clear (see the current discussions about the need for the U.S. Supreme Court to be more "business friendly" and to clarify laws such as interstate commerce regulations and federal versus state product liability laws). So there is not necessarily "one law" that we can teach.

Too many firms and individuals behave unethically at times, even though such behavior might be legally acceptable. A case in point is United Airlines (UAL), which has dumped $9.8 billion of its pension responsibilities onto a federal agency, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, which is already under-funded. With Northwest Air and Delta having also entered Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection, it is likely that they will follow UAL’s lead and transfer their pension liabilities to public funds, too.
Therefore, the question that we should ask is, do we want to develop managers with a legalistic mind frame, or managers with a sound ethical compass (not that the two are necessarily mutually exclusive!)?

The examples above of Ford, Kathy Lee Gifford, and Nike suggest that we should leave the market to judge ethical behavior. But the case of the airlines is not one of market forces at work. It is the taxpayers in this case who, once again, have allowed failing firms to survive. Frankly, airline passengers don't much care so long as there are sufficient airlines in business to provide competition, so in this case they are not likely to "vote with their pocketbooks."

Sometimes the victims are the consumers themselves. Several years ago, an article in Forbes magazine exposed the lengths to which a sub-prime lender, Household Credit, had gone to in extracting fees and interest payments from borrowers who did not qualify as prime credit risks (Condon, 2002). What room was there then for market forces? Since Household was the only lender that was prepared to do business with them, the consumers were left with no choice; they certainly did not expect the lender to be deceitful in its practices, leaving them with ballooning debts.

In my view, the actions of UAL are unethical because the airline has dumped the problem on the taxpayer and it has broken fiduciary promises to its employees. Like Household Credit, UAL’s actions were within the realm of the law. Certainly, these actions were both legal and to the benefit of the stockholders, but that doesn't make them right.

**Rebuttal (Kupetz)**

The (U.S.) Chapter 11 bankruptcy laws that UAL, Delta and Northwest are using to shift their pension liabilities to the US federal government is a perfect example of a manager acting in the best interests of the shareholder. “But that doesn’t make it right” is an argument for Congress, not for MBA schools. Ethics matter and I hope that no one teaching MBA students believes otherwise. But the law is the law. Should UAL, Delta and Northwest fail to exercise the options afforded them by law, they would certainly face shareholder litigation.

Household Credit’s lending practices as described in the Forbes article are illegal, as several courts have ruled against the firm. A manager trained to respect and honor the law, and to hire a lawyer to ensure compliance, would never have engaged in such activity because breaking the law is never – never – the way to maximize shareholder value in the long term. Unconvinced? Invite Bernard Ebbers, Dennis Kozlowski, Kenneth Lay, or John Regas as a guest speaker the week you discuss best business practices. Their firms are not under siege because of ethical lapses; they hurt their shareholders because they broke the law.

**Rebuttal (Johnson)**

The “if it’s legal, it’s OK” argument just doesn’t cut it. Consumers are not legal experts – they want straightforward information, not legalese. In the case of Household Credit vs. Pfennig, a class-action case, the US Court of Appeals of the 6th Circuit agreed with the defendant, Pfennig, that an “over-the-credit-limit” fee of $29 was subject to the Truth in Lending Act (TILA); it was thus subject to regulation by the Federal Reserve Board and not subject to further finance charges. Sounds like a win for the consumer, right? Wrong … the decision was overturned by the US Supreme Court, which stated that the $29 charge was a penalty, and therefore not subject to TILA. This meant that the lender could charge the $29 fee for exceeding the limit and then impose additional finance charges on that fee. Sure, breaking the law is never the way to maximize shareholder value in the long term. But what about stretching the law and taking advantage of legal ambiguities to nickel and dime the customer?

Peter Drucker famously said that the purpose of any business is to create and keep customers. Training managers to follow the letter of the law might increase shareholder profitability in the short-term but, when the law conflicts with the customer’s interests, managers had better do the right thing – the ethical thing – or risk losing the customer.

**References:**


**EDITOR’S NOTE:** A widely-held view among academics in the management across cultures area is that by the time students reach tertiary education age, their personality, values, morals, and ethical views are set. The objective of “ethics” courses at university should be not to lead to changes in students’ values, which cannot be achieved, but lead to changes in students' behaviour. Perhaps through reduction in Cognitive Dissonance, we might eventually change behaviour.
The news in the aftermath of hurricane Katrina made frequent reference to the outrage of US citizens witnessing their compatriots behaving in a manner described as “like they are in some Third World country.” Several issues need to be raised about the persistent use of this “Third World” metaphor and its behavioral stereotyping in our public discourse and in the international management literature.

Firstly, the term “Third World” is an archaic epithet from the cold war era. Nations who didn’t fit comfortably into either East (the “Second World”) or West block (the “First World”) got bundled together, and became targets for either the East or West’s version of economic and political salvation. A variant of this narrative survives in the modern taxonomy of “developed and developing nations.” This dyadic split retains a sense of normative superiority and implies that a specific model of economic development is historical destiny (would supporters balk if they knew how Marxist their notion is?). Accordingly, some nations “get it” and have arrived, and others are merely somewhere on a continuum towards reaching this ideological enlightenment.

More comfortably, researchers in this field may think of using the “Global North and Global South” typology. These terms implicitly connect people in one global community, rather than setting them apart in different worlds – altogether a more accurate reflection of the nature of a globalized economy. It also draws attention to the concentration of wealth in the North, and the one-directional flow of natural resources, talent (the brain drain), and assets such as money and rights across a figurative equator.

More problematic is the behavioral stereotyping that comes with this “us” and “them” typology, and specifically the persistent belief that corruption is mostly a problem of the Global South. Yes, there is a lot of corruption, but let me unsettle our usual intuition by suggesting that it is as much a problem in our Northern society, and furthermore, that it is far less forgivable at home than abroad.

To the first point, namely that corruption is as big a problem at home as abroad, the argument is best settled empirically. However, this would require that we use the same metrics and afford the measurement the same degree of attention. Also, that we frame the discourse in a similar manner. It is in the exercise of the latter that I think we create our own blindness to the scale of the problem at home. Corruption in other nations is framed as a systemic, cultural issue, while at home we approach it as a strictly localized, individualized affair – a case of a few bad apples. This approach is typified by the choice of title for a recent careful analysis of the mammoth accounting fraud scandals in the US the past few years: “The Rogue Executive.” Are we unwilling to acknowledge that our public space may be suffering the same systemic persistence of corruption, nepotism and cronyism as other parts of the world? Skim the local court news from Miami, New Orleans, any city in Rhode Island, DC, or wherever, for any given day, and it should become apparent that this pattern of behavior is not all that different than what one expects from a Lagos or Laos. But, it is not framed as a national issue or a unified theme, and hence we may blissfully keep on believing that we have “developed” beyond such practices.

We find fault with corruption in any location for at least two reasons. The first is an efficiency argument, which suggests that corrupt public officials are not procuring the best available value for citizen services because their judgment is impaired by the personal benefits they extract from the parties they appoint. Furthermore, that the discretionary nature of the corrupt exercise of authority renders business planning costly. The second is a rights argument, which suggests that corrupt practices interfere with other parties’ rights to compete freely and fairly for opportunities to provide public services. Even though this approach is steeped in the Western liberal-democratic tradition, its formal/procedural requirements could transpose into different regions independently of substantive local differences. There is no way around the rights argument, except to point out that the right to free competition is never an absolute right. For example, we condone certain affirmative procurement practices and Federal contracting wage guidelines, which both constrain an absolute right to compete. Nevertheless, the rights-based argument remains a valid critique and a compelling reason for condemning corruption. The efficiency argument, however, is ambivalent and more interesting, especially since it is the critique most frequently invoked against corruption.

Transaction cost economics (TCE hereafter), as introduced by Oliver E. Williamson, advocate that transactions are organized in order to economize on bounded rationality while simultaneously safeguarding against opportunism. TCE also dispute that court ordering of transactions are efficient. What we do know for certain is that countries of the Global South generally operate with lesser institutional infrastructure – the courts may not be efficient, organizations may not have the most advanced IT platforms or connectedness, nor the latest monitoring programmature. The lack of local managerial training and capacity add to an operating environment that faces more uncertainty and bounds to information than what we are accustomed to in the North. Amidst these operational constraints, would it be so misplaced to think of corruption as a safeguarding device that may actually reduce monitoring costs? Can honor-amongst-thieves deliver some of the safeguards and associated reduction in uncertainty that TCE aim for? When a distribution center is located 500 miles away across a dense jungle, without power and telephony and cut
off from head office for large parts of the year by torrential rains and unnavigable roads, wouldn’t it be wonderful to have someone in charge that is beholden to you, or may feel some (however corrupted) sense of ownership in the outcome?

I will not belabor the TCE analysis, short from suggesting that it may offer an interesting alternative to our conventional assumptions about the loss of efficiency from corruption. We might find that corruption actually improves efficiency where other screening, monitoring and institutional forms are lacking. If so, to what would we then attribute the persistence of corruption in our own information-rich, state-of-the-art managerial environment? Maybe we have the real problem right here at home


COMMENTARY
LABELS AND STEREOTYPES IN INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
Romie F. Littrell
Associate Professor of International Business
Auckland University of Technology
New Zealand
Email: Romie.Littrell@aut.ac.nz

I’m in agreement with Charl du Plessis, on a number of the issues. Concerning stereotyping, in a discussion of Evolutionary Psychology in the Harvard Business Review in 1998, Nigel Nicholson, Professor of Organisational Behaviour at London Business School, speculated on the origin of the propensity of humans to so readily use stereotyping of others. The following text in this paragraph are for the most part from his article. In the Stone Age, to prosper in the clan, human beings had to become expert at making judicious alliances. They had to know with whom to share food, i.e., someone who would return the favour when the time came. They had to know what untrustworthy individuals generally looked like, because it would be foolish to deal with them. Thus, Nicholson believes, human beings became hardwired to stereotype people based on very small pieces of evidence, mainly their looks and a few readily apparent behaviours. Life became simpler, every time a new group came into view, you could pick out the high-status members not to alienate. And the faster you made decisions like these, the more likely you were to survive. Sitting around doing calculus, that is, analysing options and next steps, was not a recipe for a long and fertile life. And so classification before calculus remains with us today. People naturally sort others into in-groups and out-groups-just by their looks and actions. We subconsciously (and sometimes consciously) label other people, "She's a snob" or "He's a flirt." Nicholson notes that research has shown that managers sort their employees into winners and losers as early as three weeks after starting to work with them.

However, that this propensity to classify is human nature doesn't make it right. People, cultures, and nations are complex and multifaceted. But it is illuminating to know that we might be actually genetically programmed not to see them that way. Everyone is too busy labelling others as outsiders and dismissing them in the process.

Having lived and worked for many years in both the “Global North” and the “Global South” I am concerned about the relative provincialism of many of my “Northern” academic compatriots. The majority of the USA is more southern than Europe; the majority of Russia more northern. The major inhabited political entities in the Southern Hemisphere are the majority of South America, Australasia, most of Indonesia, Papua/New Guinea, and some Pacific Islands, leaving a rather large remainder. Looking at the 2005 Human Development Index, the top three ranked countries are Finland, Iceland, and Australia, two North and a South. According to the United Nations (http://unstats.un.org/unsd/default.htm):

“In the United Nations system there is no established convention for the designation of ‘developed’ and ‘developing’ countries or areas. In common practice, Japan in Asia, Canada and the United States in North America, Australia and New Zealand in Oceania, and Europe are considered ‘developed’ regions or areas. In international trade statistics, the Southern African Customs Union is also treated as a developed region (emphasis added) and Israel as a developed country; and countries of eastern Europe and the former U.S.S.R. countries in Europe are not included under developed or developing regions.”
This definition seems to imply that “eastern Europe” is not part of “Europe”, but, that’s the UN for you.

The WTO definition is quite interesting. [http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/devel_e/d1who_e.htm]

“There are no WTO definitions of “developed” and “developing” countries. Members announce for themselves whether they are ‘developed’ or ‘developing’ countries. However, other members can challenge the decision of a member to make use of provisions available to developing countries.”

If we look at the HDI map of the world, where greener is better, it’s hard to see North, South, East, or West as meaning anything in terms of wealth or development.

Along with concerns about thoughtless, or even thoughtfully misguided, stereotyping, I am continually appalled by the relative ignorance concerning the “Global South”. In the midst of Semester 1, which is during the Southern Summer and Fall in New Zealand, I continually receive messages wishing me something or another during the “Winter Semester”, similarly for Semester 2, which is in the Southern Winter. A while back I received a notice from a university in the USA inviting me to “Summer Workshops” in Brazil; the workshops were held during the Brazilian and New Zealand winter.

Concerning Transaction Cost Economics and “Bounded Rationality”, as most lecturers and researchers in International Management are aware, and as Geert Hofstede points out in many of his lectures, “Rationality” is culture-specific, so whose bounds, and whose rationality. We find social scientists still attempting to understand and predict a global economy of myriad nations, languages, cultures, and legal systems based upon what is still a model derived from observing northern Europe in the 19th Century.

As for corruption, let us consider a small example, “nepotism”. I have a friend from Malaysia with whom I was once discussing international human resource management practices. When we got around to nepotism, he commented, “If you have a job available in your organization, and you have a relative who needs a job, how could you possibly give that job to anyone else?”

An annual Corruption Perception Index (CPI), including almost all countries in the world, is composed by Transparency International of Berlin and published on the Internet. It is based on data from business, media and diplomats (What! No academics?). In a lecture by Geert Hofstede at Auckland University of Technology in New Zealand in April, 2005, he pointed out that globally, the CPI is primarily a matter of national poverty, not of culture (poor countries are perceived as more corrupt).

When the analysis is limited to wealthy countries, corruption perception differences no longer depend on wealth, but on culture.

In 1984, Michael Hoppe collected scores for the first 4 Hofstede culture dimensions from Western political and intellectual elites, including prominent politicians, based on their own values; 76% of the CPI differences among 18 Western countries in 2002 could be predicted from their elites’ self-scored Power Distance in 1984. Using the Human Rights Index 1992 based on the 1948 Universal Declaration, a regression analysis on wealth (GNP/capita) plus Hofstede’s culture indices found that across 52 countries: only wealth explains differences (50%). If we want less corruption and more respect for Human Rights we should combat poverty.

Reference:
REPLY, Charl du Plessis

Professor Littrell’s response moves us in the right direction for getting beyond cultural differences across nation state as the phenomenon that best explains corrupt practices. He focuses our attention on the role of the distribution of wealth, albeit without fully explaining its relevance. Let my try to synthesize our two arguments with a proposition.

Cultural homogeneity within one state is non-existent in the industrial, global world we live in, and the study of subcultures becomes more interesting. It is my contention that corruption is a deviant (commercial and public) administrative subculture, which is homogenizing amongst elites across most nations because of either colonial legacy systems, or globalizing administrative practices. More often than not, corrupt practices are in conflict with the deeper traditional cultural elements and norms in most societies where international business ethicists spend too much time looking for common first principles.

Macro-sociologist Lenski taught us the important relationship between control over economic surplus and power – wealth begetting power begetting more wealth. It was only after the development of political voice and checks and balances during the late agrarian period that this vicious cycle ceased to yield growing inequalities in income, yet current data shows a renewed up tick of inequality within and across nations. I am of the opinion that administrative elites within poor and wealthy nations alike exploit the lack of mature political systems, including a functioning fourth estate in young nation states as an opportunity for deviant arbitrage. These are the very same parties either responsible for or capable of developing the institutions that should be guarding against corrupt practices. Hence, quite like professor Littrell, I support a focus on poverty as important in the fight against corruption, but mostly in so far as it serves as proxy for the lack of sophistication of institutions of power, and of those that keep them in check. Is it not true that we mostly hear complaints about corrupt leaders, not about corrupt followers? To pay a bribe, you need to have money. To deliver on a bribe, you need to have authority. To get away with it, you need weak institutions. Professor Littrell’s suggestion that we focus on the alleviation of poverty is the first part of the solution. The larger challenge is to develop the institutional infrastructure and political capabilities that serve as checks and balances on local and foreign elites operating within a particular nation state.
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AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR COMPETITIVENESS (ASC)
CALL FOR PAPERS
SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE
November 9-11, 2006, Washington, D.C. Area

The seventeenth annual ASC conference on Improving Competitiveness: Business Practices, Government Policies, and Cultural Changes, is an excellent opportunity for you to:

• Interact with scholars, business leaders, and government leaders from all over the world
• Discuss research findings and current practices pertaining to the various facets and sources of competitiveness
• Present your paper in a very congenial and professional conference environment
• Publish your article in peer-reviewed Cabell listed journals

Completed articles, work-in-progress, abstracts, and panel discussion topics focusing on the following areas are sought: traditional areas such as international trade and finance, human resource management, information technology, marketing, industry/country/region competitiveness, corporate alliances, emerging markets, leadership, quality management as well as areas of current interest such as Today’s Knowledge-Based Firm and Society, China/India and the World, Energy and Global Politics, Corporate Responsibility and Global Compact, Public Affairs & Corporate Communications, Privatization in Global Markets, Corporate Governance, E-Commerce, Supply Chain Management & Outsourcing, Competing in Dynamic Global Industries: e.g., Telecommunications, Pharmaceutical and Biotech. Accepted papers will be published in the Society’s Annual Research Volume—Competition Forum. At least one author is required to attend the conference. Highly competitive papers may be invited for publication in one of the other three journals of the Society –Journal of Global Competitiveness, Advances in Competitiveness Research or Competitiveness Review. The deadline for the receipt of submissions is June 5, 2006. To facilitate the blind peer review process, the first page should include: Title of submission, authors’ name(s), institutional affiliation(s), e-mail address, phone and fax numbers. The second page should repeat the paper title but should contain no information that would identify the author or the institution. Publication style guidelines of the American Psychological Association should be used. Please send four copies of the submission (or one copy by email) to:

Prashanth N. Bharadwaj, Academic Program Chair
American Society for Competitiveness
PO Box 1658, Indiana, PA 15705
E-mail: pnb@iup.edu
Phone: 724-357-4880    Fax: 724-357-5743
ASC Web-site: www.eberly.iup.edu/asc

The manuscript must be attached to the email as a MS WORD file. In the main body of the email it is necessary to provide full contact details of all authors, along with a clear identification of the corresponding author.

I’m Outta Here — Academic Job Sites on the Internet
Have a favorite not listed—let us know: IMDNEWS@YAHOO.COM

USA, Canada, and International:
AACSB: http://www.aacsb.edu/jobs2/
Academic Careers: http://www.academiccareers.com
Academy of International Business: http://aib.msu.edu/careercenter/
Chronicle of Higher Education Online: http://chronicle.com/jobs/
Higher ed jobs: http://www.higheredjobs.com
http://www.ujobbank.com/index.html
Job openings for Economists: http://www.aeaweb.org/joe/
Meta-site: http://www.academic360.com/
EU: http://www.academicjobseu.com/
Primarily UK: http://www.jobs.ac.uk/
UK and International: http://www.jobs.ac.uk
The London Times: http://www.jobs.thes.co.uk/

Fee sites:
Academy of International Business Conference Site: http://aib.msu.edu/careercenter/
Manuscripts are solicited for the first issues of the EuroMed Journal of Business (www.emjb.org). The EMJB aims to provide a platform for new ideas in business - the thinking, theory and practice - and a forum for debating issues that arise. In this way the journal strives to facilitate the interchange of information among researchers on a worldwide basis and assist both academics and practitioners to keep up-to-date with developments in business in the European and Mediterranean region. The Journal intends to provide a forum for the exchange of the latest research ideas and best practice. It seeks to publish academically robust, well written, papers which would communicate clearly on business related issues in the European and Mediterranean region.

Articles should cover the core theories, essential research tools, and emerging perspectives in important areas or specific topics in business including marketing, management, accounting, finance, management information systems, operations management and economics.

Submissions should be original contributions and should not be under consideration for any other publication at the same time. Three copies of the manuscript should be submitted in double line spacing with wide margins. As a guide, articles should be between 3,000 and 5,000 words in length. A title of not more than eight words should be provided. A brief autobiographical note should be supplied including full name, affiliation, e-mail address and full international contact details. Papers should be in line with the Author guidelines to the EuroMed Journal of Business (EMJB) -www.emjb.org.

The deadline for paper submission is 7th of April 2006.

Three paper copies and one electronic copy of the paper should be submitted/addressed to either of the Editors at the following addresses:

Dr Demetris Vrontis, Associate Dean, School of Business, Intercollege, 46 Makedonitissas Avenue, P.O. Box 24005, 1700 Nicosia, Cyprus, Tel: (00 357) 22 841615, Fax: (00 357) 22 353722, Email: vrontis.d@intercollege.ac.cy

Dr Petros Lois, Head of Accounting and Banking, School of Business, Intercollege, 46 Makedonitissas Avenue, P.O.Box 24005, 1700 Nicosia, Cyprus, Tel: (00 357) 22 841569, Fax: (00 357) 22 353722 Email: lois.p@intercollege.ac.cy

CALL FOR PAPERS

“Globalization and Corporate Responsibility”
2nd International Conference on Corporate Social Responsibility, October 12 & 13, 2006
Humboldt-University Berlin, Germany

For more detailed information about the conference see the homepage: www.cr06-berlin.de

The Humboldt-University Berlin with its program partners invites submissions to the 2nd International Conference on Corporate Responsibility. Topics to be discussed will range widely within the general theme about ‘Globalization and Corporate Responsibility’. An initial one-page abstract may be submitted using the online form at www submission cr06-berlin.de by April 30th, 2006 to begin the review process. Completed papers presented at the Conference will be considered for a special issue of the Corporate Reputation Review.

Conference program committee:

Joachim Schwabach, Humboldt-University Berlin (Chairman)
Michael Bürsch, MdB, Centrum für Corporate Citizenship Deutschland - CCCD
Timothy Devinney, Centre for Corporate Change, Australian Graduate School of Mgt.
Charles Fombrun, The Reputation Institute, New York City
Jan Jonker, Nijmegen School of Management
Dirk Matten, Royal Holloway University of London
Wulff Plinke, European School of Management and Technology (ESMT), Berlin
Anja Schwerk, Institute of Management, Humboldt-University Berlin
Ulrich Steger, Forum for Corporate Sustainability Management, IMD, Lausanne
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