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# EDITORS’ NOTE

Dear SIMians,

We hope you had a safe, and healthy summer and good start to the fall. This issue of *The SIMian* newsletter is mainly dedicated to the SIM events at the Virtual AOM annual meeting this past August. In addition, it includes reports from SIM committees regarding their activities over the past year and calls for submissions and participation.

The next issue of *The SIMian* will be published in January 2022, and will focus on calls for participation, recent book publications, and other announcements. Please forward any items that you would like included to us, *The SIMian* Editors ([The.SIM.Editor@gmail.com](mailto:The.SIM.Editor@gmail.com)) as an MS-WORD document or as text in an email (not in pdf format please!).

If you have questions or comments, feel free to contact us at [The.SIM.Editor@gmail.com](mailto:The.SIM.Editor@gmail.com)

We hope you enjoy the issue!

***David J. Skandera***, University of Central Florida

***Benjamin N. B. Alexander***, California Polytechnic State University

***Jae Hwan Lee***, Hamline University of Minnesota

*The SIMian* Co-editors

# 2021-2022 DIVISION CHAIR’S MESSAGE

**Katherina Pattit**

University of St. Thomas

Dear SIMians,

As Fall days are starting to get shorter, and many of us are returning to our brick and mortar classrooms, I want to take a moment to be grateful. Grateful for having seen so much patience, grace, and grit from colleagues all around as we pulled off a year of physical distancing and meeting in boxed screens. Grateful for countless hours the SIM volunteers in their many roles dedicated to keeping our community intact and thriving, even under difficult circumstances. And grateful for all SIMians who made our second virtual AOM meeting a success and reminded me what makes SIM “tick”.

I want to start my thank yous by highlighting the many volunteers that were working for weeks behind the scenes to pick award winners for our various “best” awards. The Best Ethics Paper team was led by Eva Tsahuridu and included Kam Phung, Noushi Rahman, and Harry Van Buren. The Best Paper group had Christopher Michaelson as chair and Kendy Hess and Michael Pirson as members. The Best Student Paper was selected by Carolyn Dang (chair), Anne Barraquier, and Julena Bonner. A special thanks also goes to the committee that selects the Best Dissertation winner: Lea Stadtler (chair), Casey Frid, Francois Neville, and Greg Molecke. Finally, the Best Book Award winner was chosen by Petya Koleva (chair), Yussuf Sidani, and Theodora Issa. You can read more about the award winners later on in this newsletter.

Next, my thanks go to the extremely hard working members of the leadership and meeting team that made our second virtual AOM – in spirit and time zone we were in Philadelphia – a resounding success (almost 70% of our members attended!). The professional development workshops were pulled together by Cristina Neesham. Some of the topics the PDWs covered were simulation-based teaching, racial justice, climate action, algorithmic management, and more. Looking at the PDW program as an early indicator of the direction our field is moving into, it is clear that our members are at the forefront of important developments. The scholarship-focused part of the program was no less innovative and inspiring. With the support of 51 associate editors and 280 reviewers, Colin Higgins managed 290 paper and 42 symposia submissions to create an exciting program that consisted of 187 papers and 32 symposia. The meeting was rounded out by an excellent doctoral consortium (thank you Jared Peifer and Elise Perrault), which attracted 37 students this year and the joint SIM-ONE junior faculty consortium (thank you Susana Esper and Vivek Soundararajan from SIM and Sylvia Grewatsch and Amanda Williams from ONE), which brought together 15 junior faculty and 20 senior faculty to network, discuss the future of SIM-ONE scholarship, and explore whether it is possible to have a successful career as an impact scholar. Well done everyone!

Beyond the development of the program, our board members were busy helping SIM be responsive to its members and the challenges of the turbulent times we are facing. Special thanks go to Jill Brown who initiated the racial justice committee (chaired by Robbin Derry and Paul Harper). This committee created a racial justice support statement for the website, produced a very well-received racial justice web forum series, and conducted a racial justice & business ethics PDW for a *Journal of Business Ethics* special issue. Jill has completed her 5-year leadership tour-de-force this year and has left a lasting mark on SIM. Her leadership and management skills set a high bar – thank you, Jill.

Andy Wicks, our immediate Past Division Chair has laid the groundwork for SIM’s vibrant future by initiating a thorough exploration of our membership’s needs, goals, and vision for the coming years. Under the expertly leadership of Erica Steckler, the Exploratory Committee (Jean-Pascal Gond, Emilio Marti, Pushpika Vishwanathan, and Sandra Waddock) did an incredible job providing a deep understanding of SIM’s contribution to the Academy and SIMs future.

As I take on the role of Division Chair from Andy this year, the work of the committee will provide a crucial road map for new initiatives I want to kick off. I am delighted that I will be part of a wonderful leadership team to help bring these initiatives to fruition. Amelia Carr keeps SIM financially on solid footing by being an excellent steward of our resources. Jae Hwan Lee is managing communications with the help of a nimble and creative team – Vincenzo Vastola, Daniel Alonso Martinez, Julia Grimm, Onna Van Den Broek, Benjamin Alexander and David J. Skandera. And Sarah Stephen keeps an eye on member engagement. We also have two new representatives at large, Jo-Ellen Pozner and Julia Roloff, who join our rep-at-large members Nancy Kurland, Pushpika Vishwanathan and Erica Steckler. Last but not least, our incoming PDW chair is Michelle Westerman-Behaylo.

With a terrific group of colleagues in place, we now look ahead with much anticipation. The program team will be planning for a hybrid annual meeting in Seattle next Summer (I, for one, can’t wait to see many of you in person again!) and Andy Wicks is already thinking about the party we will have to celebrate our reunion after two long years. Together we will explore new ideas to keep SIM relevant and vibrant for our members, newcomers and long-haulers alike. Stay tuned, stay in touch, share your ideas, take initiative – in short, be the SIM you want to see!

Best,

Katherina Pattit

SIM Division Chair, 2021-2022

[kglac@stthomas.edu](mailto:kglac@stthomas.edu)

A person in a blue shirt
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# 2021-2022 PROGRAM CHAIR’S MESSAGE

**Colin Higgins**

Deakin University

Dear SIMians,

The 2021 program attracted a total of 332 submissions (290 papers and 42 symposia). The PDWs are REPORTED separately. This represents about a 40% decline on submissions from 2020 (527 submissions).

The virtual format enabled a greater number of submissions to be accepted (there were caps of 65% for papers and 75% for symposia). In line with this, there were a total of 187 papers and 32 symposia accepted. This is in stark contrast to 2020 where the acceptance rate was 40% (papers) and 55% (symposia). There was some pressure from the Academy program team to accept up to the cap. In ordinary years, some of these submissions may not have been accepted.

On the topic area (by keyword) of submissions the most popular was corporate social responsibility and performance (48%), followed by ethics (38%). There was also a solid set of submissions focused on stakeholder theory (38%). Sustainability continues to be a strong topic of submissions (35%). One beneficial development is much greater room for ‘live synchronous’ sessions (about 60%) this year.

Of significance, and as something to consider going forward, 35% of submissions selected ‘other’ in their keywords. This raises two points. First: we need to re-consider the type of keywords we ‘preselect’ as part of the submissions process to ensure we are capturing the new types of areas being submitted. While we have discretion about what these are, it does require some thought going forward. We need to consider issues of ‘trust’, ‘gender’, ‘social impact’, ‘entrepreneurship’, ‘partnerships’, ‘diversity’, ‘social value’. Second: the high use of ‘other’ has implications for the automated reviewer matching. There were quite a few ‘misfires’ on the reviewer allocation, causing considerable pressure to complete adequate reviews.

One of the biggest challenges for the 2021 program was reviewing. This is a perennial problem for conferences and journals alike – and shows no signs of getting better. The main problems are: insufficient numbers of reviewers, poor quality reviewing, and reviewers who sign up but do not complete reviews. The Division (and the Academy as a whole) needs to undertake some work in to addressing this. It should be a requirement of those submitting to also sign up for review. There is also an issue of different cultural norms surrounding the reviewing process. While we are attracting more and more submissions from outside North America and Europe – there appears to be less developed norms around reviewing from these non-traditional areas.

Beyond the logistical challenges of the program, the situation in 2020 and 2021 provides some insight in to motivations to participate in the Academy conference. With the decline in submissions (and membership), it is clear that the Academy is viewed by a large proportion as primarily about networking and collaboration – rather than the submission of papers, presentation and feedback. This will cause some need for reconfiguration of the program going forward.

Best,

Colin Higgins

SIM Program Chair, 2021-2022

# 2021-2022 PDW CHAIR’S MESSAGE



**Cristina Neesham**

Newcastle University Business School

Dear SIMians,

After a well-deserved break, hopefully restful and enjoyable enough for all of you – let us spend a moment to bask in the glow of our August 2021 experiences.

Our PDW Program this year has been as varied and enlightening as ever. It was comprised of 15 sessions, including our popular SIM Doctoral Consortium and SIM Research Development Workshop. In addition, we had SIM NETworking meetings organised over most of August, whereby no less than 28 senior SIM scholars generously gave their time to mentor up to 84 participants. I am so grateful to all our PDW organisers for their tremendous efforts in making these workshops a success – and especially to Jared Peifer, Elise Perault, Annie Snelson-Powell, Tricia Olsen, Sebastian Hafenbrӓdl and Sarah Stephen. Our Business Meeting and SIM Social also brought us together as in the ‘good old days’, although trying to capture that feeling through the blue light was a bit of a challenge.

But virtual has space also had unexpected advantages: like never before, SIM has been able to co-sponsored another 40 PDWs! Having everything happen online meant that we could have as many sessions as we wanted to. And, considering the quality of the submissions, we wanted them all! This included the traditional Junior Faculty Consortium co-hosted with ONE (ONE took the lead this year, and Sylvia Grewatsch chaired it) – and also the ‘Reviewing in the Rough’ PDW for PhD students and junior faculty, organised by the MOC division (with Teresa Cardador as Chair). In total, SIM collaborated with another 18 divisions of the Academy, sharing most sessions with ONE, MSR and ENT. This is testimony of the level of interest raised by our division, with scholars from so many different fields regarding their work as being highly relevant to SIM.

The accepted submissions highlighted a diverse array of topics, such as: business and human rights, contesting CSR, racial justice, humanistic management, meaningful work, simulation-based teaching, stakeholder engagement, and transformative impact in Centres of Excellence. Interest in social impact evaluations has visibly increased, and it was very encouraging to see the racial justice agenda growing, with the support of the SIM Ad Hoc Racial Justice Committee led by Robbin Derry and Paul Harper. Importantly, we had workshops for all three tracks: original research, teaching, and professional development.

Our co-sponsored sessions engaged a wide range of topics as well. Some examples are: algorithmic management, business education and related changes, business innovation, climate action, decolonizing research and teaching, family entrepreneurship, governing the commons, intersectionality, pandemic impacts, qualitative research methods and techniques, social justice, social entrepreneurship, and sustainability.

My deepest gratitude goes to all those who put their time into this Program, in various roles, from participant to organiser – and especially to the SIM Leadership Team, who have been so wonderfully supportive all along.

As we get ready to embark on a new year, turning our gaze towards the next edition of our Annual Meeting, I encourage you all to welcome Michelle Westermann-Behaylo as incoming PDW Chair, and extend to her the warm support I have enjoyed. As for myself: I am so honoured to serve as your Annual Meeting Program Chair this year! Stepping into this exciting role after my colleague Colin Higgins, I can’t help thinking of the big shoes I have to fill in. I hope our next Program will truly inspire us to create a better world together – not in the least, one in which we can move freely again, and enjoy each other’s company, without restrictions or fear. I am delighted and humbled by the opportunity to put together such a Program. But don’t forget that this endeavour needs YOU. All of you. I encourage you to put your hand up as an Associate Editor and – especially – as a Reviewer.

We can only fulfil our dream for a vibrant SIM community if we all get together to work on it. Once you read our invitation, do not hesitate, and please register to review. If you would like to serve as an Associate Editor, please email me at [cnsimaom@gmail.com](mailto:cnsimaom@gmail.com).

I wish you the very best, keep in touch, and see you all in Seattle in August 2022!

Cristina Neesham

SIM PDW Chair, 2021-2022

# 2021 AOM CONFERENCE SIM ASSOCIATE EDITORS

We thank the following SIMians for serving as Associate Editors for the 2021 Annual Meeting.

* Laura Albareda, LUT University
* Ines Alegre, IESE Business School
* Michael Barnett, Rutgers University
* Nicholas Bartkoski, Southwestern College
* Stephen Brammer, University of Bath
* Michael Brown, Pennsylvania State University at Erie
* Jonathan Bundy, Arizona State University
* Kenneth Butterfield, Washington State University
* Michael Cummings, University of Arkansas
* Nicolas Dahan, California State University, Monterey Bay
* Nolywé Delannon, Laval University
* Timothy Devinney, University of Leeds
* P.J. Dillon, Duquesne University
* Paul Dunn, Brock University
* Edina Eberhardt-Toth, ICN Business School
* Dawn Elm, University of St. Thomas
* Naomi Gardberg, CUNY, Baruch College
* Jean-Pascal Gond, City University London, Cass Business School
* Jeffrey Harrison, University of Richmond
* Irene Henriques, York University
* Gerald Kavanagh, University of Detroit Mercy
* Tae Wan Kim, Carnegie Mellon University
* Arno Kourula, University of Amsterdam
* Nancy Kurland, Franklin & Marshall College
* Jeanne Lodgson, University of New Mexico
* Barry Mitnick, University of Pittsburgh
* Jon Moon, Korea University
* Mollie Painter-Morland, Nottingham Trent University
* Jason Pattit, University of St. Thomas
* Stephen Pavelin, University of Bath
* Kathleen Rehbein, Marquette University
* Scott Reynolds, University of Washington
* Julia Roloff, Rennes School of Business
* Ali Shahzad, James Madison University
* Tobey Sharding, Rutgers University
* Vivek Soundararajan, University of Bath
* Erica Steckler, University of Massachusetts at Lowell
* Harry Van Buren, University of St. Thomas
* Sandra Waddock, Boston College
* Jim Weber, Duquesne University
* Michelle Westermann-Behaylo, University of Amsterdam
* Duane Windsor, Rice University
* Richard Wokutch, Virginia Tech University
* Robert Yaswon, Quinnipiac University

# 2021 VIRTUAL AOM MEETING RECAP

## 2021 SIM-ONE Junior Faculty Consortium Workshop

**Vivek Soundararajan** **Susana Esper**

University of Bath IESEG School of Management

**“Reimagining SIM-ONE scholarship”**

This year’s SIM-ONE Junior Faculty Consortium was organized by Susana Esper (SIM), Vivek Soundararajan (SIM), Sylvia Grewatsch (ONE), and Amanda Williams (ONE). This year’s consortium was a great opportunity to reimagine and rethink the distinctiveness of the SIM-ONE scholar and their potential for contributing to meaningful and impactful research. The COVID-19 pandemic has changed the way we see pedagogy, research, and engagement. It has also highlighted the need for us to create impact and to work closely together with practitioners and policymakers to contribute to the betterment of society, much more than ever. Under the theme ‘Reimagining SIM-ONE scholarship’, we organized a consortium that included activities around research, life, and career path for junior scholars.

The PDW was a virtual event consisting of a 3-hour synchronous program as well as an asynchronous component. While a few adjustments were made to the original program to adapt it to the online format, the core of the JFC formula and its spirit of knowledge sharing and support within an expanding community of junior and senior faculty was successfully preserved.

We had eight participants from Europe, five from North America, one from Asia, and one from Australia. Overall, we looked for participants who represented diverse countries and institutions. We also recruited 20 senior faculty to participate in the event as panel members or mentors, seeking gender balance and geographic diversity. Lists of Junior and Senior Faculty are shown below.

The synchronous component took place on August 4th, 2021. The program kicked off with an ice-breaker activity to help the participants get to know more about each other’s research topics. The highlight of the consortium was the Panel on the future of the SIM-ONE scholarship featuring Hari Bapuji (University of Melbourne), Michelle Greenwood (Monash University), Andy Hoffman (University of Michigan), Dror Etzion (McGill University), and Charlotte Karam (American University of Beirut). We also invited one of the winners of the SIM-ONE Outreach Award (Curtis Chan, Boston College) to participate in the panel and talk about their outreach activities. After, we facilitated a networking activity, where participants and senior faculty brainstormed together in breakout groups on why it is (or is not) possible to have a successful career as an impact scholar. We concluded the consortium by sharing some key takeaways.

Overall, the JFC was an inspiring event and both senior and junior faculty enjoyed it very much.

The Junior Faculty who participated in the SIM-ONE Junior Faculty Consortium are:

1. Ivan Miroshnychenko (Free University of Bolzano)

2. Christian Busch (New York University, Rutgers, LSE)

3. Enrico Fontana (Stockholm School of Economics)

4. Patrick Cellery (Carleton University)

5. Katrin Heucher (University of Michigan)

6. Katinka Quintelier (Vrije University)

7. Julia Grimm (University of Cambridge)

8. Miron Avidan (University of St. Gallen)

9. Helena Li (UTS Business School)

10. Lucrezia Nava (Cambridge University)

11. Faiz Ahamad (Tata Institute of Social Sciences)

12. Guillaume Mercier (IESEG School of Management)

13. Andrea Marquez (University of Texas at San Antonio)

14. Marleen Wierenga (Radboud University)

15. Hassan Awad (California State University)

The esteemed Senior Faculty who participated in the SIM-ONE Junior Faculty Consortium are:

1. Sophie Bacq (Kelley School of Business, Indiana University)

2. Bobby Banerjee (City University London)

3. Hari Bapuji (University of Melbourne)

4. Jill Brown (Bentley University)

5. Maoliang Bu (Nanjing University; Ivey Business School)

6. Frank de Bakker (IESEG School of Management)

7. Dror Etzion (McGill University)

8. Caroline Flammer (Boston University)

9. Ed Freeman (Darden School of Business, University of Virginia)

10. Michelle Greenwood (Monash University)

11. Nardia Haigh (University of Massachusetts Boston)

12. Ralph Hamann (University of Capetown)

13. Minna Halme (Aalto University)

14. Andrew Hoffman (University of Michigan)

15. Nien-He Hsieh (Harvard Business School)

16. Bryan Husted (EGADE Business School)

17. Charlotte Karam (American University of Beirut)

18. Johanna Mair (Hertie School of Business, Stanford University)

19. Kathleen Rehbein (College of Business Administration, Marquette University)

20. Juliane Reinecke (King's College London)

## 2021 SIM Doctoral Student Consortium Workshop

**Elise Perrault** **Jared Peifer**

College of Charleston Baruch College, CUNY

A person with long hair
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A picture containing text, person, person, suit

Description automatically generated**Inspiring New SIMians!!!**

The 2021 SIM DC was held on Friday, July 30, in a virtual format. Students were also invited to participate in a synchronous Fireside Chat the day before (July 29), where Michael Johnson-Cramer interviewed Mette Morsing. Forty-four students applied and we accepted 38. The students who were not accepted tended to be earlier on in their PhD careers and we encouraged them to apply again in the future. One student withdrew, leaving 37 student participants for the event. Thirteen students (35 percent) were from a university in North America, 23 students (62 percent) from European universities, and one student was from an Australian university. There were 30 professors who presented. The presentation sessions included the following topics: welcome and introductions, editors’ panel, academic relationships, career (in academia and beyond), dissertation and the academic job market, teaching and ethics in the academy. Each student was paired with a mentor and either person in the dyad was invited to send an email and set up a time for a conversation over zoom. The mentors were comprised of the 30 presenters and 7 additional SIMian professors who agreed to participate. We thank all the student participants and presenters who made this a successful event! The doctoral students (mentees) and SIMian professors (mentors) who participated in the SIM Doctoral Student Consortium are:

| **Mentees** | **Mentors** |
| --- | --- |
| Aparajita Agarwal, The Wharton School | Silvia Dorado, Univ of Massachusetts, Boston |
| Jacy Anthis, University of Chicago | Jared Peifer, Baruch College, CUNY |
| Diego Arias, IESE Business School | Jim Weber, Duquesne University |
| Eunhee Bae, University of Washington | Brad Agle, Brigham Young University |
| Dillon Berjani, Vrije University Amsterdam | Erica Steckler, Univ of Massachusetts, Lowell |
| Julie Bernard, Laval University | Elise Perrault, College of Charleston |
| Felipe Calvano, Virginia Tech University | Jon Bundy, Arizona State University |
| Andrea Cavicchini, IESE Business School | Bruce Barry, Vanderbilt University |
| Renato Chaves, HEC Montreal | Greg Molecke, University of Exeter |
| Angela Chen, University of Melbourne | David Wasieleski, Duquesne University |
| Gonzalo Conti, Martin Luther University, Halle-Wittenberg | Vivek Soundararajan, University of Bath |
| Marcelo F. de la Cruz, Ludwig Maximilian Univ | Arno Kourula, University of Amsterdam |
| Michelle Gabriel, Glasgow Caledonian New York University | Johanne Ward-Grosvold, University of Bath |
| Tiziana Gaito, Hochschule für Wirtschaft, Zürich | Kathleen Rehbein, Marquette University |
| Andreas Georgiou, ESADE Business School | Colin Higgins, Deakin University |
| David Greenway, Univ of Massachusetts, Lowell | Karen Maas, Erasmus University |
| Moritz Gruban, University of Lausanne | Pushpika Vishwanathan, Univ of Amsterdam |
| Kylie Heales, University of Alberta | Annie Snelson-Powell, University of Bath |
| Julia Herzum, University of Mannheim | Mette Morsing, Stockholm School of Economics |
| Oyinkansola Olatokunbo Ige, University of Bath | Andrew Wicks, University of Virginia |
| Aude Marie Marcoux, University of Quebec | Dirk Moosmayer, KEDGE Business School |
| Prem Sagar Menghwar, Luiss Business School | Ivan Montiel, Baruch College, CUNY |
| Anna Mineeva, University of Lyon | Michelle Westermann-Behayl, University of Amsterdam |
| Raphael Ng, Martin Luther University, Halle-Wittenberg | Judith Schrempf-Stirling, University of Geneva |
| Silvan Oberholze, Hochschule für Wirtschaft, Zürich | Michelle Greenwood, Monash University |
| Junghoon Park, Baruch College, CUNY | Jill Brown, Bentley University |
| David Robles-Elorza, University of the Basque Country | Shawn Berman, University of New Mexico |
| Annebeth Roor, Erasmus University | Garima Sharma, Georgia State University |
| Lekshmy Sankar, University of Denver | Michael Johnson-Cramer, Bentley University |
| Sadek Mohammad Showkat, University of Louisville | Naomi Gardberg, Baruch College, CUNY |
| Sanjana Singh, Utrecht University | Jegoo Lee, University of Rhode Island |
| Onna Malou van den Broek, King’s College London | Ronei Leonel, University of Memphis |
| Emma van den Terrell, University of Mannheim | Frank de Bakker, IESEG School of Management |
| Bram van der Kroft, Maastricht University | Edward Freeman, Darden School of Business |
| Carolina Villegas Galaviz, Comillas Pontifical University | Miguel Alzola, Fordham University |
| Xi Xie, Trinity College, Dublin | Cristina Neesham, Newcastle University |
| Ying Zhou, University of Waterloo | Irene Henriques, York University |
| **Panel Participants** | |
| Bruce Barry, Vanderbilt University  Jon Bundy, Arizona State University  Frank De Bakker, IESEG School of Management  Michelle Greenwood, Monash University  David Wasieleski, Duquesne University  Miguel Alzola, Fordham University  Shawn Berman, University of New Mexico  Edward Freeman, University of Virginia  Johanne Ward-Grosvold, University of Bath  Michael Johnson-Cramer, Bentley University  Jegoo Lee, University of Rhode Island  Michelle Westermann-Behaylo, University of Amsterdam  Jill Brown, Bentley University  Irene Henriques, York University  Greg Molecke, University of Exeter  Ronei Leonel, University of Memphis  Judith Schrempf-Stirling, University of Geneva  Rachel Balven, Arizona State University  Deborah Mullen, University of Tennessee, Chattanooga  Benson Honig, McMaster University  Brad Agle, Brigham Young University  Pushpika Vishwanathan, University of Amsterdam  Jim Weber, Duquesne University  Naomi Gardberg, Baruch College, CUNY | |  |

## 2021 SIM Research Development PDW
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**Annie Snelson-Powell** (University of Bath, Chair, Left) and **Tricia Olsen** (University of Denver, Vice-Chair, Right) are the members of the Research Committee in 2021, and Tricia is now the Chair for 2022!

***Virtual format*.** As per 2020, the Research Committee delivered a simplified version of the research development PDW for 2021, to focus on the Manuscript Development Workshop (MDW) component of the workshop and provide one-to-one individually matched pairings.

We had a great response from mentees (SIM members preparing a manuscript for submission to a top-quality journal) and an even better response from mentors (senior SIM members with experience publishing in top quality journals.) This yielded 20 matched mentors and mentees who have arranged to meet in asynchronous virtual sessions during the period of the academy conference.

***Thank you, mentors!***The MDW was a success, and much gratitude was expressed to mentors:

**A picture containing text, mollusk
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***The work of mentees.*** Key themes in the manuscripts submitted are include questions of inclusion (e.g., diversity, stakeholder voice and engagement), authenticity and greenwashing, and corruption, controversy, and irresponsibility (see Figure 1 on page 16).

***Looking Ahead to 2022.*** A new member who is yet to be recruited will join the Research Committee for 2021/2022, and Tricia will work with this new member. We’d like to make better use of social media going forward to better connect with the SIM community and to communicate more broadly about the Research Committee and its activities. Closer collaborations with the SIM Communications Committee, chaired by Jae Hwan Lee, are thus a possibility for the Research Committee over the next year.

The SIMians who participated in the Manuscript Development Workshop are as follows.

| **Mentees** | **Mentors** |
| --- | --- |
| Anita Mendiratta, University of Dehli | Christian Voegtlin, Audencia Business School |
| Annette Yunus-Pendrey, City University of London | Colin Higgins, Deakin University |
| Anshul Mandliya, India Institute of Management | Duane Windsor, Rice University |
| Bram van der Kroft, Maastricht University | Emilio Marti, Erasmus University |
| Burcin Hatipoglu, University of New South Wales Canberra | Gastón de los Reyes, George Washington University |
| Christian Busch, New York University | Harry Van Buren, University of St. Thomas |
| Denis Griffin, University of Otago | Heather Elms, American University |
| Dillon Berjani, Vrije University Amsterdam | Irene Henriques, York University |
| Ekta Sharma, Ahmedabad University | Ivan Montiel, Baruch College, CUNY |
| Elli Meleti, University of Glasgow | Kathleen Rehbein, Marquette University |
| Eunbi Kim, Franklin & Marshall College | Laura Albareda, LUT University |
| Evelina Gillard, César Ritz Colleges Switzerland | Laura Spence, Royal Holloway University of London |
| Gabriela Pizarro, University of Nottingham | Lea Stadtler, Grenoble Ecole de Management |
| Golshan Javadian, Morgan State University | Maoliang Bu, Nanjing University |
| Ibiyemi Omeihe, University of the West of Scotland | Mark Sharfman, Oklahoma university |
| Jamila Alaktif, ISC Paris Business School | Michale Hadani, Saint Mary’s University |
| Jason Senjem, St. Ambrose University | Mike Barnett, Rutgers University |
| Juan Francisco Chavez, University of Victoria | Natalia Vidal, University of New Mexico |
| Nils Kruse, Martin Luther University, Halle-Wittenberg | Panikos Georgallis, HEC Paris |
| Nina Füreder, Johannes Kepler University Linz | Sandra Waddock, Boston College |
| Nishant Kathuria, University of Dallas | Stephen Brammer, University of Bath |
| Oyinkansola Ige, University of London | Thomas Roulet, University of Cambridge |
| Raquel García García, University of Oviedo, | Vivek Soundarajan, University of Bath |
| Silvan Oberholze, Hochschule für Wirtschaft, Zürich | Michelle Greenwood, Monash University |
| Junghoon Park, Baruch College, CUNY | Jill Brown, Bentley University |
| David Robles-Elorza, University of the Basque Country | Shawn Berman, University of New Mexico |
| Annebeth Roor, Erasmus University | Garima Sharma, Georgia State University |
| Lekshmy Sankar, University of Denver | Michael Johnson-Cramer, Bentley University |
| Sadek Mohammad Showkat, University of Louisville | Naomi Gardberg, Baruch College, CUNY |
| Sanjana Singh, Utrecht University | Jegoo Lee, University of Rhode Island |
| Onna Malou van den Broek, King’s College London | Ronei Leonel, University of Memphis |
| Emma van den Terrell, University of Mannheim | Frank de Bakker, IESEG School of Management |
| Bram van der Kroft, Maastricht University | Edward Freeman, Darden School of Business |
| Carolina Villegas Galaviz, Comillas Pontifical University | Miguel Alzola, Fordham University |
| Xi Xie, Trinity College, Dublin | Cristina Neesham, Newcastle University |
| Ying Zhou, University of Waterloo | Irene Henriques, York University |
| **Other Mentor Participants** | |
| Ben Neville, University of Melbourne  Karen Maas, Open University  Louise Obara, De Montfort University  Punit Arora, The City College of New York | |  |



Figure 1: Themes of Manuscripts Submitted by Mentees.

## 2021 SIM Curriculum Development PDW

**Jae Hwan Lee,** Hamline University

In the last two years the SIM Curriculum Development Committee has made efforts to raise the awareness of experimental learning methods. In 2020 we offered a pedagogical PDW featuring five SIMian faculty (Dawn Elm, Jared Harris, Adele Santana, Mike Hendron & David Chandler) who use experimental learning approaches when teaching business ethics, sustainability and corporate social responsibility.

At the 2021 SIM Curriculum Development PDW, the Committee introduced a variety of computer-based business simulations that SIMians can use to teach those subjects. At the beginning of the PDW, Benjamin Alexander (California Polytechnic State University) and Jae Hwan Lee, the Committee Chair, shared their experiences teaching Strategic Corporate Social Responsibility and Ethics Simulation, followed by a vibrant discussion among the attendees about advantages and challenges associated with using simulations.

For your reference, below are computer-based business simulations focused on CSR, ethics, and sustainability.

* [Strategic CSR Simulation](http://www.strategiccsrsim.com/)
* [GlobStrat](https://www.globstrat-business-games.com/)
* [Ethics Game](https://www.ethicsgame.com/)
* [Ethics-LX](http://archive.constantcontact.com/fs055/1102430296560/archive/1103450159495.html)
* [The Trade-off](https://ig.ft.com/esg-purpose-profit-game/)
* [Trust Game](https://hbsp.harvard.edu/product/ML0013-HTM-ENG)
* [CleanStart](https://mitsloan.mit.edu/LearningEdge/simulations/cleanstart/Pages/default.aspx)
* [Fishbanks](https://mitsloan.mit.edu/LearningEdge/simulations/fishbanks/Pages/fish-banks.aspx)
* [Deepwater](https://businessethicssimulation.com/)
* [World Climate](https://www.climateinteractive.org/tools/world-climate-simulation/)
* [Climate Action](https://www.climateinteractive.org/tools/climate-action-simulation/)
* [Games4Sustainblity](https://games4sustainability.org/gamepedia/)
* [Capsim’s Capstone](https://ww2.capsim.com/business-simulations/corporate/Corporate_Business_Simulations.pdf) (Strategy Simulations with Add-on Modules)

## SIM Division Awards 2021

During the SIM Division Business Meeting 2021 the following SIMians were acknowledged for their contributions to the SIM Division and their scholarly achievements.

Once again, congratulations!

2021 Sumner Marcus Award

**Shawn Berman**, University of New Mexico

2021 Best Paper Award

*“Systems Exploitation Under the Name of Modern Slavery”*

**Hong Bui**,University of Bath

Sponsored by **Jones Graduate School of Business, Rice University**

2021 Best Business Ethics Paper Award

*“Ethical Blindfolding at Work”*

**Aishwarya Shahrawat**, Indian Institute of Technology

**Kanika Bhal**, Indian Institute of Technology

Sponsored **by Journal of Business Ethics**

William C. Frederick Doctoral Dissertation Award 2021

*“A Balancing Act: Convening Cross-Sector Partnerships to Strengthen Sustainable Development in Global Supply Chains”*

**Iteke van Hille**, Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, dissertation completed at Vrije University Amsterdam

Sponsored by the **Albert P. Viragh Institute for Ethics in Business at Duquesne University**

Best Student Paper Award 2021

*“The Reputation Costs of Executive Misconduct Accusations: An Upper Echelons and Abuse of Power Perspective on High-Profile #MeToo Accusations in the US”*

**Yassin Denis Bouzzine**, Leuphana University Lüneburg

**Rainer Lueg**, Leuphana University Lüneburg

Best Book Award 2021

*“Combatting Modern Slavery”*

**Genevieve LeBaron**, University of Sheffield

**Sumner Marcus Award 2021**



***Shawn Berman***, University of New Mexico

**A Few Words from *Shawn Berman***

On the afternoon of the Monday of the 2021 SIM business meeting I was getting ready to run a meeting for a task force of the Bosque School Trustees that I was chairing, so when Harry Van Buren called to tell me that I needed to get over to the SIM business meeting, my first reaction was one of complete surprise. There was only one reason for such a call, and it was very unexpected.

When I think about the group of stellar scholars who preceded me in winning this award, I am incredibly humbled to be included in this group. It is honestly hard for me to think of being in a group that has people like Ed Freeman, Sandra Waddock, John Mahon, Jim Post, Donna Wood, Archie Carroll, Jeanne Logsdon, Kathy Rehbein, and Tom Jones. These people all provided intellectual support to me, from the start of my involvement in SIM in the late 1990s through tenure and beyond. And for me, that is the specialness of SIM, it is that intersection of the rigor of outstanding academic work and the ability to engage in conversations about your work with the top scholars in the field from Day 1 of your involvement with SIM.

The award was all the more special because of an innovation in presenting the award. Jeanne, Kathy, and Tom all helped present the award. Again, for me, the relationships we make in SIM are an integral part of the intellectual contributions we make as a field. Tom, as my dissertation chair, helped chart an intellectual journey that has sustained my career. Thinking about firm-stakeholder interactions has always framed my work and how I think about those interactions inevitably has its genesis in conversations Tom, Andy (who was also on my committee at the University of Washington), and I had over lunch somewhere in UDistrict 25 years ago. Jeanne was instrumental in bringing me to the University of New Mexico (UNM) 15 years ago, helping me find a place that supported my intellectual pursuits, but also makes a difference in students’ lives like few other R1 universities in the country. UNM also allowed me to explore the employee-employer relationship more deeply through my friendship and writing partnership with Harry. However, it’s my friendship with Kathy that truly represents the specialness of SIM to me. While we’ve never worked together as co-authors, we have supported each other through this career for the last 20 years, being intellectual sounding boards for one another and more importantly, as friends through life’s journey.

Throughout my career at BU, Santa Clara, and UNM I have worked with some wonderful colleagues in intellectually supportive environments, but there have been times in my academic life where I haven't always felt at home in my own institutions. However, I have always had a loving home in SIM. I remember being warmly welcomed into SIM by Jeanne and Donna as a doctoral student and knew immediately I had found my academic home. SIM is an exemplar of what a professional society should be, combining impactful academic work in an inclusive community that truly cares about its members. I hope I've been able to give back 1/1000th of what I've received from SIM.

There's a very long list of folks who helped me along the way to the Sumner Marcus Award, but I have to call out Heather Elm, Michael Johnson-Cramer, and Rob Phillips by name. Constant companions on and off the academic court, a guy couldn't ask for a better group of fellow travelers on a 20-year (plus... eek) journey. It was also incredibly special to have Andy Wicks and Katherina Pattit running the SIM show this year. In hindsight, I can't think of anyone else I'd want calling out my name for this.

I know I’m biased, but I believe that we do some of the most important work in the entire Academy in SIM because of its ability to help us think about the impact of business on the larger world. Understanding the negative impacts is important, but I am more inspired by writings and conversations about how business can make a positive impact on the world. So, thanks to everyone in SIM for helping us understand how business can help make this world a better place while always remaining inclusive and welcoming. Thanks most of all to my wife, Janet Holmberg, for her constant love and support. She's been the most important part of the last 15 years of the journey. Thank you again for this incredibly humbling honor.

In the words of John Mahon, "I guess this means I can join the other old farts in the back row of the business meeting."

**Best Paper Award 2021**

**

*“Systems Exploitation Under the Name of Modern Slavery”*

***Hong Bui***,University of Bath

Sponsored by **Jones Graduate School of Business, Rice University**

**Abstract**

Employing a systems perspective on tensions and informed by modern slavery theory, this study’s design involves theoretical, methodological, and data triangulation. It investigates a wicked issue of modern slavery in the Vietnamese immigrant nail-beauty community in the UK from multiple actors. The data were collected from nail bar owners, immigrant workers, their families in Vietnam, social workers, and court interpreters, and other sources of social media, and mass media. The blending strategies of zooming in and zooming out allow to understand the views of various stakeholders better and see the interconnectedness among those stakeholders. The rigorous data and multiple qualitative methods reveal patterns of exploitations among immigrants, business owners, and government systems under the name of modern slavery. The findings challenge the modern slavery theory by showing that it may not fully explain the phenomenon of modern slavery in a complex context. The tensions of the government’s tackling modern slavery when linking to immigration management open door for the development of systems counterintuitive behaviors to explain the wicked issue of modern slavery.

**A Few Words from *Hong Bui***

I feel honored to receive SIM Best Paper Award for my paper "Systems Exploitations under the Name of Modern Slavery". My gratitude goes to the School of Management, University of Bath, for its seed corn grant that allowed me to study modern slavery in Vietnamese nail bars in the UK. It took me two years to collect different sources of data and analyze them. The findings were a shock to me, and I was not sure if I would publish them. My big thank-you goes to Professor Tima Bansal, Professor Peter Bamberger, Professor Andrew Brown, and Dr. Joana Vassilopoulou for reassuring me to continue. Without their encouragement and feedback on the very early drafts, this paper would never have been completed.

I started the paper by using the modern slavery theory to explain the phenomenon of modern slavery within the Vietnamese nail community in the UK that had been widely covered in the UK media since 2016. However, my research ended with something very different. The findings went beyond the explanation of the modern slavery theory. The phenomenon of modern slavery in that community was not quite like what was depicted in the media. Instead, under the systems perspective, this study shows that the term ‘modern slavery’ seemed to be exploited by various stakeholders in the systems for different purposes. In other words, there was a circle of exploitations under the name of modern slavery. It indicates that social issues are much more complicated than what we often look at. We, as management scholars, need to pay attention to both the epistemological realm (i.e., actors' perception of the issue) and the ontological realm (i.e., the underlying reality) to understand the complexity of such social issues, rather than just either realm.

**Best Paper Award Committee’s Report**

***Christopher Michaelson (Chair)***, University of St. Thomas

As the winner of the SIM Best Paper Award 2021, sponsored by the Jones Graduate School of Business, Rice University, the committee chose paper #10440, “Systems Exploitation under the Name of Modern Slavery.” The committee said, “This paper provides a timely analysis of an important problem with compelling and sometimes counterintuitive results.” The committee also said, “All of the nominated papers reinforced the integral importance of social issues to modern management challenges, and many did so in fascinating contexts. Although the studies used a variety of empirical methods, the judges also saw opportunities within Social Issues in Management to support more imaginative, conceptual, and normative research approaches in the future to complement strong empirical work.”

The committee also included Kendy Hess (College of the Holy Cross) and Michael Pirson (Fordham University).

The runner-up is:

* *“Public & Private Governance in Business & Human Rights: A Dynamic Model of Mutual* *Influence”*

Judith Schrempf-Stirling (University of Geneva), Florian Wettstein (University of St. Gallen)

The other finalists are:

* *“Coping with Difficult Place Characteristics: Insights from a Cross-Sector Partnership”*

Lea Stadtler (Grenoble Ecole de Management), Luk Van Wassenhove (INSEAD)

* *“Rhetorical Field Settlement of the Issue of Modern Slavery: Framing in the UK Construction Sector”*

Gabriela Gutierrez Huerter O (King’s College London), Stefan Gold (University of Kassel), Alexander Trautrims (Nottingham University Business School)

* *“The Power of Shareholder Political Transparency Activism”*

Yongjun Zhang (Stony Brook University)

**Best Business Ethics Paper Award 2021**

*“Ethical Blindfolding at Work”*

***Aishwarya Shahrawat***, Indian Institute of Technology

***Kanika Bhal***, Indian Institute of Technology

Sponsored **by Journal of Business Ethics**

**Abstract**

Ethical Blindfolding, stated simply, is the act of turning a blind eye. Relating it to the literature on (un)ethical behavior, we propose and specially highlight its relation to passive unethical behavior. Further, by drawing upon Kuhn’s paradigm shift (Kuhn, 1970), we establish its novelty by contrasting it against mirror constructs such as Ethical Blindness, Self-deception and Moral Muteness. We use Skinner’s Radical Behaviorism and Bandura’s Social-Cognitive Theory to argue for its theoretical foundations. Post this, we explain how Ethical Blindfolding occurs. By doing so, we also add to and propose an intentional pathway to amoral decision-making. Post this we highlight the practical importance of Ethical Blindfolding, specifically in relation to sexual harassment, whistleblowing and pro-environmental behavior. We conclude by proposing ways of reducing Ethical Blindfolding to avoid its non-desirable implications.

The runner-up is:

* *“In the Multitude of Words, Sin Is Not Lacking: Analysis of Codes of Ethics Across Fortune 500”*Matheus Dall Agnol (University of Sao Paulo), Luiz Kabbach De Castro (University of Florida), Dulce Redín Goñi (Universidad de Navarra)

The other finalists are:

* *“(Electronic) Walls Between Us: How Electronic Monitoring Undermines Ethical Leadership”*

Chase Thiel (University of Wyoming), Nicholas Prince (University of Wyoming), Zhanna Sahatjian (California State University, Fresno)

* *“A Signaling Theory Approach to Ethical Leadership Behaviors”*

George Banks (UNC, Charlotte), Roxanne Ross (James Madison University), Allison Toth, Scott Tonidandel, Wenwen Dou, Atefeh Mahdavi Goloujeh (all UNC, Charlotte)

The 2021 Journal of Business Ethics Best Paper in Business Ethics Committee was comprised of chair Eva Tsahuridu (RMIT University), Noushi Rahman (Pace University), Kam Phung (York University), and Harry Van Buren (University of St. Thomas).

**William C. Frederick Doctoral Dissertation Award 2021**

****

*“A Balancing Act: Convening Cross-Sector Partnerships to Strengthen Sustainable Development in Global Supply Chains”*

***Iteke van Hille***, Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, dissertation completed at Vrije University Amsterdam

Sponsored by the **Albert P. Viragh Institute for Ethics in Business at Duquesne University**

**A Few Words from *Iteke van Hille***

My dissertation explores how mission-driven conveners initiate and convene cross-sector partnerships for sustainable development in global supply chains. Through a qualitative, multiple case study in the timber, coffee and tea industries, I show the balancing act conveners perform in navigating the tensions and conflicting demands they face in their work. My research is strongly embedded in practice, as my dissertation topic was shaped by my practical experience and interest in organizing sustainability transitions through collaboration. Being considered for and winning this year’s William C. Frederick SIM Doctoral Dissertation Award is a great honor. It truly inspires and encourages me to continue my research on this topic that I care so deeply about.

I am indebted to many people that supported me along the way over the past few years. First and foremost my supervisory team: Frank de Bakker, Peter Groenewegen, and Julie Ferguson. I also want to sincerely thank the reading- and defense committee: Kees Boersma, Flore Bridoux, Jeremy Moon, Philipp Pattberg, Lea Stadtler, and Katrien Termeer. And of course my academic home base during the dissertation journey: the department of Organization Sciences of Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, and the Dutch Science Council providing financial support. In closing, I would like to thank all SIMians, and in particular the SIM Doctoral Dissertation Award Committee members for their support and recognition of my work – it really means a lot to me.

A person with curly hair
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***Lea Stadtler (Chair)****,* Grenoble Ecole de Management

The 2021 William C. Frederick Social Issues in Management (SIM) Doctoral Dissertation Award, sponsored by the Albert P. Viragh Institute for Ethics in Business at Duquesne University was awarded to Iteke van Hille (Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences) for exemplary dissertation work titled ‘A Balancing Act: Convening Cross-Sector Partnerships to Strengthen Sustainable Development in Global Supply Chains.’ This dissertation, completed at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, is commendable for innovative, comprehensive, and carefully conducted research on the role of conveners in cross-sector partnerships in global supply chains. The outstanding contribution elucidates the complexities of aligning ‘people, planet, and profit’ in this context and allows us to better understand how conveners may help supply chain partners address this ambition while acknowledging with the inherent tensions and challenges that the convener role brings about.

The committee also included François Neville (McMaster University), Casey Frid (University of St. Thomas), and Greg Molecke (University of Exeter).

The other finalists are:

* *“The Allies of Others: How Stakeholders' Relationships Shape Non-Market Strategy”*

Kate (Katarzyna) D. Odziemkowska, Rice University, dissertation completed at The Wharton School

* *“Essays on Social Entrepreneurship and Sustainable Organizing: An Ethically Focused Practice-*Based Perspective”

Ignas Bruder, Freie University Berlin, dissertation completed at Freie University Berlin

**Best Student Paper Award 2021**
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Description automatically generated with medium confidence*“The Reputation Costs of Executive Misconduct Accusations: An Upper Echelons and Abuse of Power Perspective on High-Profile #MeToo Accusations in the US”*

***Yassin Denis Bouzzine***, Leuphana University Lüneburg (Left)

***Rainer Lueg***, Leuphana University Lüneburg (Right)

**Abstract**

We examine how sexual harassment accusations against individual executives affect the stock returns of the affiliated organization. Taking an upper echelons and abuse of power perspective, we identify 372 high-profile sexual harassment accusations, of which 98 are relevant to this study. We employ event study methodology to detect abnormal stock reactions for the affiliated organization. As predicted, the results indicate that #MeToo accusations substantially harmed the stock returns of the organization despite the accusation relating to the misconduct of only a single executive. Surprisingly, we discover significant results only for executives at the parent organization. For this research, we first provide evidence that individual misconduct matters for organizations. Second, we enrich the upper echelons research by focusing on accusations of executive misconduct and examining how unethical values, abuse of power, and sexual harassment shape the organizational outcomes. We demonstrate that executive misconduct becomes particularly relevant when the executive holds significant managerial power, as indicated by employment at the parent organization. For practice, our findings provide two contributions that can help organizations prevent occurrences of sexual misconduct. First, we propose that organizations should screen executives more carefully for past incidents of misconduct before hiring them. Second, we suggest that organizations should have clear and deterrent anti-sexual harassment policies in place and rigorously align them with their internal control systems to ensure adherence to these policies. Finally, the establishment of a climate of permanent “nudges” should increase the awareness of the risk of sexual harassment.

**A Few Words from *Yassin Denis Bouzzine and Rainer Lueg***

Our paper explores how public accusations of sexual harassment against executives affect the stock price performance of affiliated firms. This topic was shaped by our interest in exploring the dynamics of #MeToo and analyzing whether there is also a ‘business case’ that argues in favor of fostering CSR in terms of workplace sexual harassment prevention. Our paper successfully demonstrated that indeed reputation costs are associated with such public accusations against organizational executives, which creates even greater potential to take sexual harassment seriously.

Being considered for and winning the 2021 SIM Best Student Paper Award is a tremendous honor. We are very flattered about this unexpected success that encourages us to dig even deeper into the sphere of organizational misconduct as part of the doctoral journey. We are thankful to the multitude of persons that contributed to this success!

In closing, we thank the SIM Best Student Paper Award Committee for selecting our paper!

**Best Student Paper Award Committee’s Report**

***Carolyn T. Dang (Chair)*,** Pennsylvania State University

Each year, all papers authored or co-authored by students and accepted to the SIM Division program are eligible for the Best Student Paper Award. For 2021, the Winner of the Best Student Paper Award goes to: Yassin Denis Bouzzine and Rainer Lueg: “The reputation costs of executive misconduct accusations: An upper echelons and abuse of power perspective on high-profile #MeToo accusations in the US”

We also congratulate the runners-up: Ma Zicheng, Heng Liu, Wenwen An, and Liang Wang: “CEO social class perception and employee-related CSR? Evidence from Chinese privately owned firms”.

And extend our congratulations to the other finalists: Kaushik Mukherjee, Hyun-Soo Woo, John Berns, and Jisun Kim: “Examination of entry mode of foreign competition and domestic corporate social responsibility response”; Marcelo De La Cruz and Jelena Spanjol: “Social value in business: An interdisciplinary integrative review, typology, and research agenda”; Adrian Gombert and Rebecca Christin Ruehle: “Three dimensions of legitimacy and their meaning in the context of multi-stakeholder initiatives”

The committee also included Anne Barraquier (SKEMA Business School) and Julena Bonner (Utah State University).

The runner-up is:

* *"CEO Social Class Perception and Employee-Related CSR? Evidence from Chinese Privately Owned Firms“*

Ma Zicheng (Lingnag University), Heng Liu (Sun Yat-sen University), Wenwen An (Guangdong

University of Technology), Liang Wang (University of San Francisco)

The other finalists are:

* *“Examination of Entry Mode of Foreign Competition and Domestic CSR Response”*

Kaushik Mukherjee, Hyun-Soo Woo, John Berns, Jisun Kim (all University of Mississippi)

* *“Social Value in Business: Interdisciplinary Integrative Review, Typology, and Research Agenda”*

Marcelo De La Cruz, Jelena Spanjol (all Ludwig Maximilian University, Munich)

* *“The Three Dimensions of Legitimacy and Their Meaning in the Context of Multi-Stakeholder Initiatives”*

Adrian Gombert (Martin Luther University), Rebecca Ruehle (Vrije University Amsterdam)

**Best Book Award 2021**

*“Combatting Modern Slavery”*

***Genevieve LeBaron***, University of Sheffield

**A Few Words from *Genevieve LeBaron***

I want to most sincerely thank the AOM SIM Division for the 2021 Best Book Award. It means so much to me to receive it, not only because it is heartening to see my book recognized, but also because the Award affirms that forced labor and exploitation are vital topics for business and management scholarship to explore.

I’ve been researching the business dynamics of forced labor in global supply chains for over a decade now, both independently and in collaboration with colleagues from business and management disciplines. In the course of this work, I’ve noted considerable resistance from journal editors and scholars within business and management disciplines to the basic notion that contemporary forms of slavery are a relevant topic that connects to their core interests. No doubt, there is some excellent work underway by business scholars on forced labor, human trafficking, and exploitation. But in several key senses, the “field” of modern slavery research in business and management remains a “non-field” (as Robert Caruana, Andrew Crane, Stefan Gold, and I recently described in “Modern Slavery in Business: The Sad and Sorry State of a Non-Field,” *Business & Society* 60(2), 251–287)—and a considerable blind spot for large swathes of business scholars. This is a critical gap, given the key role played by business organizations and managers in creating the conditions under which forced labor thrives and is profitable in the first place.

It is a crucial time for business and management scholars to join efforts to understand and tackle the challenge of forced labor and overlapping forms of exploitation. As economies become more unequal, these problems are poised to expand and with them expands severe human suffering. Deep knowledge of businesses and their role in perpetrating these social problems is essential, which is one reason that AOM SIM’s work is so important.

**Best Book Award Committee’s Report**
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Regarding Genevieve LeBaron’s “Combatting Modern Slavery”, Polity Press:

This inspiring and innovative book offers a novel understanding about topical and important issues with regards to modern slavery. LeBaron delves into the labor supply chain and addresses labor issues and challenges at a global level by collecting and relying on data from various stakeholders. The book has significant research and practical implications addressing issues pertaining to labor exploitation and labor supply chains. The book represents a wakeup call to corporations and decision makers.

Regarding David Wasieleski, Sandra Waddock, and Paul Shrivastava’s “Management and the Sustainability Paradox: Reconnecting the Human Chain”, Routledge:

This thorough and deeply researched book is very timely as individuals become increasingly disconnected from their ecological environment. Trends towards becoming more materialistic and consumer focused are taking over people. Their material desires have to be satisfied no matter what the cost is socially, financially, or ecologically as long as it brings happiness to the individual. The book addresses important issues and offers important recommendations to policy makers and academics with regards to bringing back the relationship between humans and the ecology.

Regarding Christopher Marquis’ “Better Business: How the B Corp Movement is Remaking Capitalism”, Yale Press:

The book covers important aspects of the needs of and importance of having the B movement and how such actions can remake capitalism. The book demonstrates that business can be a force for good and offer scenarios and case studies to demonstrate the effectiveness of the B movement in achieving its ambitious goal.

The committee also included Theodora Issa (Curtin University) and Yusuf Sidani (American University of Beirut).

The other finalists are:

* *“Management and the Sustainability Paradox: Reconnecting the Human Chain”*

David Wasieleski (Duquesne University), Sandra Waddock (Boston College), Paul Shrivastava (Pennsylvania State University)

* *“Better Business: How the B Corp Movement is Remaking Capitalism”*

Christopher Marquis (Cornell University)

## SIM Division Awards 2020

We also want to congratulate the following SIMians who were acknowledged for their contributions to the SIM Division and their scholarly achievements at the 2020 SIM Division Business Meeting.

Best Paper Award 2020

*“Banking for a Low Carbon Future: Explaining Climate Change Responses in a Low-Salience Industry”*

***Anna Eckardt***,Zeppelin University

***Daina Mazutis***, University of Ottawa

Sponsored by **Jones Graduate School of Business, Rice University**

Best Business Ethics Paper Award 2020

*“Institutional Strengthening as Ethical Obligation: An Agonistic Approach to Business Ethics”*

***Tricia Olsen***, University of Denver

***Harry Van Buren***, University of St. Thomas

Sponsored **by Journal of Business Ethics**

William C. Frederick Doctoral Dissertation Award 2020

*“Accounting for Social Impact: Constraints, Cognition, Constructions”*

***Greg Molecke***, University of Exeter, dissertation completed at Grenoble Ecole de Management

Sponsored by the **Albert P. Viragh Institute for Ethics in Business at Duquesne University**

Best Student Paper Award 2020

*“Revisiting Conflict: Neoliberalism at Work in the Gig Economy”*

***Alessandro Tirapani***, Esade Business School

Best Book Award 2020

*“Private Governance as an Institutional Response to Wicked Problems”*

***Julia Grimm***, Jönköping University

**Best Paper Award 2020**

**

*“Banking for a Low Carbon Future: Explaining Climate Change Responses in a Low-Salience Industry”*

***Anna Eckardt***,Zeppelin University (Left)

***Daina Mazutis***, University of Ottawa (Right)

**Abstract**

While there is a great sense of urgency in the scientific community to act now in order to slow the imminent negative effects of global warming, most organizations continue to run their operations as though the external context has not changed significantly. For one industry in particular, the banking industry, radical changes have been especially slow to materialize as most institutions continue to fund unsustainable business practices. Despite this slow progress, variance in climate change (CC) responses do exist. This paper takes an exploratory comparative case study with field research at four banks, investigating the mechanisms that have led to, or prevented these organizations from integrating CC in the banks’ corporate strategies. We find that the CC response repertoire in the banking industry is dependent on a number of factors including: the initial interpretation of the CC issue, the language that is subsequently used to advocate (or not) for CC and the communication/attentional governance structures that are being invoked (or not) to spread attention to CC within the bank and to external constituents. This study therefore contributes to the research on corporate CC (in)action by developing a multi-stage process model of corporate climate change integration in a low salience industry.

**A Few Words from *Anna Eckardt and Daina Mazutis***

Climate change (CC) is a tremendous challenge humanity is facing, and corporate action against it has been slow to materialize on a global scale. Dedication to combat climate change made the first author investigate mechanisms that have led to, or prevented banks from integrating CC in their corporate strategies in her PhD.

In our article based on this research, we aimed to contribute to the academic dialogue on corporate CC (in)action by proposing the developed process model of corporate climate change integration in an industry that is not necessarily exposed to its impacts. Banks are not necessarily exposed to obvious CC risks, but pivotal as catalysis (or derailers) to global (de)carbonization by the nature of their intermediary role in our economic system through financing and investing in our low or high carbon future. And it is against this backdrop, that we were motivated not only to make the phenomenon of corporate climate change (in)action better understood from a theoretical and academic perspective but also to inform and inspire more ambitious and more effective corporate action in this area.

We are therefore truly grateful to have received this prestigious Award as a recognition of our work, reminding us to continue and pursue further research in this field that we clearly care about. In closing, we would like to thank the SIM Best Paper Award Committee to have selected our paper out of so many other great submissions.

The other finalists are:

* *“Beyond Prosperity: How Market-Shaping Firms Advance Progress”*

Wouter Rosingh (OMREUS), Peter Moran (China Europe Intl. Business School), Michele Simoni (Parthenope University of Naples), Han Ming Chng (China-Europe Intl. Business School)

* *“Corporate Data Governance: Are Data Subjects Investors?”*

Tae Wan Kim (Carnegie Mellon University), Jooho Lee (Pepperdine University), Joseph Xu, Bryan Routledge (both Carnegie Mellon University)

**Best Business Ethics Paper Award 2020**
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***Tricia Olsen***, University of Denver (Left)

***Harry Van Buren***, University of St. Thomas (Right)

**Abstract**

Business ethics scholars often write about institutions as relatively static guidelines with which companies may or may not comply (e.g., “rules of the game”). While some institutions, such as rule of law or stable monetary and fiscal policy, are good for business, we also know that (some) businesses (often) seek to manipulate institutions so that the “rules of the game” are tipped in their favor. In this article, we argue that conceiving of institutions in this way limits the role institutions can play in addressing conflict or contention. Instead, we draw from recent work by political theorist Chantal Mouffe on agonism and apply it to the corporate context. We develop the notion of agonistic business responsibility, which overcomes the existing limitations in the literature by legitimizing stakeholder voices. This approach acknowledges the perennial nature of dissensus and, rather than lamenting it, recognizes greater legitimacy may be gained through contestation.

**A Few Words from *Tricia Olsen and Harry Van Buren***

Our paper, “Institutional Strengthening as Ethical Obligation: An Agonistic Approach to Business Ethics,” was inspired by our concerns that capitalism, the institutions that support it, and the business entities of which it is comprised are facing continuing crises of confidence. It is clear to us that the status quo of business practices has contributed to questions around the legitimacy of existing institutions and corporate conduct. We draw from work by political theorist Chantal Mouffe on agonism, applying it to business ethics to develop the notion of agonistic business responsibility.

Business ethics scholars often write about institutions as relatively static boundaries with which companies may or may not comply; in the short-term, institutions function as largely exogenous forces. Rather than being static, fixed, and exogenous, institutions can be shaped, modified, and endogenous in ways that work to the benefit of businesses and their owners and to the detriment of non-owner stakeholders.

In our paper, we develop the notion of “agonistic business responsibility” which rests on the notion that deliberative processes are rife with problems and that relationships with adversaries need not be antagonistic in nature. Instead, agonistic business responsibility requires that actors treat one another with common civility; that they respect, if not agree with, differing positions; and that they bring a genuine willingness to find common ground. Recognizing difference, rather than shunning or silencing it, helps facilitate articulating common concerns and identifying innovative solutions.

Agonistic business responsibility requires that business leaders become comfortable with, and recognize the perennial nature of, contestation. Dissensus is perhaps one of the few constants as business-society relations are continually negotiated and renegotiated as conditions change. Agonistic business responsibility requires businesses to engage and strengthen institutions and, importantly, to actively avoid weakening them. One way to do that, somewhat ironically, is to support institutions and mechanisms that allow for, and even embrace, contestation.

In closing, we would like to thank both the members of the 2020 best business ethics paper committee as well as the *Journal of Business Ethics* for its sponsorship of this award.

The other finalists are:

* *“A Common Good Perspective on Deliberative Democracy in Business: Learning from Aristotle’s Ethics”*

Sandrine Frémeaux, Christian Voegtlin (all Audencia Business School)

* *“Lean as Mean: When Values Converge to Produce Depersonalized Bullying”*

Samir Shrivastava, Robert Jones, Nikola Djurkovic (all Swinburne University of Technology)

* *“Care Ethics in Social Entrepreneurship: Contextual Understanding”*

Subhanjan Sengupta (Birla Institute of Management Technology), Hanna P. Lehtimäki (University of Eastern Finland)

**William C. Frederick Doctoral Dissertation Award 2020**

*“Accounting for Social Impact: Constraints, Cognition, Constructions”*

***Greg Molecke***, University of Exeter, dissertation completed at Grenoble Ecole de Management

**A Few Words from *Greg Molecke***

am honored to have received the SIM 2020 Best Dissertation Award. My dissertation came from a long series of questions I grapple with: How do organizations that seek to have a positive impact in the world know if and how much impact they actually create? How do people who want to support social organizations know whom best to support? How does one choose which impact measures to use from the many possibilities available? And, how can we learn how to better make a difference using social impact metrics? The answers I found in my dissertation were that organizations often do not use any of the impact measures academia has created, and at the same time, they use them all. In practice, measurement frameworks are best understood as exercises in bricolage, where bits-and-pieces of different measures are harvested away from their original frameworks and merged together to make a Frankenstein’s monster of impact measures that somehow suffices. The creation of metrics in this manner is highly negotiated and better understood as sociological trust- and legitimacy-building processes rather than as objective quantifications of impact. Also, they tend to overemphasize the scale and reach of outputs as an input.

I hope this work helps people understand how to improve the social “bang for the buck” that they get as they endeavour to create social impact, either themselves or indirectly through their support of others. I also love feeling like my work might add a (small) contribution to making the world a better place.

Now that it is finished, I also realized how lucky I was to have a wonderful advisor Jonatan Pinkse who taught me well as well as a robust and engaged community at the Grenoble Ecole de Management that not only challenged me to go deeper but also raised my vision to new and unexpected theories. Perhaps the greatest thing about the Academy of Management is that I still get to connect to all of you across our many institutions and research projects. Thank you all!

The other finalists are:

* *“Organizing for Sustainable Change: Collective Entrepreneurship in the German Energy Sector”*

Björn C. Mitzinneck, University of Groningen, dissertation completed at Cornell University

* *“Controversies Around CSR and Sustainable Development: The Role of Stakeholders in the Spiral of Hypocrisy”*

Susana Claudia Esper, IÉSEG School of Management, dissertation completed at HEC Montreal

**Best Student Paper Award 2020**

*“Revisiting Conflict: Neoliberalism at Work in the Gig Economy”*

***Alessandro Tirapani***, Esade Business School

**Abstract**

This paper rethinks conflict by moving beyond functionalism, which conceptualizes it as something that must be either excluded or optimized, and structuralism, which marginalizes and undertheorizes contingency and self-interpretations. Engaging a post-structuralist approach, we present the difference between reformist and radical framings of conflict by examining the neoliberal ‘gig economy’. Our analysis also discloses how radical conflict is impeded through four dimensions of what we term ‘econormativity’: ‘radical responsibilization’, ‘quantification’, ‘universality’, and ‘disembeddedness’.

**A Few Words from *Allesandro Tirapani***

I am deeply honored to have been conferred the 2020 SIM Best Student Paper Award. I distinctively remember the feeling of joy reading the news! After many months of pandemic isolation, attending the online ceremony was a unique and thrilling experience.

My doctoral thesis looks at precariousness and nonstandard work from an organization studies perspective. This paper tackles the issue of conflict in the gig economy, studying why demands for radical changes in employment relations and workers’ rights are routinely met with minor adjustments not tackling the underlying causes of exploitation and precariousness. We reach the conclusion that the conditions of possibility for radical change are most often inhibited by individualization and by the ‘inability’ to think, enact, or scale up radical alternatives.

This paper, started in 2016, is the first project of my PhD: receiving this recognition is truly important – a testament to the value of studying the social impact of organizations that we use routinely, like food delivery. I am also delighted to be part of SIM community, and to have contributed with my work to the ongoing and important debate on platforms and conflict.

I would like to thank my supervisor and co-author, Hugh Willmott, as well as Sebastien Mena and the whole Bayes (ex-Cass) Business School community for the unfaltering support, funding, and feedback. I am also grateful to the SIM Award Committee, and I congratulate the other finalists for their exciting projects.

As in the paper we call for scholars to take the lived experiences of workers seriously, I hope SIM can be ever more attentive to the complexities of our changing reality. SIM research can hopefully support those seeking to embrace the marvels of technology and yet devise alternative, fairer and more sustainable ways of organizing.

The other finalists are:

* *“Is Corruption Imprinted? A Study on Preconditions of Corruption in Post-Communist Countries”*

Karin Knorr, Thorsten Auer, Kirsten Thommes (all University of Paderborn)

* *“Cross-Sector Partnerships for Sustainable Development: Understanding Community (dis-) Engagement”*

Ana Dahik (IMPADE Business School)

* *“In Search of a Western Relational Management Paradigm: Past Research Paths & Future Directions”*

Audrey-Anne Cyr (HEC Montreal)

**Best Book Award 2020**
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Description automatically generated with medium confidence*“Private Governance as an Institutional Response to Wicked Problems”*

***Julia Grimm***, Jönköping University

**A Few Words from *Julia Grimm***

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the Social Issues in Management Division of the Academy of Management for the 2020 Best Book Award. I am very honored by this recognition of my work “Private Governance as an Institutional Response to Wicked Problems: A Study of the German Partnership for Sustainable Textiles”.

As events unfolded, I was able to follow in real-time the evolution of a voluntary multi-stakeholder agreement which had been set up as a response to Rana Plaza. I was eager to learn why businesses agreed to participate in such partnerships and how their commitment unfolded over time. My study contributes to our understanding of what works and as importantly what does not work in the set-up of voluntary agreements. It further offers insights and generates ideas for those who – in real life – are setting up such voluntary partnerships involving multiple stakeholder groups with differing interests and goals.

Studying the success and failure of such voluntary agreements has inspired me to better understand the mechanics of what happens after such agreements are implemented. This has led to my current work on the maintenance of voluntary partnerships.

I’d like to encourage others to engage in the study of social issues in management, ensuring that their research has practical implications which can inform and influence policy makers and business practitioners because: Society is our business!

**Best Book Award Committee’s Report**
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***Petya Koleva***, Coventry University

Regarding Dr. Julia Grimm’s “Private Governance as an Institutional Response to Wicked Problems”, Nomos Publishing House:

Dr Grimm, using innovative and integrative analysis in her longitudinal study, offers a thorough theoretical treatment of why collective action is an adequate response to some extremely topical issues such as human rights violations, environmental sustainability and sustainable production. Dr. Grimm seems to refuse to opt for either an economic or a sociological perspective on the matter but argues that it takes both theoretical perspectives to gain an understanding of initiatives such as collective partnerships and the conditions under which such initiatives can form and be effective. With her interesting and innovative results, Dr Grimm contributes to our understanding of how such initiatives emerge and under what conditions they can be effective. It hence deserves the attention of anyone interested in the functioning of collective action initiatives. Her book nurtures the hope that some of our most urging ethical problems in business can be alleviated.

Regarding Prof. Morgan R. Clevenger’s “Corporate Citizenship and Higher Education: Behavior, Engagement, and Ethics”, Palgrave Macmillan:

In this book, Professor Clevenger contributes to the corporate citizenship, and higher education literature by providing and documenting examples to understand a range of motives and return on investment expectations of corporate engagement. The book sheds light on the interorganizational link between higher educational institutions and corporate partners in the US. In particular, it examines how and why such collaborations start and the challenges encountered. It gives an insight into how to be successful in interorganizational partnerships. Clevenger pioneer work will, hopefully, develop and generate new research on such crucial partnerships.

Regarding Prof. Alnoor Ebrahim’s “Measuring Social Change: Performance and Accountability in a Complex World”, Stanford University Press:

Peter Drucker is often quoted as saying that “you can't manage what you can't measure.” Drucker means you cannot know whether you are successful unless success is defined and tracked. Thus, Professor Ebrahim’s book brought forward a new approach to measurement by articulating a pluralistic model of performance management, developing a framework to guide managers for what they should be measuring, which is crucial in the private, public or non-profit organizations. His book is timely given the many social challenges in the world. The author points out how existing tools for measuring social performance was not relevant or useful for practitioners and delivers a pragmatic contingency approach, resulting in four types of social change strategies.

The committee also included Theodora Issa (Curtin University) and Sarah Stephen (University of St. Gallen).

The other finalists are:

* *“Corporate Citizenship and Higher Education: Behavior, Engagement, and Ethics”*

Morgan R. Clevenger (Hiram College)

* *“Measuring Social Change: Performance and Accountability in a Complex World”*

Alnoor Ebrahim (Tufts University)

# SIM EXPLORATORY COMMITTEE 2021 REPORT
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**Jean-Pascal Gond**, City University of London

**Emilio Marti**, Erasmus University Rotterdam

**Pushpika Vishwanathan**, University of Amsterdam

**Overview**

The Exploratory Committee (EC) was initiated in Fall 2020 by SIM Division Chair Andy Wicks to obtain (1) a deeper understanding of SIM’s unique contribution within the Academy, and (2) an actionable sense of “who we aspire to be” as a Division for the future. Between January and June 2021, the inaugural EC, chaired by Erica Steckler (Representative-at-Large) with members Jean Pascal Gond, Emilio Marti, Pushpika Vishwanathan (Representative-at-Large), and Sandra Waddock, designed and implemented several opportunities to gather input with SIM members. Exploratory research platforms have included: Winter 2021 SIM Membership Survey questions, 10 focus groups (April-June), 12 one-on-one interviews (April-June), and small-group breakout sessions during a Coffee & Cocktails gathering (April). Overall, approximately 150 SIM members participated directly in this exploratory process.

The spirit of every EC interaction has been to solicit perspectives about the SIM experience and generate idea-sharing about how the Division can best serve and support its members. An explicit goal of the EC has been to include input that reflects diversity with respect to a) career-stage, b) scholarly expertise, c) geographical background, and d) demographic characteristics, in an effort to best represent a full range of membership views and interests.

**Core I****nsights from the Exploratory Committee**

We found that the perceptions of SIM strengths and weaknesses and the expectations and visions for the future vary across the career-cycle of the SIM members (early scholars, junior faculty, mid-career scholars, and established scholars). Table 1 provides an overview of these differentiated perceptions across the distinct groups of members involved in our focus groups.

**SIM Strengths and Opportunities**

The various groups of members expressed distinct expectations explained by their stage of career development. Expectations were focused on mentoring and identifying the lead figures of the field for early careers scholars, developing networking and collaboration for junior faculty, supporting the development of alternative theories for mid-careers scholars, and enhancing the influence of SIM research on the AOM agenda for more established scholars. Even though they are expressed differently by distinct groups, several high-level thematic areas emerged that reflect broad-based agreement about SIM strengths and characteristics, as well as how SIM can do more to meet member needs and interests.

*Table 1:* Differentiated Perceptions of SIM

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Early career** | **Junior faculty** | **Mid-career** | **Advanced scholars** |
| **What are positive aspects?** | “Homey” division  Supportive & developmental  Meaningful | Social significance of research topics  Easy-going division  Interest in impact | Accessibility of senior scholars  Questioning the status quo | Friendliness & culture of caring  Boundary-spanning research |
| **What are negative aspects?** | Lack of role models  Unclear definition of academic excellence | Unequal quality of reviews / papers  Lack of bounding across generations | Low status of CSR/BE journals  Research quality at the division | Making governance more deliberative  Transmission of legacy, succession |
| **What are expectations?** | On-boarding  Mapping the field  Resourcing | Networking  Collaborating  Being inspired  Pushing new topics | Opening to alternative theories  Dealing with core S&E issues | Assuming normativity  Bridging across AOM  Pushing cutting edge issues & research |
| **What should the future look like?** | Becoming more supportive through extended mentoring | Becoming a more transformative division | Becoming the place where core S&E issues are dealt with seriously | Becoming a platform & intellectual hub for SIM issues at AOM |

***Recognizing characteristic SIM strengths.*** SIM is consistently described as an extremely friendly, accessible, welcoming, and supportive community. Members feel “at home” and have a “sense of belonging” in SIM. Representative descriptions of the SIM experience include “extended family”, “it’s where I feel more authentic”, “people are passionate”, and members care about “real issues” and “impact.” There is a sense that SIM scholars tend to be encouraging and “nurturing” of early work, with relatively less criticism of theoretical or methodological rigor compared to other divisions. SIM is perceived as a division where “fringe” topics are welcome and easy to talk about without the feeling of “being looked down upon”.

***Organizing activities between annual meetings.*** A major point of consensus is that SIM members would like to have more division activities and events happen in between annual meetings.These activities do not have to be in the form of traditional conferences, but could take up more innovative formats such as online conversations, round-tables, and idea-pitching sessions. Participants also observed that conferences have changed and there is a need to think about how we can have better quality conversations. Smaller group, regional, networking opportunities are key. Participants would appreciate opportunities to connect specifically with peers who have similar research ideas, are looking for collaborators, or work in adjacent locations.

***Providing additional networking, career, and research development resources.*** Another point of consensus, particularly among early career scholars and junior faculty members of SIM, is for the Division to provide more – and more readily accessible – resources, mentoring, professional development opportunities, job market information, etc. Many members rely on the Division to keep them informed about relevant events and skill-building opportunities as well as career-advancement opportunities, and would like for SIM to provide more communications and more resources in these areas. For example, members would like to be able to access a “map” of SIM scholars and SIM-friendly institutions on the Division website, a SIM-specific job-board, “matchmaking” options such as mentoring or research collaboration or data collection opportunities, and access to SIM social-media interest groups, among other ideas.

***Providing teaching resources.*** A further point of consensus is the opportunity for SIM to provide a repository of teaching resources, including syllabi, cases, and exercises for faculty involved with SIM-related courses. This also includes more conventional course syllabi that social issues can be integrated into. Many members felt that the Division could better support their teaching roles, both through a Division website and with teaching-specific workshops.

***Providing and expanding opportunities for Division involvement for members at all career phases.*** A final point of consensus that we highlight is the interest that many members have in being involved with and actively contributing to the SIM community, and their lack of clarity about how to go about doing this. Earliest career members through senior faculty members expressed uncertainty about how to play a meaningful role within SIM. The Division having overly formalized roles, and the desire and need to keep membership involvement fresh and innovative, were sentiments expressed by several members.

**Key Tensions of SIM**

Analyzing further the empirical material collected, we found that the strengths and weaknesses were closely related and pointed to underlying core tensions—aspects of the identity and purpose of the division that are not necessarily “either/or” dilemmas but rather co-constitutive oppositions or deep contradictions weighting on resource allocation or decisions (Lewis, 2000; Smith & Lewis, 2011). As with other research movements, the SIM Division navigates important decisions about its identity and purpose (see Clegg et al., 2021). Specifically, this exploratory process has revealed four key tensions that SIM faces (see Figure 2).

***Embracing pluralism in theory and methods vs. having a limited number of theoretical frameworks and associated methods.***A major tension concerns trade-offs between being a division with theoretical and methodological pluralism, or, a division with clearly and rigidly defined boundaries framed by a clear theoretical framework and relevant methodologies. Many SIM members appreciate that SIM is very open in terms of theories and methods. Some members argue there could be even more pluralism, for example by further embracing novel topics, including social justice, future of work, AI, global South, etc. At the same time, other participants express concerns about the boundaries of the SIM division. When research builds on multiple and diverse disciplinary foundations (sociology, philosophy, psychology), a lack of common theoretical anchors limits both depth and arc of development for particular areas or fields of focus. These two perceptions suggest the tension that it may be difficult to simultaneously increase the cohesiveness of the division while embracing pluralism.

***Doing research with impact vs. Making theoretical and methodical contributions.***Another tension concerns impact. Many participants see impact as a distinctive and important feature of SIM. Since the AOM can be perceived as a very instrumental place, participants expressed a strong appreciation for SIM’s genuine concern for realizing social change. Such sentiments serve as an important source of inspiration and motivation for participants to continue staying in academia. At the same time, other participants express the view that SIM may be seen as being less strong or rigorous than other divisions (OMT and STR, in particular) in producing research that makes theoretical and methodological contributions, and that gets published in top journals. Early or mid-career participants talked about their promotion requirements and the need to network with scholars who might review their work at top journals. These two perceptions underscore the tension that if individual members and the SIM Division prioritize realizing and fostering impact, then they will focus less on making and supporting the development of theoretical and methodological contributions and associated publications.
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Figure 2: Tensions of SIM Identified through the Exploratory Process.

***Having a core set of SIM-identified topics vs. Advancing emerging cutting-edge research topics.***A fourth tension exists in the recognition that topics once considered central to SIM are now widely dispersed throughout the AOM (and elsewhere), thus no longer providing a distinctive identity for the Division. This perception is bolstered by research that suggests that there are a few “core” SIM topics (e.g., CSR and CSP-financial performance, ethics, stakeholders, “greening” business). At the same time, there is a belief by some participants that there are significant opportunities to broaden SIM research topics around, as one participant put it, “things that need studying” around the roles of businesses / other institutions in societies – but that may not be being addressed by other divisions. This tension focuses on whether SIM wants to continue researching a limited set of core topics that are now increasingly widely dispersed within AOM, or, be what one person suggested as “the groundbreaking, paradigm-shifting place – the cool place to hang out” because it is where new ideas are constantly being generated (and then, possibly spun out to other divisions).

**C**o**ncluding Remarks**

Member insights surfaced through this exploratory process suggests that SIM and its leadership team should consider, address, and position the Division with regard to the four key tensions. For the five areas of consensus, SIM leadership should be as responsive as possible since these represent low-hanging fruit for meeting member needs and, in parallel, strengthening the value of the Division for members. In addition, each suggestion for change or improvement should be considered in terms of feasibility and alignment with the Division’s current and evolving identity. Finally, while much has been surfaced and learned through this 2020-2021 exploratory process, much remains to be implemented. We suggest that the work of the Exploratory Committee be continued in terms of an Implementation Committee (or perhaps the current Membership Committee becomes the natural “lead” for implementation) for the 2021-2022 cycle and beyond, with new sets of members and tasks for next phases of continued responsiveness and action-taking by the Division.

We thank each participant who took the time to respond thoughtfully to exploratory survey questions and who generously participated with high engagement in focus groups, one-on-one conversations, and small group breakouts at the Coffee & Cocktails session. We are grateful to the SIM Governance team, especially SIM Chair Andy Wicks, the SIM Communications team, the SIM Membership Committee, and the Academy of Management staff for their support and collaboration.

At the 2021 AOM Meeting the SIM Exploratory Committee organized *PDW, Session 1655: “SIM Exploratory Committee*.*”* David J. Skandera, latest addition to the SIM Communication Team, shares his **A person in a suit smiling
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**David J. Skandera,** University of Central Florida

Between January and June 2021, the SIM Exploratory Committee gathered data from 155 individuals, including 150 SIM Division members, via surveys, focus groups, and public and one-on-one conversations “to obtain (1) a deeper understanding of SIM’s unique contribution within the Academy; and (2) an actionable sense of ‘who we aspire to be’ as a Division for the future.” The committee made a strong effort to collect data from a wide variety of individuals, spanning a diverse range of research expertise, career stages, and geographical backgrounds, among other considerations. In this PDW, the committee discussed their findings and facilitated a debate about paths forward for the SIM Division. I share two observations discussed by the committee that I personally found particularly intriguing.

First, and most intriguingly, attendees at the PDW discussed the SIM Division’s place within the Academy. It emerged that the SIM Division could become the “Big Ideas” hub of the Academy at a time when societal issues permeate our global societies and research agendas. Specifically, the SIM Division could be the destination within the Academy for particularly impactful research that is at the forefront of developments in the organization sciences. For example, the PDW revealed evidence that ideas originating in the SIM Division have in the past populated research agendas in other Divisions, such as ENT, OMT, or STR. Moreover, the theme of the 2022 AOM Annual Meeting is *Creating a Better World Together*, calling on researchers across the entire Academy to consider societal issues and the role of organizations in addressing these issues. A focus on societal issues and how organizations relate to societal issues has been the bedrock of much SIM research. This suggests that there is an opportunity for the SIM Division to embrace a leading role in defining where management researchers focus their attention and the “Big Ideas” that they study; especially in a world where climate change, social justice, health pandemics, and other grand challenges dominate our collective psyche.

Second, the committee identified a set of four tensions that define the challenges the SIM Division faces. These tensions include (1) embracing a variety of theoretical lenses and methods while also maintaining a core set of theoretical frameworks and methods that are SIM’s own, (2) conducting research with societal impact while also making theoretical and/or methodological contributions, (3) maintaining a set of core topics that are SIM’s own while also contributing to cutting-edge research topics, and (4) building on SIM’s normative foundations while ensuring that our research is not labeled activist research. A consensus among attendees at the PDW developed around the ideas that it would be beneficial to (a) think about reconciling these tensions, and (b) work with research communities and centers to structure and manage the SIM research agenda. Doing so could help integrate SIM researchers’ wide range of expertise and thus diffuse best practices for rigorous SIM research; and it could help disseminate knowledge to practitioners quickly and effectively to ensure that SIM research can help address urgent societal issues. Reconciling the four tensions and partnering with research communities and centers could in this way help the SIM Division maintain its relevance at a time when the rest of the Academy also embraces research questions about stakeholders, ethics, CSR, and other SIM topics. Still, it is important that we, as a Division, continue thinking about these tensions and debate solutions.

I would like to thank the SIM Exploratory Committee for their hard work and presenting their findings at this PDW. The session was an insightful, enjoyable, and inspiring experience.

# SIM MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE 2021 REPORT

***Sarah Stephen (Chair),*** University of St. Gallen

***Frank de Bakker***, IESEG Lille

***Sebastian Hafenbrädl***, IESE Barcelona

***Barrie Litzky***, Drexel University

SIM (and other AOM divisions) traditionally used to be more prominent and active during the annual meetings of the AOM. This institutionalized setting, however, was changed by the pandemic. Supported by the SIM governance team, the newly formed MC was able to emphasize the division's commitment to the members and the wider community during this distressing time.

This was, firstly, via organizing C&Cs (hosted by the Division Chair, Program Chair, PDW Chair, & the Exploratory Committee) that aimed at building a sense of community and enhancing networking opportunities. These events attracted SIM members (past and present), but also new members and members from other divisions (or none).

Secondly, in collaboration with the Research Committee, we organized two cohorts of SIM NETworking (2020-21; 2021-present), a mentoring initiative linking PhD students, junior faculty, and mid-career faculty with senior faculty mentors.

Thirdly, especially given the upheavals in the job market, we organized a well-attended panel discussion with people who were recently hiring and who were recently hired, in collaboration with the Junior Faculty Consortium.

We believe that the division is now more accessible and inclusive, thanks to these online events. Our events have brought together scholars from around the world. As the events are not restricted to current members, members of other divisions or none now have a clearer idea of the division - notably, it's values, sense of community, and availability of a fertile ground for growing as a scholar. The unexpected online medium has offered opportunities for the community to develop substantial networks with other scholars - unlike the busy annual meeting week when our agendas are filled with sessions and short meetings.

On the whole, we see signs of clear and ongoing interest. The feedback we received, for instance via NETworking, is that the community would like more such events. Furthermore, over 50% of those who RSVP-ed to the events attended.

For the coming year, we plan on cementing the division's dedication to the community by continuing to organize these events. There are also other possibilities that we are exploring and we would love to collaborate with other committees in the longer run. At the same time, given the profusion of online events, we prefer to be mindful of the landscape and find areas where we can make solid contributions. We also believe that the division has now moved to a state where it is no longer present only in January and July/August, but also throughout the year.

We look forward to collaborating with other committees and the SIM members in making the division a supportive and unparalleled home for the community.

# SIM RACIAL JUSTICE COMMITTEE 2021 REPORT

The SIM Racial Justice Committee was formed in August 2020. Racial Justice Committee members are:
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**Paul Harper** University of Pittsburgh

**Howard Jean-Denis** University of Mass, Amherst

**Robbin Derry** University of Lethbridge

Our focus over the ’20-’21 academic year was organizing and hosting five online webinars on Racial Justice and Business Ethics. These ran from January through May of 2021. The topics of these webinars were wide ranging, including considerations of how racial injustice plays out in the following arenas:

* **Business school curriculum and systemic racism**
* **Social theories of race**
* **How our understanding of history shapes our understanding of race and racism in America**
* **The interactions of race and technology**
* **Environmental racism: seeing it for what it is**

In each webinar two to three invited presenters shared their research expertise and responded to questions from participants. For virtually all of the webinars we had between 100 -200 registrants. Participants in our seminars included senior scholars from many fields, as well as graduate and undergraduate students. Discussions were lively, sometimes contentious, and we routinely received notes of appreciation for contributing to greater awareness of these topics and introducing useful resources. Recordings of the webinars were posted on the SIM website for viewers who were unable to attend or who wanted to review the presentations.

We had several sponsorships and monetary contributions from the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Notre Dame, the University of Lethbridge, and Duquesne University, enabling us to give honoraria to our presenters in appreciation of their contributions. Our goal for these webinars was to encourage more interest in and awareness of the ways that racial justice work can be integrated into our teaching and research. We feel that we accomplished this goal and took valuable steps to support colleagues who are willing to take on this important work.

# CALLS FOR PAPERS AND PARTICIPATION

**Call for Special Issue Proposals**

***British Journal of Management***

**Submission Deadline: 1 December 2021**

Proposals are invited for a special issue in *BJM*. The special issue will be published in early 2024 and we anticipate that the call for papers will identify a specific topic or sub-discipline, and a range of themes that might be addressed within that area. The proposal should contain the following:

* A statement of 1-2 pages introducing the existing state of research in the area (including existing debates in *BJM*), and why the special issue will make a meaningful contribution to them.
* Clear evidence that the special issue will attract a wide readership and meaningful citations.
* A draft call for papers.
* A list of the five best publications of each of the proposed guest editors, indicating with an asterisk if the publication is relevant to the proposal.

An effective special issue should include contributions based on robust empirical investigation(s), with solid theoretical underpinnings within a specific domain, and where possible building on a comprehensive body of literature and sets the agenda for future research. All proposals will be reviewed by members of the editorial board and judged according to quality of the likely contributions as well as their ability to enhance the reputation of *BJM*.

Given the general readership of *BJM*, very focused or specialized proposals, dealing with narrow niche areas of little interest to a general audience are discouraged.

Please note the responsibilities of guest editors include handling all submissions, communicating with authors, inviting reviewers and making recommendations on each article using ScholarOne Manuscripts and the special issue should adhere to the usual *BJM* criteria for handling papers, including standards of correspondence, turnaround times and the peer review process.

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/page/journal/14678551/homepage/forauthors.html>.

The deadline for proposals is **1st December 2021**, and proposals will not be reviewed until after this date. The decision will be made by 1st March 2022.

Proposals should be emailed to [bjm@bam.ac.uk](mailto:bjm@bam.ac.uk).

Douglas Cumming

Editor-in-Chief

***Journal of Business Research***

**Call for Papers for a Special Issue**

**Critical perspectives on corporate political activities (CPA): Exploring strategic and stakeholder non-value maximizing implications and externalities of corporate political activities.**

Submission window: Oct 1 2021 - Dec 31 2021

Guest Editors:

* Michael Hadani, Saint Mary’s College of California
* Daniel Nyberg, University of Newcastle Australia
* Nicolas Dahan, California State Monterey Bay

For “Article Type”, select **corporate political activities**

Background

Corporate political activity (CPA) is one of the most common non-market strategies used by firms today (Hadani, Doh & Schneider, 2016, 2019; Nyberg, 2021; Ozer, 2010); its public policy impact ranges from food labels, wages, transportation safety, workplace safety and diversity regulation, industry barriers to entry, the cost of food, corporate liability, individual bankruptcy, cost of utilities, GHG emissions, to tax policy. These are just some among the many public policy issues impacting business and the average citizen on a daily basis. Thus, beyond the politically active firm itself, CPA impacts the firm’s competitors, shareholders, stakeholders and society at large, as well as the broader democratic institutions of society (Barley, 2007; Neron, 2016; Nyberg, 2021; Reich, 2007).

Such an impact has become more pronounced and visible since the landmark 2010 Supreme Court decision in Citizens’ United (and the 2014 McCutcheon v. Federal Election Commission decision)– allowing unlimited use of corporate funds in support or opposition of politicians running for office. The January 6th riot at the Capitol in DC and the public backlash to some politically active firms, has further brought to the fore the indirect consequences of CPA. It has highlighted both the risks for the firms engaging in CPA as well as the potential effects on the public at large.

The work of Gilens and Page (2014) indicates that corporate interests impact public policy outcomes in ways that are muting the public interest on public policy. Indeed, a recent book by Katherine Ghel and Michael Porter (2020) - The Politics Industry: How Political Innovation Can Break Partisan Gridlock and Save Our Democracy – highlights some of these issues with a special emphasis on both the supply and the demand side of the so called “political marketplace” and the significant political and social costs and long-term risks associated with CPA.

Despite the growing power and impact of CPA, and the rising concerns about its competitive and societal externalities and costs (Barley 2007; Hadani, 2012; Hadani, Bonardi, & Dahan, 2017; Hadani & Schuler, 2013; Neron, 2016; Nyberg & Murray, 2020; Nyberg, Spicer, & Wright, 2013; Prabhat & Primo, 2019; Repetto, 2007; Walker, 2012), mainstream CPA research has mostly focused on the descriptive and instrumental value of CPA. The literature has focused on the firm as the sole beneficiary of CPA, but ignored, for the most part, ethical and normative analyses of CPA, as well as the societal risks and costs it may engender. Mantere, Pajunen and Lamberg (2009: 106) summarize this situation succinctly: “Indeed, mainstream research has considered CPA to be an integral and equal part of the competitive strategies of a firm”. This is; an instrumental-structuralist view that has become a dominant monolith in CPA scholarship. They further note that there is a clear demarcation between a ‘functionalist’ CPA scholarship and a more ethically oriented CSR scholarship, which is far less developed and explored (for a similar view see Neron, 2016). This suggests that paradigmatic gate keeping may be occurring in CPA scholarship.

Aim and Scope

The special issue is motivated by the above-described state of affairs: the lack of focus on the darker side of CPA, both to politically active firms and stakeholders. The aim and scope of this special issue is to address the above theoretical and empirical voids and potential paradigmatic gate keeping. The aim is to move away from a strict focus on the firm as the major beneficiary of CPA, towards investigating and theorizing the impact of CPA on shareholders, stakeholders and the public at large.

We are calling for both theoretical and empirical papers, quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods papers that explore the potential negative consequences, costs, risks and externalities that may be associated with corporate political activities, across its different types and forms. We seek to showcase the latest developments in, and future directions of cutting edge research on the broader consequences of CPA.

Topics of Interest

The topics below provide a general but **non-exhaustive** list of questions and topics that can be addressed in this issue through quantitative, qualitative, or mixed method approaches, drawing on a variety of theoretical lenses and paradigms that should theoretically expand and challenge existing views:

* What are the potential risks and costs associated with CPA? What are the boundary or contingency factors that attenuate such risks?
* Taking into account the opaque nature of CPA, what role does mass media and other forms of visibility or scrutiny play in impacting the propensity for CPA and CPA outcomes?
* Can we model and capture firms’ propensity to use dark money and other less overt means of CPA? And how does such a propensity impact more overt forms of CPA?
* How does external and internal ownership as well as top executive and board characteristics shape CPA its potential for negative externalities? How do firms or top executives use celebrity status in CPA?
* How does CPA shape firm’s legal environments?  How does CPA influence broader public policy roles, functions and processes?
* What is the relationship among different forms of CPA and stakeholders? How does CPA impact stakeholders? How do stakeholders impact CPA? Can they?
* Can a normative lens be applied to CPA? Should such a lens be applied? Does it complement or conflict with an instrumental focus on CPA? Does it matter to executives’ CPA decision making?
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**Call for Submissions**

***2nd Organization Theory Winter Workshop***

**Vrije University Amsterdam**

The Organization Theory (OT) Winter Workshop is aimed at organization and management researchers who wish to write high quality and impactful theoretical papers for journal publication.

The workshop will offer detailed coaching and hands-on feedback sessions on participants’ papers as well as plenary sessions by members of the Organization Theory editorial team on key aspects of developing and writing theory (e.g., developing a theory contribution, construct clarity, genres of theory writing).

This will be the second edition of our annual workshop which will bring together organization and management scholars, the editors of Organization Theory, and senior academics with experience in writing theory papers as additional facilitators and mentors.

The submission system for the OT Winter Workshop will open on the 15th of October via a dedicated website (www.ot-workshop.com). We encourage both senior researchers as well as researchers in earlier stages of their careers to submit conceptual papers to be considered for this workshop. We are open to theoretical perspectives from outside the ‘mainstream’ and are keen to support the development of papers that are currently not under review. Please note that empirical papers (those with theorizing based on quantitative or qualitative data) will NOT be accepted.

This workshop will be face-to-face and will take place at Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam and is hosted by the Department of Management and Organization (unless the pandemic regulations will not allow this). We will not be able to offer a hybrid format. The best papers from the workshop will be considered for publication in Organization Theory through a fast-track review process.

The keynote speaker for the workshop will be Professor Lisa Herzog from the University of Groningen.

**Convenors**

Eva Boxenbaum | Copenhagen Business School

Joep Cornelissen | Erasmus University Rotterdam

Penny Dick | University of Sheffield

Joel Gehman | George Washington University

Markus Höllerer | UNSW Sydney & WU Vienna

Juliane Reinecke | King’s College London

David Seidl | University of Zurich

Submissions The 2nd Organization Theory workshop will take place on the 10th and 11th of February 2022. Those interested in participating should submit an extended abstract until the 15th of November through the OT Workshop website: www.ot-workshop.com. Abstracts should be no more than 1,000 words. Authors will be notified of acceptance by November 30th, 2021. Full papers must be submitted by the 15th of January 2022. Further details on the logistics of the workshop will be published through the OT Workshop website and via email to accepted participants.

Informal enquiries to:

Joep Cornelissen, [Cornelissen@rsm.nl](mailto:Cornelissen@rsm.nl),

Markus Höllerer, [markus.hoellerer@unsw.edu.au](mailto:markus.hoellerer@unsw.edu.au), or

Sophia Tzagaraki, [orgtheoryjournal@gmail.com](mailto:orgtheoryjournal@gmail.com).

**Call for Submissions**

***Management & Organization Review***

**Special Issue on:**

**Responsible Leadership in China and Beyond: A Responsible Research Approach**

Dear colleagues,

We are pleased to share a reminder that the submission deadline for the MOR Special Issue on 'Responsible Leadership in China and Beyond: A Responsible Research Approach' is **December 1, 2021.**

This special issue of *Management and Organization Review* seeks research that identifies various forms of responsible leadership, including theory development, qualitative studies, as well as hypotheses testing using quantitative, qualitative, or experimental methods. This special issue aims to contribute to both theory development and the practice of responsible leadership at different levels and in different contexts, especially in China.

The submission deadline is December 1, 2021. We expect editorial decisions within **90 days** after submission (end of February 2022). Authors of papers that have received a revise and resubmit will be invited to an MOR Special Issue Paper Development Workshop (most likely a virtual workshop). Date and location to be determined (around March/April 2022).

Following the practices of MOR Paper Development Workshops, each paper author will receive detailed reviews and editorial guidelines as well as a specific editorial decision within two months of the Workshop (before the end of June 2022). We expect to publish the special issue in December 2022 or early 2023.

**Submission Information:**

Please submit full papers via the MOR submission website by selecting the 'Responsible Leadership in China and Beyond' special issue designation: <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/mor>

For further information on the special issue, please refer [here](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/management-and-organization-review/announcements/call-for-papers/call-for-papers-special-issue-on-responsible-leadership-in-china-and-beyond).

Inquiries about this special issue may be directed to any of the guest editors by emailing:

[MORmanagingeditor@cambridge.org](mailto:MORmanagingeditor@cambridge.org)

Best regards,

The guest editors for the MOR Special Issue on Responsible Leadership:

Xu Huang

Xiao-Ping Chen

Michael Hitt

Runtian Jing

Arie Y. Lewin

Johann Peter Murmann

Anne S. Tsui

Lori Yue

Jianjun Zhang

**Call for Submissions**

***Journal of Business Research***

**Special Issue on:**

**Underdog Entrepreneurship: Causes, Mechanisms, Transitions, and Impacts**

**Submission Window:** Jan 1, 2022 – Oct 1, 2022

**Managing Guest Editor:**Jie Li ([jie.li02@xjtlu.edu.cn](mailto:jie.li02@xjtlu.edu.cn))

**Guest Editors:**

* Zhiming Cheng
* Sunny Li Sun
* Meena Chavan

**Overview**

*Journal of Business Research* will publish a special issue containing selected papers examining underdog entrepreneurship and its implications for academic research, business practices and policy-making.

While a large body of existing literature focuses on the positive personality and environmental qualities that stimulate entrepreneurship, an emerging body of literature argues the 'negative personal circumstances of an economic, sociocultural, cognitive, and physical/emotional nature may have an equally powerful role to play in getting people to become effective entrepreneurs' (Miller & Le Breton-Miller, 2017, p. 7).

The theory of underdog entrepreneurship provides a valuable perspective to explain why adversity can breed business activities. For instance, studies find that those who experienced famine (Cheng et al., 2021a; Chu et al., 2016), war (Awaworyi Churchill et al., 2021), poverty (Cheng et al., 2021b), displacement (Shepherd et al., 2020), and mental and physical health issues (Lerner et al., 2019; Wiklund et al., 2018; Yu et al., 2021) are more likely to start their businesses. In addition, those in lower social class positions but with strong prospects of upward mobility are more likely to engage in entrepreneurship (Wang et al., 2021). Indeed, entrepreneurship has been advocated as a feasible solution to poverty (Bruton et al., 2013; Sutter et al., 2019). Underdog entrepreneurs are often unresourceful, and they employ 'workaround practices', such as bribes, to overcome the adversity they face, especially under informal institutions (Baron et al., 2018; Sydow et al., 2020). Underdog entrepreneurs also develop strong resilience and a preference for innovation and risk-taking, which are crucial for building a successful business (Morgan, 2020).

Yet, there is limited research on the causal relationships and the mechanisms through which unfavourable personal and environmental circumstances affect entrepreneurial choices and outcomes, resulting in insufficient evidence for economic and social policymaking. For instance, identifying causal relationships and the underlying mechanisms is critical because the efforts to address poverty have mainly focused on subsistence entrepreneurship rather than creating ventures that empower the poor to break out of poverty (Bruton et al., 2015). A few existing studies examine the impacts of adverse childhood experiences on entrepreneurship in adulthood (Awaworyi Churchill et al., 2021; Cheng et al., 2021a; Drennan et al., 2005). Nonetheless, the literature only begins to investigate more broadly and deeply the roles of adversities in cultivating 'disadvantage entrepreneurship' (Maalaoui et al., 2020). A better understanding of underdog entrepreneurs is essential for making microfinance and other support programs more accessible and affordable for those in need (Sun & Liang, 2021). In addition, exploring what institutions and external enabling factors could shape and transfer this disadvantage entrepreneurship has relevant policy implications (Davidsson et al., 2020; Sun et al., 2020).

This special issue seeks submission to expand the understanding of the causes, mechanisms, dynamics, transitions and outcomes of underdog entrepreneurship. Interdisciplinary submissions which draw on theoretical, methodological and empirical insights from management, psychology, economics, political science, marketing, finance, strategy, organisational behaviour, international business and other disciplines are particularly welcome. We are interested in empirical papers that:

* Use lab, natural and field experimental methods, statistical/econometric approaches, or mixed methods to examine different aspects of underdog entrepreneurship.
* Examine the (causal) mechanisms/channels through which these relations take effect, the implications for the workforce/workplace and organisational or societal outcomes.
* Examine how businesses and society can utilise managerial talents and human and social capital stemmed from underdog experiences.
* Examine the roles of business organisations in the socioeconomic integration of marginalised groups with adverse childhood and adulthood experiences.
* Develop and test new theories to understand the relationship between adverse experiences and entrepreneurial outcomes in the actual business setting.
* Understand the unique mental process and activities of underdog entrepreneurs, their cognitive style, beliefs, start-up method, social network and tools for business growth.
* Understand the formal and informal institutions, external enablers which shape or transfer underdog entrepreneurship.
* Explore the impacts of underdog entrepreneurs on social innovation, poverty alleviation, and inclusive growth.
* Examine the economic, social and public policy relevance of underdog entrepreneurship.

However, submissions are by no means limited to these topics. The special issue is also open to submissions that provide negative, null or no results against their hypotheses or findings contradictory to the theory of underdog entrepreneurship.

Subject to approval, we plan to hold an online/hybrid paper development workshop for the special issue in 2022. Attendance at the workshop is neither a requirement for submitting to, nor a guarantee of acceptance into, the special issue. More information regarding the workshop will be provided to prospective contributors in due course.

**Submission Information**

* Submissions start date: **January 1, 2022**; Submission deadline: **October 1, 2022**.
* Papers for special issue should be submitted through the *Journal of Business Research* submission system ([www.editorialmanager.com/JOBR](http://www.editorialmanager.com/JOBR)).
* In the submission system, please choose the article type '*Underdog Entrepreneurship*'.
* Guide for Authors can be found [at this](https://www.elsevier.com/journals/journal-of-business-research/0148-2963/guide-for-authors) link.
* The guest editors will first review papers submitted to the special issue. A paper may be rejected without being sent for review, should the guest editors view the paper as unsuitable for the journal in terms of quality or aims and scope of the *Journal of Business Research*.
* Selected full papers will be sent out for external peer review following the *Journal of Business Research*'s policy. They will receive comments from reviewers and guest editors. As needed, manuscripts will be returned to authors for revision along with the reviewers' comments. Revised manuscripts may be examined by the guest editors and external reviewers before a final decision being made by the Editor-in-Chief.
* Accepted papers will be published continuously in the journal and listed together under a virtual special issue.
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**Call for Participants**

**Seminars To Advance Cumulative Knowledge *(STACK*)**

**Katherina Pattit,** University of St. Thomas

Mike Barnett at Rutgers has kicked off a new seminar series called STACK. Each seminar in this series looks to advance the depth and breadth of knowledge about corporate social innovation by exploring the contributions of recently accepted peer-reviewed papers (not yet published – as this is the true cutting-edge work) and mapping out their implications for research agendas and corporate practices. The papers will tend toward empirical findings (both quantitative and qualitative), as they are most amenable to this format, but conceptual papers are welcome.

Each STACK seminar opens with the paper’s author providing a brief overview of the paper’s specific research question and the exact way that the paper answers this question. Thereafter, a discussant in the same academic discipline clarifies the depth of the contribution of this paper and outlines specific studies that can validate and extend the paper’s findings. Next, a discussant from a different academic discipline clarifies how the paper’s findings relate to and inform or overlap with studies in other disciplines, and then outlines specific studies that can broaden the paper’s findings. Then, a discussant from practice clarifies the practical implications of the paper and outlines a set of related practical issues that would benefit from clearer research findings. Any remaining time is used for Q&A from the presenters and any audience.

Seminars will be recorded (via Zoom) on an ad hoc basis and are intended to be working sessions, not major public events. That said, each seminar will be publicly announced in advance to give others a chance to attend live. Also, recordings will be archived online, forming a comprehensive and continuously updated library that represents the cutting edge of research on corporate social innovation.

If you have or know of a recently accepted and not yet published paper that you think could form the seed for a STACK seminar, please submit it to future STACK seminars. And to view the archives, once they’re posted, please visit the RICSI website.
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