Building a Management Knowledge Navigator:
Organizational Performance for All Primary Stakeholders

Primary sponsor: ATT

Sunday, Aug 11 2019
11:30AM - 1:30PM

Boston Hynes Convention Center, 306

This PDW seeks to explore and encourage the development of multi-disciplinary, meta-theoretical frameworks (“meta-frameworks”) that navigate our knowledge development stocks and help to translate the causes-and-effects for organizational performance. We adopt an inclusive definition of organizational performance. We define it as a plurality of performance metrics concerning all primary stakeholders (investors, customers, employees, and community/ environment), which are considered as the shared set of dependent variables (DV)s for the PDW discussions.

Thus, the purpose of this PDW is to begin the development of a novel umbrella organizing theories, findings, and research agenda to integrate the increasingly fragmented knowledge silos in management studies. We also brainstorm and review ideas on what novel outlets can be created to visualize, host, and curate such meta-frameworks to enable continued updates, and identify what criteria can be used to evaluate the quality of meta-frameworks.

We will group the discussions into micro and macro tracks – each with two concurrent tables, each of which will have two facilitators. Following the concurrent discussions, an integrated discussion will be hosted to further brainstorm a more comprehensive meta-framework covering all levels. The most important contribution of this PDW is to recognize the value and start valuing the novelty in knowledge integration as a new priority in management research as our field matures.

Pre-registration

To ensure a meaningful and interactive conversation at the table discussions, pre-registration is required. We will select the participants based on the relevance of their topics and research experiences as demonstrated in their publications. We limit each concurrent table to have one facilitator and no more than 8 participants. In total, there is a limit of 60 participants. Please register by noon July 15, 2019 at https://www.gopeaks.org/2019-aom-pdw-on-management-knowledge-navigator.
WORKSHOP FORMAT

The organizers and facilitators are listed below, grouped by their major roles:

Host:
Victor Zitian Chen (University of North Carolina at Charlotte; GoPeaks.org)

Facilitators for the micro track – individual and team levels:
George Banks (University of North Carolina at Charlotte)
Frank Bosco (Virginia Commonwealth University; metaBUS.org)
Flore Bridoux (University of Amsterdam)
Anne Tsui (University of Notre Dame; RRBM.network)

Facilitators for the macro track – organizational and environmental levels:
Bill Glick (Rice University; RRBM.network)
Charles Dhanaraj (Temple University)
Steve Sauerwald (University of Illinois at Chicago)
Marc van Essen (University of South Carolina)

Schedule and setup (180 minutes):

Part I. To the entire audience:
15 minutes Opening introduction
30 minutes Moderated opening panels by table topic facilitators
   15 minutes Micro table facilitators’ opening thoughts on individual- and team-
       level frameworks: What have been done, and their limitations
   15 minutes Macro table facilitators on organizational-and environmental level
       frameworks: What have been done, and their limitations

Part II. Breakout sessions:
45 minutes Concurrent table discussions with participants, led by facilitators
   Micro track: two concurrent tables, each with two facilitators
   Macro table: two concurrent tables, each with two facilitators

Part III. To the entire audience:
40 minutes Conclusions
   15 minutes Conclusions (and open questions) from micro and macro tables
   25 minutes An open discussion with all participants on cross-level integration
   5 minutes Final remarks and conclusions
OVERVIEW OF THE WORKSHOP

New Legitimacy: From Novel Theory to Novel Knowledge Synthesis

“Without a common framework to organize findings, isolated knowledge does not cumulate.” ...Elinor Ostrom (2009: 419)

Organizational management is complicated (Hitt, Beamish, Jackson, & Mathieu, 2007). It deals with complex systems with many indispensable constituencies, parts, and processes, but they are studied piecewise in isolation. The literatures, knowledge, and data in business/management research are becoming increasingly fragmented, distributed, and inconsistent. It becomes exceedingly difficult to have holistic frameworks connecting all the fragments, and so effects across the fragments and their interacting factors are poorly understood.

A root cause of this fragmentation problem is that historically and currently the focus of management scholarship prizes new theory development over knowledge synthesis, such as meta-theoretical and meta-analytic studies. It is a natural outgrowth of the research scholars have undertaken for legitimacy at early stages of the management field. While foundational disciplines like economics and psychology have a long history of theory and research, management research emerged in the 1930s in response to the need for policy interventions to stimulate a depressed economy and provide more effective social services. With the explosion of business schools in the late 1950s, and reports by Gordon and Howell (1959) report, Pierson (1959), and Porter and McKibbin (1988) on the quality of management education (including research), management scholars came to prize the scientific development of theories and models, published in scientific journals.

Efforts of integrative frameworks gave way to pursuit of novel research testing hypotheses of interest from a scientific (often reductionist) view of complex management problems. Olian and Alutto (2007) report on the impact of management research further identified some problems with the research and its impact on practice. We are now 60 years post the Gordon and Howell (1959) and Pierson (1959) reports, 30 years post the Porter and McKibbin report, and more than 10 years post the Olian and Alutto report; the time for knowledge integration has arrived in a way that responds to the prior criticisms and to prepare for the needs in the future.

Thus, we propose this PDW as a continuation of a series of past events on knowledge accumulation/integration, as well as Responsible Research in Business & Management (RRBM.network), organized and/or participated by some of our facilitators, including:

- 2018 AOM PDWs on “Call for responsible research”.¹
- 2018 Editor’s Summit²
- 2018 AOM PDW on “Bringing meta-analytic evidence into the classroom: Teaching with metaBUS”.³
- 2017 AOM Symposium on “Time is ripe for knowledge synthesis: (Re)inventing technologies, outlets, and incentives” with five former AOM presidents.⁴

¹ The program can be found at https://rrbm.network/taking-action/presentations/rrbm-at-aom-2018/.
² The summit video can be watched at https://vimeo.com/264490536/4834534903.
³ The program can be found at http://www.metabus.org/publications/.
⁴ The program can be found at http://www.chenzitian.net/pub_files/aom2017_synthesis.pdf.
Specifically, this PDW builds on the prior efforts, focusing specifically on the intersection between responsible business/management research and knowledge accumulation/integration. We seek to initiate discussions on novel ways of knowledge integration by developing multi-disciplinary, meta-theoretical frameworks (“meta-frameworks”) that navigate our knowledge creation activities and translate the causes-and-effects for inclusive organizational performance. 2009 Nobel laureate late Elinor Ostrom provided perhaps the best definition for a meta-framework. To study complex phenomena, Ostrom (2010: 3) noted in her Nobel lecture: “Efforts to explain phenomena in the social world are organized at three levels of generality. Frameworks [...] are metatheoretical devices that help provide a general language for describing relationships at multiple levels and scales. Theories are efforts to build understanding by making core assumptions about specific working parts of frequently encountered phenomena and predicting general outcomes. Models are very specific working examples of a theory” (Italics added). Containing the most general set of variables and relationships, a meta-framework integrates disperse views and findings across disciplines and levels of analysis into a general language to explain any single theory and to compare multiple theories, as well as to offer a holistic basis of reasoning for data analytics.

Because most management phenomena or problems are multilevel, multifaceted, and complex (Hitt et al., 2007), we need to incentivize scholars to develop novel meta-frameworks to enable the knowledge accumulation and integration of causes-and-effects that cover various facets of organizational performance. The purpose of a meta-framework is not only to offer new insights, but primarily to synthesize a fragmented, distributed, and inconsistent literature of theories and findings into a relatively unbiased and holistic understanding of an indispensable problem, as well as to identify context boundaries to reconcile conflicting views and findings.

To our knowledge, there has yet to be a working guideline for developing such meta-frameworks in organizational management. To initiate the discussion, we suggest a meta-framework should have at least four components:

- **Meta-theorization**: discussing and comparing multiple alternative theories of a phenomenon/problem;
- **Synthesis**: organizing all concepts and their relations in into a unified taxonomic hierarchy, identifying similarities, reducing redundancies, contrasting differences, and reconciling conflicts;
- **Mapping**: listing the most generous set of constructs, variables and relationships into a unified causal- and correlation network for data analytics and/or meta-analysis;

---

5 The program can be found at [http://www.chenzitian.net/gopeaks/community_files/aom17_meta.pdf](http://www.chenzitian.net/gopeaks/community_files/aom17_meta.pdf).
6 The program can be found at [http://www.chenzitian.net/pub_files/aom2016_pdw.pdf](http://www.chenzitian.net/pub_files/aom2016_pdw.pdf).
8 The program can be found at [http://www.metabus.org/publications/](http://www.metabus.org/publications/).
Extendibility: explicating its flexibility in the face of new contexts or new evidence.

Shared Dependent Variables of Meta-frameworks: Multi-Stakeholder Satisfaction

“Inclusive organizations are open systems of opportunity in which all stakeholders have access to information, resources, and the capacity to fully contribute to their functioning” – 2019 AOM Meeting Program.

In this PDW, we focus on one particular set of DVs to develop meta-frameworks – all primary stakeholder satisfaction. We argue that if we have to simplify the complexity of management issues into one set of DVs, it is a plurality of organizational performance metrics concerning all primary stakeholders (see examples of metrics in Appendix 1), but not simpler. Among the most enduring themes in management studies is explaining the variations of organizational performance (March & Sutton, 1997). It is often considered “the ultimate dependent variable of interest for researchers concerned with just about any area of management” (Richard, Devinney, Yip, & Johnson, 2009: 719). Yet, measuring organizational performance is recognized as a highly complex and multifaceted task, with little agreement among management scholars on even the basic terminology, definition, and methodological approaches (Ford & Schellenberg, 1982; Kanter & Brinkerhoff, 1981; Singh, Darwish, & Potočnik, 2016; Venkatraman & Ramanujam, 1986). A persistent source of such complexity, as Campbell (1977) pointed out 40 years ago, is that performance criteria have to be chosen with reference to an organization’s various constituencies, stakeholders, and interest groups.

Engaging all primary stakeholders’ interests into organizational management is considered an inclusive practice to achieve sustainable growth of an organization. Formalized by Freeman (1984: 46)’s stakeholder theory, a stakeholder refers to “any individual or group who can affect or is affected by, the achievement of the organization’s objectives.” In an open ecosystem, primary stakeholder groups of organizations include investors, customers, employees, and the community/environment in which the firm operates (Tantalo & Priem, 2016). Scholars like Hill and Jones (1992) as well as Mitchell, Weaver, Agle, Bailey, and Carlson (2016) formally proposed a stakeholder-agency theory, arguing that the top management of an organization is a fiduciary agent responsible for all primary stakeholders’ interests. However, the current literature either focuses on one single stakeholder group, or lump different stakeholder groups into an aggregated index such as corporate social performance.

Despite growing academic interest in all-stakeholder engagement as the purpose of inclusive organization management, it is an extremely challenging task to implement in practice without an integrative meta-framework (Jensen, 2002; Sundaram & Inkpen, 2004). Driven by their own utility functions, different stakeholders may require different definitions, criteria, and methodologies for measuring a firm’s value creation (Richard et al., 2009; Harrison & Wicks, 2013), suggesting that satisfying one stakeholder group may be at odds with others (Chakravarthy, 1986). And, the organization as a whole is often fragmented into specialized functions and teams that corresponds to different stakeholder issues (e.g., HRM for employees, marketing for customers, corporate strategy/finance for investors, compliance for community/environment, etc.). Without an integrative framework, managers have to simplify this complexity and prioritize their attention, and the stakeholder groups with the most salient status (e.g., power, legitimacy, and urgency) such as shareholders and their agents tend to dominate the bargaining process for the performance criteria (Kanter & Brinkerhoff, 1981; Tantalo & Priem, 2016).
In summary, our knowledge about all primary stakeholders is fragmented into silos in both management research and practice. We need integrative meta-frameworks to help navigate the causes-and-effects from different stakeholder perspectives to help scholars link knowledge among silos, and to assist managers locate “best practices”. To do so, this PDW seeks to crowdsource ideas from participants from diverse backgrounds and to develop a novel umbrella organizing theories, findings, and research agenda to integrate the increasingly fragmented knowledge silos in management research.

We will also discuss several technological and methodological issues concerning all levels of analysis: (1) What existing outlets (e.g., metaBUS.org) are available to host and curate this umbrella, so it can be continuously retested and updated as more theories and findings emerge? (2) What novel incentives and/or outlets can be created to complement these existing outlets (e.g., uploading of findings by authors themselves rather than a separate team)? (3) What criteria should we use to evaluate the quality of meta-frameworks and, more broadly, knowledge synthesis?

We group the discussions at two concurrent tables for each track, both trying to develop a nested, multi-level framework to holistically explain organizational performance for all primary stakeholders as the DVs. At the micro table, scholars discuss how to integrate various explanations at the individual- and team-levels. At the macro table, scholars focus on the integration of explanations at the organizational- and (external) environmental-levels. Following the concurrent tables, a discussion with all participants will be hosted to further brainstorm a more comprehensive meta-framework covering all four levels, as well as some technological issues.

Micro Example Topics: Thinking from Inside-Out

- A holistic understanding of the motivation and behaviors of different stakeholder individuals: What are the major motivation- and behavioral theories about different stakeholders (e.g., consumer satisfaction and behaviors, employee satisfaction and behaviors, investor objective functions and behaviors, and concerns and behaviors of community/environment activists, etc.)? Do these theories (often located in different disciplines) share a common structure? Can we integrate these theories into a general micro-framework that can be used to further specify what multi-stakeholder satisfaction is, explain any single stakeholder’s behaviors as well as compare different stakeholders?
- A holistic understanding of the motivation and behavior of the CEO: What are the major motivation- and behavioral theories about the CEO’s orientation among stakeholder issues? Can we integrate these theories into a general micro-framework about the CEO’s orientation among stakeholder issues?
- A holistic understanding of leadership at the middle and lower levels of the organization (Supervisory Leadership): What are the major theories about the motivation, attitude, values and behavior of leaders who manage employees? Do these theories differ between leaders in the front line (managing frontline employees) and leaders in the middle (managing those who are leaders themselves)? Can we generate an integrative framework of leadership at the lower and middle levels of the organization? How do these leadership frameworks take into account attention to the satisfaction of various stakeholders of the organization?
- A holistic understanding of the conflicts and member satisfaction of a top management team (TMT): What are the major theories about stakeholder representation, conflicts, and
performance/satisfaction of a TMT? Can we integrate these theories into a general micro-framework about TMT conflicts, satisfaction, and performance?

- A holistic understanding of the interactions among individual stakeholders in order to explain how, when, and why individual stakeholders organize to act as a collective in their dealings with a firm: What are the major theories about cooperation among individuals? Can we integrate these theories into a general framework about collective action of stakeholders?

**Macro Example Topics: Thinking from Outside-In**

- A holistic understanding of the organizational structures, incentive mechanisms, and governance on stakeholder relations, engagement, and satisfactions: What are the major organizational-level theories on different stakeholder issues? Can we integrate them into an organizational-level framework that can be used to explain organizational performance for any single stakeholder group or for different stakeholder groups?

- A holistic understanding of the influence and confluence of macroeconomic and institutional factors on stakeholder interests and influence: How are stakeholder interests and influence determined by macroeconomic and institutional factors (e.g., market of stakeholder inputs, regulatory/legal protection of stakeholders, social movement, cognitive/cultural schemes, etc.)?

**Other General Example Topics:**

- Many issues do not have a clear cut among the different levels (individuals within firms, organizational, and inter-organizational or organization-environment levels), and thus need further integration across levels. Inevitably, frameworks at one level may touch issues that would require inputs from the other level(s). Though ambitious and may be conceptually challenging, we may consider further integrating all the levels into an interconnected and nested framework? How do we apply the framework into an integrative data analytics platform that monitors all factors at once and continuously (re)tests all hypotheses and fills interactions across models?

- What existing outlets are available to visualize, host, curate these frameworks, so that they are continuously retested and updated as new theories and evidence arise (e.g., experiences from metaBUS.org, theorizeit.org, open access mega journals, etc.)? What novel incentives and outlets do we need to create to complement the existing efforts (e.g., uploading of findings by authors rather than a separate team)?

- How do we evaluate the quality of meta-frameworks and, more broadly, knowledge synthesis? For instance, can we design a metric based on replicability and relative weight analysis in meta-analysis? How do we fit knowledge synthesis (e.g., construct mapping, knowledge curating, and meta-analysis) into scholarly performance assessment?

**Bios of Organizer/Facilitators**

George Banks is an associate professor of management at the Belk College of Business at University of North Carolina at Charlotte. His research interests include leadership and team development, strategic human resource management, and research methods such as meta-analysis. Dr. Banks’ publications include journal articles in top-tier outlets, such as *Science, Academy of Management Journal, Journal of Management*, and *Journal of Applied Psychology*. He was the recipient of the 2017 Sage Publications/CARMA Early Career Award
from the Research Methods Division of the Academy of Management. Dr. Banks currently serves as a senior associate editor at *The Leadership Quarterly*.

Frank Bosco is associate professor of management at Virginia Commonwealth University and director of metaBUS.org, a winner of the 2013 NEH Digging into Data Challenge and funded by the NSF, SHRM Foundation, SSHRC, Canadian Centre for Advanced Leadership, and the VCU PeRQ Fund. metaBUS is a scientific knowledge curation, synthesis, management, and translation platform that provides free access to a search engine of more than 1,000,000 hand-curated organizational research findings. The findings are *manually* classified according to an easy-to-use branching taxonomy of more than 5,000 topics, allowing the now nearly 1,200 registered users (a mix of scientists and practitioners) to rapidly explore, summarize, and visualize evidence on the science of organizations.

Flore Bridoux is an Associate Professor of Strategy at the University of Amsterdam. Her current research focuses on the management of stakeholders and of human capital. In particular, she studies how firms and networks of stakeholder relationships should be organized to motivate employees/stakeholders to contribute to value creation, in particular when value creation takes the form of a social dilemma. Her work has been published in, among others, *Academy of Management Review, Journal of Management,* and *Strategic Management Journal*. She is an Associate Editor for *Organization & Environment* and serves on the editorial boards of *Academy of Management Review* and *Strategic Organization*.

Victor Z. Chen is associate professor of international management at Belk College of Business, University of North Carolina at Charlotte. His research focuses on the complexity of institutional environments, corporate governance, and scientific knowledge synthesis for data analytics. Between 2011 and 2018, he was a nonresident fellow, global coordinator and editor of a global research network on emerging-market multinational enterprises at Columbia Center on Sustainable Investment. Currently, he is leading a new initiative Global OpenLabs for Performance-Enhancement Analytics and Knowledge System (GoPeaks.org), an open innovation community to synthesize scientific knowledge into meta-frameworks concerning multi-stakeholder performance indicators for data analytics. His research has been published or forthcoming in *Journal of Management, Journal of Corporate Finance, Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* among others, and awarded Best Paper Awards or Finalists by AOM and Academy of International Business (AIB).

Charles Dhanaraj joins the Fox School as the H.F. “Gerry” Lenfest Professor of Strategy. He serves as the Founding Executive Director of Fox’s Center for Translational Research in Business, and Executive Director of the Fox School’s Executive Doctorate in Business Administration program. Dhanaraj’s specialization includes strategic partnerships, global innovation, and emerging markets. He published several high-impact articles and award-winning cases. In 2017, he was elected as a Fellow of the Academy of International Business (AIB), a distinction held by elite researchers for outstanding contributions to scholarly development in international business. He serves as vice president for the AIB and deputy editor of *Cross Cultural and Strategy Management*, as well as the editorial boards of six major journals.

Bill Glick is H. Joe Nelson III Professor of Management, served as dean of the Jesse H. Jones Graduate School of Business from 2005 to 2016. As a prolific scholar in top management journals, Dr. Glick was inducted as one of 33 charter members of the Academy of Management's Journals Hall of Fame. He was also named as one of the top 100 authors in management based on the numbers of citations to their research. His primary teaching and research are in the areas of
organizational behavior and strategy. He is the former Chair of the board of the AACSB International, a Founding Member of the Community for Responsible Research in Business and Management, and on the board of directors of Peak AI Solutions, providing data science solutions for the energy industry.

Steve Sauerwald is an assistant professor of strategic management at the College of Business Administration, University of Illinois at Chicago. His research interests include comparative corporate governance, shareholder activism, executive compensation, and social responsibility. He is a recipient of Distinguished Paper Award from AOM BPS 2013, Best Paper Award of AOM SIM 2013, and Fulbright Scholarship 2007-08. His research has been published or forthcoming in *Strategic Management Journal*, *Journal of Management*, and *Journal of Management Studies* among others.

Anne S. Tsui is Adjunct Distinguished Professor at the University of Notre Dame, Motorola Professor Emerita of International Management at Arizona State University, and concurrently Visiting Distinguished Professor at Peking University and Fudan University, China. She is the 67th President and Fellow of the Academy of Management (www.aomonline.org), 14th Editor the *Academy of Management Journal*, Founding President of the International Association for Chinese Management Research (www.IACMR.org) and Founding Editor-in-Chief of *Management and Organization Review*. She is involved in a global project on “responsible research in business and management” (www.RRBM.network), working with a multi-disciplinary team of leading scholars in the field of accounting, finance, marketing, management, and operations management from over 20 universities in ten countries.

Marc van Essen is an associate professor in the Sonoco International Business Department and director of the undergraduate international business program at the Moore School, and permanent visiting professor at EMLYON Business School. He has previously worked as a professor of Entrepreneurship and Innovation at the School of Management at the University of St. Gallen. His research interests include entrepreneurship, comparative corporate governance, international business, family business and meta-analytic research methods. The results of this research have been published in leading journals, including *Academy of Management Journal*, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, *Journal of International Business Studies*, *Journal of Management*, *Journal of Management Studies*, and *Organization Science* and others.
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Appendix 1. Examples of Inclusive Organizational Performance Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Customer</td>
<td>1.1. Customer commitment (e.g., customer loyalty, retention, trust, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2. Customer satisfaction (e.g., satisfaction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3. Brand value (e.g., brand awareness, brand value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4. Product &amp; service quality (e.g., product quality, product innovation, customer service quality, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Employee</td>
<td>2.1. Employee commitment (e.g., morale, turnover, absenteeism, work attitude, retention, citizenship behaviors, job involvement, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2. Employee satisfaction (e.g., job/pay satisfaction, perceived justice, perceived fairness, perceived leader support, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3. Employee compensation, protection and benefits (e.g., salary, job security, unionization, contract breach, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4. Employee health (e.g., health indicators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community/Environment</td>
<td>3.1. Symbolic social performance (e.g., reporting what a firm has done)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2. Substantive social performance (e.g., impact a firm has made)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3. Symbolic environmental performance (e.g., reporting what a firm has done)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4. Substantive environmental performance (e.g., impact a firm has made)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5. Unspecified (Both social and environmental performance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Investor</td>
<td>4.1. Accounting-based performance (financial/productivity performance measures based on accounting data, e.g., return on assets, return on sales, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2. Stock market-based performance (financial/productivity performance measures based on current capital/stock market data, e.g., cumulative abnormal returns, return on equity, Tobin’s q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3. Survey-based performance (manager’s subjective reporting of financial/productivity performance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4. Growth-based performance (a firm’s growth in sales, market share, and other key operational measures)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Chen, Duran, Sauerwald, van Essen, & Hitt, working paper.
Confirmation letter from organizers/facilitators:

From: Bill Glick <Bill.Glick@rice.edu>
Sent: 2018 年 12 月 29 日 12:36
To: Victor Zitian Chen <zchen23@uncc.edu>
Subject: Re: Happy holidays and updates on our PDW

Hi Victor,
Thanks for pulling this together. Very good shape.

I will be at the PDW if the proposal is accepted.

Happy New Year.

Bill Glick
H. Joe Nelson III Professor of Management
(713) 829-5928

Founding Member of RRBM
Please join us:
https://www.rrbm.network

From: Bridoux, Flore <f.m.bridoux@uva.nl>
Sent: 2019 年 1 月 6 日 17:45
To: Victor Zitian Chen <zchen23@uncc.edu>
Subject: RE: AOM PDW

Dear Victor,

Here is also my commitment to participate:

I would like to confirm that I will participate as a facilitator in the PDW entitled “Building a management knowledge navigator: Meta-frameworks of organizational management for all primary stakeholders”, should it be accepted.

Thanks for organizing,

Flore

From: Anne Tsui <Anne.Tsui@asu.edu>
Sent: 2018 年 12 月 27 日 22:42
To: Victor Zitian Chen <zchen23@uncc.edu>
Cc: 'Charles Dhanaraj' <charles.dhanaraj@temple.edu>; 'George Banks' <gbanks3@uncc.edu>; fabosco@vcu.edu; f.m.bridoux@uva.nl; 'Bill Glick' <Bill.Glick@rice.edu>; 'Hitt, Michael A' <MHitt@mays.tamu.edu>; 'Hitt, Michael' <m.a.hitt@tcu.edu>; 'Steve Sauerwald' <ssauerw@uic.edu>; 'VanEssen, Marc' <Marc.Vanessen@moore.sc.edu>
Subject: Re: Happy holidays and updates on our PDW

Dear Victor,

I will be at the PDW if the proposal is accepted.
Thanks.

Anne

Anne S. Tsui
Motorola Professor of International Management Emerita
W.P. Carey School of Business
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85281

From: George Banks <gebanks@gmail.com>
Sent: 2018 年 12 月 27 日 14:09
To: Victor Zitian Chen <zchen23@uncc.edu>
Subject: Re: Happy holidays and updates on our PDW

Hey Victor,

I confirm to participate as a facilitator in this PDW entitled “Building a management knowledge navigator: Meta-frameworks of organizational management for all primary stakeholders”, should it be accepted.

Happy holidays!

George

From: VanEssen, Marc <Marc.Vanessen@moore.sc.edu>
Sent: 2018 年 12 月 23 日 12:58
To: Victor Zitian Chen <zchen23@uncc.edu>
Subject: Re: Happy holidays and updates on our PDW

I confirm to participate as a facilitator in this PDW entitled “Building a management knowledge navigator: Meta-frameworks of organizational management for all primary stakeholders”, should it be accepted.

From: Charles Dhanaraj <charles.dhanaraj@temple.edu>
Sent: 2018 年 12 月 28 日 8:01
To: Victor Zitian Chen <zchen23@uncc.edu>
Subject: AOM PDW

Dear Victor,

Thank you for organizing the PDW. I will be there at the AOM to participate. Thanks,

Charles

From: Frank A Bosco <fabosco@vcu.edu>
Sent: 2018 年 10 月 18 日 18:27
To: 'Victor Zitian Chen' <zchen23@uncc.edu>
Greetings Victor et al.,

Thanks for your enthusiasm! Some of us on this message string have allocated years of effort to enabling “meta-frameworks” and, thus, I believe we could have an interesting collaboration/discussion.

I would be delighted to contribute and will retain a 3+3 spot. Please keep me posted.

I’m also open to arranging a web meeting to discuss before the AOM deadline.

Cheers,

Frank