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Academics continuously receive a battering from the business community about their research and publication directions. I hear words like “impractical,” “irrelevant,” “impossible to read by decision makers,” and others much more profane, but which somehow, don’t seem to reduce with time. Decision makers in business, government, and social communities are still not convinced that the majority of research in the decision sciences is going to have any impact.
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FROM THE EDITOR

KRISHNA S. DHIR, Editor, Berry College

This issue of Decision Line marks the season of heart-warming autumn colors. We will soon gather in Baltimore at the annual meeting of the Institute. Hopefully, by then, Wall Street will have calmed down. The stress of its nightmare hiccup will undoubtedly be soothed by the warmth of fellowship in Baltimore. I hope that the information herein will help you make the most of the upcoming annual meeting.

As a follow-up to her letter in the July issue of Decision Line, DSI President Norma Harrison calls for a re-examination of practices that guide decision science research across cultures and economies. The needs of emerging economies are not adequately served by approaches developed in the Western milieu. Their sophistication is often inappropriate and unworkable in Asian conditions. She applauds those daring researchers who take up the charge of socially rooted research “in the nontraditional, non-mainstream, and sometimes politically incorrect or uncharted waters” across cultures.

This issue brings you an excellent array of essays. In the Research Issues feature column, Kenneth Bartkus of Utah State University discusses a strategic approach to providing undergraduate students in business schools with relevant research experiences. He calls for the development of a consortium of schools that would work “to promote greater synergies in undergraduate research.”

In the Production/Operations Management feature column, John Wacker of Arizona State University and Iowa State University points to potential conceptual flaws that can diminish the importance and impact of empirical research. He states that some common difficulties lie in classical philosophy of science that determines specific requirements for theory development, for example, conservatism, uniqueness, internal consistency, generalizability, and abstraction.

Vijay Kannan of Utah State University recently taught at the Indian Institute of Management in Lucknow, India. In the International Issues feature column, he presents his “observations and reflections on the challenges of and opportunities for business education in India.” He concludes that to meet the challenge of its enhanced global economic position, India will have to redefine the role of business education in its economic development. Traditional academic models would have to be abandoned and its standards will have to be upgraded.

In the E-Commerce feature column, J. P. Shim of Mississippi State University discusses the popularity of different social networking sites in different cultures. For instance, he characterizes Korean society as one that is collective, in contrast to the individualistic character of the U.S. society. This factor, along with others like attitudes toward privacy, interaction among users, and sharing and distribution of information, influences acceptance of various social networking sites. He calls for research on social networking in different geographic regions around the world.

In the Deans’ Perspective feature column, Marvin Bouillon of Iowa State University describes how his institution increased the number and quality of students in its Master of Accounting degree program without additional funding to support their efforts. The essay offers a number of practical, useful suggestions. This case study will warm the heart of any business school administrator and faculty member.

In the Doctoral Student Issues feature column, Andrew Schwarz of Louisiana State University, Jason Thatcher of Clemson University, and Varun Grover, also of Clemson University, team up to offer excellent advice to an assistant professor with a newly minted doctorate. They describe how the skills required to be a good doctoral student differ from those required to be a good assistant professor. They provide a very useful road map, replete with challenges, pitfalls, and surprises. They recommend practical strategies for the assistant professors to set forth on the path to success.
The two candidates for the elected position of DSI president-elect—G. Keong Leong of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas and David Olson of the University of Nebraska, Lincoln—provide their visions of the Institute.

G. Keong Leong
My vision for the Institute is that of enhanced value to its members. To achieve this vision, the Institute has to increase its reputation through international engagement, improved quality of its research publications and annual meetings, and use of technology.

Our Institute’s non-U.S. membership has varied between 12 and 18 percent of the total membership (see Table 1). The Academy of Management has more than 30 percent of its members from outside the U.S. Attendance at our Institute’s annual meetings over the last four years has ranged from 1,190 in 2005 to 1,439 in 2004, with the all-time record of 1,780 set in San Diego in 1990. Nevertheless, non-U.S. participants at the annual meetings have generally accounted for only about 7 percent of total attendance. For future growth, our annual meetings must continue to attract more international participation.

The U.S. offers a mature market. Other academic organizations, including AACSB, have had to deal with this very challenge. Our Institute started the Asia-Pacific chapter in 1994, the Mexico chapter in 2004, and the Indian Subcontinent chapter in 2006. While these represent steps in the right direction, these chapters were not formed as an outcome of a coherent strategic plan.

The Institute needs a strategic plan for its international expansion. The European Union has a large academic base of potential members for our Institute. Setting up a regional chapter in Europe should be a strategic priority for us. Hopefully, the upcoming international meeting in France will provide the impetus to start a European chapter.

The internationalization of our Institute can begin right here in the U.S. A number of non-U.S. students attend doctoral programs in the U.S. While many stay back to work and live in the U.S., many others return to careers in their home countries. Foreign students who have associated with the Institute while in the U.S. will likely continue their association on return to their respective countries. The Asia Pacific regional chapter has been successful to a large extent because of U.S.-educated members promoting the chapter to their colleagues. We should make every effort to invite and welcome doctoral students to the Institute. Many doctoral students have already found a friendly, familiar, and affordable environment for engagement and networking at our various regional meetings. Regional chapters of the Institute could serve as a very important role in cultivating future members.

Indeed, historically the Institute has not capitalized on the potential contribution of the regional chapters. Their role is not made explicit in the Institute’s Constitution and Bylaws. In fact, with regional chapters now extending outside the U.S., they can play a crucial role in spreading the name of the Institute globally and providing enhanced value to its members. Regional networks can increase participation at the Institute’s annual meetings and vice-versa. For instance, going beyond soliciting regional award-winning authors to participate in the Institute’s annual meeting, we could offer them complimentary registrations as well. Also, to enhance the integration of the regional chapters, the Conference Information System used by the Institute could be extended to the regional chapters. The regional chapters need such support.

Emerging technologies offer excellent opportunities, as well. The Institute has already redesigned its website to promote its corporate identity and brand. This design should be extended to the regional chapters to create a consistent brand image. The Internet is an excellent marketing tool to reach prospective members worldwide at minimal cost. An analysis of the Institute’s website indicates that currently our members use it mainly for placement information (72,850 views), annual meeting information (29,090 views), and paper submissions to conferences (23,468 views). We would do well to improve our website to address the global audience and their interests in these areas and others as well.

Table 1: The Institute membership and conference participation (data provided by the Institute’s Home Office).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Members</th>
<th>Non-US Members (%)</th>
<th>Conference Location</th>
<th>Conference Attendees</th>
<th>International Attendees (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td>341 (17.6%)</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>1221</td>
<td>79 (6.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>337 (16.3%)</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>99 (7.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2,170</td>
<td>397 (18.3%)</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>85 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>280 (12.4%)</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>1439</td>
<td>59 (4.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,206</td>
<td>323 (14.6%)</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We should also remain ever alert to emerging decision science disciplines that remain under served. Supply Chain Management is one such discipline. Our Institute should take the lead in further developing this area through innovative research of topics such as sustainable development and supplier ethics management, a dedicated journal, and other forums. In areas where we are already strong, we can gain greater heights. For instance, we could expand the reach of our highly regarded flagship publication, Decision Sciences, to practitioners and researchers by showcasing selected articles on the Internet using podcasts. Podcasts allow members and non-members to easily access information of interest to them. In addition, selected articles from Decision Line and Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education and presentations by the best paper award winners and instructional innovation award competition finalists at the annual meetings could be podcasted and made available on the Institute’s website. Podcast links could be sent to leading business publications and deans of business schools worldwide to alert them of information that might be relevant to them. This could lead to increased interest in the Institute and result in new members. Podcasts can be an important medium for disseminating cutting edge research, augmenting our traditional channels. The publicity gained through these podcasts could increase the citation of research published by the Institute and impact factor of its journals, enhancing the Institute’s reputation and stature.

I wish to thank the Institute for giving me the opportunity to run for the prestigious position of president-elect. Having served in many leadership capacities for the Institute, I feel confident that with your support, we can collectively enhance the international reputation of the Institute and membership value.

David L. Olson

In my opinion the Decision Sciences Institute is one of the more inclusive organizations in academia. We have provided a structure for diverse activities across all sub-disciplines within business. We have outlets for cutting edge research in Decision Sciences, as well as a leading pedagogical research journal in Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education. I have had the honor of participating in innovative education competitions and paper presentation tracks. The Institute has long provided similar venues for case studies. There have been special programs at the annual meeting for degree programs (I organized the first Ph.D. program of this type at the suggestion of Lori Franz, who organized an MBA program the year before). There have been other special programs for focus areas such as service operations, one of which was presented in 1996 when I chaired the annual meeting.

Regions have always been a key part of the Institute. This is a crucial service provided to many members. While the schools I have been with have emphasized the annual meeting, and there are so many Institute activities that one cannot attend them all, I have participated in a limited way in regional meetings as a presenter or coauthor of papers. This does not diminish in my mind the importance of regions to the Institute. They are a fundamental element in the organization’s future success, because they serve as incubators for future members and leaders of the organization.

I was an early supporter of the Institute offering international programs. The international meetings offered by the organization offer a means to globalize the Institute. The decisions of the 1990s that have led to a series of international meetings as well as the formation of international regions should prove to be highly beneficial to the organization’s ongoing success.

My philosophy is that we should continue to mutually support programs that expand the value offered by the Institute—in forms of research outlets of high quality, in forms of special programs, in forms of regional participation, and a growing international presence. There are many competitive organizations, a number of which I belong to. With responsibilities in MIS, the Decision Sciences Institute faces attractive alternatives in ICIS and AMCIS that have drawn some of my energy. In operations management, similar alternatives have grown in the form of POMS and OMA. Quantitative work has always had an alternative in INFORMS and its predecessors. There are strong organizations for all of the other functional areas of business studies. The Institute historically marketed the position that it was the second choice for all areas. DSII’s strategy has also been to be the first choice for interdisciplinary activities. That is a tough sell during periods of budget contraction. But we have survived through some tough times, and I think that this is still a viable strategy. We cannot be everything to everyone, but I think that it would be a mistake to focus on any one aspect of the programs our organization has offered.

I have served on the board in the role of at-large vice president six years. In all that time, the Institute has had a very healthy financial profile. I understand that last year was not as successful. Much of that is determined by the attendance at the annual meeting. I don’t know the particulars with respect to the past shortfall. My philosophy is to of course return to fiscal solvency on an annual basis, while at the same time seeking to avoid increases in the dues structure as much as possible. But the first priority is to attain at least a break-even posture every year.

It is my view that the Decision Sciences Institute has succeeded in obtaining membership by offering many opportunities to participate. We have many committees, each with what I consider to be many members. I have served on quite a few of these committees, and have always been impressed with the openness in which they have been conducted, offering all an opportunity to
influence what the Institute does. I think this is a real strength of the organization, leading to greater participation and commitment on the part of our members, which is crucial to our survival (which in turn directly impacts fiscal solvency).

My vision of the organization is that we continue to offer the diverse services that we have in the past. DSI attained a preeminent reputation for its job placement services. I believe this should continue to be a strength. I know that in the area of MIS, the industry has experienced some retraction, with quite a few more applicants than positions. However, we should continue to support those areas where we have had success in the past. We also should continue the participative committee structure which enables continued success.

As to job qualifications, I have been a steady participant in Institute activities for over two decades. I served on the Membership Committee from 1984-1986, and on the Innovative Education Committee in 1986-1988. I served as the Innovative Education Committee chair in 1987-1988, and as track chair in a number of annual meetings, most in the area of Decision Support Systems. I served on the Doctoral Affairs Committee 1989-1991 and 1994-1996, the last year as chair and as coordinator of the first Ph.D. Curricular Issues Program. I have been elected as an at-large vice president in 1989, 1994, and 2003, and served a total of six years on the board. The most taxing assignment I have had was as chair of the annual meeting in San Diego in 1997.

I have participated nearly every year since 1980 in the form of research papers presented at meetings, some winning awards. I was honored to be named a fellow of the Institute in 1998. I have also participated heavily as a session chair, presenter, and discussant at the annual meeting.

The six years on the board exposed me to a variety of views, and an understanding of how the organization operates. Carol Latta has documented the many diverse functions of the Institute in a very thorough manner. But each of those six boards had their own personal-

David Olson is the James & H.K. Stuart Chancellor’s Distinguished Chair in the College of Business Administration, University of Nebraska, Lincoln. dolson3@unl.edu

---

**NOMINATIONS**, from page 1

The 2007-08 Nominating Committee, chaired by Mark M. Davis (Bentley College), has completed the slate of nominees for the 2009 election of officers. The Nominating Committees for the regional subdivisions also are compiling the names of nominees who are running this year for the office of vice presidents elected by the regional subdivisions.

Ballots will be sent in January 2009. Additional nominations may be made by November 30, 2008. Each additional nomination must be made by petition signed by at least five percent of the members and submitted to the Institute’s Secretary, c/o the Institute’s Home Office, 35 Broad Street, Atlanta, GA 30303.

Additional nominations for vice presidents elected by the regional subdivisions may be made upon petition signed by at least five percent of the regional subdivisions’ members.

Please be sure that the DSI Home Office has your current email address!

---

**Submitting articles to Decision Line**

Members are invited to submit essays of about 2,000 to 2,500 words in length on topics of their interest, especially articles of concern to a broad, global audience. Please send essays (including brief bio and photo) to either the respective feature editor or to Editor Krishna Dhir.
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**Research Issues**
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**In the News**

John Davies, Victoria University in Wellington, New Zealand
john.davies@vuw.ac.nz

**Membership Roundtable**

Robert L. Andrews, Virginia Commonwealth University
rlandrew@vcu.edu

**Production/Operations Management**
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d.samson@unimelb.edu.au

**Research Issues**

Miles Nicholls, RMIT University, Australia
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The Research Group Framework: A Strategic Approach to Undergraduate Research Experiences in Colleges and Schools of Business

by Kenneth R. Bartkus, Utah State University

This essay proposes the ‘Research Group’ framework as a means of enhancing undergraduate research experiences (URE) in colleges and schools of business. Organized along the lines of a scholarly think tank with faculty serving as ‘managing partners’ and students as ‘associates,’ the framework provides an effective means of preparing students for success in graduate school and their chosen careers. In this essay, I articulate the underlying framework, the challenges of developing a formal undergraduate research program, and invite further discussion on the role of undergraduate research in business schools.

There is little doubt that undergraduate research experiences provide meaningful benefits to students, faculty, universities, and society. Elgren and Hensel (2006), for example, note that “Inviting students to invest intellectually in a project gives them the opportunity to help shape its direction, exert some of their own creativity, and experience the joy of intellectual ‘ownership’ of the products resulting from the effort.” Similarly, Schneider (2004) maintains that undergraduate research programs can “result in more successful and competitive alumni, serve as a selling point for recruiting freshman, provide positive publicity, lead to greater overall productivity, and impart a more mature learning atmosphere.” Lopatto (2006) suggests that undergraduate research contributes to the personal development of students including growth in self-confidence, increased tolerance for obstacles, interest in the discipline, and a sense of accomplishment. Gates et al. (1999) maintain that undergraduate research helps better prepare undergraduate students for graduate research requirements. Finally, Ulmbach and Porter (2002) found that faculty contact with students and a research emphasis had a “significant impact on satisfaction with education in the major and the perceived impact that college had on skill development.”

Unfortunately, too few colleges and schools of business participate in undergraduate research. In particular, while the number of bachelor’s degrees conferred in the U.S. is approximately 22 percent of the total (U.S. Department of Education 2006), undergraduate business projects at the 2007 National Conference on Undergraduate Research (NCUR) represented only 2.3 percent of the total. Given that NCUR is the major national conference for disseminating undergraduate research, the relative lack of participation by business schools is telling.

With that said, it is important to acknowledge that there are valid reasons for not implementing a formal undergraduate research program (e.g., lack of funding, lack of a research emphasis, few incentives). I believe, however, that another reason is the lack of a well-defined framework. The purpose of this essay, therefore, is to address this issue by presenting a framework that was used by the Jon M. Huntsman School of Business to develop The Research Group™. A recipient of the 2008 “Exemplary Model” award from the American Association of
University Administrators, the remainder of this essay describes The Research Group in more detail. In this regard, four fundamental elements of the program will be discussed: (1) mission, (2) administrative structure, (3) guiding principles, and (4) implementation challenges.

With regard to the mission, The Research Group has been designed as a scholarly think tank comprised of business and university scholars, corporate leaders, and qualified undergraduate students who are dedicated to the advancement of high quality research experiences. In this sense, its core purpose is to provide students with the opportunity to develop competencies in the use of the scientific method as it relates to business and public policy issues. In turn, these competencies prepare students for greater success in graduate school and their chosen careers. To provide philosophical guidance, the motto of The Research Group is Veritas et Virtus (Truth and Knowledge).

To support the mission, an administrative structure was developed to reflect a real-world business organization. In doing so, the structure sought to bridge the gap between purely educational and purely work environments. This led to the following:

1. **Director:** Responsible for coordinating the research activities of the group and to serve as a liaison to the business community and college/university administration.

2. **Managing Partners:** Business scholars who are responsible for coordinating individual projects in their respective business disciplines, and serve on the advisory board for the program.

3. **Faculty Partners:** Business scholars who participate in student/faculty research collaborations. Faculty Partnerships are open to all faculty at the university.

4. **Corporate Partners:** Recognized industry leaders who provide advisory counsel to the group and serve as liaisons to the business community.

5. **Associates and Senior Associates:** Students engaged in collaborative research with faculty.

An important benefit of this structure is that it allows recognition of faculty and student contributions that might otherwise be overlooked in less formal models. For example, students can list their participation on their resumes as work experience (e.g., students can participate in the program as an internship experience). Similarly, faculty can list mentoring as service, teaching, and research activity. Finally, the structure helps communicate the benefits of the program to relevant stakeholders (such as students, future employers, graduate schools, the state legislature, and boards of regents and trustees, among others).

Goals and objectives were then developed to serve as guiding principles:

1. **Undergraduate Research Experiences should be meaningful.**
   - Meaningful research experiences promote an understanding of the scientific method and its application to business-related issues. The scientific method is at the core of business and an understanding of its application to solving business questions is essential.
   - Meaningful experiences meet the career and academic interests of students. They are not simply another hurdle in the education experience.
   - Undergraduate research experiences are time efficient. Most projects can be completed in one academic year or less.
   - Meaningful research experiences involve students as collaborators rather than merely assistants. The real world will treat graduates as part of a team and not as students. The research group framework helps facilitate this transition.

2. **Undergraduate research experiences prepare students for graduate study.**
   - The program prepares students for graduate study, where an understanding of the principles of scientific inquiry are essential.

3. **Undergraduate research experiences involve presentations.**
   - Presentation of research allows students to gain valuable experience that will be useful in graduate school and/or their chosen careers.
   - Students are encouraged to present at national, state, and regional venues specifically dedicated to undergraduate research (e.g., National Conference on Undergraduate Research) as well as professional conferences.

4. **Undergraduate research experiences include participation in Research Forums/Symposiums at the university.**
   - Research Forums/Symposiums within the school of business allow students to share ideas and develop an esprit de corps.

5. **Undergraduate research programs participate in scholarly organizations dedicated to undergraduate research.**
   - The National Council on Undergraduate Research is the major organization dedicated to student achievement in research. It is administered through the contributions of interested faculty. Many states and regions are also developing their own organizations to promote undergraduate research.
   - The Council on Undergraduate Research is the major organization dedicated to faculty development in the area of undergraduate research. Faculty play an important role in the direction of the organization.

Despite these guiding principles, there are additional challenges such as the identification and qualification of students, the recruitment and motivation of faculty, the identification of meaningful projects, and the identification of appropriate research venues.
With regard to academic standards, we started with grade point average (i.e., 3.50 or above). While somewhat arbitrary, we reasoned that the program needed to be selective given limited faculty resources. Similarly, we considered setting limits based on class level (e.g., junior and above), but ultimately felt that this was overly restrictive. In this regard, it was argued that we could have a stronger influence if we attracted the most qualified students early in their academic careers. Two of our most productive associates began their involvement with The Research Group as first-year students.

Perhaps the most difficult challenge has been to determine whether or not a particular student has the “right stuff.” We found that while some students expressed interest in undergraduate research (and met the academic standards), they did not appear to have the intellectual maturity to be successful in the program. Oftentimes, we only found this out after the student was admitted to the program. As such, we believe it is important to select students based on both merit and potential.

To address this challenge, we typically ask students to submit a one-page essay outlining their educational/career goals and, in addition, why they are interested in undergraduate research. In doing so, we can better evaluate a student’s overall potential. In some cases, we also conduct personal interviews. This process is not unlike those commonly used by universities to award scholarships and, in doing so, helps avoid costly selection errors.

A second challenge concerns the need to attract and motivate qualified faculty. To meet this challenge, we sought to have undergraduate research mentoring formally recognized at both the college and university level. For example, in the Huntsman School of Business, we designate an undergraduate research mentor of the year. The mentor is also formally recognized at the university level.

We have also argued that undergraduate research mentoring should be recognized in the promotion and tenure process. First, we have sought to include reference to undergraduate research mentoring in the role statements of tenure-track faculty. In addition, we have recommended that it to be included in the formal university guidelines for tenure and promotion.

A third challenge is the identification of meaningful research. Since incoming students do not ordinarily have the requisite skills to develop research proposals on their own, we typically start their experience by having them participate in a project that has already been at least partially conceptualized by the faculty mentor. In doing so, the background work has already been established which thereby allows the mentoring process to be more effective and efficient. As students gain more experience, they are then able to develop projects on their own.

The downside of this process is that faculty are sharing some of their own research with students. Thus, care should be taken in the allocation of projects. For example, a project that requires significant preparation by the professor is not a good candidate for a student/faculty collaboration. Instead, smaller projects that require less preparation are typically more suitable.

Conclusion

The Research Group in the Jon M. Huntsman School of Business has resulted in a framework that facilitates quality undergraduate research experiences for students. Students in our program have presented at such undergraduate research venues as Research Day at the State Capital in Salt Lake City, the National Conference on Undergraduate Research, and the Utah Conference on Undergraduate Research. Additionally, many of our students have collaborated with faculty on publications in scholarly journals and conference proceedings. We believe that much of this success is the result of using a formalized approach to undergraduate research experiences. To this end, we would like to broaden this approach by proposing the development of a consortium of business schools who could work together to promote greater synergies in undergraduate research. Perhaps the formation of a special interest group within the Decision Sciences Institute and/or the inclusion of an undergraduate student track at national and regional conferences would help facilitate this objective. At a minimum, we hope that this essay serves to promote greater discussion and debate regarding the importance of undergraduate research.

References and Recommended Readings


Tragic Conceptual Flaws of Theory-Building Empirical Research

by John G. Wacker, Visiting Professor, Arizona State University; Professor Emeritus, Iowa State University

When empirical researchers begin a research project, they usually target specific concepts to empirically test specific issues. Yet, frequently empirical evidence is found on hidden relationships that are important for extending existing theory. These relationships should be published to extend current theory and advance the knowledge of the academic field. The purpose of this article is to assist researchers to avoid tragic conceptual flaws that hinder their research or diminish its importance and impact. Failure to avoid these conceptual flaws causes research to become fact-finding and not theory-building.

Although this article will emphasize classical statistical analyses, it is also important to include case study methods that extend theory. Theory only builds on previous theory. To understand theory-building case research, it is necessary to differentiate between classroom and theory-building cases. Classroom cases are typically utilized to illustrate a specific set of issues in a ‘real’ world business environment. Classroom cases give business students and practicing managers an understanding of the organizational interfaces among people and functions that occurs during implementation of strategies and day-to-day operations. Alternatively, theory-building case research extends current theory by introducing new relationships in a more complex environment. Theory-building case research faces the same challenges as statistical sampling research since it must follow the same basic principles of science. Otherwise, case research will be considered fact-finding rather than theory-building research.

The purpose of this article is to highlight some common difficulties of both types of empirical research. These difficulties are founded in classical philosophy of science that determines specific requirements for theory development: These requirements are highlighted as Conservatism, Uniqueness, Internal Consistency, Generalizability (and Abstraction).

**Tragic Conceptual Flaw 1: Conservatism and Poor Literature Integration**

One key issue that is uniformly accepted as a primary foundation for theory-building by philosophers of science is: Theory only builds on previous theory. The closer empirical researchers can tie their research into and integrate existing literature, the more important an empirical article is. Sometimes researchers acquire data and find really important empirical results. What is tragic is if these researchers do not study existing research, they cannot integrate these empirical findings into the larger body of academic literature, making the research fact-finding and not theory-building.

Tying these articles together with the researcher’s empirical research makes
Formal conceptual definitions have many conceptual definitions and measures. In the philosophy of science informal or accidental definitions. For example, consider the term inventory turnover. The formal conceptual definition may be: “The number of times inventory is replaced during some specific time period.” If an accountant is asked to measure inventory turns, the answer would be: cost of goods sold divided by average inventory. Consider next, a manufacturing facility needs to determine inventory turnover in a specific work center. The accounting measure is not useful since there is no cost of goods sold. However, using the formal conceptual definition, alternative measures can be used. Consequently, the formal conceptual gives guidance to a measure, while the accounting measure is not useful. In short, the formal conceptual definition is more important than the measure since it dictates which measures are acceptable to represent the concept.

Uniqueness
This lack of clarity and uniqueness causes the definition to become too broad. As definitions continue to be more inclusive, at some point these terms become so ambiguous or vague that they include innumerable concepts. When this happens the term includes so many concepts that it can never be proved nor disproved. These inclusions violate an important property of ‘good’ theory: Uniqueness.

This tragic conceptual flaw occurs when the research study emphasizes the statistical significance and explanatory power at the cost of substantive significance. Statistical significance is not as important as substantive significance. Substantive significance is derived from the existing theory and literature and causes estimates to have expected directions, which must be addressed in empirical studies. On the other hand, statistical significance has no expected direction and is merely an empirical relationship. Dropping a statistically insignificant substantive variable and including a statistically significant in reported results is a tragic conceptual flaw since the significant variable was included for some theoretical reason. Whether an empirical result is important depends on the existing literature that provides internal consistency of the theory. So without the existing literature supporting the empirical results, the results become artifacts and the results become fact-finding (McCloskey & Ziliak, 1996).

It is appropriate to recall an old econometric saying: ‘If a variable is important conceptually enough to be included in an estimate, it is important enough to stay in the estimate, regardless of statistical significance.” Reporting of insignificant substantive variables is important for extending theory that may suggest a variable may not be conceptually important.

Simplicity and Statistical Overkill
A major improvement in statistical research methodology has been the use of advanced techniques such as the many variations of structural equation modeling (SEM). Yet, use of these variations may suppress the importance of the results due to the prolonged discussion of the statistics rather than a prolonged discussion of the conceptual implications to the specific operations or business issue. With the large amount of statistics reported, the statistics are over-explained while the importance of the results is often not fully discussed. Many of the statistics should be put in an appendix or not reported at all. The APA task force on research methodology headed by Wilkinson concluded that:

The enormous variety of modern quantitative methods leaves researchers with the nontrivial task of matching analysis and design to the research question. Although complex designs and state-of-the-art methods are sometimes necessary to address research questions effectively, simpler classical approaches often can provide elegant and sufficient answers to important questions. Do not choose an analytic method to impress your readers or to deflect criticism.
If the assumptions and strength of a simpler method are reasonable for your data and research problem, use it. Occam’s razor applies to methods as well as to theories. (Wilkinson, L., et. al., 1999)

In short, keep the explanation of statistics to a minimal to provide space in the article for implications of the research. Empirical researchers can make the tragic mistake of over-explaining the many statistics and not emphasizing the important implications of the study.

**Tragic Conceptual Flaw 5: Generalizability and Random Samples Obsession**

From the very first statistics class, beginning students are told emphatically that random samples are needed for population representativeness. This sample randomness assumption is frequently interpreted to mean that the sample is actually representative of the population on all dimensions. This assumption has a conceptual flaw. To understand this difficulty an example should prove useful. Assume that in the ideal world there actually was a random sample. Each sample has many dimensions such as respondents’ innumerable characteristics (such as hair colors, length, placement on head, along with a myriad of other characteristics). Each one of these characteristics if used as variables could be related to the empirical issue. There are innumerable instances of sample characteristics causing the number of characteristic variables to be much larger then the finite sample. The likelihood that all the individual characteristics of the innumerable characteristics are not statistically significantly different than the population mean is zero. Therefore, a random sample is not actually representative of the population on all dimensions. On the other hand, one could define the sampling domain so narrowly that the data would more closely be representative of the population. But the narrow domain decreases the generalizability and the abstractness of the findings, which in turn, decreases where the findings can be applied. This conceptual flaw decreases the findings to be less important.

It is difficult to imagine that any sample is homogenous enough to expect exact replication of results. Data are always heterogeneous since there are a myriad of dimensions behind each sample. In any sample, there are more possible dimensions than there are sample items. Consequently, the control for all the dimensions is not possible. Yet research studies should control for those variables that empirically have been shown to be related to the research issue. Yet even when these variables are controlled, when an empirical estimate is carefully investigated for outliers using classical DFFITS, and DFBETAs, etc. in statistical analyses, there are usually some problems with specific observations. Naturally, there is an empirical reason causing the outliers and the model misspecification. The misspecification error may suggest the missing variable. However more typically, the outlier’s cause is a mystery that can always be explained by some specious reasoning. Assuming the outlier is caused by a data reporting error and eliminating the outlier observation does improve explanatory power but is this actually the academically honest thing to do? Most studies could eliminate so many observations that the study will have high statistical significance (explanatory power) but low substantive significance. However, if the outlier data are omitted there is loss of information that may be important for future researchers. One solution for problem outlier(s) is to include them with qualitative variable(s) so that the statistical significance is preserved while acknowledging the data have some outliers. However, this method overstates the explanatory power of the estimates since the reason for the qualitative variable inclusion is not due to an a priori specific conceptual reason. Consequently, there is no simple method for handling outliers.

For research case studies there is a very challenging sampling problem for representativeness to the general population. This problem is ensuring that the observations are typical for more than just the observed case(s). Naturally, the researcher needs great care to include the many characteristics of the case to ensure that research can be applied to wider environment.

In summary, all samples are heterogeneous and are subject to possible missing conceptual variables. What could cause a tragic mistake is to ‘massage’ the data to improve statistical significance at the cost of substantive significance.

**Tragic Conceptual Flaw 6: Lack of Implications to Improve Business Practice**

Despite what some tenure committees may believe, the ultimate purpose of business research is to assist businesses in their decision making. Although some business research is focused on improving research methodology, the ultimate goal of business research is the actual improvement of business practices. Academic research is accumulated in academic textbooks to extend the research’s application far beyond the academic journals. These textbooks are important for disseminating research findings. However, the original academic research helps businesses understand the complexity and simplicity of their strategic, tactical, and operational decisions. How to communicate academic research to the general business population is a major challenge.

Any academic that has consulted to businesses knows that definitions of business terms vary widely among organizations. To assist businesses in their decisions, great care must be taken when defining terms. Managers have many lay terms that have a very different meaning in the academic literature. Terms like competitive performance, value-added, sustainability, inventory balancing, commodity, quality and numerous others need to be carefully defined before venturing into a prolonged discussion with practicing managers. As academics, there are academic definitions of many technical terms. Researchers should explain the terms in lay business terms in an article’s conclusions and provide implications to
Both within the business and academic sectors, one cannot avoid reference to the rise of India as a dominant player in the global marketplace. Its burgeoning information technology sector, entrepreneurial private sector, abundant source of high value added, knowledge-based labor, and expanding domestic market cannot be ignored. Indian companies such as Infosys, one of the leading international IT firms, and the Tata Group, owner of brands including Jaguar, Rover, and the Ritz-Carlton Boston, are becoming globally recognizable. Foreign companies including Hyundai and Cisco are making significant expansions to their Indian operations, while others including Wal-Mart and Proctor and Gamble are developing relationships that will enable them to reach a population in excess of one billion. One of the challenges of this growth is the need to train the next generation of Indian business leaders. This places significant responsibility on the academic sector and in particular schools of business. Having recently spent time as an outsider to Indian business academe, I offer observations and reflections on the challenges of and opportunities for business education in India. While these are based on the Indian context, it is not unlikely that there are parallels in other rapidly expanding economies.

**Institutional Challenges**

In recent years, India has experienced a large increase in the number of institutions offering graduate management programs. Most of these have been private institutions. Three particular consequences of this are of significance. Given the relative infancy of graduate business education in India—the Indian Institutes of Technology (IIT), and a handful of other well established and highly reputable institutions apart—it is not clear whether international standards have been achieved within much of the sector. Even programs at the leading institutions, while being comparable in quality to those of leading programs globally are, for a variety of reasons, not accredited by international bodies such as AACSB International. Domestically, there is also no single accreditation agency, with more than a dozen agencies serving this role. The central government’s National Assessment and Accreditation Council has, for example, accredited only 15 business schools (Damast, 2008). An additional challenge is that attaining status as a ‘deemed university,’ which is required to offer an MBA degree, can come only from the University Grants Commission (UGC). The UGC is a government body that establishes and maintains educational standards within the higher education sector. However, the actions of the UGC are not necessarily driven by academics but also by politics and influence (Phatak, 2005). With new and largely private institutions entering the fold, there is a real risk that the overarching goal, certainly in the near term, is either financial or to have a presence in the marketplace, with educational quality and academic integrity being of secondary importance. Absent appropriate mechanisms to ensure oversight of academic quality, this is reason for concern.

Related to the issue of academic standards is that of faculty qualifications. The growth in the number of business schools, the financial lure of the private sector, and a ‘stigma’ associated with doctoral qualifications, have led to a shortage of qualified faculty.
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An interesting paradox exists regarding the status accorded doctoral degrees. The acquisition of wisdom or ‘gyan’, is one of the pillars of Hinduism, the predominant faith in India. One might therefore assume that value is attached to the acquisition of doctoral degrees and to those possessing such degrees. In the context of management education at least, this would appear not to be the case. A stereotype appears, in some quarters at least, that doctoral students are those that have fallen short of the bar for admission into MBA programs or more prestigious private sector appointments. Moreover, there is some indication that faculty members with outstanding business sector experience and credentials and a desire to share their experience and knowledge, acquire doctoral degrees merely to meet expectations of faculty members or requirements for certain administrative positions. One administrator commented that in order to rise in the administrative ranks, he needed to acquire a doctorate. Holding a doctorate however had negative implications for status, placing him in a ‘Catch 22’ situation. What message does this convey when one is expected to have a doctoral degree because of one’s status as a faculty member, yet to have such a degree is reason for one’s status as an academic to be undermined? Coupled with the observation that India does not have a tradition of doctoral education in business (Phatak, 2005), the result is that the supply of academically qualified business school faculty is further compromised. While leading institutions can continue to attract such faculty, it is not clear whether for less prestigious institutions this is the case. They are in some cases reduced to hiring faculty that may have been passed over for better appointments in the private sector or admissions to more prestigious graduate programs. These individuals may themselves have graduated from lower tier institutions with the corresponding issues of program quality, further exacerbating a ‘vicious circle.’ Indeed it was recently suggested that of the more than 1,600 business schools in India, beyond the top 30 or so, faculty awareness of contemporary business issues is suspect (Damast, 2008). While from my experience, the enthusiasm and motivation of faculty at lower tier schools is beyond question, this is no substitute for knowledge and experience.

Even the leading institutions are not immune to the challenges of faculty shortages. Increasing demand for business education is increasing the teaching burden. Not only does this come at the expense of other academic pursuits such as scholarship, it places greater emphasis on generating alternative revenue sources in an attempt to attract and retain faculty and otherwise compete with private academic institutions and the corporate sector. Consulting and management training are common among faculty at the leading business schools as means of supplementing institutional revenue as well as faculty salaries. Particularly at the more prestigious institutions that may have a dual role of teaching and research, increased instructional roles may have the impact of limiting scholarship and quality faculty-student interaction. These are key motivations for seasoned business practitioners to leave the private sector and join the academy, a common path among business academics. Removing these sources of motivation can serve only to further deplete the ranks of high quality faculty. While private institutions may have greater flexibility when recruiting faculty, particularly when it comes to salaries, this may have a ripple effect as elite public institutions such as the IIM’s and IIT’s lose top faculty to private institutions. The onus is therefore on the leadership of these institutions to carefully define their missions and plan for the future accordingly.

At the leading schools, teaching approaches such as the case method, simulations, and other interactive approaches that leverage student participation appear to be common. However, there would appear to be less, if any, use of these methods at lower tier schools that represent the majority of business schools. At one workshop I conducted on pedagogy, of over 100 faculty participants, a small minority used cases in classes, and even these were more likely to be ‘vignettes’ rather than Harvard or similar types of cases one often associates with MBA programs. Graduate business education is about training decision makers and business leaders. As such, while there is a crucial content-based element to this, equally, if not more important is the contextual element. The Indian educational system is rooted in the traditional teacher-centric model that has prevailed for generations. While this approach has its place, there needs to be awareness of other pedagogies that can effectively supplement traditional approaches. This places a significant burden on faculty who may have been trained in the traditional paradigm and/or are more comfortable with the traditional teacher/ student hierarchy common throughout Asia. It also places a responsibility on institutional administration to recognize the need for and the development of a portfolio of pedagogies rather than a one size fits all approach.

The challenge of faculty overburdened with instructional loads coupled with a lack of research focus raises the additional challenge of developing instructional materials that reflect the Indian context (Chanda, 2006). When available, course materials used in India, whether textbooks or cases, are typically U.S.-based or editions of U.S. materials that have been published for sale in the Indian market. While these materials are tried and tested, they do not reflect the nuances of the Indian market or of Indian business/social culture. As such, when presented by and to individuals with limited business experience, the result may not accurately reflect the realities of business in the Indian context.

Student Body Challenges

A key factor in the admissions process at the leading institutions as well as several others is the Common Admissions Test. It is typical for students, close to the completion of their undergraduate education, to sit for the test following an intense period of preparation, in anticipation of joining a graduate business
program immediately on graduation. The result is a student body, which while academically talented and technically sophisticated—a large proportion of students at the leading business schools come from the premier engineering programs—lacks work experience and an appropriate context for a graduate business education. This yields a ‘youthful’ class with limited scope to contribute to their business education and that of their peers, rather than a more mature, business savvy class that can better enhance not only the educational experience, but the reputation of the program and school. Ironically, this runs counter to the experience of the leading graduate business schools in, for example, the U.S. and Europe, and the original philosophy that drove graduate business education. At these business schools, a premium exists in the admissions process for work experience, maturity, and demonstrated workplace leadership. Such programs seek out applicants with not only outstanding academic credentials, but an understanding of their career goals, how they anticipate advanced study can help achieve these goals, and that can actively contribute to the educational process through their experience. This patterns the original intent underlying MBA programs, to provide individuals with technical backgrounds and experience with the business training necessary as they assume greater managerial responsibilities.

An implication of the admissions process is that it results in entering classes of students at the leading business schools, which, having spent the previous several years engaged in a demanding technical education, have seemingly stepped back from their commitment to the advancement of science and technology. Whether this is a reflection of disenchantment with potential careers in science and technology, the lure of large salaries in business, or a failure to define their career aspirations or objectives in obtaining a graduate business degree is not clear. Coupled with the fact that graduates at the leading academic institutions in science and technology are also being increasingly lured by rising private sector salaries rather than continuing to graduate school, one wonders what the consequences may be for the development of future engineering and technology capabilities.

A final observation mimics one already made in many programs in the U.S. A consequence of rapid economic expansion is that students recognize that upon graduation from MBA programs, and in particular, the leading ones, they will command significant salaries. Personal experience as well as that of faculty colleagues is that well before graduation, the commitment and motivation of students begins to wane and as a result students may not fully avail themselves of the academic opportunities available to them. This runs in the face of the traditional quest for knowledge that is a pillar of Hinduism. This phenomenon is not unique to India. In the U.S., for example, increased interest in MBA and similar degrees over the last 20 or so years, has led to the reality that the primary motivation for earning an MBA for many, is the lure of high salaries, rather than the desire to acquire knowledge, develop leadership skills, and enhance decision making capabilities. The result is that the true value of an MBA degree has been undermined as it increasingly becomes an ‘entry level’ credential.

Opportunities

The above observations do not represent a comprehensive scientific study of business education in India. They are the observations of one individual whose cultural roots lie in India but who has spent the last 15 years as a faculty member in the U.S. They are not intended to be critical but to identify opportunities. India has undergone significant economic transformation in the post-1991 era when the economy was liberalized, and a concerted effort made to move away from the socialist economic model that had prevailed since independence in 1947. What has transpired to date is however just a beginning. There are sectors within the economy that have barely begun the journey to modernization. Others have begun but have yet to reach the levels of progress, growth, and engagement in a global context seen by, for example, the IT sector. Demand for well trained, competent managers, comfortable making decisions in a complex, rapidly changing environment, is set to grow. If India is to maintain, if not enhance its global economic position, business schools need to respond in a timely manner. This will require not only an infusion of resources, but institutional and governmental commitment to upgrading standards and defining the role business education will play in future economic development. It will also require breaking away from traditional academic models of pedagogy and hierarchy that are deeply rooted in culture. The road ahead is filled with challenges but also untold possibilities.

Endnotes

1. In the interests of full disclosure, it should be noted that the author is what some affectionately refer to as an ‘FBI,’ or Foreign Born Indian.

2. The Indian Institutes of Management are among the leading business schools in India but are not affiliated to a university. As such they cannot offer MBA degrees but instead offer Post Graduate Diplomas in Management. This itself poses difficulties for those unaware of the stature of the Institutes in accurately interpreting the value of such a qualification.
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Early attempts at social networking on the Internet included Classmates.com (1995) and Six Degrees.com (1997). Then in 2004, MySpace made a transition from existence as a virtual storage space to a social networking site. That began the modern era of social networking. While MySpace and Facebook are the most popular social networking sites in North America, it is somewhat surprising to note that the popularity of different social networking sites in different parts of the world, even though ecommerce theory tells us that the Internet empowers us to have a global reach. In Europe, Bebo, and hi5 are popular. In Brazil and India, Orkut is it, while Asia adds Friendster and Cyworld. On the business side of social networking, LinkedIn has a different business model, selling information and social networking to business. Additional sites like Friendster and Twitter (which recently added micro-blogging for instantaneous updates on a friend’s activities) are also becoming increasingly popular. If you want to create your own social networking site, go to Ning, which allows anyone to create your own customized social network for a topic of your choosing.

One of my graduate students was excited to demonstrate a customized social network for engineers he just created on Ning. In this month’s revealing article, Professor J.P. Shim explores differences between U.S. and Korean acceptance, adoption, and use of social networking sites. His provocative insights suggest several cultural, social, governmental, infrastructure, and even geographical features that foster or impede the adoption of social networking sites. [Kenneth E. Kendall, Feature Editor]

Social Networking Sites: A Brief Comparison of Usage in the U.S. and Korea

by J. P. Shim, Mississippi State University

Social networking sites (SNS) have emerged as a new breed of Web 2.0 websites. The sites are focused on user created content (UCC), having been designed so user profiles are integrated into the community development. These social sites are catered to friend-of-a-friend (FOAF) angles and individuals and groups are connected directly with others who share common interests, as users upload and share photos, videos, and ideas (in exchange for joining, as with sites such as Flickr and YouTube). As SNS becomes more popular, with increased exposure to personal data, the information becomes a goldmine for marketing and advertising companies, and political interest groups. Users are more likely to find value service with a social component.

Several recent studies has shown that Korea is currently leading the world in every segment of the telecommunications market, broadband and Internet growth, mobile and cellular applications, and short message services. While third-generation (3G) wireless was introduced in Korea offering greater bandwidth in the earlier period of the 20th century, the U.S. did not see true nationwide 3G coverage until 2007. The purpose of this paper is to present the status of Web 2.0 and social networking sites: Korea vs. the U.S. And several issues in social networking will be discussed.

Status of Web 2.0 and Social Networking: Differences between the U.S. and Korea

Web 2.0 has grown in popularity over the past few years. It is based on social software where users generate content. In looking over the status of Web 2.0,
one can notice a few things; it’s growing, becoming more recognizable. The growth is shown by the number of new Web 2.0 programs available. As quickly as popular programs (such as Cyworld, Flickr, Facebook, MySpace, and YouTube), get snapped up by a large company, new programs take their places. This allows Web 2.0 to become mainstream (via the large companies such as Google and Yahoo picking the best available Web 2.0 programs to add into their system). Since the late 1990s, there has been an avalanche of Web 2.0 sites.

Many of these Web 2.0 sites allow members to register to become “friends,” in which the status is displayed through forged connections, which enables instant access to each other’s communication channels and other resources. For instance, a registered member of MySpace or Facebook, two of the most popular social networks in the U.S., allow users to interact and socialize within their “friends” network through instant messaging, e-mail, blogging, photographs, videos, podcasts, and numerous other resources.

Currently, the disadvantage lies in users being unable to manage multiple social network accounts from a single site. The users must log into each social networking site to interact with and discuss topics with the particular community. Korea has been a hotbed of development for upcoming technologies with its users in a condensed space with early adoption behavior. The Korean telecommunications industry is working on wireless broadband Internet technology (WiBro). Worldwide interoperability for microwave access will make social networking readily available at anytime with amazing speed. Table 1 shows history, visitors, and number of subscribers of three major social networking sites in Korea and the U.S. The sites include video sharing (Pandora TV vs. YouTube), portal/search engines (Naver vs. Google), and social network sites (Cyworld vs. Facebook). Interestingly enough, Korean social networking sites (Pandora TV, Naver, Cyworld) have been launched earlier than their U.S. counterparts.

### Issues in Social Networking

There are several major issues to be considered in social networking: cultural differences, technological infrastructure, launch timing, and design are impediments for users to be acquainted with certain social networking sites. First, Cyworld has received much attention and popularity among Korean users. Facebook had barriers during its attempt to enter Korea’s SNS market. Likewise, Cyworld’s attempted entry into the U.S. SNS market did not succeed. With the users’ early adoption behavior in Korea, there have been numerous opportunities for technological advancement.

What is important to note about the Korean culture is the collective society (compared to what some researchers characterize as an individualistic society in the U.S.). Due to the cramped and close living quarters often experienced in Korea, most people are subjected to intense peer pressure (i.e., social influence) to accept new models or technology. Second, technological infrastructures are one of the most powerful enablers for accepting “new” technology and model. Therefore, a government’s initiatives make a significant difference as to whether a country moves to technological infrastructures.

For example, Korean “Chaebols” (business conglomerate) use aggressive information and communication technology (ICT) planning to implement cellular technology and the Internet. The Korean government has leveraged its power to be instrumental in stimulating consumer demand. Third, in general, the first movers did not necessarily capture the market share (except for a few rare instances). While certain sites (i.e., Friendster) were one of the first few SNS to pioneer the scene in the U.S., the second or the third movers (e.g., Facebook and MySpace) have been able to capture most of the market. Finally, design is one of the most important determinants of a firm’s success. The Korean’s search engine (Naver’s Web site) is extremely flashy and crowded, compared to Google’s simple aesthetics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Video Sharing</th>
<th>Portal/Search</th>
<th>Social Network Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>U.S.A</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandora TV</td>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>Naver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscribers</td>
<td>3 million (2007.10)</td>
<td>55.1 million (2006.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total population</td>
<td>6.09%</td>
<td>18.11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Comparison of video sharing, portal/search, and social network sites: Korea and the U.S.
Conclusion
There are times when certain aspects of cultural differences, social and technological infrastructure, and the launch timing of technology release can be impediments for users in their level of acceptance of certain social networking sites. The relevant issues include privacy, ownership of information, interaction among users, sharing and distribution of information.

The information technology strategists should consider the dynamic and crucial role in which cultural difference, social and technological infrastructure, and timing of launches play in determining the users’ acceptance or rejection of the technology. The author believes that future research should consider the issues of privacy and trust for social networking sites. Most importantly, future research should look to expand the social networking topic to other regions to evaluate global social networking usage.
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Conclusion
Theory-building empirical research using statistical and case analyses can easily have many flaws. The avoidance of poor literature searches, poor definitions, over-emphasis on statistics, data massaging for randomness, and using only recondite academic terms are common problems that can be overcome with only slight modifications to procedures. In one sense, if carefully examined, all research has some tragic flaws since no research is perfect. Yet, the goal of business academics is to assist business managers in their decision making. It was with this lofty goal that this article was written.

Suggested Further Reading
Increase the Number and Quality of Students in Your MAcc Program without Additional Funding: A Case Study

by Marvin L. Bouillon, Iowa State University

In the late 1980s, a majority of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) voted to require 150 hours of education for its membership after the year 2000. As of December 31, 2000, there were six states or territories that did not enact the 150-hour requirement. Like many states, Iowa passed the law in 1992 to be effective in the year 2000.

As states passed the new 150-hour requirement, universities and colleges were forced to look at their programs to see how they would deal with this new education requirement. Renner and Tanner (2001) surveyed members of the AICPA, Institute of Management Accountants (IMA) and recruiters of accounting graduates from a regional Midwestern university and found that some of the popular choices (not in order of preference) were: (a) BA with a double major in accounting and finance, (b) BA with a double major in accounting and management information systems, (c) BA in accounting/MBA, (d) BA in accounting/master in accounting, and (e) BA in accounting/master in taxation. At many schools, the first two options were already available but were deemed unacceptable for the better accounting undergraduate students. Option (c) may be a good one, but could require a student to stay in school for six years. Therefore, many schools looked at options (d) and (e) as being logical choices. These options are cost-effective ways for students to complete the 150-hour requirement and leave a university with a masters’ degree!

Donelan and Reed (2000) examine the increase in graduate programs due to the 150-hour requirement. Frecka and Nichols (2004) found that the number of graduate students in accounting had increased in recent years for both existing and new programs added in response to the 150-hour requirement. They determined that the average enrollments for these programs were small when compared to existing MBA programs. Iowa State University decided to start a master in accounting (MAcc) program.

The purpose of this paper is to provide an awareness of some issues faced by the new director of the MAcc program at Iowa State University and share some of the viable solutions. We provide statistics before (shaded area in tables) and after the change in directors. We discuss a series of decisions that were made by the new director and the overall changes that resulted from these decisions. As mentioned above, we feel that these decisions are generalizable to other MAcc programs and will help them successfully increase the quality and number of students in their programs. Imagine doing this without any additional funding!

In the next section we will give you a quick overview of Iowa State University. We follow that with a brief discussion of the MAcc program at Iowa State University before July 2004, along with its potential costs and available financial support. We then provide some statistics and trends before July 2004, followed by a section discussing the issues faced by the new director appointed in 2004. Next, we discuss the new director’s decisions and present some updated information on the MAcc since July 2004. The paper
concludes with a brief summary of how this may help directors of MAcc programs at other institutions.

Iowa State University

Iowa State University is a land-grant institution that opened its doors in 1868 and is one of three state-supported institutions of higher learning in the state of Iowa. Currently, Iowa State University is a Carnegie Doctoral/Research Extensive University.

The College of Business was created in April 1984 and received its initial accreditation from AACSB in April 1991. The accounting department was separately accredited in 2000 when the College received its reaffirmation in March of that year. When the accounting department began exploring the possibility of implementing a MAcc degree, the College already had a part-time and full-time MBA program.

The College of Business is the third largest college at Iowa State University, with a fall 2007 enrollment of 3,333 undergraduate and 294 graduate students. The College moved into the Gerdin Business Building in December 2004. This centrally located building provides a state-of-the-art high-tech home for the College. The Gerdin Business Building features wireless access and high-tech laboratories where our students and faculty can replicate real-world situations in areas such as securities trading, management information systems, and market research.

Master of Accounting (MAcc)

Cyndie Jeffrey was the first director of the MAcc program. She did an excellent job of moving the program over the required hurdles in order to get the program established. The MAcc program began in the fall semester of 2000. It was designed to meet the needs of accountants in public or private accounting focusing on interpreting and analyzing accounting information for decision making. Graduates of this program comply with the Iowa Standards for Certification upon passing the Uniform Certified Public Accounting examination.

In 2004, when the directors changed, the MAcc degree was a 32-credit-hour program designed to be completed in two and one-half semesters. It consisted of 15 credits-hours of graduate accounting courses, a communications course, an international course, and nine to 12 credit-hours of electives as needed. There was also a two credit-hour creative component requirement. Generally, the creative component required the student to work on a real world or research project. Then they presented their results to a three-member committee.

Costs and Financial Support for MAcc Program

Costs to Study. The 2006-2007 tuition costs for resident (in-state) graduate students were $330 per credit hour; with fees, semester tuition was $3,433.08. Non-resident tuition (including fees) was $8,640.08 per semester.

Financial Support. At the onset of this program, the college provides financial assistance for three graduate students with one-quarter time research assistantships. Students who receive assistantships were automatically charged resident tuition rates and their in-state tuition is decreased by another 25 percent. These students also receive a monthly stipend of $718 per month. When the MAcc program was started, the dean’s office support provided three one-fourth-time assistantships. In 2004-05, they decided to no longer promise this support on an annual basis to the MAcc program.

MAcc Program—Statistics and Trends from 2000 through 2004

The college tracks recruitment, enrollment, demographic, and employment information for the MAcc program. Table 1 summarizes information regarding how many applications, admissions, and actual number of students that register for classes in the MAcc program. In 2001-2002, 20 out of 29 students (69%) eventually registered for classes. These percentages dropped off to 53 percent and 43 percent in 2003-2004 and 2004-2005, respectively.

Table 2 provides enrollment trends for the first five years of the program. The enrollment numbers show a gradual increase over the first four years, then a sharp decline of 27 percent in 2004-05. Table 3 indicates that there was a slight increase in the number of students graduating over the first four years. Based on

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Registration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: MAcc program recruitment, 2000-2007.
the number of students being enrolled and the number of students graduating, several students were taking more than a year to graduate.

Table 4 shows the profiles for MAcc students over the first five years. The profiles of graduate students in the MAcc appear to be fairly consistent from year to year. The average GPA and GMAT are approximately 3.25 and 560, respectively. Finally, Table 5 presents the employment statistics for MAcc students from 2001-02 through 2004-05. The employment opportunities for students from the U.S. have been consistently excellent, while the same opportunities for international students have been poor but improving over the first three years.

**What Issues Faced the Director?**

In 2004, this MAC Program and its director faced several significant issues:

1. How to recruit more students to the program without a recruiting budget.
2. How to increase the percentage of admitted students that actually register for the program. Based on Table 2 the college was recruiting the wrong students.
3. How to increase the number of undergraduate students to apply and register for the MAC program.
4. How to improve the number of potential graduate assistants available for the MAC students. This became even more important when the College of Business decided it would withdraw its support for the MAC program.
5. How to improve the quality and make the program more competitive with other schools.

**Addressing the Above Issues**

When Cyndie Jeffrey stepped down as the director in 2004, she recommended that we drop the GMAT requirement for undergraduate accounting majors at Iowa State University with a cumulative GPA in excess of 3.25. This suggestion has proven to be a great move in increasing the number and quality of students entering the program.

Predicting success using prior GPAs make sense. Bouillion, Doran, and Smith (1990) and Doran, Bouillon, and Smith (1991) found that a student’s cumulative GPA is a good predictor of success in both accounting principles classes, while the grade in accounting principles one is also an excellent predictor of a student’s performance in second accounting principles course. Meanwhile, Yang and Lu (2001) determined that undergraduate GPA is very useful in predicting academic performance in an accredited MBA program. Sulaiman and Mohezar (2006) also found that student’s undergraduate grades are the best predictors of their MBA performance followed by the undergraduate discipline. They found that age, ethnicity, gender, and years of work experience had no bearing on academic performance.

There are mixed results pertaining to the GMAT score as a predictor. Wright and Bachrach (2003) discovered a potential bias against females when using GMAT scores for admissions to MBA programs. Further, Hancock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students enrolled</td>
<td>% change</td>
<td>% change</td>
<td>% change</td>
<td>% change</td>
<td>% change</td>
<td>% change</td>
<td>% change</td>
<td>% change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students enrolled</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: MAcc program enrollment, total students, 2000-2007, fall semester.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees granted</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degrees granted</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(-12.5%)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3: MAcc degrees granted, 2001-2007.*
(1999) discovered that while women performed significantly lower on the GMAT, their overall MBA performance was similar to that of the male students. These results supported our decision to eliminate GMAT scores for our best students at Iowa State University. We do expect our students to have a cumulative undergraduate GPA of 3.25 at Iowa State University in order to avoid the GMAT examination.

Koys (2005) discovered that GMAT scores were a valid predictor of academic performance in an MBA program for international students. This provides support for us to continue to use the GMAT score for all international student and domestic student applications from other universities.

A second step that was used to recruit Iowa State Students was open communications with the undergraduate advising office, the undergraduate career services office, the honors office, and with Beta Alpha Psi. We had very open discussions with these groups pertaining to the MAcc degree. It was expressed to them that a student going after his or her CPA certification would be better off if they completed the MAcc degree rather than do a double major. Additionally, these groups were asked to identify students early and send them to the director so they could plan to do this as efficiently as possible.

By eliminating the GMAT test score for the best students and promoting the MAcc internally, we were able to lower the barriers for our best students. Additionally, the MAcc degree is now known as the “hot degree” among the good accounting students. These two steps increased the number of applications, admitted students registering percentage, enrollments in the program, and the number of MAcc degrees offered. In 2006-07 the admission percentage was down, but the overall registration of admissions was 85 percent. The number of MAcc degrees granted in 2006-07 was 28, which is twice the number granted just two years prior. Currently, enrollment in the program is at record levels.

The new director’s quest to increase the number of graduate assistantships available to MAcc students was achieved by:

1. Making sure that his own graduate assistant was a MAcc student. This was used to support two students since one of them was on an internship in the spring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GMAT</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs. work experience</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% international</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># countries represented</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Profile of MAcc students, 2000-2007, fall semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% employment at graduate and 3 months after graduation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int’l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: MAcc student employment, 2001-2007.
2. Making sure that assistantships given to accounting faculty from the College of Business were MAcc students. This supported four MAcc students. Two for a full year and two for a half of year.

3. Working with the Vice-President of Finance and providing a MAcc student that would work with the hockey team’s finances.

4. Working with the athletic director and providing a MAcc student/former athlete an opportunity to work in the athletic department.

5. Working with the Accounting Advisory Board to increase unrestricted funds to the accounting department. Two MAcc students were provided a half of year of support from these development funds.

   The department helped 10 students in 2006-07! The director is continually searching for new avenues to increase funding. He continues to work with the Accounting Advisory Board to develop additional funds for named graduate scholarships and assistantships. In 2007-08, there will be two students benefiting from a half-year assistantship provided from John Deere funds. The director continues to work with the college to provide graduate assistants to accounting faculty that have an accounting background. Therefore, we have been negotiating with the college for the four assistantships that we received last year. Another student will work with the Vice President of Finance Office and the finances of the hockey team. There were additional contacts with other organizations on campus to provide additional assistantships for MAcc students. These contacts were made with the offices of the athletic director, the vice president of finance, the controller and the university’s foundation. Two assistantships were secured through this process along with a possibility of two more next semester. Finally, a new database is being kept pertaining to MAcc graduate assistants obtained next year. This database will increase our chances at keeping a MAcc student in each of these positions next year. The fall 2007 began with seven students on full-year one-fourth-time assistantships and another six students receiving half-year assistantships. Another four half-year assistantships are available for the spring semester. At a minimum, there will be a 30 percent increase. More realistically, we are expecting to see a 50 to 70 percent increase in students receiving partial or full assistantships in 2007-08.

   Finally, a shortcoming of the program was that it has a two credit-hour creative component requirement. After a thorough study of competing programs, it was determined that the creative component was a deterrent for many students to apply to the MAcc program. In 2007, the creative component was officially eliminated as a requirement of the degree.

Conclusion
It is amazing what this MAcc program and its directors have accomplished in this short period of time. While the 150-hour requirement appeared to create an obstacle, it has been able to make it a positive situation for the students. It has developed a culture at this university that makes the MAcc degree important. Its students are made aware of this program the first day that they become an accounting major. They hear it from faculty, undergraduate advisors, career services, and BAP members. If they are going to be a CPA and meet the 150-hour requirement, then the MAcc is the best way to go. Why should an accounting student who is planning to go into public accounting do anything else?

Since this college’s good students are the best candidates for this program, it has lowered the barriers for them to enter. All accounting majors at this university with a GPA of 3.25 or greater will not have to take the GMAT examination. We have been very creative in developing new graduate assistantship opportunities for our students. The creation of a new database, and the process of contacting the offices of the athletic director, the vice president of finance, the controller and the university’s foundation, has provided the MAcc program with several additional graduate assistantship opportunities across campus. It makes sense to hire a MAcc student for accounting related positions. Every struggling MAcc program can implement these simple steps and will potentially increase the quality and quantity of students in its program!

Endnotes
1. California, Delaware, New Hampshire, Vermont and the Virgin Islands had not enacted the 150-hour requirement as of this date. See Boone and Coe (2002, pages 256 and 257). Colorado did enact the 150-hour requirement but later repealed it before the law became effective. See Colbert and Murray (2001, page 189).

2. Cyndie Jeffrey was the original director of the MAcc program and provided the initiative to develop and implement the program. She stepped down in 2004.

3. On July 1, 2004, Marv Bouillon took over as the director.

4. The creative component was a requirement for most new masters programs at Iowa State University without theses. When the MAcc started in 2000, the MBA was the only masters program without a creative component or a thesis. Since then, the College of Design has added a master degree program without a creative component.

5. International students traditionally take longer.

6. There were only three MAcc students that received graduate assistantships before July 1, 2004. These assistantships are no longer guaranteed for MAcc students because the College of Business has removed its support for the MAcc program.
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Making the Transition from Doctoral Student to Assistant Professor

by Andrew Schwarz, Louisiana State University; Jason Thatcher, Clemson University; and Varun Grover, Clemson University

You have made it through the doctoral program. You are a PhD. You finally have “Dr.” in front of your name. Now, it is time to move into a productive academic career—no longer kowtowing to your committee and other faculty. Your job is well within your comfort zone. After all, you have done plenty of research and teaching in the doctoral program. This job is more of the same—with a bigger paycheck. At last, you are in control of your career, making real money … and life is looking up. Think again.

While much has been written on the skill sets necessary to succeed as a doctoral student, less attention has been given to helping doctoral students’ transition into life as assistant professors. In our experience, many doctoral students view their program as the biggest hill to climb—and receive a rude awakening when their first job proves to be a greater challenge than they anticipated. Rather than expressing enthusiasm for their new jobs, these fresh assistant professors often look back fondly on the simplicity of doctoral life as they decipher expectations, navigate obstacles, and deal with the complexities of their lives on the tenure-track.

A number of stress points make academic jobs unique (Sorcinelli, 1992): (1) Not enough time; (2) Inadequate feedback and recognition; (3) Unrealistic self-expectations; (4) Lack of collegiality; and (5) Balancing work and outside life. These stress points come as a source of consternation for many fresh assistant professors. Some even decide relatively late in the process after reaching a level of frustration—that an academic career is not for them. This is unfortunate. We write this commentary as a retrospective view of this transition—in the hope that it will complement a doctoral student’s prospective view. While the commentary will sensitize students to the difficulties of academic life, our intent is not to dissuade students from this career choice. The life of a faculty member can be very rewarding in terms of flexibility, pursuing knowledge, and developing students. However, along with these intrinsic rewards comes the harsh reality of assistant professors’ lives, and the better prepared students are for this reality, the better their ability to cope.

The three classical aspects of an academic job are RESearch, Service to the university and scholarly communities, and Teaching, known collectively as the REST duties. To understand retrospectively how faculty perceive REST, we interviewed 16 colleagues: five assistant professors pursuing tenure, two assistant professors that were denied tenure and are looking for a new academic job, one assistant professor that was denied tenure and left academia, five associate professors, and three senior scholars. A list of questions was formulated to identify surprises and strategies during the transition from a doctoral student to an assistant professor. Below, we have organized these discussions and provide advice through them to assist future assistant professors.

How Do I Make a Successful Transition?

Our colleagues agreed that the skill sets required to be a good doctoral student differ from those required to be a good
Assistant professors have more demands placed on them than doctoral students. Unlike doctoral study where (say) single-minded focus on a dissertation project is not only appropriate but also a recipe for success, assistant professors find themselves suddenly confronted with a new repertoire of obligations related to juggling multiple research projects, teaching more courses and service.

I have many more demands on my time. From graduate student advising, to university commitments, to new preps for teaching (I teach 4 preps this year plus an extra-comp course), I am never caught up. You have to learn to manage your time well and prioritize.  

[Recently Tenured Associate Professor]

Assistant professors lack clear milestones to mark the path to tenure. While many doctoral students face difficulty in identifying and refining their research, they (usually) have some kind of support structure that provides valuable guidance about where to direct their energy. In the dissertation stage, committee members and particularly the advisor have made a commitment to help. Often, junior faculty do not receive such formal support or guidance. In some cases, senior faculty provide inconsistent messages about the relative importance of teaching, research, or service—leaving junior faculty with unclear guidance about where to direct their efforts.

Many schools do not do a very good job of mentoring junior faculty—and thus, you go from what ought to have been an environment with much mentoring (PhD school) to one with none (faculty).  

[Associate Professor]

Goals/objectives are less clear/more difficult to identify: As a graduate student, things are clear—you know you need to pass the comprehensive exam, finish your dissertation, etc. As a professor, the requirements for tenure may not be very clear (and the tenure review several years away), you may be given mixed messages on the importance of teaching, service, etc. Goal setting, prioritizing your time, etc. can be challenging.  

[Recently Tenured Associate Professor]

Assistant professors feel more pressure—due to increasingly stringent tenure requirements juxtaposed with tougher publication standards. In many cases the responsibility for courses and initiatives falls fully on the new faculty member—rather than “a superior” as in the case of doctoral study. Even if one meets service and teaching requirements, tenure depends on publication.

Tenure is not a fun process. Even with it complete, I feel amazing amounts of internal pressure to continue to perform at a high level. Across all business disciplines, tenure standards are going up.  

[Recently Tenured Associate Professor]

Lacking clear goals, being confronted by competing demands, and having to work under pressure to produce means that assistant professors must be more self-motivated than doctoral students. Assistant professors often lack institutional mechanisms around which to structure their lives. For example, where doctoral students have markers such as comprehensive exams or proposal defenses to mark transitions, assistant professors receive often nebulous annual reviews of their progress towards tenure. Generally speaking, senior faculty do not look over assistant professors’ shoulders to make sure that their inputs in the form of time and energy spent on research, teaching, and service required to earn tenure are commensurate with outputs required to earn tenure. Consider the following quotes:

You can do nothing for a long time and nobody will notice until an entire year goes by.  

[Senior Scholar]

It’s up to you to self-manage your areas of weakness: One of the biggest challenges is that you have much less of a ‘safety net’ to help you manage the things that get you personally into trouble…. When we are doctoral students, if we’re lucky there are [who] faculty know us very well, are aware of those things that tend to trip us up, and provide us with constructive feedback, support, suggestions, etc. that help us deal with these issues. As a new faculty member, we are expected to ‘self-manage’—there is no handholding and often minimal feedback.  

[Recently Tenured Associate Professor]

For grad students there is a support network of other grad students and faculty advisors. As a professor that network is much less concrete. Of course you can still reach out to your advisors, but you are no longer their first priority—you have been replaced by new grad students. Your cohort of fellow grad students are all busy getting settled into their new positions and starting on their own careers. If you are really lucky you will find a position with a supportive faculty and administration, but from what I’ve seen those opportunities are few and far between.  

[Denied Assistant Professor]

Assistant professors find themselves engaged in hallway talk on people and politics—something most doctoral students are not involved in. Even if students understood the politics where they earned their degree, at a new institution, the rules of the game are different, and unique to their new employer.
Becoming politically astute is necessary, as understanding personalities, power, and resources are sometimes required to be successful.

In most cases, grad students are below the fray of politics—junior faculty are not. Being aware and keeping your mouth shut are important skills to learn :) [from someone who learned them the hard way!]] [Associate Professor who was denied tenure at the first school]

Succeeding as a grad student is like being a junior officer on a ship. If your Captain knows what he/she is doing the trip will be relatively smooth and predictable—and a lot of work. You know in advance where you are going and what you have to do to get there. You don’t actually have to plan the whole trip, just the last 1/4 of it. You can stop at most any port and declare that the voyage was successful. Succeeding as a professor is like sailing that ship into new territory and finding a treasure map. The treasure map (i.e., the research literature) shows lots of places that are likely to contain buried treasures. Some treasures are easy to find but not very valuable, some treasures have already been found by other people, some treasures are impossibly hard to find—even though everybody knows they exist, and some treasures are within your grasp—provided that you stocked your ship with the right tools before you ever left the home port. [Recently Tenured Associate Professor]

But Were These Differences Unexpected?

While the differences were evident to our interviewees, they may not come as a surprise to many doctoral students. However, some aspects unique to academic life are not as easy to predict. According to our colleagues, surprises include: (1) Publication pressure, (2) Time pressure, (3) Lack of resources, and (4) The random nature of the job.

Surprise: Degree of Pressure Created by the Review Processes

A major disconnect mentioned by our colleagues is pressure felt by assistant professors due to the peer review process. While the mantra to publish or perish is well-engrained within doctoral programs, what this means is not totally clear until students send papers out for peer review. Used to encouraging feedback from faculty, students are often shocked by the nature and quality of feedback on their paper submissions.

Reviewers are not very nice. Often, reviewers are not very helpful. You have to be thick-skinned and persistent to publish. [Newly Tenured Associate Professor]

Despite challenges presented by the peer review process, the need to publish (and publish quickly) cannot be understated:

The constant ticking of the tenure clock is hard. There are not many jobs where you either get promoted or fired after a set period of time. To make things worse, a lot of the process is out of your hands (e.g., the fickle review process). [Assistant Professor]

Surprise: Now, Even Less Time

Many of our colleagues were caught off guard by the limited time available to balance diverse expectations. Doctoral students daydream about the absence of assistantship requirements and having full control of their time to teach or research. However, as an assistant professor, (a) the tenure clock is always looming and, (b) there are more demands that take away from focusing on what is important to earn tenure. Our colleagues agreed:

Being ‘fragmented’ so much in terms of the things that are demanded of you. Try as you may, even the best time management planning can be disrupted and your day can often end up fractured into little pieces. You just need to deal with it and do the best you can. [Newly Tenured Associate Professor]

Balancing the demands of teaching, research, and service—with family life. [Assistant Professor]

Just finding time to write. [Assistant Professor]

Surprise: Scant Resources

Several of our colleagues recalled feeling surprised by the lack of resources available to fund research and teaching.

Faculty are often called upon to do more with less and this bombshell stuns many newly minted PhDs. This thought was reflected in the following quote:

I always thought faculty had great travel budgets, funds for software, and graduate assistant support. This is not a reality. [Newly Tenured Associate Professor]

Surprise: More Random than Controlled Life

Our colleagues reported being initially disconcerted by the randomness of academic life. Specifically, assistant professors were surprised by how little control they have over some of the fundamental aspects of their jobs—for example, whether a paper is accepted or career opportunities.

I wish I had better understood the random nature of an academic career. You are subject to a number of factors that are outside your control. For example, job openings are driven by who retires, who decides to change positions, who doesn’t get tenure, fluctuations in student enrollments, college and university budgets, etc. Getting published is influenced to a certain extent by the abilities and conduct of your co-authors, who ends up reviewing your paper, the journal’s AE, SE, and EIC, what other papers are submitted, developments in the IS field, etc. This randomness is also present in other industries, of course. Just look at the people affected by the housing crash, for example. However, I would argue that it is more prevalent in academia, at least until you get tenure, then you have a greater degree of certainty. If I were to get philosophical about it, I might say it’s a yin and yang kind of thing—the greater randomness and uncertainty of the early years are balanced out by the greater stability and certainty of the post-tenure year. [Assistant Professor Denied Tenure]

As a grad student, if I did my research, learn and work diligently, I could make it. But as a professor to be successful, there are many other factors that can influence your success. I wish I knew that when I was a grad student. I wish I knew about the degree of influence senior colleagues
How Can a Doctoral Student Prepare for This Transition?

To prepare for the next phase of their academic life, all of our colleagues agreed that students must carefully consider their career paths. Doctoral students are trained for academic careers. However, when students do not enjoy research or teaching, they should consider exploring non-academic employment options.

An assistant professor who returned to industry told us:

I did not know there wasn’t happiness, or a sense of satisfaction, in research-extensive academia for me. I also did not know that I had any real options other than academia.... [Students should begin] by having an open, honest discussion with themselves. Do I like research? Am I good at it? Is there satisfaction in publishing? Should I really be in a teaching school? Should I really be in industry, or starting my own business?

For the majority of students, the primary decision they have to make is what type of school to pursue: state or private? Research intensive or teaching intensive? Considering these questions is important because the type of school effects how assistant professors allocate their time and energy. Although dissertation committees or fellow PhD students may offer advice, these questions can only be answered by the students themselves!

Once the student decides what job to pursue, there are strategies that can help students have a more RESTful life.

In the next section, we introduce strategies that can be employed right now to prepare for, and avoid surprises at, the first academic job.

Research Strategies

Strategy 1: Anticipate Long Review Cycles and Be Flexible

No author is able to anticipate what will happen after submitting papers to journals. Often, papers that are expected to sail through the review process end up languishing under review for months or receive outright rejections. As papers are prepared, authors should not target specific journals—they may find few alternatives for publication. Instead, papers should be written to appeal to editorial boards at multiple venues and authors should be ready to sequentially submit papers to several outlets until they are accepted for publication.

Strategy 2: Build a Research Portfolio

Earning tenure is not about a specific paper. Instead, it is based on an evaluation of a portfolio of projects, i.e., the sum of faculty work. To build a portfolio requires substantial time, making the projects started as a doctoral student important. One heuristic often used by evaluators of faculty tenure packets is the consistent production of papers from the time of initial employment through tenure. A second heuristic often used by evaluators is whether the tenure packet contains indicators of future research success, i.e., a pipeline. To manage this pressure, students should strive to have not only their dissertation completed, but also additional papers in various stages of completion when they arrive at their first academic position.

Strategy 3: Learn How to Make Time for Writing

As noted above, assistant professors often find they have less time to write as faculty than when they were doctoral students. Every faculty member has a different approach to writing. For some faculty, scheduling time to write 30-45 minutes a day or two-three longer blocks weekly helps structure their time. Other faculty write when the “muse” strikes. Rather than taking long breaks from research, students should establish, and hold themselves accountable for, goals about writing. When students write on a regular basis, they are more likely to complete their dissertation on time and develop a strong portfolio of projects.

Strategy 4: Economies of Research

Doctoral students need to achieve economies of scale and scope in their research. In terms of scale, students would be well-served to work on projects with clearly defined beginnings and endpoints. In terms of scope, doctoral students should focus on problems with clearly defined boundaries and relevant theories. Students and assistant professors should not try to solve the problems of the world—there is time for that after tenure. Instead, they should identify a few key areas and focus on projects that make a clear impact on those research streams. By narrowing their focus, assistant professors may master theories and methods necessary to push papers through to publication.

Service and Collegiality Strategies

Strategy 1: Network on Campus

Assistant professors should build relationships with colleagues in their department and college. Social activities such as visiting colleagues’ offices, going to lunch, or having a cup of coffee extend personal networks. They should get to know their colleagues’ research, approaches to teaching, and quirks of campus culture. Through getting to know colleagues, lasting relationships can be built and opportunities for collaboration can be identified.
Strategy 2: Network at Conferences

Students should not rely on faculty bringing visitors to their university as a means to build a network; instead, they should make time to get to know other faculty and doctoral students from other schools at conferences. Informal social connections are a good way of identifying job and research opportunities.

Strategy 3: Choose Service Opportunities Wisely

Choose service that yields long term benefits. A senior scholar suggested that assistant professors use the following heuristics:

• Service should not be neglected, but don’t get carried away.
• Some service assignments are really rewarding. Even if you don’t do a perfect job, if you put in a little time, it will look like gold. Very often you can spend a small amount of time and it is really appreciated.
• You should be saying “no” quite regularly or you’re taking on too many responsibilities. Some of them are worthwhile (e.g., being AE for MISQ). Some are not (writing chapters for certain encyclopedias or reviewing for conferences you don’t want to attend).
• Don’t let flattery get you to say “yes.” See previous bullet.

Teaching Strategy: Managing Time Efficiently

Our colleagues offered only one teaching strategy: faculty should manage their time efficiently. Faculty differ in how much time they invest in teaching—from six hours to 20 hours a week. Keep in mind that teaching excellence is necessary, but not sufficient, to earn tenure at nearly every university. As one senior professor said, “Teaching is increasingly important. It pays the bills. But it is a black box and can consume inordinate time. As long as students are not complaining to the dean....”

A Final Note: Prioritization is Key

Prioritizing one’s time is crucial, as many assistant professors estimate that they dedicate around 55 hours a week to their job. Guidelines faculty should consider are: using their time carefully, paying attention to their university’s values, setting priorities, and then planning out their life. As faculty approach tenure, they should keep in mind that balancing the demands of their professional life with their personal life is important, and there are many different paths towards achieving this goal.

DEANS’ PERSPECTIVE, from page 23


Quality Management Journal seeks papers that provide greater insights into healthcare services, operations, quality management, decision making, and performance improvement for a special issue on “Research in Healthcare Operations and Quality Management.” This issue seeks conceptual or empirical papers that pursue either theory-building or theory-testing. Submit manuscripts by September 30, 2009, to manuscripts@asq.org and note that you are submitting your paper for the special issue. Victor Prybutok (prybutok@unt.edu), University of North Texas, and Xiaoni Zhang, Northern Kentucky University, are serving as guest editors.
Midwest DSI
by Ceyhun Ozgur, Valparaiso University, President

Midwest DSI is alive and well in 2008. The Midwest Region of Decision Sciences held its 39th Annual Meeting on April 17-19, in Erie, Penn. The conference was hosted by Penn State – Erie, The Behrend College (Sam & Irene Black School of Business). In addition, three other local colleges and universities were also actively involved as co-hosts: Gannon University, Edinboro University of Pennsylvania, and Mercyhurst College. The program chair of this MWDSI conference was Diane Parente of Penn State – Erie.

The special consortium of academic units provided a tremendous program team with energy and commitment to new ideas and approaches to the conference. The 2008 MWDSI conference was completed successfully. There were over 90 submissions of papers and abstracts. Eighty were ultimately presented as abstracts or papers. There were 20 paper presentation sessions and 21 special sessions. The conference was held at the Courtyard Marriott and the Penn State Erie School of Business. There were 130 registrations of members, non-members and students. The sessions included:

- Research papers and abstracts
- Administrative sessions—a four-session track including an administrator’s look at teaching, and administrator’s look at research, administrative issues in online teaching, and administrative issues in accreditation
- Publishing with the Experts
- A two-session presentation and discussion on SCM 2010 and beyond
- A two-session student paper competition including masters and undergraduate papers
- A two-session case competition of MBA and undergraduate teams
- A panel discussion on interdisciplinary programs focusing on business and engineering
- A statistics tutorial given by J. Burdeane Orris on how to effectively use computer and Excel to help in teaching statistics.
- Four hands-on sessions: Online Procurement Auctions, RFID, Financial Trading Floor, and SAP enterprise systems
- Papers presented at the Erie MWDSI Conference as full papers are eligible to be considered for publication at International Journal of Operations & Quantitative Management, guest edited by Ceyhun Ozgur. Of the eligible papers, there were eight papers submitted to the special issue. All of these eight papers are under review at this point.
- Stan Hardy award paper presentation. Stan Hardy award is an annual award given to the best Operations Management paper in the previous calendar year. The 2007 Stan Hardy award was selected by judges and coordinated by Richard Penlesky. Five journal editors presented the top two articles in their journal. The award winner is selected from these 10 articles by the judges. The participating journals were Decision Sciences, Operations Management, International Journal of Production Research, Manufacturing &

Participants gather for a round-up at the 2008 Asia-Pacific Regional Annual Meeting (held in Brisbane in July) at the Australian Outback Spectacular Dinner Show in Australia’s Gold Coast.
FROM THE REGIONS

Service Operations Management, and Production & Operations Management.

Northeast DSI
by Rhonda Hyde, University of Delaware, President

The Northeast DSI region is looking forward to its 2009 annual meeting at Mohegan Sun, Connecticut. Ken Sousa (ksousa@bryant.edu), 2009 NEDSI Program Chair, is planning yet another innovative and fun NEDSI conference. Our 2008 meeting, held last March in New York City and chaired by Snehamay Banerjee, received rave reviews from many conference attendees.

In other news, Maling Ebrahimpour of Roger Williams University is the 2009 DSI program chair of the conference to be held in New Orleans. Minoo Tehran of Roger Williams University is program chair for the 2009 International DSI meeting in Nancy, France. Christine Kydd of the University of Delaware has been elected treasurer of DSI. We at NEDSI extend our congratulations to each of them.

During the summer, NEDSI sent out its inaugural issue of our newsletter called “NEDSI Jottings” to past conference participants. We hope that this newsletter will keep NEDSI conference attendees updated on upcoming events and news about individual NEDSI participants.

Southeast DSI
by Christina McCart, Roanoke College, VP-Publications

It’s a great year in the Southeast Region, with lots of good things happening. We began the year with our annual meeting, which was held at Disney World. Our officers’ reception was held at Epcot and it concluded with a fabulous display of fireworks over spaceship earth, interspersed with a total eclipse of the moon. It’s hard to beat that!

Our Orlando meeting went on to be very successful. With over 135 papers and tutorials, and 162 members in attendance, we not only sold out our room block, but exceeded the allowable block size! Three papers were recognized for “the best paper in track” award, as noted in the last edition of Decision Line. The Distinguished Service Award was bestowed upon Hope Baker of Kennesaw State University. Dr. Baker has been very active in SEDSI, holding every major office and even jumping in and taking over the program chair’s responsibilities when necessary. She is currently a past president and council member and continues to be very active at both the regional and national level, having served on at least one major committee at the national level almost every year since 1990. Dr. Baker has published in European Journal of Operational Research, Omega, Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education and Interface. She has also received numerous teaching awards. We are much honored to have such an individual in our midst and appreciate the opportunity to recognize her accomplishments and dedication. Thank you, Dr. Baker!

The totally revised SE chapter by-laws and constitution, and new officers manual were voted into effect this year at the annual meeting. Since our original charter in 1979, the constitution has been amended seven times and the bylaws have been amended nine times. With so many revisions, there were many inconsistencies in these documents and it had become apparent that this piecemeal approach was no longer effective. We also needed to update the documents to reflect the contemporary electronic age, to include such things as being able to vote by e-mail and through the web. Also, in many areas the old documents just no longer reflected how we actually operate the organization and that needed to be changed. Bill Carper, Professor of Management at University of West Florida, who is a past president of SESDI and remains incredibly active, took the initiative to totally rewrite the constitution and bylaws and then to champion them through all of the proper channels. In order to get the most of the new bylaws, Dr. Carper also created a new officers’ manual. We are very proud of our new documents; they can be viewed at http://www.sedsi.org. Thank you, Dr. Carper!

Also at this year’s meeting, we had the opportunity to use our new projectors. An issue for us over the past few years has been how to offer our participants up-to-date projection devises without paying exorbitant AV fees to a hotel. This year we solved it by purchasing, along with SE INFORMS, 10 projectors which can project PowerPoint presentations directly from a flashdrive. So far they have been very well received and worked well for us this year. With a payback period of only a little over a year, we are confident that it was a good investment.

Outside of the region, many of our members are also active at the national level, and you’ll see their names and faces throughout the Baltimore meeting. You may notice several as track chairs and committee members. Also, the New Faculty Development Consortium is being directed by three of our past presidents (Bill Carper, Carl Gooding, and Jim Pope). Rumor has it that spaces are still available, so you are encouraged to pass along the information to your junior faculty. What a great opportunity for them to learn all about career options and also about DSI!

Planning is well underway for our next annual meeting in Charleston. It is being held February 18-20 at the Doubletree Guest Suites in the historic downtown district. It is a good time of year to be in Charleston, and if you have never been, you will find that Charleston is a great place to visit. Considered by many to be a living museum, in this beautifully preserved city you can experience tours through historic landmarks, including 18th century homes and plantations, the Battery, museums, churches and the city market. But it’s not all about Charleston; our meeting will be memorable, too. Due to popular demand, we have rearranged our tracks to reflect the changing interests of our members and now have a track that includes Supply Chain Management. And, our student paper competition, as usual, will provide an opportunity for graduate students to share their research.
and perhaps even win a monetary award. Although students generally come from the Southeast Region, we welcome them, as well as more seasoned faculty, from everywhere. So mark your calendars now, start getting a paper ready for submission, and we look forward to welcoming you to our meeting in the “cultural capital of the South”!

Southwest DSI

by Bonnie F. Daily, New Mexico State University, President

The Decision Sciences Institute Southwest Region (SWDSI) had a particular busy and productive year in 2008. SWDSI held their annual meeting in Houston in March in conjunction with the Federation of Business Disciplines.

Kai Koong, associate professor of computer information systems and quantitative methods at the University of Texas, Pan-American was our 2008 program chair. He did an exceptional job; 150 papers were submitted and after a double-blind review process, 132 were accepted for presentation. Highlights of the conference included: (1) a miniconsortium for students and new faculty; (2) two panels, one on critical thinking skills in the decision sciences and one on enterprise computing challenges; (3) a keynote address by the director of the UT Telecampus System, Rob Robinson, on “Enhancing access via online technologies”; and (4) a successful, social, and professional networking reception.

Awards and Recognition: Several members received recognition for their various achievements at the conference. Two awards worthy of special notation include the Distinguished Service Award and the Outstanding Educator Award.

In recognition of more than 20 years of professional commitment, leadership, and service to the Decision Sciences Institute, Southwest Region, R. Wayne Headrick was selected to receive the 2008 Distinguished Service Award. Currently an associate professor of computer information systems at the University of Texas, Pan-American, he has been a member of the Southwest Decision Sciences Institute (SWDSI) since 1984, and was first a member of the Decision Sciences Institute (DSI) in 1982. Dr. Headrick has served SWDSI as vice president-finance (1999-2003), council member (1993-1999), and Distinguished Service Award selection committee member (1999-2000). He also served SWDSI as secretary/treasurer of the Federation of Business Disciplines (FBD), member of the FBD board of directors and FBD executive council (2003-2005). His professional activities at SWDSI, national DSI and international DSI conferences have included the presentation of many papers and participation in a variety of workshops and panel sessions. In addition, he has been an eight-time SWDSI track chairman and has participated as a manuscript reviewer, session chair and discussant for numerous conferences.

The 2008 SWDSI Outstanding Educator Award recipient was Thomas W. Jones, a professor from the University of Arkansas, Department of Information Systems. For over 30 years, Tom Jones has had a record of excellence in teaching both undergraduate and graduate courses in three distinct areas: statistics, production and operations management, and management science/operations research. He has demonstrated a continued interest in being an excellent teacher as evidenced by over 30 articles, presentations, and other teaching-related research activities. He has served as track chair of the Innovative Education track at DSI meetings and regional meetings on several occasions, and he has been involved in numerous other sessions and panels aimed at enhancing teaching effectiveness. Tom has been very effective in translating pedagogical theory into practice. Nominations for various teaching awards have spanned virtually his entire career in academia and led to numerous awards. Teaching awards received by Tom while at the University of Arkansas include: the College of Business Distinguished Achievement Award for Teaching (1979), Outstanding Faculty Award for Classroom Instruction (1983), Outstanding Faculty Contributions to Teaching Award (1986), and Outstanding Teacher Award (1988); the Business Graduate Students Association Outstanding Graduate Faculty Member (1998); and the Student Alumni Board and Associated Student Government Recognition for Excellence in Teaching (2001).

Congratulations should also be extended to the following individuals who received awards for their research presented at SWDSI ’08:

- Dr. Hsu, Dr. Wang and Dr. Chiu, Best Paper Award.
- Dr. Lu and Dr. Linda Haynes, the Alpha Iota Delta Innovative Education Award
- Ms. Diaz, Best Doctoral Student Paper Award.
- Ms. Beeler, Best Graduate Student Paper Award.
- Mr. Luke Koong and Ms. Shirley Yu, Best Undergraduate Student Paper Award.

SWDSI Annual Meeting 2009

We will be in Oklahoma City in March 2009. Joe Felan is our Program Chair for 2009. Please consider participating in SWDSI; check out our Call for Papers at our website at http://www.swdsi.org/ or contact Joe at jtfelan@ualr.edu. If you any questions regarding SWDSI, in general, please contact me, Bonnie F. Daily at bdaily@nmsu.edu. I am the current president of SWDSI. Hope to see you in OK City in ’09!
ANNOUNCEMENTS (see more information on related conferences and publications at http://www.decisionsciences.org)

Institute Meetings
The 39th Annual Meeting of the Institute will be held November 22-25, 2008, at the Baltimore Marriott Waterfront Hotel in Baltimore, Maryland. See pages 33-42 for detailed information on activities in Baltimore. Contact Program Chair Marc Schniederjans, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, at dsi2008@unl.edu. http://www.decisionsciences.org/annualmeeting/

The 40th Annual Meeting of the Institute will be held November 14-17, 2009, at the New Orleans Marriott Hotel in New Orleans, Louisiana. Submission deadline is October 1, 2009. Contact Program Chair Malin Eigehim, Roger Williams University, mebrahimpour@rwu.edu.

The 2009 International DSI Meeting will be held June 24-27, 2009, in Nancy, France. Paper submission deadline is February 1, 2009. Contact Program Chair Minoo Tehrani, Roger Williams University, mtehrani@rwu.edu.


The Indian Subcontinent Region will hold its second annual conference at the Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay, January 3-5, 2009. Submission deadline for extended abstract was July 15, 2008. For more information, contact Jatin N. D. (Jeet) Gupta, The University of Alabama in Huntsville, guptaj@uah.edu. http://cba.uah.edu/guptaj/cfpisdsi2009.pdf


The Mexico Region is still planning its next annual meeting. For more information, contact Antonio Rios, Instituto Tecnologico de Monterrey, antonio.rios@itesm.mx.

The Midwest Region will hold its 2009 Annual Meeting on April 16-18, 2009, at the Marriott Conference Center and Miami Inn in Oxford, Ohio. For more information, contact William “Rocky” Newman, Miami University, newmanw@muohio.edu.

http://www.fsb.muohio.edu/mwdsi2009/

http://www.pom.edu/mwdsi/

The Northeast Region will hold its 2009 Annual Meeting on April 1-3, 2009, at the Mohegan Sun in Uncasville, Connecticut. Submission deadline was October 10, 2008. Contact Kenneth Sousa, Bryant University, ksousa@bryant.edu.

http://www.nedsi.org

The Southeast Region will hold its 2009 Annual Meeting on February 18-20, 2009, at the Doubletree Guest Suites in Historic Charleston, South Carolina. Submission deadline was September 19, 2008. The call for papers can be found at the link below. For further information contact Program Chair Wesley Jones, The Citadel, Wes. jones@citadel.edu.

http://www.sedsi.org

The Southwest Region will hold its 2009 (30th) Annual Meeting on February 24-28, 2009, at the Renaissance Hotel, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, USA. Submission deadline for papers was October 15, 2008. For more information, contact Kai Koong, University of Texas-Pan American, koongk@utpa.edu.

http://www.swdsi.org

The Western Region will hold its 2009 (38th) Annual Meeting on April 7-11, 2009, at the Hilton Kauai Beach Resort in Kauai, Hawaii. Submission deadline for abstracts and papers is October 1, 2008. For further information contact Nafisseh Heiat, Montana State University-Billings, nheiat@msubillings.edu. http://www.wdsinet.org

Call for Papers
Conferences
26th Annual Pan-Pacific Conference, “Strategic Innovation through Collaboration and Convergence,” will be held June 1-3, 2009, in Shenzhen, China. Submission deadlines is January 30, 2009. Contact: Sang M. Lee, President, Pan-Pacific Business Association, panpac@panpacificbusiness.org

http://www.panpacificbusiness.org


Publications

Corporate Governance: An International Review seeks papers for a special issue on “Shareholder Activism.” Guest editors are Huimin Chung, National Chiao Tung University, Taiwan (chunghui@mail.nctu.edu.tw); and Till Talaulicar, Technical University of Berlin, Germany (t.talaulicar@www.tub-berlin.de). Deadline for paper submissions is March 31, 2009. http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/corg

Author Guidelines: www.cgir.org
2008 DSI Annual Meeting

2008 Program Chair’s Message

MARC J. SCHNIEDEJANS, University of Nebraska-Lincoln

The final schedule for the Decision Sciences Institute’s 2008 Annual Meeting in Baltimore is posted! We have 24 tracks with a total of 360 sessions representing over 1,100 papers, including regular sessions, panels, workshops and tutorials. The schedule is full, with sessions beginning early on Saturday morning and continuing up until the President’s Luncheon on Tuesday. To review your preliminary schedule, check your commitments, and peruse the sessions in each track use the following website:

http://dsi.byu.edu/dsis/view.pl

In addition to the regular sessions, there are four miniconferences, two consortiums and a faculty development program. The last few issues of Decision Line highlighted these special activities. They include Curricular Issues Miniconference, coordinated by Vijay R. Kannan; Technology in the Classroom Miniconference, coordinated by William Johnson and Rupak Rauniar; and the Miniconference on Successful Grantmanship, coordinated by Q. B. Chung and Kristie Seawright. New to DSI meetings we initiate this year the Doctoral Studies Miniconference, coordinated by Yair Levy, Iram Becerra-Fernandez, and George M. Marakas. We also have the Doctoral Student Consortium, coordinated by Maling Ebrahimpour; and the Miniconference on Successful Grantmanship, coordinated by Q. B. Chung and Kristie Seawright. New to DSI meetings we initiate this year the Doctoral Studies Miniconference, coordinated by Yair Levy, Iram Becerra-Fernandez, and George M. Marakas. We also have the Doctoral Student Consortium, coordinated by Maling Ebrahimpour; and the Miniconference on Successful Grantmanship, coordinated by Q. B. Chung and Kristie Seawright.

The Program Committee, consisting of over 50 DSI members has worked hard to put together a meeting with challenging content and opportunities to learn from each other. Be sure to mark these special events in your Annual Meeting calendar:

- **Annual Meeting Welcome Reception**
  Saturday (11/22, 6:00 p.m.)

- **Information System/Healthcare Keynote Speaker**
  Sunday (11/23, 3:00 p.m.)

- **Sara Lee Operations Keynote Speaker**
  Monday (11/24, 3:00 p.m.)

- **President’s Reception**
  Monday (11/24, 6:00 p.m.)

- **President’s Luncheon**
  Tuesday (11/25, 11:30 a.m.)

The 2008 DSI Annual Meeting will be held at the Baltimore Marriott Waterfront in Baltimore, Maryland. This hotel is set on the edge of Baltimore Inner Harbor in the heart of Harbor East, steps away from Inner Harbor restaurants and shopping, the National Aquarium, Maryland Science Center and the USS Constellation. For more information, see http://www.marriott.com/hotels/travel/bwiwf-baltimore-marriott-waterfront/

Please make your hotel reservation early. There are two ways to make reservations (phone or online): Reservations Phone: (800) 228-9290. Reservations Online (use group codes below): http://www.marriott.com/hotels/travel/bwiwf-baltimore-marriott-waterfront/

For single occupancy rooms, please use group code: dsidsia. For double/triple/quad occupancy rooms, please use group code: dsidsib.

The Annual Meeting website provides more information about the meeting, travel to and from the airport. We look forward to seeing you in Baltimore!
Keynote Presentations

Sunday, November 23, 3:00 pm

Innovation and eCommerce in Health Care: Decision Support and Healthcare’s Focus on Consumerism

John Janney, Vice President of eBusiness and Enrollment Services, Independence Blue Cross, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

America’s approach to healthcare is on the verge of a major shift. This shift is being driven by a number of factors: the high cost of care, inconsistent outcomes, an aging population, a large number of uninsured, and rising insurance premiums. Major health insurers and purchasers are looking for innovative approaches and tools that, through the use of the Web, will empower consumers to make better informed decisions concerning their healthcare. John Janney will discuss how he and his eBusiness department developed and implemented these decision support applications and other innovations in the launch of IBC’s new eCommerce portals.

John Janney began his career in Operations at General Accident Insurance of Philadelphia. While there, he was responsible for developing a number of software applications that were used to track transaction workflow, employee productivity, and workload. Eventually he oversaw the introduction and development of Sales-force Automation tools, Marketing Information Systems, and Geographic Information Systems at General Accident.

In 1995, John joined Independence Blue Cross to lead their newly formed Marketing Systems Department. There, he oversaw the deployment of a number of strategic system projects that helped make Marketing one of the most technologically advanced divisions in the company. During his time there, the Marketing Systems area successfully developed twelve new systems, including IBC’s first eCommerce application, a system named ROAM that today handles over 60,000 quotes for new business annually.

In 2000, he was asked to take a leadership role in IBC’s eCommerce initiative. He was responsible for implementing IBC’s strategic plan for addressing the eCommerce needs of its Physicians, Hospitals, Brokers, Employers, and Members. Under his leadership, the eCommerce department at IBC has launched a Provider Portal, Member Portal, Group Portal, and EDI Portal. These applications process tens of millions of transactions and inquiries annually.

Today, John is the Vice President of eCommerce and Enrollment Services. In that role he is responsible for overseeing a division of over 450 associates who develop and deploy all of the IBC’s eCommerce and Operational technologies and provide Enrollment services to over 3.5 million members.

Monday, November 24, 3:00 pm

Successfully Managing Sara Lee in Today’s Global Business Environment: Piece of Cake or Pie in the Sky?

L.M. (Theo) De Kool, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial and Administrative Officer, Sara Lee Corporation, Downers Grove, Illinois

Changing consumer behaviors, consolidating customers, unprecedented input cost inflation, soft economies at home and abroad, strong emerging markets, sustainable business practices, sound corporate governance, tight credit conditions and a flagging stock market: it’s all in a day’s work for today’s large cap senior executive. How can the modern-day manager deal with today’s business challenges without losing sight of tomorrow’s opportunities? From his own international perspective, Sara Lee’s CFO Theo de Kool will shed light on how Sara Lee’s senior management team manages the company in today global business environment.

De Kool began his career with Sara Lee in 1990, serving as vice president of finance for the Household and Personal Care division of Sara Lee/DE. In 1993, de Kool left Sara Lee/DE to serve as chief financial officer of the Blokker retail chain. He rejoined Sara Lee/DE in 1995 as chief financial officer and a member of the board of management, and was named a vice president of Sara Lee Corporation in 1996. He was promoted to senior vice president in 2001 and was named executive vice president and chief financial officer of Sara Lee Corporation in January 2002. He was named to his current position in February 2005.

De Kool previously held positions with Buhrmann Letterode and CPC Benelux, B.V. He is currently a member of the supervisory board of Royal Wessanen nv, which is based in the Netherlands, and is a member of the board of directors of the Executives’ Club of Chicago. He holds a masters degree in economics from Erasmus University in Rotterdam, the Netherlands.

Each and every day, Sara Lee (NYSE: SLE) delights millions of consumers and customers around the world. The company has one of the world’s best-loved and leading portfolios with its innovative and trusted food, beverage, household and body care brands, including Ambi Pur, Ball Park, Douwe Egberts, Hillshire Farm, Jimmy Dean, Kiwi, Sanex, Sara Lee and Senseo. In fiscal 2008, Sara Lee generated more than $13 billion in net sales across approximately 200 countries. The Sara Lee community consists of 44,000 employees worldwide. Please visit www.saralee.com for the latest news and in-depth information about Sara Lee and its brands.

Receptions will immediately follow each presentation.
We are pleased to announce the winner and honorable mentions for the 2008 Elwood S. Buffa Dissertation Award Competition. The purpose of the award is to encourage and publicize outstanding dissertation research by selecting and recognizing the best dissertations written during 2007 in the decision sciences. The competition is co-sponsored by McGraw-Hill/Irwin and the Decision Sciences Institute. The Competition coordinator was Julie E. Kendall, Professor of Management at Rutgers University.

Twenty submissions were received and entered into a two-stage review process. Each dissertation was subject to an initial screening by ten or eleven reviewers. This round resulted in the selection of four dissertations for further reviews. In the second round, four reviewers reviewed each of the remaining four dissertations.

The winner will receive a $1,500 check and a plaque at the Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting in Baltimore, Maryland on November 25, 2008. The Honorable Mention Awardees will each receive a plaque.

Thanks and appreciation to the following individuals who assisted with reviewing:

- Anil Aggarwal, University of Baltimore
- Patrice Auger, University of Melbourne
- Kathryn L. Blackmon, University of Oxford
- Pamela Carter, North Carolina A&T State University
- Joseph Carter, Arizona State University
- Q. B. Chung, Villanova University
- James F. Courtney, University of Central Florida
- Christopher Craighead, Penn State University
- Jo Ann M. Dufty, Sam Houston State University
- Joy Field, Boston College
- Byron Finch, Miami University
- Barbara B. Flynn, Indiana University
- S. Thomas Foster, Brigham Young University
- John Goodale, University of Oregon
- Hans Heese, Indiana University-Bloomington
- XinXin Hu, Indiana University-Bloomington
- Peter Ittig, Univ. of Massachusetts-Boston
- Kenneth E. Kendall, Rutgers University
- Mehmet Murat Kristal, York University
- G. Keong Leong, University of Nevada Las Vegas
- Kevin Linderman, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities
- Mo Adam Mahmood, University of Texas at El Paso

For more information, please contact the Dissertation Award Competition Coordinator:

Julie E. Kendall
julie@thekendalls.org
Distinguished Track Papers

Hospitality Management
The Effect of Information Technology Steering Committees on Perceived IT Management Sophistication in Hotels
Cihan Cobanoglu, University of Delaware
Baker M. Ayoun, Auburn University
Daniel J. Connolly, University of Denver

International Business
Airlines In India—A Strategic Analysis
Nat Natarajan, Tennessee Technological University
V. Sridevi, Institute of Financial and International Management, Bangalore, India

Information Systems
Why Experience May Not Matter in Data Warehousing: The Role of Expertise
Richard J. Goeke, Widener University
Robert H. Faley, Kent State University
Kevin E. Dow, Kent State University
Alan A. Brandyberry, Kent State University
Finding the Business Value after Successful ERP Implementation: Making the Case for Gross Margin
Richard J. Goeke, Widener University
Robert H. Faley, Kent State University
Kevin E. Dow, Kent State University

A Service-Design of IT Infrastructure
Pratim Datta, Kent State University
Marvin D. Troutt, Kent State University
David Booth, Kent State University
Murali Shanker, Kent State University

Knowledge Management
A Model of Virtual Community Knowledge Exchange Intentions: Perceived Network Structure, Self-Efficacy, and Individual Motivations
Kyung Woo David Kang, University of Rhode Island
Seung Kyoong Shin, University of Rhode Island
The Impact of Business Intelligence Technologies on Organizational Absorptive Capacity and Ambidextrous Innovation Competence
Lih-Bin Oh, Xi’an Jiaotong University
Hock-Hai Teo, National University of Singapore

Manufacturing Management and Practice
Schedule Stability’s Moderating Effects on the Impact of Manufacturing Flexibility
Gregory D. DeYong, Indiana University
Kyle Cattani, Indiana University
Barbara B. Flynn, Indiana University
F. Robert Jacobs, Indiana University

Supply Chain Management
Buy Now and Match Later: The Impact of Posterior Price Matching on Profit with Strategic Consumers
Lai Guoming, Carnegie Mellon University
Emergent Supply Chain Patterns and Their Impact on Performance
Barbara B. Flynn, Indiana University
Baoqiang Hou, Chinese University of Hong Kong
Xiande Zhao, The Chinese University of Hong Kong

Strategy and Policy
 Cliques and Structural Holes in Collaborative Endeavors
Yan Cimon, Université Laval
Louis Hébert, HEC Montréal
An Empirical Test of Thompson’s Model of Strategic Choice
Paul C. Nutt, University of Strathclyde

Tips for Doctoral Students—Getting the Most from the DSI Annual Meeting
The Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting provides an opportunity for doctoral students to network, develop professional skills, interview for faculty positions— and have a good time!

For students who want to know how to get the most out of the Annual Meeting, see “Tips for Doctoral Students” on the DSI Web site at
http://www.decisionsciences.org/people/doctoral.asp
See past Decision Line articles focusing on doctoral student issues at

Best Paper Awards

Best Application Paper
The Effect of Information Technology Steering Committees on Perceived IT Management Sophistication in Hotels
Cihan Cobanoglu, University of Delaware
Baker M. Ayoun, Auburn University
Daniel J. Connolly, University of Denver

Best Theoretical/Empirical Paper
Buy Now and Match Later: The Impact of Posterior Price Matching on Profit with Strategic Consumers
Guoming Lai, Carnegie Mellon University

Best Interdisciplinary Paper
Kwasi Amoako-Gyampah, University of North Carolina-Greensboro
Moses Acquaah, University of North Carolina-Greensboro
Jayanth M. Jayaram, University Of South Carolina

Best Student Paper
Applicability of Different Capacity Planning Methods: Practical Implications from Contingency Theory
Antti Tenhiala, Helsinki University of Technology

Journal Editors Attending the 2008 DSI Annual Meeting
Check out “Activities” at the link below for an alphabetical listing of editor-in-chiefs and regional editors who have expressed interest in attending the 2008 DSI Annual Meeting. Many other area editors, managing editors, and associate editors will also be in attendance.

www.decisionsciences.org/annualmeeting/
2008 Competitions

For a listing of past DSI award winners, see www.decisionsciences.org/hallfame.htm.

Elwood S. Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition

The purpose of the Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition is to encourage and publicize outstanding dissertation research by selecting and recognizing the best dissertations written in the past year in the decision sciences. The Elwood S. Buffa Dissertation Award, accompanied by a $1,500 prize, will be presented at the annual meeting. Submission deadline was April 1, 2008. For more information concerning this competition, please contact the coordinator.

Nancy Lea Hyer, Vanderbilt University, nancy.lea.hyer@owen.vanderbilt.edu

Best Paper Awards Competition

Best Paper Awards will be presented at the 2008 Annual Meeting. Categories include Best Theoretical/Empirical Research Paper, Best Application Paper, and Best Interdisciplinary Paper. At the discretion of the program chair and track chairs, outstanding scholarship may be recognized through a distinguished paper award in a given track. Reviewers will be asked to nominate competitive paper submissions for these awards. Nominations will then be reviewed by a best paper review committee, which will make award recommendations. Submission deadline was April 1, 2008.

E. Powell Robinson, Texas A&M University, e-robinson@tamu.edu

Best Case Studies Award Competition

The Case Studies Workshop serves an active role in the dissemination of new ideas with respect to case studies topics. Cases may be methodological in nature (i.e., designed to foster the integration of scientific approaches and analyses with real-world decision making). Submission deadline was April 1, 2008.

Ayman Abuhamdieh, Indiana State University, sdayman@isugw.indstate.edu

Best Student Paper Award

An award for the best student paper will be presented at the 2008 Annual Meeting. Reviewers will be asked to nominate competitive paper submissions for this award. Nominations will then be reviewed by a Best Student Paper Award review committee that will make award recommendations. This is a great opportunity for students to receive recognition for their research.

Kathryn M. Zuckweiler, University of Nebraska at Kearney, zuckweilerkm@unk.edu

Instructional Innovation Award Competition

The Instructional Innovation Award Competition seeks to recognize outstanding contributions that advance instructional approaches within the decision sciences. The focus of this award is on innovation in college- or university-level teaching. Three finalists will be chosen to make presentations at the conference competition. The winning entry receives an award of $1,500, and $750 will be divided among each of the other finalists. Applicants are required to submit all contributions electronically using instructions on the conference website.

Bicyclists admire the view of the harbor from the nearby Federal Hill neighborhood.

Baltimore loves its crabs—whether steamed or in tasty crab cakes.
2008 Professional Activities

Curricular Issues Miniconference
The 2008 Curricular Issues Mini-Conference, to be held in conjunction with the annual meeting November 22-25, will include several sessions that address issues that cut across the business curriculum. Planned sessions will address: AACSB Curriculum Guidelines, Assessment and Feedback, The Role of ERP Systems, Implementing Co-Curricular Activities, and Applying Lean Manufacturing Principles. In addition, authors of recent articles in the Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education will present details of teaching innovations and recent empirical findings.

Vijay R. Kannan, Utah State University, v.kannan@usu.edu

Doctoral Student Consortium
The Doctoral Student Consortium provides a unique opportunity for doctoral students from across the U.S. and world to interact with one another and with distinguished scholars in a one-day program devoted to career development. Attendance at this consortium is by invitation based on application. All students who meet the criteria will be accepted.

Maling Ebrahimpour, Roger Williams University, bizdean@rwu.edu

Doctoral Studies Miniconference
Doctoral education is at the core of academic and scholarly development. However, very little attention has been given to the promotion, dissemination, and sharing of research that specifically deals with issues of doctoral education in focus areas such as information systems, decision sciences, operations research and management, information technology, and information science. This miniconference will provide an opportunity for researchers to discuss new ideas on research conducted, or future opportunities for research, in doctoral studies related (but not limited) to the key focus areas noted above. Primarily, the Doctoral Studies Miniconference will be interested in original papers, initial research drafts, works in progress, and panel discussion proposals in these focus topics.

Yair Levy, Nova Southeastern University, levenya@nova.edu; Irma Becerra-Fernandez, Florida International University, beceria@fiu.edu; George M. Marakas, University of Kansas, gmarakas@ku.edu

New Faculty Development Consortium
The New Faculty Development Consortium deals with research, teaching, publishing, and other professional development issues for faculty who are beginning their academic careers. Attendance at this consortium is by application and is open to faculty members who have a Ph.D. degree and are in the first two years of their teaching career.

William B. Carper, University of West Florida, bcarper@uwf.edu; Carl W. Gooding, Samford University; James A. Pope, Louisiana State University in Shreveport

Professional and Faculty Development Program
The Professional and Faculty Development Program is for Institute members at all stages of their careers, with the goal of keeping them current in their fields. The content of the sessions is designed to provide insight into the challenges and opportunities in today’s rapidly changing environment (see topics on the 2008 Annual Meeting website). In addition, the program will include a series of sessions related to research, teaching, publishing, and other professional development issues for faculty who are beginning their academic careers. Submission deadline was May 1, 2008.

Binshan Lin, Louisiana State University in Shreveport, Department of Management, binshan.lin@lsus.edu

Successful Grantsmanship Miniconference
Securing external research grants is a valuable experience, or even a necessary step, because it can significantly enhance research projects. A day-long event to be held on Sunday, November 23, 2008, the Miniconference on Successful Grantsmanship is intended to help develop interests among DSI members in obtaining external research grants and to sharpen skills in writing grant proposals so that endeavors may be more fruitful. You are invited to hear expert panelists and network with like-minded researchers.

Q. B. Chung, Villanova University, q.chung@villanova.edu
Kristie Seawright, Brigham Young University, kristie.seawright@byu.edu

Technology in the Classroom Miniconference
Please join us at this year’s DSI meeting for the Miniconference on Technology in the Classroom. We have several interesting interactive presentations scheduled including using ‘clickers’ in the classroom, a LINKS Demo and the effective use of Excel and Power Point. The use of IT and web-based tools will be the main topic of some sessions as well as an exciting one on the use of artificial intelligence and educational robotics. Hope to see you there! Any questions can be directed to either of the coordinators below.

William Johnson, Bentley College, wjohnson@bentley.edu
Rupak Rauniar, University of St. Thomas, rauniar@stthom.edu

Baltimore’s harbor at sunset.
Curricular Issues Miniconference

CI-1: Achieving Undergraduate Degree Program Learning Goals: Assessment and the Decision Sciences Core Curriculum—The Dean’s Perspective
Sunday, Nov. 23, 2008, 8:00-9:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Paul Bobrowski (Auburn University)

Achieving Undergraduate Degree Program Learning Goals: Assessment and the Decision Sciences Core Curriculum
Paul Bobrowski (Auburn University), David Christy (Orfalea College of Business), Susan Engelkemeyer (Ithaca College), John R. Grout (Berry College)

CI-2: Lean Education in Colleges
Sunday, Nov. 23, 2008, 10:00-11:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Peter T. Ward (The Ohio State University)

Lean Education in Colleges
Peter T. Ward (The Ohio State University), Randyall L. Cook (Utah State University)

CI-3: Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education: Outstanding Teaching Briefs
Sunday, Nov. 23, 2008, 1:00-2:30 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Ceyhun Ozgur (Valparaiso University)

The Power of Doing: A Learning Exercise that Brings the Central Limit Theorem to Life
Barbara A. Price (Georgia Southern University), Xiaolong Zhang (Georgia Southern University)

Authors/Presenters: Vernon E. Francis (Graduate School of Management, University of Dallas), Nancy Schreiber (Graduate School of Management, University of Dallas)

CI-4: Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education: Outstanding Empirical Research
Monday, Nov. 24, 2008, 8:00-9:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Ceyhun Ozgur (Valparaiso University)

Influence Tactics in the Classroom and their Relationship to Student Satisfaction
Stephen S. Standifird (University of San Diego), Frank Pons (Université Laval), Dan Moshavi (Montana State University)

The Use of Problem-Based Learning to Enhance MIS Education
Peter Mykytyn (Southern Illinois University), Kathleen Mykytyn, Souren Paul (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale), Ann M. Pearson (Southern Illinois University)

Applying the Collective Causal Mapping Methodology to OM Curriculum Development
Julie M. Hays, Tatiana Bouzidine-Cahmeeva (BEM-Bordeaux Management School), Susan Meyer Goldstein (University of Minnesota), Arthur V. Hill (University of Minnesota), Annibal Jose Scavarda (RMIT)

CI-5: Leveraging Enterprise System (ERP) Technology for Curricular Innovation and Redesign
Monday, Nov. 24, 2008, 10:00-11:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: John Grandzol (Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania)

Authors/Presenters: John Grandzol (Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania), Mike Slette (Microsoft), Sandra Richtermeyer (Xavier University), Jerry Flatto (University of Indianapolis), Bernard Han (Western Michigan University)

CI-6: Assessment and Feedback Loops: What Next?
Monday, Nov. 24, 2008, 1:00-2:30 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Sarah Bryant Bower (Shippensburg University)

Authors/Presenters: Sarah Bryant Bower (Shippensburg University), Maling Ebrahimpour (Roger Williams University), Ward Ulmer (Strayer University)

CI-7: Co-curricular Activities in the Undergraduate Business Curriculum
Monday, Nov. 24, 2008, 3:00-4:30 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Marianne M. Pierce (Furman University)

Authors/Presenters: Marianne M. Pierce (Furman University), Cheryl Patterson (Furman University)

The star-shaped Fort McHenry is a famous point of interest in Baltimore. It was the valiant defense of the fort during the War of 1812 that inspired Francis Scott Key, a lawyer and amateur poet, to compose the Star-Spangled Banner.
DC-1: Continental Breakfast and Registration
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 7:30 - 8:00 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Maling Ebrahimpour (Roger Williams University) Registration and a light breakfast for participants and presenters!

DC-2: Welcome and Overview
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 8:00 - 8:10 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Maling Ebrahimpour (Roger Williams University) Welcome by the Doctoral Student Consortium Coordinator and a brief discussion on the topics that will be covered during the one day consortium.

DC-3: So YOU Want a Career in Academics?
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 8:10 - 8:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Funda Sahin (University of Tennessee) Participants: Sarah Bryant Bower (Shippensburg University) In this session, presenters will discuss factors that lead to a successful career in Academia!

DC-4: How to Identify and Interview for a Job
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 8:30 - 9:10 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Funda Sahin (University of Tennessee) Participants: Barcu B. Keskin (University of Alabama), David (Xiaosong) Peng (Texas A&M University), Tobias Schoenherr (Michigan State University) The panel of experts will present their experiences and give practical advice on how to find a job that fits you and how to prepare for a successful interview.

DC-5: Dean’s Perspective on Managing Your Career
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 9:10 - 10:00 a.m.
Session Facilitator: David G. Martin (Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania) An academic career can be filled with danger if the new faculty member makes missteps in his/her first job after graduate school. This panel will focus on the positive steps one can take to be successful as one manages the tenure process. Three Deans will give their perspectives earned through experience from the perspective of the teaching school, the teaching-research and the research school.

DC-6: Your Career as Professor: Sailing Successfully toward Tenure and Beyond
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 10:00 - 10:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Ira Horowitz (University of Florida) Ira will share some of his experiences as a newly-minted doctoral student and aspiring faculty member fifty years ago! The lessons to be gleaned from them are as valid today as they were then.

DC-7: Networking Break
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 10:30 - 10:45 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Maling Ebrahimpour (Roger Williams University) While enjoying refreshments, this short break gives a great opportunity to participants to talk to their fellow doctoral students or talk to presenters/panel members.

DC-8: Writing Publishable Articles and Navigating the Review Process (Joint session with New Faculty Consortium)
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 10:45 - 11:50 a.m.
Session Facilitators: Maling Ebrahimpour (Roger Williams University), William Carper (University of West Florida) Participants: Chetan S. Sankar (Auburn University), Krishna S. Dhir (Berry College), Vicki Smith-Daniels (Arizona State University) The session will focus on three research-based key ideas on how to improve your teaching and student learning.

DC-9: Networking Lunch (Joint Session with New Faculty Consortium)
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 12:00 - 1:30 p.m.
Session Facilitators: Maling Ebrahimpour (Roger Williams University), William Carper (University of West Florida) Participants: James Viehland (Beta Gamma Sigma), Norma Harrison (CEIBS), Marc J. Schniederjans (University of Nebraska-Lincoln), Gregory W. Ulferts (University of Detroit Mercy) While enjoying refreshments, this short break gives a great opportunity to participants to talk to their fellow doctoral students or talk to presenters/panel members.

DC-10: Research Strategy Panel and Workshop
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 1:30 - 3:00 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Paul M. Mangiameli (University of Rhode Island) The unique panel and workshop provides students with the help of well-known research faculty mentors in developing a strategic research plan. This plan will help students move from their doctoral program publications and dissertation into a research program that will see them through tenure. Working in a small breakout group, each student participant will choose a mentor’s help in identifying their areas of expertise, targeting appropriate journals, finding suitable coauthors, and planning a stream of journal articles.

DC-11: Networking Break
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 3:15 - 3:30 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Maling Ebrahimpour (Roger Williams University) While enjoying refreshments, this short break gives a great opportunity to participants to talk to their fellow doctoral students or talk to presenters/panel members.

DC-12: 25th Anniversary - Best Practices in Teaching
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 3:30 - 4:50 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Harvey Brightman (Georgia State University) The session will focus on three research-based key ideas on how to improve your teaching and student learning.

DC-13: Closing Remarks
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 4:50 - 5:00 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Maling Ebrahimpour (Roger Williams University) Concluding remark by the Coordinator and lessons learned.

DC-14: Social Hour
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 5:00 - 6:00 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Maling Ebrahimpour (Roger Williams University) A great opportunity for NETWORKING! Enjoy refreshments and mingle with your fellow doctoral students, faculty members, and presenters/panel members. Expand your network!
New Faculty Development Consortium

NF-1: Continental Breakfast
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 7:30 – 8:00 a.m.
Session Facilitator: William B. Carper
(University of West Florida)

NF-2: Program and Participant Introductions
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 8:00 – 8:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: William B. Carper
(University of West Florida)
Authors/Presenters: William B. Carper
(University of West Florida), Carl Gooding
(Jacksonville State University), James A.
Pope (University of Toledo)

NF-3: Learning the Rules of the Game: What It Means to be a Faculty Member
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 8:30 – 9:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Carl Gooding (Jacksonville State University)
Authors/Presenters: Carl Gooding
(Jacksonville State University), William Whitaker (University of Cincinnati),
Richard F. Bebee (Ohio University-Chillicothe), Danny Arnold (Frostburg State University)

NF-4: Academic Ethics
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 9:30 – 10:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: James A. Pope (University of Toledo)
Authors/Presenters: James A. Pope
(University of Toledo), Donna Mottilla
(Christopher Newport University), Richard F. Bebee (Ohio University-Chillicothe),
Danny Arnold (Frostburg State University)

NF-5: Meet the DSI Journal Editors (Joint Session with the Doctoral Student Consortium)
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 10:45 – 11:45 a.m.
Session Facilitator: William B. Carper
(University of West Florida)
Authors/Presenters: William B. Carper
(University of West Florida), Maling Ebrahimpour (Roger Williams University),
Vicki Smith-Daniels (Arizona State University), Chetan S. Sankar (Auburn University),
Krishna S. Dhir (Berry College)

NF-6: Networking Lunch (Joint Session with the Doctoral Student Consortium)
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 12:00 – 1:00 p.m.
Session Facilitator: William B. Carper
(University of West Florida)
Authors/Presenters: William B. Carper
(University of West Florida), Maling Ebrahimpour (Roger Williams University),
Norma Harrison (Macquarie Graduate School of Management), Marc J.
Schniederjans (University of Nebraska-Lincoln), Gregory W. Ulferts (University of Detroit Mercy), James Viehland (Beta Gamma Sigma)

NF-7: Teaching and Service Expectations in Various Types of Schools
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 1:15 – 2:15 p.m.
Session Facilitator: William B. Carper
(University of West Florida)
Authors/Presenters: William B. Carper
(University of West Florida), Maling Ebrahimpour (Roger Williams University),
Norma Harrison (Macquarie Graduate School of Management), Marc J.
Schniederjans (University of Nebraska-Lincoln), Gregory W. Ulferts (University of Detroit Mercy), James Viehland (Beta Gamma Sigma)

NF-8: Research Expectations in Various Types of Schools
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 2:30 – 3:30 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Robert T. Barrett (South Carolina State University)
Authors/Presenters: Robert T. Barrett
(South Carolina State University), Susan Engelkemeyer (Ithaca College), Yash Gupta
(Johns Hopkins University), Robert D. Reid
(James Madison University)

NF-9: Promotion and Tenure Expectations in Various Types of Schools
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 3:30 – 4:30 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Yash Gupta (Johns Hopkins University)
Authors/Presenters: Yash Gupta (Johns Hopkins University), Robert T. Barrett
(South Carolina State University), Susan Engelkemeyer (Ithaca College), Robert D. Reid
(James Madison University)

NF-10: NFDC Wrap Up Session
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 4:30 – 5:00 p.m.
Session Facilitator: William B. Carper
(University of West Florida)
Authors/Presenters: William B. Carper
(University of West Florida), Carl Gooding
(Jacksonville State University), James A.
Pope (University of Toledo)

NF-11: Participants Reception (Joint Session with the Doctoral Student Consortium)
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008, 5:00 – 6:00 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Gregory W. Ulferts
(University of Detroit Mercy)
Authors/Presenters: Gregory W. Ulferts
(University of Detroit Mercy), James Viehland (Beta Gamma Sigma)

Best Case Studies Award Competition
Sunday, Nov. 23, 2008
10:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Sung-Hee Park
(Kettering University)

Canon: Beyond Cellular Manufacturing
Yong Yin (Yamagata University)

ABB and Caterpillar (A), (B) and (C)
Thomas E. Vollmann (International Institute for Management Development (IMD))
Winter Nie (Thunderbird American Graduate School of International Management)
Inna Francis (IMD - International Institute for Management Development)

Keeping Logistics Under Wraps
Matthew J. Drake (Duquesne University)
Paul M. Griffin (Georgia Institute of Technology)
Julie L. Swann (Georgia Institute of Technology)
Professional and Faculty Development Program

PD-1: Achieving Teaching Excellence in Online Classrooms: Perspectives and Best Practices
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008 8:00-9:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Freda Z. Hartman (University of Phoenix)
Authors/Presenters: Freda Z. Hartman (University of Phoenix), George H. Barbosa (Strayer University), Linda Mallory (University of Phoenix)

PD-2: Traditional to Online Instruction: Making the Transition Seamless
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008 10:00-11:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Freda Z. Hartman (University of Phoenix)
Authors/Presenters: Freda Z. Hartman (University of Phoenix), George H. Barbosa (Strayer University), Linda Mallory (University of Phoenix)

PD-3: Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education Workshop for Interested Authors
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008 1:00-2:30 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Chetan S. Sankar (Auburn University)
Authors/Presenters: Barbara A. Price (Georgia Southern University), Chetan S. Sankar (Auburn University), Grandon Gill (University of South Florida), Christine T. Kydd (University of Delaware), Patrick R. McMullen (Wake Forest University), Ceyhun Ozgur (Valparaiso University)

PD-4: Nuts and Bolts for an AACSB Accreditation Review without Going Crazy
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008 3:00-4:30 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Charlotte Jones
Authors/Presenters: Charlotte Jones, Mary Fischer (The University of Texas at Tyler), Michelle McEacharn (University of Louisiana at Monroe)

PD-5: Facing the Challenge of being More Efficient and Effective in Schools of Business
Sunday, Nov. 23, 2008 8:00-9:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Robert L. Andrews (Virginia Commonwealth University)

PD-6: Positioning, Composing, and Polishing: Preparing Your Manuscript for Decision Sciences
Sunday, Nov. 23, 2008 10:00-11:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Vicki Smith-Daniels (Arizona State University)

PD-7: Faculty Liability Issues
Sunday, Nov. 23, 2008 1:00-2:30 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Karen L. Fowler (Colorado State University-Pueblo)
Authors/Presenters: Karen L. Fowler (Colorado State University-Pueblo), Krishna S. Dhir (Berry College), Shirley A. Hopkins (California State University, Chico)

PD-8: Dialogue with the Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education Editorial Board
Sunday, Nov. 23, 2008 3:00-4:30 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Chetan S. Sankar (Auburn University)
Authors/Presenters: Barbara A. Price (Georgia Southern University), Chetan S. Sankar (Auburn University), Grandon Gill (University of South Florida), Christine T. Kydd (University of Delaware), Patrick R. McMullen (Wake Forest University), Ceyhun Ozgur (Valparaiso University)

PD-9: Reflections on the Contribution of the Decision Sciences Journal
Monday, Nov. 24, 2008 8:00-9:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Vicki Smith-Daniels (Arizona State University)
Authors/Presenters: Vicki Smith-Daniels (Arizona State University)

PD-10: Bring Managerial Relevance to Business Curriculum through ERP Education
Tuesday, Nov. 25, 2008 8:00-9:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Bih Ru Lea (University of Missouri - Rolla)
Authors/Presenters: Bih Ru Lea (University of Missouri - Rolla), Chang-tesh Hsieh (University of Southern Mississippi), Heather Czech (SAP AG), Mark Jordan (Monsanto Co.), Michael Fox (Accenture)

PD-11: Remaining Energetic and Engaged in the Classroom: The Senior Faculty Consortium
Tuesday, Nov. 25, 2008 10:00-11:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Marilyn Smith (Winthrop University)

Instructional Innovation Award Competition
Sunday, Nov. 23, 2008 10:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Nancy L. Hyer (Vanderbilt University)

Integrating the Business Curriculum: International Company of the Year
Joanne M. Tucker (Shippensburg University)
Sarah Bryant Bower (Shippensburg University)

Project Flip: An Interactive Case/Exercise in Managing Uncertainty
Janelle Heineke (Boston University)
Larry Meile (Boston College Carroll School of Management)
Linda Boardman Liu (Boston University)
Jane Davies (Boston University)

Life Lessons Using Technology: Helping (Underrepresented Minority) Freshmen Get Ahead Before They Have Even Started
Roy M. Dejoie (Purdue University)
Hal F. Kirkwood Jr. (Purdue University)
Technology in the Classroom Miniconference

TC-1: Improving on the Use of PowerPoint and Ventriloquism!
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008 1:00-2:30 p.m.
Session Facilitator: David A. Johnston (York University)
In this workshop, participants will join the panel in a discussion on the use of student response systems such as clickers in utilizing presentation software in the classroom. Drs. Morefield and Bain share their experience with clickers and Dr. Jim Lyttle presents his innovative approach to student response via the use of ‘ventriloquism’.

Student Response Systems in the Classroom: A Presentation and Demonstration
Authors/Presenters: Roger Morefield (University of Saint Thomas)

Clickers in the Classroom
Authors/Presenters: Lisa Bain (Rhode Island College)

Ventriloquism with Presentation Software: Throwing your Voice Across the Classroom
Authors/Presenters: Jim Lyttle (Penn State Great Valley)

TC-2: Best-Practice Teaching with a Sophisticated Supply Chain Management Simulation
Saturday, Nov. 22, 2008 3:00-4:30 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Rupak Rauniar (University of St. Thomas-Houston)
Authors/Presenters: Randall G. Chapman (Chapman and Associates)
This workshop provides an extensive demonstration of the LINKS Supply Chain Management Simulation illustrating key instructional elements and best practices. Dr. Chapman draws on his simulation design experience, extensive personal teaching experience in traditional classroom-based and distance-learning modes and “train-the-trainer” coaching experience with scores of instructors and their 10,000+ students with the LINKS Supply Chain Management Simulation over the last nine years.

TC-3: Research on Technology in the Classroom
Sunday, Nov. 23, 2008 8:00-9:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Mary J. Meixell (Quinnipiac University)
This panel will discuss their research findings into the use of various technologies in the classroom including Excel software and teaching aspects of networking within the classroom (as opposed to networking outside the classroom as in texting friends outside the classroom!). A discussion on best practices for teaching with technology will ensue.

Teaching Networking Using a Virtual Platform
Authors/Presenters: Albert H. Huang (University of the Pacific)

Connecting Academic Learning to Practice: Teaching Wireless Networking in Business School
Authors/Presenters: Hak Ju Kim (University of Houston - Clear Lake)

An Investigation into the Gap between the Business Major Excel Achievement and Employer Expectations
Authors/Presenters: Mary J. Meixell (Quinnipiac University), Bruce White (Quinnipiac University)

TC-4: Innovative Approaches to Using Technology in Teaching
Sunday, Nov. 23, 2008 10:00-11:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Cihan Cobanoglu (University of Delaware)
This panel will discuss their research findings on two exciting approaches to utilizing technology in teaching. The first comes from Dr. Yousuf’s research on robots in education as he discusses Intelligent Agents in ‘inclusive education’ for economically challenged communities. Then, Dr. Cobanoglu shares insights from research at U. of Delaware’s Experimental Guestroom on using technology to design and educate for the Hotel of the Future.

An Inclusive Education–Incorporating Technology in the Learning Process
Authors/Presenters: Muhammad Ali Yousuf (Tecnológico de Monterrey - Santa Fe Campus)

Designing the Hotel of the Future: The Case Study of Experimental Guestroom at the University of Delaware
Authors/Presenters: Cihan Cobanoglu (University of Delaware)

TC-5: Workshop on Using Multimedia Case Studies in Class
Sunday, Nov. 23, 2008 1:00-2:30 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Randy V. Bradley (University of Tennessee)
This workshop provides participants the opportunity to discuss innovative instructional approaches for improving students’ teaming and dynamic decision-making skills and attitudes towards MIS. The panel will discuss the use of multimedia case studies aimed at both improving students’ perceptions of and attitudes towards MIS and students’ teaming and dynamic decision-making skills. Discussions will lead to practical advice for aiding others who wish to replicate this approach.

An Innovative Instructional Approach for Improving Students’ Teaming and Dynamic Decision-Making Skills and Attitudes Towards MIS
Authors/Presenters: Randy V. Bradley (University of Tennessee), Chetan S. Sankar (Auburn University), Victor Mbarika (Southern University and A&M College), Jeannie Pridmore (Loyola College in Maryland)

Miniconference on Doctoral Studies
Sunday, Nov. 23, 2008 8:00 - 9:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Yair Levy (Nova Southeastern University)

What They Didn’t Teach You in Graduate School
Paul Gray (Claremont University)

Several Models for Training Doctoral Students in the Art and Science of Teaching
Harvey Brightman (Georgia State University)

Teaching a Doctoral Course to Military and Federal Agents: Collaborative Discussion on Topics of Mutual Interest
Yair Levy (Nova Southeastern University)
The spectacular Baltimore Marriott Waterfront Hotel, which is hosting the 2008 Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting, is set on the edge of the Baltimore Inner Harbor in the heart of Harbor East, the newest Baltimore neighborhood. Guests are steps away from Inner Harbor restaurants and shopping, the National Aquarium, Maryland Science Center & USS Constellation. The hotel is also within easy walking distance of downtown Baltimore, the Convention Center, Camden Yards & M&T Bank Stadium sporting events.

For reservations at the Baltimore Marriott Waterfront, please refer to the guidelines below. Note that check in time is 4:00 pm of the day of arrival and check out time is 12:00 pm, day of departure.

Group room rate reservations may be available based on occupancy of the hotel from November 17 – December 1, 2008.

There are two ways to make reservations (hard-copy forms are no longer used*):

Reservations Line: (800) 228-9290

When booking via phone on the Marriott Reservation line, please be sure to reference the “Decision Sciences Institute Meeting” in order to secure the special group room rates.

Reservations Online (use group codes below):


Group codes:

• Single occupancy rooms: dsidsia
• Double/triple/quad occupancy rooms: dsidsib

NOTE: For room reservations for triple or quad occupancy, please note that your room rate will be changed upon arrival to $209 for a triple and $229 for a quad.

To guarantee your reservations at the Baltimore Marriott Waterfront and to receive the special offered group rate, your reservations must by made by Friday, October 31, and you must supply a credit card with the expiration date available from the following list: Visa, Master Card, American Express, Discover, Diners Club.

Note that the Decision Sciences Institute special group rate may not be available if the group room block becomes full, or after October 31, which is the cut off date for making reservations to receive the special group rate.

If for some reason your plans change, you may cancel your reservation up and until 6pm of date of arrival. Should you not cancel your reservation, you will be billed for one night room charge and tax.

Baltimore Marriott Waterfront room types:

• One king-size bed in room
• Double/double bed in one room

Rates based on occupancy:

• $174 (single)
• $189 (double)
• $209 (triple)
• $229 (quad)

*At previous Decision Sciences Institute meetings, Marriott hotels have permitted attendees to reserve rooms by faxing or mailing a hard-copy form. Starting in 2008, Marriott no longer accepts a reservation using a form that contains credit card number information.

***

Need a roommate? Doctoral students, faculty and business leaders are often looking for someone to share a room with during the annual meeting. For online assistance, fill out our roommate match form at the url below and submit your information to DSI:

http://www.decisionsciences.org/annualmeeting/meetinginfo/roommates.asp

Baltimore Marriott Waterfront
700 Aliceanna Street
Baltimore, MD 21202
410-385-3000

Marriott Centralized Reservations
1-800-228-9290

2008 DSI Annual Meeting Website
www.decisionsciences.org/annualmeeting/
2008 Doctoral Student Consortium

Creating successful career paths for students

Co-sponsored by McGraw Hill/Irwin, Beta Gamma Sigma, and DSI

The Doctoral Consortium is an engaging, interactive professional experience designed to help participants successfully launch their academic careers. We are pleased to have the sponsorship of McGraw Hill/Irwin and Beta Gamma Sigma for this important event. The Consortium will take place on Saturday, November 22, 2008, at the 2008 DSI Annual Meeting in Baltimore, Maryland.

Who Should Attend?
The Doctoral Consortium is offered to individuals who are well into their doctoral studies. The Consortium welcomes students from all subject areas within the decision sciences. A variety of students with backgrounds in operations research, management information systems, management science, strategy, organizational behavior, marketing, finance, accounting, and other areas will increase the vitality of the sessions. The program will focus on career goals, job search issues, placement services, research strategies, teaching effectiveness, manuscript reviewing, and promotion and tenure. Students who are interested in addressing these subjects in a participative, interactive way will enjoy and benefit from the Consortium.

Why Should You Attend?
There are several important reasons why you should attend.

1. Networking: Getting a job, finding collaborators, and gaining advantages in the career you are about to enter are all related to “who you know.” This is your chance to meet and get to know some of the leading researchers and educators in the field.

2. Skill development: Excellent teaching and research require practical skills in addition to content knowledge. You will learn from veterans who will share their secrets to success.

3. Furthering your research: The research incubator will give you a chance to engage in a discussion of your research ideas with your peers and with outstanding researchers.

4. Learn about DSI: This is a chance to “test-drive” DSI, learn about its people, it processes (such as placement services), and its opportunities.

5. Fun! Come socialize with your current and future colleagues in a city that has retained its sense of history and tradition, while carefully blending in cosmopolitan progress.

Program Content
The Doctoral Student Consortium involves seasoned, world-class research faculty from several schools, junior faculty just beginning their careers, and key journal editors. All will help guide discussions in the following sessions.

Teaching Effectiveness. Harvey Brightman will return to the Doctoral Consortium for another post-retirement workshop in 2007. His sessions are simply not to be missed. Even experienced faculty members sit in on these dynamic and inspiring sessions.

Research Strategy Workshop. In this hands-on workshop, tenured faculty mentors help participants to develop a strategic research plan for moving from the dissertation to a research program that will put them on a strong trajectory for tenure. Working in small breakout groups and with the advice and guidance of the faculty mentor, participants will identify their areas of expertise, target appropriate journals, find suitable co-authors, and plan a mix of publications.

Your Career as a Professor. In this session, you will hear from Professor Ira Horowitz, a DSI Fellow and past president who will share his insight and secret for success as a professor in academia.

Meet the Editors and Academic Reviewers. Editors from journals in the decision sciences and related fields will describe the missions of their publications and will discuss how to craft strong manuscript submissions, how to improve the chances of getting a journal article accepted, and how to respond to reviews. Participants will also learn about how to be a constructive reviewer of manuscripts.

Job Search Seminar. Should I target my job search on research-oriented schools? Teaching schools? Private? Public? What’s the best way to sell myself? What are the ingredients of a good job interview? This session will help participants answer these questions through insights drawn from a panel of faculty experts.

Join Us
The Doctoral Student Consortium does more than prepare individual students, it creates a community of colleagues you’ll know throughout your career. Please plan to attend the Consortium and also encourage your student colleagues to participate in this important program. Although many participants will be entering the job market for 2007-2008, others will appreciate the opportunity to get a better understanding of an academic career and how to approach the job market the following year.

Application Process
Students in all areas of the decision sciences are encouraged to apply for the DSI Doctoral Student Consortium. Those wishing to be included should submit:

1. A current curriculum vita, including contact information (e-mail in particular), your
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major field (accounting, finance, marketing, management, operations management, MIS, management science, strategy, and so on), the title of your dissertation proposal or the title of a current research paper.

2. A letter of recommendation from your dean, doctoral program director, department chair, or dissertation chair. The letter should attest to the applicant’s qualifications and good progress in the doctoral program. Interested students are encouraged to apply early if they wish to ensure themselves space in the Consortium. Materials should be sent to Maling Ebrahimpour, Doctoral Consortium Coordinator, by July 30, 2008. Those who apply by this date and meet the criteria listed above will be accepted for participation. Applications received after July 30th will receive consideration on a space-available basis.

Participants must pay the regular student registration fee for the annual meeting, but there will be no additional charge for the Consortium. This fee includes the luncheon and reception on Saturday, the networking luncheon on Sunday, and the CD-ROM of the conference proceedings. Although students will be responsible for all of their own travel and accommodation expenses, it is customary for participants’ schools to provide monetary support for these purposes.

Consortium participants will be recognized in Decision Line, the Institute’s news publication. They also receive special recognition in the placement system, special designation on their name badges, and an introduction to the larger DSI community at the breakfast and plenary session.

2008 Track Chairs

Accounting: Assurance and Public Accountability
Ashley Burrows, University of Wisconsin-Lacrosse

Business Ethics and Leadership
Shirley Hopkins, California State University, Chico

Case Studies
Corinne Karuppan, Missouri State University
Muthu Karuppan, Drury University

DSS/Al/Expert Systems
Mahour Mellat Parast, University of North Carolina-Pembroke
John H. Kim, Southwest Minnesota State University

E-Commerce
Seongbae Lim, St. Mary’s University
Daesung Chang, Kyonggi University

Fellows Track
Manoj K. Malhotra, University of South Carolina-Columbia

Information Security
Merrill Warkentin, Mississippi State University
Allen C. Johnston, University of Alabama-Birmingham

Information Systems
Jeryl Nelson, Wayne State College
Tim Garvin, Wayne State College

Innovative Education
Steven Yourstone, University of New Mexico
Rachna Shah, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities

International Business
André M. Everett, University of Otago, New Zealand

Knowledge Management
Dianne Hall, Auburn University
Todd Peachey, Auburn University

Manufacturing Management and Practice
John R. Olson, University of St. Thomas
Carol Prahinski, Michigan State University

Marketing: Theory Applications and Practice
Effie Stavroulaki, Bentley College

MS/OR: Techniques, Models and Applications
Gyu Kim, Northern Illinois University
Suk-Ki Hong, Dankook University

Organizational Behavior/Organizational Theory
Robert Dengler, Benedictine University

Project Management and New Product Development
Dwight Smith-Daniels, Arizona State University
John McCreery, North Carolina State University

Quality and Productivity
Barbara B. Flynn, Indiana University

Service Management
Jo Ann Duffy, Sam Houston State University
Gerald Köhers, Sam Houston State University

Statistics and Decision Analysis
Robert J. Pavur, University of North Texas
Kellie Keeling, University of Denver

Strategy and Policy
Karen L. Fowler, University of Northern Colorado

Supply Chain Management
Sahin Funda, University of Tennessee-Knoxville

Baltimore’s scenic harbor.
Miniconference on Successful Grantsmanship

The majority of DSI members are active researchers. External research funding can significantly enhance research efforts. The Miniconference on Successful Grantsmanship is designed to provide DSI members with an opportunity to develop interests, broaden perspectives, and explore collaboration in sponsored research while developing skills in writing grant proposals.

The miniconference is a one-day event to be held on Sunday during the DSI Annual Meeting. Session 1 will set the stage for the Miniconference with an overview of various funding opportunities. Session 2 will showcase panelists representing major funding sources ranging from government agencies to private funding organizations.

In Session 3 (Networking Luncheon), miniconference participants will form small groups and exchange research ideas and learn from one another as well as from experts sharing the table. In the afternoon, two workshops will offered. Participants will be able to participate in both workshops since they are offered twice.

Sessions 4 and 5 will feature experienced workshop leaders who will share their expertise in grant writing and show how to frame the proposal from the reviewer perspective.

Registration is required, although there is no registration fee to participate for those that are registered for the DSI Annual Meeting. To register, simply send an e-mail to either of the miniconference coordinators, with your contact information. Networking luncheon includes complimentary lunch. Seats are limited. First-come, first-served.

Miniconference on Successful Grantsmanship

Registration for the Successful Grantsmanship Miniconference is required, although there is no registration fee to participate for those that are registered for the DSI Annual Meeting.

SG-1: Tutorial: Overview of Funding Sources
Sunday, Nov. 23, 2008, 10:00 - 11:00 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Kristie K. Seawright (Brigham Young University)

SG-2: Panel: Successful Proposals from the Funding Source Perspectives
Sunday, Nov. 23, 2008, 11:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Q B. Chung (Villanova University)

SG-3: Networking Luncheon
Sunday, Nov. 23, 2008, 12:00-1:30 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Q B. Chung (Villanova University)

SG-4: Getting Started Writing Grant Proposals
Sunday, Nov. 23, 2008, 1:30-2:30 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Gregory W. Ulferts (University of Detroit Mercy)

SG-5: Grant Proposals From the Perspective of the Reviewer
Sunday, Nov. 23, 2008, 2:30-3:30 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Elliot B. Sloane (Villanova University)

Room Sharing in Baltimore

Need a roommate at the 2008 DSI Annual Meeting? Doctoral students and faculty are often looking for someone to share a room with during the annual meeting. For online assistance, fill out the roommate match form (located at the link below) and you’ll receive information about other people looking for roommates.

http://www.decisionsciences.org/annualmeeting/travel/hotel.asp

Tips for Doctoral Students—Getting the Most from the DSI Annual Meeting

The Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting provides an opportunity for doctoral students to network, develop professional skills, interview for faculty positions—and have a good time!

For students who want to know how to get the most out of the Annual Meeting, see “Tips for Doctoral Students” on the DSI Web site at

http://www.decisionsciences.org/people/doctrual.asp

See past Decision Line articles focusing on doctoral student issues at


Journal Editors Attending the 2008 DSI Annual Meeting

Check out “Activities” at the link below for an alphabetical listing of editor-in-chiefs and regional editors who have expressed interest in attending the 2008 DSI Annual Meeting. Many other area editors, managing editors, and associate editors will also be in attendance.

www.decisionsciences.org/
2008 Select Track Chair Sessions

Hospitality Management Track

This year we are proud to be co-chairing the Hospitality Management Track for the 2008 Decision Sciences Institute annual meeting. This is the first time that DSI is hosting the track. We are delighted to have received many submissions from academics all over the world, reflecting the importance and globalization of the field of hospitality management. We hope in the long term that the hospitality management track will become an integral part of the Decision Sciences Institute annual meeting. We look forward to meeting everyone at the DSI Annual Meeting in Baltimore.

Track Chairs: G. Keong Leong, University of Nevada-Las Vegas, and Natasa Christodoulidou, California State University-Dominguez Hills

International Business Track

“Teaching & Researching China” is a special panel session featuring Bill Fischer & Rebecca Chung, IMD, Lausanne, Switzerland; Linda Sprague, Rollins College, Florida; Denis F. Simon, Pennsylvania State University; and André M. Everett, Otago University, New Zealand. How to squeeze 1.3 billion more people into your classroom? China’s story is one of the biggest headlines of our time, yet how to present it in a traditional Western business curriculum? This panel will present and discuss China-focused teaching approaches and materials for use in DSI classrooms. Look for our panel in the program and on-line at http://www.DSIChinaClassroom.blogspot.com

Track Chair: André M. Everett, Otago University, New Zealand

Case Studies Track

This year, the Case Studies track abounds with exciting cases designed to stimulate our students’ critical thinking. The topics are extremely varied: project management, entrepreneurship, interfaces between marketing and operations, health care management, etc. This broad range certainly appeals to a large proportion of the DSI constituency. This is why the track chairs are urging you to attend the Case Studies sessions, share your insights, and participate in a dynamic conversation on how to engage our students with these remarkable teaching tools. See you soon in Baltimore!

Track Chairs: Corinne Karuppan, Missouri State University, and Muthu Karuppan, Drury University

Information Systems Track and Decision Support Track

A special invited panel session on the Current Status of Usage and Applications of Mobile Alert, WiBro, Cellular TV, and Web 2.0 featuring J. P. Shim, Mississippi State University; Raj Sharman, The State University of New York at Buffalo; Mark Schmidt, St. Cloud State University; Seungwook Park, Inha University; and Brett J. L. Landry, University of Dallas.

IS Track Chairs: Jeryl Nelson, Wayne State College, and Tim Gavin, Wayne State College

DS Track Chairs: Mahour Mellat Parast, University of North Carolina-Pembroke, and John H. Kim, Southwest Minnesota State University

from the Statistics Track

The mission of the “Making Statistics More Effective in Schools and Business” (MSMESB) miniconference is to improve the teaching and practice of statistics in schools and business. More specifically, MSMESB focuses on improving the teaching of statistics and statistical thinking, on cross-disciplinary research, on continuous improvement in business and education, and on interaction between academia and industry. We aim to encourage interaction between business faculty and others involved in teaching business statistics with professionals from industry and government, with publishers, and with software vendors. The following four panels will be presented as part of this miniconference. The panelists will present their findings and perspectives on a variety of challenges facing instructors teaching introductory statistics classes in colleges of business.

MSMESB Session 1: What Should We Teach Business Students in Introductory Statistics?
Session Chair: Robert Andrews, Virginia Commonwealth University
This session will examine what should be taught in an introductory statistics class from several perspectives: statistics teachers, teachers of courses that use statistics, and professionals in business. The panelists will present their findings and perspectives on what should be in the course to serve as a spring board for a moderated discussion that will include those in the audience.

Panelists: Kim Melton, North Georgia College and State University; Ellen Walk, University of Richmond; Weiyong Zhang, Virginia Commonwealth University; and Richard Drapeau, Lamar University

MSMESB Session 2: How Should We Teach Business Students in Introductory Statistics?
Session Chair: Robert Andrews, Virginia Commonwealth University
An instructor often chooses an instructional method that is deemed to be the most efficient and effective for him/her, but it may not be the most effective for the students who learn and think differently. Do we need to get out of our boxes in the area of statistics instruction? Panelists will share their findings and beliefs as well as their experiences with getting out of the box in delivering statistics instruc-

See SELECT SESSIONS, page 56
A. Ad hoc Committees/Coordinator

Ad hoc committees and special task forces may be established at the discretion of the President for one year with the possibility of reappointment by the incoming President.

Ad hoc Committee: Constitution and By-Laws vis-à-vis Policies and Procedures
Chair: Krishna Dhir

The President’s ad hoc Committee is charged with review of the Institute’s Constitution and By-Laws with respect to their supporting the future development of the Institute, and relate these to the revised Policies and Procedures Manual. The Committee shall be provided with access to any previous analyses.

1. Review (i) the Constitution & By-Laws of the Institute and (ii) the Policies & Procedures Manual to determine appropriate allocation and wording of their respective contents.

2. Report to the President and Executive Committee regarding possible changes and amendments as well as the rationale underlying any such recommendations and procedures to ensure visibility to the membership of any proposed changes.

3. A preliminary report of the Committee’s results shall be delivered to the President and the Executive Committee and subsequently the Board by end September 2008 and shall also be reported to the membership at the Annual General Meeting. The Committee shall complete its final report to the President, Executive Committee and Board by 8 December 2008.

Ad hoc Committee: Relationship of Alpha Iota Delta with DSI
Chair: Soumen Ghosh

Alpha Iota Delta is the honorary for decision sciences and information systems and has had a relationship with the DSI for many years.

1. Examine the relationship between Alpha Iota Delta and DSI with respect to their respective roles and responsibilities to each other.

2. Propose opportunities for developing a strategic relationship between the two entities so as to build on the field and leverage this relationship.

3. Prepare a brief report which defines, evaluates and recommends specific areas of collaboration, and submit to the DSI Executive Director, on or before September 29, 2008.

Ad hoc Miniconference Coordinator
Coordinator: Mark Davis

The purpose of this is to establish the conduct of special interest sessions for the DSI throughout the year. The charges are given initially on an ad hoc basis, with a proposal that it be listed as one of the regular appointed positions (2-year terms) in the DSI which receives charges supporting the institute’s strategy on growth, internationalization and value adding in terms of special interest offerings to membership.

1. Coordinate a limited number of special interest sessions in relatively small groups, held external to the normal Annual DSI conference period, i.e., in different times of the year and in different countries.

2. Work with the Home Office, the Strategic Planning for International Affairs Committee, Programs and Meetings Committee, and Miniconference Program Chairs, to offer special interest group sessions which are complementary to the normal Meetings of the institute.

3. Prepare a brief report of the first three approved Miniconferences. Submit a progress report with the following information: Title of the conference; City, country, and venue (university or hotel); Officers (both titular and active); Expected attendance; Proposed registration fees; Names of sponsors, amount of their sponsorship, and details of any agreements.

4. Make recommendations for the 2008-2009 and/or 2009-2010 Miniconferences to be held, and Program Chairs for each Miniconference.

Send the reports for (3) and (4) to Carol Latta, Executive Director, by September 29, 2008 or earlier where applicable.

5. Submit a final report of each Miniconference coordinated and return the seed money within 90 days of the conclusion of the Miniconference to Carol Latta, Executive Director. The report should contain updates on (3) above as well as the following: Copy of brochures, programs, and Web sites that contain the DSI name or logo; financial report indicating how a surplus (if any) was distributed, and corresponding pertaining to return payment of seed money to DSI.
B. Constitutionally Mandated Committees

Executive Committee/Strategic Planning

No charges

Nominating Committee

Chair: Ken Kendall

1. Seek the names of candidates (in the 2010 election of officers) for each of the following offices so that they are received by the Home Office on or before April 1, 2009: President-Elect; Treasurer; At-Large Vice Presidents.

2. During the 2008 Annual Meeting, nominate two candidates for President-Elect and two candidates for Treasurer, with nomination of at least one or two alternates for each of these offices. Nominate eight candidates for At-Large Vice President, with at least four alternates. Alternates are nominated in the event the selected candidates decline to run for office. Candidates for Regionally-Elected Vice Presidents from the DSI Asia-Pacific, Mexico, Midwest and Northeast Regions will also be included on the 2010 officer election ballot, if applicable.

3. For the appointment of all Institute Officials, other than those elected by the Regions to represent them on the Board of Directors, the nominees are required to provide a letter of interest describing their vision for the position of interest (their understanding of the responsibilities, etc.), their preparation for the position (experience, etc.), and their agenda (perceived priorities, etc.).

Prepare and send a brief final report on these charges to Carol Latta, DSI Executive Director, on or before December 8, 2008.

Regional Activities Committee

Chair: Ram Narasimhan

This committee provides a forum for regional officers to share their ideas and problems with officers from other regions.

1. Consider input from the ad hoc Committee on Relationship of Regional Activities with DSI.

2. Recommend how a symbiotic relationship can be developed between the Regions and the DSI. Determine how the Regions can play a bigger role in DSI and vice versa; how activities in this context can be implemented and the funding thereof.

3. Work with the Editor of Decision Line to establish a regular feature for regional news in Decision Line, e.g., showcasing special events, awards, news, etc.

4. Provide a plan and system to assure that information sessions regarding services and benefits of membership in DSI are provided at the regional conferences and regional websites.

5. Actively solicit award-winning authors at the regional meetings to participate in the Institute’s Annual Meeting.

Prepare and send a brief final report on these charges to Carol Latta, DSI Executive Director, on or before December 8, 2008.

Publications Committee

Chair: Marion Sobol

1. Evaluate each publication’s success in improving its stature and responsiveness among the Decision Sciences community and make brief recommendations to this effect.

2. Work with the editors of the Institute’s publications to increase the value to international members.

3. Review and evaluate the current cost of publishing and disseminating Decision Line.

4. Blackwell Publishing

4.1 Monitor Blackwell Publishing’s efforts to market and increase subscriptions to Decision Sciences and journal.

4.2 Research and evaluate immediate online access to the Institute’s journals; through Blackwell Publishing in connection with membership dues revenues.

5. If accepted by Blackwell, review and make recommendations for acceptance or non-acceptance of the Supply Chain Management Research journal, review the prospectus and begin the search for editors.

Prepare and send a brief final report on these charges to Carol Latta, DSI Executive Director, on or before December 8, 2008.

C. Standing Committees

Development Committee for Excellence in the Decision Sciences

Chair: Manoj Malhotra

The primary function of the Development Committee is to facilitate the strategic planning of the Institute. In doing so, the Committee’s activities should be visionary, consistent with the Institute’s Mission, and should not duplicate those of other committees.

1. Evaluate the Institute’s 2008-09 goals and their priority, proposing any changes or additions for the Board of Directors’ consideration and input in the next year’s goals. Included should be information which broadly indicates the types of outcomes sought from the goal and the types of anticipated costs to the Institute by seeking to reach the goal.

2. Propose action plans to accomplish the goals and strategies that have been approved by the Board, including recommended referrals to appropriate committees for developing procedures for implementation.

3. Evaluate the Institute’s accomplishments in enhancing the value of membership.

4. Monitor progress in achieving the Institute’s goals and strategies.
5. Annually review and/or conduct a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) analysis for the Board, one that highlights issues for the Board.

6. Conduct a Goals Assessment each year and providing an analysis of this assessment within its report to the Board of Directors.

Prepare and send a brief final report on these charges to Carol Latta, DSI Executive Director, on or before December 8, 2008.

**Doctoral Student Affairs Committee**
Chair: E. Powell Robinson

1. Develop a list of three to five candidates for the 2009 Doctoral Student Consortium Coordinator and 2009 Elwood Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition Coordinator. Make sure that the Doctoral Student Consortium Coordinators candidates are well established, preferably from schools with doctoral programs.

2. Develop a list of ideas for new program content for future Doctoral Student Consortium Coordinators and the Professional Development Program Director to consider (e.g., topics for workshops, panel sessions, etc.) that would enhance the value of the Annual Meeting for doctoral student attendees. Think especially in terms of new/emerging or “hot” topics.

3. Update the set of “tips” for doctoral students, such as interviewing protocol and procedures for the conference, and upgrade the web site for doctoral students attending the conference to facilitate conference participation.

4. Explore how the Institute could engage the doctoral students, e.g., tracking some of the PhD students and obtaining feedback relative to where they published, and including their experiences at the Annual Meeting. Devise ways to make the doctoral student experience as positive as it can be so that students involved in the Institute will become regular members.

Prepare and send a brief final report on these charges to Carol Latta, DSI Executive Director, on or before December 8, 2008.

**Fellows Committee**
Chair: Mark Davis

1. Recommend new Fellow appointments for 2009 and provide appropriate documentation and citations to the Board of Directors by December 8, 2008. While a candidate’s vita will typically provide sufficient documentation of research accomplishments and service to the Institute, additional documentation will be needed to support a candidate who is being recommended on the basis of teaching or administrative accomplishments, e.g., evidence of teaching excellence.

2. Coordinate with Maling Ebrahimpour, 2009 Program Chair, for special Fellows’ symposia/session(s) to be held during the 2009 Annual Meeting.

Prepare and send a brief final report on these charges to Carol Latta, DSI Executive Director, on or before December 8, 2008.

**Finance Committee**
Chair: Christine T. Kydd

1. Consider, either physically or virtually, the state of the accounts/finances and the implications of the proposed budget of the DSI prior to the Executive Committee and Board meetings, so that the Executive Committee and then the Board could concentrate on the decisions that have to be made instead of trying to understand the numbers. The purpose is to shorten the length of discussion on the DSI financials.

2. Re-evaluate the report from the 2007-08 IT Committee and further proceed. Charges will be related to databases, web site and basic systems.

3. Compile the costs of items to be included in the budget for the Information Technology (information system improvements) expenses for the Annual Meeting.

4. Review all technology-related projects and activities of the Institute.

5. Develop the next phase of the “Information Technology Roadmap,” including priorities/timeline and cost estimates for implementation.


7. Work with the Home Office to develop and maintain the systems.

Prepare and send a brief final report on these charges to Carol Latta, DSI Executive Director, on or before December 8, 2008.

**Information Technology Committee**
Chair: Vijay Sugumaran

This committee is responsible for assessing the IT needs of DSI and make recommendations on the effective use of IT/IS to enhance value to the membership. Improvement of DSI Home Office information systems, i.e., the web site, databases, internal systems, needs to be a strategic, continuing goal.

1. Re-evaluate the report from the 2007-08 IT Committee and further proceed. Charges will be related to databases, web site and basic systems.

2. Re-evaluate the report from the 2007-08 ad hoc Committee for the Long Term Strategy for the Outsourcing of the Conference Information System (CIS) and further review, evaluate and make recommendations on the progress, usability, and transferability of the CIS, with parallel implementation of an alternate system, e.g., Scholar One.

3. Compile the costs of items to be included in the budget for the Information Technology (information system improvements) expenses for the Annual Meeting.

4. Review all technology-related projects and activities of the Institute.

5. Develop the next phase of the “Information Technology Roadmap,” including priorities/timeline and cost estimates for implementation.


7. Work with the Home Office to develop and maintain the systems.

Prepare and send a brief final report on these charges to Carol Latta, DSI Executive Director, on or before December 8, 2008.

**Investment Advisory Committee**
Chair: Janelle Heineke

1. Provide the Board of Directors with an update as to the current status of the Institute’s investments.

2. Monitor the investments of the Decision Sciences Institute especially in the light of the current domestic (US)
market and losses to DSI in this area, and assess alternative investments.

3. Compare the Institute’s allocation with the allocation of similar non-profit organizations.

4. Make a recommendation to keep or change the allocation.

Prepare and send a brief final report on these charges to Carol Latta, DSI Executive Director, on or before December 8, 2008.

**Member Services Committee**

Chair: Robert Andrews

1. From the recommendations in the 2007-08 Members Services Committee report, follow up on action/implementation recommendations and associated cost allocation.

2. Develop specific recommendations for initiatives to attract new and lapsed members to the Institute.

3. Work with the Regional Activities Committee and the ad hoc Committee for the Relationship of Regions with DSI, to do the following:
   - 3.1 attract regional members to become members of DSI;
   - 3.2 determine how the regions can play a bigger role in the DSI, and vice versa;
   - 3.3 nurture a symbiotic relationship between regions and DSI;
   - 3.4 recommend the implementation path of activities resulting from this as well as the funding thereof.

4. Recommend measures to increase involvement at the Annual DSI meeting for members through increasing the number of submissions and reviewers, improving paper reviews, increasing the number of awards, and increasing participation overall.

5. Seek out and recommend new awards for the membership, i.e., innovative ways to recognize DSI members for work in their Schools, etc., as well as contributions to DSI.

Prepare and send a brief final report on these charges to Carol Latta, DSI Executive Director, on or before December 8, 2008.

**Programs and Meetings Committee**

Chair: Thomas Callarman

1. Continue to identify and develop interdisciplinary platforms and special interest groups. Work with the ad hoc Miniconference Coordinator for a limited number of sessions held external to the normal Annual DSI conference period, i.e., different times of the year, different countries.

2. Relating to the DSI Annual Meeting:
   - 2.1 Committee Chair to participate in the “visionary” meeting for the 2010 Annual Meeting to be held during the 2008 Annual Meeting by the 2010 Program Chair.
   - 2.2 Address the necessity to improve the quality of the DSI Annual Meeting. Develop a detailed proposal and action items for Board approval including the salient aspects of quality of Annual Meeting, e.g., quality of papers, sessions, presentations, attendance at sessions, participation of well-known researchers from top-tier research schools, involving international scholars, quality of plenary sessions, receptions, special events, dinners, and other food served where applicable.
   - 2.3 Consider and approve restructuring session times and create “differentiated time slots” for paper sessions, symposia and the increase in conference duration.
   - 2.4 Recommend to the Board three to five candidates for Coordinator of the 2009 New Faculty Development Consortium and the Professional Development Program Coordinator. Indicate the criteria used to generate the list.

Prepare and send a brief final report on these charges to Carol Latta, DSI Executive Director, on or before December 8, 2008.

**Strategic Planning for International Affairs Committee**

Chair: Shaw Chen

1. Present a recommendation to the Board for the next Global Development Coordinator/Strategic Planning for International Affairs Committee Chair (effective 4/1/09-3/31/12).

2. Identify the key issues that need to be addressed in making the Institute, effectively, an international organization. Develop a concise but specific proposal and action items to achieve this outcome.

3. Assess the development of the international DSI regions (Asia Pacific, Mexico, India) in terms of Board membership, regional membership, and relationship with DSI; propose other viable regions for DSI expansion.

4. Work with the editors of *Decision Line, DSJ* and *DSJIE* to increase the internationalization of these publications and their value to international authors.

5. Work with the ad hoc 2008-09 Miniconference Coordinator for a limited number of “special interest” disciplinary sessions to be held internationally.

6. Evaluate the potential for collaborating with other academic associations, U.S.-based or non-U.S. based (e.g. Association for International Business, EUROMA, AIS, POMS) for sponsorship of international meetings and other professional activities. Develop a proposal and action items regarding specific types of collaboration (e.g., joint conferences, program development, discounted joint memberships, etc.).

7. Relating to the International DSI Meetings:
   - 7.1 Work with the Programs and Meeting Committee to increase the quality and value to participants of the International Meetings;
   - 7.2 Monitor the development of the Program for the 2009 International Meetings in Nancy, France;
7.3 Call for proposals to offer the 2011 International DSI Meeting and make recommendation to the DSI Board.

Prepare and send a brief final report on these charges to Carol Latta, DSI Executive Director, on or before December 8, 2008.

Programs, Officers and Editors

Curricular Issues Program
Co-ordinator: Vijay R. Kannan

1. Prepare a report briefly summarizing your experiences with the 2008 Curricular Issues Program. Highlight your recommendations for any changes you would like to see for future programs. Send this report to Marc Schniederjans, Program Chair, by December 1, 2008.

2. Prepare a report for the 2008 Curricular Issues Program Coordinator, briefly summarizing your experiences with the 2008 Curricular Issues Program. Highlight your advice to next year’s coordinator, lessons learned, specific implementation, guidelines, etc. Send this report to Carol Latta, Executive Director, by December 8, 2008.

Decision Sciences Journal
Editor: Vicki Smith-Daniels

1. Consider the report from the Ad Hoc Blue Ribbon Committee of Scholars to Enhance Decision Sciences Journal. Recommend up to three (3) action items that should be implemented to enhance the DSJ.

2. Work with the Strategic Planning for International Affairs Committee to increase the internationalization of the Journal.

3. Work with the Publications Committee to enhance the Decision Sciences.

Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education
Editor: Chetan Sankar

1. Work with the Strategic Planning for International Affairs Committee to increase the internationalization of the DSJIE.

2. Work with the Publications Committee to enhance the DSJIE.

3. Develop interdisciplinary platforms for special interest groups.

Elwood S. Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition
Coordinator: Julie Kendall

1. Prepare a report briefly summarizing your experiences with the 2008 Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition. Highlight your recommendations for any changes you would like to see for future programs. Send this report to Marc Schniederjans, Program Chair, by December 1, 2008.

2. Prepare a report for the 2009 Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition Coordinator, briefly summarizing your experiences with the 2008 Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition. Highlight your advice to next year’s coordinator, lessons learned, specific implementation, guidelines, etc. Send this report to Carol Latta, Executive Director, by December 8, 2008.

Doctoral Student Consortium
Coordinator: Maling Ebrahimpour

1. Report on your experiences with the 2008 Doctoral Student Consortium program and, if necessary, suggest improvements. Send this report to Marc Schniederjans, 2008 Annual Meeting Program Chair, by December 1, 2008.

2. Although there may be some joint sessions between the Doctoral Student Consortium and the New Faculty Development Consortium, be sure to maintain the unique identity of the Doctoral Student Consortium in the majority of the sessions. Please note that the Institute’s Policies and Procedures Manual provides specific guidelines on program content for the non-promotion of outside journals, and the promotion of all DSI journals (with special regard to and emphasis on both journals of the Institute) as expected.

3. Distribute the hand-outs for Alpha Iota Delta, which provide a description of the Society, at the Doctoral Student Consortium.

4. Highlight in the consortium the usefulness of participation at DSI regional meetings. Include some regional officers in the development and delivery of this content.

5. Consider holding a special “reunion” session for past consortium participants: either a special session during the program or special tables at one of the Luncheons.

Doctoral Studies Miniconference

1. Prepare a report briefly summarizing your experiences with the 2008 Doctoral Studies Miniconference. Highlight your recommendations for any changes you would like to see for future programs. Send this report to Marc Schniederjans, 2008 Annual
Meeting Program Chair, by December 1, 2008.

2. Prepare a report for the 2009 Doctoral Studies Miniconference Coordinator(s), briefly summarizing your experiences with the 2008 Doctoral Studies Miniconference. Highlight your advice to next year’s coordinator, lessons learned, specific implementation, guidelines, etc. Submit this report to the Home Office by December 8, 2008.

**Home Office IT Liaisons**
Arijit Sengupta, Doug White

The Home Office IT Liaison persons are responsible for working with the IT Committee and the Home Office to assess the IT needs of DSI, recommend and implement improvements directly or through an outsourced vendor.

1. Review all technology-related projects and activities of the Institute, i.e., the web site, databases, internal systems, on a continuing basis.

2. Provide input to each DSI Executive and Board meeting, as well as to the IT Committee Chair on the following:
   - Listing of projects that need to be undertaken for the Home Office/DSI along with the assigned party for completion of each project. The projects would include maintenance/fixes of current applications and new proposed projects.
   - Prioritize the list of projects in order of importance and indicate for each project the timing for completion (immediate/short term, medium or long term).

3. Develop a vision for the Institute’s IT needs and the next phase of the “Information Technology Roadmap,” including priorities/timeline and cost estimates for implementation.

4. Document the impact of IT developments on the workload and job descriptions of the Home Office staff.

5. Work with the Home Office to develop, implement and maintain the systems.

Prepare and send progress reports on these charges to Carol Latta, DSI Executive Director, and Vijay Sugumaran, the IT Committee Chair, by end of July 2008 and end of October 2008, as well as brief status reports in preparation for each Executive and Board meeting.

**New Faculty Development Consortium**

Coordinators: William B. Carper, Carl W. Gooding, James A. Pope

1. Report on your experiences with the 2008 New Faculty Development Consortium program and, if necessary, suggest improvements. Send this report to Marc Schniederjans, 2008 Annual Meeting Program Chair, by December 1, 2008.

2. Distribute the hand-outs for Alpha Iota Delta, which provide a description of the Society, at the New Faculty Development Consortium.

3. Although there may be some joint sessions between the Doctoral Student Consortium and the New Faculty Development Consortium, be sure to maintain the unique identity of the New Faculty Development Consortium in the majority of the sessions. Please note that the Institute’s Policies and Procedures Manual provides specific guidelines on program content for the non-promotion of outside journals, and the promotion of all DSI journals (with special regard to and emphasis on both journals of the Institute) as expected.

4. Invite recent participants in the Doctoral Student Consortium to participate in the New Faculty Development Consortium.

5. Work with the Home Office to develop, implement and maintain the systems.

**Placement Services**

Coordinator: Arijit (Jit) Sengupta

1. Report on your experiences with job placement activities for 2008, and if necessary, suggest improvements.

2. Send bi-weekly placement messages between September 1, 2008 and November 15, 2008 to DSI members, and continue to send monthly messages beyond this time frame.

3. Assess the job placement software and support systems and recommend improvements.

**Professional Faculty Development Program**

Coordinator: Binshan Lin

1. Work with Bob Markland, Professional Development Program Director, to develop professional development sessions of interest to members at various stages of their career. These sessions should be integrated into the regular program. Promote these sessions in *Decision Line* and via email messages, through the current Program Chair, to the membership.

2. Provide a report briefly summarizing your experiences with the 2007 Professional Faculty Development Program. Highlight your recommendations for any changes you would like to see for future programs. Send this report to Marc Schniederjans, 2008 Program Chair, by December 1, 2008.

**Professional Development Program**

Director: Robert E. Markland

1. Work with Binshan Lin, Professional Faculty Development Program Coordinator, to ensure that there is a variety of Professional Development Program sessions included in the 2008 Annual Meeting. These sessions should be targeted at faculty members at all stages of their careers, with a variety of interests. Make an effort to include sessions/topics with an international or global focus.

2. Provide a report briefly summarizing your experiences as Professional Development Program Director, highlighting any recommendations for changes you would like to see for future programs and ideas for
the future. Send this report to Marc Schniederjans, 2008 Program Chair, by December 1, 2008.

**2008 Annual Meeting**

Program Chair: Marc Schniederjans

1. Collect, utilize and recommend various mailing lists or circulation sources to promote the Annual Meeting on a regular basis. Encourage Track Chairs and the Program Committee to use the targeted email system to promote the meeting and solicit submissions from non-members.

2. Awards:
   2.1 Administer a “Best Paper Award” for a paper written solely by a doctoral student or group of students.
   2.2 Invite winners of Best Paper Awards from regional conferences to present their award-winning papers at the Annual Meeting (coordinate with Carol Latta, Executive Director).

3. Conference information systems.
   Work with the CIS Manager, S. Sampson, for the following:
   3.1 Implement a transparent system of tracking conference “no-shows” for conference sessions. Recommend and implement procedures for non-inclusions in Proceedings and future paper acceptance based on this tracking.
   3.2 Enable a full program with meeting room numbers available online.

4. Post Annual Meeting:
   4.1 Obtain a summary report from the coordinators and/or directors of the special programs (Miniconferences, award competitions) on or before December 1, 2008.
   4.2 Prepare a report that comments on and evaluates all aspects of program planning, development and implementation of the 2008 Annual Meeting.
   4.3 Update the Annual Meeting program planning manual.

4.4 Report on the effectiveness of the conference information system. Send reports (4.1-4.4) to Carol Latta, Executive Director, by December 8, 2008.

**2009 Annual Meeting**

Program Chair: Maling Ebrahimpour

1. Consider reports from the Programs and Meetings and Member Services Committees as inputs into Annual Meeting planning.

2. Organize and conduct a Program Committee Planning Meeting for the 2009 Annual Meeting during the 2008 Annual Meeting.

3. Augment, utilize and recommend various mailing lists or circulation sources to promote the 2009 Annual Meeting on a regular basis. Encourage Track Chairs and the Program Committee to use the targeted email system to promote the meeting and solicit submissions from non-members.

4. Appoint a Web Coordinator who manages all web content pertaining to the 2009 Annual Meeting Web site. This person will write, edit, and proofread new content and keep the Web site up-to-date. The coordinator should be familiar with DSI Annual Meetings and general DSI practices. Creativity is expected of this person, who will provide content that encourages DSI members to keep returning to the Web site. The Web coordinator will work with Hal Jacobs at the DSI Home Office.

5. Appoint competition coordinators for the awards for (i) Best Case Studies and (ii) Instructional Innovation.

6. Appoint a DSI Fellow (different from the 2008 coordinator) to develop a special Fellows’ symposia/session(s) to be held during the 2009 Annual Meeting. Utilize Home Office compilation on Fellows’ expertise and interests in this selection, and for further encouragement of Fellows’ participation.

7. Consider and recommend the recreation of the role of Discussants for conference sessions.

8. Prepare a report outlining the general organizational plans, major activities, and deadlines for the 2009 Annual Meeting, with inputs from the DSI Executive Director and Program Chair of the 2008 Annual Meeting.

**2010 Annual Meeting**

Program Chair: Morgan Swink

1. Organize and conduct a visionary meeting for the 2010 Annual Meeting during the 2008 Annual Meeting. Invite the Chair of the Programs and Meetings Committee. Consider including Track Chairs, Coordinators and others involved in the 2008 and 2009 meetings.

2. Consider reports from the Programs and Meetings and Member Services Committees as inputs into the Annual Meeting planning.

**Regionally-Elected Vice Presidents**

Gene Fliedner, Karen Fowler, Jatinder (Jeet) Gupta, Kirk Karwan, Binshan Lin, Daniel Reid, Antonio Rios-Ramirez, Linda Sprague

Charges are as listed in DSI’s Policies and Procedures Manual (Chapter 6, Section I.C.2.h). In particular:

1. Submit a State of the Region Report to the DSI Executive Director and the Chair of the Regional Activities Committee, one month after the region’s Annual Meeting. Update and submit this report by December 8, 2008.

2. Serve as an effective conduit between the Board of Directors and your region, sharing information and issues of concern between both entities.

3. Work with the Member Services Committee and Regional Activities Committee to nurture a symbiotic relationship between the regions and DSI.
Successful Grantsmanship Miniconference

Coordinator: Q.B. Chung

Prepare a report briefly summarizing your experiences with the 2008 Successful Grantsmanship Miniconference. Highlight your recommendations for any changes you would like to see for future programs. Send this report Marc Schniederjans, 2008 Annual Meeting Program Chair, by December 1, 2008.

Secretary
Soumen Ghosh

1. Assist the President with parliamentary issues and interpretation of DSI Constitution, By-laws, or Policies and Procedures, in consultation with the DSI Executive Director.

2. Ensure that members of the Board of Directors get an equitable speaking time at Board meetings.

3. Assist the Chair of the ad hoc Committee, DSI Constitution and By-Laws vis-à-vis Policies and Procedures in interpretation issues, in consultation with the DSI Executive Director.

Technology in the Classroom Miniconference

Coordinators: William Johnson, Rupak Rauniar

1. Prepare a report briefly summarizing your experiences with the 2008 Technology in the Classroom Miniconference. Highlight your recommendations for any changes you would like to see for future programs. Send this report to Marc Schniederjans, 2008 Annual Meeting Program Chair, by December 1, 2008.

2. Prepare a report for the 2009 Technology in the Classroom Miniconference Coordinator(s), briefly summarizing your experiences with the 2008 Technology in the Classroom Miniconference. Highlight your advice to next year’s coordinator, lessons learned, specific implementation, guidelines, etc. Send this report to the Home Office by December 8, 2008.

Treasurer
Christine Kydd

1. Work with the Home Office to continue developing simplified, user-friendly and financially sound reports for budget and other financial documents to improve the effectiveness of review by the Executive Committee and Board of Directors.

2. Work with the Chair of the Investment Advisory Committee and act as a conduit to the Board of Directors as to the status and direction of the Institute’s investments.

3. Provide a brief note regarding any explanations preceding the audit report for publication in Decision Line. Send this report to the Home Office by December 8, 2008.

SELECT SESSIONS, from page 48

Session Chair: Barry Wray, University of North Carolina Wilmington

Business schools are facing Assurance of Learning challenges (AOL) for all courses including the Introductory Statistics course. This panel will discuss potential benefits and challenges as a result of the AOL process including (1) How can Business Schools benefit from the AOL process? (2) What are some implementation issues? (3) What are some possible problems of a poorly designed AOL process? (4) What is the future direction of AOL in the Introduction to Statistics course?

Panelists: Hope M. Baker, Kennesaw State University; Barbara A. Price, Georgia Southern University; Kimberly Killmer Hollister, Montclair State University; and Norean Sharpe, Babson College

MSMSEB Session 4: The Introductory Statistics Course: New Answers to Old Questions
Session Chair: Keith Ord, Georgetown University

The topical coverage in the introductory statistics course has not changed much over the years. However, solutions that were infeasible in the past are now available and may provide students with greater insights than classical approaches. We will explore several such issues: (1) New rules of thumb for the modern course; (2) Resampling and randomization for comparing two independent groups; (3) When to use the Central Limit Theorem? The presentations will be followed by an extended discussion.

Panelists: John D. McKenzie, Jr., Babson College; Mark L. Berenson, Montclair State University; and Keith Ord, Georgetown University

Track Chairs: Robert J. Pavur, University of North Texas, and Kellie Keeling, University of Denver
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on their practices and performance. Two commentaries in recent Decision Sciences journals have made mention of a less than ideal relationship between research, model development, and the use or reliance in practice (Guide & Wassenhove, 2007; Bendoly & Speier, 2008).

Internationally, it does not help that research methods and designs which may be applicable in the developed Western world, just fall short in the developing or undeveloped regions of the globe. For example, empirical studies which have developed to a fine art in the West, are often just not applicable in many Asian developing countries where there is a large problem of data integrity from respondents and where, even from the formal agencies, one gets constantly changing statistical data. Another thing that irritates both practitioners and researchers in developing economies is when the “fly-ins”—Western researchers who fly into less developed countries, spend a week or two there, and then emerge as “experts” in the area—either erroneously superimpose Western concepts and models on these emerging economies or conjure theories that are diametrically opposed to reality.

How helpful can exponents in decision sciences be then to industry, government and social communities in these circumstances? Often, intensive case research is more appropriate, but then this method of analysis is less commonly accepted or recognized by the “top” Western journals. This is very slowly changing as some in the production and operations management (P/OM), operations research (OR), and information systems (IS) communities have seen the need for industrially relevant research and the dangers of pursuing rigor in favor of relevance. Protocols for case research are being developed but then, junior researchers are still advised not to use case research, as there is a greater probability of publication rejection. So, a Catch 22!

Daniel Guide and Luk Wassenhove (Guide & Wassenhove, 2007) state that the need for grounded business research is now greater than ever, and have encouraged academic research partnership with industry as this can lead to research that is relevant, rigorous, and refreshing, and indeed, encourage exploration of unexplored research territory that is of vital importance to industry. However, they admit that this is not an easy route for academics interested in operations research modeling or empirical methods. While there can, and should be, methodological work in P/OM, OR, IS and other decision science areas, there should be a minimum of work on artificial problems.

Here is where the business community and government decision makers are going to take more notice very soon. There is emerging a group of researchers who are putting themselves out on a limb. They are daring to research—and attempting to publish—in the nontraditional, non-mainstream, and sometimes politically incorrect or uncharted waters, just because these are necessary to examine or are areas that the public—community or business—should be aware of, and/or make improvements in.

For example, Ramakrishna Velamuri and Sindhu Shanmugam studied the role that entrepreneurial capacity-building played in poverty alleviation in the artisan community in the southern Indian city of Athani (Velamuri & Shanmugam, forthcoming). They traced the development of a project launched by a Bangalore-based non-governmental organization, and how it turned impoverished communities around both economically and socially by more than doubling their household incomes. This supported better nutrition, better healthcare, and children’s education, and created a dramatic impact on individual families and the community at large.

Credible researchers like Aleda Roth and other (Roth, et al, 2008) have also recently made a critical study of the global food supply chain—so relevant with current concerns on the quality of food ingredients especially from developing exporting countries—and they now challenge supply chain managers to assess and improve their performance and that of their global suppliers. The criteria offered go beyond the typical focus on cost and functional specifications to emphasize the robustness of the quality, practices and processes along the supply chain itself.

The reality is that these exporting developing economies, while fast catching up with the Western world in many aspects, are still struggling to feed billions of people, the majority of whom are living at poverty levels. Part of this effort is aided by the revenue raised through exports, and therefore the greater value and relevance of research such as the above for decision scientists is to examine, make recommendation, and assist in applying methods not only beneficial to the Western world, but also to the emerging economies so that they are more able to sustain their exports thereby improving the lot of their own people.

So, once in a while, I would encourage you to succumb to the temptation of working out of the mainstream and really stretch the art of decision sciences into areas without a comfort factor but which leads you to distinctly improve the way that businesses or governments offer their products or services, so that ultimately we improve the social fabric of life.

I hope to meet up with many of you at our DSI Annual Meeting in November this year. Baltimore should be great that time of the year!

Norma J. Harrison (海 若 岚)
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Indiana University
Kelley School of Business
Department of Operations & Decision Technologies
Operations Management Faculty Openings

The Operations and Decision Technologies Department of the Kelley School of Business invites applications for Tenure-track faculty positions in Operations Management to begin Fall, 2009. These openings are in Operations Management and are targeted at the Assistant Professor level, but exceptional candidates at the Associate Professor and Professor levels will be considered. Strong records or promise in both research and teaching are required.

Research on any specialization within the broad framework of operations management and supply chain management is of interest. The major teaching responsibilities of these positions involve operations management and supply chain management courses across all levels of the curriculum.

Faculty will be available to meet with candidates at both the INFORMS and Decision Sciences Institute conferences. To ensure consideration, applications should be received by October 15, 2008. However, the search will continue until the positions are filled. Interested applicants should send a cover letter, vita, select research papers, and the names and addresses of three references to:

Chair of Faculty Search Committee
Operations Management
Department of Operations & Decision Technologies
Kelley School of Business
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405-1701

Indiana University is an Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunity Employer committed to excellence through diversity. The University actively encourages applications of women, minorities, and persons with disabilities.

Miami University
Farmer School of Business
Decision Sciences & Management Information Systems

Assistant/Associate Professor to teach undergraduate and graduate students; advise undergraduate students; provide program of scholarship; provide service contributions to profession and university.

Require: Doctorate in statistics or related discipline, or dissertation in process with completion of degree by December 31, 2009; evidence of quality teaching and research as well as service to the profession and university (for appointment as Associate Professor).

Desire: Graduate degree from business school or business experience; interest in teaching undergraduate course in data mining. A possibility of joint appointment with Department of Statistics in the College of Arts and Sciences exists for qualified candidates.

Send letter expressing interest in the position, along with a curriculum vitae to Timothy C. Krehbiel, krehbitc@muohio.edu, Chair of the Search Committee, Department of Decision Sciences and Management Information Systems, Farmer School of Business, Miami University, Oxford, OH 45056. Electronic submissions are strongly preferred.

Screening of applications begins October 15, 2008, and will continue until the position is filled. Miami University is an EOE/AA employer with smoke-free campuses. For information regarding campus crime and safety, visit www.muohio.edu. Hard copy upon request.

Richard Ivey School of Business
UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO
Operations Management


Applicants for a probationary (tenure-track) Assistant or Associate Professor appointment must hold, or be close to completing a doctorate degree. A successful candidate will show potential for excellence in research and teaching. The School supports high-quality managerially relevant research targeted at top-tier academic journals in all management disciplines. All strong candidates are encouraged to apply, particularly those whose research interests can be applied to one of the School’s current areas of research strength (see http://www.ivey.ca/research/).

Applicants for a non-tenure track, full time Limited Term (eg. Adjunct/Assistant Professor) appointment must have a doctorate or appropriate industry/teaching experience. A strong commitment to the practice of management is required as well as interest in teaching with the case study method. Applicants with a strong interest and/or experience in supply chain management, operations strategy or service management would be particularly attractive.

These positions are subject to budget approval. Applicants should have fluent written and oral communication skills in English. All qualified candidates are encouraged to apply; however, Canadian citizens and permanent residents will be given priority. The Richard Ivey School of Business and The University of Western Ontario are committed to employment equity and welcomes applications from all qualified women and men, including visible minorities, aboriginal people and persons with disabilities.

Submission deadline is November 30, 2008, applications will be accepted until the position has been filled. Please visit www.ivey.uwo.ca/faculty/Career_Opps.htm

Email: facultypositions@ivey.ca
OFFICERS’ NOMINATIONS

The Institute’s 2008-09 Nominating Committee invites your suggestions for nominees to be considered for the offices of President-Elect, Treasurer, and Vice Presidents elected at-large to serve on the Institute’s Board of Directors, beginning in 2010.

Your recommendations should include the affiliation of each nominee, the office recommended for the nominee, and a brief statement of qualifications of the nominee. If you would like to recommend persons for the offices of regionally elected Vice Presidents from the Asia Pacific, Mexico, Midwest and Northeast regions, please indicate so on the form below. These names will be forwarded to the appropriate regional nominating committee chair.

Please send your recommendations by no later than October 1st to the Chair of the Nominating Committee, c/o the Decision Sciences Institute, Georgia State University, J. Mack Robinson College of Business, University Plaza, Atlanta, GA 30303.

The Nominating Committee is most appreciative of your assistance.

Office

Nominee’s Name & Affiliation

Statement of Qualifications

Nominator’s Name & Affiliation

FELLOWS’ NOMINATIONS

The designation of Fellow is awarded to active supporters of the Institute for outstanding contributions in the field of decision sciences. To be eligible, a candidate must have achieved distinction in at least two of the following categories: (1) research and scholarship, (2) teaching and/or administration (3) service to the Decision Sciences Institute. (See the current list of DSI Fellows on this page.)

In order for the nominee to be considered, the nominator must submit in electronic form a full vita of the nominee along with a letter of nomination which may not be contained in the vita. A candidate cannot be considered for two consecutive years.

This information should be sent by no later than October 1st to the Chair of the Fellows Committee, Decision Sciences Institute, Georgia State University, J. Mack Robinson College of Business, University Plaza, Atlanta, GA 30303.
DECISION SCIENCES INSTITUTE

2008 Annual Meeting Registration Form • Baltimore, Maryland • November 22–25, 2008

All attendees must register for the meeting. Conference registrations must be postmarked by October 27, 2008, to avoid a late fee of $50. After October 27, requests for cancellation refunds will not be accepted. Mail form and payment for the registration fee to: Decision Sciences Institute, J. Mack Robinson College of Business, University Plaza, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA 30303, fax 404-413-7714.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Name &amp; Middle Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name for Badge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization/Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address (☐ New ☐ Home ☒ Business):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/State/Zip and Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone (☐ Home ☒ Business) Fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your answers to the following questions will help us plan this and future meetings. We appreciate your cooperation.

1. Where are you staying in Baltimore?
   - a. Conference hotel
   - b. Other (please specify)

2. Type of accommodation:
   - a. Single
   - b. Double

3. Date of arrival:
   - a. Fri. (11/21)
   - b. Sat. (11/22)
   - c. Sun. (11/23)
   - d. Mon. (11/24)
   - e. Tues. (11/25)

4. Do you plan to attend:
   - a. Sunday’s luncheon?
   - b. Monday’s reception?
   - c. Tuesday’s luncheon?
   - d. All?
   - e. None?

5. Interest Area (check one):
   - a. Academic Administration
   - b. Accounting
   - c. Economics
   - d. Finance
   - e. Health Care Systems
   - f. Innovative Education
   - g. International Business
   - h. Marketing
   - i. Microcomputer Systems & Apps.
   - j. IS/DSS
   - k. Managerial Problem-Solving
   - l. Organizational Behavior
   - m. Organizational Theory
   - n. Manufacturing/Service Management
   - o. Public/Nonprofit Management
   - p. Quantitative Techniques & Meth.
   - q. Stats, Decisions & Fore.
   - r. Strategic Management & Policy
   - s. Technology and Innovation
   - t. E-commerce
   - u. Other
   - v. None

6. What is your primary regional affiliation:
   - a. Asia-Pacific Region
   - b. Indian Subcontinent Region
   - c. Mexico Region
   - d. Midwest Region
   - e. Northeast Region
   - f. Southeast Region
   - g. Southwest Region
   - h. Western Region
   - i. At-Large
   - j. None

7. What is your interest in Placement?
   - a. As employer and employee
   - b. Employee only
   - c. Employer only
   - d. None

8. What was the primary reason you decided to attend the annual meeting?
   - a. Annual Meeting in general
   - b. Job Placement
   - c. Doctoral Student Consortium
   - d. New Faculty Development Consortium
   - e. Program Mini-conferences
   - f. Professional Dev.

9. Please check if you are a member of Alpha Iota Delta and would like to be identified as such at the Annual Meeting.

10. Please check if you would like to receive subscription information about the Journal of Business and Management, sponsored by the Western Decision Sciences Institute (WDSI).

Member and non-member fees for all registration categories include Sunday’s luncheon, Monday’s reception, Tuesday’s luncheon and online access to the Proceedings. The Annual Meeting Proceedings will be produced online after the meeting is held. The Proceedings will consist only of submissions accepted and presented at the 2008 DSI Annual Meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member registration</th>
<th>$325.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09 Member dues renewal</td>
<td>$(125.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(For the exact amount owed, please refer to the dues renewal notice previously mailed to you.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Outside U.S. &amp; Canada add $5)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member registration</td>
<td>$420.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Please check if you desire membership benefits. This fee entitles you to one year of membership in the Institute.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Outside U.S. &amp; Canada add $5)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student member registration</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09 Student dues renewal</td>
<td>$(150.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(For the exact amount owed, please refer to the dues renewal notice previously mailed to you.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Outside U.S. &amp; Canada add $5)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emereitus Member registration</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Outside U.S. &amp; Canada add $5)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emereitus Non-Member registration</td>
<td>$115.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Outside U.S. &amp; Canada add $5)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Sunday’s luncheon(s) @ $48 each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Tuesday’s awards luncheon(s) @ $48 each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After October 27, 2008 (LATE FEE)</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CREDIT CARD INFORMATION: ☐ Visa ☐ MC ☐ American Express ☐ Discover

Total Amount $_______

Card No. _________________________________ Expires: ___ / ___

Card Holder’s Name ____________________________ (Please Print)

Signature _________________________________

Billing Address _______________________________________

City/State/Zip __________________________________________
CALENDAR

NOVEMBER
November 22
The 39th Annual Meeting of the Institute will be held November 22-25, 2008, at the Baltimore Marriott Waterfront Hotel in Baltimore, Maryland. See pages 33-48 for detailed information on activities in Baltimore. Contact Program Chair Marc Schniederjans, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, at dsi2008@unl.edu.

JANUARY 2009
January 3
The Indian Subcontinent Region will hold its second annual conference at the Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay. For more information, contact Jatinder N. D. (Jeet) Gupta, The University of Alabama in Huntsville, guptaj@uah.edu.

FEBRUARY 2009
February 1
Submission deadline for the 2009 International DSI Meeting, to be held June 24-27, 2009, in Nancy, France. Program Chair is Minoo Tehrani, Roger Williams University. For more information, see page 32.

February 18
The Southeast Region will hold its 2009 Annual Meeting at the Doubletree Guest Suites in Historic Charleston, South Carolina. Program Chair is Wesley Jones, The Citadel. For more information, see page 32.

February 24
The Southwest Region will hold its 2009 (30th) Annual Meeting at the Renaissance Hotel, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. Program Chair is Kai Koong, University of Texas-Pan American. For more information, see page 32.

February 28
Submission deadline for the Asia Pacific Region, to be held July 4-8, 2009, on the campus of the China Europe International Business School (CEIBS) in Shanghai, The People’s Republic of China. Program co-chairs are Tom Callarman and Norma Harrison, CEIBS. For more information, see page 32.

APRIL 2009
April 1
Submission deadline for the 40th Annual Meeting of the Institute, to be held November 14-17, 2009, at the New Orleans Marriott Hotel in New Orleans, Louisiana. Program Chair is Maling Ebrahimpour, Roger Williams University. For more information, see page 32.

Decision Sciences Institute
Application for Membership

Name, Institution or Firm

Address (Home  Business)

Phone Number

Dues Schedule: ___ Renewal ___ First Time ___ Lapsed
(circle one)   U.S./Can. International

Regular Membership .........................$125 $125
Student Membership .........................$25 $25

(Student membership requires signature of sponsoring member.)

Emeritus Membership .........................$35 $35

(Emeritus membership requires signature of member as a declaration of emeritus status.)

Institutional Membership .........................$125 $125

(You have been designated to receive all publications and special announcements of the Institute.)

Please send your payment (in U.S. dollars) and application to:
Decision Sciences Institute, Georgia State University, J. Mack Robinson College of Business, University Plaza, Atlanta, GA 30303. For more

CREDIT CARD INFORMATION: □ Visa □ MC □ AmEx □ Disc.

Total amount $________________________

Card No. _________________________________ Expires: ___ /___

Card Holder’s Name ____________________________

Signature______________________________________(Please Print)