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William P Ferris

Editor-in-Chief

Transition news
I am happy to introduce the second of the four issues that we will publish this year, our first year with Palgrave Macmillan. Our move from three issues per year to four is a mark of the increasing success of our journal, now in its fifth year overall, in attracting quality manuscripts to publish. We encourage readers to submit a paper to our blind peer-reviewed process or to write me or Co-Editor Laurel Goulet of our Reviews and Research of Note section with ideas for a book or article review in an upcoming issue.

Another key transition for the journal is our upcoming move to an interactive website that Palgrave is helping us construct through EJPress. In the next few months, all submissions and reviewing will be done through our home page, which will direct the OMJ community to the interactive site. We expect this change will allow us to keep track of our authors and reviewers and their work in a much more accessible and organized way and without the occasionally clunky security and technically challenging issues that occur when the reviewing process takes place on hundreds of e-mail clients around the world. We will be sure to communicate through our home page and e-mail when the site goes public in the near future.

An issue with some common themes
This issue is comprised of manuscripts from two of our sections – Teaching & Learning as well as our usual biennial EAMI Special Issue Section. The former, overseen by Co-Editors Steve Meisel and Jon Billsberry, is a fairly regular feature of the journal. The latter is hosted by Guest Editor Joan Weiner, who has selected two outstanding manuscripts from the Eastern Academy of Management-International’s June 2007 biennial conference outside the US, this one in Amsterdam. Steve and Joan have written introductions to the articles from these two sections later in the issue.

Believe it or not, there is a commonality among the four articles we are presenting in this issue. They all are concerned on some level with ethics and values. The first of the T & L articles focuses on academic ethics by suggesting that if we, as professors, are going to be the educators of our students’ ethics and ethical development, we should look to our own first. In “Academic Ethics,” Martha C. Spears explores her findings on how students perceive ethical issues facing faculty differently from the way faculty themselves seem to. For example, students feel that using the
same test from a previous semester on their particular class has more ethical issues than faculty seem to believe it does. Until students and faculty communicate around these differences, faculty credibility will be an issue. The tables accompanying this article are especially interesting. They show more differences in student/faculty ethical perceptions than you might imagine.

In the other T & L article, “All I’m Askin’ is for a Little Respect: How Can We Promote Student Civility in our Classrooms?” authors Susan D. Baker, Debra R. Comer, and M. Linda Martinak deal with student conduct harmful to the classroom environment, certainly an ethical issue as well as a behavioral one. Like the authors of the previous article, they find part of the problem is the gap between millennial generation students and their earlier generation teachers. They deal with extensive ways to “fortify ourselves against the hurts of incivility” as well as numerous strategies for how to do so. Once again, extensive tables are of high interest as readers are invited to pore over their catalog of incivilities and their many recommendations to “engage” the students in a way that makes incivility no concern at all.

The EAMI articles are more concerned with corporate social responsibility and leadership ethics in a global organizational context. “Commitment to Corporate Social and Environmental Responsibilities: An Insight into Contrasting Differences between Perspectives in China and the US” by Carlos W. H. Lo, Carolyn P. Egri, and David A. Ralston deals with the question of the primacy of corporate responsibility (CR) in the minds and behaviors of stakeholder groups in both countries. Survey data results from over 100 CEO or CFO senior executives in each country indicate that while customer and community CR issues seem stronger in the US, employee, investor, and environmental concerns show no significant differences between the two countries. One limitation may be that the senior executives were self-reporting about their organizations and may have engaged a bit in self-serving bias, despite the well-communicated anonymity of the surveys. The authors, who come from Hong Kong, Canada, and the US, also found data encouraging an instrumental approach to CR in both countries – good CR means good business. This introduction cannot do justice to what is a very complex question and a very nuanced set of results, though. I should also note that we are building a thread around international CR with this article that follows the excellent White Paper by Sandra Waddock in our last issue, and that will itself be followed by another international CR article in our next issue.

The last article in the EAMSI section of this issue is “Discerning Leadership Perceptions of Central Eurasian Managers: An Exploratory Analysis” by Kiran M. Ismail and David L. Ford, Jr. The article deals with leadership values and perceptions as gained from interviews of 38 government, NGO, and business leaders across a basically unstudied group of eight countries – Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and three southern Caucasus countries (Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia) that surround the Caspian Sea. Two are Christian and six are moderate, secular Islamic states. The GLOBE leadership project, whose relevant results are compared to the authors’ findings in the article, has studied Georgia and Kazakhstan but none of the others. Little research exists on leadership values and perceptions in these countries, so this article is a definite contribution to such study. Why do it? Reasons include both the theoretical and the practical. On the theoretical side, if we are going to try to learn anything universal about leadership and values, then we must study them everywhere in the world. On the practical side, business of all kinds is becoming more global, and it is important to learn cross-cultural differences in areas of study like leadership and values for those interested in pursuing interests in central Eurasia. This article offers intriguing insights and important recommendations for future study of an understudied topic.

I hope you find these articles, all of which deal in some way with some common themes around ethics and values, as interesting as I did. Welcome to the issue!