

Call for contributions

8th Responsible Management Education Research Conference

Poverty and Prosperity: Implications for Advancing the SDGs and Responsible Management Education in a Post-Pandemic World

International Business School at Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University

Suzhou, China; 19th – 22nd October 2021

China's achievement in eradicating extreme poverty is a huge contribution to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the plan of action for a better and more prosperous world. Poverty and prosperity in a post-pandemic world will still be a topic requiring further contributions through leveraging various stakeholders' engagement and wisdoms.

We are pleased to invite the members of the global PRME community to join us the 8th RME Research Conference in the beautiful city Suzhou, one of the first group of "Cultural and Historic Cities" of China as well as one of the most economic-developed regions of China.

We invite contributions from a wide range of disciplinary traditions that explore responsible management issues from both conceptual and practical perspectives, and we encourage contributions, which are multi-disciplinary and cross-disciplinary in nature. We welcome contributions that can be of a conceptual, qualitative or quantitative nature.

Contributions to the conference, i.e. to its streams, can be submitted in the form of abstracts (up to 200 words), extended abstracts (up to 1,000 words), working papers (research-in-progress) (up to 2,500 words) or full papers (up to 6,000 words, excluding references).

Contributions can be submitted for any of the conference tracks, including the General Track that is open for papers on different issues, challenges, opportunities and solution in the field of sustainable development, SDGs, Agenda 2030, CSR, responsible leadership and management education.

Conference organizers and track chairs are exploring various publishing opportunities, including special issues of international journals, edited books, etc.

The conference will feature an AMLE Paper Development Workshop (PDW). This PDW provides a space for members of the RME community to receive feedback on their research-in-progress pieces and to further develop them for possible submission to AMLE or other relevant outlets. PDW places will be limited and competitive; those submitting *working papers* who wish to be considered for inclusion in the PDW should indicate this during the submission process.

The submissions window opens on 7th May 2021. The link will be available on the conference website on this date. To be accepted, contributions must be submitted only through this website. All submissions must be in English. Each accepted contribution must be accompanied by at least one full conference registration at the speaker rate. The submission deadline is 31st May 2021.

We encourage contributions, which address the following topical tracks:

Track 1: General Track

Track Proponents and Co-Chairs:

Christian Hauser

Christian.Hauser@fhgr.ch

Milenko Gudić

milenko.gudic@gmail.com

Open for all participants

The general track will group together the relevant PRME groupings (Working Groups, Regional Chapters, etc.), as well as other major international associations and networks operating in the landscape of responsible management education, who will share information on the respective current activities, outputs and future plans with an eye on identifying opportunities for a closer collaboration and possible synergy for a higher impact in the process of the post-pandemic recovery and rebuilding. This general track provides a platform for open discussion covering broad issues such as climate change, or human rights, or sustainability mindset, or any other issues related to the Conference. No paper submission is required for attending this track.

Track 2: Research and Teaching for Poverty Alleviation

Track Proponents and Co-chairs:

Carole Parkes

Emerita Professor of Responsible Management & Leadership at the University of Winchester University, UK

Al Rosenbloom

Brennan School of Business, Dominican University, River Forest, IL, USA

MilenkoGudić

milenko.gudic@gmail.com

Call for Papers

In the context of the Conference general theme on *Poverty and Prosperity: Implications for Advancing the SDGs, 2030 Agenda and Responsible Management Education in a Post-Pandemic World*, the **PRME Anti-poverty WG is proposing** a special SDG #1 related conference track consisting of the following two sessions:

Research: Action and Impact-Oriented Research that Fosters Poverty Alleviation and Facilitates Prosperity in a Post-Pandemic World

This session will focus on two issues: (1) new research that provides a better understanding of how poverty alleviation and prosperity-building efforts can promote a post-pandemic recovery, and (2) research that explores managerial and leadership capabilities and the mindset that supports implementation of new approaches to poverty alleviation and prosperity and the implication of such research for responsible management education and leadership development.

We also encourage research that provides guidance for responsible management education by focusing on the role, dynamics, and impact of how business and non-business leaders recognize the need for multi-stakeholder collaboration that can concurrently reduce poverty, facilitate prosperity and advancement of the SDGs. Conceptual or empirical research papers, along with works in progress and/or proposals for innovative research designs that lead to new insights or challenge established frameworks about responsible management and poverty, are also welcome for this track.

Teaching/Learning: Developing Mindsets and Capabilities for Poverty Alleviation through Innovative Pedagogical Methods

This session will focus on student learning. Papers that illustrate how to develop mindsets and capabilities for poverty alleviation and prosperity-building in a post-pandemic world and the Decade of Action through responsible management education and leadership development are suitable for this track. Various innovative pedagogical methods, such as action learning activities, use of multi-/cross-disciplinary faculty teams, curricular/program/course change strategies, involvement of stakeholders as learning partners, are welcome for this session. Case studies illustrating creative classroom approaches to poverty alleviation, prosperity-building in relation to the SDGs, responsible management and leadership development, as well as other innovations in teaching, can also be submitted for this session.

The sessions are designed for maximum interaction, discussion and mutual learning. They will provide presenters with valuable feedback for further improving their respective research, publishing and teaching opportunities and practices.

Track 3: One Belt - One Road (OBOR) Initiative in a Post-Pandemic World: Implications for Responsible Management Education

Track Proponents and Co-chairs:

Milenko Gudić

milenko.gudic@gmail.com

Christina Bache

PRME B4P WG Co-chair

Call for Papers

In the context of the Conference general theme on *Poverty and Prosperity: Implications for Advancing the SDGs, 2030 Agenda and Responsible Management Education in a Post-Pandemic World*, the **PRME Anti-poverty WG** and **PRME Business for Peace (B4P) Working Groups** are jointly proposing the following conference track:

Business for Peace, Poverty Alleviation, Prosperity and Advancement of the SDGs and the 2030 Agenda along the One Belt - One Road (OBOR) initiative in a Post-pandemic World: Implications for Responsible Management Education

This track will focus on the challenges and opportunities related to the potential that *the One Belt, One Road* (OBOR) Initiative offers in terms of economic restructuring, human development and broader social transformations across the Euro-Asian continent, as well as on the overall impact that this initiative could have on advancing the SDGs and the 2030 Agenda. The OBOR Initiative is grounded in the goals of fostering greater connectivity, closer ties and collaboration, and stronger people-to-people links – all of which are central to the SDGs.

Related to this is the role that responsible management education could and should play as one of the most powerful enablers and facilitators for the transformative and impactful historic process of the OBOR Initiative, particularly through the development of the necessary leadership capabilities and mindsets.

The track welcomes a broad range of research contributions related to the challenges and opportunities of the OBOR initiative. Also encouraged are presentations of best practices, cases and inspirational stories, which all could be focused on either (a) critical issues facing individual or multiple SDGs, and/or (b) different regional perspectives, including cross-border collaboration and partnerships.

Given the scope and overarching character of the track topic, and depending on the number of paper submissions, the track proponents may create issue-focused or geography-related sub-tracks.

Track 4: Circular Business Models as an Enabler for Prosperity

Track Proponents and Co-chairs:

Lisa Fröhlich, Professor for Supply Management and President of CBS International Business School, Hardefuststr. 1, 50677 Cologne, Germany, e.froehlich@cbs.de

Kristina Steinbiß, Professor for Global Marketing and Management at ESB Business School, Reutlingen University, Alteburgstr. 150, 72762 Reutlingen, Germany, Kristina.steinbiss@reutlingen-university.de

Maud Helene Schmiedeknecht, Professor for Corporate Governance and Corporate Social Responsibility at ESB Business School, Reutlingen University, Alteburgstr. 150, 72762 Reutlingen, Germany, maud.schmiedeknecht@reutlingen-university.de

Call for Papers

Especially in the current time of the pandemic, a more sustainable economic approach is indispensable. However, the change towards prosperity requires circular economy business models with new value creation structures. To develop those adapted business models for circular economies, it is necessary to adjust existing approaches, since the actors involved along the value chain take on different roles.

The consequences of the current pandemic, accelerating global warming, resource scarcity and the increasing destruction of entire ecosystems are increasingly becoming the focus of the top management of many companies. For a long time, the disciplines of business administration and management practice neglected the negative effects of corporate actions on the environment. The responsibility for solving the

resulting problems is transferred to political or social actors. However, growing consumer awareness of the problems just outlined is putting growing pressure on companies and their value chains. In this context, corporate sustainability offers a strategic competitive advantage and enormous development potential. Nature-friendly economic approaches, such as the circular economy, combine ecological and economic potential benefits. Fundamental to a development towards a circular economy are circular business models that break away from linear consumption and follow the paradigm of sustainable decoupling of economic growth and resource consumption. This transformation is accompanied by the linking of economic interests with ecological economic forms as a prerequisite for initiating a change in entrepreneurial thinking. In the literature, there is a multitude of approaches to innovate circular business models taking sustainability aspects into account. Despite these numerous considerations, the transformation to a circular economy is only being implemented very hesitantly. Previous approaches largely neglect the importance of horizontal integration and cross-company cooperation to realize valuable sector-independent synergy and symbiosis effects to secure competitive advantages along value chains. In particular, the consideration of new technologies and organizational approaches, such as digital ecosystems, must be incorporated into future considerations and developments. There is a clear need for further research in the field of circular business models for greater prosperity in research and practice. The generation of sector-independent synergy and symbiosis effects should be included as an enabler to overcome previous boundaries and barriers in the establishment of circular value networks.

Track 5: Fostering Responsible Management throughout International Supply Chains in a Post-Pandemic World

Track Proponents and Co-chairs:

Christian Hauser (FH Graubünden, Chur, Switzerland, E-mail: christian.hauser@fhgr.com)

Jeanine Bretti-Rainalter and **Eleanor Jehan** both work as research associates at the Swiss Institute for Entrepreneurship (SIFE) at FH Graubünden, Chur, Switzerland

Call for Papers

In recent years, the attributes of conducting business have changed dramatically with international business tending to be less centralized, more globally distributed (Grönroos, 2006), more service-oriented (Eriksson et al., 2017) and with a greater emphasis on a firm's supply chain (Bode et al., 2011). The Covid Pandemic has emphasized how interconnected and interdependent supply chains are, thereby highlighting their vulnerability. While it is considered vital for a firm's survival to work with external business partners (Wilding, 1998), it comes with a substantial loss of control over what is going on in upstream and downstream processing stages (Vurro et al., 2009). Numerous business scandals involving questionable business practice at different stages of the value creation process have brought to the fore the relevance of responsible management in international supply chains. Accusations aimed at (internationally-active) businesses challenge the level of transparency of value adding processes conducted throughout the international supply chain, and raise questions regarding the accountability of enterprises for irresponsible acts by business partners (Gong et al., 2019; Hsu, 2007; Smart & Hsu, 2007; Soltani & Maupetit, 2015; Wieland & Handfield, 2013). Accordingly, responsible

management literature emphasizes the need to develop and enforce responsible business practices amongst a company's own field of operations, as well as for value creating activities performed by their upstream and downstream value chain partners (Hibbert & Cunliffe 2015). Moreover, in light of changing legal landscapes, as well as the financial and legitimacy related penalties which can ensue, companies are recognizing the need to integrate responsible management practices into their corporate activities (Hauser, 2020). The call for more responsible and stakeholder-oriented management practices (Moosmayer et al., 2020) is also reflected in several initiatives on a political level, such as the "Responsible Business Initiative" in Switzerland, the "Lieferkettengesetz" in Germany, or the "anti-slavery act" in Great Britain.

Against this background, this track aims at contributing to the academic debate relating to the responsibility and accountability of enterprises, not only within their own individual value creation processes, but also within their supply chains. Therefore, we invite contributions that address, but are not limited to, the following areas

- Responsible management in international supply chains
- How companies are responding to soft-law instruments (e.g. OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, UN Global Compact) that have been created in the last couple of years, but also to the increasing number of national laws (see above)
- The measures that companies take to safeguard responsible management in international supply chains
- The roles of NGOs and governments in the debate of responsible business conduct in international supply chains
- Implications that these developments have on the responsible management education of future leaders

Resources:

- Bode, C., Wagner, S. M., Petersen, K. J., & Ellram, L. M. (2011). Understanding Responses to Supply Chain Disruptions: Insights from Information Processing and Resource Dependence Perspectives. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(4), 833–856. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.64870145>
- Eriksson, T., Nummela, N., Sainio, L.-M., & Saarenketo, S. (2017). Value Chain Management Capability in International SMEs. In S. Marinova, J. Larimo, & N. Nummela (Eds.), *Value Creation in International Business* (Vol. 13, pp. 171–193). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-39369-8_8
- Gong, M., Gao, Y., Koh, L., Sutcliffe, C., & Cullen, J. (2019). The role of customer awareness in promoting firm sustainability and sustainable supply chain management. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 217, 88–96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2019.01.033>
- Grönroos, C. (2006). Adopting a service logic for marketing. *Marketing Theory*, 6(3), 317–333. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593106066794>
- Hauser, C. (2020). From Preaching to Behavioral Change: Fostering Ethics and Compliance Learning in the Workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 162(4), 835–855. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04364-9>
- Hibbert, P., & Cunliffe, A. (2015). Responsible Management: Engaging Moral Reflexive Practice Through Threshold Concepts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 127(1), 177–188. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1993-7>

- Hsu, S.-H. (2007). A New Business Excellence Model with Business Integrity from Ancient Confucian Thinking. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 18(4), 413–423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783360701231732>
- Moosmayer, D. C., Laasch, O., Parkes, C., & Brown, K. G. (Eds.). (2020). *Sage handbook of responsible management learning and education*. SAGE PUBLICATIONS.
- Smart, A., & Hsu, C. L. (2007). Corruption or social capital? Tact and the performance of Guanxi in market socialist China. In M. Nuijten & G. Anders (Eds.), *Corruption and the Secret of Law: A legal anthropological perspective* (pp. 167–189). Ashgate Publishing.
- Soltani, B., & Maupetit, C. (2015). Importance of core values of ethics, integrity and accountability in the European corporate governance codes. *Journal of Management & Governance*, 19(2), 259–284. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10997-013-9259-4>
- Vurro, C., Russo, A., & Perrini, F. (2009). Shaping Sustainable Value Chains: Network Determinants of Supply Chain Governance Models. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 90(S4), 607–621. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0595-x>
- Wieland, A., & Handfield, R. (2013). The Socially Responsible Supply Chain. *Supply Chain Management Review*, 22–29.
- Wilding, R. (1998). The supply chain complexity triangle: Uncertainty generation in the supply chain. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, 28(8), 599–616. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09600039810247524>

Track 6: Poverty Eradication and Prosperity through Sustainability-oriented Innovation

Track Proponents and Co-chairs:

Xuanwei Cao

xuanwei.cao@xjtlu.edu.cn

Juelin Yin

yinjin@mail.sysu.edu.cn

Call for Papers

The traditional approach to lifting disadvantaged people out of poverty takes a top-down way, in which government, NGOs, or businesses create solutions and provide them to the poor. In the large-scale poverty eradication campaign in China, this strong top-down led approach provided rich public aid and made significant achievements. In this process, various approaches with innovation from policy and technology to entrepreneurship and business model have been widely applied. Yet, existing research on poverty alleviation often emphasize the role of government policies and technologies. The potential innovation power of grassroots entrepreneurs in rural regions was ignored. Few studies have paid attention to the crucial issue of scaling up poverty eradication and prosperity in a way of sustainable business model innovation.

To get rid of poverty and progress prosperity of a society, it is becoming increasingly clear that business should transform to sustainability-oriented innovation across institutional, economic, and social dimensions. Issues related to the domain of prosperity cover from living conditions, health, education, and natural environment, investment environment, enterprise conditions, market access and infrastructure, and economic quality, safety and security, personal freedom, governance, and social capital. It is through the connection of sustainability that poverty eradication and prosperity are closely interwoven.

This Track welcomes contributions from broad perspectives, including but not limited to the following topics:

- sustainability-oriented innovation
- sustainable business model innovation
- business sustainability strategy
- corporate political engagement
- institutional work and innovation
- institutional innovation and entrepreneurial opportunities

It is expected that discussions in this Track could help widen and deepen our understanding on achieving prosperity through leveraging sustainable business model innovation.

Track 7: Entrepreneurial Activities Within the Context of Poverty Reduction

Track Proponents and Co-chairs:

Juelin Yin

[yinjin@mail.sysu.edu.cn](mailto:yinjlin@mail.sysu.edu.cn)

Xuanwei Cao

xuanwei.cao@xjtlu.edu.cn

Call for Papers

Poverty reduction has increasingly become a core subject for researchers across the social sciences, from economics, finance to management and entrepreneurship. Among various initiatives, entrepreneurship has emerged as a critical response to the severity of the problem of extreme poverty (Bruton, Ahlstrom, & Si, 2015; Sutter, Bruton, and Chen, 2019). Entrepreneurship, broadly defined as introducing new goods, services, raw materials, markets and organizing methods through the formation of new means, ends, or means-ends relationships, may extend to social and institutional spheres for improving the poor's social and economic standing (Si, Ahlstrom, Wei, & Cullen, 2020). However, still limited is known about the role of entrepreneurship for the population living at the bottom of the pyramid (BoP). How could entrepreneurship make a difference in reducing poverty? What factors drive entrepreneurial

activities in the BoP context? To answer these questions, this track calls for theoretical discussions of entrepreneurship activities within the context of poverty reduction, focusing on the social impacts of entrepreneurial activities and entrepreneurial approaches to poverty reduction. In particular, more attention should be paid to the influential factors of entrepreneurship in the context of poverty reduction, such as institutional environments, entrepreneurial characteristics, and organizational resource management.

Target groups

This track hopes to attract submissions from scholars and researchers in corporate social responsibility, sustainability, entrepreneurship, strategy, and development studies, which address poverty reduction from different disciplines. Practitioners with knowledge and insights into cases and best practices of poverty reduction, primarily through an entrepreneurial approach, are also welcome to join the session.

Reference

Bruton, G. D., Ahlstrom, D., & Si, S. (2015). Entrepreneurship, poverty, and Asia: Moving beyond subsistence entrepreneurship. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 32(1), 1-22.

Si, S., Ahlstrom, D., Wei, J., & Cullen, J. (2020). Business, entrepreneurship and innovation toward poverty reduction. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 32: 1-20,

Sutter, C., Bruton, G. D., & Chen, J. (2019). Entrepreneurship as a solution to extreme poverty: A review and future research directions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34(1), 197-214.

Track 8: Utopia or lofty ambition: Why and how responsible entrepreneurs choose to terminate their entrepreneurial career

Track Proponents and Co-Chairs:

Xiao Wang

xiao.wang@xjtlu.edu.cn

Xuanwei Cao

xuanwei.cao@xjtlu.edu.cn

Call for Contributions

Why is there so much research on new venture creation and growth whereas so little on the ‘exit’ stage of entrepreneurship (DeTienne & K. Wennberg, 2016)? It is surprising that entrepreneurship researchers seemed to have missed out on one of the most important phenomena in the entrepreneurial journey (DeTienne & K. Wennberg, 2016; DeTienne, Mckelvie, & Chandler, 2015; Souitaris, Zerbinati, Peng, & Shepherd, 2020). As Aldrich (2015) notes in his recent discussion of understanding exits in capitalist societies, ‘entrepreneurial exit completes the full cycle of the entrepreneurial process, because every entrepreneurial entry carries the potential of becoming an entrepreneurial exit’ (Aldrich, 2015; D. DeTienne & K. Wennberg, 2016). Notwithstanding, why

some entrepreneurs exit at a reasonable stage while some at an early stage, especially for the social entrepreneurs, green entrepreneurs and institutional entrepreneurs whose may significantly contribute to a greater social or environmental good.

Stam and colleagues define entrepreneurial exit as 'entrepreneurial decision to quit an entrepreneurial career' (Stam, Thurik, & Zwan, 2008), implying that the decision to exit can be quite permanent, or at least that it represents a major shift in work activity and/or work identity (Markowska, 2011). It is common emotional factors such as positive or negative perception affect the choice to exit (Chirico, Gómez-Mejia, Hellerstedt, Withers, & Nordqvist, 2020), but when entrepreneurs or founders feel responsible for the society or the environment, will the positive or negative emotions still largely affect their entrepreneurs to exit? These might imply a number of potential alternatives such as creation of a new prosocial venture, returning to wage employment in commercial field, returning to education, or a multitude of other potential opportunities. As a research field, we still have limited understanding of these factors and why responsible entrepreneurs might end their entrepreneurial careers. Psychologists, sociologists, and scholars in organization theory may take an interest in such positive or negative emotions resulted from entrepreneurs' responsibility related to the exit. Is it due to simple boredom, the need for a challenge, the need to contribute to society in a different manner, the desire to create rather than to manage, or family issues? Economists, political scientists, and geographers may be interested in the macro-side of the various exits and corresponding contextual variables. Overall, there remains much to be done in understanding entrepreneurial exit before this area can present a comprehensive picture compared to what we know about new start-ups or new venture growth.

References

- Aldrich, H. E. (2015). *Perpetually on the Eve of Destruction? Understanding Exits in Capitalist Societies at Multiple Levels of Analysis*.
- Chirico, F., Gómez-Mejia, L. R., Hellerstedt, K., Withers, M., & Nordqvist, M. (2020). To Merge, Sell, or Liquidate? Socioemotional Wealth, Family Control, and the Choice of Business Exit. *Journal of Management*, 46(8), 1342-1379. doi:10.1177/0149206318818723
- DeTienne, D. R., Mckelvie, A., & Chandler, G. N. (2015). Making sense of entrepreneurial exit strategies: A typology and test. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 30(2), 255-272.
- DeTienne, D. R., & Wennberg, K. (2016). Studying exit from entrepreneurship: New directions and insights. *International Small Business Journal*, 34(2), 151-156.
- Markowska, M. (2011). Entrepreneurial Competence Development : Triggers, Processes & Consequences.
- Souitaris, V., Zerbinati, S., Peng, B., & Shepherd, D. (2020). Should I Stay or Should I Go? Founder Power and Exit via Initial Public Offering. *Academy of Management Journal*, 63(1), 64-95. doi:10.5465/amj.2017.0420
- Stam, E., Thurik, R., & Zwan, P. V. D. (2008). Entrepreneurial Exit in Real and Imagined Markets. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 19(4), 1109-1139.

Track 9: Gender Inequality and Poverty

Track Proponents and Chairs:

Shili Chen

Shili.chen@xjtlu.edu.cn

Ying Feng

Ying.feng@xjtlu.edu.cn

Call for Contributions

Gendered processes and outcomes are pervasive in educational, social, business, and economic activities (Bullough, Renko, & Abdelzaher, 2017; Fernandez-Mateo & Kaplan, 2018; Joshi, Neely, Emrich, Griffiths, & George, 2015). They shape how individuals perceive their family roles and career prospects, which kinds of life they are going to live, what opportunities they pursue, how they achieve their goals, and therefore, their living standards, social status, and contribution to economic growth (Barbulescu & Bidwell, 2013; Kossek, Su, & Wu, 2017; Terjesen, Sealy, & Singh, 2009). With decades' movement in equal opportunity and equal rights worldwide, discrimination against women is still a serious problem facing our society, which has continuously limited the ability of world economy to benefit from the talent of half the population. This is true for both low- and high-income economies, though important differences exist across countries.

According to the UN, "gender equality is not only a fundamental human right, but a necessary foundation for a peaceful, prosperous, and sustainable world." Early research has identified gender diversity as an important driver of creativity and superior performance in workgroups and firms (Adams, 2016; Herring, 2009; Kim & Starks, 2016; Post & Byron, 2015). There is also little doubt that gender equality contributes to poverty eradication and economic growth (Kabeer, 2003; Kabeer & Natali, 2013; Minasyan, Zenker, Klasen, & Vollmer, 2019).

Therefore, we call for papers that will advance our understanding of gendered phenomenon and women and girl empowerment. Avenues for exploration may include gender inequality in business and economic activities, women in leadership roles, interactions between supply-side and demand-side drivers of gender inequality, the effectiveness of gendered policies in promoting gender equality, how education shapes and is shaped by gendered dynamics, and how crisis and technology development influence gendered outcomes.

References

- Adams, R. B. 2016. Women on boards : The superheroes of tomorrow? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(3): 371–386.
- Barbulescu, R., & Bidwell, M. 2013. Do women choose different jobs from men? Mechanisms of application segregation in the market for managerial workers. *Organization Science*, 24(3): 737–756.
- Bullough, A., Renko, M., & Abdelzaher, D. 2017. Women's business ownership: Operating within the context of institutional and in-group collectivism. *Journal of Management*, 43(7): 2037–2064.
- Fernandez-Mateo, I., & Kaplan, S. 2018. Gender and organization science: Introduction to a virtual special issue. *Organization Science*, 29(6): 1229–1236.
- Herring, C. 2009. Does diversity pay?: Race, gender, and the business case for diversity. *American Sociological Review*, 74(2): 208–224.
- Joshi, A., Neely, B., Emrich, C., Griffiths, D., & George, G. 2015. Gender research in AMJ: An overview of five decades of empirical research and calls to action. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(5): 1459–1475.

- Kabeer, N. 2003. *Gender mainstreaming in poverty eradication and the Millennium Development Goals: A handbook for policy-makers and other stakeholders*. Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Kabeer, N., & Natali, L. 2013. Gender equality and economic growth: Is there a win-win? *IDS Working Papers*, 2013(417): 1–58.
- Kim, D., & Starks, L. T. 2016. Gender diversity on corporate boards: Do women contribute unique skills? *American Economic Review*, 106(5): 267–271.
- Kossek, E. E., Su, R., & Wu, L. 2017. “Opting out” or “pushed out”? Integrating perspectives on women’s career equality for gender inclusion and interventions. *Journal of Management*, 43(1): 228–254.
- Minasyan, A., Zenker, J., Klasen, S., & Vollmer, S. 2019. Educational gender gaps and economic growth: A systematic review and meta-regression analysis. *World Development*, 122: 199–217.
- Post, C., & Byron, K. 2015. Women on boards and firm financial performance: A meta-analysis. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(5): 1546–1571.
- Terjesen, S., Sealy, R., & Singh, V. 2009. Women directors on corporate boards: A review and research agenda. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 17(3): 320–337.

Track 10: Prosperity by Global Partnership

Track Proponents and Co-Chairs:

Yameng Zhang

Yameng.zhang@xjtlu.edu.cn

Wu Zhan

wu.zhan@sydney.edu.au

Piyush Sharma

Piyush.Sharma@curtin.edu.au

Call for Contributions

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which were set by the United Nations General Assembly, are a universal call to action to end poverty, protect the planet, and ensure that all people enjoy peace and prosperity. Goal 17 is to “strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development” (United Nations, 2015, 2017). Developing multi-stakeholder partnerships to share knowledge, expertise, technology, and financial support is seen as critical to overall success of the SDGs, and increasing international cooperation is vital to achieving each of the 16 previous goals. As António Guterres, the Secretary-General of the United Nations said: “to deliver on the promise of a prosperous and peaceful future, development actors will have to find new ways of working together and leveraging genuine partnerships that make the most of expertise, technology and resources for sustainable and inclusive growth”.

The achievement of the SDGs will be defined by the existence of multi-level, multi-national partnerships that will drive their implementation with a joined vision. According to the UN,

partnerships are voluntary and collaborative relationships between various parties, governments, the private sector and civil society, in which all participants agree to work together to achieve a common purpose or undertake a specific task and, as mutually agreed, to share risks and responsibilities, resources and benefits. Strong international cooperation is needed now more than ever to ensure that countries have the means to recover from the pandemic, build back better and achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. Yet, establishing partnerships is not an easy task and requires the creation of nurturing and enabling environment for partnering that includes building up institutional capacities, convening and supporting infrastructure, and a policy environment that together can help mainstreaming collaboration.

This track of RME Research Conference aims to offer critical and interdisciplinary view on the ways in which a wide range of partnering and collaborative arrangements at multiple levels (e.g., international, national, regional, local, inter-organizational etc.) are working to support the SDGs. This will raise the questions such as: How to evaluate the effectiveness of partnership at different levels? How to maximize SDG impact by partnering? What are the roles of diverse stakeholders (e.g., government, NGO, firms)? How does inter-governmental partnership influence knowledge transfer and innovation? How do firms develop their partnering capacity? What is the dark side of partnership? The call for papers is open to a wide range of regional scopes and different methodological approaches including quantitative, qualitative, mixed-methods, case study, literature review and theoretical/conceptual papers.

This track welcomes submissions with an interdisciplinary view on global partnership, including management, geography, urban studies, politics etc. It seeks papers on the following and other related topics:

At global level,

- What types of transformational development can be made by global partnership?
- How to maximize SDG impact by partnering between countries?
- What are the roles of NGOs in partnering?
- How to evaluate the effectiveness of partnership?

At regional level,

- What are the roles of regional governments to develop regional partnership worldwide?
- How do local governments facilitate knowledge/technology transfer and improve regional innovation by building friendship ties with foreign cities?
- How do regional governments improve institutional capacity to partner?

At organizational level,

- How do firms perform as development actor and partner to facilitate prosperity?
- How do firms develop their partnership capacity? How to define international partnering capacity?

- How to select international partners?
- What are the dark side of international partnership/network on firm performance?
- What types of tension/conflicts may exist in partnering process? How do firms manage power imbalances?
- What is the partnership formation journey?
- How do firms maintain heterogenous partners/stakeholders?

Track 11: Value Driven Leadership after Pandemic

Track Proponents and Co-chairs:

Mikolaj Pindelski

mikolaj.pindelski@sgh.waw.pl

Call for Papers

The goal is to highlight the challenges and issues related to the problems of shaping leaders for the post-pandemic time. Those who faced the unexpected changes and are to manage companies towards survival. In contrary also to share the benefits of managing the companies that profited from the pandemic.

The tracks expects to receive contributions to discuss the following questions:

- shaping leaders for the new times
- value driven leadership and economical survival of companies
- does the post-pandemic leadership requires new approach in teaching ?

Conference dates:

19th October 2021 Arrival and informal get-together in the evening
20th and 21st October 2021 Conference
22nd October 2020 Topic-related field trip (optional)

Conference venue:

International Business School at Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University,
Dushu Lake Science & Innovation District, Suzhou, China

Important dates:

7th May 2021 Submissions window opens
31st May 2021 Deadline for contributions submission
9th July 2021 Notification of accepted contributions
5th September 2021 Deadline for early-bird registration
10th October 2021 Deadline for regular registration

For more information on the conference, please
visit <https://www.xjtlu.edu.cn/en/events/2021/10/8th-responsible-management-education-research-conference>
or send an e-mail to rme8@xjtlu.edu.cn