

JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Special Issue on
***“Contemporary Issues in International
Business and Entrepreneurship”***

Published by

MEDEC, UiTM

(Malaysian Entrepreneurship Development Centre, Universiti Teknologi MARA)

Sponsors

Universiti Teknologi Mara, Malaysia

Texas A & M University - Commerce, U.S.A.

Guest Editor

Dr. George O. Tasie

Head

Department of Management Studies

University of Brunei Darussalam

Brunei

JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

SPONSORED BY:

**UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MARA
SHAH ALAM, SELANGOR
MALAYSIA**

AND

**TEXAS A & M UNIVERSITY - COMMERCE
TEXAS, U.S.A.**

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-in-Chief:

Prof. Dr. Zafar U. Ahmed

Professor of Marketing and International Business
Department of Marketing and Management
College of Business and Technology
Texas A&M University at Commerce
Commerce, Texas 75429-3011, USA
Tel: [1-903]-886-5695
Fax: [1-903]-886-5702
Email: Zafar_Ahmed@tamu-commerce.edu

Managing Editor:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ismail Ab. Wahab

Malaysian Entrepreneurship Development Centre [MEDEC]
Universiti Teknologi MARA
Block 13, Intekma Resort and Convention Centre
40000 Shah Alam
Selangor, Malaysia
Tel: [603]-55225470
Fax: [603]-55225467
Email: iwahab@tm.net.my

Guest Editor:

Dr. George O. Tasie

Head
Department of Management Studies
University of Brunei Darussalam
Tungku Link Road, Gadong, BE1410,
Negara Brunei Darussalam, Brunei
Tel: [673]-2-249001, Ext. 132 & 113
Fax: [673]-2-249003 & 249517
Email: otasi@fbeps.ubd.edu.bn

Associate Editor:

Dr. Wolfgang Hinck

Department of Marketing
College of Business
University of Texas at Pan American
Edinburg, Texas, USA

Patron and Founder:

Prof. Dato Dr. Adnan Alias

Professor of Entrepreneurship
Faculty of Business Management
Universiti Teknologi MARA
Selangor, Malaysia
Tel: [603]-55444692
Email: Prof_Dr_Adnan_Alias@salam.uitm.edu.my

Editorial Advisory Board

Prof. Dr. Subash Jain, University of Connecticut, Connecticut
Prof. Dr. Benoit Boyer, Sacred Heart University, Fairfield, Connecticut
Prof. Dr. Abdul Farooq Khan, College of Sharjah, UAE
Prof. Dr. Robert Terpstra, University of Macau, PRC
Prof. Dr. Daing Nasir Ibrahim, University of Science, Penang, Malaysia
Prof. Dr. Earl Honeycutt, Old Dominion University, Virginia
Prof. Dr. Joel Saegert, University of Texas at San Antonio, Texas
Prof. Dr. Frank Krohn, State University of New York College at Fredonia
Prof. Dr. Donald W. Hendon, Utah Valley State College, Utah
Prof. Dr. Syed Abdul Hamid Aljunid, Universiti Tun Abdul Razak, Malaysia
Prof. Dr. Martani Hueini, University of Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia
Prof. Dr. Azhar Kasim, University of Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia
Dr. Ahmad Zohdi Abd. Hamid, Universiti Tun Abdul Razak, Malaysia
Dr. Madan Annavarjula, Northern Illinois University, Illinois
Dr. James Ondracek, Minot State University, North Dakota
Dr. James P. Johnson, Old Dominion University, Virginia
Dr. Xia Yang, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
Dr. Peter Robinson, University of Calgary, Canada
Dr. George O. Tasie, University of Brunei, Brunei
Dr. Anusuya Yogarajah, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
Dr. Dosse Toulaboe, Fort Hays State University, Hays, Kansas
Dr. Matthew H. Roy, University of Massachusetts- Dartmouth, Massachusetts
Dr. Mohammad Arif Khan, University of Swaziland, Swaziland, Africa
Dr. Barbara D Bart, Savannah State University, Savannah, Georgia
Dr. Valentin H. Pashtenko, Fayetteville State University, North Carolina
Dr. Morry Ghjngold, Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania
Dr. Abdul Jumaat Bin Mahajar, Universiti Utara Malaysia
Dr. Anthony Rodriguez, Texas A&M International University, Laredo, Texas
Dr. Hormoz Mavassaghi, Ithaca College, Ithaca, New York
Dr. Busaya Buranasin, Vongchavalitkul University, Nakhon-Ratchasima, Thailand
Dr. Syeda-Masooda Mukhtar, PricewaterhouseCoopers, London, UK
Dr. Matt Ngui, University of Wollongong, Australia
Dr. Ajay K. Singh, University of Delhi, India
Dr. Syed Aziz Anwar, University of Sharjah, UAE
Dr. Osman Mohamad University of Science, Penang, Malaysia
Dr. George K. Najjar, American University of Beirut, Lebanon

REVIEWERS FOR THE SPECIAL ISSUE

Dr. Prem N. Asthana, Minot State University, North Dakota
Dr. Arif Hassan, International Islamic University, Malaysia
Dr. Lynn Muller, University of South Dakota, Vermillion, South Dakota
Dr. James Ondracek, Minot State University, North Dakota
Dr. James P. Johnson, Old Dominion University, Virginia
Dr. Peter Robinson, University of Calgary, Canada
Dr. Anusuya Yogarajah, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
Dr. Naresh Khatri, University of Missouri at St. Louis, Missouri
Dr. Tan Teng Kee, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
Dr. Cao Yong, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
Mr. Gerald Huang, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
Dr. Peter Maresco, Sacred Heart University, Fairfield, Connecticut
Dr. James Santomier, Sacred Heart University, Fairfield, Connecticut
Dr. Mary Trefry, Sacred Heart University, Fairfield, Connecticut
Dr. Vic Heller, University of Texas at San Antonio, Texas
Dr. Bharath Josiam, University of North Texas, Denton, Texas
Dr. Sadiq Sohail, Monash University, Malaysia

<i>CONTENTS</i>		<i>Page</i>
George O. Tasie	Preface	i
Dosse Toulaboe	Currency Devaluation and International Competitiveness: The Case of the CFA Zone of West and Central Africa	1 - 18
Mohd Khairuddin Hashim Syed Azizi Wafa Osman Mohamad Mohamad Sulaiman	The Moderating Effect of Distinctive Capabilities on the Competitive Strategy and Performance Relationship in Malaysian SMEs	19 - 36
Mohd. Yusoff Ibrahim Daing Nasir Ibrahim Subramaniam Pillay	Competition, New Management Practices and the Emphasis Given to Non-Financial Indicators in Manufacturing Organizations	37 - 56
Jamil Bojei Mohd. Shahwahid Othman Yeap Teik Bu	Global Marketing Strategies: An Examination of the Malaysian Wooden Furniture Industry	57 - 84
Desalegn Abraha Syeda-Masooda Mukhtar	The Process of Firm Establishment in Less Developed and Loosely Structured Markets: A Case of Two Swedish Firms in Kenya	85 - 108
George O. Tasie	Customer Perception About Quality of Service: The Case of Vietnamese and Australian Managers	109 - 126
James Santomier, Jr.	Sport Mega-Brands: Case Studies in International Marketing	127 - 151
Sanjiv S. Dugal Matthew H. Roy	Creating Value Through Relationship Building in a Globalized Marketplace	153 - 170
Sanjiv S. Dugal Matthew H. Roy Matthew Eriksen	(Re)viewing Organizational Reputation in a Global Context	171 - 181
Sandra McKay Uday Tate Mary Blalock	A Profile of U.S. Home Internet Users and Online Shoppers: Implications for Retailers and E-Tailers	183 - 202

The Editorial Board, Publisher, and the Sponsors accept no responsibility for the views expressed by the authors of the articles published in this Journal.

PREFACE

Dr. George O. Tasie
Guest Editor

*Special Issue on "Contemporary Issues in International Business
and Entrepreneurship"*

Previously technology, globalisation, and trade liberalisation did not play a dominant role in business environments, but today the approach is totally different. The millennium is characterised by globalised trading system and the predominance of the revolutionary information technologies. This scenario is where the real challenge is for the entrepreneuristic persons and organisations, raising the issue of how entrepreneurs and business organisations respond to the demands of the globalised markets and the fierce competition of business organisation in the so-called "borderless world".

The papers in this special volume of Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship (JIBE) explain some of these challenges by providing in-depth and analytical information on various topics of international business interests. For instance, the article on service quality demonstrates the extent in which customer satisfaction and expectations have become a popular area of academic attention and economic development of society. Other articles also draw on the importance of internationalisation of businesses, such as global marketing, organisational reputation, Swedish entrepreneurship, the impact of currency in business and scores of other thought-provoking research papers.

The articles chosen for this special issue represent and reflect the crucial challenges facing international business and management during the past and present economic crises. Although the current worldwide economic crisis has eased and most of the countries affected are on the way to recovery, we have to recognise the factors contributing to the crisis.

It is hoped that this volume will contribute towards creating an awareness of the need for better business practices and excellent management ideas across the world. I am optimistic that wider readers will benefit largely through reading this particular issue.

Above all, I must record my thanks and profound appreciation to the contributors of articles to this issue, and especially Professor Zafar U. Ahmed for affording me an opportunity to guest edit this special issue. Finally, I wish to thank the JIBE's Editorial Board and the reviewers for the job well done. Without their invaluable contribution, the publication of this special issue would not have been possible.

PROFILE OF GUEST EDITOR

Dr. George O. Tasie

George O. Tasie, Ph.D (Manchester), M.Sc (Leicester), M.P.A; B.Sc (Hon) (Liverpool), M.M.S (London), is Head, Department of Management Studies at the University of Brunei Darassulam [UBD], Brunei. His teaching interests are in general management, human resource management, human resource development, organisational behaviour, and international management. His professional work and experience in academia has taken him to the U.S.A, the United Kingdom, Malaysia, Australia, Singapore, the Philippines, Indonesia, Brunei, Vietnam and Nigeria. The publication of one of his books on "Public Sector Administration and Management" was sponsored by the University of Malaysia Sarawak, where he was an associate professor before joining UBD. He has contributed articles to other internationally accredited journals. Dr. Tasie has also written and published books on rural financial planning and management. He has been involved in short courses and consultancy works for a variety of organisations in the U.S.A, U.K, Singapore, Nigeria, Malaysia, Brunei and JASPOC (Joint ASEAN Senior Officers' Course). His current research interests center on business-government relations, training and development and stress management in Southeast Asia.

(RE)VIEWING ORGANIZATIONAL REPUTATION IN A GLOBAL CONTEXT

Sanjiv S. Dugal
Matthew H. Roy
Matthew Eriksen

Abstract

An organization undertaking competitive actions possesses different "reputations" that vary in terms of their perception among stakeholders. This paper is about perception, that is, how do viewers come to perceive an organization in a certain way. We review the processes of reputation and identity. Further, we explain perceptual space and its' implications for reputation formation. Lastly we provide some food for thought for recreating reputations in today's chaotic globalized business world.

Dr. Sanjiv S. Dugal is affiliated with the Department of Management, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, U.S.S.

Dr. Matthew H. Roy is affiliated with the Department of Management, University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth, U.S.A.

Dr. Matthew Eriksen is affiliated with the Department of Management, United States Coast Guard Academy, New London, U.S.A.

INTRODUCTION

An organization undertaking competitive actions possesses different “reputations” that vary in terms of their perception among stakeholders. For instance, an organization might be perceived as “innovative,” frequently offering new products to drive out rivals, and at the same time, it may also be perceived as offering products of “standard quality” or using standard processes to produce the products around the world. For example, Rubbermaid introduces over 400 new products annually. However, as recently as 1995 they lacked automated stock replenishing capabilities. The same is true among different cultures across the globe. Organizational actions to move production to more affordable areas of the world may be perceived as geocentric by host country employees, and simultaneously as exploiting cheap labor in their country of origin. This paper is about perception, that is, how do viewers come to perceive an organization in a certain way?

The problem is that the term “reputation” as commonly used in conversation covers too much ground, and consequently it is difficult to locate. It refers to very different entities, thus causing a great deal of confusion. The process of reputation is made confusing by the multifarious, temporal, contradictory, paradoxical, and imaginary aspects that take place (Dugal and Roy, 1997). After considering literature from the fields of cognitive science, literary criticism, media studies, and management, we propose that the notion of reputation is genetically intertwined with that of identity whenever the question of perceiving an organization is raised. Consequently, we framed the question as: “how is reputation/identity formed in perceptual space?”

MANAGEMENT LITERATURE ON REPUTATION

There are three dominant views of reputation in the field of management today.

- *Economic View: external perceptions of traits and signals*

Economists adhere to a view of “reputation” as either *trait* or *signal*. For instance, Game theorists regard reputations as character traits that distinguish among “types” of organizations and thereby explain their strategic behavior. On the other hand, Signaling

theorists emphasize the information content of reputations. Both trait and signal theorists recognize that reputations are perceptions of organizations held by external viewers.

- *Strategic View: external perceptions of past interactions*

Strategic analysts view “reputation” as describing the history of an organization’s past interactions with stakeholders and so suggest to viewers what the organization stands for (Dutton and Dukerich, 1991). Here too, reputations are externally perceived.

- *Sociological View: external perceptions of intermediaries*

Social performance theorists view “reputation” as addressing social concerns in order to secure external legitimacy (Cameron & Whetten, 1999). External viewers not only interpret the signals that an organization routinely broadcasts, but also rely on the evaluative signals refracted by key intermediaries such as public interest monitors, market analysts and media reporters.

INTEGRATING THE THREE VIEWS

That reputation is an external perception of traits and signals; of past interactions and; of intermediaries jointly suggests that an organization’s reputation constitutes subjective, collective assessments of credibility and reliability. Furthermore, these three perspectives underscore the following characteristics of reputation:

- *Reputation reconciliates multiple images*

Reputation reconciles multiple images of the organization among viewers, and signals the overall attractiveness to employees, customers, investors and local communities. In other words, it can serve to help us make sense of confusing and contradictory situations (Dugal and Roy, 2000). We are less likely to question motivations/intentions (which are not empirically evident) when one’s reputation is spotless.

- *Reputation constitutes diverse criteria*

Reputation crystallizes, from the bottom-up, constructions of diverse viewers, each applying a combination of economic and social, selfish and altruistic criteria.

- *Reputation is formed in context*

Reputation embodies two key dimensions of the organization's effectiveness: An appraisal of the organization's economic performance, and an appraisal of their success in fulfilling social responsibilities (Etzioni and Gross, 1988). This context is now terribly difficult to comprehend because of the multifarious nature of the new global order.

- *Reputation is constrained by past allocations*

Reputation develops from the organization's prior resource allocations and histories that constitute mobility barriers and constrain the organization's actions.

- *Reputation is a second-order characteristic of an emerging social system*

Reputation is derivative, that is to say, reputation is a second-order characteristic of the organization's social system that crystallizes the emergent status of individuals and the various sub-groups.

REPUTATION IN PERCEPTUAL SPACE

Perceptual space may be seen as a "space" where an interactive concern of the mind takes place. Minds meet here at an elementary level because everything in this space presents itself as reality. This is an important notion to grasp. To say that everything presents itself as reality is to say that reality is not dictated by a passive recording of stimulus material, alone. (McKim, 1999). That is to say that one's subjective reality is not constrained by boundaries which are physical and material. Reality is constituted perceptually by interactive minds, and its maintenance at a particular time and place is consensually agreed upon. Inter-subjectivity is a popular term to describe this because it includes both conscious aspects of private experience—reflection upon experiences, memories, etc.—and also the unconscious and its effects.

The nature of reputation in perceptual space may be seen as having a form which interconnects the following three:

- Reputation is a sort of mental activity, an insight that occurs inside the heads of interacting viewers.

- An individual's own perception of reputation is not sufficient for the existence of a certain reputation, i.e., it exists only through interaction.
- Reputation exists only in reference to some specific contextual standards, and there is no way to tell whether a particular reputation is acceptable between viewers, until it passes this reality-check. (Etzioni and Gross, 1988).

In other words, reputation resides in the on-going interaction between peoples' thoughts within a particular context, or situation. The reality of a certain reputation is created and maintained by interacting viewers whenever they image its product or service between themselves. This is done whenever viewers inter-subjectively agree upon a certain reputation. The image of this reputation is tenuous and ephemeral, precariously balanced through checks and counter-checks. Furthermore, this image exists within the framework or structure of a particular situation.

The imaging of reputation within a particular situation, implies that reputation, as a whole, exists in an inter-related system of situations. This leads us to believe that reputation is situation-specific and images some aspect of that sub-system's *identity*. In perceptual space, members of an organization, and external viewers, interactively image multifarious patterns of relationships. These patterns emerge through series of organizational situations between internal and external viewers, and constitute aspects of the organization's identity. Therefore, in perceptual space, reputation is not just an image alone, but one of identity as well. Consequently, we might say, *reputation is an image among viewers reflecting the organization's self-identity*.

IDENTITY AS A MEDIATING CONCEPT

Identity is a convenient "tool" through which to try and understand the reputation of the organization. Epistemologically, there are two approaches to the understanding of identity. One is to find out as much as one can about it objectively, from the outside. The second choice is to describe how members of the organization feel about it, what we know from the inside. These two approaches, or perspectives, are the "it is" and the "I am", respectively the third and first person positions. In the "it is" perspective, the organization is seen from the point of the viewer; the "I am" perspective is the organization's own view, of a particular situation.

In our view, identity is really a mediating concept between the external and the internal. That is, between the external perception of viewers and the internal view of members about themselves. It is the process of bringing together things that would otherwise be unconnected. This notion is important in semiotics, since signs perform the function of mediation.

When I put on my glasses, they mediate between my eyes and my visual field. When the curtain falls in a theater, it comes—and, thus, in a sense, mediates—between the audience and the performers who only a moment before were visible to it. In both cases there is a process of mediation, of one thing coming between two others. But the results of such a process can be, as the two examples show, quite different. When I put on my glasses, they mediate in such a way as to make accessible what would otherwise be beyond my power to see; but when the curtain falls, it mediates in such a way as to make inaccessible what just moments before was visible to the audience. Often times the mediating process is triggered by the actions of an external agent. For example, The Body Shop has long been recognized (had a reputation/identity) as an environmentally and socially conscious company. They have differentiated their products based on this reputation and attracted a labor force that identified with this image. When accusations of animal testing and toxic spills were made against the Body Shop in a 1994 article in *Business Ethics*, the reputation of the company had to be re-evaluated. The article in question served as “the curtain” for some and “the glasses” for others.

In most circumstances, the outcome of this process is an open question; whether it brings the mediated things together or cuts them apart can only be ascertained on a case-by-case basis. Many attempts to define identity in its most general sense focus on one or another function (for example, the function of one thing standing for something other than itself, or that of representing an object). The function of mediating, of bringing together what would otherwise be disparate or unconnected is proposed as the defining trait of anything we might, properly speaking, call identity.

To understand the mediating nature of identity, it might be helpful to think of the “imaging of a situation” in metaphoric terms; as a kaleidoscope, where the patterns are continuously changing between the external and internal. It is clear that identity is an interactive process and not something we find in ourselves, or have once and for all.

Identity is a process, and that is why it is difficult to grasp. Identity is not a thing; the self is necessarily incomplete, unfinished—it is the “the subject in process,” as perceived from the outside.

The process of identity

The process of identity may be seen as a rough equivalent of sign function, as used by Umberto Eco. The motivation to prefer the term sign function or process of identity to just identity is that the term function suggests something dynamic and flexible. Whatever constitutes identity, does so by virtue of some function (for example, the function of standing for something other than itself or that of mediating between two things that would otherwise be disparate or unconnected). And the same identity can perform different functions in different contexts and even in the same context.

For the investigation of identity in process, opposition in general and binary opposition in particular are important. Such opposition makes possible articulation and thus signification (the process by which identity is generated). It is only by a thing standing over against other things that it stands out at all; and it is only by standing out that a thing marks itself off from other things. In short, opposition makes differentiation possible, and, in turn, differentiation makes articulation possible. Moreover, identity is always related to what one is not—the other. That is to say, identity is only conceivable in and through difference. To maintain a separate identity, one has to define oneself against the other. That one is not what the other is, is critical in defining who one is. Though it is hard, we should perhaps try and think of identity and difference together, dialectically. For instance, in certain situations or contexts, an organization might stress identity in the sense of sameness of shared values. At other times, a group within the organization may stress difference.

In perceptual space what appear to be oppositional, outside or threatening to identity are really functional parts of an organization. For example, the Watergate affair exhibited the political scandals and illegal acts of the Nixon administration and thereby created the image that the system in fact respected and embodied law and order. The scandal thus served to mask the perception that the system itself might be fundamentally a scandal.

CREATING REPUTATION/IDENTITY IN A GLOBAL CONTEXT

An organization forms its identity by (re)presentation of signs and symbols in perceptual space. It is always within representation that we recognize ourselves. In the feudal era, there was a fixed social order which established a hierarchy of signs of class, rank and social position. Signs at this stage were fixed, restricted, perfectly clear and transparent. During this period, one could readily read from an individual's appearance his or her social rank and status.

After the Industrial Revolution production became mechanised, and turned out series of mass objects, exact replicas, infinitely produced and reproduced by assembly-line processes and eventually automation. Signs and signals were turned out in series of mass objects and exact replicas. In perceptual space, production is replaced by the simulation model. The functioning of social logic passes from sign producing identity, to sign producing sign. This is the stage in which simulation models come to constitute the world, and overtake and finally "devour" representational identity.

MODELS TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER THINGS

Media practices have rearranged our senses of space and time. What is real is no longer our direct contact with the world, but what we are given in perceptual space. Perceptual space is the world: perceptual space is dissolved into life, and life is dissolved into perceptual space. No longer is there any space between subject and object, seeing and seen, cause and effect. Nothing separates one from another; there is a sort of contraction in each other, a fantastic telescoping, a collapsing of the two traditional poles into one another; an implosion.

We create identity in perceptual space, through the production and consumption of signs. But because signs carve out reality (domains) for us, in effect EVERYTHING IS NOW "SIGNS" available as image. What we mean by this is that identity is no longer to be seen as the external/internal dichotomy producing signs. Now signs produce identities. What we're suggesting is that identity involves a symbolic function by being open to argument, reciprocal exchange and didactic process. It should comment on

and criticize itself and so upset the illusion of a once for all collective identity. Technologies of mass reproduction produce identity as signs. The problem here is the original identity and its infinite reproduction in perceptual space. The technique of reproduction detaches the reproduced object from its domain and substitutes a plurality of copies for unique existence.

In order to re-create one's reputation, an organizational goal may be stated as *to set out to accomplish, or, bring into existence something genuinely new that is valued enough to be added to the organization's identity*. Reputation can be observed only in the interrelations of a system made up of three main parts.

- The first of these is the domain, which consists of a set of symbolic rules and procedures. Marketing is a domain, or at a finer resolution telemarketing can be seen as a domain. Domains are in turn nested in what we call organization culture, or the symbolic knowledge shared by us.
- The second component of reputation is the field, which includes all the individuals who act as gatekeepers to the domain. It is their job to decide whether a new idea or product should be included in the domain.
- Finally, the third component of the Reputation system is the individual person.

This draws attention to identifying the constituent members or DOMAINS of the system and examining relationships among them and with the environment. Equally important, it forces us to go beyond members and relations to evaluate the organizing principal through which they are arranged into a coherent whole.

When the image of a domain changes, the viewer must know whether the change is due to the domain itself or to the context or to both, otherwise the viewer understands neither the domain nor its surroundings. Intertwined though the two appear, one can attempt to tease them apart, especially by watching the same domain in different contexts and the same context acting on different domains.

Re-creating reputation occurs when a person, using the symbols of a given domain such as Organization Behavior or Finance, etc., has a new idea or sees a new pattern,

and when this novelty is selected by the appropriate field for inclusion into the relevant domain. Occasionally re-creating reputation involves the establishment of a new domain. So the definition that follows from this perspective is: Re-creating reputation is any act, idea, or product (like a course offering) that changes an existing domain, or that transforms the existing domain into a new one. It is important to remember, however, that a domain cannot be changed without the explicit or implicit consent of the gatekeeper responsible for it.

CONCLUSION

Perhaps the most important implication of the systems model is that the level of Reputation in a given place at a given time does not depend only on the amount of individual creativity. It depends just as much on how well suited the respective domains and fields are to the recognition and diffusion of novel ideas. This can make a great deal of practical difference to efforts for re-creating Reputation. Gatekeepers must learn to recognize the valuable ideas among the many novel ones, and then find ways of implementing them across the world.

REFERENCES

- McKim, (1999) *Experiences in Visual Thinking*, Boston: PWS Publishers.
- Cameron, K. and Whetten, D. (1999) *Developing Management Skills*, Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Dugal, S. S. and Roy, M. H. (1997) "Formulating reputation and identity in perceptual space," Proceedings of the Conference on Telecommunications and Information Markets.
- Dugal, S. S. and Roy, M. H. (2000) "A management guide to the creation of product and service images in marketspace," *International Journal of Management*, 17 (3).
- Dutton and Dukerich (1991)
- Etzioni, A. and Gross, E. (1988) *Organizations in Society*, Paramus: Prentice Hall.