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Dear EIBAzine Readers

Philippe Gugler (University of Fribourg), EIBA Chair

I trust you are fully enjoying the seasonal spring weather and are already working on the papers you will be submitting to EIBA 2018 by mid-July – many of which will hopefully be presented at the 44th EIBA Annual Conference in Poznań this December!

EIBA 2017 Milano – a great success!

More than 600 delegates attended the EIBA 2017 Conference in Milan last December. Past EIBA President & 2017 Conference Chair Lucia Piscitello, along with her incredible team of local organizers headed by Stefano Elia, offered us an outstanding event. The quality of the paper and panel sessions reflected the high academic standard of the Academy. The EIBA 2017 Milan delegates also enjoyed the generous supply of delicious Italian food! The colourful plates were ready and waiting for our collective consumption at the breaks and lunches – carefully prepared to address the various dietary considerations of participants, especially those seeking vegetarian options and gluten-free meals. The Gala dinner, organized in a former skating rink, was the “cherry on the cake”! After being warmly received and treated to a convivial & friendly reception, we were seated at tables in a very elegant atmosphere, highlighted by a classical music performance (à La Scala), followed by an amazing Oscar-style award ceremony – with lots of humour, large screens and fanfare (but without the tears and endless thanking of parents, teachers, pets, etc.). The entire event reflected perfectly the character of our hostess – Lucia Piscitello is a distinguished and classy professional, with a big heart and warm personality to top it all off!

EIBA Board: welcomes & farewells to NRs

Five recently-elected National Representatives (NRs) to the EIBA Board (for the 3-year term 2017-2020) were announced at the 2017 EIBA General Assembly. I am delighted to welcome: Tamar Almor (Israel); Kristin Brandl (Canada); Timothy Devinney (UK); Josephine Igoe (Ireland); Dana Minbaeva (Denmark). I would also like to thank the five outgoing NRs who ended their terms as EIBA Board members: Jens Gammelgaard (Denmark); Chang Hoon Oh (Canada); Dorota Piaskowska (Ireland); Roger Strange (UK); Orly Yehezkel (Israel).

In memoriam: Reijo Luostarinen (Fellow)

A few weeks prior to the 43rd EIBA Annual Conference, we received the sad news that Reijo Luostarinen, long-time EIBA Fellow and Professor Emeritus of International Business at the Aalto University School of Business in Finland, had passed away. His academic contribution to EIBA and IB was acknowledged in a special panel session at EIBA 2017 Milan that was chaired by Vítor Corado Simões. This issue of EIBAzine-IBP also includes a tribute to Reijo Luostarinen contributed by EIBA Fellows Mats Forsgren and Rebecca Piekkari.

Congratulations to Rajneesh Narula (OBE)

As is the case with families, EIBA has faced some sad situations but also some pleasant ones – such as the good news regarding Prof. Rajneesh Narula (John H. Dunning Chair of International Business Regulation at Henley Business School, University of Reading, UK) who, in recognition of his services to business research, was appointed an Honorary Officer of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire (OBE) by Her Majesty, the Queen of England. Our congratulations to Rajneesh!

2nd EIBA Workshop: Budapest, March 2018

On March 7th, the second EIBA-Workshop (EIBA-W) was held in Budapest, Hungary, at Corvinus University. Erzsébet Czakó (NR for Hungary) and Magdolina Sass organized this professional event comprised of a panel session, three paper presentation sessions, and a PhD session.
On behalf of EIBA, I wish to express my gratitude to: Filip De Beule, Marta Götz, and Constantina Kottaridi, who kindly agreed to participate in the 2nd EIBA-W as panellists – as well as to Tilo Halaszovich, who organized a special session dedicated to PhD students. Those above also reviewed the submitted papers, with added input from other EIBA Board members, present and past. Without this level of dedicated support, it would not have been possible to organize the first two EIBA-Ws. The underlying goal of these recent strategic events is to promote and raise the visibility of EIBA within the Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries.

Poznań welcomes you in December 2018!

Barbara Jankowska (EIBA President & EIBA 2018 Conference Chair) and her team are “full speed ahead” with organizing the 44th EIBA Annual Conference, scheduled for December 13–15, 2018, in Poznań, Poland. EIBA members have already received the EIBA 2018 call for papers informing them about deadline dates and the main topics / tracks of the conference.

Acknowledgements from the EIBA Chair

May I conclude with expressing my warm appreciation to Jose Pla Barber (EIBA Vice Chair) for his faithful friendship and solidarity, to the EIBA Board members for their amazing commitment to all EIBA activities, to John Cantwell (Dean of the EIBA Activities) for his sound advice whenever I am facing dilemmas, and to Ene Kannel (EIBA Executive Secretary) for her energy and daily involvement with our numerous members & growing EIBA family. 

EIBA 2017 Milan – Awards
Lucia Piscitello (Politecnico di Milano), EIBA Past President

It was a great privilege for me and the entire team to welcome participants to the recent 43rd EIBA Annual Conference in Milan, Italy! The event was hosted by the School of Management at Politecnico di Milano, last December 14-16, 2017.

The theme of EIBA 2017 was “International Business in the Information Age”. Photos of the event, a video of the opening plenary, and the online abstract proceedings can all be accessed via the EIBA 2017 Milan conference website at the link http://eiba2017.eiba.org/.

The awards announced during the EIBA 2017 conference dinner & presented by various EIBA officials or sponsors to their worthy recipients follow (see also the EIBA website):

- **EIBA Distinguished Honorary Fellowship Award**
  Reinhilde VEUGELERS
  – Full Professor, KU Leuven, Department of Management, Strategy and Innovation | Senior Fellow, European think-tank Bruegel | European Commission & European Research Council (Belgium).

- **Danny van den Bulcke Best Paper Prize**
  Irina MINDORA SURDU (University of Reading); Kamel MELLAHI (University of Warwick); Keith GLAISTER (University of Warwick)
  Back so fast? Empirical evidence on the speed of foreign market re-entry after initial entry & exit.

- **EIBA Best Doctoral Thesis Proposal in IB Award**
  Florian KLEIN (Vienna University of Economics and Business – WU)
  Institutional Dynamism in International Business: Conceptualization, Measurement, and Firm Strategies.

- **Copenhagen Business School Prize**
  Luisa GAGLIARDI (University of Geneva);
  Andrea ASCANI (Utrecht University)
  Heterogeneous spillover effects from MNE investments: Domestic learning capacity and technological opportunities.
  **Runner-Up:**
  Tuuli HAKKARAINEN (Aalto University School of Business)
  Sharing expertise in MNCs: Focus on strategies of experts.
• **MRQ BEST REVIEWER PRIZE**
  Asmund RYGH (Alliance Manchester Business School)
  – for delivering in-depth and constructive reviews of outstanding quality for papers submitted to EIBA 2017.

• **IBR BEST JOURNAL PAPER OF THE YEAR AWARD**
  Mohammad F. AHAMMAD (University of Leeds);
  Shlomo TARBA (University of Birmingham);
  Yipeng LIU (University of Birmingham);
  Keith GLAISTER (University of Warwick)
  *Knowledge transfer and cross-border acquisition performance: The impact of cultural distance and employee retention.*
  [IBR, February 2016, 25(1), pp. 66-75]

• **GSJ GLOBAL STRATEGY RESEARCH PRIZE**
  Luisa GAGLIARDI (University of Geneva); Simona IAMMARINO (London School of Economics);
  Andrés RODRIGUEZ-POSE (London School of Economics)
  *Offshoring and the Geography of Jobs in Great Britain.*

• **IMR INTERNATIONAL MARKETING PRIZE**
  Johannes HIRSCHMANN, Nadine BATTON & Bernhard SWOBODA (Trier University, Germany)
  *Diverse role of corporate reputation dimensions for MNCs: An analysis across nations.*

• **IJOM EMERGING MARKETS PRIZE**
  Guus HENDRIKS (RSM Erasmus University) & Arjen SLANGEN (KU Leuven)
  *When do emerging market multinationals upgrade their domestic asset base? Overcoming recombination barriers to growth.*

• **EPI-JIBE INTERNATIONAL TRADE & INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION IN INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS PRIZE**
  Bo Bernhard NIELSEN (University of Sydney); Christian ASMUSSEN (Copenhagen Business School); Cecilia WEATHERALL (Krak Fon Institute for Urban Economics Research, Denmark); Ditte HAAKONSSON (Krak Fon Institute for Urban Economics Research, Denmark)
  *Foreign direct investment in subnational geographic locations.*

• **LAZARIDIS INSTITUTE SMES & INTERNATIONAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP BEST PAPER PRIZE**
  Pavlina JASOVSKA, Hussain RAMMAL, Carl RHODES & Danielle LOGUE (University of Technology, Sydney, Australia)
  *Intra-industry competition and power in the beer industry: How small players delegitimise large multinationals.*

• **EIBA 2017 CONFERENCE TRACK BEST PAPER AWARDS**
  Certificates for the EIBA 2017 Milan conference track best papers were presented to the winning authors at the end of their sessions & were also officially announced at the conference dinner.

**NOTE:** The list above is also posted on the [EIBA website](http://www.eiba.net).

Thanks to those who participated in EIBA 2017 Milan – without you the conference would not have been as successful. We hope you enjoyed the event as much as we did hosting you all.

We look forward to seeing many of you again at EIBA 2018 Poznań this coming December – Good luck with submitting your best papers & see you at the 44th EIBA Annual Conference! 🌟

For more details on EIBA awards & sponsors, please visit the [EIBA website](http://www.eiba.net) & select the relevant links under the Awards tab.
The main goal of the EIBA Workshop (EIBA-W) strategic outreach initiative is to promote the European IB Academy – particularly in the Eastern European countries & regions. The underlying aim is to offer a convivial forum for IB scholars located in these areas to gather to share research ideas and provide the opportunity to form a network of geographical communities within the greater EIBA family.

The 2nd EIBA Workshop (EIBA-W) took place on March 7, 2018, again hosted by and held at Corvinus University of Budapest, in Budapest, Hungary. In addition to the sessions for paper presentations, the event featured an EIBA panel on the theme topic: Competitiveness of Firms and Locations in the Digital Age (chaired by Philippe Gugler, EIBA Chairman) – as well as a parallel session for PhD students and early-stage researchers on the practical topic: Measuring Competitiveness – Methods and Data (chaired by Tilo Halaszovich of the EIBA Early Career Network). Submitted papers (14) received detailed and well-grounded reviews from EIBA scholars (see names below), whose contributions are very much appreciated.

The 2nd EIBA-W provided a good opportunity for 15 participating authors to present their papers and obtain high-quality constructive feedback on their collective 12 works in progress, which are being written with the hope of publishing them in internationally-renowned scholarly journals. A secondary goal of this EIBA-W was to further promote the European International Business Academy and its benefits to potential members in Hungary and in other under-represented CEE countries. Some program details & statistical data follow.

Program Chairs
- Erzsébet Czakó
  Corvinus University of Budapest, Business School, Competitiveness Research Centre, Budapest, Hungary
- Magdolna Sass
  FDI Research Group, Centre for Economic and Regional Studies, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Hungary

Scientific Committee
- Jarolim Antal (Czech Republic)
- Anže Burger (Slovenia)
- Radek Čajka (Czech Republic)
- Erzsébet Czakó (Hungary)
- Filip De Beule (Belgium)
- Pervez Ghauri (United Kingdom)
- Marian Gorynia (Poland)
- Philippe Gugler (Switzerland)
- Tilo Halaszovich (Germany)
- Andreja Jaklič (Slovenia)
- Barbara Jankowska (Poland)
- Kalman Kalotay (UNCTAD)
- Constantina Kottaridi (Greece)
- Andrei Panibratov (Russia)
- Jonas Puck (Austria)
- Magdolna Sass (Hungary)
- Stefan Schmid (Germany)
- Ana Tavares-Lehmann (Portugal)

Reviewers
- Tamar Almor (Israel)
- Filip De Beule (Belgium)
- Susana Costa e Silva (Portugal)
- Philippe Gugler (Switzerland)
- Tilo Halaszovich (Germany)
- Andreja Jaklič (Slovenia)
- Barbara Jankowska (Poland)
- Constantina Kottaridi (Greece)
- Erica Kovacs (Brazil)
- Dana Minbaeva (Denmark)
- Dirk Morschett (Switzerland)
- Jonas Puck (Austria)
- Sami Saarenketo (Finland)
- Stefan Schmid (Germany)
- Tiia Vissak (Estonia)

Panel Members
- Philippe Gugler, chair (University of Fribourg)
- Filip De Beule (KU Leuven)
- Marta Gótz (Vistula University)
- Constantina Kottaridi (University of Piraeus)

Session Chairs
- Marta Gótz (Vistula University)
- Constantina Kottaridi (University of Piraeus)
- Magdolna Sass (MTA KRTK)
Participants

1. Lucian Belascu [author]  
   (Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, Romania)
2. Joseph August  
   (Bernaro City University of Seattle, USA)
3. Erzsébet Czakó  
   (Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary)
4. Filip De Beule  
   (KU Leuven, Belgium)
5. Andrea Éltető [author]  
   (MTA KRTK, Hungary)
6. Sonia Ferencikova [author]  
   (School of Management, Bratislava, Slovakia)
7. Marta Götz  
   (Vistula University, Poland)
8. Philippe Gugler  
   (University of Fribourg, Switzerland)
9. Tilo Halaszovich  
   (Jacobs University Bremen, Germany)
10. Zsolt Havran [author]  
    (Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary)
11. Alexandra Horobet [author]  
    (Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania)
12. Jana Hrdlickova [author]  
    (School of Management, Bratislava, Slovakia)
13. Annamária Kazai-Ónodi  
    (Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary)
14. Péter Kiss  
    (Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary)
15. Artur Klimek [author]  
    (Wroclave University of Economics, Poland)
16. Constantina Kottaridi  
    (University of Piraeus, Greece)
17. Miklós Kozma  
    (Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary)
18. Agnieszka McCaled  
    (Warsaw School of Economics, Poland)
19. Tomasz M. Napiórkowski [author]  
    (Warsaw School of Economics, Poland)
20. Pavla Neumannová  
    (University of Economics, Prague, Czech Republic)
21. Oana Cristina Popovici [author]  
    (Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania)
22. Judit Sass  
    (Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary)
23. Magdolna Sass  
    (MTA KRTK, Hungary)
24. Szabolcs Seberek [author]  
    (Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary)
25. Monika Sulimowska-Formowicz [author]  
    (University of Economics in Katowice, Poland)
26. Andrea Szalavetz [author]  
    (MTA KRTK, Hungary)
27. Ágnes Szunomár [author]  
    (MTA KRTK, Hungary)
28. Péter Vakhal [author]  
    (TÁRKI-Kopint, Hungary)
29. Li Yusan  
    (MTA KRTK, Hungary)
30. Máté Zavarkó [author]  
    (Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary)

The 30 participants represent ten countries (more than one person is shown in brackets):

1. Belgium  
2. Czech Republic  
3. Germany  
4. Greece  
5. Hungary (14)  
6. Poland (5)  
7. Romania (3)  
8. Slovakia (2)  
9. Switzerland  
10. USA

Overall, the 2nd EIBA-W provided an excellent follow-up & opportunity for IB researchers to network and benefit from scholarly advice, attracting a total of 30 participants from Europe and North America: 9 from Europe (including 5 from the CEE), and 1 from the US. The success of this second strategic EIBA event should help to further build & spread the reputation of EIBA in Hungary and other CEE countries – with the hoped-for result of more members from some of these countries joining the EIBA family.
Reijo’s work and the Uppsala model: Similarities and differences
Mats Forsgren (Uppsala University) & Rebecca Piekkari (Aalto University), EIBA Fellows

Tribute to Reijo Luostarinen (1939-2017)

The Nordic countries have a long tradition of internationalization research. Although the Nordic view on internationalization of firms is often connected to the paper by Johanson & Vahlne (1977) in the Journal of International Business Studies – and consequently referred to as the “Uppsala model of internationalization” – no one would deny the importance of Reijo Luostarinen’s work on a similar model, which he called “the Finnish model” among his PhD students to denote its pioneering role in the country. Reijo tested and refined his conceptual ideas and tools through constant interaction and collaboration with managers and policy makers who were dealing with the practical challenges of internationalization in their daily work, for whom he had a lot of respect.

What then are the main similarities and differences of the models on each side of the Baltic Sea? The core of the models is strikingly similar and for Reijo, the article by Johanson & Vahlne (1977) was a key reference. Both treat firms’ internationalization as an issue of organizational learning, and consequently describe the firms’ behavior as an incremental process in terms of a dynamic interplay between knowledge, uncertainty and foreign commitments. Both models were launched in the late half of the 1970s. This was the time when the first Finnish companies started to actively internationalize their operations, while the Swedish firms had embarked on global expansion already 100 years earlier. Both models can be seen as a reaction to the dominant static FDI theory at the time, which did not seem appropriate for analyzing international operations among firms in small, open economies like Finland and Sweden. Both models were also focusing on how firms internationalized and consequently put the internationalization process at the centre of the analysis. However, a closer look at the models reveals some interesting differences.

While the Uppsala model (at least in the original version of 1977) presents a rather straightforward relationship between acquisition of market knowledge through experiential learning - and therefore reduced uncertainty - and foreign operations, Reijo’s model on firms’ international behavior is richer when it comes to the independent variables. His accompanying empirical study was also more substantial, covering as it did almost the entire population of industrial firms in Finland. Indeed, it could be argued that it is one of, if not the, most substantial study of internationalization that has been accomplished in the last 40 years.

Similar to the founders of the Uppsala model, Reijo was also inspired by the work of Penrose and Cyert & March, but his theoretical framework also included Ansoff’s strategic decision-making theory as well as systems theory (Luostarinen 1979). A special role in Reijo’s framework is the concept “lateral rigidity”, that is the propensity of firms to stick to known alternatives in their strategic decision-making. This concept is used by Reijo to discuss the circumstances in which the firm is willing to actively search for new alternatives rather than only passively react to old ones. This analysis partly heralds the idea of opportunity seeking and entrepreneurship that has become so important in later versions of the Uppsala model (see e.g. Johanson & Vahlne, 2009; Forsgren, 2016). It is of note that the impact of rigidity or inertia on internationalization has only recently been seriously taken up – about 4 decades after Reijo’s work (Dow, Liesch and Welch, 2017).
Another important difference is how internationalization is conceptualized. Reijo and his colleagues (first and foremost Lawrence Welch) emphasized the direction of internationalization, the range of product, operation and market patterns of internationalization and the need to internationalize the different company functions such as finance and human resource management. Let us start from the direction of the internationalization process. While scholars in Uppsala almost entirely focused on how to explain outward internationalization, Reijo and his co-authors distinguished between inward, outward and cooperative activities. They argued that a firm’s outward and inward international steps are related, and consequently cannot be analyzed separately (Korhonen, Luostarinen & Welch 1996; Luostarinen & Welch 1990; Welch & Luostarinen 1988). Korhonen, Luostarinen and Welch (1996) pointed out that among Finnish SMEs in 1990, a majority started with inward foreign operations before engaging with outward foreign operations. For instance, a relationship with a foreign supplier in a certain country might cause a firm to start exporting to that country. They also suggested that the link between inward and outward operations is closer in SMEs than in large MNCs, due to the larger organizational distance between units responsible for purchasing and marketing in these big corporations.

Alongside the direction of internationalization, Reijo further approached the process of outward internationalization from the perspective of distinct product, operation and market patterns. He argued that manufacturing companies tend to introduce product categories into foreign markets in the following order (Luostarinen, 1979): 1) goods, 2) services, 3) systems (such as turnkey projects and franchising packages) and 4) know-how (such as technological know-how and management know-how). He explained that due to lateral rigidity and the perceived risks of internationalization firms are more likely to offer product categories to foreign customers in this order. He also classified international outward categories into marketing vs production operations and distinguished between non-investment operations vs direct-investment operations. The Finnish SMEs in Reijo’s study seemed to prefer more familiar marketing operations to more risky production operations and were more willing to start with non-investment operations rather than direct-investment operations (see also Korhonen, 1999). Finally, he grouped foreign markets into four categories - 1) very close, 2) close, 3) medium distant, and 4) very distant markets - to identify the main market pattern. Instead of psychic distance, Reijo drew on the concept of business distance which measures geographical, cultural and economic distances between the home market of a firm and the market of a single target country. Reijo explained that the less knowledge the firm has, the higher its degree of lateral rigidity towards entering the market of this country. Therefore, firms were likely to first enter markets that were perceived as very close rather than very distant.

Reijo did not only study internationalization at the aggregate level of the firm, but also paid special attention to the internationalization of individual functions such as finance, purchasing, sales and human resource management. He argued that in order for a firm to fully internationalize, all functions need to embrace the opportunities offered by internationalization. It is not possible for one or several functions such as human resource management to lag behind other functions and adopt a reactive rather than a proactive position towards internationalization. This would be unsustainable for the firm in the long run. Overall, Reijo’s conceptualization of the internationalization process is more holistic than that of the Uppsala model (see also, Korhonen, 1999).

Another point of discussion is the empirical base for the theoretical reasoning. Within the IB community, the Uppsala model of 1977 is typically associated with the analysis of the international operations of four Swedish MNCs (Johanson & Wiedermarg-Paul 1975). Recently, it has even been demonstrated that the histories of these four firms invite a rather
different interpretation than the one suggested by the Uppsala model (see Håkansson & Kappen 2017). In tracing the origin of the Uppsala model, Welch, Nummela and Liesch (2016, pp. 784-785) point out that in fact this model also drew on a broad research programme led by Sune Carlsson. They explain that “[t]he establishment chain and the role of psychic distance were identified from a database of more than 2000 subsidiaries” that the group of researchers in Uppsala assembled through comprehensive questionnaires of the population of Swedish multinationals in 1964 and 1969–1970”.

Reijo’s work is based on three extensive data surveys (1976, 1984, 1991) of around 1,000 Finnish firms each year. Based on the data from 1976 he reported that around 10 per cent of the companies started their international operations in the same year they were founded and another 30 per cent within the first five years of their existence (Luostarinen 1979). He called these firms “immediate international business involvers”. He could have used the label “born globals”, and in that sense be at least twenty years ahead of the upcoming strong focus on this phenomenon in IB research! The rich and unique data on Finnish firms 1976–1991 is an important legacy of Reijo’s scholarship.

On a personal note, Reijo would very much have enjoyed and appreciated to see a comparison between the Uppsala model and his model in print. The relationship between the researchers in Uppsala and Reijo’s team was like between two brothers, the older one being in Sweden and the younger one being in Finland. When two active research groups with such similar interests work at the same time, there is always a dual sense of both rivalry and respect in the relationship.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: The authors wish to gratefully acknowledge the most helpful and insightful suggestions and comments provided by: Kirsti Luostarinen; Heli Penttinen (formerly Korhonen), one of Reijo’s doctoral students and co-authors; Catherine Welch and Lawrence Welch.
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How do online retailers internationalize?

Dirk Morschett (University of Fribourg) & Matthias Schu (University of Fribourg)

Online retailers have become important actors in many economies around the world and many online retailers have reached a substantial degree of internationalization. Still, there are only a few IB studies on the internationalization of these firms.

Online retailing has a market share of more than 10% in many countries of the world and in certain sectors, e.g. electronics, even more than 30%. The leading online retailers have developed into multi-billion-dollar companies, e.g. Amazon, JD.com, Zalando, or ASOS. Many online retailers internationalize very quickly after their inception. Thus, it is surprising that online retailing did not really catch the attention of IB scholars.

Particularities of Online Retailers

Online retailing is different from most other types of business models that are usually studied in IB research. Many firms that are investigated in IB research are manufacturers or, more seldom, service companies. Some research on ibusiness exists but while the key offering of other ibusiness firms are fully digital (Brouthers, Geisser and Rothlauf 2015), this is not the case for online retailers. The business model of online retailers combines intangible services, like the presentation of an assortment, the marketing to customers, and transactional services in logistics and payments, with a tangible offer, i.e. the product assortment itself. But the assortment is usually not the retailer’s own brands but it is composed of brands that competitors can also offer in their online shops. Thus, a first question is which firm-specific assets the online retailer holds. Furthermore, this assortment needs to be physically transported to private consumers, either from the home country of the online retailer or from a logistics center in the host country (or from a third country). Usually, this requires a substantial cooperation with local logistics providers (as well as financial service providers). And at least in the case of local fulfilment, online retailers may procure the products that they sell in a foreign market in this market. Thus, a “markets as networks” view is highly relevant for online retailers.

Even though some online retailers internationalized very quickly, they do not fit the typical “born global” view. Born global research frequently focuses on knowledge-intensive companies, e.g. in biotechnology, software or other fields that, unlike online retailers, either do not have any physical logistics at all or at least do not conduct very frequent transports of rather low-value products in small quantities to foreign markets. The product or service offers of born globals are often unique which is not the case for many online retailers for which the copying of business models provides evidence.

Another particularity of online retail internationalization is that is not even easy to define whether an online retailer has expanded internationally. For example, the US retailer Sears announces on its website that it ships its products to over 100 countries. Except for the currency, no other adaptations to foreign customer are made. Does this fulfil the usual definitions of internationalization?

Internationalization Speed

Many online retailers display a high internationalization speed. On first sight, this is surprising because it has been argued in literature that the business models of online retailers are rather easily replicable (Ferguson, Finn and Hall 2015), so an “O advantage” may be missing. This may be the reason why online retailers focus on expanding and retaining their customer base very quickly (Amit and Zott 2001).
In fact, in a study by the authors which is based on more than 1'000 foreign market entries of online retailers, the imitability of an online shop was shown to be the most important factor influencing the internationalization speed of an online retailer. The relationship between imitability and the internationalization speed was an inverted U-curve: Low imitability permits an online retailer to internationalize slowly after exploiting the market potential in the home country. Very high imitability does not give an online retailer the firm-specific assets that are required to be internationally successful. Moderate levels of imitability provide a firm with the necessary advantages to internationalize and simultaneously exert the pressure to do so quickly in order to transform the temporary advantage of the online shops into a more sustainable advantage, namely, a large customer base in different countries (Schu, Morschett and Swoboda 2016).

Another interesting finding from this study is that internationalization of online retailers initially accelerates with each new country entered because the expanding country portfolio provides an even better basis for further expansion. But beyond a certain size of the country portfolio, the speed decreases because saturation effects emerge and it becomes increasingly difficult for a firm to identify further attractive markets.

**Country Selection**

Concerning country selection, it is sometimes assumed in literature that in the case of e-commerce, psychic distance and other institutional distances get less relevant, i.e. that Friedman’s statement “The world is flat” is particularly true for this type of companies. However, the country selection of online retailers seems to have much in common with that of other firms, as another study by the authors has shown (Schu and Morschett 2017). Cultural and geographical proximity between a host country and the home country make it more likely that this market is entered by an online retailer. Common language is one of the strongest predictors of country choice.

Foreign markets are initially often entered by shipping from a warehouse in the home country which may explain the influence of geographic distance. The further expansion often occurs by establishing warehouses in foreign markets if certain sales levels are achieved and then serving nearby countries from there. In this respect, a path-dependency was found in the above-mentioned study: Countries geographically close to markets that an online retailer had already entered in previous steps were more likely to be entered in the following periods.

Another aspect that is particular for online retailers is the link to the store-based retailing. There are internet pure players but also multichannel retailers that have an online shop and brick-and-mortar stores. In the above mentioned study, it was shown that store-based retailers are much more likely to establish an online shop in a country in which they already have a physical presence which can be easily explained from a knowledge-based perspective. However, the link to the physical presence in a country is more complex and should be investigated further. For example, the German discounter Aldi has recently announced to open stores in China after it has already been present in the country with online retailing for about one year. Thus, online retailing may also be a first, rather cost-efficient way to gain experiential knowledge in a country. For a multichannel retailer, this may be seen as an expansion in the internationalization process models.

Finally, with regard to country selection, the challenge to clearly define market entry remains. Similar to the mentioned example Sears, the British fashion online retailer ASOS mentions in its 2017 annual report that they "serve customers in more than 230 countries and territories". Early export stage models mention “unsolicited orders” which may lead a company to “experimental involvement” in exporting (Cavusgil 1980). In online retailing, this is common. Furthermore, companies may explicitly open their websites for such foreign orders and serve them with occasional shipments, or they may even actively market
their offers in a foreign country, with a country-specific website, local advertising on search engines and other measures. At which stage a country should be considered as “entered” by a retailer, still remains open for discussion.

Entry Modes

To the best of the knowledge of the authors, there are no studies on market entry modes of online retailers. On the one side, many of the traditionally considered entry modes are also available to online retailers.

However, mixed modes that do not fit well into the traditional classifications are also very common. If an online retailer establishes a sales subsidiary in a foreign market, opens a specific website for this country, etc., and ships its products from a warehouse in the home country, this still fits the usual definitions of export. Subsequently, logistics capacity may be established in a foreign market, e.g., in cooperation with a logistics service provider. Since the products are not manufactured by the online retailer, one can discuss whether the establishment of a warehouse (owned/outsourced) in the host country is already the next stage in the internationalization process.

Which stages have relevance for online retailers remains an issue to be investigated. Another entry mode for online retailers is marketplaces, which are not usually considered in IB research on entry modes.

Marketplaces

Among the top e-commerce companies in the world, many apply a marketplace business model, e.g., Amazon, Alibaba, Rakuten, or eBay. For IB research, these marketplaces can be analyzed from two perspectives. In one perspective, those marketplaces have intensively internationalized and they belong to the largest companies in the world, so their internationalization should be subject to research.

Marketplaces are two-sided markets, and for their success in a foreign country, they need to attract suppliers and customers to their platform. Brouthers et al. (2015) propose to extend the internationalization process model for this type of companies and they show that marketplace companies suffer from liability of outsidership and have to focus on becoming user-network insiders in the foreign country.

In another perspective, empirical evidence shows that marketplaces are vehicles for foreign market entry of online retailers. One can find numerous examples of retail companies entering the Chinese market via TMall Global, the B2C retail platform of Alibaba, and of foreign retailers entering the British, German or French online market with a presence on the Amazon marketplace in these countries. Given that in many countries, marketplaces are (by far) the market leaders in e-commerce, this is not an exception but rather the rule for foreign market entry. TMall in China or Amazon in the mentioned European markets are network insiders and thereby provide foreign online retailers with a quick access to the market. In terms of traditional IB theory, this could be classified as “export via agents” but this type of agent is very different in its services and characteristics from the agents that are traditionally investigated.

This is appealing from a number of theoretical perspectives. From a network perspective, the marketplace has the benefit of an existing network of users (final customers). Furthermore, Amazon also leverages its network of suppliers. It provides the suppliers of the Amazon marketplace in one European country with all required services to also offer their products on other Amazon country sites. Thereby, it does not only give its suppliers in one country access to its final customers in many other countries but at the same time it gives its customers in one country access to its suppliers from many other countries. Thus, the two-sided markets are also providing double benefits from the existing network(s) with Amazon acting as boundary spanner between the country markets.
Conclusion

How do online retailers internationalize? As we have briefly shown, research has only rarely touched upon this highly relevant question. There are very few answers but many open questions, and we tried to highlight in this article the particularities of online retailing in many of the traditional research fields of IB. In our view, this would make it worthwhile to investigate these types of firms much more intensively.
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Who wants to change the rules? Sources of competitive advantage and incentives for and against institutional evolution

Tilo Halaszovich (Jacobs University Bremen) & Arijit Ghosh (Jacobs University Bremen)

Introduction

Developing countries contain major institutional voids that hinder economic growth and the development of competitive advantages of indigenous firms (Luo & Tung, 2007). Filling up these voids should hence be beneficial for the local economy. Yet, the benefits of institutional changes might be perceived differently by different actors, resulting in different incentives with regard to whether one should aim for institutional improvements or maintain the status-quo. An important takeaway from the literature is that highly embedded firms (both domestic and foreign) in countries with poor institutions are accustomed to the prevailing “rules of the game” (North, 1990: 3) and use them as a source of competitive advantages (Cuervo-Cazurra & Genc, 2014; Halaszovich & Lundan, 2016; Khoury, Cuervo-Cazurra & Dau, 2014). As a consequence, “changing the rules” (i.e., improving the quality of institutions) might take away this competitive advantage that they would have over firms trying to enter the country (Halaszovich, 2018). For more advanced firms, on the other hand, institutional upgrades are essential to developing their competitive strength further (Luo & Tung, 2007). Taken together, the motivation for engaging in institutional co-evolution (Cantwell, Dunning & Lundan, 2010) depends on whether the flawed institutional environment in an economy is a source of or constraint to its firms’ competitive advantages.

Analytical Framework

We analyze this situation using a 2x2 matrix drawing on a country’s attractiveness of local sourcing and attractiveness of local sales from an inside-out perspective and examine the underlying incentives for and barriers to bringing about improvements in the institutions. The resulting matrix is shown in Figure 1.
The low/high top left quadrant of the matrix contains countries that are characterized by a highly attractive local supply of production factors, paired with a low demand for the local output. The high/low bottom right quadrant of the matrix represents the opposite, where locally supplied input factors are less attractive for businesses, but the market has a high demand for production outputs. Next, we will use both dimensions to discuss the sources of competitive advantage and incentives for and against institutional evolution.

**Low-High Quadrant**

As argued above, the willingness to actively engage in institutional co-evolution or to lobby for the status-quo depends on the sources of competitive advantage a firm can exploit. Firms that have based their business model on, for instance, low wage production are indeed dependent on a system that is facilitating low wage levels and, thereby, often times also inefficient market mechanisms (Arbache, Dickerson & Green, 2004). A market described by such characteristics, at the same time, cannot absorb the output of firms due to a lack of local buying power. Hence, it is characterized by low local demand for the output and a high level of supply for weakly developed input factors. Under these conditions, improvements in the institutional system, for example by increasing the average wage level, would erode the supply of relevant input factors while an increase in local demand will only materialize after a period of transition. In sum, local companies have a strong incentive to prevent those institutional upgrades that erode their relevant input factors. Instead of actively engaging in institutional co-evolution (Cantwell et al., 2010), companies have a strong incentive to maintain the status-quo as long as their output can be channeled to foreign markets. Hence, these firms might advocate trade liberalization (Arbache et al., 2004) but no changes towards more efficient market mechanisms. Triggering institutional upgrades, therefore, requires a third party. This party might be either the government or a supranational organization. The effectiveness of the government as an agent of change depends on the interconnectedness between governmental agencies and firms. High levels of corruption, for instance, might limit the interest of the government to change the institutional environment (Cuervo-Cazurra, 2016). In this case, the government will fail to generate momentum in the institutional development. Hence, institutional upgrades need to be triggered by supranational organizations.
High-Low Quadrant

Opposite to the situation discussed above, newly industrialized economies are characterized by high local demand and a lack of supply of suitable production factors (McGahan & Victer, 2009). In these economies, the demand for low-cost basic input factors is almost non-existent. The basis of competitive advantages has shifted to scarce resources such as knowledge, especially technical knowhow, or high-tech intermediary products. Once these factors have been exhausted in the domestic market, it is necessary to turn the sourcing efforts towards other countries (Li, Li, Liu & Yang, 2010). To sustain their competitive advantages, firms need an appropriate institutional structure that ensures access to these global factor markets and promotes the creation of local supply. In such economies, the establishment of suitable intellectual property rights and reliable enforcement mechanisms is necessary for building trust and creating an environment in which innovators can access complementary assets (Hennart, 2009; Khoury et al., 2014; Li et al. 2010). These conditions provide a strong incentive for local firms to engage in institutional co-evolution.

High-High Quadrant

The top-right quadrant in Figure 1 combines elements of both quadrants discussed above. Firms embedded in economies in this quadrant, therefore, face incentives for and against institutional co-evolution. The Chinese economy, for example, is characterized by these opposing influences. While many local firms still exploit low wages in low-tech industries, an increasing percentage of companies engage in high-tech manufacturing and innovation activities (UNCTAD, 2016). In the special case of China, the domestic market is large enough to sustain a highly attractive supply of local factors of production and an attractive demand for the output produced in the economy simultaneously. Therefore, we would expect a mixed incentive structure. Without a dominant incentive for either alternative, an inefficient compromise can materialize. Eventually, this compromise can neither promote the competitive advantages of low-tech firms nor of high-tech firms. As we will discuss below, this can drag an economy towards the low-low quadrant. China seems to follow a different path as the institutional development is centrally controlled by a strong government. From this perspective, a third party (for example the government or supranational organizations) can help to overcome stalemate situations. With an increasingly competitive high-tech industry, it seems more likely that a third party will endorse institutional upgrades in favor of the development of the high-tech industry over low-tech firms, given that the former’s impact on economic growth is supposedly larger than the latter’s (Wong, Ho & Autio, 2005).

Low-Low Quadrant

The quadrant on the lower left side of Figure 1 is characterized by a low attractiveness of supply of domestic production factors and a low demand for the output. Somewhat similar to the high-high scenario discussed above, no clear incentive structure can be expected. This resulting stalemate situation again requires a third party to develop momentum. Yet the direction a third party will favor is less clear. Institutional upgrades (i.e. favoring high-tech industries) will take time to generate beneficial outcomes, as firms need to develop their competitive advantages while local demand is developing only slowly. Institutional downgrades (i.e. favoring low-tech industries) might yield more timely results by increasing employment rates but might face strong resistance from the population since institutional achievements would be reverted. Discussing the different political and societal processes taking place in these situations is beyond the scope of this article. Yet, it is noteworthy that economies moving away from the low-high quadrant will most likely face a low-low situation in their transition period since the erosion of the former sources of competitive advantages will take place at a faster rate than the formation of the future sources.
Conclusion

The incentives (for or against institutional upgrades) firms facing depend on the sources of their competitive advantage. By implementing this perspective, our conceptual findings can help to develop a more fine-grained understanding of the motivations of different actors to either promote or prevent institutional upgrades. Our analytical framework could help policymakers both at the national and supranational levels to develop strategic approaches for overcoming institutional inertia and promoting the creation of efficient markets. The theoretical discussion in this article is only a first and rather limited step towards a deeper understanding of the motivational drivers underlying the incentives of different actors to promote or hinder institutional development. Nevertheless, we believe our framework can help to broaden the scope of research on institutional development.
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Call for Papers – EIBA 2018 Poznań: International Business in a Transforming World – The Changing Role of States and Firms
Barbara Jankowska (Poznań University of Economics and Business), EIBA President

It is a great privilege and honour to have been given the opportunity to host EIBA and its members at the upcoming 44th EIBA Annual Conference to take place in Poznań, Poland! This year’s conference will be organized by and held at the Poznań University of Economics and Business, December 13-15, 2018.

Introduction & Background

The variety, diversity, and magnitude of trends that shape the international relations of firms and governments in the era of globalization are tremendous. Many of these processes substantially redefine the context for international activities of multinational enterprises (MNEs), small and medium enterprises (SMEs) or born globals. These forces affect the position of states, their governments and firms.

New tendencies have been observed in the past few years, such as the recent (post)crisis rise of populism, growing anti-European sentiment among the member states of the European Union, increasing protectionism, and the growth slowdown of emerging markets, adversely affecting the global economy. These tendencies have been accompanied by the emergence of new players (including those from post-transition countries), the unprecedented acceleration of international commerce and communication owing to falling barriers and technological advancements, and the continuing trends of outsourcing and deep restructuring of corporate governance structures, as well as progressing international investments, trade agreements and partnerships.

Collectively and individually, these processes continue to reshape the future of international business and their consequences will undoubtedly resonate for many decades.

As well as fundamentally redesigning the global landscape, they also raise questions regarding the new balance between sovereign states and markets. EIBA 2018 Poznań – the 44th Annual Conference of the European International Business Academy (EIBA) – is dedicated to exploring the new challenges faced by international business, particularly the threats and opportunities arising for MNEs, SMEs, INVs and global start-ups. Special attention is being paid to the changing economic and political context worldwide.

Conference Tracks

We invite competitive and interactive papers, posters, and panel proposals, for any of the 14 EIBA 2018 conference tracks listed below.

Competitive papers should be close to a publishable state whereas interactive papers and posters may be in an earlier stage of development.

1. MNEs in a transforming world – the changing role of states and firms
   Marta Götz & Constantina Kottaridi
2. Internationalization of firms and markets – the case of CEECs
   Arnold Schuh & Krzysztof Wach
3. Developments in IB Theory – methods, trends, critical approaches
   Stefan Schmid
4. FDI and foreign market entry – strategies, policies and new trends
   Desislava Dikova
5. SMEs and International Entrepreneurship
   Tiia Vissak & Sami Saarenketo
6. Location and IB
   Lucia Piscitello
7. Digitalization and IB
   Mariola Citewska-Mlinarić & Grzegorz Mazurek
8. MNC strategy and organization
   Dowra Piaskowska & Ciaran Heavey
9. International Finance, accounting and corporate governance
   Trond Randøy
10. International HRM and Cross-Cultural Issues
    Matevž Rašković
11. International Marketing
    Tilo Halaszovich
12. Knowledge Management and Innovation
    Małgorzata Lewandowska & Michal Lemanski
13. Networking and Relationships
    Noemi Sinkovics
14. Teaching IB
    Elizabeth Rose
For more information & details, including the descriptions of tracks, please visit the conference website: www.eiba2018.eiba.org.

Call for Competitive & Interactive Papers

All papers received by the EIBA 2018 submission deadline (which meet the eligibility requirements) will be evaluated in a double-blind review process. The final accepted papers that are presented in the competitive and interactive sessions will be published online in the EIBA 2018 Poznań proceedings. Detailed guidelines for the preparation and submission of papers are available on the conference website: www.eiba2018.eiba.org. The submission deadline for competitive and interactive papers is: Monday, July 16, 2018.

Call for Panel Proposals

Panel proposals for EIBA 2018 Poznań on contemporary issues within all areas of interest to IB scholars are welcome. Detailed guidelines for submitting panel proposals are available on the conference website: www.eiba2018.eiba.org. The deadline for panel proposals is: Monday, July 16, 2018.

Call for Posters

We also welcome Poster submissions to any of the 14 EIBA 2018 conference tracks – those accepted will be presented in a dedicated Poster Session (during a plenary slot where no other conference activities are scheduled). A group of high-level academics will be invited to review the posters and provide quality feedback to the authors. Guidelines for the submission of posters are available on the conference website: www.eiba2018.eiba.org. The submission deadline for posters is: Monday, September 3, 2018.

Call for Reviewers

We invite volunteers to register as Reviewers for the EIBA 2018 Poznań conference.

Reviewers can expect to be sent two to three manuscripts to review soon after the submission deadline for papers (July 16, 2018) – all reviews to be completed and returned by Monday, August 20, 2018.

The quality of academic meetings depends critically on the invaluable input and presence of the reviewers of the papers – so we fully realize how dependent we are on our able volunteers in this respect. You may register online as a Reviewer for EIBA 2018 Poznań at the link https://www.conftool.com/eiba2018/. One excellent EIBA 2018 Reviewer will be presented with the EIBA Best Reviewer Award!

Other Activities at EIBA 2018 Poznań

Alongside the regular conference program, a series of pre-conference events and other activities (some listed below) will be held during EIBA 2018 Poznań. More information on these events will be posted on the conference website as it becomes available:

- 32nd John H. Dunning Doctoral Tutorial
- 7th Danny Van Den Bulcke Doctoral Symposium
- Paper Development Workshops (PDWs)
  - IBR | JIBS | JIBP
- 4th EIBA Early Career Network (ECN) Workshop
- Social networking events & Gala Dinner

The submission deadline for doctoral events and PDWs is: Monday, September 3, 2018.

Awards

Numerous awards & prizes will be presented for best papers and outstanding contributions to the EIBA Annual Conference and to the IB community. Winners of the following awards (among others) will be announced and prizes presented at the EIBA 2018 conference:

- Danny Van Den Bulcke Best Paper Prize
- EIBA Best Doctoral Thesis Proposal in IB Award
- SSE Gunnar Hedlund Award
- Copenhagen Business School Prize
- IBR Best Journal Paper of the Year Award
- GSJ Global Strategy Research Prize
- IMR International Marketing Prize
- IJoEM Emerging Markets Prize
- JIBE International Trade & Industrial Organization in International Business Prize
- Lazaridis Institute SMEs & International Entrepreneurship Best Paper Prize
- EIBA Best Reviewer Award
- EIBA Distinguished Honorary Fellowship Award
Consult & Contact Us

Please consult the EIBA 2018 Poznań website www.eiba2018.eiba.org for any conference-related information you may need, such as: venues, travel, accommodation, registration, fees, etc. If you cannot find what you are looking for or would like to contact the organizers, please send an e-mail inquiry to: info@eiba2018.eiba.org – we will do our best to reply as promptly as possible.

*We are very much looking forward to hosting you at EIBA 2018 in Poznań this December!*  

For more & regularly updated information on the 44th EIBA Annual Conference, please visit the EIBA 2018 Poznań website:

---

### The SSE Gunnar Hedlund Award, 2017-2018

The **SSE Gunnar Hedlund Award** is a coveted prize presented for the best PhD thesis in the world in the field of International Business. In 1997, the Institute of International Business at the Stockholm School of Economics (SSE) established the award in memory of SSE Professor Gunnar Hedlund. The idea behind the award is that it should act as a vehicle to stimulate PhD candidates around the world in the field of International Business, and also commemorate Professor Gunnar Hedlund’s important work in the field. The award is administered by the Stockholm School of Economics, in collaboration with The European International Business Academy (EIBA). The winner receives a medal, a diploma and €10,000, and is announced bi-annually at the Annual Conference of the European International Business Academy in December.

#### Submissions for the 2017-2018 Prize

To be eligible for the 2017-2018 SSE Gunnar Hedlund Award, the doctoral dissertation (written in English) must be completed within the time frame of July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2018. Submissions are welcome at any time, but must be sent in before August 1, 2018, to be considered for the 2017-2018 SSE Gunnar Hedlund Award. (Later submissions will be considered for the next prize.)

---

### Evaluation Criteria & Jury

A jury of leading international business scholars will decide on the winner. The jury is chaired by Professor Udo Zander and the prize will be awarded to the work that in the opinion of the jury has the greatest potential to have an impact on the field of international business in the future. Both theoretical and empirical contributions are appropriate. Emphasis, in the spirit of Professor Gunnar Hedlund, will be put on intellectual boldness, creativity and originality.

#### Submission Procedures & Contact Details

Submissions to the 2017-2018 prize will close on **August 1, 2018**. The finalists will be asked to present their work at the 44th EIBA Annual Conference in Poznań in December 2018. A stipend will be awarded to each of the 3-4 finalists to partly cover travel expenses and registration to the EIBA 2018 conference.

For more information, including requirements and details for preparing and formatting the abstract, refer to the SSE Gunnar Hedlund Award website: https://www.hhs.se/en/outreach/sse-gunnar-hedlund-award/

Enquiries and submissions for the **Gunnar Hedlund Award 2017-2018** may be directed to the e-mail address: agneta.carlin@hhs.se.
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European International Business Academy (EIBA)

The European International Business Academy (EIBA) was founded in 1974 under the auspices of the European Foundation for Management Development (EFMD) and in close cooperation with the European Institute for Advanced Studies in Management (EIASM).

EIBA is a professional society for academics and practitioners with an interest in the growing field of International Business (IB). It is distinct from other associations in that members range from a wide variety of disciplines and functional backgrounds yet share the common practice of using the international context to bridge and even cross the intellectual boundaries that so often divide institutions of higher education.

The main mandate of EIBA is to serve as the core network in Europe for the communication and dissemination of professional information, as well as for the promotion of international exchange in the field of International Business. Annual EIBA membership is available to individuals in Europe and elsewhere in the world (either by attending the Conference, or by joining and/or renewing online). At present, the European IB Academy consists of more than 600 members from 50+ countries representing all five continents.

EIBA organizes an Annual Conference hosted each December by a renowned university in Europe (or occasionally abroad). In addition to the usual academic program of competitive and interactive papers, there are also several panels and special sessions as well as posters featured. Doctoral events for registered PhD students are organized by esteemed IB faculty (among other pre- and sometimes post-conference activities).

A number of awards are presented at the EIBA Annual Conference, including the following (among others): Danny Van Den Bulcke Best Paper Prize; EIBA Best Doctoral Thesis Proposal in IB Award; Copenhagen Business School Best Paper Prize; SSE Gunnar Hedlund Award; EIBA Conference Track Best Paper Awards; Best Reviewer Prize; IBR Best Journal Paper Award; EIBA Distinguished Honorary Fellowship Award.

Among the many compelling reasons for joining the EIBA family & community are the following:

- EIBA members form an integral part of a global professional network of individuals that are actively involved in International Business research, study, teaching, and practice.
- EIBA members receive six print issues yearly of the International Business Review (IBR), EIBA’s official flagship journal (published by Elsevier).
- EIBA membership also includes online access to Progress in International Business (PIBR), an annual book series (published by Emerald Insight); each volume features high quality research presented at the previous year’s EIBA Annual Conference.
- EIBA members receive two issues annually (May & November) of EIBA’s own renowned newsletter: EIBAzine – International Business Perspectives.
- EIBA members are kept informed (via e-mail and websites, etc.) of Academy activities, news, and other relevant IB events, and may be offered special promotional or discounted prices on selected IB publications, as well as being invited to participate in the EIBA Annual Conference & General Assembly.

As of 2017, the annual EIBA membership fee is €130 per calendar year (€100 for PhD students) plus 21% VAT. A personal journal subscription to International Business Review (IBR) (printed version) published by Elsevier, and online access to Progress in International Business Research (PIBR) – a book series published by Emerald, are bundled into the membership benefits package.

NOTE: The EIBA Annual Conference registration fee includes EIBA membership and IBR / e-PIBR subscriptions for the following year (but not for the current year).

To find out more about your EIBA membership status or your subscription to IBR / e-PIBR, as well as for general enquiries, please contact the EIBA Secretariat by sending a detailed e-mail to the address: info@eiba.org.

For more information and news on EIBA and its activities, or to renew your annual membership online, you are invited to visit the EIBA website: www.eiba.org.
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