

03-24 Seminar: Latin American Research Identity, Theoretical Framing, and Journal Strategy

Introduction

This document is a complete, verbatim-style transcription and structured organization of a multi-part lecture and seminar focused on framing Latin American phenomena so they travel theoretically—particularly in strategy, entrepreneurship, and international business—while building and publishing a strong research identity. It also covers research contextualization, theoretical contribution, paper planning and execution, journal targeting, the revise-and-resubmit (R&R) process, AI use in research, ethics in publishing, and strategic academic identity across regional contexts. The session includes interactive audience questions and comments, primarily with participants identified as Diego, Speaker 1, and other speakers. The content creation date is 2026-03-24 16:09:03.

Chapter 1: Setting the Stage and Audience Context

- [Speaker 1] : How to frame Latin American phenomena so they travel theoretically, particularly as it relates to strategy, entrepreneurship, international business related issues. And essentially, then you know identity as we talk about, whilst down to publishing good research. So how do we make sure that our research gets published? Before I begin let me, Let me actually first understand the audience here.
- [Diego] : How many of you are currently doctoral students? So I.
- [Speaker 1] : See quite a few about 10 and 12. And how many of you, including the doctoral students, are within five years of your academic career? Meaning you got your PhD degree only five years ago. Only five years ago. So most of most of others are, You know, more senior people like this may not be applicable, But please jump in and you know, share your thoughts to help all of us, including myself in this process. Now the question I have particularly for

doctoral students is before Roberto introduced me. Sorry, Ricardo introduced me, did you know who I am?

- [Diego] : Or who knew amongst the doctoral students who I am?
- [Diego] : No one,
- [Speaker 1] : Right? So what does this tell? It's actually good that no one knows me because that essentially tells that I don't have any research identity amongst that particular group, right? The group of you know current doctoral students. And when we're talking about research identity. It becomes really important as to how we define, you know, our research identity. What is the group in which we belong and so on. So, you know, just to make it fun. If I continue this conversation who am I? Swarupam Haldar. Which is what most of you are saying. Absolutely acceptable response. Think XN - localization right? That could be one of my research, not research identity, but identity in general, right? Who is this person if I were to ask?
- [Speaker 1] : Must be another of those, you know, narcissistic American-educated American professor. Like talking so much about, you know, himself or herself, right? So that's also a very legitimate view that many people hold of people technocracy. None of these is how I would like to be ideally seen. Ideally how I would like to be seen is this person has done some research in international business. Wait, what is ID? You may not even know what ID is just by looking. But that's one. And then more specificity, My research identity would be if you know audience or the general group amongst whom I want to be known, could tell that this person is expert on X Y Z. Right? And, what is that X Y Z that we can sort of figure out for ourselves? That's what you know I'm going to talk about. You know it could be context.

Chapter 2: Identity Dimensions— Context, Frameworks, Methods

- [Speaker 1] : Right, so uh for instance if this was an audience in Asia, China and India in particular, You know, they would say, okay, this guy has done a lot of research on internationalization of, you know, funds from emerging markets. So that's that's context. Chirpy right? Will people only buy chirpy? That's another way to think about it. So what is the framework that this person uses and this is where.
- [Speaker 1] : My perspective and ideas are coming more from strategy, international business, entrepreneurship field where theory and these issues are important. If you're a finance scholar, theory is less important for you. It's specific phenomenon or context or research issue becomes important for you. So that's why I just put it as one thing. Methods,

- [Diego] : Right? How many of you know Harman test? Harman test? Anybody knows? Can show some example.
- [Speaker 1] : He is one of the top cited person, and his identity is pretty much on. He was also, I thought people would know because he was also president of Academy of Management, and one of the most cited persons in the field. But his identity is primarily on methods. So he has sort of developed himself as an expert on methods. So all of these issues, of course become important as we think about ourselves in short run, And then might say, you know why the hell none of this matters I don't care about it. I maybe want to become an administrator that will change the way you look at yourself as a career. And the way you want to build your identity, maybe you want to get more involved in administrative work, organizing events, even within the organization in which you are working. Right? Uh, you may want to have your identity as a policy person and policy also in a local context, which will, again change the nature of work that you're doing. But we're going.
- [Speaker 1] : The focus here is more in terms of research identity, right? That is the topic here.

Chapter 3: Role Models and Pathways to Identity

- [Speaker 1] : Now, when you think of research identity, the first step should be to identify your models. Because, you know, there are some people who have an identity. And if you're thinking of yourself having an identity, then you would try and emulate them and try and become like them. And when I put this slide, initially, I thought I am going to put some top scholars from Latin. America. On the slide. And then um uh, the number was so large and I was so afraid of, you know, just looking at this conference, the people who are, you know, attending this, many of you know, uh people attending this conference are already, you know, quite well known scholars I would not like to compete, so I left the slide blank. But uh.
- [Speaker 1] : But you need to think for yourself depending on whatever is your field, who are the top scholars in your field. You don't need to have 20, 30, 40 people. Just five or ten of them if you can identify. That would be the role model for you, and that is what you need to sort of follow. Because in the next step will be, how did they reach where they are? If you wish to reach there, right? So now there are certain lessons to be learned. There are also mistakes that you could see that people have made. Re sulted in some taking much shorter time to reach where they wanted to reach or where you wish to reach and some taking much longer time. And in the process, even muddling their identity. Maybe someone actually started with a want himself to be known as a medical expert.

Maybe he wanted himself to be known as something else. But maybe you want to be known as something else. So, this is where you have to sort of figure out what is that place where I want to be by looking at specific.

- [Diego] : Role models that you have for yourself.
- [Diego] : Right, so again,
- [Speaker 1] : You know, and I'm going to come back to this topic later in the presentation. But, what I've been trying to explain here is that identity is what others say about you. You know, when you leave the room. It's not what they say. It's not what Ricardo tells that you know, I'm a known ID scholar and have done X Y Zs and so on. It's about what we talk about when the person leaves the place and if the name just comes. Something what is this guy known for? Right? That is what that is what identity is. You can have multiple uh pathways to that. Uh thematic focus, contextual claim, right, your bibliographical signature, your publication trajectory. And in fact, all of these become quite important in in building identity, but what I mean by thematic focus, right? So.

Chapter 4: Types of Research and Building Thematic Focus

- [Speaker 1] : Types of research. One is, of course, team-based research with systematic processes and the other is opportunistic research, right? So opportunistic research is, you know, You are in a conference and you meet someone, and you have amazing access to, let's say, uh, you know, Toto group, which is a Columbia I learned yesterday based uh company. Um. So you know the son of the CEO or whatever. And then you have this other person who is expert in doing uh. Ethnographic studies or you know deep qualitative research. So you could provide access to this particular, you know, Company to this person, and we can collaborate, and we can come up with with ideas about how entrepreneurship in local context differs, you know, in Colombian context. And that would be a very legitimate meaningful research right? But it's opportunistic research. Now, this will become thematic research if your whole identity, or you know the type of papers that you do are based on understanding how entrepreneurs in different contexts.
- [Speaker 1] : So it then goes beyond, you know, let's say Toto Group, But you are studying different entrepreneurs in Latin American context and how they have overcome the institutional challenges, Institutional voids that firms or entrepreneurs face in these companies to still make their companies big. So that's the theme of your research. Now with that theme, you could make a claim on a specific context. For instance, your research could be just narrowly focused only on Brazil. It could be, of course, more broadly focused in the you

know broader Latin American context. And you do not need to take your context outside of that one, right? So, we know a lot of Chinese scholars who have all their life research only on Chinese forms, right? They have not taken their context outside of. In fact, A lot of people who do become, you know, people with identities will have all of these components in them, which is that they will have thematic focus. They will have a contextual claim.

- [Speaker 1] : Meaning, you know, they would be expert on certain contexts and certain issues. There will be some methodological signature on the type of work that they do. Right? So for example, if someone comes to me and says that, you know, I want to work with you. And you know, I'll ask, what is the type of work you're doing? And, the person will say that I have done these three rounds of surveys on 500 entrepreneurs. You know amazing data and so on. But I do not do survey research. So that's not my, you know, that's the logical signature. So the logical thing for me would be to say that, you know, it's amazing great but this is not the type of work I do. You know I am focusing on, you know, secondary data research longitudinal and not something else. If I was opportunistic, which is that I really wanted to keep my attention on themes and context.
- [Speaker 1] : And not so much on the methods. So, there is some issues that I have not been able to study because I did not have data. Then maybe I will bring this type of research also in my portfolio of things, which is surveys. But particularly for younger scholars, It really becomes important to plan these things in a longer scheme of things, rather than simply being opportunistic, because, you know, research takes time as we all know. And I'm going to make a little bit of controversial statement here, which is lousy research takes more time than doing good research. And I'm going to sort of explain it, you know, As we go along, why good research is more meaningful and takes relatively speaking, less time in the larger scheme of things than, for instance, doing opportunistic work where you are developing expertise from one domain to the next domain to the next domain.
- [Speaker 1] : And then finally, publication trajectory, right? So people who have identities would have, you know, somewhat coherent publication profiles. Sometimes, it becomes more harmful to have X publication in your profile than not to have that X publication. You need to sort of figure out for yourself. Where do you want to operate in that domain. And this is the reason why many big professors, people with identity you will see Will have a set of papers in journals, and then they will have a lot of papers which just go as book chapters. Now those papers, why do they appear in books? They could very well be published in let's say lower rank journals. But publishing in those journals sometimes might be interfering with the identity that you want to create. At the same time, this is that research you have done, you want to put it out. So you would rather.

- [Speaker 1] : You know, put it out as working paper or a book chapter, right? Or even in monograph rather than you know diluting your publication package. Right? So, all these four things are critical. If we want to have a strong research identity in the long run versus we just want to be known for, you know, one or two papers. Once you have, you know going back to this slide, identified your role models, right?
- [Speaker 1] : And if you're looking at how did they reach there, This pattern recognition is very clear, dynamic that goes on. And there are these six components to it, which we will discuss more as we go along. So theory first and I'm going to elaborate on what I mean by theory first. Latin America is important, but just because something has not been studied in Colombia does not make it interesting. What makes it interesting is what aspects of financial institutions are different in Colombia versus in other contexts, which will then help us understand institutional theory better. So then Colombia just becomes a secondary, right? The context just becomes an aid, right? A help in the issue that we're explaining rather than being the central focus of our paper. So theory first. Universal mechanism, they identify mechanisms that work.
- [Speaker 1] : You know, differently in Latin America, whether it is institutional voids, you know, institutional modality informality and then theorize why that happens. Right? So that's mechanism identification. Partnerships become very important. And again, I am talking more from the perspective of younger scholars, doctoral students and so on. People take a cynical view on partnerships, Which is that you know, you will only be able to publish in, let's say, North American journals. If you partner with someone who is operating there and knows the system inside. That's a cynical view of it. A more positivist view of it is to complementing what you have with something that you do not have. And sometimes that something you do not have is nothing but experience, right? So if someone has published more, then that person has a little bit more experience than you have.
- [Speaker 1] : And learning from someone else, vicarious learning, which is learning from someone else's experience, is not harmful if it can shorten our cycle. Right? So strategic partnerships is what I'm talking there. Journal fit, I'm going to talk about super important could be a source of huge disappointment at any stage in career. But identifying those journals that fit our research and then positioning our research. So that. Methodological rigor and your sustained program. So all of those things. Let me come back to why mainstream journals are important a bit later because this is a bit of controversial issue, particularly when we are talking in non- North American context. I am not going to argue that mainstream journals are not important, but from the point of view of building your identity.
- [Speaker 1] : As I argued earlier, you might be able to build your identity without necessarily focusing on mainstream journals, particularly if you look at your identity in a broader way. So, therefore, I'm going to come back to this

issue of mainstream journals, maybe later. Um alright now before I go ahead the article is at the bottom, the central part is main theme. How many.

- [Diego] : Of you have read this article? Please raise your hand. So I see only three or four hands. How many of you know the authors of these articles? So.
- [Speaker 1] : That's very interesting because again, I see only four or five hands. And you know, you want to build your research identity. Uh. In by publishing, you know, Latin American research. The first thing you should be doing is simply go to Google or ChatGPT and ask it, if I want to research on Latin America, what are the topics I should be studying? And help me identify five articles or three articles through which I can learn what to study. And this will appear at the very top. This article comes up, at least in my Google search. This comes up as the first article.
- [Speaker 1] : And the next thing I'll do is look at who those authors are. And one of the authors is sitting here in this room, just at the center of them. You do not need to go outside, or you know, sit for hours and discussion or friend there, right? He's co-author on this article. You just need to have conversation with him. I want to you know do research on Latin America, what do I study? Right? Certainly person sitting over there is, you know, I can no way claim myself to be. Anywhere close to being an expert on Latin America, you know, maybe up to here I know much more than that. But we have a world-renowned expert in these settings. You know, that's the point which one of my doctoral students is sitting here. He was talking earlier that if we simply keep our eyes and ears open and rest right, that's my student. If, we simply keep our eyes and ears open. There are plenty of opportunities to, you know, advance ourselves in whichever direction we want to advance ourselves.
- [Speaker 1] : Right, so if you actually see this article, This article talks about what I earlier mentioned in and I'm going to go back to the previous slide. Latin America is not a limitation, it is a theoretical leverage. And.
- [Diego] : Most of the people who have become known based on.
- [Speaker 1] : Research outside of North, American context have done so on this core assumption. Which is that they have taken those specific contexts as research laboratory and then using that laboratory or using the unique things that they can do in that laboratory, they have tried to advance our current understanding of issues. Right? So whether you're looking at, you know, there are plenty of scholars who have done research on China.
- [Speaker 1] : And when they have done research on China, they have not simply studied how Chinese from China. They have advanced theory, the whole, the whole, the literature on uh institutional voids and uh and institutional transition, particularly comes based on comes from, you know, research, which is based out of China and India right at Harvard. You know Krishna political development and so on, then they came up. The majority of this, Aguilera, you know, she is a scholar who has done a lot of research on that. Her work on

corporate governance is simply based on experimenting in settings, which are outside of North America and arguing that the basic principles of corporate governance that we sort of take for granted in the North American context, such as board independence, do not apply in other contexts because you can have as independent board as you wish. And yet everyone else will just not even blink an eye.

- [Speaker 1] : Questioning in questioning I mean they will just never question right? So the whole thought process goes independently always. So so coming back to this article, read this repeatedly and deeply, if you really want to, you know, do research on that environment. And this will tell you lot more than I'm going to talk in next, whatever time we have uh, coming back to this this part here, right? Why mainstream journals uh are important in terms of uh, you know, building your your research identity. Right, so the article that I showed you, Mr. So's article, Arman was also co-author there, was published in a mainstream journal, Journal of Management, which is an FT journal, and you know, the article is good on its own. It's a very strong article, but if the same article was published in, let's say, as a book chapter or in an unknown journal, then it would not have received as much attention as it has received, right? So visibility.
- [Speaker 1] : Visibility and impact once you publish your research in a good journal. So in our field, right, there's lot of information asymmetry. Information asymmetry meaning, you know, why are you listening to me as against someone else? Because, we don't know what the other person is going to tell is going to be valuable or not. That is information asymmetry. And then there are multiple signals Through which you can minimize that information. In my case, some of those signals will be, for example, I have done research. So I can show that, you know, I have a sort of I am not just a random person. And just not talking gibberish. Same thing with the top journals is more often than not that they publish studies, which have had impact in the field, both from the point of view of practice as well as from the point of view theory. So if your research also appears there.
- [Speaker 1] : That first question you can overcome that, you know, is it even meaningful, right? Why am I reading this? So that's the first step. Visibility and impact. Of course everything else is sort of outcome or correlates of those institutional currency. You know, it helps build reputation, tenure promotion, even monetary benefits which are related to Theory generalization, your Latin American findings, right? If you're doing your research just on Latin America become part of the global, you know, Setting where people are then drawing upon and using that to explain things in other places. Just as for example, You know, many people would use, let's say Tavant Khandla's work on institutional voids or business groups to now study business groups in Latin America. Right? That research was done on Indian business group by Khandla and Khalepu, but now that is used all over the world.

- [Speaker 1] : So likewise, if you can use, you know, I mean if I have to give an example of Latin American context, you know this socio-economic wealth concept right? The family businesses, the entrepreneurship. A lot of that work has been actually it has originated in Latin America, and it has now gone on to people are using that concept of socio- economic wealth to explain the shorter versus long-term horizon of family run businesses in multiple contexts, including Europe and so on. Right? So So that's the theory generalization. Of course, you have network access, you become known, your research agenda sort of become leadership in that field. And I have this point about JW opportunities. You can forget the word JWB, and you can simply replace it by the word mainstream journal opportunities. I can tell you that almost all of the mainstream journals are super excited and super interested to publish something which is different from what they are already publishing.
- [Speaker 1] : And what are they already publishing?

Chapter 5: Context and Appeal Beyond North America

5.1 Predominance of North American Contexts in Top Journals

- [Speaker 1] Most of the research in top journals, the context is North America. So if there is something which is coming outside of that context, it is immediately appealing. Right? It's it's the journals are super uh interested in that. It does not reach here for the reasons that you know, I'm going to talk later uh in later slides. But uh, that goes back to uh this. Point in the next slide. It's not limitation. It's a laboratory where if you do meaningful work, you would be able to achieve all of these things. So mainstream journals do not publish contexts, they publish theoretically meaningful questions, right? So just because your work is based out of China or Brazil or Mexico does not make it interesting. What makes it interesting is.

5.2 From Context to Theoretically Meaningful Questions

- [Speaker 1] Which institutional characteristics in Mexico led to so much of FDI in such a short period of time as compared to, for instance, other Latin American countries? Now you could argue that it's simply NAFTA. But that's very logical explanation. Is there, something which is beyond NAFTA that can explain the

flow of FDI into whether from geopolitical context or whatever, right? So that would be something which is theoretically meaningful. Rather than simply saying that you know, you have a PI in Latin America. Latin America becomes an advantage when it sharpens the mechanism, reveals boundary conditions, exposes a phenomenon earlier and more clearly than other settings. So because you are studying this issue in Latin America, you are able to answer these questions more deeply. The strongest identities usually built at the intersection of these three things that I have here in red.

Chapter 6: Building a Strong Scholarly Identity

6.1 Recurring Puzzle

- [Speaker 1] Which is a recurring puzzle. And what a recurring puzzle is, you are repeatedly putting your hammer at the same part, right? So you are asking the same question. Whether it is nascent entrepreneurship, whether it is a sustainability question, whether it is an immigration problem that you're trying to address, immigrant entrepreneurship issues that you're trying to address. Micro entrepreneurs. Very common, Some of these things that I am talking are more specific or unique to Latin America than elsewhere in the parts of the world. So recurring puzzle, recognizable theoretical lens which is again recurring. More often than not, we see some variation of institutional explanation when it comes to explaining things, but it has to go beyond institutional explanations. For instance, when this concept of socioeconomic wealth was introduced.

6.2 Recognizable Theoretical Lens and Going Beyond Institutions

- [Speaker 1] Of course, there is variation in how wealth is perceived and created in these different contexts, and that is institutional variation. But there is this new construct of socioeconomic wealth comes in. And that is the theoretical contribution of Latin American economists. In a context where a scholar has genuine access and insight, this is really important. You see a lot of scholars who would be publishing work in, On context for which they have very little understanding. And yet they are, you know, Able to publish because they sometimes partner and the partners sort of lose sight of what they want to, you know, what is that they bring in. You know what I'm saying is that you have

deeper understanding of this concept, Sorry context than, for instance, the partners that you search for or partners that you choose to work with.

6.3 Access, Insight, and Making Context an Advantage

- [Speaker 1] And making use of that context can help you not only not needing a partner, but even if you do, To be able to make that meaningful contribution much better than someone else with more access can do. So resource constraint can become a clear advantage. The goal is not to sell that innovative, the goal is to use this to say something that field should care about. Right? Whether Again, I'm repeating some ideas here. Institutional discontinuity that you were talking about, the volatility of environments that you talked about. State-owned enterprises, you know, State- owned enterprises. If you look at and majority of the state- owned enterprises research is based out of China. And, we know that the nature of SOEs between China and Latin America is different. So there's clear opportunity here to study Latin America and understand how state-owned enterprises.

6.4 Linking Latin American SOEs to Global Relevance

- [Speaker 1] Operate in that context, which can help us understand, you know, for instance, how sovereign wealth funds of European countries operate right? So that would be.
- [Diego] Something that scholars around the world would care about all right.

Chapter 7: Models of Contextualization

7.1 Context as Argument and Three Models

- [Speaker 1] So uh going uh from here, uh, context as argument there are argument. There are three models of contextualization. The first one, which is easier, one of the easiest options. And I have in some of the slides a clear action plan, particularly from Dr. Liston's perspective. But anyone who wants to plan for three to five years. So the first one is simply replicate with positive conclusions, right? So, you know, you could pick up a research, which has been done in mainstream journals like System of Science, right? You have this work on.

7.2 Model 1: Replicate with Extension (Boundary Conditions)

- [Speaker 1] What under what conditions do business groups thrive? And, they have not really looked at the conditions because most of their research is on single context. And in Latin America, you have multiple types of business groups, and the context also differs. So you could bring out something unique, for instance, from those contextual variations to identify the ones. So this is replication with extension, right? Extension is identification of boundary conditions. It's easier entry point, mostly for doctoral students when you're learning how to do research, you're learning how to do analysis, you're just like because you have a model, you can simply copy that model. I'm also going to present the model in the next few slides. But here's simply copying that model which is much easier right? You have to of course identify your local data set. So, this is a project that people should be doing in their first semester or second semester.
- [Speaker 1] Class work where you have to do an empirical paper as part of the project, right? So just pick up a paper replicate it right, and you can get it published. What might happen as you're doing it. If you actually start I mean, you will realize that this this what I'm doing is something interesting. I don't need to undersell. Let me put little more effort, right? And maybe I can uh go to the next level. That's that's the general trajectory through which people go. The next one is uh extend theory to a new phenomenon. So identify what those new phenomena are in, you know, multiple contexts. Identify key theoretical lenses that have been used to explain those phenomena and then try and, you know, extend them to the new context. So if you simply look at immigrant entrepreneurship. Right? Immigrant entrepreneurship there is not a lot, but significant body of research where people have looked at how immigrants and particularly.

7.3 Model 2: Extend Theory to New Phenomena

- [Speaker 1] Both legal as well as illegal immigration, migration in particular. How have they gotten into entrepreneurship in countries like Germany, other European countries? And, a lot of it is based on what is the type of support that the state provides to these entrepreneurs to help them integrate and earn their own livelihood and so on. That's where a lot of that research is. You do not have that kind of support in many other countries around the world where migration is happening, both legal and illegal. Most of these people are on their own, right? Which then leads to this concept of micro-entrepreneurship, right? Where micro-entrepreneurship where you know in the morning these guys are selling cigarettes, you know open packs just buy your cigarette. Right? In the

afternoon, maybe they are collecting trash and then maybe they're doing something else. Right? That's micro-entrepreneurship.

- [Speaker 1] How do you sort of make it more formalized, right? Or what can you do to make this informal sector succeed more? That's a real problem. If you look at, you know, Context wise over lunchtime I learned that there are nearly what three or four million illegal immigrants just in Colombia. Right? That's a huge problem for a country, which is not so big in terms of population size, if you have a sizable population coming from somewhere else. How do we sort of, you know, bring them into mainstream? Right. To the extent we need to or to the extent you know we can. That would be a so extend theory to new phenomenon, making those new phenomenon interesting. I have some other examples hyper competition under you know, macroeconomic turbulence multilatinas, of course, which are operating in multiple of Latin American countries. You would not necessarily even call them. You could argue that those are not multinational corporations in the.
- [Speaker 1] Traditional sense, right? Those are more like, you know, after the Second World War, The European companies, which are operating when European Union was not an integrated body, were not lobbying companies operating in other countries. And, then the third is challenge and overturn existing theory, which has the highest impact. This where you ideally want to be. Right? This what then gets published in the very top end of the journals. The previous one You know, would be more for your theme specific journals like, for instance, If you're working in the international business field or if you're working in an entrepreneurship field. You know, entrepreneurship theory and practice JBP and so on. But the next one where you're challenging, what are the existing theories will then take you to the next level, which is AMJ's and ASQ's and SMJ's of the world, right, where you are questioning and challenging their assumptions. Uh and and.

7.4 Model 3: Challenge and Overturn Existing Theory

- [Speaker 1] And extending our understanding of the core theoretical issues about which we know. Please stop me,

Chapter 8: Opening and Framing the Session—From Country Study to Theoretical Contribution

- [Diego] Any questions, any comments here? So if not, I'm going to move on to.

- [Speaker 1] More of the process issues, right? Planning your paper from country study to. Theoretical contribution. I have talked about many of these things so far as I've been talking at the point of time. We study X in Brazil because there is limited research on Brazil. That's not interesting, you know, Brazil's unique combination of institutional voids and commodity market cycles creates natural experiment to test theories. Right. Now you could argue that this is simply an issue of grafting and I'm going to talk about how.
- [Speaker 1] You know, some of that nuances have made this crafting much, much, much easier. Please feel free to share this presentation. It's already on the Collaborative with the audience, if that's helpful because I'm going to skip some of these things. But essentially simply arguing on you saying that Latin America is important or paper examines corporate governance in Mexico. I mean, this not meaningful. This what would be published in a C level journal or you know, You know, D minus journal. If you want to sort of bring it to the next level, you have to uh rely on a stronger frame, which has to be around making a clear theoretical contribution, relying on the context or the phenomenon that you're trying right. So here are some examples again in.
- [Diego] This strategy and uh, international industry.

Chapter 9: Contexts, Mechanisms, and Exemplars

9.1 Features, Mechanisms, and Scholars

- [Speaker 1] So the features, you know, on the first column I have like political and regulatory volatility. The mechanisms that have been used: dynamic capabilities, behavioral agency, institutional theory. Right? And I have also listed some scholars who have sort of published this type of work. : Sengupta, JWB. Family business groups - as I was talking about business groups, research has been you know, quite broad and quite deep. Not so much on family business groups because even though this research was based out of India, The work, which was done, did not take into account the unique characteristics of the family. People have taken that and you know, to the Latin American context and utilize these strong visions of family to then, you know, come up with these concepts that I am talking about principal agency problem, you know socially connected wealth and so on.
- [Speaker 1] And some of these scholars are not even in North America, right? I mean, they are based out of institutions here in Latin America. Multilatinas, it's a quite known term by now in international business research. Again, relying on some of the existing theoretical frameworks: Springolding, you know OLI and

so on. Alvaro, Many of you might know, especially in IB field at Northeastern has done quite a bit of work here. Informal economy, right? It's dominant in Latin America. 30 to 50% of the employment. A lot of work on micro entrepreneurship and so on. Again, relying on transaction costs, different theories of entrepreneurship, institutional voids has gone on to many journals. And then of course natural resource industries. Latin America is rich on natural resources.

- [Speaker 1] Not least because of the huge coastline, But also, which is, of course, a strong natural source in terms of creating shipping lanes and so on. But also the raw materials which are here, right? And that has again gone into mainstream journals from scholars who are operating in the Latin American context. What do they do? Again, going back to the common patterns, They do not treat Latin America itself as a contribution, but as a source of leverage. There is a post to the mainstream conversations. You need to identify what those mainstream conversations are, which goes back to the very first point that I mentioned in my talk, which was to identify your role models. Find out those people. And then the next step in that is going beyond role models, identify maybe 40 or 50 of IP experts.
- [Speaker 1] If you know, 10 years down the line, if you could just write any papers, what would be those 40 papers that you will write? And once you identify those, that will tell you all of these things. Mainstream. If you're researching on internationalization. It's not how Brazilian firms go to Argentina. It's about internationalization of firms. How do overcome the. How do make use of the advantages, which is in your home context? And how do translate them into host country context? Right, So understanding home and host institution, uh what they are regarded, as uh they did portfolios, not isolated papers, right? So again, picking up one theme, right? Narrow is good. Now one does not have to be limited to one. It could branch out to two or three. The moment it becomes more than that, particularly in the early stage in your career, then you're too eclectic. You're just about think of yourself.
- [Speaker 1] Right, You would be an opportunistic scholar rather than a person who's trying to build a theory. Because, how could you work on five different streams as a doctoral student or a junior? I mean, it all is resource intensive, right? So and that's not going to be super rewarding. But again, it's a matter of you know personal choices in that area. Uh so they build portfolios, they don't work on isolated papers. Let me actually elaborate on this point more. As a doctoral student particularly if you're starting your career It's much easier to think of a theme and collect data that will help you feed your research, not for that one paper or one dissertation, but for next 10 years. Because, remember, once you get out of the luxury that you have as doctoral, students is not going to stay with you as you become senior. You need to become boss.
- [Speaker 1] You will be doing a lot of service work, Administrative work so on and so forth, which are you will have much less time. Let's also face something

which many of us do not, you know happily face it. We also become obsolete as time goes right, you become obsolete in terms of particularly one skill which is technological skills. It's lot easier and lot more important to learn these things as doctoral students than it will be possible as seniors. Not have enough time, nor will you have the mental capacity to do so. Let's accept it. Right? Senior people would not, you know, they are much less competent than doctoral students when doing this job. Right? Not just in terms of, you know, they have experience which is they wanted but they don't have the learning capability. They may have higher absorptive capacity, which helps them learn things, but they don't have the basic learning gaps. That's that's a fact right? So you can really build your research portfolio.

- [Speaker 1] At a lead speed, you know, making your hands dirty, doing the dog's work if that's an appropriate phrase. Right? Or donkey's work. Whatever is the appropriate phrase. You know collecting the data that will help you feed not a two or three paper, but the whole research agenda mapping out I'm going to give an example of, you know that research agenda based on my own I mean, I know about my research more than anyone else. So so I had that towards the end um. You collaborate internationally without surrendering the ownership of what you're doing. So collaboration is absolutely something that I would encourage because you can complement your skills and learn, but you don't have to become a subordinate. You can remain the leader of the, because you know it more than someone else does. This is again something very important for us to think about as doctoral students. The issue that we are examining only you can get it.
- [Speaker 1] No one else can. Your advisor is assumed to be an expert, but even beyond your advisor, Someone who is a pioneer in the field cannot be an expert because that person is not spending those three years just studying, let's say this small piece of instrument or engineering. So I would know about this not more than my advisor or broader network. And therefore I don't have to give up. You should not give up the ownership of the issues that you are examining. Make feminine specific work speak to general theory. This will become a bit clearer as we go along. Some examples to the previous point, you know, the previous point was feminine specific work speak to the general theory. So, what are some of the phenomena, particularly in this strategy, international business entrepreneurship field that can tell? Right? So internationalization under volatility and repeated institutional shocks. Now think of it.
- [Speaker 1] Internationalization, we have been studying for quite some time. In fact, the IB field, International business field was kind of founded to study how American firms are successful in UK. Both are pretty standard and stable context. And then it started extending beyond and so on and so forth. More recent research has been again how Chinese firms have become successful internationally. In none of these contexts you have these two issues, which is repeated institutional shocks, which is something that we are experiencing

right now all over the world. Something that Latin America has been experiencing for the past I don't know how many number of years. So, you have lot more and deeper data as well as understanding of this issue to help. For example, firms deal with, let's say, Trump policies that change every week, you know super quickly. Right? So because this is what you know.

- [Speaker 1] Firms have been dealing with in this context. Maybe doing nothing is the right strategy. I do not know, I am not an expert on that. But that's kind of capability building by latecomer firms under resource constraints, right? I mean quite obviously innovation in commodity-linked sectors and sustainability transitions, okay? Something, which is you know, Latin America has been experiencing more so in recent years than in the past. All of these issues in my assessment can prevail But I will go back to Anisur's paper in the Journal of Management, where many of these issues are elaborated with much more detail as well as supporting literature. Showcasing strategies, stakeholder management in unequal societies, state-business relationships, family ownership, business group dynamics, regional expansion, Multilateral growth patterns -, all of these are in my view transferable and can travel across and bring theories.
- [Speaker 1] Insights to scholarship which is beyond Latin America, which is what mainstream journals are doing. So that's you know very broadly about identity. I'm going to come back to the identity, but I'm again, going to pause for a longer time and invite some questions,
- [Diego] Observations, comments. Yes?

Chapter 10: Audience Q&A on Replication, Context, and Contribution

10.1 The Question

- [Speaker 3] I Was wondering because I am actually writing a paper. In which Latin American countries are the main targets. We are replicating a paper from China and enhancing the methodology, creating a framework. And I was wondering basically if there is a little.
- [Speaker 3] That area, it's kind of novel. And actually the frameworks are borrowed from other areas of study. It's my responsibility to to analyze a counterfactual. For example, you know what happens with the United States, with Europe, etc. if, If that hasn't been done in previous literature, what do you think is necessary or.

- [Diego] That's up to other authors? Yeah. So there are many layers to your question.

10.2 The Response

- [Speaker 1] The best way to get answer to this specific issue that you're talking about. So let me first talk very generic response. Based on you know this 30 second of question how you explain it, This your research, the way you're explaining looks more like the first domain of the three categories that I showed, which is replication with extension. Which is valuable, I'm not saying it's not valuable. As you sort of work on it. There is what I'm arguing is there's this potential to take this paper from this first level to maybe at least next level or even beyond.
- [Speaker 1] Now, That beyond comes by not simply comparing what has been done in United States or China and what has not been done in Latin America because that is simply context. But to explain whether this theoretical explanation, so very broadly, North American context considers a lot of external factors as stable. They do not change. At least they did not change until Trump came along, right? I mean the policies remain pretty standard and same and so on. So that's how North America, like market economy, right? Rules and regulations are very important. As you move from North America to China, You have a context, which is very different from how things operate in North America. Right? In North America you have market-based, China is state-owned, right? Philosophy. Now, as you could argue that these theoretical explanations are still not sufficient because when you're looking at Latin America, you have I'm guessing here I might be wrong You have a hybrid model.
- [Speaker 1] Which is partly market and so partly North American market, partly Chinese market. So state-owned versus you know market-based mechanism. And that challenges the theoretical assumptions, which are put in these two models, because in both the context is considered stable, right? In one case you know CPI, the Chinese you know Communist Party of CPC China remains the same. In the other case, market economy remains the same. But in Latin America, Which leads to the sensitivity estimation. So that could be a way to take it from level one to level two. But a more practical advice to taking this from level one to level two would be, you actually seek what you're seeking, which is an answer to your question. But in more one-on-one settings, Such as by submitting your paper to paper development workshops where you could be paired with one or two people. Many of these workshops are these days available online.
- [Speaker 1] Right. If you attend any of the mainstream North American conferences like AOM or AIB, they have paper development workshops. Anyone

can submit. If you do not have access to these things, these days, these things are much simpler. The topic that you're researching goes back to the previous point. If, you have those five ten scholars who are your role models and 50 papers on which you're sort of friendly, You can write to any of the chair your paper and ask for a one-on-one feedback. Right, not giving up ownership, not even seeking co-authorship. Many of them do not want. They will be more willing to give feedback if you don't seek co-authorship. Right? So that would be, you know, More practical way to advance it, because then only I can actually read your paper, see exactly where it lacks and where it can be enhanced. And potentially, you might even find someone who would be willing to even without being a co-author give you. Step-by-step guidance, which is meeting you not just once, but three - four times over six months as we made progress.

- [Diego] Does that make sense? Any other question? All right, if not, I'm going to.

Chapter 11: Drafting and Execution—A Positivist Paper Structure

11.1 Audience and Relevance

- [Speaker 1] Proceed because this question is also related to this issue of drafting and execution. And this might be, not might be, this will be less relevant for of course people who are more experienced. So uh pardon my uh repetition for your uh, but uh especially for junior scholars, which is what this session is supposedly. Um so this slide is my favorite slide. I I talk about it. You know, every time I talk to doctoral students um and uh, you know, even my junior scholars when I am giving these workshops in emerging markets, why this slide is my favorite slide. This makes our job as.
- [Speaker 1] One type of scholars, Which is those who are working on a positivist research based on some kind of data. So what is positivist research? You have hypothesis, you have data and you are testing those relationships through regression. It could even be qualitative study but again a positivist not inductive. Meaning, you have hypothesis and you have your data through qualitative studies, and you are testing those hypothesis through qualitative.
- [Speaker 1] Now, coming back here, why this framing? You know, why I find this super interesting? Because once I had this, it's like fill in the blanks. It's like you know, I don't know. Middle school project literally where you have these five sections. These five sections are very very defined. You have introduction, which is typically five paragraphs, not more than two and a half pages. Five paragraphs will take two and a half pages. If your paragraph is like a page long,

then it's not a paragraph right? So, five pages, two and a half, you know, pages, what do you have in those? Sorry, five paragraphs, what do you have in those five paragraphs? You have a summary of all of these five sections in those five paragraphs, right? So the introduction of five paragraphs see, it's it becomes very mechanical in the first paragraph. You're talking of what you are studying, right? That's the summary of your whole paper.

- [Speaker 1] Then in the second paragraph and potentially going to the third paragraph, you're summarizing your theory, which is what is the contribution, right? So first, what are you studying? Why, are you studying it? And why it is important to study that is theory. Right. And then the fourth paragraph how are you studying it? That's your methods. And the final paragraph is your contribution. Right. Which is your discussion and conclusion. So what I'm saying is that the five paragraphs of introduction Are essentially summary of your rest of the paper. Now you can develop your paper depending on your preference, in whichever way. Most people will actually start with introduction of those five paragraphs, and they will spend, you know, You will hear people often talking as this is not a uncommon occurrence that I spent like I wrote my introduction even hundred times because I am not even clear what am I contributing?
- [Speaker 1] Am I doing the right thing? And sometimes as you write this introduction, you realize that this is meaningless. Ideally, this realization should not take more than a week. Throw out that paper, Move on to the next project before you go on to the rest of it. In other words, by creating the table of content for your research paper, that's your introduction. Next is theory and hypothesis and I have some details about each of these so I'll go there. Build from established theory, identify the mechanisms so on and so forth. Very clear methods, right? So then, so you have again going back two and a half pages of introduction. Then you have your theory and hypothesis. Typically three to five hypotheses. If you have fewer hypotheses, you have to argue more strongly about the theoretical contribution. If, you have more hypothesis that theoretical contribution sometimes comes in the mechanism that you are putting forward by way of hypothesis.
- [Speaker 1] Each of those hypothesis will take anywhere from two to three pages. So if you're looking at five hypothesis, you're looking at 12 to 13 pages of theory section. Right? So two and a half to three pages of introduction, 12 to 13 pages of theory section. That takes you to about 16 to 17 pages. And then rest is just so mechanical, right? You are like describing your sample, you are describing your variables, Right, you're describing your analysis, then you're describing your results. And then in the conclusion section, discussion and conclusion, you're describing that last paragraph of your introduction in two and a half pages.
- [Speaker 1] Now If I was doing a workshop, I would actually go down. And you know, each of these paragraphs,

- [Diego] For example, your contribution paragraph.
- [Speaker 1] Will have about five to ten sentences. And you can actually read any of the papers which are published. This is not made up from my mind. It's based on the pattern that I recognize. So if you read those contribution sections, you have three to five contributions. That is what you are explaining in your discussion section in much longer way, right? So if you have three contribution, each of those contribution will take one or one to two paragraphs. That's two pages of contributions, right?
- [Speaker 1] One paragraph for summary, and then that's it. So two to three pages. So about 25 pages is all you need for a paper. And then, of course, you have tables and references and so on. If your paper is 25 pages, you are not engaging enough. If your paper is 60 pages, you do not know what you're talking about. So that's where this is like. So if your introduction is not in two and a half pages. Make someone else read it. You know, you don't know what you're talking about. The easiest way to read your own papers, and you know about drafting issues is when you have read it two or three times, and then you read it, pay attention which are the sentences you are skipping.
- [Diego] There will.

Chapter 12: Crafting the Paper and the Role of Contributions

12.1 Avoiding Unread Paragraphs

- Speaker 1: "Be not just sentences," followed by a critique of common practice:
 - Readers often do not read certain paragraphs, especially those that state "in the rest of the paper we do this."
 - Speaker 1's favorite example: "In the rest of the paper we do this." An entire paragraph is spent on such statements, but readers do not read it. No one cares to read it.
 - The point: If you yourself do not read certain parts, expecting others to read them makes the paper "nonsensical engagement."
 - This concern is about crafting.

12.2 Contribution Paragraph: Position, Length, and Focus

- Speaker 1 on contributions:

- Contributions: one paragraph maximum.
- Emphasis on the last paragraph of the introduction as the crux of the paper.
- Target length: about 150 words. If you cannot keep it within this limit, the paper is not focused enough.
- You are only explaining a small phenomenon, not the whole world; clarity is essential.

12.3 Clarity of Argument and Gap Framing

- Speaker 1:
 - If you cannot clearly articulate what you are explaining, it often means you lack a strong argument.
 - Maybe what you are adding does not fill a gap.
 - Key questions: Are you extending, challenging, reconciling? What exactly is the gap being filled? There is “really never a gap or there’s always a gap,” but you need to specify in what ways.
- Diego: “Right? So that’s more descriptive.” “Lead with it, right? The contribution paragraph belongs in.”

12.4 Placement and Theoretical Anchoring

- Speaker 1:
 - Place the contribution paragraph in paragraph three or four, not buried in the discussion.
 - The fourth paragraph is where the contribution belongs.
 - Be specific about which theories you are extending or building on. Do not go beyond two:
 - One main theory, plus contingencies from another if needed.
 - If you have multiple theories, you likely do not know what you are trying to explain.
 - “Does this make sense?”
- Diego: “Ask me any questions if you have.”

Chapter 13: Choosing the Right Journal

13.1 Targeting and Reading the Journal

- Diego: "Choose the right journal, right? Targeting a journal."
- Speaker 1:
 - Importance of choosing the right journal.
 - Loaded question: How often have you submitted a paper to a journal without reading a single article from that journal?
 - If asked to raise hands, people would deny it, but in reality, many submit without reading the journal (perhaps only two or three pages).
 - Then they complain that the paper is "just rejected." Of course it will be rejected; you did not read the journal.

13.2 Journals as Ongoing Conversations

- Speaker 1:
 - Journals link scholars in ongoing conversations around a topic or discipline.
 - You will almost always be a latecomer.
 - Metaphor: A gala dinner where a set of people are already talking; you want to join that group.
 - Two ways to join:
 - Be already well known (can walk into any group).
 - Have something really insightful to contribute.
 - If you are not well known, you need to bring insight; otherwise, you will feel out of place and others will show you off, making you out of place.

13.3 Preparation via Reading and ChatGPT

- Speaker 1:
 - To participate, first know what they are talking about.
 - Best way: Read the journal.

- In the world of ChatGPT (to be discussed later), this is not a big exercise.
- Read the last three years of what the journal has published on your topic.
- This might seem humongous, but:
 - Identifying papers: ~30 minutes of work with ChatGPT.
 - Summarizing and getting a good sense: another hour.
 - Then go deep beyond ChatGPT: half a day or a full day.
- In other words, you can do all of this in a day.
- If you are too lazy to spend one day, and cannot participate in mainstream conversations (papers get rejected), then we should agree we did not deserve it.
- Do not be lazy and blame something else.

13.4 Conferences and Editorial Positioning

- Speaker 1:
 - First step: conference submissions (regional conferences wherever you can go).
 - Target journals are actively looking for emerging markets research.
 - Read editorial statements and editor's pieces carefully.
 - Bring them into your introduction to show the editor you paid attention and positioned the paper according to the journal's needs.

13.5 R&R (Revise and Resubmit) as Near Acceptance

- Speaker 1:
 - "Let's forget about this selection for plenty of reasons we all know them. But R and R someone told me when I was in a doctoral program, one of my professors that R and R is just nearly as good as acceptance."
 - If you do everything asked, R&R is like acceptance.
 - Legitimate reasons might prevent doing certain things, possibly leading to rejection, which is fair.
 - More often than not, R&R is like acceptance.
 - Senior successful scholars often say their success rate post-R&R is 80–90%, very different from low general acceptance rates.

- Why? Because you take R&R seriously and add clear points to the process.

13.6 Treat Reviewers as Readers, Not Adversaries

- Speaker 1:
 - Treat reviewers as readers, not adversaries.
 - Good journals have good reviewers interested in your research and in helping you advance.
 - They are looking to accept papers, not reject them.
 - Fatal flaws will not be accepted.

13.7 Fatal Flaws and Journal Realism

- Speaker 1:
 - Example of a fatal flaw: single wave survey research attempting to establish causality between explanatory and dependent variables.
 - Most top journals will not accept such a design; causality cannot be established.
 - It's unclear what should be the independent or dependent variable with single-respondent, single-wave surveys.
 - If that is your research, be realistic about the type of journal to target.
 - This ties back to targeting the right journal.

13.8 Reading Past Three Years to Assess Fit

- Speaker 1:
 - Read the past three years of the journal you are targeting.
 - If you cannot identify at least five papers similar to your work (methods, phenomenon), your work does not belong there.
 - Either it is too novel or not novel enough.
 - People often claim journals are not taking good quality work and theirs is the best, hence not published. Speaker 1: supportive of "self happiness," but that's not how it works.
 - Identify three to five similar papers in methods and phenomenon.

- Next step: How is your work different from theirs?

13.9 Too Many or Too Few Similar Papers

- Speaker 1:
 - If you find 50 papers on what you are studying in the journal, you are doing something already done.
 - Back to the core point: What is rigorous research? There is no clear answer.
 - Rigorous research is the research that is published.
 - Reading one to three years of work in that journal helps identify what is rigorous for that journal, as standards vary.

13.10 Standards Vary Across Journals

- Speaker 1:
 - Something rigorous for one journal (e.g., strategic management top journal) may be basic for ASQ.
 - If you have a CCSM-type or JBM-type article and send it to AMJ, there might be a fundamental mismatch.
 - Utilize methods suited to the question, not just the methods you can do.

13.11 Data Access and Method-Phenomenon Fit

- Speaker 1:
 - Not having access to data is less of an excuse now; you virtually have access to any type of data using advanced technological tools, AI, Python, etc.
 - Be sure to understand your phenomenon.
 - “All of these things I talked about it. I’m going to skip this example.”
[Transition to an example paper.]

Chapter 14: Example: CEO Extroversion and CEO Pay (Theory Building)

14.1 Overview of the Paper Example

- Speaker 1:
 - A paper in which he helped authors (not as a co-author), later published in AMR.
 - “We released our kind of safety.” [Unintelligible]
 - “I should have taken authorship. But in any case.”
 - First step: describe independent and dependent variables.

14.2 Variables and Baseline Relationship

- Independent variable: CEO extroversion (how extrovert the CEO is). There is substantial literature on CEO extroversion; define it.
- Dependent variable: CEO annual total pay.
- One could argue a positive relationship between an extrovert CEO and the pay they get.
- Diego: “CEO and the pay that they get, right?”
- Speaker 1: You could argue negative; look at the literature.

14.3 Extending to Mechanisms (Mediators)

- Speaker 1 and Diego:
 - To build theory, extend the mechanism: From extroversion to pay via mediating processes.
 - Diego: “How does extraversion even lead to CEO pay? So mediating mechanisms, right? What do extrovert CEOs do that lead them to get more paid?”
 - Mechanism examples:
 - Extrovert CEOs may get more offers; more marketability; better matching.
 - Extrovert CEOs may get more seats on other boards; increases marketability.
 - Two mediating relationships proposed:
 - CEO extroversion → CEO board network → CEO pay (no direct relationship).
 - CEO extroversion → more external offers → CEO pay.

14.4 Elaborating the Mechanism Chain

- Speaker 1:
 - Potential moderating relationships also considered; then correction:
 - “Sorry let me go back.”
 - Expanded mechanism chain:
 - CEO extroversion → board membership → outside job opportunities → high bargaining power → more pay.
 - Now you are unpacking the mechanism.

14.5 Novelty within a Well-Studied Area

- Speaker 1:
 - The paper is not “old.” The relation between CEO extroversion and pay is well studied.
 - This mechanism identification was published in 2024.
 - Even in very standard areas, you can find opportunities to contribute.

14.6 Moderators and Contingencies

- Speaker 1:
 - Identify moderating variables:
 - Example: Gender moderates the relationship among CEO extroversion, board network, and pay.
 - Who has more access to board networks, men versus women?
 - Argument: Men CEOs generally have higher pay than women CEOs at the same extroversion level.
 - Possible reason: Men secure more board seats, leading to higher marketability and bargaining power.
 - Contextual variation:
 - CEO extroversion × Gender → network positions → CEO pay.
 - Extend mechanisms and identify contingencies at multiple levels:
 - Micro (individual), group, firm, industry, extreme macro (country).

- Example context: Latin America; contingencies at various levels can alter relationships.
- Opportunities:
 - Extend by showing relationships do not hold under certain contingencies.
 - Reconcile findings by incorporating contingencies.

Chapter 15: Building a Research Identity —Programmatic Research

15.1 Thematic Focus and Programmatic Research

- Speaker 1:
 - “This is where we started, right? Building a research identity is about thematic focus.”
 - Example theme: CEO extroversion and pay.
 - With the variables and relations:
 - You could produce at least five to ten papers by exploring different moderators and mediators.
 - The discussed paper was a theory paper; testing it could yield five to ten empirical papers.

15.2 Data Strategy and Framework Before Collection

- Speaker 1:
 - Before collecting data, think through the framework to cover multiple mechanisms and moderators.
 - Collect data on multiple elements, not just CEO extroversion and pay.
 - Feasible with modern methods:
 - Text analysis of letters to shareholders.
 - Other technological tools to gather rich data without ten-page surveys.

- A doctoral student could spend two years collecting such data to set up a research identity, then translate into papers.

15.3 Partnerships and Networks

- Speaker 1:
 - “What do you bring to partnership? What are your, you know.”
 - Third thing: partnership, about developing network relationships.
 - “I am going to skip this.”
 - “I am also cognizant of the time.”

Chapter 16: Doctoral Planning and Progress Milestones

16.1 First Year: Idea Generation and Flexibility

- Speaker 1:
 - Plan for those starting, especially doctoral students.
 - First year:
 - Concretize dissertation idea.
 - Develop one conference paper by end of first year.
 - Flexibility:
 - You may start with set ideas and realize they do not take you far; do not take too long to realize this.
 - Encourage bringing multiple ideas every week and discarding them next week for at least six months.
 - Generate maybe a hundred or more ideas.
 - Recognize which are meaningless, not doable, impractical, or already done.
 - Modern approach:
 - Write your idea in 10 words, put it on Google, quickly assess feasibility, how much research exists, scope of contribution.

- If none: move on.
- Data constraints:
 - If an idea requires inaccessible data, it is not working; keep it in the back burner.

16.2 Long-Term Idea Persistence and Data Opportunities

- Speaker 1:
 - Personal example:
 - Published a paper last year in a top journal.
 - Had written the whole paper, including analysis, in 2006.
 - When submitted back then, feedback was that data was too weak.
 - Found the right data two years ago; published the paper now using new data.
 - Lesson: You may stay with some ideas; opportunities can arise later.

16.3 Second and Third Year: Submissions and Collaborations

- Speaker 1:
 - Second year/third year:
 - Submit your first paper.
 - Start developing your second paper.
 - Think of collaboration; reach out to role models or extensions of role models as identified in the literature you are reading.
 - Graduate with at least two to three submissions (“three plus submissions” would be optimistic).
 - At least one accepted paper, even if not in a top journal, to establish long-term identity.

16.4 Identity as a Career Question

- Speaker 1:

- Concluding prompt: “Right. And this this is a question that you have to ask yourself, Do you want identity or.” [Unintelligible]

Chapter 17: AI Use, Language Barriers, and Ethics in Publishing

17.1 Diego’s Opening Prompt

- [Diego] “What kind of identity do you want for yourself in India? Um, all right. Let me uh yeah,”

17.2 Speaker 1 on AI Use in Research: Position and Rationale

- [Speaker 1] “This is I think this is interesting because we have also in a lot of discussion on this AI in this context, which I was very happy to see a lot of panelsum, A lot of journals are putting forth agenda to be, We have several editorials as well as papers on how to use AI and how much to use AI. I have to say there is wide variation here. I am of the camp which is pro-AI, which is as much as you can use. And part of it is coming from my own experiences, you know, Coming from a context where English English is probably third or fourth language for me, right? I mean my children don’t understand when I speak with them in English.”
- [Speaker 1] “They say that your extent is too thick. So this is discriminatory in the sense that if you don’t have language expertise, that means keep journals published. Of course, English language papers, AI can help us, right? That is not to generate arguments. That is to literally if you want to speed up the process, synthesize the literature or you want to polish your language absolutely. But polishing the language is again not asking AI to write your theory section. Polishing the languages that you have these 10 lines, which are already written, maybe in poor English, right? You are then feeding those 10 lines into whatever LLM you like and just asking it. Can you polish the language? And when the output is coming, you are again reading it and figuring out. Oh, this not what I want to say. Yes, this, you know, AI is saying it, but this absolutely absurd. This not so again, going back and changing in your own words and then feeding it that’s line of polishing.”
- [Speaker 1] “In my assessment, this is totally legitimate. Some journals will still expect you to be transparent about it and acknowledge, and there’s no harm in acknowledging that you used, for instance, ChatGPT for language polishing.

That's very fair rather than hiding. Data analysis and support again as much as you can, especially if you do qualitative data and you have these huge transcripts, you can use You know, ChatGPT to sort of analyze those transcripts, you know, video interviews and so on. But that's not to replace your voice, right? I mean, it's a tool which is working as an assistant rather than rather than replacing you in the process. Right? So so that's my perspective on the use of AI. All legitimate. Very important to be very transparent about it. I'll talk of this tomorrow also for those who will not be tomorrow. Right now we are being involved in a."

17.3 Ethics Violation Case and AI Hallucinations

- [Speaker 1] "Examination ethics violation very senior scholars, very top scholars right in the field. Their papers have come under investigation. Uh because they have fabricated references right now, this they did not do fabricated references. Anyone you ask, they would not, you know, but they partnered with people and someone provided responsibilities. Everyone, right? That's not the. That's not the basis. Now, this may end up in the papers being retracted, which is a blot for the rest of them. At least it will result in a correction being published, which is still, you know, quite a bit of reputational damage. That is one of the reasons many senior scholars that you actually reach out to would be very happy to give you feedback as actively as they want, but they may be reluctant to co-author with you until unless they have absolute trust on who you are."
- [Speaker 1] "So nothing to feel personal about it. It's just the nature of enterprise, because you know, this, this junior person, whom these guys were trying to help just fabricated, fabricated the references, three of them which do not exist. It's I don't know if you use chat, How much have you used? But I have found in several instances chat GPT fabricating, my own references and I am able to see it because oh, wow, I wrote this paper. You know where is this paper? This does not exist. Right, so this hallucination is real. And if, for instance, If you use ChatGPT to write your references, and if you had put a disclaimer that ChatGPT was used to clean and create the reference list, Then you have something to fall back, even though the response rate is still yours. But you acknowledge ahead of time that this mistake might have been made by right. So this is where disclosures are really important, I feel like."
- [Speaker 1] "Right. But again, it's a matter of choice. As an editor, my perspective is that this has to rest with the authors. I should not force something that I cannot you know police right? So if there is no way for me to assess, How do I force you to declare that you have not used the chat GPT? There's also an O B S P P article, which actually did show that if you declare that you have used ChatGPT, there's negative perception about the quality of the work. So, you know, there is like legitimate basis one could argue not to

disclose. We never disclosed when we use those research assistance to the literature search in the library. That's how it is. So it's a gray area but I'm just sharing my perspective on this."

Chapter 18: Session Scope, Time, and Takeaways

18.1 Session Goals and Time

- [Speaker 1] "For the next few days, this is what you're going to be, yeah. Think of, you know, like in terms of contribution. When you are going to talk, it's an elevator pitch. What is your research about? What is the context and how does it contribute to future regimens? Um I think it's one and a half hours. We are pretty much right. Okay. So I'm going to stop I was going to give my own example, but that's a boring one in any case. So uh. I am going to stop here and open the floor for any remaining questions."

18.2 Explicit Takeaways

- [Speaker 1] "These Were the takeaways: context as an argument, sharing must provide data, generalizability is the goal, build relationships strategically. Right the way editors we rejection is information, not rejection. Sometimes it's information that it's not the right fit. Sometimes it's information. Most of the times. It's information. It's not a right fit because fit is not just about you know topic. It's also about quality if you're submitting your article to a journal, which is expecting much higher quality, then it's not a right fit so rejection is uh information."
- [Speaker 1] "It makes sense to invest on research identity."
- [Diego] "The question is, are you ready for that investment? Thank you. Any questions, comments, observations? Yeah."
- [Diego] "Good afternoon. You."

Chapter 19: Q&A – What Makes a Good Research Question?

19.1 Audience Question on Good Questions

- [Speaker 4] “Referred the importance of a good question. I am going to ask about that. What do you think that makes a good question? Because I hear from every person in the academic world the importance of that, but, I would like to hear from you the structure of a good question or maybe what makes a question a good one.”

19.2 Speaker 1’s Framework: Relevance and Rigor (R&R)

- [Speaker 1] “Yeah, there’s no short response to that, but you know there’s this word in research process R and R, right? Which is revise and resubmit. Another translation of that revise and resubmit is relevance and rigor, right? So, from my perspective, the question has to be relevant. Right? And what I mean by relevant is that over time certain issues become less relevant. So that’s also about the importance of topics over time. So if I were to talk international business for instance in particular, A lot of research, including my own career, was built on understanding the mode of entry into foreign markets, you know ownership levels in foreign markets. That’s how.”
- [Speaker 1] “A lot of IB research is started. I think that question is not a good question anymore because we have already done a lot of research on that. But that leads to the second point which is rigor. Now, SMJ, I think two years ago again published the same, You know, there was an article published on the same question, which was SBO, and they used multiple data to challenge, right? So in a very rigorous way, they challenged the assumptions and findings of certain studies. And came up with alternative explanations and so on. So even very beaten down questions could be good questions if they are studied in a very rigorous way. So that’s a very broad response, But again, it’s still going back to the previous point, which is how to identify this question. There are some simple ways and there are more than complex ways. A simple way is if you can frame your question in just 5 - 10 words, which is the title of your topic.”
- [Speaker 1] “And, you put that title these days in LLM model and ask is this question right? Llm can you know sort of give you some idea, like who has studied them and so on. In, the previous world, we would actually put them on Google Scholar and see just that topic, right? How much of research has been done in leading journals, right. And, that’s the part of literature review because then you may have to move beyond. And your research question let’s say it’s on entrepreneurship, you had three top journals in entrepreneurship, Go back past one year or two years and see what is, you know, others have done and that will help you understand whether this question is good or not. Broadly again relevance and rigor is important. Rigor is not just in terms of methods, rigor is also most fundamentally in terms of making theoretical contribution,

whether it's advancing identifying the boundary conditions, challenging the assumptions like some of those things but yeah."

- [Diego] "Not sure if that, Is zero is the answer. Trust me, we keep at it all the time."

19.3 Example: Three-Year Journey from Weak to Accepted Paper

- [Speaker 1] "Three years ago, One of my doctoral students came up with a paper, and we submitted that paper to conference, and the paper was rejected at the conference, right? And you know, we would share and that paper was pretty weak paper to begin with. The question we were asking was not very important question. But as the first layer, which is, you know, replication, it was I thought relevant and interesting. And then, you know, looking at the same data and similar datasets we started asking other questions, you know doing some other analysis. And, then we came up, can we combine these two so that we can theoretically extend? It took three years from that first paper, which was already developed to reach at this stage, where that paper has been just very recently accepted actually."
- [Speaker 1] "Which is a top journal for international business field. So it was a, you know, good outcome but it takes time to, uh, yeah. I mean, you know, especially if you are studying topics which are well studied already."

Chapter 20: Q&A – Timing, Methods Expertise, and Student Pressures

20.1 Audience Question on Timing, Projects, and Student Constraints

- [Speaker 5] "Thank you very much Professor Gaur. Uh I think we all really enjoyed your session. My question has to do with timing with the length of working in a project. Especially with PhD students, even master students. They have a specific timeline. They have to do a certain project in a couple of months. And I fully agree with you in the sense that we kind of like doing a good project is actually faster, but with them."
- [Speaker 5] "Can, you give us a little bit of words of hope here, because I think that they are somehow rushing and and it's not quality, which is rather like,"

20.2 Speaker 1's Advice: Advisors, Data Access, and Methods Mastery

- [Speaker 1] "Yeah, yeah, very important question, because that pressure comes from multiple directions. One is, of course, the time of completing the program, right? Uh. Sometimes this pressure also comes uh from the people with whom you are working, right. And and some of these things can become out of control. This is why it's very important really to. You always do not have choice to choose your advisors, right? But in your mind, you can start working with someone else and develop some other connections through which you can work. I'll give you my own examples, right? So I went to and maybe I was lucky in many ways. When I joined the PhD program, I went to this person and I said, "I want to work with you." And his response was very straightforward that "Listen if you work with me, I am on this XYZ rules as vice dean and so on. Your process will be very slow.""
- [Speaker 1] "Go this two steps down, you know there's this new person. He seems to have a lot of fire in him, and maybe you will be much faster in your work, even though you will not get as much reputational advantage as you will working with. So work with the person for a month, figure out and you can come back. This was an advice which I think was super helpful. I went to like a very junior professor. This professor had a lot of data which he shared with me. So I did not have to collect the data for my very first paper. And, the two papers that I published in PSD were basically part of the term papers for two courses, which I did in the first two semesters. So it was pretty helpful, right? But the time that it takes more is often in data gathering if you do not have access to good data. One way through which this time can be squeezed is to become, let me be very honest, if you want to."
- [Speaker 1] "Be a future leader in this field. There is no shortcut to become an expert in methods, because with the advancements in AI and new techniques, which are coming and the speed with which people are working on those topics, If you're not expert in, for example, Python coding and you know extraneous data collection, A process that will take you a year is something that someone can do in a week. So, how will you compete with the person who's doing that in a week versus someone who has done it in a year? Andres, You would remember the painstaking data collection that we had to do in those projects. Took you almost a year because there was no, you know, two years, right? To do that. Nowadays that data analysis can be done in 10 days. Right? So uh, yeah. I mean in present times, if you are not an expert in using advanced analytic tools, not just AI, then uh you would find it very difficult at."
- [Speaker 1] "At the same time, if you are, The timing is actually much less of a challenge right now than what it was five years ago."
- [Diego] "Correct. Yeah, thank you professor."

20.3 Audience Comment on Data Familiarity and Slides

- [Speaker 6] "I'm going to ask a question. But yeah, follow up is that also, we had the chance to get to know the data more. Now it's faster and you know your database a lot less. I don't know, I feel like doing it like the way I did it was, More enriching, but that's another issue. So again, thank you for the talk. It was amazing. Please share the slides or I'll come to get it. Okay, And the question is two questions, maybe related is do we really get more contextual? Do we really need an identity in Latin America because."
- [Speaker 6] "It might be harder, like in the US you really you really see that, you know, you need to show that you have, you know, are known and it's hyper competitive. But maybe here could be slightly different? Or is this a universal thing that everybody has to reach? So an academic identity. That's a question. Like an academic regardless of the region should, Aim to have that. That's the first question. The second one is also kind of related, is that here we have an option of okay, do I publish top journal A, you know ANJ or SMJ or JIPs? That will take me several years where I publish several B papers that will give me tenure, you know give me full professorship easily. You know schools here value."
- [Speaker 6] "Quantity more than quality. So how do we build an identity with quantity over quality? You know, the context changes a little bit. So what's your insight on this?"

Chapter 21: Q&A – Identity, Context, and Publication Strategy

21.1 Speaker 1 on Identity Across Contexts and Trade-offs

- [Speaker 1] "Thank you. Yeah, no, Very relevant questions. Because you know, I originally come from India. And you know, the similar type of pressures are faced. Just, a small point about the previous timing issue again with respect to the research that was done in the past. I used to use a copy editor, whom I had to book one month in advance. And then this person will take another two weeks or three weeks to get back. So the lead time used to be two months, right? And oftentimes when I send the paper and I'm expecting the reviews to come back in two months or in three months time, I'll book this copy editor ahead of time, right? To improve my language. I can do all of this nowadays in

much better way in just one day. Of course, I have to sit for the whole day, Put one sentence at a time, and you know, correct it and check and so on.”

- [Speaker 1] “But you know, that’s about shortening the idea. But yeah, this question, you know, does everyone need to sign in? So it’s a philosophical question at one level which is what gives you happiness. You have to sort of figure out for yourself. You know fishing sitting at the. But if you are in this enterprise I think identity is important and rewarding. Regardless of the context, the question is what type of identity, right? And different contexts may value different types of identities. So for instance, It may not simply be AMJ identity that you need to have in North American context as you are identifying or pointing out that publishing multiple papers in these Nobel outlets might still be valuable. And that’s a path you might want to pursue.”
- [Speaker 1] “Which is in some sense fair, but before you go that route, You still need to ask yourself this question : Is this something that is all I want to do for myself? Or do I want to go beyond this? And if your answer is that I want to go beyond this, then you could be little bit more systematic and careful about the process. Because again, I don’t know Latin American context totally, but my sense is that if you publish let’s say an SMJ, Versus you published five articles in, let me pick my journal JWB, which is not so low but still right. So if you publish one SNJ or one AMJ, I believe institutions will reward you and not throw you out. You know they may not make you full professor. Maybe five JWPs will make your full professor. Right? One AMJ may not but.”
- [Speaker 1] “But, you will still get rewarded so much so that you will not just be no one in that institutional setup. That’s my sense. That is the situation in India, right? For sure, you can publish one AMJL, you can reap that benefits for a longer period of time. And so therefore if that is your objective, That is you want to move beyond just immediate context and thinking ahead of time. And that means making some sacrifices, which is maybe delaying your full professorship by a few years. And maybe pursuing this path because let’s say you fail, right? Failure is very common. You fail in this path, you always have the backup option, right? But if you start at a midway, then you start going down. If you don’t succeed at a midway, then going up would be relatively more challenging. Not, just because you are harming your identity in some sense, but also because the type of skills that you will develop will not be suitable for that next level of success.”
- [Speaker 1] “The type of data that you will collect, the type of network that you will build will be different. So, that’s in terms of research identity local versus global. But yeah, I agree. In many of these contexts India, including, for instance, one could actually have a very strong identity simply in terms of policy advice, Engaging with the local firms, governments and so on and actually not doing any meaningful publication at all. Which is maybe legitimate, you know, maybe that will be happiness. But that’s a yeah. Or yeah, writing cases and teaching cases. Sure. Becoming a good teacher. So. So those are all you know,

sort of choices that we have to make for ourselves. All I can say is that there is, you know, if I were to say that all of this is totally fine, I would be lying. I think there is clear hierarchy in in the profession, and uh in most contexts. Research hierarchy is you know higher?"

- [Speaker 1] "In terms of identity, but maybe it's different. If I may add."

21.2 Speaker 3 on Hiring Criteria and FT50

- [Speaker 3] "Something to this point, if you check the call for applicants in different universities, Some of them are asking that you publish or are in the track to publish in FT 50 journals."
- [Speaker 1] "Some Others not. So, it is also where you see yourself in the medium long term. I want to be part of the faculty of a triple accredited university or school. You must follow one path because those schools value more these kind of journals. But in Latin America in general, in our context, you say:"
- [Speaker 1] "Publish three or four B journals and that's it. So we just want you to be active in publications, no matter the quality or the ranking of the journal. Two journals works fine."
- [Speaker 3] "For Latin American universities, not for Europe, not for US. So, it is a matter of where you want to be in the medium and long term. Well, that's my."
- [Diego] "Thank You very much."

Conclusion

This multi-part lecture and seminar emphasized developing a clear research identity that others can articulate when you leave the room, built through thematic focus, contextual claims, methodological signature, and a coherent publication trajectory. Key points included:

- Identify role models (five to ten scholars) in your field and study their pathways and pitfalls.
- Prioritize "theory first": use Latin American contexts as theoretical leverage to sharpen mechanisms, reveal boundary conditions, and contribute to broader conversations.
- Recognize three contextualization models: replication with extension (boundary conditions), extending theory to new phenomena (e.g., micro-entrepreneurship, multilatinas, hypercompetition under turbulence), and most ambitiously, challenging and overturning existing theory.

- Plan and execute papers with a disciplined, positivist structure: a five-paragraph introduction (~2.5 pages), 12–13 pages of theory and hypotheses (three to five hypotheses), followed by methods, results, and a 2–3 page discussion/conclusion—targeting ~25 pages total.
- Craft concise, early contribution paragraphs (~150 words), anchor in one or two theories, and avoid unread filler sections.
- Choose journals by reading the past three years to understand ongoing conversations, standards of rigor, and fit; treat R&R as near acceptance and reviewers as readers and collaborators; avoid fatal design flaws.
- Use modern tools, including AI, responsibly and transparently for language polishing and qualitative assistance, while remaining vigilant about ethics (e.g., fabricated references, AI hallucinations).
- For doctoral students: aggressively generate and prune ideas in the first six months, collect data strategically to fuel a decade-long agenda, collaborate without surrendering ownership, and aim for multiple submissions by years two and three.
- Consider regional contexts and career goals when building identity: high-prestige outlets (AMJ/SMJ) yield durable benefits; multiple B-level publications may meet local tenure requirements; FT50 expectations vary across institutions. Alternative identities (policy advisory, teaching, cases) are legitimate based on personal goals, but research prestige typically ranks higher in professional hierarchy.

The session included practical examples (e.g., institutional voids, corporate governance, socioeconomic wealth in family firms, SOEs), an illustrative theory-building case on CEO extroversion and pay, and actionable strategies for positioning Latin American research to travel theoretically in mainstream conversations.