



Editorial

Asian Business & Management (2005) 4, 3–4. doi:10.1057/palgrave.abm.9200122

How is a journal to be evaluated? By the size of the society responsible for its production? The number of its subscribers? Its publishing history? Or its ranking in journal citation impact indexes?

All of these criteria contribute to an overall evaluation of a journal, but surely the true worth of a publication rests on the quality of the ideas and perspectives conveyed through the material it publishes and how the journal as a whole addresses the theoretical and empirical issues outlined in its editorial policy. Our policy at *ABM* reflects that perspective.

We evaluate the papers we receive by various yardsticks, such as the importance of the topic, originality of approach and findings, soundness of scholarship, level of interest and relevance for our readers, quality of structure, depth and strength of argument and clarity of expression. Among these, ‘importance of topic’ and ‘originality of approach’ are especially crucial in our assessment of a paper’s value, though other factors in the overall impact of the paper are naturally also taken into consideration.

On a more general level, journals reflect the intellectual interests and orientations of their contributors. At *ABM*, we publish about 20 papers a year, comprising around 20–25 authors from 10 to 15 countries; our writers are drawn from a wide cross-section of international academia, and their individual perspectives range from mainstream managerialism to broad critical approaches. In methodology, our papers tend to be either qualitative/contextual or quantitative/positivist.

In 2004 alone, topics addressed have included macro-economy (from a critical perspective), transfer of management practices, corporate governance/competitiveness, corporate social responsibility, production systems, employment/management systems, information technology, capital cost/financial policy, political economy/ideology, multi-national corporations, stakeholders, inter-corporate relations, technology policy, politics/bureaucracy, export strategy and more.

Qualitative/contextual papers account for 70 per cent of all papers received, and generally reflect, explicitly or implicitly, consciously or unconsciously, the authors’ underlying motivations. A common motivation is the quest for sources of competitiveness, either at the micro-corporate or macro-national level, and this motivation is encouraged by the dynamics of globalization, a phenomenon which is manifest in the selection of topics as well as approaches.



The influence of globalization on social and academic awareness is particularly felt in topics such as ‘corporate governance’, ‘transfer of management practice’ and other kinds of comparative study. As well as responding to the practical needs of multinational corporations, such studies are useful in identifying the logic of the correlations between different phenomena and will also contribute to advancing our knowledge and understanding of management *per se*.

A key question for *ABM*, however, is how to appreciate the contribution of the modern paradigm of managerialism — and then go beyond it. The framework of managerialism tends to limit us to studies of company competitiveness, efficiency and profitability, but today’s socio-economic circumstances urge us to adopt a broader and more encompassing social viewpoint — to push forward with a thorough re-evaluation of the place and role of corporate logic and other dynamics in contemporary society. Should research proceed further on the conventional premises of competitiveness, efficiency and profitability? How can themes and perspectives be introduced that will shed new light on existing and emerging issues in the human environment, redefining them in such a way as to confer more meaningful values to our research issues and agenda?

More concretely, we see the contextual issues that face us all as concerning the wider social relevance of business studies — issues like the environment, ethics, war, and the general social, global political and economic backdrop in Asia. What kinds of perspective and approaches are required if we want to incorporate these issues, and will such attempts enrich or dilute our understanding of business and management ?

In an attempt to address such issues, we will soon be issuing various ‘calls for papers’ on our *ABM* homepage. These, we hope, will be thematically and theoretically challenging and will stimulate thinking and ideas towards opening new research frontiers in Asia. So please keep an eye on our homepage — www.palgrave-journals.com/abm! I look forward to the continuing company of all of you on our journey towards creating a new frontier of learning — a quest that will determine the value of *ABM* in the years to come.

Finally, our thanks go once again to those who have lent their support to *ABM* over the past year, and especially to those anonymous reviewers who have so helpfully worked with our contributors.

Harukiyo Hasegawa
General Editor