[redacted] CONTINUED

05-Mar-96	In a novel ruling, Federal District Court Judge Jack B. Weinstein in Brooklyn, New York, says that victims of handgun violence may proceed with a lawsuit against the firearms industry to discover whether it failed to take adequate steps to prevent weapon sales to illegal buyers like teenagers. Several legal experts said the current case appeared to be the first that involves the industry's marketing practices.
01-Jan-96	Davis Industries files bankruptcy, alleging too many lawsuits.
01-Jan-95	Ms. Elisa Barnes files a lawsuit against the gun industry on behalf of Mrs. Hamilton. This case is known as the *Hamilton* case.
01-May-94	Pettit & Martin takes gun manufacturer to court.
28-Feb-94	Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act, requiring a five-day waiting period for the purchase of a handgun, goes into effect.
30-Nov-93	The Brady bill is signed into law by President Clinton. The law was named after former White House Press Secretary James Brady, who was shot in the head during the 1981 assassination attempt on President Ronald Reagan. James Brady's wife, Sarah, heads Handgun Control Inc. (HCI), a highly influential 400,000-member organization that lobbies against gun ownership.
01-Jan-93	Shooting erupts in the law firm of Pettit & Martin, leaving several dead.
01-Jan-87	The Firearm Owners Protection Law repeals cross-state firearm sales prohibition (19- Jun-1968).
01-Jan-72	Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (ATF) is created from a division within the IRS.
19-Jun-68	The Omnibus Crime Control & Safe Street Act, signed by President Johnson, prohibits firearm sales to criminals, fugitives, mentally incompetent persons, drug addicts, and illegal aliens. Cross-state firearm sales are also prohibited.
01-Jan-34	Federal controls are imposed on machine guns, sawed-off shotguns, and other dangerous devices by the National Firearms Act.
01-Jan-33	An assassination attempt is made on President Franklin Roosevelt.
01-Feb-14	The St. Valentine's Day massacre by underworld gangsters causes an uproar from citizens to curtail guns.
01-Jan-11	New York City passes the Sullivan law, which required a police permit for both owning and carrying a gun, after an attempted assassination of the governor of New York.

QUESTIONS

1. What is the controversy regarding "gun control" in the U.S.?
2. Who is "winning" (stands to gain) and who is "losing" (more likely to suffer) in this controversy?
3. Looking at the evolution of laws and litigation on gun control, what insights do you gain?
4. Are guns (firearms) a "dangerous" product like cigarettes? Explain.
5. Why has Colt managed to survive and succeed in its business? What does the company need to be concerned about now? Why?
6. Explain your position on private citizens being able to buy and use firearms.

CASE 12
WOMEN IN PUBLIC ACCOUNTING (AND OTHER PROFESSIONS): GENDER AND WORKPLACE OBSTACLES

The accounting profession has seen rapid growth in the percentage and number of women entering the profession over the past 15 years. However, this increase has not been appropriately reflected in the number of women who have penetrated the higher echelons of accounting firms, particularly the Big Six firms. Also, although a growing number of women are entering the profession, a significant number of women are leaving.

The retention of talented Certified Public Accountants (CPAs), many of whom are women, has become a critical issue for the Big Six. Firms allot a sizable amount of money to recruit, train, and develop CPAs. Deloitte and Touche noted that "companies that lose women employees recoup no long-term payback on their recruiting and training dollars, and there is no pot of gold at the end of the learning curve."[1] It is widely agreed that CPA firms that do not respond to the needs of increasing numbers of women will find themselves at a competitive disadvantage in the near future. As Joanne Alter observed, "Public accounting is a game of finding and keeping top talent. Half of that talent happens to be female. If we can keep these top people, we're at a competitive advantage."[2]

In 1977, 28 percent of all graduating accounting students were female. In 1991, that percentage increased to 50 percent.[3] By the year 2000, 60 percent of the entrants into the accounting profession will be female. However, in 1983, only 1 percent of partners and principals in what were then the Big Nine were women.[4] In 1990, the percentage had increased only to 3 percent, and was estimated to be about 5 percent in 1990 in the Big Six.[5]

Initially, one might conclude that the lack of women at the top may be the result of a time lag. It generally takes 10 to 12 years to be promoted to partner in the Big Six. Women began to permeate the profession just about 10 or 12 years ago. However, it does not appear that a time lag explains the low percentage of female partners. Accounting firms hired men and women in equal ratios during the 1980s; yet, after six to eight years, only two women remain for every three men in the same accounting class.[6] In addition, the American Women's Society of CPAs estimates that less than 20 percent of managerial positions are held by women; yet 40 percent of all women CPAs have been in the field for at least ten years.[7] In the CPA

Personnel Report, an annual survey of women in public accounting in 2001 found that 12.8 percent of partner-level positions at the nation's largest firms were occupied by women. This represents an increase of 11.7 percent over 2000. (Women's share of partnerships at large firms rises to 12.8%. Oct. 2001. *CPA Managing Partner Report* [Atlanta], 5.) These statements indicate the following: first, that women are leaving the profession after only a few years; and second, that those who stay are not being promoted at the same rate as men.

Until recently, there was little written on the issue of retention and promotion of women CPAs. However, during the last five years, an increasing number of surveys and articles have been published that address reasons why women are leaving the profession. There is also a growing awareness of this problem.

In 1984, the Accounting Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) Future Issues Committee identified the upward mobility of women in public accounting as one of the 14 major issues facing the profession. As a result, the Upward Mobility of Women Special Committee was formed and charged with identifying obstacles to the upward mobility of women CPAs and with recommending strategies to eliminate these obstacles in order to promote upward mobility of women in public accounting. This report was submitted to the AICPA Board of Directors in March 1988. Since then, several articles and studies have been published. Most of the literature appears in the national trade journals such as the *Journal of Accountancy* and the *Ohio CPA Journal*, as well as more regional publications.

Issues

The first issue raised is, Why are women leaving public accounting firms? One theory is that the profession is perceived by women to be irreconcilable with having a family. A 1989 New York Society of Public Accountants study demonstrated that 45 percent of more than 800 women CPAs surveyed found family responsibilities incompatible with their career in their present firm under its current policies.[8] Additionally, a 1988 survey conducted by the American Women's Society of CPAs suggested that the main reason women leave public accounting is scheduling demands that negatively impact their family life. Results from an industry survey showed that "about one third of the respondents indicated that their careers have had some adverse effect on either their marriages or on opportunities to marry . . . several [respondents] indicated that job considerations (such as overtime and stress) had influenced the decision not to have children."[9]

When the Management of Accounting Practice Committee of the AICPA asked a staff sample if they believed they could simultaneously attain partnership and be a parent, the results were startling. Eighty-one percent of the men surveyed said yes, while only 41 percent of the women said yes.

Stress

Another factor that is thought to impact women CPAs' decision to leave public accounting is stress. A study published by the National Society of Public Accountants in 1983 found that women faced greater stress than men in the workplace. Women perceived that they were constantly being scrutinized by upper management—mainly male—and consequently they felt they had to perform better than their male counterparts.[10] The New York Society study found that an "estimated 49 percent of all women surveyed believed they were less accepted by partners than were males, while nearly half reported having fewer advancement opportunities than males."[11] This observation raises another issue: Are women in fact scrutinized more than their male counterparts; and are women discriminated against when considered for upper-level promotions?

Other Obstacles

It is helpful to examine the results of the study conducted by the AICPA's Upward Mobility of Women Special Committee. The Committee was composed of four men and four women. Their methodology included the following: review of relevant literature, analysis of statistics, interviews, distribution of questionnaires, and communications with other professional organizations.[12]

As previously mentioned, the Committee was charged with identifying the obstacles to women CPAs' upward mobility in public accounting. Having identified seven obstacles, the Committee stated that these were not unique to accounting, but rather were universal obstacles confronting women in the workplace in general.[13]

First, it was determined that outdated, negative ideas about women still exist in organizations. Often women are seen as dependents, not colleagues. Women are still referred to as "girls" or "ladies," and they are criticized for displaying traits such as aggressiveness, which is viewed as a positive trait in men. Overall, management tends to judge women as a group, while judging men as individuals.[14]

The Committee also identified a second obstacle, termed "the perception problem," in which employers deny that such attitudes still exist.

The third obstacle identified involved awareness of success criteria by women. The Committee felt that women receive less advice from superiors about how to achieve success within an organization. Women can identify personal traits required to succeed, but seem to have a hard time identifying the subtle criteria, such as visibility in the organization and projecting a successful self-image.

The fact that women still bear most of the responsibility for child care is also viewed as an obstacle. Marriage and family are viewed as a social asset for a man in an organization, yet these are considered a liability for women, and sometimes marriage and family can hinder advancement in a firm. Some women sense these obstacles and abandon getting married and having a family; others resent having to make such choices and leave public accounting instead.

(5) NETWORKING

It was also noted that women do not participate as actively as men in professional organizations. Such networking can further careers through contacts.

(6) Another obstacle that the Committee presented was the fact that some organizations appeared to have dating and marriage policies that discriminated unfairly against women.

(7) Again, women face stress that results from facing all of the other obstacles. A woman still experiences more family pressures and organizational prejudice, and maintains the perception that, to succeed, her performance must exceed that of her male peers.

WOMEN IN OTHER PROFESSIONS

Many of the issues facing women in public accounting are not unique to the profession, but are experienced by women in the workforce in general. Literature on the subject of retention and promotion addresses women in the legal profession. In many ways, the accounting and legal professions are similar with regard to partnership structures and the increased entry of women into these fields in the past ten to fifteen years. Many of the issues faced by female lawyers are related to those experienced by women in public accounting. Many top law firms are increasingly facing the loss of talented women and are trying to address the situation.

Take the information technology (IT) industry. "According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the number of women computer professionals—computer-systems analysts, scientists and programmers—has grown to 710,000 in 2000 from 426,000 in 1990. However, the percentage of women in the profession has declined during the same years to 28.4% from 35.2%. Moreover, it appears that an increasing number of women are shying away from high tech. The most recent statistics from the U.S. Department of Education show that women received just 27% of computer-science degrees in 1998, down from 37% in 1984."[15]

Why is this the case? ". . . [F]rom a recent survey of women in high tech by Deloitte & Touche, the accounting firm, and pollster Roper Starch Worldwide: Three of every five women in IT would choose another profession if they could because of a perceived glass ceiling. Women surveyed by Deloitte and Roper say they're perceived as less knowledgeable and qualified than men. One woman surveyed says women have a tough time 'being taken seriously' in high tech. To advance in such a clubby atmosphere, women also must develop a rapport with their male bosses."[16]

A panel of female high-tech executives assembled by the Computing Technology Industry Association, based in Lombard, Illinois, were asked about the problem of women entering and staying in IT fields. Many women reportedly have misconceptions about high-tech careers. It seems they are afraid of getting stuck forever staring at a computer, writing lines of arcane programming code. "Women don't want to sit and talk to a computer," says Terry Taylor, a former senior vice president of field operations for Spherion Inc., a human-capital management company in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. "Women want more people interaction."[17]

Female professionals in general face a variety of challenges unique to their gender. Many of these are the result of generations of a male-dominated business world, a type of "old boy network." The passing of time is no longer an explanation for why women have not advanced in corporations. As one female executive in her mid-forties observed, "My generation came out of graduate school fifteen or twenty years ago. The men are now next in line to run major corporations. The women are not. Period."[18] A recent study by *Fortune* of the 1,000 largest U.S. industrial and service companies found that of the 4,012 people listed as the highest-paid officers and directors, only 19 were women. This is less than one-half of 1 percent. Although this is slightly higher that a similar study done in 1978, the results are hardly encouraging.

PRECONCEPTIONS AND POWER DIFFERENCES

The primary barriers to professional women are stereotyping and preconceptions. In a Fortune poll of 1,000 CEOs, 81 percent listed these factors as the main impediments to women's professional advancement. This is a subtle form of discrimination. For example, if one were to ask most male executives whether they were prejudiced against women, the answer would likely be no. However, when selecting an individual for a top job, males frequently choose men.

Corporate males are often uncomfortable dealing with women in the workplace. Negative feedback is often more difficult from men to women. One executive commented, "Men often worry women will run from the room in tears . . . they think they are yelling at their mothers or their wives . . . they just don't trust them as much as the guys with whom they talk football."[19] These stereotypes of women impede their success. For example, a strong male is seen as "aggressive" or "ambitious." An equally strong woman is often categorized as "abrasive" or even "bitchy." The same qualities in the different genders are regarded differently, especially by professional males in power.

THE PART-TIME STIGMA

Difficulties and disadvantages in climbing the corporate ladder are also encountered by professional women who have chosen to work part-time for a period of time. One law firm believed that promoting women who have worked part-time to partnership sent a message that the firm was not "demanding an equal commitment to the firm . . . [it] would be telling all of [its] associates that [it] no longer values motivation and dedication."[20] However, the firm also realized that "the rules must change because the game has changed."[21] Firms need to "redefine the word *commitment* to mean whatever it takes to meet client needs—not a particular number of hours spent at the office."[22]

Firms realize the investment in female employees. As one CEO affirmed, "It seems idiotic if we're investing in people but making it impossible for them to advance. Are we sending out signals that women need not aspire to the top?" One male executive noted that "the question should not be what's wrong with a woman who doesn't want to work twelve-hour days, but what's wrong with a man who does—and a culture that applauds, glorifies, promotes people who put their jobs before their families. . . . This penchant for promotions via overtime reflects an assumption that those willing to work long hours are the best and the brightest, but maybe the ones willing to work long hours are just the ones willing to work long hours. . . . What if we discover the answer to moving American commerce and industry ahead is finding those smart enough not to work twelve-hour days and turning the reins of business over to them?"[23]

Recommendations for Change

Even though Deloitte & Touche reportedly plans to double the number of women partners in the U.S. firm by 2005, to 35 percent, up from the current 18%,[24] the issues identified above regarding the recruitment and retention of women in the accounting profession must be addressed by national and local associations as well as by the leading companies in the field that set the example and trends.

Change Salary Disparities

"The 2001 Salary Survey from CareerBank.com polled 1,500 accounting, finance and banking professionals on how much they make, what degrees they possess and why they left their last job. Among entry level accountants, 54% of women are making less than $30,000. The same percent of men are making between $30,000 and $70,000 per year."[25]

Moreover, the same survey found that of the entry- to mid-level staff accountants surveyed, the majority of men (70 percent) and women (85 percent) make between $30,000 and $50,000 annually.[26] "'In many cases, the Salary Survey shows a significant difference in the salaries of men and women even when they are at the same level on the corporate ladder,' said CareerBank president and chief executive Robert Epstein. 'Why are women so often making less than men in this profession? Why are men more likely to have an MBA?'"[27]

It was also found that 56 percent of those surveyed earned a bachelor's degree and 28 percent have a master's degree. Fifty-five percent of men and 57 percent of women completed undergraduate studies. Seventy percent of men have a master's degree, while only 30 percent of women have that degree. Thirty-one percent of respondents said that they left their last job because they were not earning enough; 30 percent said it was for a career change.[28]

Interestingly, the surveyors concluded, "We certainly don't know all of the answers to the questions raised by this survey, but we hope the results serve as a starting point for a discussion of these issues within the industry." (Ibid.) We suggest some recommendations below based on other surveys and studies in this area. Specific recommendations for the public accounting industry, in particular, are offered by the AICPA Special Committee. These recommendations may also apply to other professions. The Committee suggested that employers establish a mentoring process to encourage training and guidance of talented women. The Committee also recommended that open discussions be held by firms on the issue of upward mobility, that organizations rid their publications and policies of sexist materials and references, and that constructive steps to deal with pregnancy and child care issues be mandated.

The Committee's recommendations to women included increasing participation in the AICPA and state societies; becoming more involved in office activities, such as business luncheons and meetings with clients; and joining support groups.

Recommendations to the AICPA itself included monitoring trends and continuing to compile more information on the upward mobility of women CPAs. Also, appointing more women to AICPA committees, boards, and the Council, and studying and reporting on the effect of stress on female CPAs related to career advancement should be priorities.

CPA Rebeka Joy Maupin, in her article "Why Are There So Few Women CPA Partners?"[29] offers more in-depth explanations for women's problems in professions. She presents two types of perspectives used to account for the scarcity of women in partnership positions: the person-centered perspective and the situation-centered perspective.

The Person-Centered versus the Situation-Centered Perspective

The person-centered perspective suggests that female socialization in our culture encourages the development of personality traits and behavior patterns that are contrary to the demands of a managerial role. This view asserts that a man will be more committed to his work than a woman because a female is socialized to choose her family if a conflict arises. Furthermore, even if a woman makes an equal initial commitment, the many demands she faces, with more intensity than her male counterpart, may encourage her incapability of maintaining her commitment. Because of extended socialization, women often lack the requisite managerial skills and traits and behave in a different manner than men in managerial positions.

In contrast, the situation-centered perspective emphasizes that the characteristics of an organization shape and define a women's behavior on jobs. For example, when women are viewed as a token group in an organization, three negative outcomes result: (1) visibility, which creates perceived performance pressures on the token group, (2) contrast, which exaggerates the differences between the groups and results in isolation of the token group from nonwork activities; and (3) assimilation, where the dominant group (males) assigns stereotypes to the token group to accept them.

Maupin administered a survey to 700 AICPA members (350 men and 350 women), using a questionnaire describing these two separate explanations for the problem. The results illustrated that men disproportionately emphasized the person-centered perspective, assigning blame to women's personal and social traits. Women emphasized both perspectives, recognizing women's responsibility, as well as organizational responsibility, for the problem.

Those who subscribe to the person-centered explanation believe the solution lies with women. Those who aspire to top management might develop more "male-oriented" behavior patterns and suppress or eliminate attitudes and behaviors identified as "typically female." Women can be resocialized to compete with men on an equal basis if they are taught traditional male-oriented skills.

Disturbingly, some studies suggest that some women who have reached the upper echelons resemble males in power, demonstrating "old boy network" aggressiveness and dominance.

Maupin supports further exploration of the situation-centered hypothesis. She cites a need to "critically appraise current organizational barriers for women" and cautions that conforming to the person-centered perspective and acquiring the appropriate skills and traits "may do nothing to reduce the hostility that women face on the job or mitigate the fact that they may be in token positions."[30]

Why Change?

Many of the findings in Deloitte & Touche's (D & T) special report team bulletin "Women in the 90's: A Business Imperative" are still valid. In that issue, Ellen Gabriel, D & T's national director for the advancement of women, wrote that if firms do not see the ethical, legal, or moral arguments for advancing women, sheer business reasons should be enough. She stated that the combination of three factors—(1) the percentage of men available in labor pool is declining; (2) global businesses will continue to prosper, creating labor needs; and (3) low birth rates in the 1970s will result in a growth in the population of less than 1 percent per year through the following decades—should motivate firms to accommodate talented women and promote their retention.

Why?

Solutions?

First, it is imperative that firms recognize a problem exists and take steps to resolve it through formal programs. Much of the literature implies that the first step in creating a formal program is for firms to articulate a stated, solid commitment to support women employees and to seek solutions to their problems. The MAP survey mentioned earlier found that although half of the staff respondents to the survey favored the implementation of flex-time and sabbaticals for parents who opt to take a slower path to partnership, they would hesitate to take advantage of such programs for fear that it would still impact their advancement in the long run. The message is that even if employers establish policies to address women professionals' problems, companies must also assure employees that the organization supports these employees. Second, employers can survey employees to identify their needs and ask what would make it easier to continue working in the current organization. Third, flexible schedules such as part-time or work-at-home programs can be offered. Child care options can be provided. Concrete guidelines on advancement paths within the firm (i.e., partnership requirements) can be explicitly published. Mentor programs for women can be created. Delayed and nonpartnership tracks for those who may not be able to meet the traditional partner track advancement can be established.

Firms need to recognize the urgency of these problems and take concrete steps to help women in need and at risk. Companies can address these issues openly and offer comprehensive goals for advancement. Firms can no longer address these problems on a piecemeal basis because if follow-through is lacking, expectations are raised, then dashed.

The high turnover rate in public accounting costs firms money and resources. As noted by Big Six CPA firm Deloitte & Touche, companies willing to address these issues are finding the results worth the cost. All the differences that now hold women back in the corporate workplace are remedial—and at a cost that is infinitesimal compared with the devastating cost of continuing to bury their talent. As one female CPA stated in an interview, "In a ferociously competitive global economy, no company can afford to waste valuable brainpower, simply because it's wearing a skirt." However, in the meantime, in order to strive to achieve corporate advancements, women may have to follow what has, unfortunately, been the American female's formula for success: "Look like a lady; act like a man; work like a dog."

Questions for Discussion

1. Why are there so few women CPA partners? Is this phenomenon unique to accounting firms?
2. What are some major obstacles that prevent women in public accounting and other professions from advancing to top-level positions?

3. Identify the person- and situation-centered perspectives regarding women's roles in the workplace. Comment on whether or not you find these perspectives of value, and why.
4. Discuss some solutions that companies and women can use to help advance their career paths to top-level positions.
5. Evaluate the validity of this statement as a success criterion from your perspective: "Look like a lady; act like a man; work like a dog."
6. Is there an "equal and level playing field" for women in most professions? Explain your point of view.

CASE 13
DOUBLECLICK'S BATTLE OVER ON-LINE PRIVACY

Ad sales house DoubleClick has signed up to the Safe Harbor agreement in the US as part of its ongoing efforts to repair an image damaged by claims over the company's privacy standards. Safe Harbor, a system designed to ensure US companies meet data protection standards laid down by the European Union, has only attracted around 100 members including Intel and Microsoft (Gale Group Inc., 2001).

INTRODUCTION

> In the wake of the September 11 terrorist attacks . . . Privacy advocates have trouble mustering a case against government plans to intelligently link their databases with those of the State Dept. and the FBI to help prevent terrorist suspects from entering the country (*Business Week* Online, 2001). After September 11, how many Americans will really complain if they are thoroughly checked out before boarding an airplane? In the new America, no one can afford to be a privacy absolutist. That doesn't mean that the battle over privacy rights is over, however. In the next few months, the government will be making dozens of critical decisions about who has access to what data and how it will be scanned, sorted, and linked. That's why now, more than ever, it's essential to strike a balance between security and the right to be left alone (Black, 2001).

On June 14, 1999, DoubleClick Incorporated (http://www.doubleclick.com), a global Internet advertising solutions firm, announced its plans to acquire market researcher Abacus Direct (http://www.abacusonline.com) in a $1 billion stock swap deal. Under the terms of the agreement, e-commerce sites in DoubleClick's extensive network would be correlated with the names and addresses in Abacus's database of consumer catalog shoppers. The resulting database of several billion consumer profiles would link personally identifiable information, including names, addresses, and other personal details, with individual on-line and catalog buying habits. What followed the announcement was a storm of protest from consumer groups and privacy advocates from around the country and the international community. The ethical and legal implications pushed the issue to the forefront of the public's consciousness, resulting in a flurry of legal activity, including class action lawsuits and proposed state and federal legislation.

BACKGROUND

TECHNOLOGY. At the core of the privacy and consumer profiling issue is the underlying Internet technology that enables DoubleClick and competing Web-based advertisers to gather information about on-line consumers and use this data to deliver targeted advertisements. To gather personal information, DoubleClick uses cookies, small data files written to the users' hard drives by certain Websites when they are viewed in the users' browsers. These data files contain information that can be used by that site in order to track such information as passwords, sites that the user has visited, and the date that a user last viewed a particular page (http://coverate.cnet.com/Resources/Info/Glossary/Terms/cookie.html). Although cookies can be used for benign purposes such as keeping track of on-line purchases, DoubleClick and other advertisers read and write cookies on users' PCs when they visit Web pages containing one of their banner ads. This practice enables the advertisers to store the "clickstream" of user activities, showing exactly what sites consumers visit and in what order.

According to the *Wall Street Journal*, the ease by which advertisers obtain this information is a result of the Web's open structure. Originally designed to allow small groups of global scientists to share information, the Web has retained this open structure despite the technology's widespread proliferation, making user information intrinsically vulnerable.

PROPOSED MERGER. Prior to June of 1999, DoubleClick operated an advertising network of over 1,300 Websites. The company's DART system employed cookies to track users' Internet surfing habits in order to deliver targeted advertisements to consumers visiting sites within its network. According to DoubleClick's privacy policy posted on its Website, the company promised not to collect any personally identifiable information about consumers:

> DoubleClick does not know the name, email address, phone number, or home address of anybody who visits a site in the DoubleClick Network. All users who receive an ad targeted by DoubleClick's technology remain completely anonymous. Since we do not have any information concerning names or addresses, we do not sell or rent any such information to third parties. Because of our efforts to keep users anonymous, the information DoubleClick has is useful only across the DoubleClick Network, and only in the context of ad selection (Junkbusters, 2000).

On June 14, 1999, DoubleClick announced its intended merger with market researching firm Abacus Direct. As a result of the merger, the e-commerce