

# Middlesex University Research Repository

An open access repository of

Middlesex University research

<http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk>

Pudelko, Markus, Tenzer, Helene and Harzing, Anne-Wil (2015) Cross-cultural management and language studies within international business research: past and present paradigms and suggestions for future research. In: The Routledge Companion to Cross-Cultural Management. Routledge Companions in Business, Management and Accounting . Routledge, pp. 85-94. ISBN 9780415858687

Final accepted version (with author's formatting)

This version is available at: <http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/14513/>

## Copyright:

Middlesex University Research Repository makes the University's research available electronically.

Copyright and moral rights to this work are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners unless otherwise stated. The work is supplied on the understanding that any use for commercial gain is strictly forbidden. A copy may be downloaded for personal, non-commercial, research or study without prior permission and without charge.

Works, including theses and research projects, may not be reproduced in any format or medium, or extensive quotations taken from them, or their content changed in any way, without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). They may not be sold or exploited commercially in any format or medium without the prior written permission of the copyright holder(s).

Full bibliographic details must be given when referring to, or quoting from full items including the author's name, the title of the work, publication details where relevant (place, publisher, date), pagination, and for theses or dissertations the awarding institution, the degree type awarded, and the date of the award.

If you believe that any material held in the repository infringes copyright law, please contact the Repository Team at Middlesex University via the following email address:

[eprints@mdx.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@mdx.ac.uk)

The item will be removed from the repository while any claim is being investigated.

See also repository copyright: re-use policy: <http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/policies.html#copy>

# **Cross-Cultural Management and Language Studies within International Business Research: Past and Present Paradigms and Suggestions for Future Research**

**Markus Pudelko  
Helene Tenzer  
Anne-Wil Harzing**

Version January 2015

Accepted for The Routledge Compendium to Cross cultural management

**Copyright © 2014-2015, Markus Pudelko, Helene Tenzer, Anne-Wil  
Harzing**

**All rights reserved.**

Prof. Anne-Wil Harzing  
Middlesex University  
The Burroughs, Hendon  
London NW4 4BT  
Email: [anne@harzing.com](mailto:anne@harzing.com)  
Web: [www.harzing.com](http://www.harzing.com)

# **Cross-Cultural Management and Language Studies within International Business Research: Past and Present Paradigms and Suggestions for Future Research**

by

**Markus Pudelko, Helene Tenzer & Anne-Wil Harzing**

## **Abstract**

Our contribution seeks to (1) outline how cross-cultural management and, more recently, language studies developed as two interrelated subareas within international business research; (2) discuss the changing paradigms and orthodoxies under which empirical research in cross-cultural management and language studies has been executed, focusing in particular on what we consider shortcomings in past and present research; and (3) formulate our suggestions how research should develop in the future. As such, our contribution offers a critical reflection on the evolution of this research area over time, combining elements of descriptive retrospection and analysis of the current situation with the normative elements of a position paper.

## **The development of international business research: From the “culture-free” to the “culture-inclusive” paradigm**

To set the scene, we will start by providing a compact overview of the emergence and further development of international business studies. Shenkar (2004) suggests that initial theory in international business owed much to context-sensitive academic disciplines such as anthropology, sociology, political science and area studies. We posit that only shortly afterwards, however, international business research established itself by seeking legitimacy through emulating the ‘hard disciplines’ of international economics and subsequently strategy, a discipline which itself was heavily influenced by economics. As such, its main concern became to produce mostly quantitative, generalizable results on the narrow basis of concepts and paradigms from economics-based strategy and largely irrespective of contextual specificities. This is in our view all the more deplorable as international business scholars should possess the strongest competitive advantage to unearth valuable context-embedded insights (Brannen & Doz, 2010), given that they are “more knowledgeable about foreign and international environments and about ‘cross-bordering’” (Boddewyn, 1999: 13). Yet, with the understanding that international economic activities can only be fully understood by considering human behavior, a significant number of scholars shifted their attention from economics-based to human-centered, psychology-based research (Evans, Pucik & Barsoux, 2002). It was also increasingly understood that societal context, and in particular culture, was

of relevance and therefore had to be included in the study of international business phenomena. As a result, the dominating research paradigm shifted from a “culture-free” orthodoxy (Lammers & Hickson, 1979) to what we call a “culture-inclusive” paradigm. These developments, we argue, provided a fertile ground from which cross-cultural management studies gradually emerged in the 1980s, joining strategy as a second pillar of international business (Brannen & Doz, 2010). A further powerful stimulus proved to be one particular development in the world economy: the rise of the Japanese economy in the 1980s and the painful realization for Western business people and business scholars that economic success could be achieved on the basis of management principles that were very different from those common in the West (Ouchi, 1981).

### **The development of cross-cultural management research: The dominance of the “reductionist culture specific paradigm” being challenged**

Following this introductory section, we will briefly illustrate how cross-cultural management studies established themselves as a separate research stream within international business, facilitated by the highly influential cultural framework developed by Geert Hofstede (1980). This and similar frameworks (e.g., Schwartz, 1992; Trompenaars, 1993; House et al., 2004) allowed for the introduction of culture into the study of international business. Given that culture for the first time now occupies the center of attention of international business scholars, we consider “culture-specific” the appropriate label for this new paradigm (in opposition to the “culture-free” approach and going beyond the “culture inclusive” approach). More specifically, as culture is mostly operationalized through its reduction to a few cultural value dimensions (Tung, 2008), we label this approach the “reductionist culture-specific orthodoxy”. In our view, the ease by which the vague, complex and difficult to grasp construct of culture can be translated under this paradigm into a few, directly comparable, value scores, constituted a key factor for the success of cross-cultural management studies. Studies under this paradigm mostly employ cultural differences (or, in their most aggregated form, cultural distance) as an independent variable to explain a large variety of dependent variables. In terms of research methods, both the context-free orthodoxy and the ensuing orthodoxy of cultural inclusiveness or even cultural specificity share the same preference for large-scale, static, quantitative cross-sectional survey studies.

We do not intend to downplay the value and significance of this kind of research, to which we owe the introduction of culture into business studies and a first distancing from an ethnocentric perspective that identified Western management as “best practice” (Pudelko & Harzing, 2008). Nevertheless, we are more concerned here in setting out the limitations of this dominant orthodoxy of cross-cultural management research. For example, Hofstede’s concepts mold cultures into clearly circumscribed and delimitable “units”, neglecting the

permanent exchange between cultures in our globalized world. When scholars cast cultures in boundaries and contrast them against each other, they inevitably also play down the fact that modern societies are internally highly differentiated (Welsch, 1999). Dimensional models of culture furthermore conceptualize cultures as logically consistent and coherent systems (Jahoda, 1993; Ono, 1998; Schwartz, 1992), a notion which has met with increasing criticism. Hofstede's metaphor of culture as a "software of the mind" (Hofstede, 2001: 2) also implies that people's cultural background has a decisive and inescapable influence on their thoughts and behavior. This deterministic view has been increasingly challenged (Abdallah-Preteille, 2001). A further problematic feature of Hofstede's cultural models is the fact that dimensions can only describe cultures at the point in time when they are observed. This view of cultures as static entities neglects the fact that cultures should be regarded as "work in progress" (Hannerz 1987: 550).

It is due to these limitations and the "obsession" with cultural values (Earley, 2006: 925) that more recently a new research paradigm started to emerge. This paradigm is less concerned with the comparison of static cultural values on the national level, but more with the in-depth description of the dynamic interaction processes between people of different nationalities on the organizational level (e.g., Birkinshaw, Brannen & Tung, 2011; Salk & Shenkar, 2001). Under this new paradigm, a methodological reorientation took place, away from deductive, static and survey-based quantitative studies and towards interview- and observation-based qualitative research, focused on the inductive investigation of dynamic processes of interpersonal interactions, and designed to generate rather than test theory. Much of this research concluded that the struggle for adaptation, negotiation, hybridization and formation of cultures on the (sub)organizational level (Brannen & Salk, 2000) provides more insights about actual organizational practice than the description of the clash of national values. In addition, studies increasingly adopt the notion of national and organizational culture forming complementary instead of fully separate concepts. Furthermore, bi-culturals are identified as valuable bridge-makers who can assist MNCs in coping with their complex cultural legacies (Brannen, Thomas & Garcia, 2010). It is due to the appearance of this significantly more differentiated, complex and multi-faceted concept of culture that we label this emerging paradigm "differentiated culture-specific" as opposed to the "reductionist culture-specific" previously outlined. Whether this emerging paradigm develops into a new orthodoxy still remains to be seen. Figure 1 provides an (idealized) comparison between the two paradigms.

	<b>reductionist culture-specific</b>	<b>differentiated culture-specific</b>
<i>Concept of culture:</i>	reduction to an aggregate score	differentiation to accommodate for complexity
<i>Objective of study:</i>	comparison of values	description of interactions
<i>Perspective towards time:</i>	static	dynamic
<i>Reasoning:</i>	deductive	inductive
<i>Relation towards theory:</i>	theory testing	theory generation
<i>Relation towards knowledge:</i>	confirmation	exploration
<i>Relation towards context:</i>	abstraction of specific contexts	embeddedness in a specific context

Figure 1: Idealized comparison between the “reductionist culture-specific” and the “differentiated culture-specific paradigm”

### **The emergence of language research in international business: The dominance of the “differentiated culture-specific paradigm” so far being unchallenged**

We argue that it was this emerging differentiated concept of culture that prepared the ground for a new research stream in international business, one which only gradually took off in the first decade of the new millennium: studies on language differences. While there have been studies considering language effects in business from a variety of disciplines, such as language training (e.g., see Holden, 1989), marketing (e.g., see Ricks, Arpan & Fu, 1994) and trade (e.g., see Lohmann, 2011), international business scholars investigating the management of multinational firms and their employees only gradually came to notice the relevance of language differences. Given the importance of language for cross-national interaction and exchange processes and in spite of early studies highlighting the relevance of language and linguistics as a research area for business studies (e.g., see Holden, 1987), one might wonder why it took the research community so long to “discover” the relevance of language for international business. One reason probably is that language has been frequently defined by scholars from international business studies (see e.g. Leung et al., 2005) and from anthropological linguistics (see e.g. Duranti, 1997) as being “merely” part of culture. Another reason might have been that scholars and practitioners alike perceived the “solution” to language differences, the adoption of English as the lingua franca of international business, as straightforward and unproblematic, and therefore not worthy of further investigation (Fredriksson, Barner-Rasmussen & Piekkari, 2006).

Only recently, some authors came to position language at the centre of culture (Vaara, Tienari, Piekkari & Säntti, 2005), acknowledging that languages are systems of meanings that are central to the process of constructing organizational, social and global realities (Tietze, Cohen & Musson, 2003). Piekkari and Tietze (2011: 267) characterize language as “the first

and foremost means and source through which the ‘connecting’ of different socio-cultural, institutional and individual worlds occurs.” Consequently, an increasing number of international business scholars recognize the importance of language and call for conceptual innovation and sophisticated empirical investigations specifically dedicated to the impact of language on international business activities (see e.g. Holden, 2008; Maclean, 2006; Piekkari & Zander, 2005; Hinds, Neeley & Cramton, 2013). Furthermore, even the use of a common language such as English has been shown to be significantly more problematic than many might have expected (Kassis Henderson, 2005; Piekkari, Vaara, Tienari & Sääntti, 2005; Fredriksson, Barner-Rasmussen & Piekkari, 2006). In response to the perceived increasing need to study the complex role of language in international business, a series of special issues have been dedicated to this emerging theme over the last few years: *International Studies of Management and Organization* (35/1, 2005), *Journal of World Business* (46/3, 2011) and the *Journal of International Business Studies* (2014).

### **The paradigmatic opening up of language research in international business?**

Very much in line with the “differentiated culture-specific” paradigm, studies of this emerging research stream on language focus on dynamic interaction processes on the micro-level and frequently refer to concepts of organizational behavior research such as power structures (Neeley et al., 2012; Neeley, 2013; Hinds, Neeley & Cramton, 2013), social identity formation (Lauring, 2008; Bordia & Bordia, 2013; Tong, Hong, Lee & Chiu, 1999), trust (Lagerström & Andersson, 2003; Piekkari, 2006; Tenzer, Pudelko & Harzing, 2013), shared cognition (Harzing & Feely, 2008; Tenzer & Pudelko, 2012), knowledge sharing (Lagerström & Andersson, 2003; Piekkari & Tietze, 2011), emotional climate (Neeley et al., 2012; Tenzer & Pudelko, 2013), leadership (Zander, Mockaitis & Harzing, 2011; Zander, 2005; Tenzer & Pudelko, 2013) or choice of communication media (Klitmøller & Lauring, 2013). Due to the strong parallels with the “differentiated culture-specific” paradigm we call this approach “differentiated language-specific”.

A further similarity lies in the fact that also for the literature of the “differentiated language-specific” paradigm inductive, theory-generating and interview-based qualitative research clearly stands in terms of methods in the foreground. Starting with Piekkari’s influential study of language issues in the Finnish multinational Kone (Marschan, Welch & Welch, 1997; Marschan-Piekkari, Welch & Welch 1999; Charles & Marschan-Piekkari, 2002), a proliferation of exploratory studies has so far been conducted to chart the vast territory of previously unaddressed influences of language on international business (see e.g. Chikudate, 1997; Hyrsky, 1999; Davis, Leas & Dobelman, 2009; Piekkari et al., 2013). Given the novelty of this research area, the exploratory character of qualitative research certainly has made much sense. It gave rise to pioneering discoveries, linked language differences to a large variety of different topics, suggested important contextual modifications to established

organizational behavior theories, and continues to provide a rich basis for the further development of the field.

However, almost two decades after the pioneering work by Piekari (see e.g., Marschan, Welch & Welch, 1997) the field still relies predominantly on qualitative case-study research, often conducted in a few countries/regions such as Scandinavia and Japan. We are concerned that the current stream of qualitative research that focuses on interaction processes on the micro-level could develop into a new orthodoxy. While we in no way wish to criticize the direction of this research – after all, we as authors are also part of it – we have two specific concerns: first, we distrust any kind of orthodoxy, as it has the tendency to hold whatever it defines as outliers at bay; secondly, by establishing an “insular orthodoxy” in language studies that contrasts with the still “dominant orthodoxy” of mainly quantitative international business including cross-cultural management research, language studies might risk to remain a relatively isolated area with less contact to mainstream research than would be beneficial to its further development. Figure 2 illustrates the paradigmatic developments of international business, cross-cultural management and language studies within international business.



Figure 2: Paradigmatic development of international business, cross-cultural management and language studies within international business (dominating paradigm in bold)

### Suggestions for further research in language studies

With language research reaching adolescence, we argue that it should emancipate itself from its infant past and start to venture into new territories. Whereas there is clearly still much room for significant qualitative studies, at this more advanced stage of the field quantitative survey studies could become increasingly useful as well to actually start testing those hypotheses that qualitative research has generated over the last one and a half decade. The first steps into this direction were taken by Sweeney and Hua (2010), Barner-Rasmussen and Aarnio (2011) and Harzing and Pudelko (2013, 2014). We acknowledge that some initial work has also been done on language distance (Miller & Chiswick, 2004; Dow & Karunaratna, 2006; Slangen, 2011), thus adding language to a long list of other distance concepts such as cultural, institutional, political, legal, economic, technological distance.

Despite this, we argue that it is noteworthy that the distance concept appears to be significantly less relevant in language studies in international business than in cross-cultural management. Given the dominant “reductionist culture-specific orthodoxy” in international business and, possibly to a lesser degree, in cross-cultural management, the importance of cultural distance for these areas can hardly be overstated (Zaheer, Schomaker & Nachum, 2012). In contrast, the reductionist concept of language distance appears to meet a higher degree of scepticism from the more interaction-oriented language scholars, who, for the most part, adhere to the “differentiated language-specific paradigm”.

While we call for a broadening of language research, we should emphasize that this includes more than merely increasing the amount of survey-based research. Other research methods, such as experimental research (see e.g. Akkermans, Harzing & van Witteloostuijn, 2009; Ayçiçeği & Harris, 2004; Hosoda, Nguyen & Stone-Romero, 2012; Puntoni, de Langhe & van Osselaer, 2009), could also provide novel insights. In terms of disciplines, we would like language studies in international business to draw more on other research areas. Linguistics is an obvious candidate in this context (see e.g. Chen, Geluykens & Choi, 2006; Kassis Henderson, 2005; Tenzer & Pudelko, 2012), but innovative new areas such as neuroscience (see e.g. Takano & Noda, 1993; Volk, Köhler & Pudelko, 2014) should also be referred to. Beyond merely drawing on other disciplines, the integration of knowledge from various areas as a key to interdisciplinary research would provide particularly fruitful insights (Dunning, 1989).

Additionally, we would appreciate language studies in international business to be conducted increasingly on all levels of analysis, thus investigating the effects of language differences between organizations (e.g., in mergers, acquisitions or strategic alliances) (e.g. Tienari, Vaara & Björkman, 2003; Piekkari et al., 2005; Slangen, 2011), between different units of organizations (e.g., in headquarters-subsidiary relations) (e.g., Björkman & Piekkari, 2009; Harzing & Pudelko 2013, 2014; Harzing, Köster, & Magner, 2011), within groups of individuals (e.g., multilingual teams, both collocated and virtual) (Kassis Henderson, 2005; Klitmøller & Luring, 2013; Tenzer et al., 2013) and finally on the level of individuals (e.g., cognitive or emotional) (Luna, Ringberg & Peracchio, 2008; Puntoni, de Langhe & van Osselaer, 2009; Volk, Köhler & Pudelko, 2014).

Next, we would also welcome an expansion of the countries and languages that scholars are including in their investigations. So far, research has tended to include only a few countries, thus opening itself up to the risk of describing mere ideosyncracies instead of generating more encompassing theories. The majority of studies on language effects in international business has so far focused on barriers between English and a few other languages, mostly Scandinavian languages, Japanese or Chinese. Considering that a recent study also names Arabic, Hindi, Portuguese and Russian among the ten most influential

global languages (Ly et al., 2013), covering a broader range of languages could further enhance the impact of this research area. Harzing and Pudelko's (2013, 2014) language studies have so far been the most comprehensive ones, including data from 13 countries. Furthermore, irrespective of the number of languages included or the relative importance of those languages in international business, the selection of languages should be conducted more carefully on theoretical grounds instead of, for example, convenience samples, thus strengthening the explanatory power of language studies.

In addition, in the same way that cultural diversity is not limited to national diversity but also relates to diversity in professions (Bloor & Dawson, 1994), functions (Pratt & Beaulieu, 1992), industries (Phillips, 1994), organizations (Schein, 1984), social class (Erickson, 1996), education (Halsey, Lauder, Brown & Wells, 1997), ethnicity (Cox, Lobel & McLeod, 1991), age (Lawrence, 1988) or gender (Kochan et al., 2003), the concept of language diversity can and should equally be applied to such dimensions. While such studies would carry research on language diversity out of the so far still fairly enclosed camp of language studies in international business, they would ultimately also provide a fresh impetus to this field.

Finally, we call for a better clarification of the relationship of the two, closely interrelated concepts that also stand in the foreground of this chapter: culture and language. This clarification could and should go both ways: in the direction of delineation (what can language studies achieve that cultural studies cannot and vice versa) and in the direction of integration (what arguments are valid for both cultures *and* languages). For both kinds of research efforts more conceptual clarity between the two constructs would be highly useful. Here we call upon empirical studies, but particularly also on conceptual reflections. Finally, beyond the further clarification of these two concepts, conceptual studies on language differences in international business, such as the pioneering paper by Luo & Shenkar (2006), could provide highly valuable additional insights.

## **Conclusion**

While we are concerned that static, comparative-oriented and quantitative cross-cultural management research with all its efforts to emulate economics-based strategy research has led to a thematic narrowness and a neglect for context, we are equally concerned that a new orthodoxy of dynamic, interaction-oriented and qualitative cross-cultural management research and language studies might lead to a collection of case-based hypotheses that will never be tested in a more systematic and comprehensive way.

Consequently, instead of calling for a new paradigm in the areas of cross-cultural management and language research in international business, we make a plea for a closer

integration of the comparative-oriented “reductionist culture-specific” orthodoxy and the interaction-oriented “differentiated culture/language-specific” paradigm. We suggest that a plurality of methods, disciplines, ontological and epistemological approaches and research objectives that not only co-exists in separate silos but that are able to cross-fertilize each other should lead to both more in-depth insights and a better understanding of what is generalizable and what not in the areas of cross-cultural management and language studies in international business.

### **Bibliography**

Abdallah-Preteuille, M. 2001. Intercultural Communication Elements for a Curricular Approach. In: Kelly, M., Elliott, I. & Fant, L. (Eds.): *Third Level, Third Space: Intercultural Communication and Language in European Higher Education*: 131-142. Bern: Peter Lang.

Akkermans, D., Harzing, A.-W., Witteloostuijn, A. 2009. Cultural accommodation and language priming: Competitive vs. cooperative behavior in a prisoner’s dilemma game. *Management International Review*, 50(5): 559-583.

Ayçiçeği, A. & Harris, C. 2004. Bilinguals' recall and recognition of emotion words. *Cognition and Emotion*, 18(7): 977-87.

Barner-Rasmussen, W. & Aarnio, C. 2011. Shifting the faultlines of language: A quantitative functional-level exploration of language use in MNC subsidiaries. *Journal of World Business*, 46(3): 288-295.

Birkinshaw, J., Brannen, M.Y. & Tung, R.L 2011. From a distance and generalizable to up close and grounded: reclaiming a place for qualitative methods in international business research, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 42(5): 573-581.

Björkman, A. & Piekkari, R. 2009. Language and foreign subsidiary control: An empirical test. *Journal of International Management*, 15(1): 105-117.

Bloor, G. & Dawson, P. 1994. Understanding professional culture in organizational context. *Organization Studies*, 15(2): 275-295

Boddeyn, J.L. 1999. The domain of international management. *Journal of International Management*, 5(1): 3-14.

Bordia, S. & Bordia, P. 2013. Linguistic Identity Management in Indian Call Centers. Paper presented at the Academy of Management 73<sup>rd</sup> Annual Meeting, *Orlando*, 9-13 August.

Brannen, M.Y. & Doz, Y. 2010. From a distance and detached to up close and personal: Bridging strategic and cross-cultural perspectives in international management research and practice. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 26(3), 236-247.

Brannen, M. Y. & Salk, J. E. 2000. Partnering across borders: Negotiating organizational culture in a German-Japanese joint-venture. *Human Relations*, 53(4): 451-487.

Brannen, M. Y., Thomas, D.C. & Garcia, D. (2010) Bicultural individuals and intercultural effectiveness. *European Journal of Cross-Cultural Effectiveness and Management*, 1(4): 315-333.

- Charles, M. & Marschan-Piekkari, R. 2002. Language training for enhanced horizontal communication: a challenge for MNCs. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 65(2): 9-29.
- Chen, S., Geluykens, R. & Choi, C. 2006. The importance of language in global teams: a linguistic perspective. *Management International Review*, 46(6): 679-695.
- Chikudate, N. 1997. Exploring the life-world of organizations by linguistic oriented phenomenology in sub-cultural analysis of organizations: A comparison between Japanese and US banks. *Management International Review*, 37(2): 169-183.
- Cox, T.H., Lobel, S.A. & McLeod, P.L. 1991. Effects of ethnic group cultural differences on cooperative and competitive behavior on a group task. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(4): 827-847.
- Davis, A., Leas, P. & Dobelman, J. 2009. Did you get my email? An exploratory look at intercultural business communication by email. *Multinational Business Review*, 17(1): 73-98.
- Dow, D. & Karunaratna, A. 2006. Developing a multidimensional instrument to measure psychic distance stimuli, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(5): 578-602.
- Dunning, J. 1989. The study of international business: A plea for a more interdisciplinary approach, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 20(3): 411-436.
- Duranti, A. 1997. *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Earley, P.C. 2006. Leading cultural research in the future: a matter of paradigms and taste, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(6): 922-931.
- Erickson, B.H. 1996. Culture, class, and connections. *American Journal of Sociology*, 102(1): 217-251.
- Evans, P., Pucik, V. & Barsoux, J.-L. 2002. *The Global Challenge. Frameworks for International Human Resource Management*. New York City: McGraw-Hill.
- Fredriksson, R., Barner-Rasmussen, W. & Piekkari, R. 2006. The multinational corporation as a multilingual organization: The notion of a common corporate language, *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 11(4): 406-423.
- Halsey, A.H., Lauder, H., Brown, P. & Stuart Wells, A. 1997. *Education: Culture, Economy and Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hannerz, U. 1987. The World in Creolisation. *Africa*, 57: 546-579.
- Harzing, A.-W. & Feely, A. J. 2008. The language barrier and its implications for HQ-subsubsidiary relationships, *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 15(1): 49-60.
- Harzing, A.-W., Köster, K. & Magner, U. 2011. Babel in Business: The language barrier and its solutions in the HQ-subsubsidiary relationship. *Journal of World Business*, 46(3): 279-287.
- Harzing, A.-W. & Pudelko, M. 2013. Language competencies, policies and practices in multinational corporations: A comprehensive review and comparison of Anglophone, Asian, Continental European and Nordic MNCs. *Journal of World Business*, 48(1): 87-97.

- Harzing, A.-W. & Pudelko, M. 2014. Hablas vielleicht un peu la mia language? A Comprehensive Overview of the Role of Language Differences in Headquarters-Subsidiary Communication. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(5): 696-717.
- Hinds, P., Neeley, T. & Cramton, C.D. 2013. Language as a lightning rod: Power contests, emotion regulation and subgroup dynamics in global teams. *Journal of International Business Studies*, advance online publication 12 December, doi:10.1057/jibs.2013.62.
- Hofstede, G. 2001. *Culture's Consequences*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Holden, N. 1987. The treatment of language and linguistic issues in the current English-language international management literature, *Multilingua*, 6(3): 233-246.
- Holden, N. 1989. Language learning and international management development in Japanese corporations. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 21(4): 3-8.
- Holden, N. 2008. Reflections of a cross cultural scholar: Context and language in management thought. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 8(2): 239-251.
- Hosoda, M., Nguyen, L.T. & Stone-Romero, E.F. 2012. The effect of Hispanic accents on employment decisions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 27(4): 347-364.
- House, R.J., Hangness, P.J., Javidian, M., Dorfman, P.W. & Gupte, V. 2004. *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. London: Sage.
- Hyrsky, K. 1999. Entrepreneurial metaphors and concepts: An exploratory study. *International Small Business Journal*, 18(1): 13-34.
- Jahoda, G. 1993. *Crossroads Between Culture and Mind: Continuities and Change in Theories of Human Nature*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Kassis Henderson, J. 2005. Language diversity in international management teams. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 35(1): 66-82.
- Klitmøller, A. & Luring, J. 2013. When global virtual teams share knowledge: Media richness, cultural difference and language commonality. *Journal of World Business*, 48(3): 398-406.
- Kochan, T., Bezrukova, K., Ely, R., Jackson, S., Joshi, A., Jehn, K., Leonard, J., Levine, D. & Thomas, D. 2003. The effects of diversity on business performance: Report of the diversity research network. *Human Resource Management*, 42(1): 3-21.
- Lagerström, K., & Andersson, M. 2003. Creating and sharing knowledge within a transnational team: The development of a global business system. *Journal of World Business*, 38(2): 84-95.
- Lammers, C.J. & Hickson, D.J. 1979. Are organizations culture-bound? In C.J. Lammers and D.J. Hickson (eds), *Organizations Alike and Unlike. International and Interinstitutional Studies in the Sociology of Organizations*: 402-419. London: Routledge.
- Luring, J. 2008. Rethinking social identity theory in international encounters. Language use as a negotiated object for identity making. *International Journal of Cross-cultural Management*, 8(3): 343-361.

- Lawrence, B.S. 1988. New wrinkles in the theory of age: Demography, norms, and performance ratings. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31(2): 309-337.
- Leung, K. Bhagat, R.S., Buchan, N.R., Erez, M. & Gibson, C.B. 2005. Culture and international business: recent advances and their implications for future research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36(4): 357–378.
- Lohmann, J. 2011. Do language barriers affect trade? *Economics Letters*, 110(2): 159–162.
- Luna, D., Ringberg, T., & Peracchio, L. 2008. One individual, two identities: Frame switching among biculturals. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35(2): 279-293.
- Luo, Y. & Shenkar, O. 2006. The multinational corporation as a multilingual community: Language and organization in a global context. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(3): 321-339.
- Ly, A., Esperanca, J P., Pereira, I.N. & Amaral-Baptista, M.A. 2013. The ten most influential global languages: exploring their effect on international trade. Paper presented at the Academy of Management 73<sup>rd</sup> Annual Meeting, *Orlando*, 9-13 August
- Maclean, D. 2006. Beyond English: Transnational corporations and the strategic management of language in a complex multilingual business environment. *Management Decision*, 44(10): 1377-1390.
- Marschan, R., Welch, D.E. & Welch, L.S. 1997. Language: the forgotten factor in multinational management. *European Management Journal*, 15(5): 591-98.
- Marschan-Piekkari, R., Welch, D.E. & Welch, L.S. 1999. In the shadow: The impact of language on structure, power and communication in the multinational. *International Business Review*, 8(4): 421-40.
- Miller, P. & Chiswick, B. 2004. Linguistic distance: A quantitative measure of the distance between English and other languages. EconStor. *IZA Discussion Paper*.
- Neeley, T.B., Hinds, P.J. & Cramton, C. D. 2012. The (un)hidden turmoil of language in global collaboration, *Organizational Dynamics*, 41(3): 236-244.
- Neeley, T. B. 2013. Language matters: Status loss and achieved status distinctions in global organizations. *Organization Science*, 24(2): 476-497.
- Ono, K.A. 1998. Problematizing “nation” in intercultural communication research. *International and Intercultural Communication Annual*, 21: 193-202.
- Ouchi, W.G. 1981. *Theory Z. How American Business Can Meet the Japanese Challenge*. New York: Avon Books.
- Phillips, M.E. 1994. Industry mindsets: Exploring the cultures of two macro-organizational settings. *Organization Science*, 5(3): 384-402.
- Piekkari, R. & Tietze, S. 2011. A world of languages: implications for international management research and practice. *Journal of World Business*, 46(3): 267-269.

Piekkari, R., Welch, D.E., Welch, L.S., Peltonen, J.-P. & Vesa, T. 2013. Translation behavior: an exploratory study within a service multinational. *International Business Review*, 22(5): 771-783.

Piekkari, R., Vaara, E., Tienari, J., Säntti, R. 2005. Integration or disintegration? Human resource implications of the common corporate language decision in a cross-border merger. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(3): 330-44.

Piekkari, R. & Zander, L. 2005. Preface. Language and communication in international management. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 35(1): 3-9.

Piekkari, R. 2006. Language effects in multinational corporations: A review from an international human resource management perspective. In G. Stahl, & I. Björkman (Eds.), *Handbook of Research in International Human Resource Management*: 536-50. Bodmin: MPG Books Ltd.

Pratt, J. & Beaulieu, P. 1992. Organizational culture in public accounting: Size, technology, rank, and functional area. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 17(7): 667-684.

Pudelko, M. & Harzing, A.-W. 2008. The golden triangle for MNCs: Standardization towards headquarters practices, standardization towards global best practices and localization. *Organizational Dynamics*, 37(4): 394-404.

Puntoni, S., de Langhe, B. & van Osselaer, S.M.J. 2009. Bilingualism and the emotional intensity of advertising language. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35(6): 1012-1025.

Ricks, D. 1983. Products that crashed into the language barrier. *Business and Society Review*, 45: 46-50.

Salk, J.E. & Shenkar, O. 2001. Social identities in an international joint venture: An exploratory case study. *Organization Science*, 12(2): 161-178.

Schein, E.H. 1984. Coming to a new awareness of organizational culture. *Sloan Management Review*, 25: 3-16.

Schwartz, S.H. 1992. *Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Shenkar, O. 2004. One more time: international business in a global economy. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 35(2): 161-171.

Slangen, A. 2011. A communication-based theory of the choice between greenfield and acquisition entry. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48(8): 1699-1726.

Sweeney, E. & Hua, Z. 2010. Accommodating toward your audience: Do native speakers of English know how to accommodate their communication strategies towards nonnative speakers of English. *Journal of Business Communication*, 47(4): 447-504.

Takano, Y. & Noda, A. 1993. A temporary decline of thinking ability during foreign language processing. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 24(4): 445-462.

Tenzer, H. & Pudelko, M. 2013. Leading across language barriers: Strategies to mitigate negative language-induced emotions in MNCs. *Best Paper Proceedings*, Academy of Management 2013 Annual Meeting.

Tenzer, H. & Pudelko, M. 2012. The impact of language barriers on shared mental models in multinational teams. *Best Paper Proceedings*, Academy of Management 2012 Annual Meeting.

Tenzer, H., Pudelko, M. & Harzing, A.-W. 2013. The impact of language barriers on trust formation in multinational teams. *Journal of International Business Studies*, advance online publication 19 December. doi:10.1057/jibs.2013.64

Tienari, J., Vaara, E. & Björkman, I. 2003. Global capitalism meets national spirit: Discourses in media texts on a cross-border acquisition. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 12(4): 377-393.

Tietze, S., Cohen, L. & Musson, G. 2003. *Understanding Organizations Through Language*. London: Sage.

Tong, Y.-Y., Hong, Y.-Y., Lee, S.-L. & Chiu, C.-Y. 1999. Language use as a carrier of social identity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 23(2): 281-296.

Trompenaars, F. 1993. *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business*. London: Random House Business Books.

Tung, L.R. 2008. The cross-cultural research imperative: The need to balance cross-national and intra-national diversity. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 39(1): 41-46.

Vaara, E., Tienari, J., Piekkari, R. & Sääntti, R. 2005. Language and the circuits of power in merging multinational corporation. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(3): 595-623.

Volk, S., Köhler, T. & Pudelko, M. 2014. Brain drain: The cognitive neuroscience of foreign language processing in multilingual organizations. (paper accepted by *Journal of International Business Studies*).

Welsch, W. 1999. Transculturality – the puzzling form of cultures today. In: Featherstone, M. & Lash, S. (Eds.): *Spaces of Culture: City, Nation, World*: 194-213. London: Sage.

Zaheer, S., Schomaker, M.S. & Nachum, L. (2012). Distance without direction: Restoring credibility to a much-loved construct. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 43(1): 18-27.

Zander, L. 2005. Communication and country clusters. A study of language and leadership preferences. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 35(1): 83-103.

Zander, L., Mockaitis, A. & Harzing, A.W. 2011. Standardization and contextualization: A study of language and leadership across 17 countries. *Journal of World Business*, 46(3): 296-304.