



# The futures of *critical perspectives on international business*

Joanne Roberts

*Newcastle Business School, Northumbria University,  
Newcastle upon Tyne, UK, and*

Christoph Dörrenbächer

*Berlin School of Economics and Law, Berlin, Germany*

## Abstract

**Purpose** – The purpose of this extended editorial is to elaborate on the possible future trajectories of *critical perspectives on international business*. In addition, the content of the current issue is introduced.

**Design/methodology/approach** – This editorial reviews recent reflections on the field of international business to identify the concerns of mainstream scholars and to contrast these with those of central concern to critical scholars of international business. In the light of this, consideration is given to how *critical perspectives on international business* seeks to facilitate the development of academic debates that continue to question orthodox approaches to international business whilst also offering relevance for all stakeholders in international business activities from managers, shareholders and policy makers to workers, consumers and citizens, including future generations.

**Findings** – Taking stock of recent reflections on the future of the field of international business is useful in determining possible topics for future contributions to *critical perspectives on international business*.

**Originality/value** – This is the first attempt to review reflections on the future of international business since the Global Financial crisis of 2008. As such it offers an assessment of the current thinking in the field and offers directions for the development of *critical perspectives on international business*.

**Keywords** International business, Inter disciplinary, Multi-disciplinary, Trans-disciplinary, Critical studies, Critique, Futures markets

**Paper type** General review

Welcome to the first issue of *critical perspectives on international business (CPoIB)* for Volume 8. In light of the editorial changes that come into effect with this volume, namely the introduction of Christoph Dörrenbächer as the new co-editor alongside Joanne Roberts, this editorial offers a timely opportunity to reflect on the possible futures of both the journal and the field of international business. Indeed, in recent years there has been much debate about the future of international business and management (IB/IM) as a practice and as an academic discipline (Devinney *et al.*, 2010a, b; Roberts and Fuller, 2010a; Ramamurti and Hashai, 2011; Michailova, 2011; Mudambi and Swift, 2011; inter alia). Here we review these contributions from the perspective of critical scholars. Moreover, we aim to build on previous *CPoIB* editorials (Cairns and Roberts, 2005, 2011) which noted the growing need for critique of international business in all its various forms, and, especially from inter, multi and trans-disciplinary perspectives.



---

In contemplating the future of IB it is important to be aware of its past, and, in particular, to remember that as an academic discipline it only emerged in the 1950s as a response to the growth of IB activity in the post Second World War period, developing first in the USA before spreading to Europe. For instance, Columbia University introduced the first Master of Science Programme in International Business in 1955 (Fayerweather, 1994). In 1959 the Association for Educators of International Business was established, which later became the Academy of International Business (Elahee, 2007, p. 146). In addition, three IB journals originate in this period, namely, *Thunderbird International Business Review*, formerly *The International Executive* (first published in 1959), *Management International Review* (1961) and *Journal of World Business*, formerly *Columbia Journal of World Business* (1966). Today's top academic IB journal, *Journal of International Business Studies (JIBS)*, was not established until 1970 (Eden, 2009, p. 1).

*CPoIB*, the first academic journal dedicated to exploring critical perspectives on IB, was launched in 2005 to address issues that had been neglected by these mainstream journals, including the failure to consider the broader impact of IB. The establishment of *CPoIB* was also influenced by the rise of critical management studies (CMS) in the 1990s (Alvesson and Willmott, 1992). Importantly the use of the term critical, as defined by CMS scholars, has been influential in the positioning of *CPoIB* in the field of IB. As Adler *et al.* (2007, p. 120) note, the critical in CMS:

... signifies more than an endorsement of the standard norms of scientific scepticism or the general value of "critical thinking". It also signifies more than a focus on issues that are pivotal rather than marginal. Critical here signifies radical critique. By radical is signaled an attentiveness to the socially divisive and ecologically destructive broader patterns and structures – such as capitalism, patriarchy, neo-imperialism, and so forth – that conditions local action and conventional wisdom. By critique, we mean that beyond criticism of specific, problematic beliefs and practices (e.g., about teamwork), CMS aims to show how such beliefs and practices are nurtured by, and serve to sustain, divisive and destructive patterns and structures; and also how their reproduction is contingent and changeable, neither necessary nor unavoidable.

From its inception *CPoIB* has sought to engage in a diverse range of research communities and to satisfy their various needs for an outlet for research and a forum for debate on IB from a wide variety of disciplinary perspectives.

As our new co-editor notes:

When I first came across *CPoIB* in 2005 at the Critical Management Studies Conference in Cambridge, I immediately felt that this is a journal that has been urgently needed for quite some time. Having worked on MNCs for about 15 years at that time in different countries and different types of organizations (research institutes, international organizations, universities) I found that mainstream IB/IM journals only poorly represent the many critical issues that have been raised at different times and places with regard to IB/IM issues in general and MNCs in particular. Contributing to a journal with such an editorial mission (Cairns and Roberts, 2005, 2011) is a great honour and opportunity for me.

This was a common response from academics engaged in the study of IB, and it accounts for the support the journal has received over its short life, including the receipt of Emerald's Best New Journal Award in 2010. However, as the journal's Editorial Advisory Board illustrates, *CPoIB* has from its inception received encouragement and support from academics that are fully engaged in the traditional

IB community. And, it is perhaps through the work of such individuals and the existence of *CPoIB* that mainstream IB/IM journals have begun to open up to more interdisciplinary perspectives and to some critical themes such as corruption or corporate and social responsibility (CSR) in recent years. Additionally, as Buckley (2002) argues, the traditional IB agenda has been running “out of steam” and consequently there has been a need to look beyond the historical boundaries of the academic discipline.

Despite the evolution of the concerns of mainstream journals, *CPoIB*, now in its 8th volume, remains an indispensable forum for both unorthodox academic thinking and in particular for the discussion of the many political, social, economic and environmental problems and concerns cross border economic activity raises. Today, as in 2005, there is an enduring need to critically reflect, discuss and disseminate information on corporate (mis)behaviours, systemic deficiencies in the regulation of IB activity, as well as on the many essential questions of mankind that have a nexus with IB activity such as climate change, globalization, inequality and sustainability (Jonsen *et al.*, 2010).

Given the many open questions and pressing problems that strongly impact our daily lives and will impact the lives of future generations, closing the “relevance gap” (Oesterle and Laudien, 2007, p. 39) should have top priority for IB related research today and in the future. However, much of the ongoing debate on the future of IB is concerned with other matters, matters that some commentators might consider inward looking and self serving. This is perhaps a reflection of the field’s immaturity or lack of confidence. Indeed, in relation to IM, Michailova (2011, p. 299) argues that the field is undergoing a “tortuous evolution” on its way to maturity. She outlines the following five core issues that account for the failure of IM to reach its full potential: identity struggles; no strong and clear impact on IM practice; emphasizing instrumentalities; not enough true and continuous interdisciplinarity; and, the articulation of ideas and findings as if they emerge in a vacuum. Although these points would seem to have relevance for IB, it is the following three issues that are at the fore in mainstream discussions of the future of the field:

- (1) the disciplinary scope of IB;
- (2) the impact IB-related research has on related disciplines; and
- (3) the big questions ahead.

We explore each of these in turn.

First, enlarging the disciplinary scope of IB was a major concern of early contributions to the “future of IB” debate. For instance, Dymsza (1984), *JIBS* editor in chief from 1975 to 1984, saw the future of IB in a multidisciplinary perspective overcoming a traditionally strong economics and functional focus. Similarly, Dunning (1989) called for a more interdisciplinary approach to IB research. Such calls have stimulated specific proposals to open IB up to other disciplines. For instance, Jones and Khanna (2006) argued in favour of bringing history into IB research in order to allow historical variation, detect path dependencies, define what is new and to deal thoroughly with questions that require a longitudinal approach. Despite early claims and recurrent proposals, more than 20 year later Czionkota and Ronkainen (2009) in their attempt to define future IB topics state that the “cross-over of information between the ‘silos’ of disciplines is still very limited”. This view is corroborated by a 2011 editorial of *JIBS*, in which the journal is re-positioned as an interdisciplinary

---

journal (Cantwell and Brannen, 2011). Reasons given for this move do not only refer to changes in the nature and context of the IB field but also to an expected increase in citations, impact and status of a journal with a broader scope (Cantwell and Brannen, 2011, p. 5). *CPoIB* has taken the lead in encouraging and publishing IB research that is inter-, multi- and trans-disciplinary in nature. The journal's archive and Editorial Advisory Board provides testament to this. Moreover, in a recent contribution the journal, Faulconbridge (2010) has elaborated on the benefits of a trans-disciplinary approach in the field of IB.

A second major concern of the debate on the "future of IB" is about how a future research agenda can improve the position of IB as a discipline *vis-à-vis* other disciplines. This obviously is closely related to the previous discussion about broadening the scope of IB, with Schenkar (2004) for instance arguing that the unique selling proposition of IB (against economics and strategy) and its future orientation should be towards the synergetic integration of knowledge bases from diverse fields, such as anthropology and country studies.

Such proposals need to be seen against the background of a general assumption that IB lacks competitiveness as a discipline. "We are, whether we like it or not, an appendage of economics, psychology, sociology and other management disciplines" (Devinney *et al.*, 2010b, p. 35). This does not mean that there are no IB achievements of the past that fed and feed back into other areas of social science. However, as Buckley and De Beule (2006) note, the "trade balance" is negative, with the IB research community being an "importer of concepts, techniques and results and only a minor exporter" (Buckley and De Beule, 2006, p. 327). Sharing this view, Devinney *et al.* (2010a, b) conclude that if anything, future success in IB/IM will be about substantially impact on primary disciplines, such as economics or strategy, by applying critical aspects of what makes IB distinct, that is, the variance and complexity of the phenomena studied. To reach the same end Peng (2004) suggests moving IB towards a more paradigmatically developed field that centres on the question of what impacts international firm performance. What is interesting about the debates within traditional IB is that they remain inward looking and how the proposed solutions are self serving. Clearly this has implications for the themes that will be favoured by mainstream journals and this is evident in the third core theme in the "future of IB" debate, that is, what will be the next big IB question?

Third, according to Buckley (2002, p. 365) IB research has made major achievements in answering the big questions of the past including: explaining the flow and impact of foreign direct investment (FDI); the existence, strategy and organization of MNCs; and, new forms of foreign market entry and operation. Similar accounts of past contributions of IB/IM can be found in Wright and Ricks (1994), Werner (2002), Eunni and Post (2007) or Griffith *et al.* (2008), albeit the questions considered to be big in the past differ considerably. Unsurprisingly such differences also extend to what is assumed to be the coming big questions for IB/IM. Despite some reservations, whether it makes sense at all to indulge in such endeavours (Caves, 1998, Sullivan and Daniels, 2005), a lively debate about the big IB questions of the future has taken off. With a few exceptions that have been published recently and that will be discussed in more detail in the next paragraph (Roberts and Fuller, 2010b; Jonsen *et al.*, 2010) much of this debate takes on a rather scholarly (epistemological) tone. As already mentioned, Peng (2004) proposes a focus on the performance of international firms. Caves (1998, pp. 9-16) list the following themes as major avenues for future research in IB: What are the bases

for profitable foreign investments, MNEs and competitive processes, financial flows and business behaviour, development and technology transfer, and alliances. Buckley (2002) identified the following four questions as having the potential to turn into big ones:

1. Can we explain the sequence of entry of nations as major players in the world economy? (Great Britain, USA, Germany, Japan, Singapore, Korea, China).
2. Why are different forms of company organization characteristic of individual cultural backgrounds? Or is this an artifact?
3. In what empirical measures can we identify trends to (and away from) globalization?
4. Challenges to global capitalism (Buckley, 2002, p. 371).

In a later attempt Buckley and De Beule (2006) found “three key areas [suggesting] themselves as future and imminent research questions” (Buckley and De Beule, 2006, p. 330): “Globalization and development, the strategy of TNCs in a globally integrating world, and economic geography and business” (Buckley and De Beule, 2006).

Compared to these and similar lists of big questions (Wright and Ricks, 1994; Werner, 2002; Griffith *et al.*, 2008; Cheng, 2007) the contributions by Roberts and Fuller (2010b) and Jonsen *et al.* (2010) have a different frame of reference. Roberts and Fuller (2010b) ask for “sustainable futures for IB [that] necessitate alternative structures and beliefs” (Roberts and Fuller, 2010b, p. 908). Jonsen *et al.* (2010) claim for the future of IB to be “scientifically mindful”, what they define as “a holistic, cross-disciplinary, and contextual approach, whereby researchers need to make sense of multiple perspectives with the betterment of society as the ultimate criterion” (Jonsen *et al.*, 2010, p. 44).

Such reflections are more in line with the purpose of *CPoIB* which has broader concerns than those that dominate the mainstream. However, it is important to remember that the development of IB as a distinct field of study was motivated by a desire to understand the impact of international activity, and in particular of FDI, on the regions in which it locates both in terms of economic efficiency and the welfare of the recipient country. For instance John Dunning’s (1958) early work was concerned with the impact of US FDI on UK manufacturing. Hence, much early work was focused on informing policy and therefore had relevance to the lives of stakeholders beyond those directly engaged in the IB activity. Indeed, it is also important to remember that Stephen Hymer, whose doctoral contribution to understanding FDI in the 1960s underpinned the development of the theory of the multinational enterprise (MNEs) (Hymer, 1976), was also concerned with boarder issues, including economic (under)development, relations between MNEs and labour, the state, and international systems of governance, and the possibility of an alternative economic system (Pitelis, 2002, p. 15). Hymer was not alone in considering issues of power in IB activity. Other contributions include Raymond Vernon’s (1971) *Sovereignty at Bay: The Multinational Spread of US Enterprises*, Barnet and Mueller’s (1974) *Global Reach: The Power of the Multinational Corporations* and later works such as Cowling and Sugden’s (1987) *Transnational Monopoly Capitalism*.

*CPoIB* seeks to reclaim this heritage and to provide a forum for academic debate on a wide variety of issues that emerge from the activities of IB whether these are internal to the organizations involved or the networks in which they are engaged or whether it is about the individuals, societies, cultures and places on which IB impacts.

Moreover, *CPoIB* provides a space for reflection on existing IB, and related, research as well as the reporting of findings from new research activity. Understanding the complexity of IB and its impact requires the use of various research methods and

---

innovative investigative practices. While the mainstream IB journals continue to be dominated by research employing quantitative methods, *CPoIB* provides an outlet for both quantitative and qualitative research. Moreover *CPoIB* is inclusive in terms of the theoretical and empirical approaches employed. The journal is open to novel research methods and original thinking more generally. Indeed, *CPoIB* is able to get new thinking out quickly, as exemplified by the publication of a special issue on the Global Financial Crisis in the spring of 2009 – one of the very first collections of academic reflection on the September 2008 crisis.

The journal has its origins in the UK academic environment, but from the very beginning it has had an international Editorial Advisory Board. Since its establishment the internationalization of the journal has increased with the core editorial team now being drawn from across Europe, Australasia and South America. Even so the journal remains poorly represented in Asia and Africa in terms of contributors, although it does have a growing readership in these regions. It is clearly not enough to merely espouse inclusivity without appropriate action. Exploring opportunities to broaden the appeal of *CPoIB* in under represented regions and also finding ways to make the journal accessible in such areas will continue to be a concern for the editors over the coming years.

Finally, we are keen to attract content on topics that have not yet received attention in the field of IB. We end our reflection on the future of *CPoIB* with some suggested areas for individual articles or special issues. These topics are in no sense meant to be exclusive, and we focus here on areas that have not yet received significant attention in the journal:

- IB related to criminal activity – mafia, people trafficking, slavery, sex tourism, drugs, trade in protected species, illegal trade in arms, diamonds, etc.
- The structures that support IB – including the global governance of trade and investment; issues of power and representation in such structures and their consequences.
- IB of the environment – global warming, carbon trading, the global recycling and waste disposal sector, sustainable IB, etc.
- International non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and labour organizations as actors in global production networks.
- Issues of gender, race, age and identity in IB management practice and scholarship.
- Small and medium sized businesses, social enterprise and community production in international contexts.
- BRICS and emerging countries – Chinese FDI in Africa, BRICS MNCs, the impact of the “Arab spring”, issues related to the bottom of the pyramid, etc.
- The international mobility and solidarity of workers – from elites to unskilled labour.
- Under researched sectors and activities at an international level, for instance, logistics and supply chain management, aid organizations and other NGOs as forms of IB.
- Technology and IB – biotechnology, research and development, communications and transportation, social media and e-commerce.



- Challenges to neo-liberalism and the increasing commodification and globalization of every aspect social and cultural life, including education, healthcare and private lives.
- Global inequalities, ethical issues and CSR.
- The relevance of IB research for all stakeholders – managers, shareholders, workers, consumers, citizens and future generations.
- *CPoIB* as a teaching resource – developing critical approaches to IB education.

Some of the topics listed above will be taken up in future contributions but so too will other topics that are of equal interest to critical scholars of IB. The future holds many possibilities and we look forward to discovering these with the journal's contributors and sharing them with its readers.

Turning to the current issue, we are pleased to present another exciting collection of articles and two book reviews considering a range of issues, from the role of corporations in defining the notion of global or international business and the Americanization of Brazilian management to the apparent paradox that multinational firms may and sometimes do pursue social benefits as their main objective and the challenge to labour transnationalism. With contributions from authors in Brazil, Canada, Italy, The Netherlands and the UK this issue reflects our continued commitment to producing a truly international journal.

In the first research paper entitled "Markets, organizations, institutions and national identity: Pan American Airways, postcoloniality and Latin America", Chris Hartt, Albert J. Mills, Jean Helms Mills and Gabrielle Durepos examine how the idea of the global or international business is developed, in part, through the activities of international companies. They achieve this through a case study of Pan American Airways, which in its early years (1927 to 1945) played a powerful role not only in US "Latin American" relations but also in shaping the idea of "Latin America". The authors highlight profound implications in terms of national identity, international trade and the role of international businesses.

Continuing with related themes the next paper entitled "Americanizing Brazilian management" by Rafael Alcadipani and Miguel P. Caldas begin by briefly discussing post-colonialism and Latin America, before going on to analyze the content of US management and its prevalence in the world. The authors then consider the process of the intentional Americanization of Brazil before going on to argue that the Americanization of Brazilian management is a process that resembles colonialism. This contribution has wider relevance for understanding how management knowledge is produced and reproduced in developing economies.

This is followed by "Playing around an oxymoron: international business with a human face" in which Antonello Zanfei considers the apparent paradox that multinational firms may pursue social benefits as their primary objective. Zanfei extends considerations of social business to an international context through an exploration of the notion of the "social multinational". He argues that institutional and technological transformations have created opportunities for the emergence of this phenomenon over the past three decades.

We are pleased to include a position paper by Nathan Lillie and Miguel Martínez Lucio entitled: "Rollerball and the spirit of capitalism: competitive dynamics within the global context, the challenge to labour transnationalism, and the emergence of ironic

---

outcomes”, in which the authors argue that through global competition capital is able to play unions in different locations off against each other. While trade unions have responded through, for instance, new forms of network-based cooperation the authors argue that these responses are insufficient to allow unions to overcome weaknesses inherent in their operating at a lower geographic level than capital.

The issue concludes with two book reviews. The first from Joanne Roberts on the sixth edition of Peter Dicken’s landmark text *Global Shift: Mapping the Changing Contours of the World Economy* (2011), and a second from Fei Qin on Edward Tse’s book *The China Strategy: How to Win the New Game of Global Enterprise* (2009).

We hope that you will enjoy reading this issue of *CPoIB*, that it will stimulate further critical debate concerning issues of relevance to IB and, importantly, that it will inspire further responses in the academic community, in the classroom and in the wider context of global society. As always, we encourage readers to participate in ongoing discussions and to raise new issues through contributions to the journal.

Finally, this issue sees changes to the editorial arrangements for reviews as Martyna Sliwa steps down from the role as Reviews Editor. We take this opportunity to thank Martyna for her efforts on behalf of *CPoIB* and we look forward to her continued support. In order to give more scope for the development of review contributions, two new Reviews Editors have been appointed, first, Mehdi Boussebaa from the University of Bath, UK, and second, Jens Gammelgaard, from the Copenhagen Business School, Denmark. We look forward to the development of the reviews section of the journal over the year ahead and encourage readers to get in touch with our new Reviews Editors with ideas for reviews and review essays. They can be contacted as follows: Mehdi Boussebaa – mb404@management.bath.ac.uk; and, Jens Gammelgaard – jg.int@cbs.dk

## References

- Adler, P.S., Forbes, L.C. and Willmott, H.: (2007), “Critical management studies”, in Walsh, J.P. and Brief, A.P. (Eds), *The Academy of Management Annals*, Vol. 1, Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ, pp. 119-79.
- Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H. (Eds) (1992), *Critical Management Studies*, Sage Publications, London.
- Barnet, R.J. and Mueller, R.E. (1974), *Global Reach: The Power of the Multinational Corporations*, Simon & Schuster (Touchstone), New York, NY.
- Buckley, P. and De Beule, F. (2006), “The research agenda in international business: past, present and future”, in Buckley, P. (Ed.), *Multinational Enterprise and the Globalization of Networks of Knowledge*, Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 311-38.
- Buckley, P.J. (2002), “Is the international business research agenda running out of steam?”, *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 365-73.
- Cairns, G. and Roberts, J. (2005), “Introduction from the Editors”, *critical perspectives on international business*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 4-6.
- Cairns, G. and Roberts, J. (2011), “Reflections on seven years of *critical perspectives on international business*: an extended editorial”, *critical perspectives on international business*, Vol. 7 No. 4, pp. 289-96.
- Cantwell, L. and Brannen, M.Y. (2011), “Positioning JIBS as an interdisciplinary journal”, *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 42 No. 1, pp. 1-9.
- Caves, R.E. (1998), “Research on international business: problems and prospects”, *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 5-19.



- 
- Cheng, J.L. (2007), "Critical issues in international management research: an agenda for the future", *European Journal of International Management*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 23-38.
- Cowling, K. and Sugden, R. (1987), *Transnational Monopoly Capitalism*, Wheatsheaf, Brighton.
- Czionkota, M.R. and Ronkainen, I. (2009), "Trends and indications in international business: topics for future research", *Management International Review*, Vol. 49 No. 2, pp. 249-65.
- Devinney, T., Pedersen, T. and Tihanyi, L. (Eds) (2010a), *The Past, Present and Future of International Business and Management*, Advances in International Management, Vol. 23, Emerald Group Publishing, Bingley.
- Devinney, T., Pedersen, T. and Tihanyi, L. (2010b), "The past present and future of international business and management", in Devinney, T., Pedersen, T. and Tihanyi, L. (Eds), *The Past, Present and Future of International Business and Management*, Advances in International Management, Vol. 23, Emerald Group Publishing, Bingley, pp. 33-41.
- Dunning, J.H. (1958), *American Investment in British Manufacturing Industry*, George Allen & Unwin, London.
- Dunning, J.H. (1989), "The study of international business: a plea for a more interdisciplinary approach", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 411-36.
- Eden, L. (2009), "Letter from the Editor-in-Chief: happy 40th anniversary!", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 1-4.
- Elahee, M.N. (2007), "Lee C. Nerht (1926-): a pioneering international business scholar", *European Business Review*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 142-59.
- Eunni, R.V. and Post, J.E. (2007), "What matters most? A review of MNE literature, 1990-2000", *Multinational Business Review*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 1-28.
- Faulconbridge, J.R. (2010), "TNCs as embedded social communities: transdisciplinary perspectives", *critical perspectives on international business*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 273-90.
- Fayerweather, J. (1994), "A personal odyssey through the early evolution of the international business pedagogy, research, and professional organization", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 1-44.
- Griffith, D.A., Cavusgil, S.T. and Xu, S. (2008), "Emerging themes in international business research", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 39, pp. 1220-35.
- Hymer, S.H. (1976), *The International Operations of National Firms: A Study of Foreign Direct Investment*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Jones, G. and Khanna, T. (2006), "Bringing history (back) into international business", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 453-68.
- Jonsen, K., Aycan, Z., Berdrow, I., Boyacigiller, N.A., Yoko Branner, M., Davison, S.C., Dietz, J., Gluesing, J., Kwantes, C.T., Lazarova, M., Madzar, S., Maloney, M.M., Maznevski, M., McDonough, E.F. III, Taylor, S., Thomas, D.C. and Weber, T.J. (2010), "Scientific mindfulness: a foundation for the future themes in international business", in Devinney, T., Pedersen, T. and Tihanyi, L. (Eds), *The Past, Present and Future of International Business and Management*, Advances in International Management, Vol. 23, Emerald Group Publishing, Bingley, pp. 43-69.
- Michailova, S. (2011), "The tortuous evolution of international management research: critical issues on the way to maturity", *Thunderbird International Business Review*, Vol. 53 No. 3, pp. 299-310.
- Mudambi, R. and Swift, T. (Eds) (2011), "Frontiers of research in international business", *Journal of International Management*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 185-262.
- Oesterle, M.-J. and Laudien, S. (2007), "The future of international business research and the relevance gap: a German perspective", *European Journal of International Management*, Vol. 1 Nos 1-2, pp. 39-55.

- 
- Peng, M.W. (2004), "Identifying the big question in international business research", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 35 No. 2, pp. 99-108.
- Pitelis, C.N. (2002), "Stephen Hymer: life and the political economy of multinational corporate capital", *Contributions to Political Economy*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 9-26.
- Roberts, J. and Fuller, T. (Eds) (2010a), "The futures of international business", *Futures: The journal of policy, planning and future studies*, Vol. 42 No. 9, (special issue).
- Roberts, J. and Fuller, T. (2010b), "International business: past, present and futures", *Futures*, Vol. 42 No. 9, pp. 901-9.
- Ramamurti, R. and Hashai, N. (Eds) (2011), *The Future of Foreign Direct Investment and the Multinational Enterprise*, Research in Global Strategic Management, Vol. 15, Emerald Group Publishing, Bingley.
- Schenkar, O. (2004), "One more time: international business in a global economy", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 35 No. 2, pp. 161-71.
- Sullivan, D.P. and Daniels, J.D. (2005), "Defining international business through its research", in Buckley, P. (Ed.), *What Is International Business?*, Palgrave, London, pp. 68-84.
- Werner, S. (2002), "Recent developments in international management research: a review of 20 top management journals", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 277-305.
- Wright, R.W. and Ricks, D.A. (1994), "Trends in international business research: twenty-five years later", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 25 No. 4, pp. 687-701.

### Further reading

- Buckley, P.J. and Lessard, D.R. (2005), "Regaining the edge for international business research", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 36 No. 6, pp. 595-9.

### About the authors

Joanne Roberts is Professor of International Business at Newcastle Business School, Northumbria University, UK. Her research interests include the new forms of international business and critical perspectives on knowledge in organization and economy. She is author of *Multinational Business Services Firms* (Ashgate, 1998) and co-editor of three books, most recently, *Community, Economic Creativity and Organization*, with A. Amin (Oxford University Press, 2008). She is also the co-founder and co-editor of *critical perspectives on international business*. Joanne Roberts is the corresponding author and can be contacted at: joanne.roberts@northumbria.ac.uk

Christoph Dörrenbächer is Professor for Organizational Design and Behaviour in International Business at the Berlin School of Economics and Law, Germany. He has worked as a consultant and research fellow at various organizations in Germany and abroad, including the Social Science Research Centre, Berlin and the University of Groningen, The Netherlands. He has held visiting appointments with the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations (New York), the Central European University (Budapest) and Manchester Metropolitan University. His current research focus is on politics and power in multinational corporations featuring issues such as knowledge transfer, subsidiary role development, subsidiary initiative taking, headquarters-subsidiary relationships and careers in multinational corporations. He is co-editor of *critical perspectives on international business*.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.