Dr. Philippe Lecomte

Toulouse Business School

p.lecomte@tbs-education.fr

Preferred conference track : track 2

Interdisciplinarity and its impact in management education and research

The multifaceted nature of language in IB and management research and its implications for management education: A call for interdisciplinary approach

Introduction

As stated 20 years ago, « language needs to be considered as an important element in managing multinationals because it permeates virtually every aspect of their business activities" (Marschan et al., 1997). Indeed, language shapes all human activities and although there is a "relative neglect of language in the general IB literature" (Welch & Welch, 2008; Harzing & Pudelko, 2013), interest in language-sensitive studies have been characterized by several peaks in academic publications between 2005 and 2016, (Tenzer et al., 2017). According to Brannen & Mughan (2017), it has become a central issue in IB & organizational studies and is distinct from cross-cultural studies. Brannen et al. (2014) point out the "decoupling of language from culture". Due to the « multifaceted role of language » an interdisciplinary approach is needed both in IB research and management education. Therefore, language-sensitive management research encompasses all aspects of business and managerial activities.

The main mission of Business Schools is to prepare students for complex professional contexts and to develop required competencies to work effectively in companies. The objectives of 'Language' Courses should be to enable future managers to communicate effectively in multinational /multicultural/multilingual settings. The internationalization of the student body does not automatically heighten competencies for effective work in multilingual/multicultural contexts. There is a need to explicitly formulate and integrate added value of multicultural group learning in program objectives and to better integrate language faculty by linking academic research and pedagogical engineering to the main management program.

How does language-sensitive research permeate Higher Management Education? How are language issues faced by international companies and managers represented in the curricula of business schools? This article aims at examining the link between academic research in international business / management and management education through the lens of language. We first outline the development of academic research in language-sensitive management research. Then we showcase new trends in the field before discussing implications for Higher Management Education and business schools. We conclude with a call for a holistic approach of the language issue and for a multidisciplinary research perspective in IB.

Language-sensitive research in IB and IM

In this section we look at the state of the art and, taking a historical stance, at the evolution of the field. In the past three decades there has been a growing recognition of the importance of language in International Business, organization and management studies. This is reflected by five important Special Issues of leading management and IB journals: *International Studies of Management and Organizatio*n, 2005, *3(1)*; *Journal of World Business*, 2011, 46 (3); *Journal of International Business Studies*, 2014, 45(5); and two Special Issues, based on the best papers of the International GEM&L Conferences 2015 (IJCCM released in April 2017) and 2016 (EJIM to be released in November 2017)

The multifaceted role of language

The multifaceted role of language in IB/IM is illustrated by the numerous domains in which language issues are addressed. In their bibliographical study based on the JIBS publications from the very beginning of the 70' to now, Brannen and Mughan (2017) found four clear inflection points among 32 selected articles where language was central :"1) an initial interest in language as instrument; 2) a preliminary inflection point indicating a turn toward linking language with culture; 3) a second inflection point toward linking language with MNC strategy; and 4) a more recent turn toward understanding language as a central construct in IB theory".

Therefore, language-sensitive research is multi-layered and mobilises different theoretical angles. Language plays a crucial role at the individual, the group and the firm levels. The most influencing theoretical perspectives are the social role played by language usage within the organisation. It encompasses the structuring role of language in organisations, the issue of individual and social power, the social identity perspective, the question of linguistic hegemony, not only in international companies but also in international business research, as we will see. This literature review shows as mentioned above the centrality of language and therefore highlights the emerging call for an interdisciplinary approach.

The individual perspective

Most of these studies examine the effect of incertainty, anxiety and tension due to linguistic asymmetry on the individual (Neeley, 2012; Tenzer & Pudelko, 2015; Qiu Wang et al., 2016). In line with the social identity theory (Tajfel, 1982), they highlight the importance of the sense of belonging or the role of emotions in team building, (Klitmøller & al., 2015), trust building and the social status of non-native language speakers (Neeley, 2013). Also gender studies (Santacreu-Vasut et al. 2014) highlight the link between the linguistic features of their native language and the role of females in company boards.

The group level perspective

Boundary-crossing has become an integral part of doing business in the world, as companies are compelled to engage in network-building and knowledge-sharing at home and abroad to meet their strategic objectives. At the same time, language barriers have been a great challenge companies and managers had to deal with. Language use, language friction, language boundaries have been addressed by a lot of scholars (Saulière, 2014; Fredriksson et al., 2006; Welch et al., 2005) as well as boundary spanning (Marschan et al. 1999; Peltokorpi & Vaara 2014; Welch & Welch, 2015; Peltokorpi, 2007). Language friction does affect alliance formation and the effects of language friction are economically significant and strategically consequential. Empirical research on language has given rise to a large amount of studies on language use, linguistic ostracism, language diversity on board processes. (Klitmøller & al. 2016; Dotan Elliaz et al. 2009; Piekkari & al 2015). Harzing & Feely (2008) or Welch & Welch (2015) have documented the positive or negative effects of mono vs multilingualism. The dark side of language is rooted in language asymmetries in multilingual teams, leading to marginalisation of actors and stigmatisation of sub-communities. These negative effects of linguistic inequality explain exclusion and/or resistance phenomena (Lauring & Klittmøller, 2014; Lønsmann, 2017; Wilmot, 2017)

The firm perspective

At the firm level, language policies (monolingual or multilingual perspective), knowledge transfers between headquarters and subsidiaries, circuits of power and language clusters within the organisation are crucial issues. International business questions the importance of the semiotic analysis as well as the role of contextualization (Brannen, 2004).

"Language is an essential if not the most important part of knowledge transfer in MNCs" (Welch & Welch 2008). Many scholars address the relation between language and knowledge transfer (Reiche et al., 2015; Peltokorpi, 2015; Argote et al., 2003; Welch & Welch 2008). In MNCs parallel networks can develop, based on the sharing of a common language, which threaten the cohesion of the organization and the sharing of knowledge (Marschan et al. 1999, Peltokorpi 2010 &2015). Also interunit relationships have been largely documented as a growing effect of globalization and a need to assure effective knowledge transfer within the whole organization (Peltokorpi, 2015; Schomaker & Zaheer, 2014; Reiche et al., 2015). Marschan-Piekkari, Welch & Welch (1999) examine the existence of a "shadow structure" created through informal networks based on language clusters. Vaara et al. (2005) show how language can generate inequalities, empowering or disempowering people, and determining their place in social networks.

International human resource management scholars look at the effects of language policies (Linn et al. 2015; Barner-Rasmussen & Arnio, 2011; Fredriksson, 2006; Sanden and Lønsmann, 2017), the importance of the language skills in career development and expatriation (Selmer & Lauring, 2015; Zhang & Peltokorpi.

Theoretical perspectives

The structuring role of language

The French scholar Jacques Girin (1990), albeit not often quoted in IB language-sensitive research, has been a pioneer in the field. He paved the way for language-sensitive research in organisations. Girin demonstrates in the early 80's the structuring role of language in organisations, showing that language communities are groups of agents who are constituted by language. As communities are unaware of this pervasive role of language, they are unable to understand arising misunderstandings. To overcome this difficulty, it is necessary to go beyond what Girin calls the code model based on Shannon & Weaver's definition of the communication channel. Girin highlights the non-neutrality of language, describing two dimensions of language: Indexicality (the ability to refer to the situation of the speech acts) and contextuality, (the existence of cognitive maps, which are used to give meaning to action). According to Girin the reason why these attributes of language are ignored is the naive belief that language is only a transparent tool for communication.

Bakhtin's dialogism

One of the most powerful conceptual frameworks to understand what really happens in multilingual/multicultural teams is Bakhtin's concept of dialogism. Bakhtin saw dialogue as the co-production of meaning through the intertwining of "utterances", forming a chain of never-ending utterances. The characteristics of a dialogic situation are polyphony (multiple voices), heteroglossia (different ways of speaking), addressivity and responsivity. Dialogical relations are shaped by historical, material, and social conditions, as well as intentions and expectations and their social status (Beeler & Lecomte, 2017). Dialogism and addressivity also refer to the concept of language hospitality forged by Paul Ricoeur.

The issue of power

The double-edged sword of language of power and of power of language is largely documented, drawing on sociolinguistics and organizational behaviour (Vaara et al., 2005; Welch & Welch, 2008). Discourse embodies power and can be an instrument in the creation or hindrance of power relations (Foucault 1981). Clegg (1987) describes language as an integral part of the "circuits of power" flowing in the organization. A lot of studies draw on Bourdieu's work to examine how the ability to use the language of the social, educational, and political elite confers status and power on the speaker. Vaara, et al. (2005), reinforcing Girin's analyse, show that language use is not neutral. It can create inequalities, empowering or disempowering people, and determining their place in social networks". In a recent presentation at the GEM&L conference 2017, Anders Klitmøller, adopting a Bourdieusian practice perspective examines the role of common language capital in the multilingual MNC and Josiane Martin and John E. O' Brien, use the conceptual frame of Pierre Bourdieu, in order to analyse how the newly acquired International Management Language delivered by an Indian Business School increased the social power of trained Indian managers. Marschan-Piekkari et al. 1999) show how a "shadow structure" is created through informal networks based on language clusters in a Finnish MNC, empowering these parallel networks detrimental to the MNC headquarters. Gaibrois and Steyaert (2017) investigate cooperative aspects of power in multilingual organisations.

Linguistic hegemony

Tietze (2004) demonstrates the link between the dominant North American culture in international management and the linguistic hegemony of the English language. She highlights that language is not a neutral medium and that Business English also acts as a conduit of power in order to impose the domination of one business ideology on the rest of the world and also to Business education. Horn et al. (2016) study how academics as language users of English experienced and coped with manuscript rejections in the fields of International Business. Horn (2017) launched a "series of experiments investigating the effects of 'stereotype vulnerability' of non-native speakers of English on difficult reasoning tests". Tietze (2017) questions "Management Scholarship in English Only?", by contrasting multilingual research with the monolingual nature of management research, when disseminating new generated knowledge.

Studies on M&A have highlighted the importance of language and communication issues for the success of cross border management (Lopez Duarte & Vidal Suarez, 2013; Cuypers & al. 2015). Language is not only a strong identity marker (Björge et al., 2015; Cohen & Kassis-Henderson, 2012, Neely, 2012). it also acts as "a reconfiguration agent" (Welch & Welch, 2008), which means that language affects and alters all operations of international business. Vaara et al. (2005) show power implications and indirect effects of a corporate language policy implemented in the case of a merger between a Swedish and a Finnish bank, arguing that "language skills become empowering or disempowering resources in organizational communication" and that the choice of a corporate language can "ultimately lead to the reification of post-colonial and neo-colonial structures of domination in multinational corporations". Boussebaa et al. (2014) draw on post-colonial analysis and associate Englishisation with power relations at call centres in India.

Language and translation studies

As Welch, Welch and Piekkari (2015) point out, “The demands of translation and their effects are embedded in the broader context of the language influence on international business”. Due to the rapidly increasing globalization of international Business operations, translation processes are at the heart of collective understanding (Piekkari et al. 2013). In this perspective, the conceptualisation of translation has become a core theoretical issue of language-sensitive academic research. Translation and translators can no longer be considered as simple transmitters of written and oral texts. The translation process is much better defined as a creative activity, which shapes a new reality. This is what Brannen et al (2014) describe as the “transformative power” of translation.

Piekkari and Westney (2016) examine the role of Japanese expatriates as the principal translators of Japanese management systems and organizational practices that were moved from Japan to the transplant factories in the US and Europe in the 1980s and 1990s. They show how these Japanese translators “with poor fluency in spoken English but with deep knowledge of the company-specific organizational practices […] acted as simultaneous interpreters to their American managers in order to render Japanese practices understandable and meaningful for the local context”. In a recent article, Tietze et al (2017) focus on the transfer of talent management knowledge to a Slowak company from a translation perspective. They demonstrate that the translator is a key agent in the cross-language knowledge transfer process, “in shaping the transfer process by addressing the ‘discursive void’ that characterizes local experiences with, and knowledge about, talent management”, while providing cultural and political interpretation of key vocabularies. Janssens et al. (2004) draw on translation studies in order to conceptualise different language strategies of international companies.

New perspectives in language sensitive IB and management research

This review of literature, albeit non exhaustive, opens new avenues for further research. Angouri & Piekkari (2017) argue for a break from conceptual binaries, which artificially oppose categories such as MNCs and SMEs, private and public sector, mono vs multilingual. They call for a more holistic approach and for a better consideration of processual and context-oriented research. They propose to move from static categories such as organisation and national languages to dynamic ones such as organis-*ing* and languag-*ing* in order to better capture the “dynamics of processes, fluidity and change in organisational life”. Therefore, they argue for a holistic and context sensitive approach to the study of linguistic ecosystems and make the case for a multi-layered and multidisciplinary approach to better understand multilingualism in the workplace.

For example, language diversity is no longer seen as a barrier, but as an opportunity. New concepts such as translanguaging (Garcia et al.,2014; Langinier et al., 2016), code-mesching (Canagarajah 2011) and other associated concepts such as hybrid language practices (Gaibrois, 2016) provide new ways of exploring language as a dynamic organizational process, as a co-construction of reality in the workplace not only of middle and top managers, but also for other categories of workers, who are now increasingly confronted with multilingual reality.

There is growing need to bridge together traditional research streams of management sciences and other relevant disciplines of social sciences. Angouri et al. consider that the ground-breaking article by Alvesson & Kärremann (2000) on the linguistic turn in social sciences has inspired a lot of research articles but has not really led to multidisciplinary research. They argue that there is no integrating attempt to liaise language, which is considered as a central factor in IB, with management disciplines. This can only be achieved methodologically by multidisciplinary language sensitive research.

In this section we illustrate possible examples of interdisciplinary research. One is the analogy between language and knowledge management. Other perspectives such as the Communicative Constituted Organization, (Cooren et al., 2011) call for a cross-pollination between language and organisation studies. Engeström's expansive learning theory, Lorino's activity theory and the heritage of Bakhtin and Vigotsky (dialogism) shed new light on the interaction between language and agency. Moreover, language is considered as action in itself within a semiotic system. We develop these points now.

A fruitful cross-fertilisation perspective: Language and Knowledge management

We argue the conceptual proximity between language and knowledge can open new avenues for a fruitful cross-fertilisation perspective. Many scholars have studied the interaction between language and knowledge in MNCs (Peltokopri 2015; Reiche, Harzing & Pudelko, 2015; Welch & Welch 2008; Renzl 2007; Ambos & Ambos 2009; Barner-Rasmussen & Björkmann 2007; Peltokorpi & Vaara, 2014; Schomaker and Zaheer, 2014; Piekkari & al 2013; Welch & Welch 2008), to quote a few of them. But no one has tried to examine how language and knowledge barriers are created and overcome. We draw on language in IB and knowledge transfer literature in an attempt to compare conceptual and methodological outcomes in both research streams.

For this purpose, we compare two similar approaches coming from two different academic fields: knowledge management and language-sensitive research. On the knowledge management side, Carlile's (2002) semiotic triangle presents three levels. The syntactic transfer based on an information-processing approach, the semantic transfer, based on interpretive differences and the pragmatic or political transfer, when particular conflicting interests are at stake. On the language side, Janssens' et al. (2004) model of language strategies based on the translation studies mentioned above is also a three steps model: 1 a mechanical strategy; 2 a cultural strategy; and 3 a political strategy. Both systems applied to knowledge transfer and to "linguistic" transfer overlap perfectly.

Other similarities between knowledge and linguistic boundaries are quite interesting. Both are complex processes: neither neutral nor transparent. Both are contextualized and culturally embedded, invested in practice. Both shape situations and structure communication.

There are a lot of analogies with the context of multilingual teams: False and naive belief in language transparency. Dark and bright side of language vs tacit and explicit knowledge (Nonaka et al. 1995; Tsoukas, 2009). Need to find a common ground of understanding in order to ensure effective communication. Knowledge and language are characterized by ethnocentrism: knowledge and language are embodied and culturally embedded (Hislop, 2002). In both cases, knowledge or language, team members have to question and collectively analyse the way they are thinking and speaking, because this thinking and speaking are the outcome of a collective construct.

The field of organization studies

In the field of organization studies, there are numerous opportunities for language-sensitive scholars to contribute to existing research streams such as the Communicative Constituted Organization. For Cooren, Kuhn, Cornelissen, Clark (2011), language structures the organization. In the language-sensitive research field, new concepts are arising. Piekkari et al (2013) put forward the idea of "language absorptive capacity" (the collective ability of the organization to understand and absorb communication in a different language). Welch & Welch (2015), echoing Girin's conceptual framework, have shaped the concept of language operative capacity (LOC) defined as "language-in-place, language-in-time and language-in-context, which, when properly managed on the organizational level, enables the MNE to function effectively as a multilingual entity and thereby potentially gaining competitive advantage".

We argue Engeström's activity system can describe the tensions and contradictions, which appear within a multilingual team with different cultural and professional backgrounds and unequal language skills. In both cases, team members believe in the transparency of knowledge and language. We argue that contradictions within a system or between two activity systems are similar to contradictions and tensions in multilingual, multicultural settings.

Lorino (2014) describes this process in terms of semiotic systems, which he calls "the language of habits" (drawing on Pierce philosophy). « Collective activity is an organising process, a discursive process based on the language of habits ». « Activity is a discourse in acts. » (Lorino, Activités, vol 10, n°1 electronic journal). Lorino's activity theory explains how different activity systems collide, creating disruptions and misunderstandings based on different habits (semiotic systems). The need of rebuilding the discursive frames of the participants' collective activity go through the process of inquiry that leads to reflexivity and the framing of a new activity system. Totally independent of Lorino's approach, Mary-Yoko Brannen (2004) explores the collision of two different semiotic systems in her case study on the Walt Disney Company's internationalization. Lorino goes beyond Austin's performativity of discourse. He calls for the discursiveness of action. He proposes a theoretical framework based on mediation, inquiry and dialogism (drawing on Bakhtin's theoretical framework mentioned in our first section). Dialogism conceptualizes the production of meaning through the situated interactions of actors. Semiotic mediation means that semiotic systems link situated experience to socially constructed generic categories of meanings. Inquiry articulates logical thinking, narrative thinking and experimenting (Pierce & Dewey). There are strong links between, activity, organis-*ing* (organisation process) and sense making. When semiotic systems (habits) are no longer able to link experience to generic categories of meanings the situation becomes incomprehensible. Inquiry is only possible when collective sense-making gets lost. Then inquiry is the collective way to construct a new semiotic system, new habits through discursive activity. We think the processes described by the activity theory and Bakhtin's dialogism are similar to those involved in miscommunication. Language barriers are due to different linguistic systems, different cultural frames of reference. The ethnocentric stance makes that thoughts and behaviours are anything but relative. Misunderstandings and marginalisation of minorities can only be overcome collectively by creating new frames of action

In other words, the heritage of Bakhtin and Vigotsky shed new light on the interaction between language and agency, moreover language is considered as action in itself within a semiotic system. Methodologically, this implies new forms of participative observation of the reality that can only be captured by immersion in the situation.

Practical implications

As shown in the literature review, language diversity has presently become a critical component in international organizations. This appears as well in the business world as in the educational sector. Previously an under-explored component of cultural diversity, language diversity in organizations is now being studied by applied linguists and management scholars. Their research findings lay emphasis on the de facto multilingualism, characterized by the interplay of different languages, in today's multicultural workplaces.

With the intensification of connections between people of different cultures and backgrounds, a simplistic and limited view of language has given way to a fuller understanding of the complexity of communication and language-related issues in today's international organizations. This has been facilitated by what has been termed the 'linguistic turn' in the social sciences which has given greater recognition to the importance of language in the social construction of reality (Vaara et al. 2005) and to language as a 'performative act', because using words means taking action rather than merely using a symbolic system describing reality (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2000). In recent years, the field of applied linguistics has also moved on operating a "multilingual turn" in research on second language acquisition. This approach has been hailed as no less than revolutionary, questioning as it does, the monolingual foundation of theoretical and applied linguistics (Kramsch 2012, May 2013) and thus acknowledging the 'performative role' of language.

By looking at management education, and in particular at the role of language and communication studies, there is a need to reconsider learning objectives, to introduce what could be called "a multilingual turn" in the context of today's business schools, moving away from the framework previously formulated in terms of distinct national languages and cultures. This 'multilingual turn' questions the monolingual foundation of applied linguistics and takes as a starting point the advantages of diversity-driven language use. This, we argue, should be reflected in the curricula of management higher education.

Management scholars and applied linguists have pointed out the inadequacies of the traditional approach to language and cross-cultural communication studies, stressing the need to move beyond the static and comparative models of cultural interaction on which it is based. As Holden (2002) has observed, a knowledge of 'national' languages and the cultures associated with them is no guarantee of successful interaction in the multilingual/ multicultural settings in MNCs. Despite the fact that cross-cultural studies have dominated academic research in the past, the link between culture and language has been addressed by Kassis-Henderson et al (2005) who show that people from different cultural backgrounds use specific rhetoric patterns, which are not recognized by speakers from other countries.

In her work on language use in the real world of business organisations, Nickerson (2005) has pointed out the mismatch between language teaching material used to prepare students for a specific business context (meetings) and the discursive practices actually used in concrete situations. Rather than focusing on linguistic competence based on the native speaker as a model, she recommends that students should learn to identify the different rhetorical strategies that are used in exchanges between speakers of different languages. Other scholars have also recommended adopting a broader perspective in the assessment of communication skills of employees, claiming that these should not only be based on the ability to use a specific language system (Charles and Marschan-Piekkari 2002) but on the impact and effectiveness of its use in a given context.

In today's complex world, companies must therefore show greater reactivity and flexibility to adapt to the continuously changing environment. This new situation requires a demanding skill-set ranging from cross-cultural awareness, adaptability to new working contexts, flexibility and permanently contextualized management thinking. Companies need well-trained, inventive, adaptable and innovative managers, able to quickly understand issues of an ever-increasing complexity. These qualities of the ideal profile would be more fully achieved if the importance of contextualizing language and communication skills were more explicitly integrated.

Until recently the tendency of language training policies in many business schools was to reduce language learning to the acquisition of a linguistic code (the hegemonic English language) and was disconnected from the overall learning objectives in management programmes. The teaching objectives of such language courses were often designed to match the criteria of standardized tests, therefore the importance of developing wider communication skills such as adapting language to specific contexts and to speakers of other languages was neglected. Ensuring the diversity of languages taught and enlarging the pedagogical objectives of courses to focus more on pragmatic competencies is a crucial strategic issue for institutions, especially in the context of allocating limited resources.

In some French Business Schools, bilingual examinations have been introduced to accustom students to the interplay of languages by switching from one language to another, using Spanish or German as well as English, which is often the reality in the workplace when dealing with various actors, be they colleagues, suppliers or customers. Some classes are also bi-lingual, with students and faculty switching languages according to the topic and speakers. Such too rare practices help prepare students to face the challenges posed by language diversity and improve their competencies to effectively manage language diversity in international contexts

As interacting within a culturally and/or linguistically homogenous population has become a rarity, course models based on traditional notions of language and culture which hold the native speaker as model and impose national boundaries as reference will not adequately prepare the student for the type of interaction and challenges they will necessarily encounter in the multilingual/multicultural contexts that are the norm in today's global economy. Preparing students "to move between languages and to understand and negotiate the multiple varieties of codes, modes, genres, registers, and discourses that [they] will encounter in the real world" (Kramsch, 2012) must become a core objective of management education.

As educators, we cannot allow these competencies to remain the advantage of those randomly born to multilingual/multicultural parents – a new twist to the native speaker privilege found in the mono-lingua franca model! The question must therefore be asked as to how we could best transpose these research findings into useable skills. Therefore, the question is how can we mobilize the language learner to first recognize and then adequately confront communicative obstacles (Kramsch, 2012), to become an adept member of multilingual/multicultural groups? And ultimately, how can language and cultural diversity better articulate the ‘global mindset’ (Jeannet, 2000) or ‘global literacy’ (Rosen, 2000) which are recognized as the “new competencies needed for the new economy?” (Söderberg & Holden 2002).

Language and communication departments in business schools can be one of the drivers for change within business education. The internationalisation of business school campuses does not automatically lead to the emergence of intercultural learning; schools must put adequate structures in place to draw tangible results from the presence of mixed student populations. French business schools, for their part, have always had departments of “language and communication studies” although these are often considered as non-academic areas because of the general and mistaken assumption that they simply teach “language courses” in the narrow sense of language as a simple tool for communication. The goal is not to teach languages or even communication competence in multilingual settings but to train students to adopt a flexible approach to language use, according to the composition of multilingual teams and to make them aware of the challenges posed by language boundaries and of the multifaceted role of language in international Business.

Conclusion

This study shows that it is urgent to develop shared learning goals with other departments and collaborate with them in order to acquire a cross-disciplinary understanding of international management issues. International business and language-sensitive studies are two areas that could be mutually reinforced through the development of joint programmes based on joint research within a broad-based Department of International Business combining economics and strategy, cross-cultural studies, and language / communication studies.

For this purpose, schools need to adopt a holistic approach in order to break down disciplinary boundaries. We therefore recommend a cross-disciplinary perspective, allowing business schools to strengthen the links between management sciences and other human sciences such as linguistics, IB and management studies, anthropology, social psychology, organisation and communication studies.

References

Alvesson & Kärremann (2000). Taking the Linguistic Turn in Organizational Research: Challenges, Responses, Consequences, *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 36: 136.*

Ambos, T-C. & Ambos, B. (2009). The impact of distance on knowledge transfer effectiveness in multinational corporations, *Journal of International Management 15, 1–14*

Angouri, J. and Piekkari, R. (2017). Organising multilingually: Setting an agenda for studying language at work, *European Journal of International Management, 11(6).*

Argote, L., Mc Evily, B., Reagans, R. (2003), Managing Knowledge in Organizations: An Integrative Framework and Review of Emerging Themes, *Management Science, 49(4): 571-582.*

Bakhtin, M.M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

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, 288–295*

Barner-Rasmussen, W. & Björkman, I. (2005). Surmounting Interunit Barriers: Factors Associated with Inter-Unit Communication Intensity in the Multinational Corporation, *Int. Studies of Mgt. & Org., vol. 35 (1), 28–46.*

Beeler, B. & Lecomte, P. (2017). Shedding light on the darker side of language: A dialogical approach to cross-cultural collaboration*. International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 17(1), 53–67

Björge, A.K. and Whittaker, S. (2015). Social identity in the linguistically and culturally diverse workplace: The impact of corporate values and language. *Paper presented at the 9th GEM&L International Workshop, 10-12 June 2015, Aalto University, School of Business Helsinki, Finland.*

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Boussebaa, M., Sinha, S. & Gabriel, Y. (2014). Englishization in offshore call centers: A postcolonial perspective. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 45, 1152-1169

Brannen, M. Y. and Mughan, T. (2017). *Language in International Business, Developing a Field,* Springer International Publishing AG.

Brannen, M.Y. (2004). When Mickey loses face: Recontextualisation, semantic fit, and the semiotics of foreignness. *Academy of management review, 29(4), 593 – 616*.

Brannen, M.Y., Piekkari, R. and Tietze, S. (2014). The multifaceted role of language in international business: Unpacking the forms, functions and features of a critical challenge to MNC theory and performance. *Journal of International Business Studies 45(5), 495–507.*

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Code-meshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *Modern Language Journal, 95, 401–417.*

Carlile, R. P. 2002. A pragmatic view of knowledge and boundaries: Boundary objects in new product development. Organ. Sci. 13 442–455.

Charles, M.L. & Marschan Piekkari, R. (2002) Language training for enhanced horizontal communication: A challenge for MNCs. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 65 (2), 9-29

Clegg, S. R. (1987). The Language of Power and the Power of Language. *Organization Studies*, 8 (1), 61-70.

Cohen, L. & Kassis-Henderson, J. (2012). Language use in establishing rapport and building relations: implications for international teams and management education. *Paper presented at the 6ème séminaire d'études du groupe GEM, 28 - 30 mars 2012, ESSEC, Paris.*

Cooren F, Kuhn T, Cornelissen JP and Clark T (2011). Communication, Organizing and Organization: An Overview and Introduction to the Special Issue. *Organization Studies 32(9), 1149–1170.*

Cuypers, I. R., Ertug, G., and Hennart, J. F. (2015). The effects of linguistic distance and lingua franca proficiency on the stake taken by acquirers in cross-border acquisitions. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 46(4), 429-442.

Dotan Elliaz & al. (2009). Multilingual Groups: Effects of Linguistic Ostracism on Felt Rejection and Anger, Coworker Attraction, Perceived Team Potency and creative performance. *Basic and applied social psychology, 31,363–375.*

Engeström, Y. (2001). Expansive Learning at Work: toward an activity theoretical reconceptualization. *Journal of Education & Work, 14(1),133-156.*

Foucault, M. (1981). "The order of discourse". In R. Young (Ed), Untying the text: a post-structural anthology (pp. 48-78). Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul. http://webspace.qmul.ac.uk/sbaumgarten/Foucault_The%20Order%20of%20Discourse.pdf).

Fredriksson, R., Barner-Rasmussen, W. and Piekkari, R. (2006). The multinational corporation as a multilingual organization. The notion of a common corporate language. *Corporate Communication: An International Journal* 11 (4), 406-423.

Gaibrois, C. (2016). Turning away from National Languages: How Hybrid Forms of Language Use Affect Communication in Multilingual Organizations. Working paper, 10th GEM&L International conference, Paris.

Gaibrois, C. and Steyaert, C. (2017). Beyond possession and competition: Investigating cooperative aspects of power in multilingual organizations. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management,* 17(1), 69–84

Garcia, O. and Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education,* Paris, Palgrave Macmillan.

Girin, J. (1990) « Problèmes du langage dans les organisations », in Chanlat et al. : *L'individu dans l'organisation : les dimensions oubliées,* Presses Universitaires de Laval (Québec), collection "Sciences administratives", et éditions ESKA (Paris), 37-77.

Harzing, A-W. and Feely, A. (2008). The language barrier and its implications for HQ-subsidiary relationships. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 15(1).

Harzing, A-W. and 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, 87-97.*

Hislop, D. (2002). Mission impossible? Communicating and sharing knowledge via information technology. *Journal of Information Technology* 17, 165–177

Holden, N.J. (2002). *Cross-cultural Management: A Knowledge Management Perspective.* London, Financial Times/Prentice Hall.

Horn, S. A., Piekkari, R. & Tietze, S. (2016). Coping with Manuscript Rejection: A Comparative Study of the Strategies of English Language Users. Working paper, 10th GEM&L International conference, Paris.

Horn, S. A. (2017). Language, lies & liability: Stereotypes and their impact on performance in work environments. Working paper, 11th GEM&L International conference, Copenhagen.

Janssens, M., Lambert, J., Steyaert, C. (2004*). "*Developing language strategies for international companies: the contribution of translation studies", *Journal of World Business, 39, 414 – 430.*

Jeannet, J.P. (2000). *Managing with a global mindset*, Financial Times Prentice Hall.

Kassis-Henderson, J. (2005). Language diversity in international management teams, *International Studies of Management and Organization, 35 (1), 66-82.*

Klitmøller, A. (2017). A Bourdieusian practice perspective on the multi-lingual MNC: The role of common-language capital. Working paper, 11th GEM&L International conference, Copenhagen.

Klitmøller, A. and Lauring, J. (2015). When distance is good: A construal level perspective on perceptions of inclusive international language use, *International Business Review, 25(1), Part B,276–285.*

Kramsch C., (2012). Authenticity and legitimacy in multilingual SLA, *Critical Multilingualism, an interdisciplinary journal,* 1(1).

Langinier, H., Ehrhart, S. and Barner-Rasmussen, W. (2016). Translanguaging practices in multilingual business contexts: Observations from France and Finland. *Paper presented at the 10th GEM&L Conference, March 17-18, ESCP-EUROPE, Paris.*

Lauring J., and Klittmoller, A. (2014). Corporate language based communication avoidance in MNCs: A multi-sited ethnography approach, *Journal of World Business http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2014.01.005.*

Linn, A., Refsum Sanden, G. and Piekkari, R. (2015). Language standardization in sociolinguistics and international business: theory and practice across the table. *Working paper presented at the 31st EGOS Colloquium, July 2–4, Athens, Greece.*

Lønsmann, D. (2011). English as a corporate language. Language choice and language ideologies in an international company in Denmark. Roskilde: Roskilde University PhD dissertation.

Lønsmann, D. (2017). Embrace it or resist it? Employees' reception of corporate language policies. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management,* 17(1) 101–123

Lopez Duarte, C. and Vidal Suarez, M.M. (2013). Cultural distance and choice between JV and wholly owned subsidiaries. *Journal of Business Research,* 66, 2252-2261.

Lorino, P. (2014). From Speech Acts to Act Speeches: Collective Activity, a Discursive Process Speaking the Language of Habits. In: *Language and Communication at Work: Discourse, Narrativity, and Organizing, François Cooren, Eero Vaara, Ann Langley, Haridimos Tsoukas, Oxford (United Kingdom): Oxford University Press, 95-124.*

Marschan, R., Welch, D. and Welch, L.S. (1997). Language: The Forgotten Factor in Multinational Management. *European Management Journal, 15(5), 591-598.*

Marschan-Piekkari, R., Welch, D., Welch, L. (1999). In the shadow: the impact of language on structure, power and communication in the multinational. *International Business Review, 8, 421–440.*

May, S., (2013), *The multilingual turn, Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education*, Taylor & Francis.

Neeley, T. (2012). Global Business Speaks English: Why You Need a Language Strategy Now. *Harvard Business Review* 90(5), 116–124.

Neeley, T. (2013). Language matters: Status loss and achieved status distinctions in global organizations. *Organization Science,* 24(2), 476-497.

Neeley, T.B. and Dumas T.L. (2016). Unearned Status Gain: Evidence from a Global Language Mandate. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(1), 14-43.

Nickerson, C. (2005). English as a lingua franca in international business contexts. *English for specific purposes*, 24, (4), 367-380.

Nonaka, I., Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The Knowledge-Creating Company.* Oxford University Press, New York.

Peltokorpi, V. (2007). Intercultural communication patterns and tactics: Nordic expatriates in Japan, *International Business Review, 16, 68–82.*

Martin 0' Brien, J. & O'Brien J-E. (2017). International Management Language (IML) confronts Indian Managerial Practice: between Managerial Assertion and Accommodation. Working paper, 11th GEM&L International conference, Copenhagen.

Peltokorpi, V. (2010). Intercultural communication in foreign subsidiaries: The influence of expatriates' language and cultural competencies. *Scandinavian Journal of Management 26, 176-188.*

Peltokorpi, V. (2015). Corporate Language Proficiency and Reverse Knowledge Transfer in Multinational Corporations: Interactive Effects of Communication Media Richness and Commitment to Headquarters, *Journal of International Management, 21, 49–62.*

Peltokorpi, V. and Vaara, E. (2014). Knowledge transfer in multinational corporations: Productive and counterproductive effects of language-sensitive recruitment. *Journal of International Business Studies, 45, 600-622.*

Piekkari, R. & Westney, D-E. (2016). Canada Expatriates as Translators in Japanese Transplants: The Complexities of a "Common" Corporate Language. Working paper, 10th GEM&L International conference, Paris.

Piekkari, R., Oxelheim, L. and Randøy, T. (2015). The Silent Board: How Language Diversity May Influence the Work Processes of Corporate Boards, *Corporate Governance: An International Review, 23(1), 25–41.*

Piekkari, R., Welch D., Welch, L., Peltonen, J-P. and Vesa, T. (2013). Translation behaviour: An explanatory study within a service multinational. *International Business Review*, 22, 771-783.

Piekkari, R., Welch, D., Welch, L. (2014). *Language in international business: The multilingual reality of global business expansion.* Cheltenham, UK & Northampton MA, USA: Edward Elgar.

Reiche, B. S., Harzing, A-W. and Pudelko, M. (2015). Why and how does shared language affect subsidiary knowledge inflows? A social identity perspective, *Journal of International Business Studies, 1–24.*

Renzl, B. (2007). Language as a vehicle of knowing: the role of language and meaning in constructing knowledge. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 5, 44–53

Rosen, R.H. (2000). *Global literacies: Lessons on business leadership and national cultures*, New York: Simon & Schuster.

Sanden, G. and Lønsmann, D. (2017) 'Discretionary power on the front-line: A bottom-up perspective on corporate language management', *European Journal of International Management*, 11(6).

Santacreu-Vasut, E., Shenkar, O., & Shoham, A. (2014). Lingusitic gender marking and its international business ramifications. *Journal of International Business studies, advance online publication, 20 February, doi: 10.1057/jibs.2014.5.*

Saulière, J. (2014). Anglais correct exigé : Dynamiques et enjeux de l'anglicisation dans les entreprises françaises, PhD thesis, Ecole polytechnique, Université Paris –Saclay.

Schomaker, M. and Zaheer, S. (2014). The Role of Language in Knowledge Transfer to Geographically Dispersed Manufacturing Operations. *Journal of International Management, 20, 55–72.*

Selmer, J. and Lauring, J. (2015). Host country language ability and expatriate adjustment: the moderating effect of language difficulty. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 26(3), 401-420.*

Söderberg, A. & Holden, N. (2002). Rethinking Cross Cultural Management in a Globalizing Business World. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 2(1), 103-121.

Steyaert, C., & Janssens, M. (2013). Multilingual scholarship and the paradox of translating and language in management and organization studies. *Organization, 20(1), 131–142.*

Tajfel, H. (1982). *Social identity and intergroup Relations*. Cambridge University press, Cambridge.

Tenzer, H. and Pudelko, M. (2015). Leading across language barriers: Managing language-induced emotions in multinational teams. *The Leadership Quarterly,* 26, 606-625

Tenzer, H. and Pudelko, M. (2016). Media Choice in multilingual virtual teams, *Journal of International Business Studies, 1–26.*

Tenzer, H., Terjesen, S. and Harzing, A.-W. (2017). Language in international business research: A review and agenda for future research. *Paper presented at the 11th GEM&L International Workshop on Management & Language, 4-5 July 2017, Copenhagen, Denmark.*

Tietze, S. (2004). Spreading the Management Gospel – in English*. Language and Intercultural Communication, 4 (3), 175–189.*

Tietze, S. (2017b). Multilingual research, monolingual publications: management scholarship in English only? *European Journal of International Management*, 11(6).

Tietze, S., Tansley, C., Helienek, E. (2017a). The translator as agent in management knowledge transfer. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 17 (1), 151–169.

Tsoukas, H. (2009). A Dialogical Approach to the Creation of New Knowledge in Organizations. *Organization Science,* 20, (6), 941–957

Vaara, E., Tienari, J., Piekkari, R. and Säntti, R. (2005). Language and the Circuits of Power in a Merging Multinational Corporation. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(3), 595–623.

Vygotski, L.S. (1986). *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Wang, Q., Clegg, J., Gajewska De Mattos, A. & Buckley, P. (2016). What A Feeling: An Empirical Study of the Nexus of Emotion and Cultural Friction in the Context of Intra-MNC Knowledge Transfer, working paper, 10th GEM&L International conference, Paris.

Welch, D. and Welch, L. (2015). Developing multilingual capacity: A Challenge for the multinational enterprise. *Journal of Management*, DOI: 10.1080/09585192.2015.1072104.

Welch, D., Welch, L. (2008). The importance of language in international knowledge transfer, *Management International Review, 48(3).*

Welch, D., Welch, L., Marschan-Piekkari, R. (2005). Speaking in tongues, the importance of Language in International Management Processes, *Studies of Management and Organization*, 35 (1).

Wilmot, N-V. (2017). Language and the faces of power: A theoretical approach. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management,* 17(1), 85–100

Zhang, L-E. and Peltokorpi, V. (2015). Multifaceted effects of host country language proficiency in expatriate cross-cultural adjustments: a qualitative study in China, T*he International Journal of Human Resource Management,* http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1072104.