JANNE TIENARI and EERO VAARA

The Contested Terrain of Globalization: Review and Conceptual Clarifications for Management Studies

ABSTRACT

The concept of globalization has become a shorthand for making sense of contemporary society. It reflects large-scale economic and social change, which affects people differently and evokes different viewpoints. Globalization is thus a highly contested concept and phenomenon. Contradictory and competing views, in turn, seem to be based on different interpretations of the present dominant forms of globalization, and of the material, economic, social and cultural conditions that these forms produce and give rise to. We view globalization not only as a significant set of economic, financial, social, political and cultural forces but as a powerful and contested discursive space. In this article, we present an overview of recent literature to introduce different thematic perspectives on globalization, to specify different ideological and discursive bases to approach globalization, and to place multinational corporations (MNC:s) within this context. Our account is not exhaustive, rather, it is intended as a basis for further discussion on the nature and role of multinational corporations in complex "global" society.

JANNE TIENARI, Professor
Lappeenranta University of Technology, • e-mail: janne.tienari@lut.fi
EERO VAARA, Professor
Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration, Helsinki, • e-mail: eero.vaara@shh.fi

413

DISCUSSION

Introduction

Globalization is constantly in the news. Globalization is celebrated when financing flows, innovations flourish and new business opportunities open up. Globalization is blamed when businesses vanish, factories are shut down or moved, when jobs are lost and working conditions deteriorate. Globalization has become a shorthand for making sense of complex and multifaceted phenomena in the contemporary world.

In this article, we review literature on globalization and provide some conceptual clarifications to understand its present forms and consequences. We view globalization not only as a significant set of economic, financial, social, political and cultural forces but, significantly, as a powerful and contested discursive space. Our aim is, first, to unpack recent literature on globalization, second, to specify neo-liberal global capitalism and nationalism as discourses and ideologies vis-à-vis globalization and, third, to place multinational corporations (MNCs) within this context.

The vocabulary of globalization has become a pervasive way of thinking and writing about late modernity (or post-modernity), that is, contemporary society. The concept of globalization has in recent years been discussed in disciplines such as *business and political economics* (Ohmae 1990; Fukuyama 1992; Dunning 1999; Kobrin 2001; 2001b), *economic history* (Hobsbawm 1990), *finance theory* (de la Torre et al 2002), *political science* (Held 1990), *anthoropology* (Friedman 1994, 2000; Appadurai 1996), *sociology* (Robertson 1992; Castells 1996; Bauman 1998; Bourdieu 1998; Giddens 1999; Guillén 2001; Bourdieu and Wacquant 2001), *psychology* (Sampson 1989; Marsella 1998; Arnett 2002), *social psychology* (Herriot and Scott-Jackson 2002), *social policy* (Gough 2004), *media and communication studies* (Herman and McChesney 1997; McPhail 2002; Curran 2002; Kellner 2003), *linguistic theory and applied linguistics* (Chomsky 1999; Fairclough 2000; Fairclough and Thomas 2004), *philosophy* (Jameson 1999), and *geography* (Taylor et al 2002), to name but a few examples of authors in each discipline. Globalization has also been discussed in, for example, fields such as feminist (Eisenstein 1998; Marchand and Runyan 2000; Mohanty 2004) and postcolonial (Prasad 2003; Loomba et el 2005) studies.

The concept of globalization reflects large-scale economic and social change, which affects people differently and evokes different viewpoints. Reviewing the literature it becomes clear that a focus on globalization entails cross-disciplinarity and challenging established barriers between the sciences, as John H. Dunning (2003), for example, shows in his edited volume on *"Making Globalization Good: The Moral Challenges of Global Capitalism"*. A review of the literature also suggests, however, that globalization is a highly contested concept and phenomenon. There are strong voices for and against what is understood as globalization. These contradictory and competing views, in turn, seem to be based on different interpretations of the present dominant forms of globalization, and of the material, economic, social and cultural conditions that these forms produce and give rise to.

Protagonists emphasize globalization's links with economic growth and the trickling down of wealth to an increasing number of people on a global scale (e.g. Friedman 1999; Norberg 2001; Bhagwati 2004; Wolf 2004). In contrast, critics argue that contemporary globalization is fundamentally unbalanced, and point their criticism to inequality, exclusion and mar-

ginalization as well as polarization of wealth (e.g. Pritchett 1997; Herman and McChesney 1997; Bauman 1998; Bourdieu 1998; Chomsky 1999; Rupert 2000; Mohanty 2004). In brief, while protagonists emphasize the importance of globalization in creating new resources, critics argue that economic globalization in its present form works to misuse resources and to reinforce poverty and inequality.

In addition to the disciplines listed above, the roots, forms and consequences of globalization have been studied in *management and organization theory*, which is our primary area of interest in this article. A polarization between managerialistic and critical perspectives is evident in management and organization studies, which discuss globalization in general and multinational corporations within this context in particular (e.g. Bartlett and Ghoshal 1992; Westwood 2000; Banerjee and Linstead 2001). To put it crudely, while managerialistic framings are often abstract, uncritical and naiively enthusiastic about the opportunities globalization offers for business, critical framings often associate globalization with all questionable contemporary phenomena without specifying the processes and dynamics involved.

Following Fiss and Hirsch (2005), the present condition may thus be conceived of as a struggle between different discursive framings and, in consequence, a dispute concerning understandings of the legitimacy of particular forms of economic and social change. In our view, the apparent polarization of viewpoints (and analyses) has created a situation where open discussion and a more fine-grained exchange of ideas on different facets of "globalization" has to a significant extent stagnated.

In the following, we first present an overview of recent literature to briefly introduce dif-

ferent thematic perspectives on globalization. Next, we specify different theoretical and ideological bases to approach globalization, and go on to place multinational corporations (MNCs) in this context. Finally, we summarize our findings and propose agendas for future research. It should be noted, however, that our sketching is tentative. It is far from being exhaustive. We offer this article as one attempt towards conceptual clarification. First and foremost, our account is intended as a basis for further discussion on the nature and role of multinational corporations in contemporary "global" society.

Globalization: A Contested Concept and Terrain

Different views on globalization notwithstanding, it is evident that trade and business on an ever larger – even global – scale will be accentuated in the 21st century. Globalization can in this sense refer to the ways in which economic and industrial institutions such as investors and multinational corporations (MNCs) increasingly interact in various locations throughout the world. Based on existing literature it may also be argued that such contemporary economic globalization is based on, and conditioned by, three intertwining elements.

The first, and arguably the most significant, force in economic globalization is the dramatic development in *information and communications technology*. Kobrin (2001b: 34), for example, claims that "the dramatic increases in the scale of technology, the internationalization and integration of production, and especially the digital revolution and the emergence of an electronically networked world economy will be impossible to reverse." Such arguments for inevitability and irreversibility build on technological advancement. They seem to indicate

415

DISCUSSION

continuing global convergence in forms of economic organization. Such arguments are substantiated by the fact that an increasing number of people have quick access to rapidly increasing amounts of information, the production and consumption of which is in principle no longer dependent on time and place.

Second, developments in information and communications technology have in past decades coincided with *deregulatory acts* in a range of industries in an increasing number of countries. Deregulation has also taken place between countries and regions in relation to diverse cross-national bodies such as the *World Trade Organization*, the *World Bank* and the *International Monetary Fund*[1]. Contemporary global financial markets are perhaps the most significant individual example of the effects of deregulation. From the late 1950s onwards, the established structure of world banking has disintegrated and an international money and capital market was (re)created as regulatory regimes were progressively lifted in a number of national markets (Jones 1998). Deregulation in the form of a step-by-step dismantling of barriers between different markets and institutions has since become the key driver in the construction of a new, market-driven global order (cf. Morgan and Knights 1997).

Third, information technology and deregulation have contained the emergence of a *global media system* that is increasingly detached from governmental control. Although its roots can be traced back decades or even centuries, the establishment of an integrated global media market began in earnest in the late 1980s. It has been argued that contemporary global media are a crucial part of the overall expansion and spread of an increasingly integrated global corporate system; apart from being a gigantic and growing business *per se*, mass media corporations complement and support the needs of

---

1 The *World Trade Organization* (WTO) is the "only global international organization dealing with the rules of trade between nations. At its heart are the WTO agreements, negotiated and signed by the bulk of the world's trading nations and ratified in their parliaments. The goal is to help producers of goods and services, exporters, and importers conduct their business." WTO was founded in 1995 as the successor to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), established in the wake of WWII, to administer trade agreements, to provide a forum for trade negotiations, to handle trade disputes, and to monitor national trade policies. (www.wto.org; accessed July 8, 2005)

The *World Bank* and the *International Monetary Fund* (IMF), in turn, were established as a result of the Bretton Woods meeting of 1944. The World Bank (initially known as International Bank for Reconstruction and Development) was initially founded to contribute to the rebuilding of war-torn Europe. With the introduction of the Marshall Plan, however, this role soon became redundant and the World Bank turned to the developing world. Today, its mission statement stands as "World Bank – Working for a World Free of Poverty." It is "an international organization fighting poverty in more than 100 developing countries by providing loans & advice. […] It is a development Bank which provides loans, policy advice, technical assistance and knowledge sharing services to low and middle income countries to reduce poverty. The Bank promotes growth to create jobs and to empower poor people to take advantage of these opportunities." (www.worldbank.org; accessed July 8, 2005)

IMF was founded in 1945 to manage balance of payment equilibria and the fixed exchange rate system, and act as a bank through which funds from surplus countries were channeled as short-term loans for deficit countries. Today, "the IMF is an organization of 184 countries, working to foster global monetary cooperation, secure financial stability, facilitate international trade, promote high employment and sustainable economic growth, and reduce poverty" (www.imf.org; accessed July 8, 2005).

WTO, World Bank and IMF are all institutions stemming from the Cold War period. Through their policies – for example, subjecting recipient countries to "structural adjustment programmes" based on trade liberalization, curtailing public expenditure, relaxing barriers to external capital flows, privatization of state-owned business, and deregulating the labour market – the WTO, the World Bank and IMF continue to promote principles of neo-liberal global capitalism discussed in detail below. For an accessible critical historical account of these institutions and their roles in contemporary globalization, see e.g. Hertz (2004).

non-media enterprises in providing part of the global infrastructure for corporations and in facilitating their business (see e.g. Herman and McChesney 1997; McPhail 2002). It has also been argued that the media promote and legitimate specific kinds of ideologies, ideas and practices in business organizations and society at large (see e.g. Mazza and Alvarez 2000; Vaara and Tienari 2002; Mazza and Strandgaard Pedersen 2004; Kjaer and Langer 2005).

Overall, the emerging global context marked by the intertwining elements of technological advancement, deregulation and global mass media has been conceptualized in a multitude of ways. This context has been termed the *information and network society* (e.g. Castells 1996), the *digital economy* (e.g. Tapscott 1997; Brynjolfsson and Kahin 2000), the *knowledge-based economy* (e.g. Prusak 1997), the *knowledge economy* (e.g. Powell and Snellman 2004), the *information-intensive economy* (e.g. Child and McGrath 2001), the *learning economy* (e.g. Lundvall and Johnson 1994), and the *globalizing learning economy* (e.g. Archibugi and Lundvall 2001), to name but a few examples.

Focusing on debates in sociology in particular, Guillén (2001) identifies three broad contemporary interpretations of globalization: civilizing, destructive or feeble (cf. Hirschman 1982). Guillén (2001) goes on to argue that existing theoretical and empirical research on globalization, from the point of view of the three perspectives, is organized around a number of key issues or questions. Is globalization really happening? Does it produce convergence? Does it undermine the authority of nation-states? Is globality different from modernity? Is a global culture in the making?

In a somewhat different take on the literature, Held et al (1999) outline three broad schools of thought in interpreting globalization: hyperglobalists, sceptics and tranformationists. Fiss and Hirsch (2005) note that contradictory conclusions on globalization illustrate how divergent interpretations can selectively cite and assert empirical support for their arguments. Fiss and Hirsch suggest that globalization has become a grand contest of social constructions and an "umbrella concept". Consequently, it requires substantial interpretation. (Cf. Hirsch and Levin 1999)

Beyond the various interpretations, it seems to be widely accepted that the emerging context outlined above affects corporations and other organizations significantly and in apparently unprecedented ways. On the one hand, a general transition from an economy based on materials to an economy based on flows of information puts emphasis within organizations on factors such as accepting contradiction and paradox, responsiveness to uncertainty, strategic focus on structure and process design, the social and the interpersonal and issues of legitimacy (Child and McGrath 2001). Innovations and knowledge creation are argued to have become the principal assets of organizations, and the management of knowledge and innovation the key challenge and driver of prosperity (e.g. Nonaka and Takeuchi 1995; Prusak 1997).

On the other hand, managerial practices in large corporations and other organizations have arguably shifted from being driven by production to being finance-driven; managers manage firms increasingly as investment targets rather than production units (Tainio et al 2003). A focus on the preferences and whims of investors – culminating in the floating market value of the corporation – has evidently become the single most important element of the corporate executive agenda. In all, in such a context, ac-

417

DISCUSSION

cording to Kobrin (2001b), globalization can be defined as a transition from a world ordered geographically, where the basis for economic and political organization is sovereign territoriality, to an aterritorial networked mode of organization whose form is not yet clear.

A persistent state of unclarity thus surrounds the concept of globalization. Waters (1995: 3) defines globalization as a "social process in which the constrains of geography on social and cultural arrangements recede and in which people become increasingly aware that they are receding." Deviating further from more technology-oriented views, it could also be argued that core aspects of globalization remain geographical. Globalization is constituted by trans-state processes, indicating a specific scale of social activity transcending relations between (nation-)states (Taylor et al 2002). It relates to the intensification of economic, political, social and cultural relations across existing borders (Holm and Sorensen 1995).

However, as terms such as "glocalization" (e.g. Robertson 1995; Swyngedoux 1997) and "local-global" (e.g. Pred and Watts 1993) indicate, any analysis that pits local and national versus global is developing a suspect research agenda (Taylor et al 2002). First, it may be argued that the simultaneity of the global and the local – of the universal and the particular – is characteristic of the globalization process (Wallerstein 1990; Robertson 1992; Banerjee and Linstead 2001). Second, it can be argued that categories of global and national are not mutually exclusive; elements of globalization are embedded in particular institutional locations within nation states (Sassen 1998). We will return to these crucial points in our discussion on nations, nationalism and national identities below.

Alternative ways to theorize globalization provide a vantage point for such concerns. Banerjee and Linstead (2001), for example, present a detailed and insightful review of what they term the fiction of globalization. They define globalization as a discourse (or, rather, a set of discourses), which promotes new global colonialism. The discourse of globalization, in turn, is in their view related to the broader Western discourse of industrial and capitalist progress, which continues to nurture an assumption of its own inevitability (cf. Hirst and Thompson 1998). It can thus be argued that the momentum in globalization is rooted in the capitalist logic of expanding markets and the international integration of capital and the forces of production. On such a basis, Banerjee and Linstead (2001) argue for understanding contemporary globalization as a (discursive) construct, and discuss extensively the purposes and means of its construction. Importantly, Banerjee and Linstead discuss issues related to power within their overall framework of globalization as discourse(s).

Apart from its economic and political dimensions, then, globalization can be discussed in terms of the social and the cultural. Globalization, like modernity, is in this respect first and foremost associated with the diffusion of capitalist society and Western culture (cf. Waters 1995). It does, however, produce tension between the universal and the particular, and between cultural homogenization and cultural heterogenization (see e.g. Banerjee and Linstead 2001). Specifically, as Banerjee and Linstead (2001: 696) put it:

> "There is not one global mass culture, but rather transnational processes produce the globalization of culture where a multitude

of cultural flows, not always consistent with dominant nation-state ideologies, emerge (Lash and Urry, 1994). In fact, some writers argue that globalization tends to reinforce ethnicity and nationality rather than create a new global culture. [...] [T]hese ethnicities are reconstructed and managed through the circulation, appropriation and manipulation of images of contemporary culture (Lash and Urry, 1994; Smith, 1990)."

These considerations typically associate the "West" with colonization and the "non-West" as the colonized – although the colonized may at times appear ideologically and culturally resistant. In our view, it is problematic that the critical literature on globalization typically presents the "West" as a monolithic block and analyzes its influences accordingly. Even those authors who consider the "West" not as a phenomenon in itself, but as a discourse or discursive space (cf. Banerjee and Linstead 2001), seem to conceptualize it as a relatively uniform construct. In partial contrast, we develop an alternative conceptualization of globalization and related constructs in this article, and argue that the "West" is a fragmented discursive space marked by persistent nationalisms and national identities, which cannot be reduced to uniformity, even in the face of a "non-West".

This reasoning deviates from other contemporary debates where terms such as *crealization* (e.g. Howes 1996) and *multiculturalism* (e.g. Harris et al 2004; Hoobler 2005) have been introduced to analyze the meeting of "global forces" and local traditions and concerns. Howes (1996: 5) uses the concept of crealization to denote "the process of recontextualization whereby foreign goods are assigned meanings and uses by the culture of reception". Banerjee and Linstead (2001: 699) argue that such a conception "does not overturn the nexus between global capitalism and what Sklair (1995) calls the 'culture-ideology of consumerism'".

Multiculturalism, in turn, when viewed in relation to the discourse of globalization, has become a concept that can be employed to manage the often problematic (from the point of view of the globalizers / colonizers) consequences of cultural diversity (Banerjee and Linstead 2001). In this sense, multiculturalism is a discursive tool in the hands of managerialist advocates of globalization to control suspicion and resistance. Those who are not deemed to be part of the dominant culture are rendered different and exotic (Hall 1991; Moore 1994), in need of managerial inverventions. Tomlinson (1999), however, suggests that what he calls a genuinely cosmopolitan culture is unlikely to emerge unless cultural differences are respected. In all, it is evident that social and cultural differences persist – and need to be considered in relation to processes of globalization.

Before proceeding further, it is important to note that globalization is a contested concept also from a regional perspective (Rugman 2000; 2005). Regionalization has been specified as a significant contemporary economic and social force, operating in tandem with (or even in opposition to) globalization. A region can in this perspective be defined as a limited number of states linked by a geographical relationship and a degree of mutual interdependence. Regions can be conceived of as intermediate forms of community between the (potential) global community of humankind and national communities of the state (cf. Whiting 1993).

The three arguably most significant regions in the new millenium are North America, Europe and Asia. Each region provides an exam-

419

ple of a specific form of regional integration. In 1994, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) was signed to lower tariffs and lift limitations on international investments between the United States, Canada and Mexico. In Europe, regionalization in the form of political integration has materialized in the expansion of the European Union (EU). This integration, in turn, has had ramifications for both (national) economies and business activity. The establishment of a single European market in 1992 and the introduction of the common currency Euro in 2001 were arguably the single most important milestones in this process so far.

Finally, apart from its economic, political, social, cultural and regional aspects, globalization can be conceptualized as a physical condition for individuals, a mental state or even an imagined condition. This takes the discussion towards flux, fragmentation and discontinuity rather than uniformity of economic and social forces. Anthropologists, for example, have in recent times been active in examining the development of "global cities" such as New York, London and Tokyo, and of transnational business people who move between such locations over the course of their career to facilitate the global integration of corporations (e.g. Sassen 1991; Sklair 2001; Beaverstock 2002).

Transnational business people can be conceived of as the elite of contemporary globalization. Moore (2004) studied what she calls the social maps of such individuals. She emphasizes the complex array of their connections to locations of varying degrees of global or local orientation, and the constant need to negotiate between global and local social spaces. As key nodes in globalization, global cities are comprised of flux, fragmentation and discontinuity

420

linked to technological (Moore 2004) and social (Leyshon and Thrift 1997) change in the minds of transnational business people. Moore (2004) even goes on to maintain that global cities are an example of a postmodern culture: globally engaged, in continuous flux, driven by changes in technology and transportation, and inhabiting, in a sense, a discontinuous, Utopian space.

Significantly, for mobile transnational business people to be able to facilitate the global integration of corporations, some people need to stay put in, or immigrate to, low-skilled and low-paid jobs. Bauman (1994) argues that globalization means that the lives of people at the lower levels of economic activity must be rendered as rigid as possible: "their freedom to choose, to accept or refuse, let alone to impose their own rules of the game, must be cut to the bare bone" (ibid.: 105). Mohanty (2004) points out that it is women and girls that suffer disproportionately in contemporary globalization. According to Eisenstein (1998), women do two-thirds of the world's work and earn less than one-tenth of its income.

Globalization can in this way be thought of as a set of gendered processes, material and discursive. Transnational elite business people, for example, have been the subject of organization theorists' scrutiny. Feminist literature has paid attention to the fact that transnational elite business people tend to be men (cf. Calas and Smirich 1993, 1999; Acker 1998; Connell 2001; Tienari et al 2005). Calás and Smirich (1993) argue that in an apparently globalizing world, "the household is extended up to the national border". According to the dominant discourse, women are not able to travel as much as is required of executives, due to their family obligations. They are unable to meet the

challenges of the global playing field or arena[2].

In consequence, senior executive management in multinational organizations remains in practice reserved for men whose wives (or domestic help) take care of the home. Connell (2001) argues that a specific type of masculinity has thus become prominent along with the contemporary reform of national and international economies. This transnational business masculinity is flexibly calculative and egocentric. It is marked by conditional loyalties (even to the company) and a declining sense of responsibility for others. Hooper (2000) identifies the Anglo-American nature of the emerging hegemonic masculinity. On the one hand, it retains an image of aggressive frontier masculinity and, on the other, it draws from more benign images of non-hierarchical management skills (ibid.).

More generally, it has been argued that discourses of globalization are themselves gendered. Marchand and Runyan (2000), for example, discuss the gendered metaphors and symbolism in the language of globalization whereby particular actors and sectors are privileged over others: market over state, global over local, finance capital over manufacturing, finance ministries over social welfare, and consumers over citizens (see also Mohanty 2004).

In all, it is clear that conceptions of globalization provide pervasive ways of thinking and writing about contemporary society. Globalization can in this sense be understood as a significant set of contemporary economic, so-cial, political and cultural forces. Crucially, however, globalization also makes up a discursive space where different views, based on different ideologies, become articulated and contested. As already indicated above, some ideologies and discourses are particularly powerful in contemporary society.

Globalization: Different ideological and discursive bases

In the following, we present two apparently powerful bases for understanding contemporary globalization as a set of economic, social, political and cultural forces and as a discursive space. First, we look at what we term neo-liberal global capitalism and, second, we focus on nations, nationalism and national identities.

Neo-liberal global capitalism and its critics

As discussed above, globalization entails both integration and interconnectedness. It is important to note, however, that changes in the geographical scales of economy and business do not just emerge. Rather, they are constructed through human action. In this sense there is nothing inevitable about an increasing, "global" scale of economic activities (Taylor et al 2002; Smith 1993). The current political hegemony of neo-liberalism in the United States, Europe and elsewhere has led many to equite this programme of policies with globalization itself. Others, however, point out that such a direct parallel is an inaccurate one (e.g. Kobrin 2001b). As Jones (2003: 252) puts it: "Globali-

---

2 Barnet and Cavanagh (1994), for example, characterize the global commercial arena in terms of four intersecting webs: (1) *the global cultural bazaar* (which creates and disseminates images and dreams through films, television, radio, music and other media), (2) *the global shopping mall* (a planetary supermarket that sells things to eat, drink, wear and enjoy through advertising, distribution and marketing networks), (3) *the global workplace* (a network of factories and workplaces where goods are produced, information processed and services rendered) and (4) *the global financial network* (the international traffic in currency transactions, global securities etc.). Mohanty (2004) points out that in each of these webs, racialized ideologies of masculinity, femininity and sexuality play a role constructing the legitimate consumer, worker and manager.

DISCUSSION

zation and advanced capitalism are involved in a complex dance in which there is no clear leader; that is, they are internally distinct but inextricably intertwined phenomena."

Neo-liberalism (or advanced capitalism) is typically referred to as the removal of barriers to free movement of capital and goods around the globe, and to the extension of the market to virtually all areas of social life. *The New York Times* columnist Thomas L. Friedman outlined the neo-liberal case for globalization in its most extreme form in his popular book *The Lexus and the Olive Tree* (1999). Friedman views globalization in terms of the integration and what he calls democratization of capital, technology and information across national borders. He introduces globalization as a permanent post-Cold War system.

Friedman maintains that within this new "system", national governments need to attend to what he coins as the electronic herd of moneylenders, international investors, analysts, MNCs and the like, who aim to secure the best possible yield for their investments. In this way, the thinking goes, the herd contributes to the most efficient allocation of economic resources on a global scale. In Friedman's thinking, any country can be a "winner" if it succumbes to market forces and the electronic herd. Nations, societies and communities have in this perspective no choice but to participate in the New International Information Order (ibid.). The United States emerges in Friedman's book as the most positive example of a nation taking advantage of globalization (thus apparently suggesting that nations continue to matter[3], even for a

hard-line advocate of neo-liberal globalization).

Thomas L. Friedman was heavily criticized for his views (e.g. Rupert 2000), but like-minded commentators soon came to rescue. Johan Norberg (2001), an economist from the Swedish right wing think-tank *Timbro*, Martin Wolf (2004), an economist writing for *The Financial Times*, and Jagdish Bhagwati (2004), Professor of Economics at Columbia University, all joined Friedman in celebrating the merits of neo-liberal global capitalism. They dismissed critics for being emotionally and politically charged (Norberg 2001) or accused them of airy socialist utopias that make for nice theory, but do not work in practice (Wolf 2004). It is interesting to note that neo-liberal arguments, especially when uttered by economists and financial analysts, are often presented in the form of neutral "facts". Such declarations of neutrality and facts extend to, for example, communications scholars (e.g. McPhail 2002) who disparage the ideas of critical media approaches while championing "free market" approaches to international communications theory.

Crucially, however, it should be noted that arguments for particular forms of economic globalization are not ideologically neutral. "Facts" are often opinions presented in sophisticated ways. In view of globalization, many commentators have pointed out that capital has in recent decades *re*gained its lost power. In this sense, Thomas L. Friedman and other contemporary authors build on the shoulders of giants. While the decades following World War II marked regulation in and between national

422

---

3 Hertz (2004: 29), among others, argues that institutions such as the World Bank already throughout the Cold War were "blatantly used by the US as a conduit of its foreign policy" through issuing loans to particular countries / nations and withholding loans from others.

markets, Ronald Reagan's presidency in the US (1981–1988) and Margaret Thatcher's rule in the UK (1979–1990) – under the emblematic banner of "There Is No Alternative" – triggered a series of political acts based on different ideals. Ms Thatcher, apart from her fondness for the ideas of Milton Friedman, embraced the work of Austrian economist Friedrich Hayek (1889–1992), who forcefully advocated classical liberal (i.e. libertarian) principles and free market policies[4].

In the 1980s, neo-liberalism began to gain ground as a dominant ideology, which entailed a particular form of globalization; one determined and led by owners and investors. Many Western nations followed the Anglo-American example. Through a series of deregulatory acts since the early 1980s, Finland, for example, heeded the call. The deregulation of the Finnish financial system began in 1983 (Halttunen and Suvanto 1988) and the established power blocs in business and industry began to crumble (Kuusterä 1990). The Finnish business system transformed towards a market-oriented model (Skurnik 2005).

In all, the removal of regulatory barriers to investment and trade in and across nations is one manifestation of the ideology of neo-liberalism rather than the essence of globalization. It could, in fact, be argued that globalization is the result of processes that are much broader than neo-liberalism, and that these concepts should be kept analytically separate (cf. Taylor et al 2002). The rapid development of information technology, for example, is a separate force from neo-liberal global capitalism – albeit one

that has in recent decades occurred simultaneously with deregulatory acts.

Not surprisingly, then, extensive academic criticism of the ideals of neo-liberal globalization has persisted. One basis for such criticism is that popular books such as Thomas L. Friedman's have little engagement with the vibrant scholarly literature on globalization, and that they are uncritical toward globalizing capitalism in general. For example, it has been suggested that one problematic consequence of the ideology of neo-liberalism is that democratically elected governments are increasingly obliged to weigh their social, fiscal and monetary policies against the interests of investors and multinational corporations which, in turn, are not democratically responsible for their actions (Rupert 2000). In general, it has been claimed that globalization characterized by neo-liberal ideals marks a "race to the bottom"; a competition between nations and governments to reform fiscal policies and trim down social welfare systems in order to please market forces (Greider 1997). Norberg (2001), in his defense of global capitalism, shrewdly spoke of the "race to the top", and referred to multinational corporations as the major force in driving up wages and working conditions in the Third World by virtue of their superior efficiency and productivity.

In parallel to these relatively broad debates, the contested hegemony of contemporary neo-liberal globalization has opened up for a range of active and extensive academic discussions in terms of, for example, introduction of "New Public Management" in government (for

---

4 For those interested in a non-academic, accessible critical account of the reigns Mrs Thatcher and Mr Reagan – and the forms and practical outcomes of contemporary neo-liberalism more generally – *"How Mumbo-Jumbo Conquered the World"* by Francis Wheen (2004) is a good place to start.

DISCUSSION

an overview, see e.g. Barzelay 2001). The increasing power of multinational corporations has also spurred debate on changing industrial and employment relations (e.g. Colling and Clark 2002; Ferner and Quintanilla 2002), new forms of corporate governance (e.g. Almond et al 2003) and changing negotiating relations between states and MNCs (e.g. Agmon 2003; cf. Kobrin 2001).

Further, contemporary global mass media provide a particularly vivid example of the contested nature of neo-liberal globalization (Fairclough 1995). The rise of neo-liberal policies in an increasing number of countries has rendered possible the marketization of crucial popular media such as television. The advent of global media corporations has led to further downsizing of public-service broadcasting systems around the world. The global media work hand-in-glove with other forces of contemporary globalization (for a critical discussion, see e.g. Herman and McChesney 1997). It has also been argued that such a global system thrives on a flow of media spectacles (cf. Kellner 2003) provided by Western, mainly US, media corporations.

Protagonists point out that free market competition makes the field of mass media more efficient. Critics point to the increasing concentration of mass media ownership within and across national borders and to its problematic consequences in terms of democracy in general and the content of the media coverage in particular (e.g. Herman and McChesney 1997; Bourdieu 1998; Shah and Thornton 2003). The domination of information flows by a few large corporations is argued to be profoundly undemocratic, and the pressure to make profits and serve advertisers is argued to lead media corporations to disregard public service and hype entertainment and violence. Consum-

ers of mainstream mass media such as television are often left with generic news content that emphasizes sensational events and politically "safe" topics (although typically in an ideologically loaded form), while contextualized and critical discussions of social and economic trends and deep analysis of the human condition are downplayed or ignored (Shah and Thornton 2003).

Among academics, the controversy surrounding contemporary globalization has also spawned renewed interest in 20th century classics. The work of Karl Polanyi, particularly *The Great Transformation* (1944/1957), is an example of this. Polanyi – who is perhaps today more well-known for his ideas on "tacit knowledge" (recycled in contemporary knowledge management theory) – maintained that historical evidence indicates that self-regulating markets are not sustainable; that markets must be embedded in the social and political order to survive (cf. Kobrin 2001b).

Further, a significant strand of criticism for neo-liberalism and neo-liberal globalization emphasizes its linguistic and semiotic aspects. In this way, contemporary globalization can be seen as a collection of various discourses that link with neo-liberal (Bourdieu 1998) and global capitalist ideologies (Fairclough 1997; Fairclough and Thomas 2004). According to Pierre Bourdieu (1998), neo-liberalism is a political project for the reconstruction of society in accord with the demands of an unrestrained global capitalism. Norman Fairclough, in turn, has examined in detail and depth the specific characteristics of the discourse on global capitalism and explored specific issues related to "globalization" in the organizational context (Fairclough 1989; 1995; 1997; 2000; 2003; Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999; Fairclough and Thomas 2004).

Neo-liberalists' claims of the inevitability of their project – imposing new representations of the world, but masking their political nature – has been a particular concern and subject of analysis for Fairclough and his colleagues.

Fairclough and Thomas (2004), for example, conceptualize discursive representations of globalization as resources that are developed by social actors in order to accomplish social objectives. The crucial point is that these representations contribute to the process of globalizing itself, albeit sometimes in ways unintended and unanticipated by the actors involved. In other words, as the discourse gains ground, it takes on the performative power to make real the fantasies it describes (Fairclough and Thomas 2004; Bourdieu and Wacquant 2001). However, as Fairclough and Thomas point out, a hegemonic discourse always competes against alternatives. It is, for example, modified to comply with local discourses. This will be further discussed in relation to nationalism below.

Further, Mohanty (2004) provides a thorough argumentation on the problematics of contemporary neo-liberal global capitalism from a feminist point of view, and outlines a transnational feminist politics for social justice in this context. She calls this "the feminist solidarity or comparative feminist studies model", which is "based on the premise that the local and the global are not defined in terms of physical geography or territory but exist simultaneously and constitute each other. It is then the links, the relationships, between the local and the global that are foregrounded" (ibid.: 242). Mohanty (2004: 235) maintains:

"It is especially on the bodies and lives of women and girls from the Third World/South … that global capitalism writes its script,

and it is by paying attention to and theorizing the experiences of these communities of women and girls that we demystify capitalism as a system of debilitating sexism and racism and envision anticapitalist resistance. Thus any analysis of the effects of globalization needs to centralize the experiences and struggles of these particular communities of women and girls."

It must also be born in mind that the mobility of capital – the heart of the present neo-liberal project – is nothing new. Historians and political scientists in particular have reminded contemporary commentators that capital has indeed *re*gained its lost power. For example, it has been pointed out that international penetration of financial markets in (contemporary) OECD countries was, in fact, greater between 1900 and 1914 than in the late 1980s, as was the ratio between foreign trade and GDP (Hirst and Thompson 1998). The previous golden age of international trade and mobile capital was ended by the outbreak of World War I in 1914 and the concurrent collapse of colonialism (Jones 1998; Flandreau and Zumer 2004). The 1920s brought further pressures in the form of social unrest and, for example, a dramatic sinking of stock prices. Regulatory regimes, then, did not emerge in a vacuum. Rather, they were a response to changing economic and social conditions of, first, the interwar period and, second, the period immediately following World War II.

Finally, it is useful to note that contemporary globalization has also been associated with the expansion of a new form of global consumer culture, which is a distinctly US culture (e.g. Hall 1991), permeating other regions of the world through mass-mediated images. This ex-

425

pansion of American consumerism has been labelled Americanization (Kobrin 2001b). Concepts and labels may again be somewhat misleading. Americanization is a term already used for the growing economic and cultural impact of the US in Western Europe in the immediate aftermath of World War II. This American influence or the "American challenge" (Servan-Schreiber 1968), supported by Marshall Aid as well as incentives to carry out legislative changes in the fashion of the United States was a significant feature of Cold War Western Europe (Fligstein 1990; Guillén 1994; Djelic 1998; cf. Ainamo and Tienari 2002). This coincided with the growing impact of multinational corporations originating from the US. Recently, the concept of Americanization has been extended to denote dissemination and spread of management ideas originating from the United States by contemporary carriers and mediators such as business gurus and management consultants, the business media and multinational corporations (Engwall and Kipping 2002).

In all, it is clear that the concept of globalization should not be used as a shorthand for all economic phenomena that seem to appear on a "global" scale. We suggest that the term neo-liberal global capitalism is more accurate to denote policies, practices and discourses that promote the global mobility of capital, arguing for its contribution to a supremely efficient allocation of economic resources. These policies, practices and discourses may, however, be manifest in a multiplicity of forms. In consequence, when theorized, they always need to be contextualized. They are faced by alternatives.

426

Nations, nationalism and national identities
It is evident in the discussion above that capitalism has entered a phase where production proc-

esses within large corporations are being decoupled from specific territories and formed into new systems, which are international or "global" (Howells and Wood 1993). In the face of such globalization, nations and nation states have been studied in a range of academic disciplines. In general, from the perspective of nations, neo-liberal globalization with its apparent homogenizing tendencies can be seen as a threat (Taylor et al 2002). Already in 1969, however, economic historian Charles Kindleberger famously claimed that the nation-state is just about through as an economic unit. According to Kindleberger (1969), nation-states may be about the right size politically, but they are too small to be meaningful economically and too large to be meaningful culturally.

Subsequently, it has been argued that nations are in decline (Held 1989), that nations are becoming inconsequential to the new supranational restructuring of the globe (Hobsbawm 1990), that globalization is an inescapable reality making nation states obsolete (e.g. Ohmae 1995; Schmidt 1995), and that globalization in terms of networks and information flows is likely to diminish the concept of nation as a political institution (cf. Poster 1999). As Banerjee and Linstead (2001: 687–688) summarize: "[g]lobalization is … theorized in many quarters as an inevitable process, which, as Hirst and Thompson (1998) point out, serves to curtail any attempt to articulate radical reform strategies at the national, regional or local level by deeming them 'unviable' in the face of the inexorable 'logic' of international markets." In brief, globalization is frequently contrasted with the decreasing influence or even demise of nation states and with the erosion of nationalist sentiments.

In contrast, it may be argued that even if

economic and financial globalization will be accentuated in the 21st century, at least politics, culture and civic society will remain more local, national and regional. Also, as pointed out above, elements of economic globalization continue to be embedded in particular institutional locations within nation states (Sassen 1998). Many interests within nation states see the economic risks and costs of the adjustments involved with the expanding economic power of multinationals (cf. Vernon 1998: 219). It is thus premature to dismiss nation states as irrelevant in the contemporary globalized economy (Smith 1990; Tienari et al 2003). The present policies of the United States testify for this. The continued relevance of nations is also evident in regional constellations such as the European Union. Further, the number of nation states has increased rather than decreased after the Cold War and in the advent of the New International Information Order, as Friedman (1999) terms his post-Cold War "system".

In all, it has been argued that reports of the demise of the nation-state are greatly exaggerated: "central functions of the nation state will become those of providing legitimacy for and ensuring the accountability of supranational and sub-national governance mechanisms" (Hirst and Thompson 1998: 171). To put it in another way, categories of global and nation are not mutually exclusive (Sassen 1998). As Banerjee and Linstead (2001: 688) note, "[e]ven the most global industries – finance, media, information technology – operate through a global network located in national sites where strategic decisions on the deployment of capital and location of resources serve to strengthen the international division of labour and strategic concentration of infrastructure". Further, it is likely that nationalist ideals will continue to have an impact on globalization in general and the development of multinational corporations in particular because notions of national integrity are firmly embedded in contemporary ideology (Lyons and Breakwell 1996; Billig 1996).

Defining nation and nationalism, however, opens up yet another contested academic terrain. The concept of nation is by no means unambiguous. Generally speaking, nation and nationalism can be approached from a political or cultural perspective (cf. Hutchinson 1987). As we will show below, it is particularly useful to view the nation from a discursive perspective (e.g. Billig 1996; DeCillia et al 1999). Political, cultural and discursive perspectives are not, however, mutually exclusive although in practice political and cultural perspectives "articulate different, even competing conceptions of the nation, form their own distinctive organizations, and have sharply diverging political strategies" (Hutchinson 1987: 12).

Max Weber (1948), one of the pioneers of modern sociology, locates the concept of nation in the field of politics, but maintains that in practice the reasons for the belief that one represents a nation vary greatly. According to Weber, on the one hand, a group of people under certain conditions may attain the quality of a nation through specific behavior, or they may claim this quality as an "attainment" – and within short spans of time at that. On the other, there are social groups that profess indifference to, and even directly relinguish, any evaluational adherence to a single nation. Weber goes on to maintain that the significance of the "nation" is usually anchored in the superiority, or at least the irreplaceability, of the cultural values that are to be preserved and developed only through the cultivation of the peculiarity of the group. This conception – even if located in the field of

politics – already points towards the constructed nature of nations.

For historian Eric Hobsbawm (1983), the nation is invented tradition, made possible by three modern innovations: first, the development of primary education as a secular equivalent of the Church, second, the invention of public ceremonies and, third, the mass production of public monuments (see also e.g. Moscovici 1993). For Benedict Anderson (1983), nations are imagined communities. Anderson provides an intriguing introduction to *imagining nations*:

"The very possibility of imagining the nation only arose historically when, and where, three fundamental cultural conceptions, all of great antiquity, lost their axiomatic grip on men's minds. The first of these was the idea that a particular script-language offered privileged access to ontological truth, precisely because it was an inseparable part of that truth. It was this idea that called into being the great transcontinental sodalities of Christendom, the Ummah Islam, and the rest. Second was the belief that society was naturally organized around and under high centres – monarchs who were persons apart from other human beings and who ruled by some form of cosmological (divine) dispensation. Human loyalties were necessarily hierarchical and centripetal because the ruler, like the sacred script, was a node of access to being and inherent in it. Third was a conception of temporality in which cosmology and history were indistinguishable, the origins of the world and of men essentially identical. Combined, these ideas rooted human lives firmly in the very nature of things, giving certain meaning to the everyday fatalities of existence (above all death, loss, and servitude) and offering, in various ways, redemption from them.

The slow, uneven decline of these interlinked certainties, first in Western Europe, later elsewhere, under the impact of economic change, 'discoveries' (social and scientific), and the development of increasingly rapid communications, drove a harsh wedge between cosmology and history. No surprise then that the search was on, so to speak, for a new way of linking fraternity, power and time meaningfully together. Nothing perhaps more precipitated this search, nor made it more fruitful, than print-capitalism, which made it possible for rapidly growing numbers of people to think about themselves, and to relate themselves to others, in profoundly new ways." (Anderson 1983: 36)

In this vein, discussion on nations and nation-states must be extended to the concepts of nationalism and national identity; how people "think about themselves" and "relate themselves to others". While most scholars agree that nationalism is a peculiarly modern phenomenon (as is evident above), they disagree on its causes, relationship to modernization and to political power, and whether it is a weak or strong agent of change (Hutchinson and Smith 1994: 47).

Historians, who have traditionally dominated the scholarly attention on nationalism, trace its roots to Western Europe and North America in the latter half of the 18th century (e.g. Hobsbawm 1990). As an ideology and discourse, nationalism was given rise to by The Peace of Westphalia, which ended the Thirty Years War in 1648, and marked the end of medieval universalism and the origin of the mod-

ern (nation) state system (Krasner 1993). Social historians have documented how the growth of nationalism has been accompanied by the creation of traditions, myths and collective memories (see e.g. Hobsbawm 1983; Samuel 1989; Schwartz 1990).

For Kohn (1945), nationalism is a state of mind as the process of history can be analysed as a succession of changes in communal psychology, in the attitude of man toward all manifestations of individual and social life. Gellner (1983) maintains that it is nationalism which engenders nations, and not the other way round. In his words, to the modern person, "a man [sic] must have a nationality as he must have a nose and two ears. [...] [H]aving a nation is not an inherent attribute of humanity, but it has come to appear as such" (ibid.: 6). It can also be argued that nationalism is by nature ambivalent, and the cultural representation of this ambivalence emerges as a key question (Bhabha 1990), in this case, in theorizing about globalization, nationalism and multinational corporations.

Returning to connections between globalization, nation states and nationalism, there is a constant flow of examples, which indicate that nationalism remains one of the most powerful social forces in the late modern (or postmodern) world. Nation-states and particular constructions of ethnicity often go together; it is evident that globalization has coincided with the rise in ethnic conflicts across the world. Current proliferation and intensity of ethnic conflicts should not, however, mask the fact that nationalism is by no means necessarily linked to ethnicity. Michael Billig (1995; 1996) provides an insightful theorization of how and why nationalism and the construction of national identities persists. Billig (1996: 182) views nationalism as a constituent feature of the contem-

porary world; "it is the ideology by which nation-states are reproduced as nations". Crucially, nationalism is a general ideological condition of the contemporary world:

"If the globe is covered by nation-states, then so will it be filled with discourses, representations and habits of thought which reproduce the nation-state as the accepted, and generally desired, form of community today. [...] Nationalism not only permits different peoples to think of themselves as uniquely different 'nations', deserving their own independent state (Anderson, 1983); but it allows these communities to be imagined in a uniform, globally distributed way" (Billig 1996: 183; see also e.g. Giddens 1985b; Birch 1989).

The world of nations, then, is not merely a political form; it is also a psychological or ideological form. Therefore, it is important to study its mundane or banal aspects, and pay particular attention to the ways in which the sociopsychological aspects of nationhood are constituted within familiar discourses (Billig 1996). Nations can only be imagined vis-à-vis other nations. "Nationalism as an international and banal ideology, involves more than the imagining of ingroups and outgroups: 'we' and 'them' have to be imagined as nations, and, thus, nationhood itself has to be imagined (Breuilly, 1985)." These imaginings take the form of common-sense assumptions about the naturalness of nations in a world of nations, that is, assuming who "we" are, who are not "we" (i.e. who are "them"), and placing these social categories in a totality (Billig 1996). Ruth Wodak and her colleagues, for example, have examined the central characteristics of nationalistic discourse and ideology and elaborated on various kinds

of macro- and micro-level functions and strategies used when (re)constructing national identities (e.g. Wodak et al 1999).

In all, globalization in the form of neo-liberal global capitalism continues to be met with another powerful conception; that of nations, nationalism and national identities. Next, we discuss multinational corporations (MNCs) as constituents and carriers of economic, financial, social and cultural globalization in terms of these contrasting ideological and discursive bases.

Globalization and multinational corporations

Multinational corporation (MNC) refers here in the first instance to corporations with operations across more than one nation and to division of ownership between nationals (private and corporate) of two or more nations. It must be born in mind that the growing impact of MNCs predates neo-liberalism in its present form. Concerns about the impact of international economic activity also predates the term "multinational corporation", which is said to have been first used by David Lilienthal at a conference at Carnegie Mellon University in 1960 (cf. Fieldhouse 1986). It is useful to note, for example, that the number of subsidiaries of American MNCs more than tripled already from 1950 to 1967 and that the average size of subsidiaries grew by 50 percent during this period (UN 1973; Kobrin 2001b).

The growing power of multinational corporations in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s began to attract scholarly attention in several scientific fields. Literature on neo-imperialism and new colonialism, for example, were concerned about the actions of MNCs in their host countries. Theories of neoimperialism assumed that

dependence and poverty in the developing countries are structural and systemic. Capitalism was conceived of as a global international system while national economies and nation states were defined as subsystems within it (e.g. Sunkel 1972). As an example of theorizing from a new colonialist perspective, Levitt (1970: 98) maintained that "[t]he new colonialism is carried by the ideology of materialism, liberalism and anti-nationalism. By means of these values they seek to disarm the resistance of national communities to alien consumption patterns and the presence of alien power." It is interesting to note that Levitt wrote about Canada as a peripheral satellite of the US in his theorization of new colonialism.

On a more practical note, the rise of the multinational corporation triggered research on the new management challenges for coordination and control, which the cross-national aspects of business brought about. The problematics of what has been termed cross-cultural, comparative management began to receive increasing attention in the 1950s and 1960s. Harbison and Myers' *Management in the Industrial World: An International Analysis* (1959) and Farmer and Richman's *Comparative Management and Economic Progress* (1965) are two early examples of this. In brief, while before World War II research interest was focused at the macro, abstracted and universal level of nomothetic economic theory rather than at differences in management systems and styles, subsequent focus on cultural aspects of management from a comparative point of view coincided with, and drew from, several interrelated influential research programs and projects (for a discussion, see e.g. Westwood 2001).

By way of example, the "crystallization of anthropological concerns with culture" as well

as more "ideographic anthropological concerns with personality and national character" was influential in forming research agendas in comparative, cross-cultural management (Westwood 2001: 251). Other sources of inspiration included Talcott Parsons' theories of societal evolution and the role of cultural values therein as well as the debates around modernization, development and industrialization. These debates involved Western economists, sociologists and political scientists especially from the 1950s onwards (ibid.).

In the study of internationalization and MNCs, Morgan (2001) outlines three currently dominant concerns: first, the focus is on how firms make choices regarding expansion of their operations, second, what stages characterize internationalization and, third, how multinational firms can be managed. This includes, for example, the multiculturalism issue discussed above. Morgan (2001) admits that the three concerns provide a powerful template for examining the development of multinationals, but questions the ways in which they are bound together by a certain underlying set of assumptions that is concerned with the building of rational models and testing them empirically.

Also, in contrast to emphasizing the global scale of business activities, the regional aspects of contemporary multinational business have been argued to be crucial. Rugman (2000; 2005), for example, criticizes authors such as Bhagwati (2002) for taking a quantum leap by equating internationalization with globalization and equating it with the idea that the world is a fully integrated market place. In contrast, Rugman claims to expose the facts behind the popular myths of doing business globally. According to Rugman (2005), a "global" perspective assumes away the necessity of selectivity in in-

ternationalization, which, he points out, is mainly a firm-driven phenomenon (see also e.g. Yin and Choi 2004). According to Rugman and Verbeke (2003), authors such as Bhagwati (2002) have emphasized the alleged economic inferiority of regional vis-à-vis multilateral integration outcomes, while in reality regionalism is often an efficient substitute for ill-functioning multilateral institutions. Economic integration in regional clusters is often organic and many multinational corporations remain in practice strongly regional rather than "global".

Further, it is notable that the emergence and proliferation of multinational corporations has given rise to a growing interest in what have been rather vaguely termed cultural differences. Among the most well-known individual examples of such theorizing are Geert Hofstede's *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-related Values* (1980) and Fons Trompenaars' *Riding the Waves of Change: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business* (1993). Both dimensionalize culture and study how these dimensions appear in different forms across nations and clusters of nations. The bulk of cross-cultural, comparative management research has placed into the centre of attention the question of the extent to which management practice follows universal logics and principles, on the one hand, and the ways in which it is determined by local tradition, custom and values, that is, "culture", on the other. Analysis is frequently based on the level of the individual manager and his preferences and behaviors (Hofstede 1980; see also e.g. Manev and Stevenson 2001). Debates have centred around the tendency to convergence vis-à-vis continuing diversity of organizational forms and practices in varying national settings (Quintanilla and Ferner 2003). As pointed out above, in recent

431

decades these debates have taken place in a context where the lifting of various barriers to trade across national boundaries have been negotiated and where technological development has been drastic.

In the cross-national comparative management literature, differences based on "cultures" often emerge as hindrances and obstacles to carrying out business efficiently on an international or global scale. In other words, differences need to be managed (see e.g. Crane 2000; Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars 2000; Harris et al 2004). Differences in management systems and practices across national divides have also given rise to research more concerned with nationally specific institutional arrangements and the path-dependencies these arrangements give rise to (see e.g. Aguilera and Jackson 2000). Seminal works have, for example, addressed such issues in relation to social capital in MNCs (Kostova and Roth 2003).

One way to assess the development of the institutionally-oriented field of research on convergence and divergence in management is to identify influential research programs such as the societal effect approach (Maurice et al 1980; Sorge 1996) and the business systems approach (Whitley 1992; Lilja, Ed. 2005; cf. Lane 2000). Both research programs include reflections on management practice, albeit as part of systemic, societal totalities. The business systems approach in particular has developed into an active international network of researchers who have coherently and in a structured manner examined fundamental questions such as the varying forms of corporations in different economies (Whitley and Hull Kristensen 1996), diverse national capitalisms, global competition and economic performance (Quack et al 1999; cf. Hall and Soskice 2001), the multinational corporation (Morgan et al 2001), and globalization and institutions (Djelic and Quack 2003). In contrast to economic and managerialist perspectives that treat multinationals as cohesive, goal-directed rational actors, the business systems approach draws on traditions of comparative organizational analysis to understand multinationals as organizations with complex internal processes of contradiction and conflict that are distinct from those present in non-international firms (Morgan 2001). Nationalism, as we argued above, continues to provide a basis for such contradiction and conflict.

Further, Child (2000) distinguishes between low- and high context research approaches in international business studies. This distinction is based on the various approaches' "sensitivity to nations or regions as analytically significant contexts" (ibid.: 30). In Child's framework, low-context perspectives view corporations structured by their environment, which is increasingly global. High-context perspectives, in turn, view organizations as institutionally deeply rooted and socially embedded into their respective (often national) contexts.

Geppert et al (2003) outline a spectrum of perspectives in the present debate on the impact of globalization on the multinational corporation. At one extreme, it is argued that MNCs can be regarded as stateless (Parker 1998), transnational (Bartlett and Ghoshal 1989) or highly globalized (Lane 2000). At another extreme, national and/or regional environments are regarded to play a significant role in the activities of MNCs (Rugman 2000; 2005). In making sense of the different positions, Geppert et al (2003) argue for what can be defined as the third way. To simplify somewhat, this position takes into account both similarities and differences. In our view, making sense of research on

MNCs can be informed by what Fiss and Hirsch (2005) call struggles between different discursive framings on globalization. Because the phenomena studied are so complex and multifaceted, empirical support can be selectively cited and asserted for divergent interpretations. Discourse comes to play a central role in the argumentation.

In parallel to managerialistic framings, then, multinational corporations have continued to attract a distinctly critical literature, which is concerned, first, about the static, normative and essentialist view on "cultures" in the mainstream research literature and, second, about the "West" (particularly the US) being the unquestioned norm in the cultural comparisons involved (see e.g. Boyacigiller and Adler 1991; Westwood 2000). While early criticism of MNCs was primarily based on the specific actions of corporations, in recent times this been extended to criticism of MNCs for being MNCs. Kobrin (2001b), for example, suggests that while specific criticism of multinationals persists, much of the current concern is more general. MNCs are under fire for their role as the primary integrative – or homogenizing – forces or agents in the world economy.

Kobrin (2001b) provides an example of how to outline interrelated and interwoven contemporary criticisms of globalization and the MNC. First, the shift of decision making processes from national governments to international institutions such as the WTO, IMF or the World Bank, and the increasing power of MNCs relative to national governments and civil society, can be seen as a threat to democracy in general. Second, MNCs as organizations have been criticized for being neither transparent nor democratic. Third, they represent the "tyranny of the market"; MNCs can be seen as emblems of mar-

kets colonizing all aspects of social life. Fourth, MNCs are a significant force for economic and eventually cultural homogenization.

Of course, Kobrin's listing is not exhaustive. For one, it does not consider the crucial role of MNCs as carriers of particular gendered images, discourses and practices. Recent studies suggest that MNCs may become the pretext for particular procedures, norms and values that have significant gendered consequences, for example, in terms of eroding the particular gender egalitarian tradition in the Nordic countries (Hearn and Kovalainen, 2000; Meriläinen et al, 2004; Tienari et al 2005).

All these concerns bring us back to the crucial question of nations, nationalism and national identities. While nation-states and nationalism have been actively debated in relation to the concept of globalization, it is interesting to note that the literature on multinational corporations is relatively silent on the subject. This is not unsurprising as the study of nationalism has been neglected in many academic disciplines, due to the kaleidoscopic forms nationalism takes, on the one hand, and to its interdisciplinary nature, on the other (Hutchinson and Smith 1994). The traditional, taken-for-granted view seems to pit multinationals (as carriers of globalization and universalism) and nation states (as carriers of nationalism, difference and particularism) against each other. In this way, already in the 1970s, attention was paid to the clash between corporate and national interests, particularly in relation to the operations of MNCs (Levitt 1970; Sunkel 1972). In the 1990s, the "race to the bottom" (or "race to the top", depending on the viewpoint) has raised similar concerns (cf. Greider 1997).

Yet, it may be argued that the more that national economic and political sovereignty is

433

DISCUSSION

undermined, the greater the need for constructing a semiotically potent cultural nation (cf. Rowe et al 1998). As a social and discursive space, sports provide a particularly clear-cut example of this (e.g. Boyle and Haynes 1996; Rowe et al 1998; Bishop and Jaworski 2003). We suggest that MNCs are no different from sports in terms of the mundane construction and reconstruction of nationalism and national identities. This is evident in studies of managers in multinationals (e.g. Vaara et al 2003a; 2003b) and media discussions around them (e.g. Risberg et al 2003; Tienari et al 2003).

Nations, nationalisms and national identities do not "disappear" in the face of contemporary (neo-liberal) globalization because they are imagined or socially constructed. We argue that they persist precisely for this reason. As social categories, they offer individuals and groups possibilities for constructing identities and forming a sense of belonging. Billig's (1995) concept of banal nationalism captures this aptly. Banal nationalism refers to how the construct of nation is often reproduced and accepted in everyday life, rendered possible by mundane habits of language, thought and symbolism. When Jorma Ollila, CEO of Nokia, a major global corporation, claims in public that "The roots of business are much deeper in the national soil than is apparent on the surface" and that "One of the most important explanations for the success of Finland and Finns is, after all, the strength of the national culture, Finnishness" (Helsingin Sanomat, 4 March, 1998), he is reproducing in a mundane way the Finnish nation vis-à-vis other nations. Apparently, he needs to appropriate the concept of nation to serve the needs of his global MNC.

In a rare example of an empirical study that explicitly addresses nationalism in a multi-

national organization, Cooper et al (1998) focus on a multinational accounting firm opening new markets in post-communist Eastern Europe. They discuss issues related to nationalism as part of the investment process and show how nationalism triggered problems for coordination and integration. In this way, nationalism provided a space in which people – including the top managers involved – could resist the actions of others.

"Typically, when nationalism is discussed in relation to multinationals and globalization, the view is taken that the multinational represents international capital, a supra nationalist force that seeks the most profitable outlets worldwide. The nation state and local political elites are depicted as representing nationalism, seeking to maintain sovereignty and national independence. In this view, nationalism is related to protectionism and multinationals are seen as agents of free international trade." (Cooper et al 1998: 540).

Interestingly, in apparent contrast to the above, Cooper et al (1998: 541) maintain that in their study, "nationalism was only loosely related to economic imperatives; it reflected a concern by managers [in the multinational organization] with their own identity." One of their most striking observations was the "overlay of nationalism that permeated manager's explanations of events and philosophies. […] [N]ational stereotypes, histories and characteristics, whether real or imagined, were used in making investment decisions" (ibid.: 541).

With its explicit take on the peculiarities of nationalism in a multinational organization, Cooper et al's (1998) study opens new ground. However, Cooper et al's focus is not on a cor-

434

poration, but on a professional partnership. Their claim that "[n]ationalism is a significant part of the organizational landscape of the big international accounting firms, with most of these firms still reflecting their national histories and allegiances" (ibid.: 532) is likely to take more subtle forms in the MNC context. Second, in their argumentation of nationalism as a space for resistance, Cooper et al provide a relatively one-sided view to a complex web of discourses and identities. In brief, more nuanced understandings are called for.

Suggestions for future research: specify, specify, specify!

In this article, we have reviewed literature on globalization and provided some conceptual clarifications for the benefit of management studies to understand its contemporary forms and consequences. Our aim has been, first, to unpack recent literature on globalization, second, to specify neo-liberal global capitalism and nationalism as discourses and ideologies vis-à-vis globalization and, third, place multinational corporations (MNC:s) within this context.

As our point of departure, we noted that the concept of globalization reflects large-scale economic and social change, which affects people differently and arouses different viewpoints, and suggested that the related polarization of theoretical and ideological perspectives on globalization can be thought of as a struggle between different discursive framings (cf. Fiss and Hirsch 2005). We also pointed out that the resultant polarization of viewpoints and analysis in academic research has created a situation where discussion and more fine-grained exchange of ideas on the concept of globalization has to a large extent stagnated. Globalization

seems to have become a shorthand on both (or all) sides of the fence.

Based on our review of recent literature, then, we would like to pinpoint some fruitful agendas for future research. Overall, specification is called for in making sense of "globalization" and its links to management and organization. The ways in which transnational or global processes and local, nationalist considerations intertwine in particular organizational contexts is a case in point. While the literature on globalization and MNCs is relatively silent on nations, nationalism and national identities – which, as discussed above, yet continue to be crucial for making sense of contemporary society – literature on specific instances of transnational organizational interaction is more helpful in this respect. The burgeoning literature on mergers and acquisitions across national borders is a timely example of this (see e.g. Vaara et al 2003a; 2003b; Tienari et al 2003; Risberg et al 2003; Vaara et al 2005; Tienari et al 2005) and may be used as a basis for more fine-grained research on forms and consequences of contemporary "globalization".

On the one hand, cross-border mergers and acquisitions are frequently justified and legitimized with notions of increasing value for owners, efficiency and synergies. In this way, these events are infused with the ideology and principles of neo-liberal global capitalism. On the other, multinational corporations formed by cross-border mergers and acquisitions simultaneously provide a platform for making sense of "self" and "others" from the perspective of nations and national identity, buttressing conceptions of difference rather than undermining them. In the cross-border merger context, then, discourses of global capitalism and nationalism intertwine in interesting ways, providing a dis-

435

DISCUSSION

cursive space marked by ambiguities and tensions.

We suggest that the cross-border merger context is – metaphorically – one example of a microcosm of the broad field of globalization covered in this article. Thus, it presents particularly interesting avenues for future empirical research. Thematically, the following sets of questions could be focused on:

• How do people from different national backgrounds find solutions to meaningfully work together, innovate and create new knowledge in "global" organizations? What conditions encourage (or discourage) and sustain such social interaction? What is the sufficient time-frame to assess the outcomes of interaction? Who should make these assessments? Why?

• How does the media construct and reconstruct particular versions of cross-national encounters such as mergers and acquisitions? Whose voices are privileged in media texts? Whose voices are marginalized and silenced? Why? How does this relate to people's understandings and perceptions of the "global" and the "national"? ■

References

ACKER, J. (1998) The Future of 'Gender and Organizations': Connections and Boundaries. *Gender, Work and Organization* 5: 195–206.

AINAMO, A. and TIENARI, J. (2002) The Rise and Fall of a Local Version of Management Consulting in Finland. In *Management Consulting: Emergence and Dynamics of a Knowledge Industry*, Eds. M. Kipping and L. Engwall. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

AGMON, T. (2003) Who Gets What: The MNE, the National State and the Distribution Effects of Globalization. *Journal of International Business Studies* 34: 416–427.

AGUILERA, R.V. and JACKSON, G. (2000) The Cross-National Diversity of Corporate Governance: Dimensions and Determinants. *Academy of Management Review* 28/3: 447–465.

ALMOND, P., EDWARDS, T. and CLARK, I. (2003) Multinational and Changing National Business Systems in Europe: Towards the "Shareholder Value" Model? *Industrial Relations Journal* 34/5: 430–445.

ANDERSON, B. (1983) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso Editions and NLB.

APPADURAI, A. (1996) *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

ARCHIBUGI, D. and LUNDVALL, B-Å (Eds.) (2001) *The Globalizing Learning Economy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ARNETT, J.J. (2002) The Psychology of Globalization. *American Psychologist* 57: 774–783.

BANERJEE, S.B. and LINSTEAD, S. (2001) Globalization, Multiculturalism and Other Fictions: Colonialism For the New Millenium? *Organization* 8/4: 683–722.

BARNET, R.J. and CAVANAGH, J. (1994) *Global Dreams: Imperial Corporations and the New World Order*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

BARTLETT, C.A. and GHOSHAL, S. (1992) *Transnational Management: Text, Cases, and Readings in Cross-Border Management*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

BARZELAY, M. (2001) *The New Public Management: Improving Research and Policy Dialogue*. Wildavsky Forum Series 3. California: The University of California Press.

BAUMAN, Z. (1998) *Globalization: The Human Consequences*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

BEAVERSTOCK, J.V. (2002) Transnational Elites in Global Cities: British Expatriates in Singapore's Financial District. *Geoforum* 33: 525–538.

BHABHA, H. (1990) Introduction. In *The Nation and Narration*, Ed. H. Bhabha. London: Routledge.

BHAGWATI, J. (2004) *In Defense of Globalization*. New York: Oxford University Press.

BHAGWATI, J. (2002) *Free Trade Today*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

BILLIG, M. (1995) *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage.

BILLIG, M. (1996) Nationalism as an International Ideology: Imagining the Nation, Others and the World of Nations. In *Changing European Identities: Social Psychological Analyses of Social Change*, Eds. G.M. Breakwell and E. Lyons. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.

BIRCH, A.H. (1989) *Nationalism and National Integration*. London: Unwin Hyman.

BISHOP, H. AND JAWORSKI, A. (2003) "We Beat'em": Nationalism and the Hegemony of Homogeneity in the British Press Reportage of Germany Versus England During Euro 2000. *Discourse & Society* 14/3: 243–271.

BOURDIEU, P. (1998) *Acts of Resistance – Against the New Myths of Our Time*. UK: Polity Press.

BOURDIEU, P. and WACQUANT, L. (2001) New-LiberalSpeak: Notes on the New Planetary Vulgate. *Radical Philosophy* 105: 2–5.

BOYACIGILLER, N.A. and ADLER, N.J. (1991) The Parochial Dinosaur: Organizational Science in a Global Context. *Academy of Management Review* 16/2: 262–290.

BOYLE, R. and HAYNES, R. (1996) 'The Grand Old Game': Football, Media and Identity in Scotland, *Media, Culture and Society* 18: 549–564.

BREAKWELL, G.M. and LYONS, E. (Eds.) (1996) *Changing European Identities: Social Psychological Analyses of Social Change*. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.

BREUILLY, J. (1985) Reflections on Nationalism. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 15: 65–75.

BRYNJOLFSSON, E. and KAHIN, B. (Eds.) (2000) *Understanding the Digital Economy: Data Tools, and Research*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

CALÁS, M.B. and SMIRCICH, L. (1999) Past Postmodernism? Reflections and Tentative Directions. *Academy of Management Review* 24: 649–671.

CALÁS, M.B. and SMIRCICH, L. (1993) Dangerous Liaisons: The 'Feminine in Management' Meets 'Globalization'. *Business Horizons* 36/2: 73–83.

CASTELLS, M. (1996) *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture Vol 1: The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.

CHILD, J. (2000) Theorizing About Organizations Cross-Nationally. In *Advances in International Comparative Management (Vol 13)*, Ed. R.B. Peterson. Stamford, CA: JAI Press, pp. 27–75.

CHILD, J. and GUNTHER MCGRATH, R. (2001) Organizations Unfettered: Organizational Form in an Information-Intensive Economy. *Academy of Management Journal* 44/6: 1135–1148.

CHOMSKY, N. (1999) *Profit Over People – Neoliberalism and Global Order*. New York: Seven Stories Press.

CHOULIARAKI, L. and FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1999) *Discourse in Late Modernity – Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

COLLING, T. AND CLARK, I. (2002) Looking for "Americanness": Home-Country, Sector and Firm Effects on Employment Systems in an Engineering Services Company. *European Journal of Industrial Relations* 8/3: 301–324.

CONNELL, R.W. (2001) Masculinity Politics on a World Scale. In *The Masculinities Reader*, eds. S.M. Whitehead and F.J. Barrett. Cambridge: Polity Press.

COOPER, D.J., GREENWOOD, R., HININGS, B. and BROWN, J.L. (1998) Globalization and Nationalism in a Multinational Accounting Firm: The Case of Opening New Markets in Eastern Europe. *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 23/5–6: 531–548.

CRANE, R. (Ed.) (2000) *European Business Cultures*. London: Pearson Education.

CURRAN, J. (2002) *Media and Power*. London: Routledge.

De la TORRE, A., LEVY YEYATI, E. and SCHMUCKLER, S.L. (2002) Financial Globalization: Unequal Blessings. *International Finance* 5/3: 335–357.

De CILLIA, R., REISIGL, M. and WODAK, R. (1999) The Discursive Construction of National Identities. *Discourse and Society* 10/2: 149–173.

DJELIC, M-L (1998) *Exporting the American Model*. USA: Oxford University Press.

DJELIC, M-L and QUACK, S. (Eds.) (2003) *Globalization and Institutions; Redefining the Rules of the Economic Game*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

DUNNING, J. (Ed.) (2003) *Making Globalization Good: The Moral Challenges of Global Capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

DUNNING, J. (Ed.) (1999) *Governments, Globalization, and International Business*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

EISENSTEIN, Z. (1998) *Global Obscenities: Patriarchy, Capitalism, and the Lure of Cyberfantasy*. New York: New York University Press.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1989) *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1995) *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1997) *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. (2000) Guest Editorial: Language and Neo-liberalism. *Discourse and Society*, 11: 147–148.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. (2003) *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Longman.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. and THOMAS, P. (2004) The Discourse of Globalization and the Globalization of Discourse. In *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Discourse*, Eds. D. Grant, C. Hardy, C. Oswick and L. Putnam*: 379–396. London: Sage.

FARMER, R.N. and RICHMAN, B.M. (1965) *Comparative Management and Economic Progress*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.

FERNER, A. and QUINTANILLA, J. (2002) Between Globalization and Capitalist Vatriety: Multinationals and the International Diffusion of Employment Relations. *European Journal of Industrial Relations* 8/3: 243–250.

DISCUSSION

FIELDHOUSE, D.K. (1986) The Multinational: A Critique of the Concept. In *Multinational Enterprise in Historical Perspective*, Eds. A. Teichova, M. Levy-LeBoyer and H. Nussbaum. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

FISS, P.C and HIRSCH, P.M. (2005) The Discourse of Globalization: Framing and Sensemaking of an Emerging Concept. *American Sociological Review* 70/1: 29–52.

FLANDREAU, M. and ZUMER, F. (2004) The Making of Global Finance 1880–1913. Paris: OECD.

FLIGSTEIN, N. (1990) *The Transformation of Corporate Control*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

FRIEDMAN, J. (2000) Globalization, Class and Culture in Global Systems. *Journal of World-Systems Research* 6/3: 636–656.

FRIEDMAN, J. (1994) *Cultural Identity and Global Process*. TCS Book Series. London: Sage.

FRIEDMAN, T.L. (1999) *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

FUKUYAMA, F. (1992) *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press.

GARTEN, J.E. (2001) *The Mind of the CEO*. New York: Basic Books.

GELLNER, E. (1983) *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

GEPPERT, M., MATTEN, D., and WILLIAMS, K. (2003) Change Management in MNC:s: How Global Convergence Intertwines With National Diversities. *Human Relations* 56/7: 807–838.

GIDDENS, A. (1999) *Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives*. London: Profile Books.

GIDDENS, A. (1985) *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism*. London: Macmillan.

GIDDENS, A. (1985b) *The Nation-state and Violence*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

GOUGH, I. (2004) Human Well-Being and Social Structures: Relating the Universal and the Local. *Global Social Policy* 4/3: 289–311.

GREIDER, W. (1997) *One World, Ready Or Not: The Manic Logic of Global Capitalism*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

GUILLÉN, M. (2001) Is Globalization Civilizing, Destructive or Feeble? A Critique of Five Debates in the Social Science Literature. *Annual Review of Sociology* 27: 235–260.

GUILLÉN, M. (1994) *Models of Management: Work, Authority, and Organization in a Comparative Perspective*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

HALL, S. (1991) The Local and the Global: Globalization and Ethnicity. In *Culture, Globalization and the World-System*, Ed. A.D. King. London: Macmillan.

HALL, P. and SOSKICE, D. (Eds.) (2001) Varieties of Capitalism – The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

HALTTUNEN, H. and SUVANTO, A. (1988) Rahoitusinnovaatiot ja Suomen rahamarkkinat. In *Raha, inflaatio ja talouspolitiikka*, eds. Seppo Honkapohja and Antti Suvanto. Helsinki: Valtion painatuskeskus. [Finance Innovations and the Finnish Monetary Market.]

HAMPDEN-TURNER, C. and TROMPENAARS, F. (2000) *Building Cross-Cultural Competence: How to Create Wealth from Conflicting Values*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

HARBISON, F.H. and MYERS, C.A. (1959) *Management in the Industrial World: An International Analysis*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

HARRIS, P.R., MORAN, R.T. and MORAN, S.V. (2004) *Managing Cultural Differences: Global Leadership Strategies for the 21st Century* (Managing Cultural Differences Series). 6th edition. Burlington, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

HELD, D. (1989) The Decline of the Nation State. In *New Times: The Changing Face of Politics in the 1990s*, Eds. S. Hall and M. Jacques. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

HELD, D., MCGREW, A., GOLDBLATT, D. and PERRATON, J. (1999) *Global Transformations*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

HEARN, J. and KOVALAINEN, A. (2000) *Gender Relations in Transnational Organisations: A Theoretical, Conceptual and Methodological Overview*. Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration, Finland, Working Papers 450.

HERMAN, E.S. and MCCHESNEY, R.W. (1997) The Global Media: The New Missionaries of Corporate Capitalism. London and Washington: Cassell.

HERRIOT, P. and SCOTT-JACKSON, W. (2002) Globalization, Social Identities and Employment. *British Journal of Management* 13: 249–257.

HERTZ, N. (2004) *I.O.U. – The Debt Threat and Why We Must Defuse It*. London: Fourth Estate.

HIRSCH, P.M. and LEVIN, D.Z. (1999) Umbrella Advocates Versus Validity Police: A Life-Cycle Model. *Organization Science* 10: 199–212.

HIRSCHMAN, A.O. (1982) Rival Interpretations of Market Society: Civilizing, Destructive or Feeble? *Journal of Economic Literature* 20: 1463–1484.

HIRST, P. and THOMPSON, G. (1998) *Globalization in Question*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

HOBSBAWM, E. (1983) Introduction: Inventing Traditions. In *The Invention of Tradition*, Eds. E. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

HOBSBAWM, E. (1990) *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

HOFSTEDE, G. (1980) *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-related Values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

HOLM, H-H AND SORENSEN, G. (1995) Introduction: What Has Changed?. In *Whose World Order? Uneven Globalization and the End of the Cold War*, Eds. H-H Holm and G. Sorensen. Boulder, CO: Westview, pp. 1–17.

HOOBLER, J.M. (2005) Lip Service to Multiculturalism: Docile Bodies of the Modern Organization. *Journal of Management Inquiry* 14: 49–56.

HOOPER, C. (2000) Masculinities in Transition: The Case of Globalization. In *Gender and Global Restructuring: Sightings, Sites and Resistances*, Eds. M. Marchand and A. Runyan. New York: Routledge, pp. 44–58.

HOWELLS, J. AND WOOD, M. (1993) *The Globalization of Production and Technology*. London: Belhaven Press.

HOWES, D. (1996) Introduction: Commodities and Cultural Borders. In *Cross-Cultural Consumption*, Ed. D. Howes. London: Routledge, pp. 1–16.

HUTCHINSON, J. (1987) *The Dynamics of Cultural Nationalism*. London: Allen and Unwin.

HUTCHINSON, J. and SMITH A.D. (1994) Introduction. In *Nationalism*, Eds. J. Hutchinson and A.D. Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

JAMESON, F. (1999) Notes on Globalization as a Philosophical Issue. In *The Cultures of Globalization*, Eds. F. Jameson and M. Miyoshi. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 247–270.

JONES, G. (1998) Concentration and Internationalisation in Banks After the Second World War. In *International Banking in the Age of Transition: Globalisation, Automation, Banks and their Archives*, eds. S. Kinsey and L. Newton. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.

JONES, M.T. (2003) Globalization and the Organization(s) of Exclusion in Advanced Capitalism. In *Debating Organization: Point-Counterpoint in Organization Studies*, Eds. R. Westwood and S. Clegg. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 252–270.

KELLNER, D. (2003) *Media Spectacle*. London and New York: Routledge.

KINDLEBERGER, C. (1969) *American Business Abroad*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

KJAER, P. AND LANGER, R. (2005) Infused with News Value: Management, Managerial Knowledge and the Institutionalization of Business News. *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 21/2, pp. 209–233.

KOBRIN, S.J. (2001) Sovereignty@Bay: Globalization, Multinational Enterprise and International Political System. In *Oxford Handbook of International Business*, Eds. T. Brewer and A. Rugman. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

KOBRIN, S.J. (2001b) "Our Resistance is as Global as Your Oppression": Multinational Corporations, the Protest Movement and the Future of Global Governance. Paper presented at the 2001 Meeting of the International Studies Association, Chicago.

KOHN, H. (1945) *The Idea of Nationalism*. New York: Macmillan.

KOSTOVA, T. and ROTH, K. (2003) Social Capital in Multinational Corporations and a Micro-Macro Model of Its Formation. *Academy of Management Review* 28/2: 297–317.

KRASNER, S.D. (1993) Westphalia and All That. In *Ideas and Foreign Policy*, J. Goldstein and R.O. Keohane. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

KUUSTERÄ, A. (1990) Taloudellisesta vallasta Suomessa: Historiaa – käsitteitä – empiriaa. *TTT Katsaus* 4/1990: 31–40. [On Economic Power in Finland: History – Concepts – Empirical Evidence.]

LANE, C. (2000) Understanding the Globalization Strategies of German and British Multinational Companies. In *Embedding Organizations: Societal Analysis of Actors, Organizations and Socio-Economic Content*, Eds. M. Maurice and A. Sorge. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 188–208.

LASH, S. and URRY, J. (1994) *Economies of Signs and Space*. London: Sage.

LEVITT, K. (1970) *Silent Surrender: The Multinational Corporation in Canada*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

LEYSHON, A. and THRIFT, N. (1997) *Money/Space: Geographies of Monetary Transformation*. London: Routledge.

LILJA, K. (Ed.) (2005) *The National Business System in Finland: Structure, Actors and Change.* Helsinki School of Economics/Helsingin kauppakorkeakoulun julkaisuja B-60. Helsinki: HeSe Print.

LOOMBA, A., KAUL, S., BUNZL, M., BURTON, A. and ESTY, J. (Eds.) (2005) *Postcolonial Studies and Beyond*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.

LUNDVALL, B-Å and JOHNSON, B. (1994) The Learning Economy. *Journal of Industrial Studies* 1/2: 23–42.

LYONS, E. and BREAKWELL, G.M. (1996) Changing European Identities and Social Change in Europe: A Challenge for Social Psychology. In *Changing European Identities – Social Psychological Analyses of Social Change*, Eds. G.M. Breakwell and E. Lyons. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 3–12.

MANEV, I.M. and STEVENSON, W.B. (2001) Nationality, Cultural Distance, and Expatriate Status: Effects on the Managerial Network in a Multinational Enterprise. *Journal of International Business Studies* 32/2: 285–303.

439

DISCUSSION

MARCHAND, M. and RUNYAN, A. (Eds.) (2000) *Gender and Global Restructuring: Sightings, Sites and Resistances*. New York: Routledge.

MARSELLA, A. J. (1998) Toward a Global-Community Psychology: Meeting the Needs of a Changing World. *American Psychologist* 53: 1282–1291.

MAURICE, M., SORGE, A. and WARNER, M. (1980) Societal Differences in Organizing Manufacturing Units: A Comparison of France, West Germany and Great Britain. *Organization Studies* 1: 59–86.

MAZZA, C. and ALVEREZ, J.-L. (2000) Haute Couture and Prêt-à-Porter : The Popular Press and the Diffusion of Management Practices. *Organization Studies* 21/3, pp. 567–588.

MAZZA, C. and STRANDGAARD PEDERSEN, J. (2004) From Press to E-media? The Transformation of an Organizational Field. *Organization Studies* 25/6, pp. 875–896.

MCPHAIL, T.L. (2002) *Global Communication: Theories, Stakeholders and Trends*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

MERILÄINEN, S., TIENARI, J., THOMAS, R. and DAVIES, A. (2004) Management Consultant Talk: A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Normalising Discourse and Resistance. *Organization* 11/4: 539–564.

MOHANTY, C.T. (2004) *Feminism Without Borders*. 4th printing. Durham & London: Duke University Press.

MOORE, F. (2004) Tales of the Global City: German Expatriate Employees, Globalisation and Social Mapping. *Anthropology Matters Journal* 6/1. [www.anthropologymatters.com/ journal/2004-1/moore_2004_tales.pdf; accessed 2005-03-01.]

MOORE, H.L. (1994) *A Passion for Difference*. Cambridge: Polity.

MORGAN, G. (2001) The Multinational Firm: Organizing Across Institutional and National Divides. In *The Multinational Firm; Organizing Across Institutional and National Divides*, Eds. G. Morgan, P. Hull Kristensen and R. Whitley. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1–24.

MORGAN, G. and KNIGHTS, D. (1997) Introduction. In *Deregulation and European Financial Services*, eds. G. Morgan and D. Knights. London: Macmillan Press.

MOSCOVICI, S. (1993) *Inventing Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

NONAKA, I. and TAKEUCHI, H. (1995) *The Knowledge-Creating Company*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

NORBERG, J. (2001) *Till världskapitalismens försvar*. Stockholm, Sweden: Timbro. [In Defense of Global Capitalism.]

OHMAE, K. (1995) Putting Global Logic First. *Harvard Business Review*, Jan-Feb: 119–125.

OHMAE, K. (1990) *The Borderless World: Power and Strategy in the Interlinked Economy*. New York: Harper.

PARKER, B. (1998) *Globalization and Business Practice: Managing Across Boundaries*. London: Sage.

POLANYI, K. (1944/1957) *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Boston: Beacon Press.

POSTER, M. (1999) National Identities and Communications Technologies. *The Information Society* 15/4: 235–240.

POWELL, W.W. and SNELLMAN, K. (2004) The Knowledge Economy. *Annual Review of Sociology* 30: 199–220.

PRASAD, A. (Ed.) (2003) *Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis: A Critical Engagement*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

PRED, A. and WATTS, M. (1993) *Reworking Modernity*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University.

PRITCHETT, L. (1997) Divergence, Big Time. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 11/3: 3–17.

PRUSAK, L. (Ed.) (1997) *Knowledge in Organizations*. New York: Butterworth-Heinemann.

QUACK, S., MORGAN, G. and WHITLEY, R. (Eds.) (1999) *National Capitalisms, Global Competition and Economic Performance*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

QUANTANILLA, J. and FERNER, A. (2003) Multinationals and Human Resource Management: Between Global Convergence and National Identity. *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 14/3: 363–368.

RISBERG, A., TIENARI, J. and VAARA, E. (2003) Making Sense of a Transnational Merger: Media Texts and the (Re)construction of Power Relations. *Culture and Organization* 9/2: 121–137.

ROBERTSON, R. (1995) Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity. In *Global Modernities*, Eds. M. Featherstone, S. Lash and R. Robertson. London: Sage, pp. 25–44.

ROBERTSON, R. (1992) *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

ROWE, D., MCKAY, J. and MILLER, T. (1998) Come Together: Sport, Nationalism, and the Media Image. In *MediaSport*, Ed. L.A. Wenner. New York: Routledge.

RUGMAN, A.M. (2005) *The Regional Multinationals: MNE:s and 'Global' Strategic Management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

RUGMAN, A.M. (2000) *The End of Globalization*. London: Random House.

RUGMAN, A.M. and VERBEKE, A. (2003) Multinational Enterprises and Clusters. *Management International Review* 43/3: 151–169.

RUPERT, M. (2000) *Ideologies of Globalization: Contending Visions of a New World Order*. London: Routledge.

SAMPSON, E.E. (1989) The Challenge of Social Change for Psychology: Globalization and Psychology's Theory of the Person. *American Psychologist* 44: 914–921.

SAMUEL, R. (Ed.) (1989) *Patriotism, Volume III: National Fictions*. London: Routledge.

SASSEN, S. (1998) *Globalization and Its Discontents: Essays on the New Mobility of People and Money*. New York: The New Press.

SASSEN, S. (1991) *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

SCHMIDT, V.A. (1995) The New World Order, Incorporated: The Rise of Business and the Decline of the Nation State. *Daedalus* 124/2: 1–17.

SCHWARZ, B. (1990) The Reconstruction of Abraham Lincoln. In *Collective Remembering*, Eds. D. Middleton and D. Edwards. London: Sage.

SERVAN-SCHREIBER, J-J (1968) *The American Challenge*. New York: Atheneum.

SHAH, H. and THORNTON, M.C. (2003) *Newspaper Coverage of Interethnic Conflict: Competing Visions of America*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

SKLAIR, L. (2001) *The Transnational Capitalist Class*. Oxford: Blackwell.

SKLAIR, L. (1995) *Sociology of the Global System*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

SKURNIK, S. (2005) *Suomalaisen talousmallin murros: suljetusta sääntelytaloudesta kaksinapaiseen globaalitalouteen*. Helsinki School of Economics, Acta Universitatis Oeconomicae Helsingiensis A-251. [The Transformation of the Finnish Business System: From a Closed Regulated Economy into a Bipolar Globalized Economy.]

SMITH, N. (1993) Homeless/Global: Scaling Places. In *Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change*, Eds. J. Bird, B. Curtis, T. Putnam, G. Robertson and L. Tickner. London: Routledge.

SMITH, A. (1990) Toward a Global Culture? *Theory, Culture and Society* 7: 171–191.

SORGE, A. (1996) Societal Effects in Cross-National Organization Studies: Conceptualizing Diversity in Actors and Systems. In *The Changing European Firm: Limits to Convergence*, Eds. R. Whitley and P. Hull Kristensen. London: Routledge

SUNKEL, O. (1972) Big Business and 'Dependencia': A Latin American View. *Foreign Affairs* 50/3: 517–531.

SWYNGEDOUX, E. (1997) Neither Global Nor Local: 'Glocalization' and the Politics of scale. In *Spaces of Globalization*, Ed. K. Cox. New York: Guildford.

TAINIO, R., HUOLMAN, M., PULKKINEN M., ALI-YRKKÖ, J. and YLÄ-ANTTILA, P. (2003) Global Investors Meet Local Managers: Shareholder Value in the Finnish Context. In *Globalization and Institutions; Redefining the Rules of the Economic Game*, Eds. M-L Djelic and S. Quack. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 37–56.

TAPSCOTT, D. (1997) *The Digital Economy: Promise and Peril In the Age of Networked Intelligence*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

TAYLOR, P.J., WATTS, M.J. and JOHNSTON, R.J. (2002) Geography/Globalization. In *Geographies of Global Change*, Eds. R.J. Johnston, P.J. Taylor and M.J. Watts. 2nd edition. Oxford: Blackwell, 1–18.

TIENARI, J., SØDERBERG, A-M, HOLGERSSON, C. and VAARA, E. (2005) Gender and National Identity Constructions in the Cross-Border Merger Context. *Gender, Work and Organization* 12/3: 217–241.

TIENARI, J., VAARA, E. and 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.

TOMLINSON, J. (1999) *Globalization and Culture*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

TROMPENAARS, F. (1993) *Riding the Waves of Change: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business*. London: Economist Books.

UN/DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS (1973) *Multinational Corporations in World Development*. New York: United Nations.

VAARA, E. and TIENARI, J. (2002) Justification, Legitimization and Naturalization of Mergers and Acquisitions: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Media Texts. *Organization* 9/2: 274–304.

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.

VAARA, E., TIENARI, J. and SÄNTTI, R. (2003a) The International Match: Metaphors as Vehicles of Social Identity-building in Cross-Border Mergers. *Human Relations* 56/4: 419–452.

VAARA, E., RISBERG, A., SØDERBERG, A-M and TIENARI, J. (2003b) Nation Talk – The Construction of National Stereotypes in a Merging Multinational. In *Merging Across Borders: People, Cultures and Politics*, Eds. A-M Søderberg and E. Vaara. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press, pp. 61–86.

VERNON, R. (1998) *In the Hurricane's Eye: The Troubled Prospects of Multinational Enterprises*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

WALLERSTEIN, I. (1990) Culture as the Ideological Battleground of the Modern World-System. In *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*, Ed. M. Featherstone. London: Sage.

441

DISCUSSION

WATERS, M. (1995) *Globalization*. London: Routledge.

WEBER, M. (1948) The Nation. In *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, translated and edited by H.H. Gerth and C. Wright-Mills. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

WESTWOOD, R. (2001) Appropriating the Other in the Discourses of Comparative Management. In *The Language of Organization*, Eds. Robert Westwood and Stephen Linstead. London: Sage Publications.

WHEEN, F. (2004) *How Mumbo-Jumbo Conquered the World*. London: Harper Perennial.

WHITING, V.R. (1993) The Dynamics of Regionalization: Road Map to an Open Future? In *The Challenge of Integration: Europe and the Americas*, Ed. Peter H. Smith. Miami, FL: North-South Center, pp. 17–49.

WHITLEY, R. (Ed.) (1992) *European Business Systems: Firms and Markets in their National Contexts*. London: Sage.

WHITLEY, R. and HULL KRISTENSEN, P. (Eds.) (1996) *The Changing European Firm: Limits to Convergece*. London: Routledge.

WODAK, R., DE CILLIA, R., REISIGL, M. and LIEBHART, K. (1999) *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

WOLF, M. (2004) *Why Globalization Works*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

YIN, E. and CHOI, C. (2004) The Globalization Myth: The Case of China. *Management International Review* 44/4.