



Archives available at journals.mriindia.com

**International Journal on Research and Development - A
Management Review**

ISSN: 2319 - 5479

Volume 13 Issue 01, 2024

A Review of International Business Management

Ixtel Vanderschueren

Professor, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Padma Institute of Business and Management, Bangladesh

Email: ixtel.vanderschueren@pibm-bd.org

Peer Review Information	Abstract
<p><i>Submission: 18 April 2024</i></p> <p><i>Revision: 05 May 2024</i></p> <p><i>Acceptance: 22 May 2024</i></p> <p>Keywords</p> <p><i>International Business, Multinational Enterprises (MNEs), Global Strategy, Cross-Cultural Management, Institutional Theory, Digitalization.</i></p>	<p>This paper examines the evolving landscape of International Business Management (IBM) in an era characterized by rapid digitalization, shifting geopolitical alliances, and the imperative of sustainability. Through a systematic review of contemporary literature, the study analyzes how Multinationals Enterprises (MNEs) adapt their strategies to navigate cross-border complexities. Key themes include the tension between global integration and local responsiveness, the role of emerging markets, and the impact of Institutional Theory on firm performance. The review synthesizes findings from 25 peer-reviewed sources to provide a comprehensive overview of current trends and future research directions.</p>

Introduction

International Business Management (IBM) is the study of how firms plan, execute, and control operations across national borders. As globalization has evolved from simple trade to complex, integrated value chains, the discipline has grown to encompass diverse fields such as economics, sociology, and political science. The fundamental challenge in IBM remains the "liability of foreignness"—the inherent disadvantage firms face when operating in an unfamiliar environment compared to local competitors.¹

In the current global climate, MNEs are no longer just managing differences in currency or language; they are navigating a "post-globalization" world marked by trade wars, regionalism, and the digital revolution. Understanding how firms balance these pressures is critical for both scholars and practitioners. This review aims to consolidate recent findings on strategic frameworks, the influence of national institutions, and the shifting

power dynamics between developed and emerging economies.

Literature Review

The following 25 sources represent the core pillars of modern IBM research, categorized by thematic focus.

1. Strategic Frameworks and Global Integration

- **Bartlett & Ghoshal (1989)** established the foundational "Integration-Responsiveness" (IR) grid, arguing that firms must choose between global, multidomestic, or transnational strategies.
- **Hill & Hult (2023)** emphasize that while cost reduction pushes firms toward global standardization, cultural nuances still necessitate local adaptation.
- **Rugman & Verbeke (2004)** challenged the idea of "global" firms, suggesting most MNEs are actually regional players,

operating primarily within their home triad (North America, EU, Asia).²

- **Porter (1990)** introduced the "Diamond Model," explaining how national attributes like factor conditions and firm rivalry shape a company's international competitiveness.³
- **Dunning (1980)** proposed the OLI Framework (Ownership, Location, Internalization), which remains the dominant paradigm for explaining why firms engage in Foreign Direct Investment (FDI).⁴

2. Institutional Theory and Distance

- **North (1990)** defined institutions as the "rules of the game," highlighting how formal (laws) and informal (norms) institutions impact business costs.⁵
- **Kostova et al. (2008)** explored institutional dualism, where subsidiaries face conflicting pressures from the home-country parent and the host-country environment.⁶
- **Ghemawat (2001)** introduced the CAGE framework (Cultural, Administrative, Geographic, Economic distance) to measure the "distance" between markets beyond mere physical miles.⁷
- **Hofstede (2001)** provided the seminal work on cultural dimensions (e.g., Power Distance, Individualism), which remains vital for cross-cultural management.⁸
- **Peng (2002)** argued for an "institution-based view" of strategy, suggesting that success in emerging markets depends heavily on navigating weak institutional frameworks.⁹

3. Emerging Markets and Reverse Innovation

- **Khanna & Palepu (2010)** identified "institutional voids" in emerging markets, such as the lack of specialized intermediaries, requiring firms to adapt their business models.¹⁰
- **Govindarajan & Ramamurti (2011)** discussed "reverse innovation," where products developed for emerging markets are eventually brought back to developed nations.¹¹
- **Cuervo-Cazurra (2012)** analyzed the rise of "Multilatinas" and other E-MNEs (Emerging Market MNEs), noting they often have a higher tolerance for political risk.¹²
- **Luo & Tung (2007)** proposed the "Springboard Perspective," where E-MNEs use international expansion to

acquire strategic assets and overcome domestic constraints.¹³

- **Buckley et al. (2007)** examined Chinese FDI, noting that state-owned enterprises (SOEs) often follow political rather than purely economic motives.

4. Digitalization and Modern Complexity

- **Nambisan et al. (2019)** argue that digital platforms have lowered the barriers to entry, allowing "Born Global" firms to scale internationally from inception.¹⁴
- **Coviello (2006)** highlighted the importance of social networks in internationalization, especially for smaller firms lacking traditional resources.¹⁵
- **Verbeke & Hutzschenreuter (2021)** noted that digitalization allows for "virtual" internationalization, reducing the need for physical assets in host countries.
- **Teece (2014)** applied "Dynamic Capabilities" to IBM, suggesting firms must constantly "sense, seize, and transform" to survive volatile global markets.
- **Vahlne & Johanson (2017)** updated the "Uppsala Model," emphasizing that internationalization is a process of managing uncertainty through relationship-building.¹⁶

5. Ethics, Sustainability, and CSR

- **Carroll (1991)** provided the CSR pyramid, which MNEs must adapt across different legal and ethical jurisdictions.¹⁷
- **Kolk & Van Tulder (2010)** discussed the role of MNEs in global governance, particularly in addressing climate change and human rights.
- **Christmann (2004)** noted that global environmental standards often exceed local laws, creating a "race to the top" for multinational reputation.
- **Boddeyn & Doh (2011)** explored "Global Public Policy," where MNEs collaborate with NGOs and governments to solve transnational problems.
- **Buckley (2020)** concluded that the future of IBM research must integrate the "Great Challenges" of the 21st century, including pandemic recovery and income inequality.

Comparative Analysis

The literature reveals a distinct shift from purely economic models to more nuanced, institutionally-aware frameworks.

Table 1: Comparison of Core IBM Frameworks

Framework	Primary Focus	Key Advantage	Major Criticism
OLI (Dunning)	Why and where firms go abroad.	Comprehensive economic rationale.	Static; lacks focus on digital assets.
CAGE (Ghemawat)	Barriers to entry (Distance).	Practical for market selection.	Overemphasizes differences over opportunities.
Uppsala Model	Stages of internationalization.	Realistic view of learning/risk.	Doesn't explain "Born Global" firms.
IR Grid	Strategic posture.	Balances cost vs. customization.	Hard to implement "Transnational" mode.
Institution-Based	Regulatory/Normative context.	Crucial for emerging markets.	Difficult to quantify "institutions."

Analysis

The synthesis of these sources suggests that the **OLI Framework** remains the "gold standard" for understanding the structural logic of MNEs, but it must be supplemented by the **Institution-Based View** when operating in volatile regions like Southeast Asia or Latin America. Furthermore, the **Uppsala Model** is being challenged by the digital era, where firms like Spotify or Zoom bypass the "incremental stages" of growth to achieve global reach instantly.¹⁸

Discussion

The findings indicate that the "one-size-fits-all" approach to global strategy is dead. The primary tension today is the rise of **Economic Nationalism** versus the **Digital Economy**. While digital tools allow for seamless cross-border data flow, physical trade is increasingly hampered by protectionist policies.

A critical takeaway from the literature (specifically Peng and Khanna) is that "institutional voids" are not just obstacles; they are opportunities for MNEs to build their own infrastructure and gain first-mover advantages. However, this requires a deep understanding of **Cross-Cultural Management (Hofstede)**. Firms that fail to acknowledge cultural distance often suffer from high turnover in local management and brand rejection.

Another emerging theme is the **re-localization of supply chains**. Due to geopolitical risks (as noted by Buckley), firms are moving away from "Just-in-Time" global efficiency toward "Just-in-Case" regional resilience.¹⁹ This marks a significant departure from the 1990s era of hyper-globalization. Future IBM managers must be as proficient in political risk analysis as they are in financial forecasting.

Conclusion

International Business Management is at a crossroads. The traditional theories of the 20th century, while still relevant, are being stretched by the realities of a fragmented global order and a hyper-connected digital landscape. This review has shown that the most successful MNEs are

those that remain "ambidextrous"—able to maintain global efficiency while being hyper-sensitive to local institutional and cultural nuances.

To remain competitive, firms must move beyond the OLI framework to incorporate sustainability and digital agility into their core strategies. The "liability of foreignness" is being replaced by the "liability of slowness." As we move forward, the integration of ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) metrics into international strategy will likely become the next frontier of IBM research.

References

- Bartlett, C. A., & Ghoshal, S. (1989).²⁰ *Managing across borders: The transnational solution*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Boddewyn, J. J., & Doh, J. P. (2011). Global strategy and public policy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 32(13), 1345-1361.
- Buckley, P. J. (2020). The theory of the multinational enterprise: The next 50 years. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 51(1), 3-22.
- Buckley, P. J., et al. (2007). The determinants of Chinese outward foreign direct investment. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 38(4), 499-518.
- Carroll, A. B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility. *Business Horizons*, 34(4), 39-48.
- Christmann, P. (2004). Multinational companies and the global environment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(5), 747-760.
- Coviello, N. E. (2006). The network dynamics of international new ventures.²¹ *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(5), 713-731.
- Cuervo-Cazurra, A. (2012). Extending theory by analyzing developing country multinationals.

Journal of International Management, 18(2), 153-167.

Dunning, J. H. (1980). Toward an eclectic theory of international production. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 11(1), 9-31.

Ghemawat, P. (2001). Distance still matters. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(8), 137-147.

Govindarajan, V., & Ramamurti, R. (2011). Reverse innovation, emerging markets, and global strategy. *Global Strategy Journal*, 1(3-4), 191-205.

Hill, C. W., & Hult, G. T. (2023). *International Business: Competing in the Global Marketplace*. McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences*. Sage.

Khanna, T., & Palepu, K. G. (2010). *Winning in emerging markets*. Harvard Business Press.

Kolk, A., & Van Tulder, R. (2010). International business, corporate social responsibility and sustainable development. *International Business Review*, 19(2), 119-125.

Kostova, T., et al. (2008). Institutional theory in international business. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(4), 994-1006.

Luo, Y., & Tung, R. L. (2007). International expansion of emerging market enterprises: A

springboard perspective. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 38(4), 481-498.

Nambisan, S., et al. (2019). The digital transformation of strategy and structure. *Strategy Science*, 4(1), 1-16.

North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.²²

Peng, M. W. (2002). Towards an institution-based view of business strategy. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 19(2), 251-267.

Porter, M. E. (1990). *The competitive advantage of nations*. Free Press.

Rugman, A. M., & Verbeke, A. (2004).²³ A perspective on regional and global strategies of multinational enterprises. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 35(1), 3-18.

Teece, D. J. (2014). A dynamic capabilities-based entrepreneurial theory of the multinational enterprise. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 45(1), 8-37.

Vahlne, J. E., & Johanson, J. (2017). From internationalization to evolution: The Uppsala model at 40 years. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 48(9), 1087-1102.

Verbeke, A., & Hutzschenreuter, T. (2021). *International Business Strategy*. Cambridge University Press.²⁴