

Englishization and the Politics of Translation

Abstract

Purpose This article investigates the treatment of translation within the international business and management (IBM) literature in order to highlight colonialist assumptions inscribed in this treatment as a result of the hegemonic status of English.

Design/methodology/approach This investigation takes the form of a systemic literature review to examine the treatment of translation in the IBM literature through a postcolonial lens.

Findings The findings demonstrate that despite growing interest in language in international business, matters of translation have received comparatively little attention. However, those articles which do address translation matters tend to do so in five key ways, including epistemological/methodological considerations, exploring translator agency, the investigations of the discursive void/conceptual fuzziness between languages, and approaches which discuss translation as social practice.

Research limitations/implications Despite our critique of English language hegemony, our literature review is restricted to English-language journals, which we acknowledge as problematic and discuss within the article.

Practical implications In exposing the limited treatment of translation within the literature, we provide a call to action for IBM scholars to be more explicit in their treatment of translation in order to ensure representation of cultural and linguistic Others, rather than providing domesticated accounts of multilingual research.

Originality/value Although there have been other articles which have examined translation in the past, this article is the first to do so through a postcolonial lens, demonstrating from a linguistic perspective the colonialist assumptions which are still prevalent in IBM knowledge production as evidenced by the treatment of translation in the field.

Key words Translation, postcolonial theory, language, representation

Introduction

In this article we contribute to postcolonial, critical international business research through an investigation of how the English language and translation are used in the knowledge production process. Through a systematic literature review which includes both methodological papers which specifically address translation in international business and management (IBM) research, and papers which deal with language diversity as an empirical phenomenon, we demonstrate that the majority of studies treat translation as an administrative, mechanistic

necessity, and that only a minority use it to break open the hegemonic assumptions and practices of knowledge production within international business. Furthermore, we argue that the role of English and translation need to be incorporated into critical, post-colonial international business research, which remains to date firmly monolingual.

We adopt a postcolonial approach as our primary theoretical lens through which to interpret the data, as we consider it to be an under-utilised tool through which to explore language practices (e.g. Boussebaa *et al*, 2014). We use our systematic literature review in the field of IBM in order to illustrate the scant attention which matters of translation are afforded in the extant literature, and argue that this is due to the colonialist assumptions which haunt management and organisation studies (Fougère and Moulettes, 2012).

Given that language-sensitive international business is no longer in its infancy and has now reached a degree of maturity (e.g. Karhunen *et al*, 2018; Tenzer *et al*, 2017) we believe that the time is ripe to explore approaches to translation in management from a postcolonial perspective which explores the politics of power and privilege which are present in the production of management knowledge, particularly international research which is then packaged for dissemination in the English language. Although this issue is drawing scholarly attention (e.g. Xian, 2008; Tietze, 2018; Boussebaa and Tienari, 2019), a postcolonial approach helps us to further demonstrate how the privileging of English reflects the colonialist assumptions inherent in much IBM literature (Westwood, 2006; Jack and Westwood, 2006; Westwood and Jack, 2007; Jack *et al*, 2011). Despite early consideration in this strand of critical management studies (e.g. Jack, 2004), language has been an aspect of this dynamic which has hitherto been largely ignored. For example, Westwood (2006) suggests that the inclusion of local informants could challenge the hegemony of Western knowledge production. However, he minimizes the specific issue of language in order to emphasize metaphorical, rather than interlingual, aspects of translation “firstly, they are more often required to research and write in a language other than their own, but *more importantly* [emphasis added] they will be translating their knowledge and cultural content into forms comprehensible to western audiences” (p.107).

Within the field of management and organisation studies more generally, postcolonial approaches are not new, and have been used in order to interrogate issues such as international knowledge transfer (Chio, 2008; Mir, Banerjee and Mir, 2008); global careers (McKenna and Peticca-Harris, 2015), workplace diversity (Prasad, 1997); identity work (Srinivas, 2013) and language management practices (Boussebaa, *et al*, 2014), amongst others. However, outside

of *critical perspectives on international business*, postcolonial approaches remain relatively scarce in the mainstream IBM literature. Even within this critical tradition however, there is still a blindness to issues of language and translation. Although a relatively early work in this area by Jack (2004) highlights the linkages between English language use in international business and power, subsequent pieces have tended to ignore issues of language and translation, and largely consider postcolonialism through a monolingual perspective (Steyaert and Janssens, 2013), despite language and accent being a visible site of tension in neo-colonial encounters (e.g. Thomson and Jones, 2015).

Theoretical lens

In this study, we have particularly drawn upon the work of Gavin Jack and Robert Westwood (e.g. Jack, 2004; Jack and Westwood, 2006; Westwood, 2006; Jack *et al*, 2011) who have made a significant contribution towards opening up a critically interrogative space in which the ongoing effects of colonial projects and their impact on IBM can be investigated. Postcolonial studies is a heterogenous field (Nkomo, 2011), which has origins in literary criticism, but now ranges from cultural studies through translation studies to management and organisation, and as such, has an array of theoretical underpinnings (Westwood and Jack, 2007). However, it is generally “concerned with revealing continuities and persistent effects of the colonial project and colonial experience in *contemporary* ways of knowing and acting in the world” (Westwood, 2004, p. 57)

Postcolonialism offers a theoretical framework within which the continuing effects of Western imperialism and its influence on management can be understood (Mika and O’Sullivan, 2014). As a political engagement with research practice (Jack and Westwood, 2006), postcolonialism offers a space in which scandalization (Steyaert and Janssens, 2013) can occur, and points to the way in which, since the Second World War, centres of management knowledge production have been established primarily within North America and Northern Europe (Jack, 2004; Westwood, 2004, Üsdiken, 2010; Grey, 2010). Such an approach led to the existence of colonialist binaries (Prasad, 1997) in which cultural Others were exoticized and constructed in terms of their opposition to the West, which was depicted as superordinate; the epitome of modernity and progress, standing in stark contrast to the more primitive “Orient” (Said, 2003). From the perspective of management knowledge production, this has meant that peoples and cultures outside of these dominant centres are frequently essentialised as an object of study (Fougère and Moulettes, 2012) and only “conceptualised through the refracting lens of Western

categories, constructs and theories” (Westwood, 2004, p. 63). The continued dominance of these centres of knowledge production has meant that such an approach has produced little self-scrutiny, and is rarely recognised for the ideologically bound and parochial perspective that it is (Boyacilliger and Adler, 1991; Westwood, 2004; Jack, 2004; Jack *et al*, 2011; Boussebaa, 2020).

Accordingly, there is now a substantial critique of the ways in which American management practices have been transported to developing economies under the guise of modernity, which reinforces the boundary between these centres of knowledge production and those on the periphery which at the same time legitimises and strengthens their hegemonic position (e.g. Alcadipani and Caldas, 2012).

From a translation perspective, postcolonial approaches have a long tradition of explicitly viewing acts of translation to be exercises of power and which necessarily engage with the politics of representation (e.g. Spivak, 2012).

However, due to the centrality of the UK and the US as centres of management knowledge production, this is a struggle with which IBM research has not fully engaged, as it treats English as the universal, theory-neutral language through which reality can be objectively reported, as explored in the following section.

The Politics of English

Within the literature on language management in international business, there is a substantial body of literature which argues English to be a “neutral” vehicle of communication, one which can be divested of ownership by native speakers, to be owned by the international business community (e.g. Neeley, 2017). Whilst this is appealing from the dominant functionalist perspective, it ignores the ways in which the English language achieved its global reach, firstly, through the colonial expansion of the British Empire, which relegated local languages to vernacular status whilst privileging English as the language of the elite (Gopal, 2019), and more recently, through the spreading of the management gospel (Tietze, 2004), which privileges English as the vehicular language of management knowledge.

In this respect, IB remains mired in parochialism (Boyacigiller and Adler, 1991) and often fails to interrogate its own ontological and epistemological position – rather than being truly “international” business, it is often little more than Anglo-American/Northern European business (Westwood and Jack, 2007). Given this positioning, it is unsurprising that the role

which the English language plays within this is rarely subjected to sustained critique – albeit with some exceptions (e.g. Boussebaa and Tienari, 2019; Tietze, 2018).

The English language has become the global lingua franca of knowledge, commerce and culture. Its influence is so dominant that it is not possible to partake in the global (knowledge) economy without having access and a degree of mastery over the English language. While enabling global flows and sharing of knowledge, there are also other consequences, as in some academic disciplines, including management and business (Steyaert and Janssens, 2013; Tietze, 2018) it has become the dominant language outside of which no valid knowledge claims can be made and where the most powerful centres of knowledge production are the US, followed by the UK (Üsdiken, 2010; Grey, 2010). The use of English is so ingrained in business disciplines that is taken to express objective and universal truths – even in accounts which subscribe to critical or constructionist epistemologies and which are located in multilingual research contexts (see Gaibrois, 2018; Tietze, 2018; Steyaert and Janssens, 2013). Such cavalier treatment of the English language has also consequences for the reconstruction of academics within Anglophone terms (Boussebaa and Brown, 2017), for the content and contours of knowledge accounts (Tietze and Dick, 2013) and also for the kind of knowledge that is produced (Tietze, 2018) in line with the perspectives of these influential centres of management knowledge production. Boussebaa and Tienari (2019) refer to the totality of these processes, institutions and practices as ‘Englishized’ as expressive of the politics of knowledge production. They are hegemonic as they implicitly privilege the meaning systems and values of the powerful centres of knowledge production (Boussebaa and Brown, 2017; Meriläinen *et al*, 2008; Tietze and Dick, 2013), e.g. through topic selection, to decisions where to publish. An additional consequence, which is rarely articulated, is also that the use of English renders translation invisible, and, so it is assumed, unnecessary; this, in turn, can lead to a closure of meanings, leaving only visible, countable and valid knowledge claims made in English (Meriläinen *et al*, 2008).

The Politics of Translation

Of particular relevance to this discussion is Translation Studies, which has been influenced to a much greater extent by postcolonial thought than the field of management. As a discipline, it has long grappled with the tensions between domestication and foreignization (Venuti, 1993), i.e. the extent to which the translated text should move away from its original form in order to conform to the cultural and linguistic expectations of the reader, or conversely, the extent to

which the reader themselves should move away from their own cultural context and norms to transport themselves closer to the text.

Kanneh (1997, p. 272) reminds us that “*gaining knowledge of other cultures is not a simple, uncomplicated matter of neutral translation from one social order to the direct relativity of another.*” There is no absolute equivalence of meaning between languages (Chidlow *et al.*, 2014); the translation of meaning is always a precarious act, rendering meaning negotiable. Such negotiation is always a political act as it is situated historically and geopolitically and the meaning which becomes accepted will depend on the relative power dynamics between the two languages in the translatorial relationship (Kanneh, 1997).

As the language of management knowledge production and writing is English, its meanings systems are treated as the universal, ‘naturally-given’ ones, creating a scenario in which other languages, and the acts of translation which through which they are rendered in English, as largely invisible (Venuti, 2008).

Here, the dominance of English is contributing to a “domesticating” effect in management research (Venuti, 1993). Its dominance is cemented within the assumption that all management knowledge can unproblematically be expressed in English, be it by management researchers or managers implementing the use of BELF (Business English as a Lingua Franca).

It is assumed that BELF is a neutral vehicular language of communication that is owned by “nobody – and everybody” (Kankaanranta and Louhiala-Salminen, 2013, p. 29) and therefore has a hybrid nature: it allows space for the expression of users’ diverse cultural backgrounds. We recognise the utility of BELF in communicating in multilingual environments; however, to claim neutrality is a de-historicized perspective, ignoring historical and geopolitical factors that have led to the contemporary choice of English as a global language of communication (Boussebaa, 2020).

Therefore, we argue that within academia itself, the choice of BELF allows UK and US interests to be propagated by contributing towards their maintenance as powerful centres of knowledge production (Üsdiken, 2010).

From a postcolonial perspective, the omnipresence of BELF in international business is an example of the continued “presence of the colonial” (Mir and Mir, 2009 p. 104). This symbolic presence - which removes the possibility of dialogue due to the continued imposition of colonialist ideologies - means that local knowledge is not valued; but is still used, distorted to

fit an external agenda, in the same way that a domesticating approach does from a translation perspective. For example, even in multilingual workplaces where BELF is present, native English speakers are still able to claim “ultimate linguistic authority” (Lovrits and Bres, 2020, p.12) over the quality of English used by non-native speakers, and rather than being perceived as neutral, different varieties of English are placed in a hierarchy (Boussebaa *et al*, 2014).

A further explanatory concept from postcolonial theory, which has gained some traction within management and organisation studies, is that of hybridity. This idea, as considered by Bhabha (2004), suggests that colonial encounters can lead to the creation of a third space. Through processes of mimicry, the colonized subject, in trying to reproduce the dominant logics of the colonizer, will often produce something different, which can be a hybrid form in which the colonized is able to assert their own identities. Although in management studies, translation has largely been treated as a mechanistic task (Peltokorpi and Vaara, 2014), this assumption is not taken for granted in Translation Studies, in which the translator plays a much greater agentic role, and in which the creativity and pluralities inherent in the process are recognised (Munday, 2016; Pym, 2014). When translation work is made visible as an agentic social process (Tyulenev, 2014), translators emerge as key agents who influence the character of such third spaces in which meaning and equivalences between languages may clash, and out of which new and hybrid forms of meaning are born.

Hybridity has already been used as a theoretical lens in management and organisation studies (e.g. Yousfi, 2014). However, beyond works such as Gaibrois (2018), Bousebaa *et al* (2014), and Janssens and Steyaert (2014), a consideration of hybridity in language practices has yet to make significant inroads in language-sensitive international business. This indicates the *“imprint of [...] colonialist doctrine [...] whenever the various apparatuses of the Western world (and that includes [...] academics, scholarly journals, [...]) assert their right (or obligation to “guide” the rest of the world, be it for intellectual, economic, social, or political “development”* (Prasad, 1997, p. 304). In short, the use of English, and more specifically, BELF, within IBM represents a form of “hegemony at home” (Bhabha, 2004, p.xv) in which other languages and ways of knowing, are marginalised and silenced due to continued colonialist influence linked to the existence of centres of knowledge production (Üsdiken, 2010).

In the light of our discussion, postcolonial studies, with its emphasis on encounters between peoples and nations, which necessarily involve communications across language boundaries,

translation has to be a frequently enacted practice. It is also a theoretical lens through which to begin such an interrogation. Furthermore, an emphasis on translation enables us to open up the possibility for a genuine recognition and acknowledgement of cultural and linguistic Others in management research, by presenting our research contexts and participants in their complexity, rather than the sanitised version (Xian 2008). While there have been notable steps towards establishing an understanding of translation as a process of social interaction within the international business literature (e.g. Lecomte *et al*, 2018; Brannen and Mughan, 2016; Chidlow *et al*, 2014), such an approach is still a minority one, which we aim to advance through this review.

Methodological Approach

In line with recent literature reviews on language in international business (e.g. Karhunen *et al*, 2018; Tenzer *et al*, 2017), we reviewed business articles which explicitly dealt with the issue of translation. Translation was chosen as the main focus because we argue that the lack of attention which it has received in the management literature (Zhong and Chin, 2015) is reflective of the domesticating agenda of international business – despite the multilingual contexts in which data is collected, the accounts are typically sanitised to the extent that readers are often unaware that the data has been translated at all, how, and by whom (Xian, 2008).

Such questions are not only pertinent in the IBM literature. Much empirical work in the field of management and organisation studies in general also relies on data which was collected in languages other than English and has the same challenges, which is why we have not restricted our search to IBM journals alone, but also management and organisation studies more broadly.

Therefore, in this systematic literature review, we have incorporated two types of paper – firstly, those which deal specifically with translation as a methodological issue in management research, and secondly, those which address language diversity as an empirical phenomenon in the context of IBM. We have selected these two areas for our review due to the fact that international business is the area of management which, due to its nature, has engaged the most with interlingual diversity (Piekkari, Welch and Welch, 2014) and therefore is presumed to engage with translation as part of this field of enquiry. Further, given that management studies more broadly is facing calls for greater methodological pluralism rather than emphasizing the discipline's positivist roots, we were aware that there are a number of methodology papers which deal specifically with translation as a methodological issue when engaging in

multilingual, qualitative research and therefore, wished to incorporate perspectives from such articles into our review.

The time period of publication was determined as the period between 1997 and 2019, as 1997 saw the landmark publication by Marschan *et al* which began to establish language as a legitimate and distinct area of study within International Business (Brannen *et al*, 2014; Tietze and Piekkari, 2020). In order to perform the search, Scopus was used, as the largest scholarly database on business and management texts, in order to access a wide cross-section of articles. We excluded book chapters and monographs from this review due to the lack of consistency in indexing these in search engines.

The search parameters were defined as language/linguist*/bilingual/multilingual + “international business” + translat* within the entirety of the article.

Using this method meant that the search would pick up any variations of translation, including translator and translating, in addition to variants of linguist, such as linguistic (Tenzer *et al*, 2017). The search included management issues relating to language and translation more generally, without restricting it specifically to international business journals, as with Chidlow *et al*'s (2014) literature review on translation, from which the present study differs in a number of ways. Firstly, we have included management and international business journals more broadly, rather than focusing on the four which Chidlow *et al* (2014) reviewed. Additionally, our review spans a longer time period – 1997-2019 versus 2000-2009, and is a thematic review underpinned by postcolonialism as a theoretical lens, which represents a substantial departure from prior research which has reviewed the treatment of translation in international business from an equivalency perspective (e.g. Chidlow *et al*, 2014; Holden and Michailova, 2014).

These search terms lead to the identification of 1,009 articles published in business and management journals which met the criteria. A very small number of articles (fewer than ten) which were not in English were removed from the list. Our use of English-language search terms only is not unproblematic, given the previous discussion regarding the hegemony of English in academia. Although previous literature reviews (Karhunen *et al*, 2018; Tenzer *et al*, 2017; Chidlow *et al* 2014) also restricted their searches to English-language articles, and this is therefore in line with established conventions, we recognise the contradiction between our central arguments and this approach, which we discuss in more detail in the following section on reflexivity. The abstracts of the remaining articles were then reviewed to understand the focus of the paper. This led to articles which dealt with computer languages and translation;

translation as a metaphor; translation in literary or non-business settings; and non-business journal articles being removed. Additionally, we incorporated only articles which were published in either international business or general management journals, and removed articles from disciplinary-specific journals which primarily related to tourism, accounting and marketing. Although such disciplines deal with organisational settings, they have their own traditions of discussing language use, which have hitherto not had significant dialogue with international business (Piekkari *et al*, 2014), which is the field which has hitherto engaged the most with matters of language and translation, although we acknowledge in particular the increasing interest within accounting of translation related matters (e.g. Evans, 2018; Kettunen, 2017). This led to the establishment of a list of 180 papers which discussed in some way language and translation in an organisational setting.

From this list, a content search of the term *translat** and its variants took place, to uncover the extent to which the article engaged with issues of translation. Following this process, articles which only made a cursory mention of translation as a language management strategy, were removed so that only those articles which dealt with translation work in a substantive way were remaining. This process demonstrated the silence which still exists within business on translation issues, as illustrated by significant number of the papers which examined language use in organisational matters did not discuss translation. After this process, only 61 articles remained, which were then reviewed in their entirety by the authors.

[INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

During this review process, the articles were examined to determine the ways in which they engaged with and discussed translation processes, enabling a thematic categorisation based on this treatment. We were particularly interested in those categories which indicated a discussion of translation that was not purely mechanistic. Both authors established a list of themes on this basis, which were discussed in dialogic exchange throughout the process. From this, we identified an overview of how translation was discussed in this literature, and then from this considered those themes which emphasized translation as a social practice. This led to five major themes which we present in a later section.

Reflexivity

As we are discussing issues of language and translation, it is helpful to briefly outline our own linguistic identities, so that as authors and researchers, we may interrogate whether we are appropriately positioned to research across such linguistic and cultural boundaries (Jack and

Westwood, 2006; Westwood and Jack, 2007). Both authors are from the Global North, are currently working in British universities, and have multilingual backgrounds. The first author is British and speaks English as a first language, and also speaks Spanish and (some) French, having used both languages extensively for business purposes throughout her career, and spent a period living and working in Spain. The second author is German and speaks German as a first language, but has lived and worked in the UK for over thirty years.

Likewise, some reflexivity about our epistemological position is required to explain the analysis of the articles. Our motivations for engaging in this literature review are stimulated by our own experiences with multilingualism. Therefore, when engaging in reflexivity in order to interrogate our perceptions of what we and others take for granted (Cunliffe, 2016) we acknowledge the influence of our personal life and language competences and interrogate what it means to our understanding of language and translation that our own multilingualism comes from fluency in multiple colonial languages (Phipps, 2019). We engage with reflexivity to interrogate our own relationship with linguistic Others, and to highlight the boundaries of our knowledge (Cunliffe, 2018). This is an issue with which we grappled through the process of analysis and writing of this literature – not least given that we are writing it in English, something which we critique as a major contributor to the domesticating agenda of international management research (Tietze, 2018) and the erasure of indigenous identities. In particular, we note that our review solely used English-language search terms. This review does not incorporate insights from work published in other languages which may well address translation issues, and also excluded a small number of articles in Mandarin which appeared in the search, which we were unable to appropriately engage with for the purposes of literature review. Thus, we recognise the extent to which our own knowledge production is bounded by our linguistic capabilities and therefore demonstrates how, even in the act of challenging dominant assumptions, we continue to maintain them, demonstrating their hegemonic status.

However, in line with Spivak (1988), we consider that this does not preclude us from reflecting on such research issues. By making the partiality of our knowledge and perspective visible (Wray-Bliss, 2003) we hope to stimulate further reflection on these issues amongst the audience of *critical perspectives on international business*, as to open up dialogue on this area to a broader audience is part of the process of scrutinization and scandalization of our own research practices (Steyaert and Janssens, 2013).

Current Status of the Field

The review uncovered five major findings. The first two relate to epistemological positions and consequent methodological decisions evident in the papers. Findings three, four and five express the thematic approaches developed in reviewed papers, through which translatorial agency, situatedness and context contingency (social practice) and opportunities to generate or manipulate meanings through translation (equivalence) are debated.

Epistemic and methodological approaches

The first important finding is a simple, yet significant one: few of the papers deal with translation in a meaningful way; given that they all deal with language diversity and therefore translation is inherent to the subject matter, this is a substantive finding. This demonstrates the lack of awareness about the consequences of translation in this field, which we argue is not engaging in epistemic reflexivity, in which interests are exposed, fundamental structures – in this case, the unproblematic acceptance of English as a publication language – are questioned, and the participation of those being researched is encouraged (Johnson and Duberley, 2000). Very few of the papers make explicit their epistemological and ontological assumptions regarding the nature of language and English specifically.

Secondly, within the methodology papers which address translation, they do so in one of two ways. One approach is to address translation from a mechanistic perspective, which is primarily concerned with the translation of survey instruments across different languages (e.g. Briseño *et al*, 2019; Littrell *et al*, 2018; Cascio, 2012). It emphasizes translation equivalence and back translation (Brislin, 1970) as a mechanism to achieve this. A second body of work is primarily concerned with translation of qualitative, multilingual data, which highlights the difficulties of the translation process of management research due to the situated nature of texts (e.g. Abalkhail, 2018). It critiques the dominant mechanistic approaches (e.g. Schedlitzki *et al*, 2017) and advocates cultural and political approaches to translation which embrace social context (e.g. Usunier, 2011; Xian, 2008).

For example, Xian (2008) describes how her translation of interviews reflecting the lived experience of Chinese women entrepreneurs, which took place in Chinese, became part of the analytical process itself. In this detailed discussion of the translation decisions made as part of the research process, and how they could influence the interpretation and understanding of the participant's accounts, she explains how "there is no separation, at this stage, between data interpretation and data translation" (p.241).

Under such approaches, translation becomes a tool which opens up access to different knowledge traditions (Chanlat, 2014); although the hegemonic status of English within management (Schedlitzki *et al*, 2017) often acts as a barrier.

Translator agency

Our third finding relates to a body of literature which strongly points to the translator as an active agent in knowledge transfer and meaning making. Different groups of translators can be identified: professional translators (e.g. Blenkinsopp and Shademan Pajouh, 2010; Boncori and Vine, 2014), and “paraprofessional” translators (Tyulenev, 2014), who translate or interpret in situ and often ad hoc. These are also referred to as boundary spanners within the terminology of international business (e.g. Aichhorn and Puck, 2017; Barner-Rasmussen and Aarnio, 2011), whose work includes translation or interpreting when engaged in multilingual work settings. Translator agency is greater in situations where discursive void or “fuzziness” are present, as discussed in a subsequent section. A key example of translator agency is found in Tietze *et al* (2017) who demonstrate the influential role a translator played in facilitating a 2-day workshop on talent management in Slovakia. The translator considered his frequent interventions as expressive of how “his translation and interpretation work was conducted through the historical lens of communism” (p.164). In other words, the decisions he made about how to translate were not neutral, but deeply influenced by his historical understanding of the context and the organisation itself, and he used this knowledge to “bring a sense of immediacy and urgency to the intervention” (p.164).

Within these groupings of translating agents, professional translators are rarely discussed in depth. The exceptions are Blenkinsopp and Shademan Pajouh (2010), who point out the decisions made by translators if faced with the lack of equivalent concept and meaning, and Tran *et al*, (2017) who discuss how they work in conjunction with paraprofessional translators. Otherwise they are discussed as a cost item (Boncori and Vine, 2014).

With regards to paraprofessionals, emphasis is given to their feelings and emotions of about translation work (e.g. Aichhorn and Puck, 2017), their gatekeeping positions (Welch and Welch, 2008), and whether their particular positioning as boundary spanner provides them with prestige and influence or excessive workloads (Zhang and Harzing, 2016; Hinds *et al*, 2014).

Little, however, is known about what Holz-Mänttari (1984) described as translatorial action, i.e. the very translation acts and decisions through which third spaces are created and hybrid meanings are (potentially) generated (for an exception see Piekkari *et al*, 2013).

Translation as social practice

Before we discuss the fourth theme in the literature, it is necessary to point out that agentic understanding of translation is interlinked with viewing acts as translation as socially and culturally embedded practice – though it makes analytic sense to keep them apart in this section. The papers on which this section is built emphasize the social practice elements more strongly than the agentic-bound papers. These articles emphasize that translation is much more than the mechanistic process of translating text from one language into another, but that it involves a great deal of social networking activity (Holden and Von Kortzfleisch, 2004). Consequently: “processes of interlingual translation involve translators in making decisions between alternative linguistic frameworks of understanding and meaning [...] decision-making processes are themselves embedded in wider social and cultural systems” (Ciuk and James, 2015, p. 569). Therefore, translator agency can be considered as being embedded social practice in that translatorial decisions are constituted through both in situ and by individual (or collective) action. A useful example of translation as social practice is found in Tran et al (2016) who discuss how Facebook crowdsourced translation as part of the company’s internationalisation process. Volunteers were recruited to provide translations into multiple languages, and tools on the site itself enabled users to view the original text plus translations suggested by their peers. The final translation decision was one approved via a voting system, in which “each translation competed against other translations, and the one with the highest rating was chosen” (p.490). This was then given final approval by a professional translator. As a result, hundreds of thousands of individuals participated in these translation processes, in order to reach a shared agreement about the most appropriate translation to be used by Facebook.

Beyond this, our review reveals that the area of IB which deals to the greatest extent with the concept of translation as social practice is that of international knowledge transfer. This has undoubtedly been influenced by the contributions of Holden (e.g. Holden, 2002; Holden and Von Kortzfleisch, 2004; Holden and Michailova, 2014) and Welch and Welch (e.g. Welch and Welch, 2008). The knowledge transfer literature more broadly emphasizes how ideas change as they travel across different contexts (Czarniawska and Sevón, 2005), although not necessarily in an interlingual sense (Ciuk and James, 2015). The social practice approaches add to the understanding of translation as it emphasizes the networked, dispersed and often collective efforts to arrive at shared meanings or to render particular meanings dominant over

others. In this regard, they expand our understanding of agency as moving beyond individual foci.

Lack of Equivalence of meaning: Discursive void and 'fuzziness'

Our final finding relates to those papers which specifically highlighted how translation deals with a lack of an appropriate terminology between source and target languages. This lack of equivalence can be a total absence of vocabulary and meanings of the subject area or it can take the form of the existence of vaguely similar vocabulary and meanings, so that the resulting fuzziness of conceptual meaning and practical applications provides a 'wiggling space', where meanings can be reshaped, challenged and manipulated. The first lack of equivalence has been coined as "discursive void," (Tietze *et al*, 2017) who highlight that management concepts do not necessarily move between languages which have evolved in different political and cultural contexts. Holden and Michailova (2014) demonstrate this in relation to the translation of the Handbook of Knowledge Management into Russian, and evidence the difficulties in translating KM concepts into the Russian language. They discuss how the term "knowledge sharing" which, in Western management discourse, views knowledge as a resource which can be shared amongst a community, does not easily translate into a Russian context where knowledge is viewed as a source of power, which is often hoarded at the top of an organisational hierarchy.

Blenkinsopp and Shademan Pajouh (2010) demonstrate how professional translators/interpreters deal with the lack of equivalence for a Farsi word (and its practice) *tarouf*, which expresses a culturally specific practice of civility and reciprocity in social and business settings. In the examples provided, the lack of equivalence enables translators to make decisions, be it to simply not translate a concept, to add on their own personal perspective on its meaning or even the 'invention' of additional features to the central theme to be translated. As discussed previously, translator agency is quite high in these contexts.

Examples of research accounts that document the translation of texts, concepts and meanings that are characterized by an inherent 'fuzziness' are Logemann and Piekkari (2015), who capture how the translation work of incoming documents and instructions sent by headquarters done by a subsidiary head enabled this manager to write his own preferred interpretation of what the central change programme meant into the guidance that went out to the subsidiary workforce. His aim was to safeguard as much as possible the relative independence of the subsidiary. Here the "fuzziness" of translations is highlighted, particularly when dealing with

issues of organisational specificity as in the account provided. Likewise, papers by Bjørge and Whittaker (2015) and Ciuk and James (2015) and Ciuk *et al* (2019), investigate the translation of corporate values across linguistic boundaries for use in organisational subsidiaries. Here the fuzziness of translation is highlighted when dealing with issues of organizational specificity - corporate values being such an area where vagueness enables a degree of subtly changing their meanings when translating them 'into' the receiving context. In this regard 'fuzziness' creates a space where divergent interpretations, even if only nuanced and subtle, can be inscribed into the translated text and meaning. The papers led by Ciuk (Ciuk and James, 2015; Ciuk *et al*, 2019) show how a corporate change programme was interlingually translated by a group of employees and consultants from (Headquarter) English to subsidiary Polish and how, in this process, some meanings were locally adapted.

Future Research Agenda

Our findings fall into two groups: one about the philosophical-epistemic aspects of the treatment of translation and a second group which identified three interrelated themes which yield understandings of agency, social and cultural practice, and meaning-making from a translation perspective. We now relate these findings with the concepts and debates developed in the first part of the paper, so that we can take them forward into grounded, substantive recommendations for a future research agenda.

Reflexivity and Representation

In the reviewed papers there is a distinct lack of epistemic reflexivity about how the use of English and 'Other' languages are accounted for. If translation is discussed at all, it is often treated through mechanistic approaches (back translation) as the favoured way to deal with language data; although in some qualitative projects, approaches which understand translation as cultural, political negotiated meaning making were also used. Mainly, these papers point to the analytic richness which can be gained if incorporating translation into the methodological repertoire. However, whether used in a mechanistic or in an interpretive spirit, in either case translation is not used to reflect upon the imbalances inscribed in colonial encounters themselves (rare exceptions include the papers by Ciuk and James, 2015; Ciuk *et al*, 2019). In total, however, epistemic reflexivity is quite low and consequently, very few of the papers make explicit their epistemological and ontological assumptions regarding the nature of language, English specifically, and translation.

Our findings bear out that the phenomenon of Englishization continues to shape the knowledge accounts of international business; a concomitant phenomenon is the relative translation-blindness of most international business research, even if (self-) labelled as language-based or language-sensitive. Yet there are also some studies, particularly those espousing social practices approaches, which integrate agentic-decision making with historically, culturally and social-politically grounded translatorial work. These accounts tend to have a relative higher degree of epistemic reflexivity in that they account for authors' linguistic background or their role in the translation of empirical data.

The question arises as to how to engender what Westwood (2004, p. 106) describes as “the total reconfiguring of research practices, including their ontological, epistemological, methodological, ethical and political dimensions”. In doing so, he argues, the politics of representation can be addressed and broken open as to make space for the knowledge and self-representation of local people.

We recommend increasing epistemic reflexivity within the reporting structure of research accounts: authors reveal their positions, including their linguistic ones, as part of their methodological reporting including the translation work they, or indeed other agents, have done to enable the production of respective research accounts. This practice addresses the existence of hegemonic publication practices because hegemony thrives when left invisible and unreported. Thus, articulating the linguistic Other, giving it room and space in research accounts, is creating a space for the local in the colonial encounter. Such practices could easily be integrated into existing protocols of how one reports one's ontological and epistemological commitments as well as accounting for research design and (data) analysis. To stress, such a change in reporting practices is not just a superficial add-on to existing reporting mechanisms, nor just a way to deepen data analysis – though it may well achieve this (Xian 2008), but it is a means of de-centring the text/knowledge production process by acknowledging the existence of ‘the Other’ (language, knowledge, way of being) as legitimate and important within IBM research accounts. While Westwood remains sceptical about the possibilities of translation, we would advocate to make translation central to cross-language research accounts as an epistemological challenge. Consequently, the reported translation process, with all its difficulty, messiness and boundedness renders open the representational process, which mainly remains unaddressed to date. However, there are the beginnings of change as the foundations of problematizing English and addressing its role in knowledge creation are currently being laid (Tietze and Piekkari, 2020).

That said, reflexivity is not to be contained exclusively within the methodological section of research accounts. Instead, we promote the use of particular literacy strategies throughout the research text. We follow Venuti's (1993) idea of foreignization understood as a way of writing in which the original language and meaning are represented, preserved and protected as a means to achieve a different form of representation. In line with Chakrabarty (2008) we argue that, not only should English be provincialized, so should epistemic traditions which privilege European and American knowledge over indigenous forms of knowing. This will take the form that in the bodies of research accounts, the language of the local is left visible, intact and integrated (e.g. Mika and O'Sullivan, 2013; Xian, 2008). As a consequence, its very existence subverts the smoothness of an otherwise domesticated account. In their analysis of textbooks Fougère and Moulettes (2012) describe texts as 'haunted' by the colonial legacy, i.e. they are based on implied epistemic assumptions privileging Western perspectives. In adopting representational writing strategies based on reflexivity and foreignizing, such ghosts could be exorcized, at least to an extent.

However, it is not sufficient to change the practices which underpin the writing of individual research accounts. We know from our discussion that paper-production processes are underpinned by the political Englishization process of management and based on a series of institutionalized practices (Boussebaa and Tienari, 2019; Steyaert and Janssens, 2013; Tietze, 2018). The majority of the reviewed papers have low or no awareness of the Englishization that underpins their very existence. These institutional practices are difficult to decentre; however incremental gains may be had through changing journal editorial policies along the lines that research accounts reporting from multilingual projects are expected to account for their translatorial methodological choices or that each published paper needs to have an abstract in at least two languages (journals outside the management disciplines have already developed such good practices).

Thematic and conceptual trajectories

The literature review showed three interrelated themes: translator agency, translation as social practice and meaning making in contexts of no or only partial equivalence of meaning. While some reviewed papers are rich in detail, there is currently no clear trajectory within which to take the notion of translation forward as a focus of empirical research and concept-building based on it. In other words, there is an emergent, but still scattered, body of work which analyses the dynamics of the colonial encounter - in particular in the context of cross-language

knowledge transfer. However, it lacks an integrated or shared understanding of translatorial action (Holz-Mänttari, 1984) as a means to investigate embedded translatorial agency as it unfolds in the knowledge transfer contexts and how it contributes to hybridity, change, resistance and also adoption.

The constructs discussed in the first part of the paper, i.e. the notion of the third space and mimicry/hybridity are useful in understanding the power dynamics inscribed within colonial encounters, and have already been used to understand such relationships with regards to knowledge transfer (e.g. Mir and Mir, 2009; Frenkel, 2008). We see these encounters as being in the first instance, language and translation-bound encounters. We therefore recommend combining the notion of translatorial action with the conceptual vocabulary of the third space and hybridity to explore in depth how translatorial action can make a difference to the skewed balance within this encounter. While there is some scattered knowledge about how translatorial action informs such encounters (e.g. Ciuk and James, 2015; Ciuk *et al*, 2019) there is a need for more studies researching such encounters from a translation perspective within a variety of different settings and theoretical orientations.

We therefore recommend that a fleet of empirical studies is necessary to build a body of work that is conceptually sophisticated and located, geopolitically, in ‘peripheral countries’ whose voices should be heard and left visible in future research accounts. Thus, the empirically-based body of work we envisage is firstly, thematically focused on language diversity and translation as it unfolds with in situ between different language users. Secondly, such studies draw on the established and highly effective vocabulary of the third space as the space where the “*cutting edge of translation and negotiation between the colonizer and the colonized is to be found*” (Bhabha, 1994, p. 38) and where hybridity as the outcome of this encounter is generated and critically commented upon. Thirdly, these studies need to be written as highly reflective pieces where authorship and translatorship are visible, discussed and embedded in debates about what constitutes originality and imitation, on what grounds such claims are made, and who benefits from them.

Conclusion

The use of language is never neutral as language practices are embedded in political, social and historical contexts. Therefore, the use of English as a taken-for-granted language of knowledge and lack of attention paid to translation are based on essentialist, universalist assumptions about the nature of knowledge and how to represent it in written research accounts. Indeed, the

communities of critical and postcolonial scholars is yet to engage with its own use of language, and in this regard its own ways of representing its knowledge claims and truths reflect, even if only unconsciously, the oligarchic ordering of knowledge and the privileging of English language meanings and values. In particular, postcolonial studies are almost by definition located in 'Other' language environments and likely to be, if empirical, multilingual in character; if theoretical, they may draw on 'other' concepts and words reflecting traditions and orderings that fall outside the knowledge producing Western epistemological preferences. We therefore advocate that the inclusion of translation decisions goes some way to address the politics of representation as *"It is through the process of translation, the central problematic for postcolonial analysis, that indigenous knowledge is lost"* (Long and Mills, 2008, p.394).

References

- Abalkhail, J.M. (2018), "Challenges of translating qualitative management data", *Gender in Management*, Vol. 33, No.1, pp. 66-79
- Aichhorn, N., and Puck, J. (2017), " "I just don't feel comfortable speaking English": Foreign language anxiety as a catalyst for spoken-language barriers in MNCs", *International Business Review*, Vol. 26, No. 4, pp 749-763.
- Alcadipani, R. and Caldas, M.P. (2012), "Americanizing Brazilian Management, *critical perspectives on international business*, Vol. 8 No.1, pp. 37-55.
- Barner-Rasmussen, W., and Aarnio, C. (2011), "Shifting the faultlines of language A quantitative functional-level exploration of language use in MNC subsidiaries", *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 46 No. 3, pp. 288-295.
- Bhabha, H. (1994), *The Location of Culture*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Bhabha, H. (2004), *The Location of Culture*, Routledge Classics, London.
- Bjørge, A.K., and Whittaker, S. (2017), "Corporate values: A linguistic approach", *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 347-362.
- Blenkinsopp, J., and Shademan Pajouh, M. (2010), "Lost in translation? Culture, language and the role of the translator in international business", *critical perspectives on international business*, Vol. 6 No. (1), pp. 38-52.
- Boncori, I., and Vine, T. (2014), " "Learning without thought is labour lost, thought without learning is perilous": The importance of pre-departure training and emotions management for expatriates working in China," *International Journal of Work Organisation and Emotion*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 155-177.
- Brannen, M. Y., Piekkari, R., and Tietze, S. (2014), "The multifaceted role of language in international business: Unpacking the forms, functions and features of a critical challenge to MNC theory and performance", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 45(No.5), pp. 495-507.

- Brannen, M.Y., and Mughan, T. (2016) Language in international business: Developing a field, in M.Y. Brannen, T. Mughan., and S. Ghoshal (Eds.) *Language strategies for global business*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Boussebaa, M., and Brown, A.D. (2017), “Englishization, Identity Regulation and Imperialism”, *Organization Studies*, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 7-29.
- Boussebaa, M., Sinha, S., and Gabriel, Y. (2014), “Englishization in offshore call centres: a postcolonial perspective”, *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 45 No. 9, pp. 1152-1169.
- Boussebaa, M., and Tienari, J. (2019), “Englishization and the Politics of Knowledge Production in Management Studies”, *Journal of Management Inquiry*, DOI: 10.1177/1056492619835314.
- Boussebaa, M. (2020), “From cultural differences to cultural globalization: towards a new research agenda in cross-cultural management studies”, *critical perspectives on international business*, DOI: 10.1108/cpoib-01-2020-003
- Boyacigiller, N.A. and Adler, N.J. (1991), “The parochial dinosaur: Organizational science in a global context”, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 262-290.
- Briseño, A., Leal, A.R., Aguiñaga, E., and López-Lira, A. (2019) Lost in translation: Lessons learned from instrument translation on entrepreneurial learning versatility in Mexico, *Management Research*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 2-23
- Brislin, R.W. (1970), “Back-Translation for Cross-Cultural Research”, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 185-216.
- Cascio, W.F. (2012), Methodological issues in international HR management research, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 23 No. 12, pp. 2532-2545.
- Chakrabarty, D. (2008), *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial thought and historical difference*. New Jersey, Princeton University Press.
- Chanlat, J.-F. (2014), “Language and thinking in organization studies: The visibility of French OS production in the Anglo-Saxon OS field”, *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 504-533
- Chidlow, A., Plakoyiannaki, E., and Welch, C. (2014), “Translation in cross-language international business research: beyond equivalence”, *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 45 No.5, pp. 565-582.
- Chio, V.C.M. (2008), “Transfers, training and inscriptions: The production of modern market citizens in Malaysia”, *critical perspectives on international business*, Vol. 4 No. 2/3, pp. 166-183.
- Ciuk, S., and James, P. (2015), “Interlingual translation and the transfer of value-infused practices: an in-depth qualitative exploration”, *Management Learning*, Vol. 46 No.5, pp. 565-581.

- Ciuk, S., James, P. and Śliwa, M. (2019), “Micropolitical Dynamics of Interlingual Translation Processes in an MNC Subsidiary”, *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 926-942.
- Cunliffe, A.L. (2016), ““On Becoming a Critically Reflexive Practitioner” Redux: What Does it Mean to Be Reflexive?”, *Journal of Management Education*, Vol. 40 No. 6, pp. 740-746.
- Cunliffe, A.L. (2018), “Alterity: The passion, politics and ethics of self and scholarship”, *Management Learning*, Vol. 49 No. 1, pp. 8-22.
- Czarniawska, B., and Sevón, G. (2005), *Global ideas: How ideas, objects and practices travel in the global economy*, Liber & Copenhagen Business School Press, Copenhagen.
- Evans, L. (2018), “Language, translation and accounting: towards a critical research agenda”, *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, Vol. 31 No. (7), pp. 1844-1876.
- Fredriksson, R., Piekkari, R. and Barner-Rasmussen, W. (2006), “The multinational corporation as a multilingual organization”, *Corporate Communications*, Vol. 11 No. 4, pp. 406-423.
- Fougère, M. and Moulettes, A. (2012), “Disclaimers, dichotomies and disappearances in international business textbooks: A postcolonial deconstruction”, *Management Learning*, Vol. 43 No. 1, pp. 5-24.
- Frenkel, M. (2008), “The Multinational Corporation as a Third Space: Rethinking International Management Discourse on Knowledge Transfer through Homi Bhabha”, *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 33 No. 4, pp. 924-942
- Gaibrois, C. (2018), ““It crosses all the boundaries”: hybrid language use as empowering resource”, *European Journal of International Management*, Vol. 12 No. 1/2, pp. 82-110.
- Gopal, P. (2019), *Insurgent Empire: Anticolonial Resistance and British Dissent*, Verso, London.
- Grey, C. (2010), “Organizing Studies: publications, politics and polemic”, *Organization Studies*, Vol. 31 No. 6, pp. 677-694
- Holden, N.J., and Von Korfzfleisch, H.F.O. (2004), “Why Cross-Cultural Knowledge Transfer is a Form of Translation in More Ways than You Think”, *Knowledge and Process Management*, Vol. 11 No. (2), pp. 127-136.
- Holden, N.J., and Michailova, S. (2014), “A more expansive perspective on translation in IB research, insights from the Russian Handbook of Knowledge Management”, *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 45 No. (7), pp. 906-918.
- Holz-Mänttari, J. (1984), *Translatorisches Handeln: Theorie und Methode*. Helsinki, Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- Jack, G. (2004), “Language(s), Intercultural Communication and the Machinations of Global Capital: Towards a Dialectical Critique”, *Language and Intercultural Communication*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 121-133.

- Jack, G. and Westwood, R. (2006)., “Postcolonialism and the politics of qualitative research in international business”, *Management International Review*, Vol. 46 No. (4), pp. 481-501.
- Jack, G., Westwood, R., Srinivas, N., and Sardar, Z. (2011), “Deepening, broadening and re-asserting a post-colonial interrogative space in organization studies”, *Organization*, Vol. 18 No. (3), pp. 275-302.
- Janssens, M., Lambert, J., and Steyaert, C. (2004). “Developing language strategies for international companies: the contribution of translation studies”, *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 39 No. (4), pp. 414-430.
- Janssens, M. and Steyaert, C. (2014), “Reconsidering language within a cosmopolitan understanding: Toward a *multilingual franca* approach in international business studies, *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 45 No. 5, pp. 623-639.
- Johnson, P., and Duberley, J. (2000), *Understanding Management Research*, Sage, London.
- Kankaanranta, A., and Louhiala-Salminen, L. (2013), “What language does global business speak? – The concept and development of BELF”, *Ibérica: Revista de la Asociación Europea de Lenguas para Fines Específicos*, 26, pp. 17-34
- Karhunen, P., Kankaanranta, A., Louhiala-Salminen, L., and Piekkari, R. (2018), “Let’s Talk about Language: A Review of Language-Sensitive Research in International Management”, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 55 No. 6, pp. 980-1013.
- Kanneh, K. (1997), ““Africa” and cultural translation: Reading difference”, in Ansell Pearson, K., Parry, B., and Squires, J. (Editors) *Cultural Readings of Imperialism: Edward Said and the gravity of history*, Lawrence and Wishart, London, pp. 267-289.
- Kettunen, J. (2017), “Interlingual translation of the International Financial Reporting Standards as institutional work, *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, Vol. 56 No. C, pp. 38-54.
- Lovrits, V., and de Bres, J. (2020), “Prestigious language, pigeonholded speakers: Stances towards the ‘native English speaker’ in a multilingual European institution”, *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, DOI: 10.1111/josl.123431
- Lecomte, P., Tenzer, H., and Zhang, L.E. (2018), “Working across language boundaries: New perspectives on language sensitive international management research”, *European Journal of International Management*, Vol. 12, No. 1/2, pp. 1-7.
- Littrell, R.F., Warner-Soderholm, G., Minelgaite, I., Ahmadi, T., Dalati, S., Bertsch, A., and Kuskova, V. (2018), “Explicit preferred leader behaviours across cultures: Instrument development and validation, *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 37, No. 3., pp. 243-257.
- Logemann, M. and Piekkari, R. (2015), “Localize or local lies? The power of language and translation in the multinational corporation”, *critical perspectives on international business*, Vol. 11 No. (1), pp. 30-53.

- Long, B.S. and Mills, A.J. (2008), "Globalization, postcolonial theory and organizational analysis: lessons from the Rwanda genocide", *critical perspectives on international business*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 389-404.
- McKenna, S., and Peticca-Harris, A. (2015), "Globalization, academic knowledge interests and the global careers discourse", *critical perspectives on international business*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 331-347.
- Marschan, R., Welch, D.E. and Welch, L.S. (1997), "Language: The forgotten factor in multinational management", *European Management Journal*, Vol. 15 No. 5, pp. 591-598.
- Meriläinen, S., Tienari, J., Thomas, R. and Davies, A. (2008), "Hegemonic academic practices: experiences of publishing from the periphery", *Organization*, Vol. 15 No. 4, pp. 584 – 597.
- Mika, J.P., and O'Sullivan, J.G. (2014), "A Māori approach to management: Contrasting traditional and modern Māori management practices in Aotearoa New Zealand", *Journal of Management and Organization*, Vol. 20 No. 5, pp. 648-670.
- Mir, R., and Mir, A. (2009), "From the Colony to the Corporation: Studying Knowledge Transfer Across International Boundaries", *Group and Organization Management*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 90-113
- Mir, R., Banerjee S.B., and Mir, A. (2018), "Hegemony and its discontents: a critical analysis of organizational knowledge transfer", *critical perspectives on international business*, Vol. 4 No. 2/3, pp. 203-227.
- Munday, J. (2016), *Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*, 4th edition, Routledge, Oxon.
- Neeley, T. (2017), *The Language of Global Success*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey.
- Nkomo, S. (2011), "A postcolonial and anti-colonial reading of 'African' leadership and management in organization studies: tensions, contradictions and possibilities", *Organization*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 365-386.
- Peltokorpi, V., and Vaara, E. (2014), "Knowledge Transfer in multinational corporations: Productive and counterproductive effects of language-sensitive recruitment", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 45 No. 5, pp. 600-622.
- Phipps, A. (2019), *Decolonizing Multilingualism*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon.
- Piekkari, R., Welch, D.E., Welch, L.S. (2014), *Language in International Business: The Multilingual Reality of Global Business Expansion*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Prasad, A. (1997), The Colonizing Consciousness and Representations of the Other: A Postcolonial Critique of the Discourse of Oil, in Prasad, P., Mills, A.J., Elmes, M., and Prasad, A. (Editors) *Managing the Organizational Melting Pot: Dilemmas of Workplace Diversity*, Sage, California, Sage. pp. 285-311.
- Prasad, P. (2015), *Crafting Qualitative Research: Working in the Postpositivist Traditions*. Routledge, Abingdon.

- Pym, A. (2014), *Exploring Translation Theories*, 2nd edition, Routledge, London.
- Said, E.W. (2003). *Orientalism*, new edition. Penguin, London, Penguin.
- Schedlitzki, D., Ahonen, P., Wankhade, P., Edwards, G., and Gaggiotti, H. (2017), “Working with Language: A Refocused Research Agenda for Cultural Leadership Studies”, *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol. 19, No. 2., pp. 237-257.
- Srinivas, N. (2013), “Could a subaltern manage? Identity work and habitus in a colonial workplace”, *Organization Studies*, Vol. 34 No. 11, pp. 1655-1674.
- Spivak, G.C. (1988)., Can the Subaltern Speak?, in Nelson, C. and Grossberg, L. (Editors), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, Macmillan, pp. 271-313.
- Spivak, G.C. (2012)., The Politics of Translation, in Venuti, L. (Editor) *The Translation Studies Reader*, 3rd edition, Routledge, Oxon, pp. 312-330
- Steyaert, C., and Janssens, M. (2013), “Multilingual scholarship and the paradox of translation and language in management and organization studies”, *Organization*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 131-142.
- Tenzer, H., Terjesen, S., and Harzing, A.-W. (2017), "Language in International Business: A review and agenda for future research", *Management International Review*, Vol. 57 No. 6, pp. 815-854.
- Thomson, K., and Jones, J. (2015), “Being and becoming a professional accountant in Canada”, *critical perspectives on international business*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 156-172.
- Tietze, S. (2004), “Spreading the Management Gospel – In English”, *Language and Intercultural Communication*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 175-189.
- Tietze, S. and Dick, P. (2013), “The Victorious English Language: Hegemonic Practices in the Management Academy”, *Journal of Management Inquiry*, Vol. 22 No. (1), pp. 122-134.
- Tietze, S., Tansley, C. and Helienek, E. (2017), “The translator as agent in talent management knowledge transfer”, *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 151–169.
- Tietze, S. (2018), “Multilingual research, monolingual publications: management scholarship in English only?”, *European Journal of International Management*, Vol. 12 No. 1/2, pp. 28-45.
- Tietze, S. and Piekkari, R. (2020), Language and Cross-Cultural Management, in Szkudlarek, B., Romani, L., Caprar, D.V. and Osland, J.S. (Editors), *The SAGE Handbook of Contemporary Cross-Cultural Management*, Sage, California, pp. 181-195.
- Tran, Y., Yonatny, M., and Mahnke, V. (2016), “Crowdsourced translation for rapid internationalization in cyberspace: A learning perspective”, *International Business Review*, Vol. 25, pp. 484-494.
- Tyulenev, S. (2014). *Translation and Society*, Routledge, Abingdon.
- Üsdiken, B. (2010), “Between contending perspectives and logics: organizational studies in Europe”, *Organization Studies*, Vol. 31 No. 6, pp. 715-735.

- Usunier, J.C. (2011), "Language as a resource to assess cross-cultural equivalence in quantitative management research", *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 46 No. 3, pp. 314-319.
- Venuti, L. (1993), "Translation as cultural politics: regimes of domestication in English", *Textual Practice*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 208-223.
- Venuti, L. (2008), *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*, 2nd edition, Abingdon, Routledge
- Welch, D.E., and Welch, L.S. (2008), "The Importance of Language in International Knowledge Transfer", *Management International Review*, Vol. 48 No. 3, pp. 339-360.
- Welch, D.E., and Welch, L.S. (2018), "Developing Multilingual Capacity: A Challenge for the Multinational Enterprise", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 44, No. 3, pp. 854-869
- Westwood, R. (2004), Towards a Postcolonial Research Paradigm in International Business and Comparative Management, in Marschan-Piekkari, R., and Welch, C. (Editors) *Handbook of Qualitative Methods for International Business*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp. 56-83.
- Westwood, R. (2006), "International Business and management studies as an orientalist discourse a postcolonial critique", *critical perspectives on international business*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 91-113.
- Westwood, R., and Jack, G. (2007), "Manifesto for a post-colonial international business and management studies: A provocation", *critical perspectives on international business*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 246-265.
- Wray-Bliss, E. (2003), "Research Subjects/Research Subjections: Exploring the Ethics and Politics of Critical Research", *Organization*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 307-325.
- Xian, H. (2008), "Lost in translation? Language, culture and the roles of translator in cross-cultural management research", *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 231-245.
- Yousfi, H. (2014), "Rethinking Hybridity in Postcolonial Contexts: What Changes and What Persists? The Tunisian Case of Poulina's Managers", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 35 No. 3, 393-421.
- Zhang, L.E., and Harzing, A.-W. (2016), "From dilemmatic struggle to legitimized indifference: Expatriates' host country language learning and its impact on the expatriate-HCE relationship", *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 51, No. 5, pp. 774-786
- Zhong, W., and Chin, T. (2015), "The role of translation in cross-cultural knowledge transfer within an MNEs business network: A 3D hierarchical model in China", *Chinese Management Studies*, Vol. 9 No. (4), pp. 589-610.