

Call for Papers

Historical Perspectives on Deglobalization's Antecedents, Outcomes, and Managerial Responses

Submission Deadline: 1 July 2023

Guest Editors:

Marcelo Bucheli (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign)

Daniel Raff (University of Pennsylvania and NBER)

Andrew Smith (University of Liverpool)

Heidi Tworek (University of British Columbia).

JMS Editor:

Johann Fortwengel (King's Business School)

BACKGROUND

Since 2016, the use of the term *deglobalization* has increased markedly (Google Trends; Van Bergeijk, 2019). This relatively novel word is now employed by journalists (Financial Times, 2021; Economist, 2022), political risk consultants (Swarup, 2016), policymakers, economists (Irwin, 2020; Van Bergeijk, 2019), historians (James, 2018; Tooze, 2018) and management academics (Aguilera, Henisz, Oxley, and Shaver, 2019; Buckley, 2020; Munjal, Budhwar, and Pereira, 2018; Witt, 2019) as they attempt to make sense of such interrelated phenomena as rising protectionism, nativism, and the re-imposition of controls on flows of goods (Peng, Kathuria, Viana, and Lima, 2021), capital (Roubini, 2020), labour (Farndale, Thite, Budhwar, and Kwon, 2021) and ideas (De Chant, 2022). In effect, they use the term deglobalization to describe developments that make economic exchange across borders harder than was previously the case. For people who use the term in this fashion, deglobalization denotes the opposite of globalization, economic liberalization, and movement towards a borderless world economy. Users of the term deglobalization usually focus on decisions taken by policymakers as the causal drivers behind it, although other drivers, such

as environmental and epidemiological, are also certainly possible. The rise of protectionism, nativism, and the intensification of geopolitical rivalries in the early 2020s has created new challenges that forced scholars studying firms and other organizations to bring politics and hostility to globalization back into the agenda (Witt, Li, Välikangas and Lewin, 2021; Doh, Darhan, Cassario, 2022). In the aftermath of the Cold War, many Western liberals mistakenly saw globalization as inevitable and irreversible (Friedman, 2005). Few subscribe to that viewpoint today.

The advent of deglobalization means that scholars in business schools are in (seemingly) uncharted territory. However, the world economy has experienced cycles of globalization and deglobalization over the last few centuries, as the business historian Geoffrey Jones (2005) noted in a paper that now seems prophetic. History can serve as one guide for thinking about deglobalization's antecedents and outcomes, because historical and history-informed research can advance management theory (Argyres, De Massis, Foss, Frattini, Jones, and Silverman, 2020; Buckley, 2021; Raff, 2020; Sasaki, Kotlar, Ravasi, and Vaara, 2020; Suddaby, Coraiola, Harvey, and Foster, 2020; Suddaby and Jaskiewicz, 2020; Wadhvani, Kirsch, Welter, Gartner, and Jones, 2020; Wadhvani, Suddaby, Mordhorst, and Popp, 2018). As Argyres et al. (2020) observe, the field of history-informed management research is very diverse, encompassing myriad theoretical perspectives and research methods, positivist, interpretivist, and phenomenological. Historical and history-informed research in management includes papers that examine historical phenomena in light of management theory. It also includes research about what managers and other actors in the present do with historical narratives as in the literature in management on 'rhetorical history' -how managers use historical narratives to persuade others- and 'history-as-sensemaking' -how managers draw on their historical knowledge to make sense of the present (Suddaby, Coraiola, Harvey, and Foster, 2020).

This Special Issue seeks to include diverse historical approaches to deglobalization that can advance management theory and provide actionable guidance to practitioners. At the same time, the Special Issue will enable historical scholars to engage with management, producing theoretical cross-fertilisation. We anticipate that this Special Issue will include representatives of the different branches of historical and history-informed research and of different research traditions, including International Business, Strategic Management, and Historical Organization Studies. We seek papers about deglobalization's history (from the distant past and right up through the present) and equally about how any of a wide variety of essentially historical approaches to and perspectives on this once again current and salient phenomenon can advance management theory and provide actionable guidance to decision-makers.

TOPICS OF INTEREST

This Special Issue will showcase historical and history-informed research that contributes to contemporary debates about deglobalization's antecedents, outcomes, and

managerial responses. We therefore encourage submissions that engage with, but are not limited to, the following themes.

Theme 1. Antecedents of Deglobalization

Deglobalization has many antecedents that remain underexplored by researchers. We need to know about what causes deglobalization. We encourage contributors to be explicit about the macro-level theories they use to understand global political economy, whether hegemonic stability theory (Meyer and Li, 2022), Marxian theories of political economy (e.g. Van Lent, Islam, Chowdury, 2020), world-systems theory, or postcolonial theory (Boussebaa, Sinha, and Gabriel, 2014; Boussebaa and Brown, 2017; Said, 1978). Theories that causally link deglobalization and pandemics (Tworek, 2019) might also be usefully applied here. Historical and history-informed research can therefore help to address the following questions, among others:

- How is the concept of waves of globalization and deglobalization developed by economic historians (Findlay and O'Rourke, 2007) useful in management research?
- How do organizations of different types (firms, non-profit organizations etc.) contribute to and experience deglobalization?
- How can comparisons of different episodes of deglobalizations, such as the present one with the deglobalization of the early 1930s, illuminate the underlying causes of deglobalization, be they technological, ideational, or environmental?
- What is the role of nonmarket strategy (e.g. Lawton, Dorobantu and Sun, 2020) and/or corporate political activity (Lawton, McGuire, and Rajwani, 2013; Sutton, Devine, Lamont, and Holmes 2021) in driving deglobalization?
- What is the role of corporate political activity in generating the policies associated with deglobalization?
- What is the relationship between business and peace (Ganson, He, and Henisz, 2021)?
- How does deglobalization change the nature of institutional distance and actors' perceptions of institutional distance?
- What causal connections, if any, exist between deglobalization and inequality?

Theme 2. Outcomes of Deglobalization

A second major theme of the special issue will be how deglobalization differentially impacts organizations with different characteristics, such as size, purpose (e.g., profit-seeking or non-profit), nationality, and organizational structure. Papers submitted to the special issue might also engage ongoing debates about de-internationalization (e.g. Kafouros, Cavusgil, Devinney, Ganotakis, and Fainshmidt, 2022), international entrepreneurship (Terjesen, Hessels, and Li, 2016), and political risk management (Forbes, Kurosawa, and Wubs,

2018; Hartwell and Devinney, 2021) through the use of historical case studies. Historical and history-informed research might shed light on the following questions, among others:

- Does deglobalization impose greater or lesser costs on large multinational enterprises (MNEs) than on smaller ones?
- How does the structure of ownership and control of overseas operations affect the costs of deglobalization?
- How does deglobalization impact the lived experiences of MNE managers, relations between workers and managers, and the international human resource management strategies of firms?
- How does deglobalization affect the entrepreneurial opportunities of overseas supply chain firms?
- What are the implications of deglobalization for different types of entrepreneurship?
- Does deglobalization have different impacts on family-owned firms versus other firms?
- How does deglobalization change the relationship between firms and the state?

Theme 3. Managerial Responses to Deglobalization

A third major theme is understanding how managers in different types of organizations (MNEs, domestic companies, non-profits) creatively respond to deglobalization. Managers appear to have considerable agency in how they respond to deglobalization. We know from the existing historical research that some multinational firms responded to the deglobalization episodes of the early twentieth century by using cloaking (Boon and Wubs, 2020; Casson and da Silva Lopes, 2013; Donzé and Kurosawa, 2013; Forbes, Kurosawa, and Wubs, 2018; Jones and Lubinski, 2012; Kobrak and Hansen, 2004). In a cloaking strategy, a firm attempts to hide its nationality to avoid being caught in the cross-fire between warring nation states. Other multinational firms of that era exploited the tensions between nations associated with deglobalization to engage in “geopolitical jockeying” (Lubinski and Wadhvani, 2020). Historically, some firms responded to deglobalization by embracing host country’s nationalism (Moreno, 2005) or by strategically incorporating members of a protectionist host country’s elite into the firm’s hierarchy (Bucheli and Salvaj, 2018; Garner, 2011). Firms have also used wartime sanctions regimes to attain competitive advantage (Mulder, 2022). We would therefore welcome historical and history-informed papers that deal with such questions as:

- Which strategies have managers developed to deal with deglobalization?
- How can managers draw on their knowledge of history in trying to respond to deglobalization? How have they done so?
- Does deglobalization create profit opportunities for entrepreneurs and firms and, if so, how are such opportunities identified and exploited?

- What ethical dilemmas does deglobalization create for managers and how do they resolve them?
- How might deglobalization change how the managers of multinational firms make decisions about how to enter new markets and manage political risk?

SUBMISSION PROCESS

Submission deadline: 1 July 2023

Expected Publication: Late 2025

- Submissions should be prepared using the JMS Manuscript Preparation Guidelines (<http://www.socadms.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/JMS-ManuscriptPreparationGuidelines.pdf>)
- Manuscripts should be submitted using the JMS ScholarOne system (<https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/jmstudies>)
- Articles will be reviewed according to the JMS double-blind review process.
- We welcome informal enquiries relating to the Special Issue, proposed topics, and potential fit with the Special Issue objectives. Please direct any questions on the Special Issue to the guest editors.
 - Marcelo Bucheli, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: mbucheli@illinois.edu
 - Daniel Raff, University of Pennsylvania and NBER: dan.raff@wharton.upenn.edu
 - Andrew Smith, University of Liverpool: adasmith@liverpool.ac.uk
 - Heidi Tworek, University of British Columbia: heidi.tworek@ubc.ca

SPECIAL ISSUE EVENTS

Pre-submission

Online workshops for individuals interested in submitting to the Special Issue will be held in the autumn of 2022. Potential contributors are strongly encouraged to attend at least one of these workshops, which will be held at times to accommodate researchers in different time zones. The guest editors will discuss the aims and scope of the Special Issue and will answer questions from potential contributors at these workshops. Those interested in attending these Zoom workshops should prepare a two-slide PowerPoint presentation that succinctly describes the aims of the paper they are planning to submit.

Post-submission

It is anticipated that the guest editors will organize a special issue in-person revision workshop (date and location TBA) for authors who have received an initial R&R decision on their manuscript. Please note that participation in the workshop does not guarantee acceptance of the paper. Participation in this workshop is also not a prerequisite for publication.

REFERENCES

- Aguilera, R., Henisz, W., Oxley, J. E. and Shaver, J. M. (2019). 'Special issue introduction: International strategy in an era of global flux'. *Strategy Science*, **4**, 61-69.
- Argyres, N. S., De Massis, A., Foss, N. J., Frattini, F., Jones, G. and Silverman, B. S. (2020). 'History-informed strategy research: The promise of history and historical research methods in advancing strategy scholarship'. *Strategic Management Journal*, **41**, 343-68.
- Boon, M. and Wubs, B. (2020). 'Property, control and room for manoeuvre: Royal Dutch Shell and Nazi Germany, 1933–1945'. *Business History*, **62**, 468-87.
- Boussebaa, M. and Brown, A. D. (2017). 'Englishization, identity regulation and imperialism'. *Organization Studies*, **38**, 7-29.
- Boussebaa, M., Sinha, S. and Gabriel, Y. (2014). 'Englishization in offshore call centers: A postcolonial perspective'. *Journal of International Business Studies*, **45**, 1152-69.
- Buckley, P. J. (2020). 'The theory and empirics of the structural reshaping of globalization'. *Journal of International Business Studies*, **51**, 1580-92.
- Buckley, P. J. (2021). 'The role of history in international business: Evidence, research practices, methods and theory'. *British Journal of Management*, **32**, 797-811.
- Casson, M. and da Silva Lopes, T. (2013). 'Foreign direct investment in high-risk environments: An historical perspective'. *Business History*, **55**, 375-404.
- De Chant, T. (2022). 'Big Tech spent decades skirting geopolitical issues. That's no longer an option'. *Ars Technica*. <https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2022/02/big-tech-spent-decades-skirting-geopolitical-issues-thats-no-longer-an-option/>
- Doh, J. P., Dahan, N. M. and Casario, M. (2022). 'MNEs and the practice of international business diplomacy'. *International Business Review*, **31**, 101926.
- Donzé, P. Y. (2020). 'The Advantage of Being Swiss: Nestlé and Political Risk in Asia during the Early Cold War, 1945–1970'. *Business History Review*, **94**, 373-97.
- Donzé, P. Y. and Kurosawa, T. (2013). 'Nestlé coping with Japanese nationalism: Political risk and the strategy of a foreign multinational enterprise in Japan, 1913–45'. *Business History*, **55**, 1318-38.

Dorobantu, S., Kaul, A. and Zelner, B. (2017). 'Nonmarket strategy research through the lens of new institutional economics: An integrative review and future directions'. *Strategic Management Journal*, **38**, 114-40.

Economist. (2022). *Amid Russia's war, America Inc reckons with the promise and peril of foreign markets*. March 12 edition.

Farndale, E., Thite, M., Budhwar, P. and Kwon, B. (2021). 'Deglobalization and talent sourcing: Cross-national evidence from high-tech firms'. *Human Resource Management*, **60**, 259-72.

Financial Times (2018). *Year in a Word: Thucydides's trap*. 19 December

Financial Times (2021). *Baillie Gifford's Anderson: Don't 'give up on China*. 5 November <https://www.ft.com/content/c7002c97-4d81-4e2d-a23e-0c26582fd072>

Findlay, R. and O'Rourke, K. H. (2007). *Power and Plenty: Trade, War, and the World Economy in the Second Millennium* (Vol. 51). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The World is Flat: a Brief History of the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005.

Forbes, N., Kurosawa, T. and Wubs, B. (2018). *Multinational Enterprise, Political Risk and Organisational Change: From Total War to Cold War*. Routledge.

Ganson, B., He, T. L. and Henisz, W. J. (2022). 'Business and peace: The impact of firm-stakeholder relational strategies on conflict risk'. *Academy of Management Review*, **47**, 259-81.

Hartwell, C. A. and Devinney, T. (2021). 'Populism, political risk, and pandemics: The challenges of political leadership for business in a post-COVID world'. *Journal of World Business*, **56**, 101225.

Irwin, D. (2020). 'The pandemic adds momentum to the deglobalization trend'. *Peterson Institute for International Economics*. <https://www.piie.com/blogs/realtime-economic-issues-watch/pandemic-adds-momentum-deglobalization-trend>.

James, H. (2018). 'Deglobalization: The rise of disembedded unilateralism'. *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, **10**, 219-37.

Jones, G. G. (2005). *Nationality and Multinationals in Historical Perspective*. Harvard Business School Working Paper

Jones, G. and Lubinski, C. (2012). 'Managing political risk in global business: Beiersdorf 1914–1990'. *Enterprise & Society*, **13**, 85-119.

Kafouros, M., Cavusgil, S. T., Devinney, T. M., Ganotakis, P. and Fainshmidt, S. (2022). 'Cycles of de-internationalization and re-internationalization: Towards an integrative framework'. *Journal of World Business*, **57**, 101257.

Kobrak, C. and Hansen, P. H. (Eds). (2004). *European business, dictatorship, and political risk, 1920-1945* (Vol. 1). Berghahn Books.

- Lawton, T. C., Dorobantu, S., Rajwani, T. S. and Sun, P. (2020). 'The implications of COVID-19 for nonmarket strategy research'. *Journal of Management Studies*, **57**, 1732-36.
- Lawton, T., McGuire, S. and Rajwani, T. (2013). 'Corporate political activity: A literature review and research agenda'. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, **15**, 86-105.
- Lubinski, C. and Wadhvani, R. D. (2020). 'Geopolitical jockeying: Economic nationalism and multinational strategy in historical perspective'. *Strategic Management Journal*, **41**, 400-21.
- Meyer, K. E. and Li, C. (2022). 'The MNE and its subsidiaries at times of global disruptions: An international relations perspective'. *Global Strategy Journal*, forthcoming.
- Moyo, D. (2019). 'Are businesses ready for deglobalization'. *Harvard Business Review*, **6**.
- Mulder, N. (2022). *The economic weapon: The rise of sanctions as a tool of modern war*. Yale University Press.
- Munjal, S., Budhwar, P. and Pereira, V. (2018). 'A perspective on multinational enterprise's national identity dilemma'. *Social Identities*, **24**, 548-63.
- Peng, M. W., Kathuria, N., Viana, F. L. E. and Lima, A. C. (2021). 'Conglomeration, (De) Globalization, and COVID-19'. *Management and Organization Review*, **17**, 394-400.
- Raff, D. M. G. (2020). 'Business History and the Problem of Action'. *Enterprise and Society*, 561-91.
- Said, E. (1978). *Introduction to Orientalism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Smith, A., Mollan, S. and Tennent, K. D. (Eds). (2016). *The impact of the First World War on international business*. London: Routledge.
- Suddaby, R., Coraiola, D., Harvey, C. and Foster, W. (2020). 'History and the micro-foundations of dynamic capabilities'. *Strategic Management Journal*, **41**, 530-56.
- Sutton, T., Devine, R. A., Lamont, B. T. and Holmes Jr, R. M. (2021). 'Resource dependence, uncertainty, and the allocation of corporate political activity across multiple jurisdictions'. *Academy of Management Journal*, **64**, 38-62.
- Swarup, B. (2016). *Macro Matters: Globalisation is dead*. <https://www.ipe.com/macro-matters-globalisation-is-dead/10014924.article>
- Terjesen, S., Hessels, J. and Li, D. (2016). 'Comparative International Entrepreneurship: A Review and Research Agenda'. *Journal of Management*, **42**, 299-344.
- Tooze, A. (2018). *Crashed: How a Decade of Financial Crises Changed the World*. Penguin.
- Tworek, H. (2019). 'Communicable disease: Information, health, and globalization in the interwar period'. *American Historical Review* **124**, 813-42.
- Van Bergeijk, P. A. (2019). *Deglobalization 2.0: Trade and openness during the great depression and the great recession*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Van Lent, W., Islam, G. and Chowdhury, I. (2021). ‘‘Civilized Dispossession’’: Corporate accumulation at the dawn of modern capitalism’. *Organization Studies*, 01708406211026127.

Wadhvani, R. D., Kirsch, D., Welter, F., Gartner, W. B. and Jones, G. G. (2020). ,Context, time, and change: Historical approaches to entrepreneurship research’. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, **14**, 3-19.

Wadhvani, R. D., Suddaby, R., Mordhorst, M. and Popp, A. (2018). ‘History as organizing: Uses of the past in organization studies’. *Organization Studies*, **39**, 1663-83.

Witt, M. A. (2019). ‘De-globalization: Theories, predictions, and opportunities for international business research’. *Journal of International Business Studies*, **50**, 1053-77.

Witt, M. A., Li, P. P., Välikangas, L. and Lewin, A. Y. (2021). ,De-globalization and decoupling: Game changing consequences?’. *Management and Organization Review*, **17**, 6-15.