

DOI: 10.2478/doc-2025-0015

This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons AttributionNonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

Mike Szymanski

Gies College of Business, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, United States

mikeszym@illinois.edu

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2215-6909

Evodio Kaltenecker

D'Amore-McKim School of Business, Northeastern University, United States

e.kaltenecker@northeastern.edu

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6431-5007

Why Language Matters
in Management: Regional
Contributions to a Global
Conversation

Article history:**Received** 10 September 2025**Revised** 16 November 2025**Accepted** 27 November 2025**Available online** 16 December 2025

Abstract: This research note examines how Latin American scholarship contributes to the understanding of language in management. We reviewed top local management journals across Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking countries, identifying 18 articles published in the past two decades that explicitly address the role of language in management practice and management academia. We aimed to bring forward voices and perspectives often underrepresented in the global management literature. The analysis reveals points of convergence with dominant international discourses as well as distinctive insights shaped by regional cultural, institutional, and linguistic contexts. By highlighting these contributions, we position Latin American scholarship as an essential participant in the global conversation on why language matters in management.

Keywords: Latin America, language, literature analysis, knowledge creation

Introduction

The concept of *culture*—and with it, *cultural difference*—has long been accepted in the management literature. Some of the most influential studies of cultural difference, such as Hofstede and the GLOBE project, originated in business research before spreading into other academic circles. For decades, cultural differences have been credited (or blamed) for a wide range of managerial and organizational outcomes, from market entry mode choice (Kogut & Singh, 1988) to the likelihood of adopting global digital strategies (Meyer et al., 2023). Yet underlying this work was a hidden assumption: that global business speaks one language, with English as the unproblematic lingua franca. More than that,

there appeared to be “one English”, as if all participants in corporate life could be treated as linguistically equivalent once they adopted the language, leaving cultural difference as the only recognized axis of variation.

It was only about 25 years ago that international business scholars began to interrogate this assumption systematically. Early work by Marschan-Piekkari, Welch, and Welch (1999) brought the issue of language to a broader IB audience. Their in-depth case study of the Finnish multinational Kone showed how language imposes its own structures on communication flows and networks: staff with limited language skills relied heavily on mediators, while those with superior language competence could access broader relational networks. This shift also helped bridge a longstanding gap in cross-cultural management research, which had traditionally treated culture as a fixed set of values while leaving language largely unexamined. As Brannen and Salk (2000) argue, language is one of the primary media through which culture is enacted and negotiated; paying attention to language, therefore, reveals culture as a dynamic, interactional process rather than a static category. A language-sensitive perspective thus complements—and in some cases corrects—the limitations of the earlier culture frameworks. A turning point came around 2014, when Tietze, Piekkari, and Brannen (2014) urged the IB community to take the multifaceted role of language more seriously, catalyzing a wave of subsequent studies.

Given the inherently multilingual settings of multinational corporations, this attention was perhaps inevitable. As Neeley and Kaplan (2014: 70) observe, language permeates “every aspect of organizational life”. Yet for a long time, the debate remained confined mainly to international business research. More recently, organizational and management scholars have started to recognize that language similarly permeates domestic organizations, even those operating in ostensibly monolingual contexts. Kalra and Szymanski (2023) show how regional dialects and accents can create fault lines within national teams. Hideg, Shen, and Hancock (2022) demonstrate that non-native accents in linguistically homogeneous settings shape both interpersonal evaluations (e.g., hiring decisions) and intrapersonal experiences (e.g., sense of belonging). Schmaus and Kristen (2022) document how non-native accents significantly reduce interview chances in the German labor market. Moreover, even perfect command of a language

does not guarantee equal standing, as native speakers retain privileged status (Szymanski & Brighi, 2025). Collectively, these studies affirm that language is not merely an IB issue but a pervasive organizational phenomenon.

It is no coincidence that European scholars spearheaded early work in this area—unsurprising given the linguistic diversity of Northern Europe (Marschan-Piekkari et al., 1999), Germany (Tenzer & Pudelko, 2017), and France (Vigier & Bryant, 2023, 2025). This Eurocentric concentration, however, has limited our understanding of language effects. Scholars have repeatedly called for more research on language diversity in emerging economies (Tenzer et al., 2017) and other megalanguages outside the English sphere of influence. (Ramboarisata & Berrier-Lucas, 2025). Some valuable work has emerged on Asian organizations (Kalra & Szymanski, 2023; Peltokorpi, 2022), but such studies remain relatively scarce. As a result, international journals—already dominated by Western scholars—continue to publish disproportionately on Western organizational contexts (Tietze & Dick, 2013). Voices from other regions risk being muted or overlooked altogether.

This research note seeks to recover some of those missing voices. Specifically, we examine how Latin American scholarship contributes to the understanding of language in management. Recognizing that English-language journals dominate the global conversation, we conducted a literature search of leading academic journals published in Spanish and Portuguese, focusing on the Latin American region. We identified 18 articles published over the past two decades that explicitly address language in management practice and management academia. Our analysis highlights both points of convergence with dominant international discourses and distinctive insights shaped by regional cultural, institutional, and linguistic contexts. By doing so, we aim to position Latin American scholarship as an essential participant in the global conversation on why language matters in management.

Literature analysis

We systematically reviewed leading management journals in Latin America—20 titles published in Spanish and Portuguese, ranging from

well-established outlets (e.g., *Revista de Administração de Empresas* [RAE], founded 1961; *Cadernos EBAPE.BR*, 2003) to newer publications—assessing both their visibility and content (see Table 1). To identify these journals, we first contacted colleagues and senior academics across Latin American countries and asked them to share the most highly regarded local management journals used in national accreditation systems, promotion procedures, and doctoral training. We then cross-referenced this list with the SCImago Journal Rank (SJR) database for the Business, Management, and Accounting category, filtered by the Latin American region, to ensure that all journals had recognized visibility. Journals clearly outside the management domain (e.g., agriculture or public policy-focused outlets) were excluded. This process resulted in the final list of 20 journals.

Many of these journals are regionally influential but occupy mid-tier positions in international rankings. *Cuadernos de Gestión* consistently falls in the Q2–Q3 range on the SCImago Journal Rank (SJR = 0.419 in 2024; h-index = 17). RAE similarly ranks in Q3 (SJR = 0.265; h-index = 24) with a modest two-year impact factor (≈ 0.6). Other journals showed similar patterns, indicating respectable regional presence but limited global footprint. We acknowledge that additional journals may exist outside these rankings or our professional networks.

Table 1. Overview of Selected Latin American Management Journals (2005–2025)

Journal	Language	Year Founded	Country	Publisher	Articles 2015–2025	Language-related Articles
Cuadernos de Gestión / Management Letters	Spanish	1985	Spain	Universidad del País Vasco	170	2
Spanish Journal of Marketing – ESIC	Spanish	1996	Spain	Emerald Publishing	180	2
Contaduría y Administración	Spanish	1956	Mexico	Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México	300 (e)	1
INNOVAR	Spanish	1991	Colombia			
RECAL – Revista de Estudios en Contaduría, Administración e Informática	Spanish	2012	Mexico	Universidad Autonoma del Estado de Mexico	116	0
REVESCO – Revista de Estudios Cooperativos	Spanish	2011	Spain	Universidad Complutense Madrid	279	0
Brazilian Business Review	Portuguese	2004	Brazil	Fundação Instituto Capixaba de Pesquisas em Contabilidade, Economia e Finanças (FUCAPE)	115 (e)	0
Revista Brasileira de Gestão de Negócios	Portuguese	2004	Brazil	Fundação Escola de Comércio Álvares Penteado (FECAP)	385	0
Revista de Administração de Empresas (RAE)	Portuguese	1961	Brazil	Fundacao Getulio Vargas (FGV)	715	2

Journal	Language	Year Founded	Country	Publisher	Articles 2015-2025	Language-related Articles
Revista de Administração Contemporânea (RAC)	Portuguese	1997	Brazil	Associação Nacional de Pós-Graduação e Pesquisa em Administração (ANPAD)	645	0
Gestão e Secretariado	Portuguese	2010	Brazil	SINSESP – Sindicato das Secretárias e Secretários do Estado de São Paulo	2,748	1
Cadernos EBAPE.BR	Portuguese	2003	Brazil	FGV EBAPE	530 (e)	3
Revista de Gestão (REGE)	Portuguese	2010	Brazil	Emerald on behalf of the University of São Paulo (USP)	500 (e)	0
Revista Organizações & Sociedade	Portuguese	1993	Brazil	School of Management, at the Federal University of Bahia	188	3

Source: Authors' own compilation based on journal websites, Scimago Journal Rank (SJR), and national accreditation lists.

Our objective was to identify how Latin American management scholarship has engaged with language over the past two decades. To do so, we systematically screened leading journals in the region using Web of Science, Clarivate, and direct searches on journal websites. Both authors independently examined all article titles and abstracts using Spanish and Portuguese terms related to language (e.g., idioma, língua, linguagem, diversidade linguística, proficiência, acento, dialeto). One author initially identified 15 potentially relevant articles and the other 12. After cross-checking and removing duplicates, we arrived at a consolidated list of 18. These 18 articles were drawn from a combined pool of more than 4,000 articles published across the 20 journals between 2005–2025 (see Table 2). We then read all 18 articles in full and synthesized recurring themes and points of divergence through comparative reading rather than formal coding, consistent with the aims of a research note. In itself, this rather low yield of articles reveals an important gap in the literature: although language is increasingly recognized as central to organizational and academic practices globally, it remains comparatively neglected within Latin American management scholarship.

Table 2. Summary of the 18 Latin American Studies on Language in Management (2005–2025)

Reference	Name of the Journal	Area of Influence	Language	Type of the Article	Sample Size	Findings of the Article
1. Faustino & Proença, 2015	The European Journal of Management Studies	Portuguese-speaking world (Portugal focus)	English	Empirical	37 countries, 167 observations, panel data 2000-2005	Immigrant stock positively influences intra-industry trade indexes. Shared language between immigrants and the host country amplifies these effects.
2. Chanlat, 2014	Revista de Administração de Empresas	Portuguese-speaking world	Portuguese	Essay/ Conceptual	N/A	Calls for maintaining linguistic diversity in management research rather than defaulting exclusively to English. Critiques hegemonic practices of English-language dominance in academic publishing.
3. Oliveira & Bulgacov, 2013	Revista de Administração Contemporânea	Brazil only	Portuguese	Essay/ Conceptual	N/A	Applies Wittgenstein's concept of language games to organizational studies and strategy research. Suggests that language games provide a useful lens to analyze strategizing processes and organizational practices. Highlights how linguistic pragmatics can deepen understanding of management and strategy dynamics.

4. Toledo Sarracino, 2023	Revista de Gestão Social e Ambiental	Brazil only	English	Empirical	100 students	English proficiency is a key factor in the success of student exchange programs. Students acquire English through multiple channels; TV/radio (35%), living in the US (25%), and private schools (25%). Studying subjects in English improves post-exchange academic performance; policy recommendations emphasize stronger institutional language support.
5. Carrió Pastor & Calderón, 2010	Revista de Lenguas para Fines Específicos	Spain only	English	Empirical	34 students	Spanish students' business letters diverge from English norms due to first-language influence, including paragraph structure and communicative goals. Limited use of text connectors (2.8%), leading to weaker cohesion. Inclusion of personal information not appropriate in English-speaking business contexts.
6. Foguesatto et al., 2023	SSRN Working Paper	Brazil	English (with Portuguese abstract)	Empirical	1,018 bilingual articles from 4 Brazilian Journals (RAE: 64, BBR: 472, RAC: 48, RBGN: 434)	Portuguese-language articles received significantly more citations than English versions Possible reasons: (a) lower English proficiency in Brazil, (b) journals not tied to major international publishers, (c) focus on Brazilian-specific topics with limited global relevance.

7. Ferreira et al., 2022	Accounting Education	Brazil	English	Empirical	2,594 English-language papers by 489 professors from 36 graduate accounting programs (2000-2020)	English-language publications by Brazilian accounting researchers grew steadily, with 62.8% appearing between 2015 and 2020. Only 18.4% were published in strictly accounting journals, and just 67% appeared in JCR-indexed outlets. The majority (73%) were published in journals without impact factors, reflecting difficulties in accessing high-quality international platforms.
8. Chanlat, 2021	Revista de Administração de Empresas	Brazil/French-speaking world	English (trilingual with French and Portuguese abstracts)	Essay	N/A	French intellectual traditions strongly shaped Brazilian administrative sciences through three streams: 1) Organization science (institutional analysis, sociology of organizations), 2) Work sciences (psychodynamics of work, ergonomics), 3) Heterodox economics (regulation theory, economics of convention). This influence is rooted in historical ties and in Brazilian scholars' search for alternatives to Anglo-Saxon academic dominance.

9. Abduljawad, 2023	Revista de Gestão Social e Ambiental	Brazil only	English	Empirical	Hybrid: Qualitative and Quantitative (72 Learners)	English proficiency shows a moderate positive correlation with memory, cognitive, and metacognitive learning strategies. Strong correlations also exist among clusters of learning strategies themselves.
10. Alcadipani, 2017	Revista de Administração de Empresas	Portuguese-speaking world	Portuguese	Essay/ Conceptual	N/A	There is a steady increase in Brazilian academic journals publishing primarily in English. Many journals now require at least one version of submitted articles to be in English.
11. Chanlat, 2015	Revista de Administração de Empresas	Portuguese-speaking world	Portuguese	Essay/ Conceptual	N/A	Organizational studies remain dominated by Anglo-American norms. French-speaking academia shows resistance to this dominance. Advocates for developing a “Latin field” that values linguistic and intellectual diversity while addressing current social challenges.
12. Gantman et al., 2015	Revista de Administração de Empresas	International (focus on Latin America & non-Anglo-Saxon regions)	English	Essay	N/A	Anglo-Saxon dominance in management and organizational knowledge constitutes a form of epistemic colonialism. This dominance marginalizes and excludes perspectives from peripheral countries. Calls for greater plurality in the discipline through development of indigenous knowledge.

13. Alves & Pozzebon, 2013	Revista de Administração de Empresas	International (emphasis on Latin America & Brazil)	English	Essay	N/A	Identifies three strategies to resist English linguistic dominance: Scandalization—exposing and protesting the normalization of English. Scrutinization—analyzing how linguistic power is negotiated. Invention—encouraging multilingual practices, retaining original terms, and supporting multi-language journals.
14. Rosa & Alves, 2011	Revista de Administração de Empresas	Brazil and Portuguese-speaking world, with focus on Global South academic production	Portuguese (with abstracts in English and Spanish)	Conceptual Essay/Theoretical	N/A	English hegemony in management knowledge reproduces colonial logics, creating an asymmetric flow of information from North to South. Publication and circulation criteria controlled by the Global North marginalize non-English knowledge, placing Southern researchers in a subaltern position. Brazil's Qualis evaluation system reinforces this hierarchy by prioritizing English-language publications. Counter-hegemonic resistance lies in valuing Global South knowledge and revising evaluation parameters.
15. Fonseca, 2011	Cadernos EBAPE.BR (FGV EBAPE)	Brazil only	Portuguese/English	Empirical (qualitative descriptive field study based on semi-structured interviews)	No information	Cross-cultural interactions reveal both challenges and synergies. Brazilian workers benefit from cultural diversity through stronger relational approaches with customers. American supervisors tend to treat Brazilian employees more equally, generating positive motivational effects.

16. Valverde & Oliveira, 2023	Cadernos EBAPE.BR (FGV EBAPE)	Brazil only	Portuguese/ English/ Spanish	Empirical (qualitative descriptive field study based on semi-structured interviews)	16 consultants	Consultants use <i>translation into practice</i> —adapting concepts to organizational realities—to gain legitimacy across sectors and firm sizes. Rhetorical skill, combined with theoretical and practical knowledge, underpins this translation process. Consultants rely on specialized vocabularies and language games, showing the strategic role of language in their professionalization.
17. De Stefani & Azevedo, 2014	Revista de Ciências da Administração	Brazil	Portuguese	conceptual analysis	N/A	Drucker frames administrator language as a tool to align communication with company goals and secure employee compliance. Administrative practice is predominantly <i>perlocutionary</i> —rooted in command, economic rationality, impersonality, and hierarchical power. The administrator acts as a discourse agent, exercising authority through speech grounded in specific arguments.
18.Tavares, 2005	Cadernos EBAPE.BR (FGV EBAPE)	Brazil only	Portuguese/ English/ Spanish	Essay	N/A	N/A

Source: Authors' own compilation based on full-text review of all identified articles.

Still, the studies we did find are far from marginal. They include sharp critiques of epistemic colonialism and linguistic domination, alongside empirical work on publishing practices and the dilemmas faced by Latin American scholars (e.g., the paradox of “publish in English or perish locally”). Taken together, these contributions show that the conversation about language in management is happening in the region, but in a scattered and often critical way. What seems to be missing is volume and continuity.

Findings

Our review of leading Latin American journals in Spanish and Portuguese reveals a distinct and often critical perspective on the role of language in management, particularly when compared with what is typically described as “global literature”. Importantly, these journals frequently define “global” as academic production dominated by the Anglo-Saxon world, especially the United States and the United Kingdom (Chanlat, 2015; Foguesatto et al., 2023). This difference in vantage point shapes both the areas of convergence with mainstream discourses and the points where Latin American scholarship diverges in profound ways.

Shared Themes

Despite their critical stance, Latin American sources also share important common ground with dominant global discourses. First, both perspectives recognize the central role of English as a lingua franca in academia and business (Rosa & Alves, 2011; Foguesatto et al., 2023). Where Anglo-Saxon literature tends to treat this as a pragmatic given, Latin American contributions interrogate its implications. Second, both bodies of work acknowledge the impact of globalization on business, particularly through FDI, mergers and acquisitions, and expansion into emerging markets (Novais & do Nascimento, 2016). Third, culture is widely understood as a key moderator of human behavior and managerial outcomes, shaping practices from sustainable consumption to

entry mode choices (Novais & do Nascimento, 2016). Fourth, there is a shared emphasis on research quality and impact; however, Latin American sources question how “quality” is measured, exposing the power relations embedded in journal rankings and impact factors (Alves & Pozzebon, 2013; Cooke & Faria, 2013). Finally, both literatures employ qualitative methods, yet Latin American scholarship tends to do so within a stronger critical and interpretive tradition (Novais & do Nascimento, 2016).

Divergent Voices

The most significant distinctions emerge from Latin American journals’ explicitly post-colonial and de-colonial perspectives on Anglo-Saxon dominance in management knowledge. Unlike mainstream work, which rarely questions its own epistemic foundations, Latin American authors foreground critiques of “epistemic colonialism” and “linguistic imperialism” (Chanlat, 2015, 2021). They argue that Anglo-Saxon concepts and models achieve global dominance not because of their neutrality, but because they are institutionally privileged, marginalizing other perspectives and producing what Chanlat (2021) calls “mental colonization” and a “closure of meaning”.

This critique also extends to the very definitions of “international” and “global”. Whereas mainstream literature often uses these terms as shorthand for broad applicability, Latin American sources show how “international” frequently means “Anglo-Saxon-dominated” (Gantman, Yousfi & Alcadipani, 2015). In contrast, they advocate for a pluriversal approach in which multiple epistemologies and linguistic realities can coexist (Ferreira et al., 2022; Chanlat, 2021). This commitment to local realities is further evident in calls for management research rooted in specific regional challenges rather than universalized abstractions.

Latin American journals also mount a strong critique of evaluation systems and rankings. They expose how JCR, Qualis (the Brazilian journal classification system used by CAPES to evaluate graduate programs), and similar metrics privilege English-language publications and systematically devalue scholarship

in other languages (Alves & Pozzebon, 2013). This not only reproduces global hierarchies but narrows creativity, reinforcing a “publish at any cost” mentality. Closely related is the distinctive treatment of translation: while global literature often presents translation as a technical step, Latin American authors highlight its political and epistemic dimensions. They lament the near absence of inverse translation (from non-English into English) (Alves & Pozzebon, 2013), emphasize the transformative nature of each act of translation (Valverde & Oliveira, 2023), and advocate practices such as reflexive use of English or retaining original terms with explanatory notes.

Another recurring theme is the depth of attention to linguistic and cultural nuances. Beyond cultural dimensions à la Hofstede, Latin American work stresses that language embodies entire worldviews and ways of knowing (Fonseca, 2011). This perspective foregrounds the *psychic distance paradox*—the possibility that even geographically close cultures may harbor profound, unperceived differences due to language and cultural specificity (Novais & do Nascimento, 2016).

Finally, the Latin American literature identifies the paradox of “publish in English or perish”. While global academia views English publication as the route to legitimacy and advancement, evidence from bilingual Brazilian journals suggests the opposite: publishing in English may reduce local impact by alienating non-English-speaking audiences (Foguesatto et al., 2023). This tension particularly disadvantages younger researchers, who may struggle to gain recognition both locally and internationally (Cooke & Faria, 2013). In response, Latin American scholars actively describe strategies of resistance, from promoting multilingual journals (e.g., *M@n@gement*, *RAE*, *Management International*) (Chanlat, 2015) to building alliances with French-speaking colleagues to jointly challenge Anglophone dominance (Gantman et al., 2015).

Discussion

When we began this review, we expected to uncover new empirical insights into how language shapes management practice and scholarship in Latin America.

Instead, what we found was strikingly different. Very few studies addressed the organizational implications of language use, proficiency, or accents. Instead, much of the discussion concentrated on the dominance of English in business and academia. This absence is notable: despite Latin America's linguistic diversity—Spanish and Portuguese being spoken by hundreds of millions—questions of dialect, accent, or the hierarchies between regional varieties (such as Spanish *castellano* vs. Latin American dialects, and European vs. Brazilian Portuguese) were almost absent. This contrasts with contexts like Finland (Ristolainen et al., 2023) or France (Ramboarisata & Berrier-Lucas, 2025), where postcolonial histories and migration patterns have made language politics highly salient. The Latin American experience is more complicated. Up until the early decades of the twentieth century, the region was a major destination for immigrants: Brazil, for instance, became home to the largest Japanese community outside Japan, as well as large Italian, Lebanese, and other diasporas. From the 1970s onward, however, economic crises and political instability turned many Latin American countries into sources of emigration rather than primary destinations. This historical reversal may help explain why contemporary management journals in the region seem less attuned to issues of linguistic diversity: although migration has been central to Latin American history, recent decades have made outward rather than inward flows more visible in public and scholarly discourse.

Here, our findings resonate with international work that highlights how linguistic difference shapes both organizational careers and academic knowledge production. In organizational contexts, studies in the UK (Śliwa & Johansson, 2014) and Germany (Schmaus & Kristen, 2022) show that non-native English speakers often face discrimination in hiring and evaluation, regardless of their actual competence. Latin American authors push this discussion further into academia itself, pointing to a paradox that has not received much attention elsewhere: the dilemma of “publish in English or perish locally” (Foguesatto et al., 2023; Alves & Pozzebon, 2013).

The mechanism is subtle but consequential. Publishing in English is seen as the only route to enter the “global” academic conversation, yet success is far from guaranteed. Junior scholars in particular may find that their English-language articles receive little traction internationally, while simultaneously

drawing fewer citations and recognition from their local communities. As a result, they risk weakening both their international and domestic standing. Publishing in Portuguese or Spanish, on the other hand, preserves local impact but often ensures that those insights will never be heard on the bigger global stage. The paradox is therefore more profound than a simple trade-off: efforts to comply with the international system can actively undermine local scholarly careers. It underscores what Chanlat (2015, 2021) calls epistemic colonialism: the structural privileging of Anglophone knowledge systems that narrows what counts as legitimate scholarship.

The local vs. international publishing dilemma is even sharper when juxtaposed with findings from outside Latin America. Bashirzadeh, Meunier, and Mai (2025) show that students—arguably the primary beneficiaries of management scholarship—value diversity among professors and even evaluate international faculty more positively when they perceive greater cultural distance. Similarly, Tenzer and Pudelko (2017) demonstrate how relative proficiency and linguistic formality structure power dynamics in multinational teams, while Boussebaa and Morgan (2014) argue that multinationals reproduce neo-imperial hierarchies through language and management practices. Taken together, these studies suggest that organizational members and students are open to, and even benefit from, diverse linguistic and cultural voices. Yet the academic publishing system continues to penalize precisely those contributions, thereby reproducing inequality.

These findings raise both methodological and institutional challenges. On one hand, the creation of multilingual journals and bilingual outlets, such as *M@n@gement* or *RAE*, represents a form of resistance (Chanlat, 2015; Gantman et al., 2015). On the other hand, advances in digital tools and AI-based translation may make it increasingly feasible to publish articles in multiple languages, thereby reaching both local and international audiences. Wilmot and Tietze (2023) caution that translation is never a neutral act but an inherently political one; nevertheless, reflexive and creative approaches to translation (Valverde & Oliveira, 2023) could help reduce the epistemic asymmetries that our review has highlighted. For Latin America, as for other non-Anglophone regions, the challenge is not only to resist linguistic domination but also to

reimagine knowledge dissemination in ways that support both global dialogue and local impact.

Our review also speaks to the broader debate outlined in the introduction: the longstanding, culture-dominant frameworks in cross-cultural management versus the more recent language-sensitive approaches. The Latin American evidence suggests that these perspectives are not mutually exclusive. Rather, language provides the interactional medium through which cultural meanings are expressed, negotiated, and sometimes constrained. In this sense, the regional contributions extend the language-sensitive agenda while highlighting how linguistic hierarchies, translation practices, and publishing pressures shape what counts as legitimate knowledge. These findings point toward a more integrated view, in which culture cannot be understood without attention to language, and where Latin American scholarship offers insights that help expand the global literature.

Future research

Our focus in this note was intentionally narrow. We limited our review to management journals published in Spanish and Portuguese across Latin America, reflecting both our linguistic competence and our familiarity with this regional scholarly context. This focus allowed us to identify and analyze relevant contributions with confidence, but it also means that other bodies of scholarship were left outside our scope. For example, language has been examined extensively in psychology and applied psychology (e.g., DeFranza et al., 2020; Kinzler, 2021), yet our expertise did not allow us to reliably evaluate the quality of those outlets or studies. Future research could build bridges across disciplinary boundaries, connecting management-focused language studies with insights from adjacent fields.

A promising next step would be to extend this type of literature search to other linguistic traditions beyond English, Spanish, and Portuguese. In particular, countries whose languages spread through imperial histories—such as France, Italy, and Russia—offer fertile ground for uncovering distinctive contributions.

Ramboarisata and Berrier-Lucas (2025), for instance, highlight the role of French in shaping global business practices, but many local perspectives remain underexplored. Just as our review surfaced Latin American critiques of Anglo-Saxon hegemony, parallel efforts in other linguistic regions could further pluralize the global conversation.

By systematically incorporating voices from diverse linguistic and cultural traditions, future scholarship can move closer to what Latin American authors describe as a *pluriversal* approach: an epistemic orientation that values the coexistence of multiple ways of knowing rather than privileging one dominant perspective (Chanlat, 2021; Ferreira et al., 2022). We see this as both a methodological challenge and a moral imperative, one that aligns directly with the aims of this special issue.

Conclusion

In the past two decades, language has gained long-overdue visibility in management research. Once primarily the concern of international business outlets such as the *Journal of International Business Studies* and the *Journal of International Management*, language is now increasingly present in mainstream journals, including the *Academy of Management Journal*, *Journal of Management*, and *Journal of Management Studies*. This shift reflects a growing recognition that language is not peripheral but constitutive of organizational life. Ironically, while the impact of language barriers on knowledge flows has been widely examined in the context of multinational corporations (Tenzer et al., 2021), much less attention has been devoted to language barriers within management academia itself. Despite repeated calls to investigate language diversity in contexts beyond Western corporations (Tenzer & Pudelko, 2017), such studies remain scarce.

Our review suggests that local academic discourse on language in management remains relatively weak in volume but not in insight. Latin American scholarship offers distinctive critical perspectives—particularly around epistemic colonialism, translation, and the paradoxes of publishing in

English—that enrich the global conversation. By surfacing these contributions, this research note seeks not only to amplify underrepresented voices but also to remind us that the politics of language extend into the very structures of management knowledge production.

In closing, we see this as an invitation: to scholars across linguistic and geographic contexts, to explore how language both enables and constrains organizational life, and to take seriously the challenge of building a more inclusive, reflexive, and pluriversal management scholarship.

References

Abduljawad, S. (2023). Social development strategies of English as second language learners for international management. *Revista De Gestão Social E Ambiental*, 17(7), 1–20.

Alcadipani, R. (2017). Periódicos brasileiros em inglês: A mímica do publish or perish global. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 57, 405–411.

Alves, M. A., & Pozzebon, M. (2013). How to resist linguistic domination and promote knowledge diversity? *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 53, 629–633.

Bashirzadeh, Y., Meunier, L., & Mai, R. (2025). Do Business School Students Value Faculty Diversity? Insights From a Dyadic Analysis of Students' Evaluations of Teaching. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, in press.

Boussebaa, M., & Morgan, G. (2014). Pushing the frontiers of critical international business studies: The multinational as a neo-imperial space. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, 10(1/2), 96–106.

Brannen, M. Y., & Salk, J. E. (2000). Partnering across borders: Negotiating organizational culture in a German-Japanese joint venture. *Human Relations*, 53(4), 451–487.

Carrió Pastor, M. L., & Muñiz Calderón, R. (2010). Variations in business English letters written by non-native writers. *LFE. Revista de Lenguas para Fines Específicos*, 15/16, 39–56.

Chanlat, J. F. (2014). A língua e o pensar no campo da pesquisa em administração. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 54(6), 706–714.

Chanlat, J. F. (2015). The Field Of Organizational Studies: Critical Eye Of A Multilingual Researcher. *Rae-Revista De Administracao De Empresas*, 55(2), 226–230.

Chanlat, J. F. (2021). The Influence of French Language Thought on the Brazilian Administrative Sciences: A Quebec French look. *Rae-Revista De Administracao De Empresas*, 61(3), NA-NA.

Cooke, B., & Faria, A. (2013). Development, Management and North Atlantic Imperialism: For Eduardo Ibarra Colado. *Cadernos Ebape. Br*, 11, I–XV.

De Stefani, D., & Azevêdo, A. (2014). A Linguagem Gerencial Analisada à Luz da Teoria dos Atos de Fala de JL Austin: estudo do pensamento de Peter Drucker. *Revista de Ciências da Administração*, 16(40), 173–190.

DeFranza, D., Mishra, H., & Mishra, A. (2020). How language shapes prejudice against women: An examination across 45 world languages. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 119(1), 7–22.

Faustino, H. C., & Proença, I. (2015). Immigration and intra-industry trade: The relevance of language, qualification and economic integration. *European Journal of Management Studies*, 20(1), 3–17.

Ferreira, D. D. M., de Oliveira, M. C., Borba, J. A., & Schappo, F. (2022). Do Brazilian researchers in graduate accounting programs publish in English? An exploratory study. *Accounting Education*, 31(4), 431–451.

Foguesatto, C. R., Müller, F. M., & Wegner, D. (2023). Publish (in Portuguese) or Perish? Analyzing Brazilian Bilingual Journals of Business Management. *Analyzing Brazilian Bilingual Journals of Business Management (March 18, 2023)*.

Fonseca, A. C. P. D. (2011). Comunicação intercultural em uma empresa transnacional: a visão dos brasileiros sobre sua comunicação com os norte-americanos. *Cadernos EBAPE. BR*, 9, 1099–1121.

Gantman, E. R., Yousfi, H., & Alcadipani, R. (2015). Challenging Anglo-Saxon dominance in management and organizational knowledge. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 55(2), 126–129.

Hideg, I., Shen, W., & Hancock, S. (2022). What is that I hear? An interdisciplinary review and research agenda for non-native accents in the workplace. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 43(2), 214–235.

Kalra, K., & Szymanski, M. (2023). Alike yet distinct: The effect of language diversity on interpersonal relationships within national and multinational project teams. *Management and Organization Review*, 19(4), 627–654.

Kinzler, K. D. (2021). Language as a social cue. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 72(1), 241–264.

Kogut, B., & Singh, H. (1988). The effect of national culture on the choice of entry mode. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 19(3), 411–432.

Marschan-Piekkari, R., Welch, D., & Welch, L. (1999). Adopting a common corporate language: IHRM implications. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 10(3), 377–390.

Meyer, K. E., Li, J., & Brouthers, K. D. (2023). International business in the digital age: Global strategies in a world of national institutions. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 54(4), 577.

Neeley, T., & Kaplan, R. S. (2014). What's your language strategy? *Harvard Business Review*, 92(9), 70–76.

Novais, A. L. M., & do Nascimento João, B. (2016). Cultural influences on entry mode choice in international business: An assessment and review. *Gestão e Projetos: GeP*, 7(1), 1–14.

Oliveira, S. A. D., & Bulgacov, Y. L. M. (2013). Wittgenstein e a administração: potencialidades da pragmática da linguagem aos estudos organizacionais e à estratégia. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 17, 556–573.

Peltokorpi, V. (2022). Headhunter-assisted recruiting practices in foreign subsidiaries and their (dys) functional effects: An institutional work perspective. *Journal of World Business*, 57(6), 101366.

Piekhari, R., & Tietze, S. (2014). Micropolitical behavior in the multinational enterprise: A language perspective. In *Multinational enterprises, markets and institutional diversity* (pp. 259–277). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Ramboarisata, L., & Berrier-Lucas, C. (2025). Language hegemony revisited: insights from the francophone world. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, 21(5), 625–657.

Ristolainen, J., Outila, V., & Piekhari, R. (2023). Reversal of language hierarchy and the politics of translation in a multinational corporation. *Critical perspectives on International Business*, 19(1), 6–26.

Rosa, A. R., & Alves, M. A. (2011). Can management and organization knowledge speak Portuguese?/Pode o conhecimento em gestão e organização

falar Portugues?/? Puede el conocimiento en gestion y organizacion hablar Portugues? *Rae-Revista De Administracao De Empresas*, 51(3), 255–265.

Schmaus, M., & Kristen, C. (2022). Foreign Accents in the Early Hiring Process: A Field Experiment on Accent-Related Ethnic Discrimination in Germany. *International Migration Review*, 56, 562–593.

Śliwa, M., & Johansson, M. (2014). How non-native English-speaking staff are evaluated in linguistically diverse organizations: A sociolinguistic perspective. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 45(9), 1133–1151.

Szymanski, M., & Brighi, C. (2025). “Do you understand me correctly?” The role of accents in communication in global virtual teams. *Journal of International Management*, 31(2), 101221.

Tavares, R. R. (2005). Linguagem, cultura e imagem na pesquisa qualitativa: interpretando caleidoscópios sociais. *Cadernos EBAPE. BR*, 3, 1–13.

Tenzer, H. & Pudelko, M. (2017). The influence of language differences on power dynamics in multinational teams. *Journal of World Business*, 52, 45–61.

Tenzer, H., Pudelko, M., & Zellmer-Bruhn, M. (2021). The impact of language barriers on knowledge processing in multinational teams. *Journal of World Business*, 56(2), 101184.

Tietze, S., & Dick, P. (2013). The victorious English language: Hegemonic practices in the management academy. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 22(1), 122–134.

Tietze, S., Piekhari, R., & Brannen, M. Y. (2014). From standardisation to localisation: Developing a language-sensitive approach to IHRM. In *The Routledge Companion to International Human Resource Management* (pp. 482–495). Routledge.

Toledo Sarracino, D. G. (2023). The Language Policy Of Learning English As Support To The Internationalization Management Of Universidad Autónoma De Baja California [Mexico]. *Environmental & Social Management Journal/Revista de Gestão Social e Ambiental*, 17(2), e03428.

Valverde, J. M., & Oliveira, S. A. D. (2023). Translating management ideas: consultants as language artificers. *Cadernos EBAPE. BR*, 21(2), e2022-0167.

Vigier, M., & Bryant, M. (2023). Contextual and linguistic challenges for French business schools to achieve international accreditation: experts as boundary-spanners. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, 19(1), 70–89.

Vigier, M., & Bryant, M. (2025). Language inequalities and business school accreditation: voices from non-English-speaking countries. *Higher Education*, 1–33.

Wilmot, N. V., & Tietze, S. (2023). Englishization and the politics of translation. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, 19(1), 46–69.