



Deposited via The University of Leeds.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/245960/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Hajro, A., Zilinskaite, M. and Bretones, F.D. (Accepted: 2026) Migration Studies and International Business Scholarship: Toward Mutual Renewal in the Study of High-Skilled Migration. *International Migration Review*. ISSN: 0197-9183 (In Press)

This is an author produced version of an article accepted for publication in *International Migration Review*, made available via the University of Leeds Research Outputs Policy under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC-BY), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

MIGRATION STUDIES AND INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS SCHOLARSHIP: TOWARD MUTUAL RENEWAL IN THE STUDY OF HIGH-SKILLED MIGRATION

Introduction to the Special Issue by Guest editors

Aida Hajro*

Professor in International Business
The University of Leeds
Maurice Keyworth Building, Woodhouse, Leeds LS2 9JT
United Kingdom
a.hajro@leeds.ac.uk

Milda Žilinskaitė*

Senior Scientist
Vienna University of Economics and Business
Competence Center for Sustainability Transformation and Responsibility
Welthandelsplatz 1, 1020 Vienna,
Austria
mzilinsk@wu.ac.at

Francisco D. Bretones

Professor and Dean of the Faculty of Labour Sciences
The University of Granada
C/Rector López Argüeta s/n
18071 Granada
Spain
fdiazb@ugr.es

*Please note that first two authors contributed equally to this paper.

Introduction To the Special Issue:

MIGRATION STUDIES AND INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS

SCHOLARSHIP: TOWARD MUTUAL RENEWAL IN THE STUDY OF

HIGH-SKILLED MIGRATION

Abstract

This paper introduces a special issue of *International Migration Review*, aimed at bringing migration studies and international business (IB) scholarship into dialogue. Although both interdisciplinary fields examine processes that are fundamentally interconnected—the movement of people and the movement of firms—they have largely developed in parallel. In this introduction, we review the most relevant IB scholarship, consider the extent to which it has drawn on migration-related insights, and reflect on why it has nonetheless remained relatively detached from broader migration studies. We then examine what IB can contribute to research on high-skilled migration, what migration studies can offer IB in return, and outline four pathways for building stronger conceptual bridges between the two fields. Collectively, the papers in this special issue illustrate that potential by illuminating the multiple intersections between high-skilled migration and international business.

Keywords

high-skilled migration, international business scholarship, migration studies, multi-disciplinarity, multinational enterprise

INTRODUCTION: BRINGING MIGRATION STUDIES AND INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS INTO DIALOGUE — AND WHY IT MATTERS

The movement of people and the movement of firms are deeply intertwined, each often triggering, shaping, and sustaining the other. Yet despite this evident interdependence, migration studies and international business (IB) scholarship have rarely been in conversation. Instead, the two fields have largely evolved in parallel, generating rich but separate bodies of knowledge about phenomena that are, in practice, profoundly connected. This introductory essay to the special issue on high-skilled migration and IB begins from the premise that bringing these fields into closer dialogue is both overdue and necessary.

This disconnect does not imply that IB ignored the cross-border mobility of people. On the contrary, for decades, IB scholars have generated important insights into corporate expatriation and other forms of high-skilled mobility, focusing on how firms recruit, move, and coordinate talent across locations. The movement of people in this literature has been predominantly analyzed in terms of its implications for firms' access to knowledge and the ways multinational enterprises (MNEs)—companies that own and control operations in multiple countries—deploy and coordinate this knowledge across geographically dispersed organizational units (Minbaeva et al. 2025)¹. What remained largely absent was an explicit engagement with migration as a broader phenomenon in its own right and as a domain of relevance for IB scholarship (Hajro et al. 2023).

Only recently has this divide begun to narrow. A growing body of IB research has begun to examine the implications of global migration for firms' cross-border activities. At

¹ Most research in IB focuses on MNEs, which remain the field's central organizational actor. However, IB scholarship also covers small- and medium-sized enterprises, state-owned enterprises, international joint ventures (i.e., strategic alliances in which two or more legally distinct firms from different countries create a jointly owned entity), and other types of firms engaged in cross-border business activity (Arikan and Shenkar 2022).

the same time, this work has opened a complementary line of inquiry: migration does not only influence firms; firms also impact migration. The relationship is therefore better understood as reciprocal and co-constitutive. Firms, and MNEs in particular, do not merely adapt to migration; they also actively shape migration patterns (Hajro and Žilinskaitė 2024). Their influence extends beyond the recruitment and relocation of skilled labor to the shaping of the broader political, economic, and sociocultural conditions under which high-skilled migration becomes feasible and attractive—in other words, the possibility space of mobility (Hajro and Žilinskaitė, forthcoming).

We believe these insights matter for migration studies. While the field has generated seminal accounts of how states, intermediaries, networks, diasporas, families, and infrastructures shape migration (Carling 2024; de Haas 2021), firms have remained relatively peripheral and undertheorized, despite their considerable influence in structuring contemporary high-skilled mobility.

From this perspective, the dialogue this special issue seeks to initiate is essential to a fuller understanding of both migration and international business. If migration scholars stand to gain from greater scholarly engagement with firms as actors that structure mobility, IB scholars, in turn, stand to benefit substantially from the conceptual and empirical depth that migration studies offer on the geography of migration, migration infrastructures, migrants' aspirations and capabilities, transnationalism, and, ultimately, processes of development.

Against this backdrop, the five papers included in this special issue—two conceptual, two empirical, and one validation study—build on insights from migration studies while illustrating different ways in which IB can complement and extend scholarship on high-skilled migration. Before turning to the individual contributions, we review the most relevant work in IB, consider how the field has been informed by migration scholarship, and outline pathways for building stronger conceptual bridges between the two fields.

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS SCHOLARSHIP: FOUNDATIONS, KEY THEMES, AND ENGAGEMENT WITH MIGRATION

The origins of IB as a distinct academic field are usually traced to the mid-20th century, the foundational work of John Dunning (1958), Stephen Hymer (1960), Raymond Vernon (1966), and the 1976 seminal book *The Future of the Multinational Enterprise* by Buckley and Casson. Their work helped define IB as a distinct interdisciplinary field by shifting attention from market exchange alone to the managerial coordination of cross-border activities, thereby highlighting the “visible hand” of management alongside, and often over, Adam Smith’s “invisible hand” of the market (Buckley 2024).

Importantly, early theories adopted a holistic understanding of international business, in which the MNE was seen as one important element within a wider international political–economic environment (Dunning 1958; Hymer 1976/1960). In this sense, the field’s development was shaped by what we would today call a multilevel perspective, with firm-level comparisons embedded in a broader systemic account (Cantwell 2024). Against this backdrop, IB went on to experience a creative phase in which scholars engaged a range of important empirical phenomena. Key advances included explaining the existence and character of foreign direct investment (FDI) flows, theorizing the emergence and evolution of both Western and emerging market MNEs, and conceptualising the transition from internationalization to globalization, especially through the increasing use of joint ventures and alliances as modes of organizing cross-border business (Buckley 2025).

Over time, however, this broad analytical orientation gradually narrowed. As the field matured, IB increasingly privileged the MNE as its central unit of analysis, becoming more “inward-looking” and “self-referential” in the process (Buckley, Doh, and Benischke 2017, 1046). As Cantwell (2024) notes, overemphasis on the theory of the MNE, or on the firm as such, can obscure wider systemic interactions. This point is central to our argument, because

it suggests that IB's later consolidation around the firm entailed a partial loss of the broader systemic sensibility evident in earlier scholarship. This narrowing of analytical scope is also evident in how IB has approached migration. IB long remained preoccupied with the internal, firm-mediated movement of high-skilled employees—particularly between headquarters and foreign subsidiaries—examining issues such as corporate expatriate adjustment, the career consequences of global mobility, and how MNEs use cross-border staffing to coordinate operations, transfer knowledge, and improve firm performance (Andersen 2021; Fan et al. 2021; Minbaeva et al. 2025).

Precisely because IB had long approached migration in narrowly organizational terms, its emergence as a central theme at the John H. Dunning Centre's International Business Conference in 2019—one of the field's leading intellectual venues, named after one of its founding figures—marked an important shift. The significance of that moment lay in the fact that it brought migration, as a broader phenomenon rather than merely a matter of cross-border staffing, into one of IB's most prominent forums. In doing so, it foregrounded a question that had until then received little explicit attention within the field: what are the implications of global migration for IB scholarship?

Since then, scholarship at the intersection of migration and IB has expanded rapidly. This emerging body of work has examined migration as a broader force shaping firms' environments, strategies, and internal dynamics. Studies have shown, for example, that migration can influence firms' internationalization processes, including foreign market selection and broader resource commitment decisions. In particular, migration-related knowledge embedded in diasporic communities can shape firms' investment decisions by providing market intelligence and informal institutional support (Kunczer et al. 2019; Li, Hernandez, and Gwon 2019). Beyond these external effects, scholars have also begun to explore how migration changes firms internally by altering the composition of managers and

employees with implications for organizational culture, firm-level exploration, and strategic direction (Hajro et al. 2023; Coda Zabetta et al. 2025; Uhlbach and Anckaert 2025).

Yet despite these important advances, scholarship in this area remains insufficiently commensurate with the significance of migration for IB. As Buckley recently observed, migration “has not yet had the impact in IB that its importance requires” (2025, 3). Addressing this gap is, again, one of the key motivations behind this special issue.

FROM SILOED SCHOLARSHIP TO COMPLEMENTARY INSIGHTS AND FUTURE INTERDISCIPLINARY PATHWAYS

If migration and IB are seen as mutually constitutive phenomena, whereby change in one shapes processes and outcomes in the other, scholarly progress depends on bringing the insights of their respective fields of inquiry into closer conversation. To understand why that conversation has remained limited, however, we must situate this disconnect within a broader pattern of intellectual development.

On Why Scholarship Became Fragmented and Turned Inward

As fields mature, they often become more internally differentiated and less outward-facing. In Kuhnian terms, this is a familiar tendency of disciplinary development. Once inquiry becomes organized around established paradigms, scholarship is increasingly oriented toward puzzle-solving within accepted frameworks rather than toward phenomena or questions that fall outside them (Kuhn 1997). This tendency is visible in both migration studies and IB, although in somewhat different ways.

In migration studies, for example, it has taken the form of increasing internal fragmentation. Natter and Welfens (2024) argue that migration studies has become increasingly segmented into specialized subfields with limited exchange among them. In their account, this fragmentation has fostered a form of “academic tribalism,” whereby different

corners of the field too often delegitimize one another's knowledge practices and pathways to socio-political impact.

IB has faced similar, though not identical, dynamics. In its founding decades, IB pioneers were scholars from different disciplines and backgrounds—political science, economics, sociology, finance, marketing etc. However, as the field grew larger and matured, it increasingly drew on its own prior scholarship, topics, and theories, consolidating into a “canon” (Arikan and Shenkar 2022, 1485). The perceived costs of this narrowing are evident in recent reflections on the field's trajectory. Tung and her co-authors (2023), for example, lament the field's earlier intellectual openness and call for a return to the intellectual breadth and outward orientation on which it was founded.

Second, the disconnect between migration and IB studies is reinforced by academic politics, the “publish or perish” culture, and impact-factor-driven evaluation systems (Cantwell, Piepenbrink, and Shukla 2014; Natter and Welfens 2024). If the first dynamic helps explain why fields become more internally focused, these institutional pressures help explain why scholars often remain reluctant to cross established disciplinary boundaries. As in migration studies, early-career IB scholars are under strong pressure to align with established expectations to secure publications in highly ranked journals and gain recognition within their field. As Levitt (2023, 862) notes, “young scholars [...] have to play by the rules” if they are to endure in an increasingly precarious academic labor market.

These incentives are especially powerful in business schools, where hiring, promotion, and tenure decisions are often tied to journal rankings such as the *Chartered Association of Business Schools' Academic Journal Guide* and the *Financial Times 50*. Multidisciplinary journals such as IMR are undervalued because they are not typically included in these rankings. Moreover, their citations are dispersed across multiple scholarly communities rather than concentrated within a single large field, which can translate into lower overall impact factors. By contrast, specialized journals such as the *Journal of International Business Studies*

benefit from dense intra-field citation networks and, consequently, tend to achieve higher impact factors (Cantwell, Piepenbrink, and Shukla 2014). The result is a system in which publishing in respected outlets outside the dominant rankings brings limited institutional payoff.

We encountered these dynamics directly while assembling this special issue. At the outset, we sought to involve mid-career IB scholars, inviting them to contribute to an interdisciplinary conversation with migration studies. However, many declined, pointing—implicitly or explicitly—to the very institutional pressures described above. We then approached some of the field’s most established scholars, all of whom accepted. This experience was instructive, as it illustrated that interest and willingness to “export” IB knowledge and engage with other disciplines are present, but the career structures governing academic participation remain a significant obstacle, except for well-established scholars.

Returning to Kuhn’s (1997, 65) observation that “novelty ordinarily emerges only for the man who, knowing with precision what he should expect, is able to recognize that something has gone wrong,” one might argue that the limited dialogue between migration studies and IB signals such a moment. Both fields have undoubtedly advanced, yet their parallel development has also left important blind spots. Bringing them into closer conversation may therefore offer an opportunity for the kind of “retooling” Kuhn associates with intellectual renewal.

An Opportunity for Intellectual Retooling

In the pages that follow, we identify four broad pathways through which migration studies and IB can learn from and contribute to one another. These pathways are guided by the themes reflected in the five papers included in this special issue and are therefore not intended to be exhaustive. Rather, our objective is to sketch an initial agenda for exchange, in the hope of encouraging more sustained intellectual engagement between the two fields in the future.

Before turning to these pathways, however, it is important to establish some conceptual clarity. While the two fields address closely related phenomena—namely, the movement of people and firms—they do so through somewhat different vocabularies and categorizations. The migration literature typically defines high-skilled migrants as individuals with tertiary education or high occupational status attained through other means, such as entrepreneurial skills, artistic or sporting talents, who migrate to live and work abroad (Skeldon 2018). The term “expatriates” in this literature is often used as a social category to denote a more privileged or “elite” form of mobility (Beck 2023). In contrast, the IB scholarship draws a more fine-grained distinction between firm-assigned transferees (including the IB-specific terms “expatriates,” “inpatriates,” and “third-country nationals”) and high-skilled migrants who self-initiate their mobility (for more details, see the paper by Hajro and Žilinskaitė in this special issue, forthcoming). Whereas the former are relocated by organizations, mostly on a temporary basis, the latter move abroad on their own initiative for an indeterminate period (Hajro et al. 2019)

In migration studies, high-skilled migration is a relatively recent category of inquiry, as the field historically focused more on lower-status migrant groups, with attention shaped by concerns about ethnicity, inequality, and exclusion (Sandoz 2019). In this respect, the contrast with IB is striking: the latter has over five decades of research on high-skilled intra-company transferees, while largely overlooking lower-skilled forms of labor mobility (Žilinskaitė et al. 2025).

We next turn to the four thematic pathways, which we view as stepping stones for cross-field dialogue. These include: (i) Migration Infrastructures and the MNE; (ii) Migration, Trade, and Firms’ Strategy and Organization; (iii) Transnationalism and Institutional Affinity; and (iv) Acculturation, Biculturalism, and Multiculturalism.

Migration Infrastructures and the MNE. The “infrastructural” perspective in migration studies foregrounds the wider assemblage of institutions, technologies, and actors

through which cross-border mobility is facilitated, conditioned, or constrained (Xiang and Lindquist 2014). Its analytical emphasis is on “those who move migrants rather than the migrants themselves” (Lindquist, Xiang, and Yeoh 2012, 9). Research in this area has generated important insights into the role of intermediaries—such as trade unions, professional associations, or recruitment and travel agencies—in shaping migration (Bastide and Yeoh 2025; Leurs 2019). Yet far less emphasis has been placed on the firm (Hajro and Žilinskaitė, forthcoming).

By contrast, IB scholarship has centered the MNE as the principal organizational actor influencing high-skilled migration. Existing work has focused especially on the ways firms recruit, relocate, and coordinate skilled labor across borders. More recent studies have broadened this agenda by examining firms’ global talent-sourcing strategies, MNE responses to restrictive immigration policies, and their involvement in the labor-market integration of high-skilled refugees. In this sense, IB has generated important insights into how firms actively organize and channel high-skilled migration (Belderbos et al. 2025; Nayak, Moreira, and Mudambi 2025; Szkudlarek et al. 2021).

The IB literature on refugee workforce integration is particularly relevant here. Migration scholars have shown that refugee movements unfold within complex and uneven organizational fields that include humanitarian organizations, refugee camps, intergovernmental organizations, resettlement agencies, smugglers, and human traffickers. These actors may enable protection, settlement, and labor-market access, but they may also constrain, redirect, or exploit mobility (Hajro, Žilinskaitė, and Gibson 2025). Within this broader field of inquiry, the role of firms has received comparatively less sustained attention, particularly where refugee mobility intersects with recruitment, employment, and labor-market integration. IB insights on refugee recruitment and employment therefore provide a useful bridge to migration-infrastructural approaches by foregrounding how firms become implicated in the wider fields that govern both mobility and incorporation. Szkudlarek, Lee,

Du, and Johnson's (2025) contribution to this special issue develops this line of argument further by examining how multinational firms engage in collaborative initiatives that support more sustainable refugee workforce integration pathways.

Seen in this light, the two fields offer highly complementary analytical lenses and point to a potential shared research agenda. Bringing them into closer conversation draws attention to the ways in which MNEs are situated within, and may actively reconfigure, wider migration infrastructures, thereby opening up a number of important questions for future research: When and under what conditions do MNEs emerge as influential actors within wider migration infrastructures? Through what mechanisms do they orchestrate the activities of other mobility-enabling actors? How do firm–infrastructure dynamics vary across institutional contexts, industries, and migrant categories? What are the consequences of these dynamics for the direction, governance, and lived experience of high-skilled migration?

Migration, Trade, and Firms' Strategy and Organization. Scholarship on the trade–migration nexus, developed largely in economics but increasingly taken up in IB, has identified three main channels through which migrant networks can facilitate trade and FDI. First, through an information effect, diaspora networks reduce transaction costs by alleviating information asymmetries across borders (Gould 1994). Second, through a demand effect, migrant communities stimulate trade by generating demand for goods from their countries of origin (Felbermayr and Toubal 2012). Third, migrants can act as creators of institutional affinity: over time, they may alter the institutional environment of a location in ways that make it less foreign and more attractive to investing firms (Shukla and Cantwell 2018).

Early work by Gould (1994) remains foundational in this regard. Using panel data on 47 US trading partners, he shows that migrants' ties to their countries of origin have a strong positive effect on both exports and imports. Extending this network logic to FDI, Hernandez (2014) finds that foreign subsidiaries in the United States are more likely to locate in, and continue operating in, states with larger concentrations of immigrants from the same country

of origin as the investing firm. Similarly, Li, Hernandez, and Gwon (2019) demonstrate that co-ethnic communities have a stronger positive effect on firms' location choices in places where formal institutions are weak or environmental uncertainty is high. The paper by Cantwell and Shukla (2025) in this special issue advances this literature by shifting attention from goods and services to digital trade. Collectively, these studies show how diasporic communities outside the firm influence firms' trade and foreign expansion.

Yet this external network perspective captures only part of the migration–firm relationship. Migration also shapes MNEs from within, through the incorporation of high-skilled migrants into their workforces and leadership structures. Foley and Kerr (2013), for example, studied the impact of immigrant innovators on the global activities of US multinational firms. Their results reveal that increases in the share of an MNE's innovation performed by inventors of a particular ethnicity are associated with greater affiliate activity in their countries of origin, including the establishment of foreign subsidiaries, thereby influencing the geographic direction of MNE expansion. Extending this insight from migrant innovators to firm leadership, Coda Zabetta and co-authors (2025) examine how foreign-origin top management team members shape firms' location choices. They find that managers' knowledge of their countries of origin increases the likelihood that firms will choose those countries as investment destinations. Despite this, the internal dimension of the migration–firm relationship remains underexplored, even as recent research underscores its importance. Dillon, Kerr, Kerr, and Wang (2025), in this special issue, show that MNEs disproportionately employ early-career skilled migrants relative to medium-sized firms, while Hajro and Žilinskaitė (forthcoming) demonstrate how MNEs themselves shape high-skilled migration patterns.

A related question concerns what happens when firms' access to high-skilled migrant employees is suddenly disrupted, for example through changes in migration policy. Very recent evidence suggests that abrupt restrictions on high-skilled migration can have significant

consequences for how MNEs organize their global activities. Rather than simply substituting domestic workers for foreign talent, firms respond by increasing the geographic dispersion of Research and Development (R&D) (Nayak, Moreira, and Mudambi 2025). Similar effects are evident in the global allocation of production, where barriers to high-skilled migration can redirect MNE production activity across countries (Morales 2025).

This opens important avenues for future research that are directly relevant to migration scholars. Research on high-skilled migration has examined how states design policies to attract, retain, or reconnect with mobile talent in pursuit of labor-market, innovation, and competitiveness objectives (Czaika 2018). Yet far less attention has been paid to how the effects of these policies are mediated by firms, and especially by MNEs. If firms respond to restrictions on high-skilled migration by relocating R&D activities, redirecting production, or reorganizing global operations, how do such responses affect the national competitiveness of countries? Also, how are state strategies for attracting and retaining skilled talent amplified or redirected through the organizational decisions of firms? Finally, how does the changing internal composition of MNEs—specifically, the increasing presence of high-skilled migrants—affect their strategies and location decisions?

Transnationalism and Institutional Affinity. A third pathway for dialogue builds on our discussion of institutional affinity in IB by bringing it into conversation with transnationalism in migration studies. Although these strands of scholarship differ in scope and disciplinary orientation, placing them in dialogue is analytically valuable because each offers complementary insights into the ways cross-border mobility and connectedness shape societies.

Drawing on knowledge-based theories and economic approaches to institutional change, institutional affinity focuses specifically on the knowledge exchanges that migrants facilitate within their communities and between countries of origin and residence (Shukla and Cantwell 2018). Its central insight is that migrants may, over time, alter the institutional

environment of a location in ways that make it less foreign and more attractive to investing firms. In the contribution to this special issue, Cantwell and Shukla (2025) further refine this argument by distinguishing between different migrant roles: transient or internationally mobile migrants may intensify channels of knowledge connectivity, while more locally embedded migrants may strengthen institutional affinity between places. Across their work the primary analytical focus is on migrants and migrant communities.

Transnationalism takes a broader approach, foregrounding the “multiple ties and interactions linking people or institutions across the borders of nation-states” (Vertovec 2009). Such channels are not only sustained by migrants and migrant communities but also by institutional and organizational actors that contribute to the broader societal transformations (Levitt and Jaworsky 2007; Levitt and Khagram 2008). Migration scholars have examined actors within transnational social fields, including immigrant transnational organizations and hometown associations, religious organizations, political organizations, state institutions, and transnational entrepreneurial ventures (Levitt 2003; Bauböck 2003; Portes, Escobar, and Radford 2007; Lacroix 2014). Yet, despite their central role in the global economy, MNEs have remained largely peripheral in these discussions. This is where IB can make a contribution. MNEs, the field’s central organizational actor, play a consequential yet comparatively under-theorized role in transnational space. They do not merely respond to given locations; they can also help reshape locations over time. As Hajro and Žilinskaitė (forthcoming) show, MNEs can influence the wider political, economic, and sociocultural environments within which high-skilled mobility becomes possible.

Read together, these strands of scholarship open up a promising agenda for cross-field research. They invite us to ask what becomes visible when multinational firms are treated not merely as background organizational settings, but as transnational actors that participate in cultural and institutional change. How do MNEs interact with local and transnationally connected communities in ways that reshape the cultural environments of the places in which

they operate? How do such processes affect the perceived familiarity and navigability of particular destinations? And how might these transformations, in turn, shape migration aspirations and the future directions of high-skilled mobility?

Acculturation, Biculturalism and Multiculturalism. The broader dynamics of cultural change, in turn, direct attention to a fourth pathway for dialogue and future research: how such changes are lived and negotiated by high-skilled migrants themselves.

For international migrants, acculturation is a key dimension of the migration experience. In broad terms, it concerns how migrants engage with the cultural practices, attitudes, and values of the destination society, while simultaneously maintaining, adapting, or distancing themselves from those associated with the country of origin (Schwartz et al. 2022). Berry's (1997) influential framework identifies four acculturation orientations: assimilation, separation, marginalization, and integration, or biculturalism. Existing research suggests that integration is often the preferred orientation among migrants and is generally linked to better psychological well-being and social functioning (Berry et al. 2006; Nguyen and Benet-Martínez 2013). Studies have further highlighted the importance of person–context interactions, showing how migrants' acculturation orientations are shaped by the expectations, constraints, and opportunity structures they encounter in receiving societies (Bourhis et al. 1997; Titzmann and Jugert 2015).

This emphasis on context foregrounds the wider societal conditions that shape migrant incorporation. Destination countries vary in the degree to which they enable both cultural maintenance and participation in the broader society. Canada and New Zealand, for example, are often described as comparatively multicultural settings, whereas France is more frequently associated with assimilationist expectations (Schwartz et al. 2022). Within migration research, multicultural contexts are generally seen as more supportive of integration, while strong assimilation pressures may lead migrants to withdraw into heritage-cultural communities, potentially reinforcing social fragmentation (Berry 2005).

Yet IB research suggests that the relationship between national incorporation regimes and organizational practice may be more complex than this societal-level framing implies. Organizations, and MNEs in particular, may absorb, reinterpret, or challenge broader national expectations regarding cultural difference. Hajro, Gibson, and Pudielko (2017), for example, studied multinational companies with regional or main headquarters in Austria, a country often characterized by exclusionary and assimilationist tendencies in migration policy (Malmusi 2015). They identified three types of organizational diversity climates: awareness-focused, which resembles multiculturalism; engagement-focused, which resembles integration; and policy-focused, which resembles assimilation. The significance of this finding is that different diversity climates emerged within the same national context. Firms, therefore, do not simply reproduce societal-level attitudes toward migrants and cultural difference. Instead, they may constitute distinct acculturative contexts in which migrants encounter expectations, opportunities, and constraints that differ from those found in the wider society. For migration scholarship, this points to the workplace as a critical but still underexplored site of acculturation.

This opens an important bridge to cross-cultural management scholarship in IB, which has long examined differences in values, norms, and practices across countries. A foundational reference point is Hofstede's *Culture's Consequences* (1980), which conceptualized national cultures as varying along dimensions such as individualism–collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity–femininity, later extended by long- versus short-term orientation and indulgence versus restraint. Alongside related frameworks, including GLOBE, Schwartz, and Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, this work has shaped IB research on foreign market entry, knowledge transfer, international

human resource management, multicultural teamwork, and expatriate adjustment (Schwartz 1994; Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner 1997; House et al. 2004; Stahl and Tung 2015).²

For migration studies, this literature raises an important question that remains insufficiently theorized: how does cultural distance—the degree of difference between two cultures across one or more cultural dimensions—affect migrants’ acculturation dynamics? Cultural distance may have adverse or enabling effects on how migrants adapt, retain prior orientations, and negotiate belonging across contexts (Stahl et al. 2024). Moreover, cultural distance should not be understood only in terms of broad national-cultural differences. The GLOBE project’s distinction between cultural practices — “culture as is” — and cultural values — “culture as should be” — is particularly useful here (House et al. 2004). Societal practices refer to how things are commonly done, whereas societal values refer to what people consider desirable. Because these are not always closely aligned, migration may reduce or heighten migrants’ experience of mismatch between the world they come from and the world in which they settle (Maseland and Van Hoorn 2010). For example, a migrant moving from a society in which hierarchical authority remains common in everyday organizational practice, even though egalitarian relations are widely valued, to a society in which lower power distance is both more strongly valued and more consistently enacted may experience migration as increasing the alignment between their normative expectations and the practices encountered in the receiving context (Stahl et al. 2024). Cultural frameworks may therefore help explain migrants’ acculturation experiences alongside factors more commonly emphasized in migration studies, such as state policies, labor-market structures, public attitudes, inequality, and postcolonial legacies.

Finally, IB scholarship can also contribute by shifting attention from acculturation as an individual adaptation process to acculturation as a source of organizational outcomes.

² The frameworks have not been without criticism, as they tend to treat culture as relatively stable, bounded, and measurable through shared national values (Kirkman, Lowe, and Gibson 2006; Bird and Maznevski 2026).

Research on individuals with multicultural and bicultural identities in organizations has shown how culturally complex identities can shape global teamwork, leadership effectiveness, boundary spanning, knowledge transfer, and performance in MNEs (Brannen and Thomas 2010; Fitzsimmons 2013; Fitzsimmons, Lee, and Brannen 2013; Vora et al. 2019; Szkudlarek et al. 2020). Vora et al. (2025), in this special issue, extend this perspective by showing how individuals who know, identify with, and internalize more than one culture can act as cultural brokers, supporting international knowledge flows and the formation of intercultural social networks in a range of settings, including MNEs, international nongovernmental organizations, and intergovernmental associations.

Bringing all these insights into conversation with migration studies invites new questions: How do organizational diversity climates shape the acculturation experiences of high-skilled migrants? When do workplaces reinforce national assimilationist pressures, and when do they buffer or counteract them? How might MNEs, as important sites of everyday intercultural encounter, contribute to broader patterns of migrant integration in receiving societies? How do migrants experience and negotiate alignments or mismatches between cultural values and everyday practices across origin, destination, and organizational contexts, and with what consequences for belonging, incorporation, and access to opportunity?

THE AUTHORS AND PAPERS

As we mentioned earlier, in 2023 we actively reached out to IB scholars working at the intersection of international business and migration, soliciting extended abstracts. Based on their quality, we invited authors to submit full papers in fall 2024. We (the three guest editors, each from distinct disciplinary backgrounds) then conducted in-depth reviews and, in late 2024, held a special issue workshop that focused on the “translation” of IB knowledge to ensure accessibility for scholars from other disciplines. The selected manuscripts were revised and submitted by the contributing teams to IMR, where they underwent additional rounds of

anonymous external reviews. The role of these reviewers has been essential in ensuring that the contributions complement and enrich migration scholarship, thereby opening up new interdisciplinary pathways.

The finalized special issue comprises five papers. Together, they illustrate the multifaceted ways in which high-skilled migration and international business intersect and highlight how *multidisciplinary* insights can contribute to building a more complete understanding of the interdependencies between these two phenomena.

Hajro and Žilinskaitė's conceptual paper "High-Skilled Migration Revisited: Foregrounding the Multinational Enterprise in Migration Infrastructures" bridges scholarship on *migration infrastructure* and IB by conceptualizing MNEs as structural actors that both co-produce high-skilled mobilities and reshape the broader conditions that render such mobilities feasible. Using a well-established IB construct of *knowledge internalization*, the authors identify three interlocking direct mechanisms through which MNEs shape high-skilled migration. They further outline the indirect ways in which MNEs influence the broader possibility space of high-skilled migration by interacting with political, economic, and sociocultural environments. The authors argue that, given their global reach and orchestration capacity, incorporating MNEs more directly into the analytical framework of migration infrastructure scholarship can not only enrich migration studies but also generate actionable policy insights.

In "Multi-Stakeholder Collaborations: How Multinational Enterprises Can Drive Refugee Employment," Szkudlarek, Lee, Du and Johnson address the hitherto underexplored role of MNEs in tackling the challenge of high-skilled refugee employment through multi-stakeholder collaborations. There is a burgeoning literature on refugee workplace integration in IB research, which has yet to establish a closer dialogue with work in migration studies, where the focus has traditionally been on refugees themselves, policymakers, support organizations, and intergovernmental agencies such as the UNHCR. Drawing on *stakeholder*

theory, the authors highlight the conditionality of MNE involvement in broader refugee employment ecosystem initiatives, including its associated risks and opportunities. The paper also includes six vignettes with examples from different national and regional contexts, serving as real-world touchpoints that complement the conceptual arguments and illustrate potential policy implications.

Moving on to the empirical studies, the paper by Dillon, Kerr, Kerr, and Wang, “Positioned at Extremes: Future Job Placements of Immigrant Students at US Colleges,” which draws on linked Census and longitudinal employment data, finds that immigrant students attending US colleges are disproportionately likely to be employed in either MNEs, or small firms and self-employment but not in mid-size firms. The study shows that degree fields predict MNE placement, while ethnic specialization is the main reason behind small-firm sorting. The analysis connects migration and IB scholarship by theorizing MNEs as structured gateways for early-career immigrants and by considering the alignment between the co-evolution of firm location and high-skilled labor supply in larger cities. Surprisingly, the findings also reveal that immigrant students who remain in the US earn, on average, more than their native peers, suggesting that the *segmentation* between MNE and small-business employment reflects efficient employer-employee matching rather than blocked opportunities.

In “Migrants, Knowledge Connections, and Digital Trade in the Information Age,” Cantwell and Shukla examine how skilled migrants facilitate cross-border digital trade between their country of origin and their country of residence. Digitalization is a key contemporary trend that has dramatically expanded the scale and scope of cross-border trade. Using migration and services trade panel data for US trading partners from 2000 to 2020, the study shows that both recent and permanent migrants increased exports to their countries of origin, with a stronger effect among the latter. The authors propose that the growth of cross-border digital trade is associated with the expansion of international knowledge connections and institutional affinity facilitated by migrant relationships that span national borders. This,

in turn, suggests potential pathways for interdisciplinary dialogue between economic theories of *knowledge* and *institutional change*, IB concepts of *connectedness* and *institutional affinity*, and the extant work on migrant *transnationalism* in migration studies.

Finally, the paper by Vora, Fitzsimmons, and Thomas, “Unlocking the Potential of Multicultural Migrants: Cultural Brokering Scale Development and Validation,” develops and validates a new measurement scale that should be of interest to migration scholars across multiple disciplines. IB research has long acknowledged that high-skilled migrant employees possess knowledge and skills that positively contribute to their employing organizations and beyond. Their close familiarity with, or identification and internalization of, more than one culture allows them to support international knowledge flows and facilitate intercultural social networks. This behavior, known in the literature as *cultural brokering*, has until now lacked a concrete measurement. The authors develop and validate a context-general measurement scale that can be used to examine cultural brokering across a wide range of settings. As such, the tool can support efforts to narrow the research–policy–practice gap.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Engaging with the topics featured in this special issue matters not only for advancing scientific knowledge, but also for offering clearer guidance to policymakers. International businesses are among the biggest beneficiaries of high-skilled migration, yet their role is often missing from both research-informed policy advice and, relatedly, from policymakers’ portrayals of migration. Although early research in IB played a significant role in shaping government approaches to MNEs and FDI, and influenced the thinking of international organizations such as the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, its external outreach has recently been argued to have diminished (Buckley, Doh, and Benischke 2017; Tung et al. 2023). A similar concern has also been raised

in migration studies: “scientific and expert knowledge on migration is often disregarded in policymaking and plays only a minor role in public debates” (Natter and Welfens 2024, 1669). Thus, one hoped-for outcome of this special issue—also reflected in the individual articles it brings together—is to encourage mutually reinforcing knowledge exchange that may, in turn, serve as a springboard for amplifying academic voices in political debate and public life.

CONCLUSION

Returning to our opening claim that the movement of people and the movement of firms are deeply intertwined, we contend that migration studies and IB scholarship share a common analytical core: both understand mobility not as a one-off event, but as an ongoing and transformative process. In migration studies, mobility is seen as reshaping not only where people live and work, but also their skills, aspirations, identities, and orientations toward life across borders. Likewise, in IB literature, the internalization of cross-border knowledge, capabilities, and coordination mechanisms transforms firms from nationally bounded enterprises into organizations structurally oriented toward international existence. In both domains, knowledge and information are the central connective tissue: migrants sustain ties through flows of information, while firms rely on flows of knowledge that guide strategy, adaptation, and further expansion. In view of these parallels, the limited engagement between the two fields is all the more striking. The significance of bringing them into closer dialogue lies in enabling a more integrated understanding of the intertwined dynamics that shape the cross-border trajectories of people and firms—an endeavor that, in our view, is well worth pursuing.

REFERENCES

- Andersen, N. 2021. "Mapping the Expatriate literature: A Bibliometric Review of the Field from 1998 to 2017 and Identification of Current Research Fronts." *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 32(22): 4687–4724.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2019.1661267>.
- Arikan, I., and O. Shenkar. 2021. "Neglected Elements: What We Should Cover More of in International Business Research". *Journal Of International Business Studies* 53(7): 1484. <https://doi.org/10.1057/S41267-021-00472-9>
- Bastide, L., and B. S. Yeoh. 2025. "Mapping the 'Middle-Spaces' of Migration: Towards a Linked Ecology Approach to Migration Industry, Migration Infrastructure, and Migration Brokerage." *Migration Studies* 13(1): mnaf005.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mnaf005>
- Bauböck, R. 2003. "Towards a political theory of migrant transnationalism." *International migration review* 37(3): 700-723. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2003.tb00155.x>
- Beck, S. 2023. *Expatriation and Migration: Two Faces of the Same Coin*. Brill.
- Belderbos, R., B. Leten, N. H. Nguyen, and M. Vancauteran. 2025. "Multinational firms and the quest for global talent: Employing (skilled) foreign workers at home and abroad: René Belderbos et al." *Journal of international business studies* 56(2): 151-173.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-023-00643-w>
- Berry, J. W. 1997. "Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation." *Applied psychology*, 46(1), 5-34. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.1997.tb01087.x>
- Berry, J. W. 2005. "Acculturation: Living Successfully in Two Cultures." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 29(6): 697–712.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.07.013>
- Berry, J. W. et al. 2006. *Immigrant Youth in Cultural Transition: Acculturation, Identity, and Adaptation across National Contexts*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780415963619>
- Bird, A., and M. Maznevski 2026. "Reconceptualizing Culture for International Business in the 21st Century." Conference Presentation. *Academy of International Business*, Jul 1, 2026, Manchester, UK.
- Bourhis, R. Y. et al. 1997. "Towards an Interactive Acculturation Model: A Social Psychological Approach." *International Journal of Psychology*, 32(6): 369–86.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/002075997400629>
- Brannen, M. Y., and D. C. Thomas. 2010. "Bicultural Individuals in Organizations: Implications and Opportunity." *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* 10(1): 5-16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595809359580>
- Buckley, P. J. 2024. "Internalization Theory." In *Encyclopedia of International Strategic Management*, edited by C. G. Asmussen, N. Hashai, and D. Minbaeva, 177–181.

Cheltenham, UK, Northampton, USA: Edward Elgar.
<https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800884045.ch48>

- Buckley, P. J. 2025. "The Kaleidoscope of International Business – The Past, Current, and Future Development of Theory." *Journal of Business Research* 189: 115205.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2025.115205>
- Buckley, P. J., and M. C. Casson. 1976. "*The future of the Multinational Enterprise*." London: Macmillan.
- Buckley, P. J., J. P. Doh, and M. H. Benischke. 2017. "Towards a Renaissance in International Business Research? Big Questions, Grand Challenges, and the Future of IB Scholarship." *Journal of International Business Studies* 48(9): 1045-1064.
[doi:10.1057/s41267-017-0102-z](https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-017-0102-z)
- Cantwell, J. 2024. "Hymer and the Theory of the MNE: A Commentary by John Cantwell." *European Management Review* 21(4): 748-755. <https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12693>
- Cantwell, J., A. Piepenbrink, and P. Shukla. 2014. "Assessing the Impact of JIBS as an Interdisciplinary Journal: A Network Approach." *Journal of International Business Studies* 45(7): 787-799. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2014.40>
- Cantwell, J., and P. Shukla. 2025. "Migrants, Knowledge Connections, and Digital Trade in the Information Age." *International Migration Review*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/01979183251388052>
- Carling, J. 2024. "Why Do People Migrate? Fresh Takes on the Foundational Question of Migration Studies." *International Migration Review* 58 (4): 1753–1787.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/01979183241269445>
- Coda Zabetta, M., E. Miguelez, F. Lissoni, and S. Hegarty. 2025. "Foreign-origin Managers and FDI Location Choice." *Journal of International Business Studies* 56(2): 194-202.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-024-00726-2>
- Cooke, F. L., G. Wood, M. Wang, and A. Veen. 2019. "How Far Has International HRM Travelled? A Systematic Review of Literature on Multinational Corporations (2000–2014)." *Human Resource Management Review* 29(1): 59–75.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2018.05.001>
- Czaika, M. (Ed.). 2018. *High-skilled migration: Drivers and policies*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198815273.001.0001>
- de Haas, H. 2021. "A Theory of Migration: The Aspirations-Capabilities Framework." *Comparative Migration Studies* 9(8): 1-35.
- de Haas, H. 2025. "Towards a Global Migration Paradigm: And the Imperative of Ridding Ourselves of the 'Push-Pull' Model." *Comparative Migration Studies* 13(1): 76.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-025-00481-9>

- Dillon, F., S. P. Kerr, W. R. Kerr, and A. Wang. 2025. "Positioned at Extremes: Future Job Placements of Immigrant Students at US Colleges." *International Migration Review*, Online First. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0197918325139400>
- Dunning, J. H. 1958. *American Investment in British Manufacturing Industry* London and New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203013175>
- Fan, D., C. J. Zhu, X. Huang, and V. Kumar. 2021. "Mapping the Terrain of International Human Resource Management Research Over the Past Fifty Years: A Bibliographic Analysis." *Journal of World Business* 56: 01185. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2020.101185>
- Felbermayr, G. J., and F. Toubal. 2012. "Revisiting the trade-migration Nexus: Evidence from new OECD data." *World Development* 40(5): 928–937. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2011.11.016>
- Fitzsimmons, S. R. 2013. "Multicultural Employees: A Framework for Understanding How they Contribute to Organizations." *Academy of Management Review* 38(4): 525-549. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2011.0234>
- Fitzsimmons, S. R., Y. T. Lee, and M. Y. Brannen. 2013. "Demystifying the myth about marginals: Implications for global leadership." *European Journal of International Management* 7(5): 587-603. <https://doi.org/10.1504/EJIM.2013.056479>
- Foley, C. F., and W. R. Kerr. 2013. "Ethnic innovation and US multinational firm activity." *Management Science* 59(7): 1529-1544. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1120.1684>
- Gould, D. M. 1994. "Immigrant links to the home country: Empirical implications for U.S. bilateral trade flows." *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 76: 302–316.
- Hajro, A., and Žilinskaitė, M. Forthcoming. "High-Skilled Migration Revisited: Foregrounding the Multinational Enterprise in Migration Infrastructures". *International Migration Review*.
- Hajro, A., and M. Žilinskaitė. 2024. "Migrants and Migration." In *Encyclopedia of International Strategic Management*, edited by C. G. Asmussen, N. Hashai, and D. Minbaeva, 285–287. Cheltenham, UK, Northampton, USA: Edward Elgar.
- Hajro, A., C. B. Gibson, and M. Pudelko. 2017. "Knowledge exchange processes in multicultural teams: Linking organizational diversity climates to teams' effectiveness." *Academy of Management Journal* 60(1): 345-372. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2014.0442>
- Hajro, A., C. Brewster, W. Haak-Saheem, and M. Morley. 2023. "Global Migration: Implications for International Business Scholarship." *Journal of International Business Studies* 54: 1134–1150. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-022-00565-z>
- Hajro, A., G. K. Stahl, C. C. Clegg, and M. B. Lazarova. 2019. "Acculturation, Coping, and Integration Success of International Skilled Migrants: an Integrative Review and

- Multilevel Framework.” *Human Resource Management Journal* 29(3): 328– 352.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12233>
- Hajro, A., M. Žilinskaitė, and C. B. Gibson. 2025. “The Refugee Journey: an Exploration of the Role of Organizations and Psychological Processes”. *Organization Science* 37(2): 424-443. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2023.17726>
- Hernandez, E. 2014. “Finding a home away from home: Effects of immigrants on firms’ foreign location choice and performance.” *Administrative Science Quarterly* 59(1): 73-108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839214523428>
- Hofstede, G. 1980. *Culture’s consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage
- House, R. J., P. W. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman, and V. Gupta. 2004. *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hymer, S. A. 1960. *The International Operations of National Firms: A Study of Direct Foreign Investment*. Boston: MIT Press. <http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/27375>
- Hymer, S. H. 1976/1960. *The international operations of national firms: a study of direct foreign investment*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press Ph.D. dissertation, MIT, 1960.
- Kirkman, B. L., K. B. Lowe, and C. B. Gibson 2006. “A quarter century of culture's consequences: A review of empirical research incorporating Hofstede’s cultural values framework” *Journal of international business studies*, 37(3): 285-320.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400202>
- Kuhn, T. S. 1997. *The structure of scientific revolutions (Vol. 962)*. Chicago: University of Chicago press.
- Kunczer, V. M., T. Lindner, J. Puck, and A. Verbeke. 2019. “Benefitting from immigration: The value of immigrants’ country knowledge for firm internationalization.” *Journal of International Business Policy* 2: 295–317. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s42214-019-00034-9>
- Lacroix, T. 2014. “Conceptualizing transnational engagements: A structure and agency perspective on (hometown) transnationalism.” *International Migration Review* 48(3): 643-679. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imre.12105>
- Leurs, K. 2019. “Migration Infrastructures.” In *The SAGE Handbook of Media and Migration*, edited by K. Smets, K. Leurs, M. Georgiou, S. Witteborn, and R. Gajjala. London: SAGE.
- Levitt P., and S. Khagram. 2008. “Constructing transnational studies.” In *The Transnational Studies Reader*, ed. S. Khagram, P. Levitt. New York: Routledge.
- Levitt, P. 2003. “You know, Abraham was really the first immigrant”: Religion and transnational migration. *International migration review* 37(3): 847-873. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2003.tb00160.x>

- Levitt, P. 2023. "Decentering Migration Studies: Toward a Southern Attitude." *Sociological Forum* 38 (3): 856–64. <https://doi.org/10.1111/socf.12913>
- Levitt, P. 2023. "Decentering Migration Studies: Toward a Southern Attitude." *Sociological Forum* 38 (3): 856–64. <https://doi.org/10.1111/socf.12913>.
- Levitt, P., and B. N. Jaworsky. 2007. "Transnational migration studies: Past developments and future trends." *Annual Review of Sociology* 33, 129-156. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.33.040406.131816>
- Li, Y., E. Hernandez, and S. Gwon. 2019. "When do ethnic communities affect foreign location choice? Dual entry strategies of Korean banks in China." *Academy of Management Journal* 62(1): 172–195. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amj.2017.0275>
- Lindquist, J., B. Xiang, and B. S. Yeoh. 2012. "Opening the black box of migration: Brokers, the organization of transnational mobility and the changing political economy in Asia." *Pacific affairs* 85(1): 7-19. <https://doi.org/10.5509/20128517>
- Malmusi, D. 2015. "Immigrants' health and health inequality by type of integration policies in European countries." *European Journal of Public Health* 25: 293–299. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/cku156>
- Maseland, R., and A. van Hoorn. 2010. "Values and marginal preferences in international business." *Journal of International Business Studies* 41(8): 1325–1329. <https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2010.24>
- Massey, D. S., J. Arango, G. Hugo, A. Kouaouci, A. Pellegrino, and J. E. Taylor. 1993. "Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal." *Population and Development Review* 19(3): 431–466. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2938462>
- Minbaeva, D., R. Narula, A. Phene, and S. Fitzsimmons. 2025. "Beyond global mobility: How human capital shapes the MNE in the 21st century." *Journal of International Business Studies* 56(2): 136–150. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-024-00755-x>
- Morales, N. 2025. "High-Skill Migration, Multinational Companies, and the Location of Economic Activity." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 107(4), 982-996.
- Natter, K., and N. Welfens. 2024. "Why has Migration Research so Little Impact? Examining Knowledge Practices in Migration Policy Making and Migration Studies." *International Migration Review* 58(4): 1669-1700. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019791832412716>
- Nayak, D., S. Moreira, and R. Mudambi. 2025. "Restrictive immigration policies and MNE innovation." *Journal of International Business Studies* 56(1): 84-104. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-024-00737-z>
- Nguyen, A. M. D. and V. Benet-Martínez. 2013. "Biculturalism and Adjustment: A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 44(1): 122–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022111435097>

- Portes, A., C. Escobar, and A. W. Radford. 2007. "Immigrant transnational organizations and development: A comparative study." *International migration review* 41(1): 242-281. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2007.00063.x>
- Sandoz, L. 2019. *Mobilities of the Highly Skilled towards Switzerland*. Cham: SpringerOpen. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-21122-6>
- Schwartz, S. H. 1994. "Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values." In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, methods, and applications*: 85–119. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Schwartz, S. J., et al. 2022. "The Role of Psychologists in International Migration Research: Complementing other Expertise and an Interdisciplinary Way Forward." *Migration Studies* 10(2): 356–373. <https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mnz054>
- Shukla, P., and J. Cantwell. 2018. "Migrants and multinational firms: The role of institutional affinity and connectedness in FDI." *Journal of World Business* 53(6): 835-849. <https://doi.org/10.7282/t3-61wx-7c05>
- Skeldon, R. 2018. "High-skilled migration and the limits of migration policies." In *High-Skilled Migration: Drivers and Policies*, edited by M. Czaika, 48–64. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stahl, G. K., and R. L. Tung. 2015. "Towards a more balanced treatment of culture in international business studies: The need for positive cross-cultural scholarship." *Journal of International Business Studies* 46(4): 391-414. <https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2014.68>
- Stahl, G. K., E. Akkan, B. S. Reiche, A. Hajro, M. Zellmer-Bruhn, M. Lazarova,... and L. Zander. 2024. "Linking institutional context to the community and career embeddedness of skilled migrants: The role of destination-and origin-country identifications." *Journal of International Business Studies* 55(6): 703-722. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-024-00683-w>
- Szkudlarek, B., J. Osland, D. Caprar, and L. Romani. 2020. *The Sage handbook of contemporary cross-cultural management*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, Singapore: Sage.
- Szkudlarek, B., L. Nardon, J. S. Osland, N. J. Adler, and E. S. Lee. 2021. "When context matters: What happens to international theory when researchers study refugees." *Academy of Management Perspectives* 35(3): 461-484. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2018.0150>
- Titzmann, P. F., and P. Jugert. 2015. "Acculturation in Context: The Moderating Effects of Immigrant and Native Peer Orientations on the Acculturation Experiences of Immigrants." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 44(11): 2079–94. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-015-0314-0>

- Trompenaars, F., and C. Hampden-Turner. 1997. *Riding the waves of culture. Understanding cultural diversity in business*. London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.3920100209>
- Tung, R. L., G. Knight, P. Ghauri, S. Prashantham, and T. Fang. 2023. “Disruptive Knowledge in International Business Research: A Pipe Dream or Attainable Target?.” *Journal of International Business Studies* 54(9): 1589-1598.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-023-00656-5>
- Uhlbach, W. H., and P. E. Anckaert. 2025. “Migration and innovation: How foreign R&D hires shape firm-level exploration in their host country.” *Organization Science* 36(3): 1110-1130. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2021.16073>
- Vernon, R. 1966. “International Investment and International Trade in the Product Cycle.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 80: 190–207. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1880689>
- Vertovec, S. 2009. *Transnationalism*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203927083>
- Vora, D., L. Martin, S. R. Fitzsimmons, A. A. Pekerti, C. Lakshman, and S. Raheem. 2019. “Multiculturalism within individuals: A review, critique, and agenda for future research.” *Journal of International Business Studies* 50(4): 499-524.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/48703514>
- Vora, D., S. R. Fitzsimmons, and D. C. Thomas. 2025. “Unlocking the Potential of Multicultural Migrants: Cultural Brokering Scale Development and Validation.” *International Migration Review*, Online first.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/01979183251405873>
- Xiang, B., and J. Lindquist. 2014. “Migration Infrastructure.” *International Migration Review* 48(S1): 122–S148. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imre.12141>
- Žilinskaitė, M., A. Hajro, P. Baldassari, and C. Miska. 2025. “Migration, human supply chains, and the multinational enterprise: Confronting an overlooked global mobility challenge.” *Human Resource Management Journal* 35(3): 742-753.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12592>