



Norwegian  
Business School

This file was downloaded from BI Open, the institutional repository (open access) at BI Norwegian Business School <https://biopen.bi.no/>

It contains the accepted and peer reviewed manuscript to the article cited below. It may contain minor differences from the journal's pdf version.

Amdam, R. P., Benito, G. R., & Grøgaard, B. (2023). The untold story: Teaching cases and the rise of international business as a new academic field. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-023-00609-y>

Copyright policy of Springer, the publisher of this journal:

"Authors may self-archive the author's accepted manuscript of their articles on their own websites. Authors may also deposit this version of the article in any repository, provided it is only made publicly available 12 months after official publication or later. He/ she may not use the publisher's version (the final article), which is posted on SpringerLink and other Springer websites, for the purpose of self-archiving or deposit..."

<http://www.springer.com/gp/open-access/authors-rights/self-archiving-policy/2124>

# **The untold story: Teaching cases and the rise of international business as a new academic field**

## **Rolv Petter Amdam**

BI Norwegian Business School  
Nydalsveien 37, 0484 Oslo, Norway  
Phone: +47-4641 0662  
rolv.p.amdam@bi.no

## **Gabriel R. G. Benito**

BI Norwegian Business School  
Nydalsveien 37, 0484 Oslo, Norway  
Phone: +47-4641 0455  
gabriel.r.g.benito@bi.no

## **Birgitte Grøgaard**

BI Norwegian Business School  
Nydalsveien 37, 0484 Oslo, Norway  
Phone: +47-4641 0535  
birgitte.grogaard@bi.no

Accepted for publication in JIBS 2023

## **Acknowledgments**

We are grateful for valuable comments and suggestions from Editor-in-Chief Alain Verbeke and three anonymous reviewers. Earlier versions of this article also greatly benefitted from discussions at the 2021 European International Business Academy annual conference (Madrid), the 2022 Academy of International Business UK & Ireland and Reading IB conferences (Reading, UK), and the 2022 Academy of International Business annual meeting (Miami, FL).

## About the authors

**Rolv Petter Amdam** is Professor of business history at BI Norwegian Business School, Oslo, Norway. His research focuses on the global expansion of executive education by drawing on the academic fields of international business and business history. He earned his doctorate from the University of Oslo, Norway.

**Gabriel R.G. Benito** is Professor at the Department of Strategy and Entrepreneurship, BI Norwegian Business School, Oslo, Norway. He is a Fellow of Academy of International Business and a Fellow of European International Business Academy. His current research agenda focuses on corporate governance, the strategies and organization of multinational enterprises, and the economic organization of international business.

**Birgitte Grøgaard** is Professor at the Department of Strategy and Entrepreneurship at BI Norwegian Business School in Oslo, Norway. Her research interests include strategies of multinational enterprises, headquarter–subsidiary relationships, and foreign direct investments. Birgitte’s research is currently focused on energy transition. Prior to pursuing a PhD, Birgitte worked for a multinational oil and gas company.

# **The untold story: Teaching cases and the rise of international business as a new academic field**

## **Abstract**

The dominant narrative about the rise of international business (IB) focuses on early research and the institutionalization of a new academic field. In this study, we explore the role of case writing in the field's formative period from the mid-1950s to the mid-1960s. Based on an analysis of teaching cases on IB topics, we demonstrate that case-based teaching, including the writing of cases, was an innovative pedagogical method that made a strong impact on the formation of the new academic field. Analyzing the cases and the background and affiliation of their authors offers new insights into the linkages to other disciplines from which the new academic field emerged. The analysis of the cases also provides new insight into how the case authors connected to the new practical experiences from an increasing number of multinational enterprises, particularly from the US, and conceptualized the experiences into a pedagogical language. The investigation covers 489 cases written by scholars located in 18 countries from the early 1950s to 1963, as well as archival studies of the business schools and institutions that initiated the production of cases.

**Keywords:** Evolution of academic field, history of IB, educational development, teaching cases

## INTRODUCTION

International business (IB) has developed into a strong academic field since its inception in the 1950s. Our knowledge about the rise of IB as a new academic field is, however, primarily based on studies of research conducted by pioneering scholars (Buckley, 2011; Buckley & Lessard, 2005; Engwall, Pahlberg, & Persson, 2018; Shenkar, 2004; Wright & Ricks, 1994), new academic journals (Doh, Luthans, & Slocum, 2016; Harvey & Moeller, 2016; Nielsen et al., 2020), and the founding of new professional associations (Fayerweather, 1960, 1974, 1986; Hawkins, 1984). Except for some early reports and overviews of courses that were taught around 1970 (Boddewyn & Nath, 1970; Fayerweather, 1974; Terpstra, 1970; Towl, 1970; Wright, 1970), the development of education capital in the formative period of IB from the mid-1950s to the mid-1960s (Fayerweather, 1986) has barely been examined.

According to Cummings and Cummings (2022), the rise of new academic fields depends on how an aspiring group of scholars develops research and education capital, defined as the capital created through research and teaching, to gain power and influence within academic institutions. In this study, we examine how IB was taught in its formative period by analyzing cases written for teaching purposes from the early 1950s to 1963. This is primarily a historical study with a focus on how these cases led to the creation of education capital. In 1963, the Ford Foundation financed a project organized by researchers at Harvard Business School (HBS) to collect information from all over the world about existing teaching cases “which would be primarily useful for teachers who are developing new courses in the multinational area for the use in the United States” (Lindfors, 1964: iv). Based on an annotated overview of 489 collected cases from this project, we analyze the pioneering teaching cases in the field of IB with the following question in mind: How did these cases contribute to the formation of IB as an academic field?

Our study reveals that this formative period included much broader and more varied activities and resources than hitherto indicated by accounts focusing solely on research capital. We identify the role of an extensive international network of scholars focused on IB teaching and show that they had a

stronger focus on management and organizational challenges than what extant studies of research activities would suggest. The international network was closely linked to the internationalization of US enterprises and business schools. We make three reflections regarding the development of IB as an academic field that also have implications for theory on the development of new academic fields. First, we uncover the role of education capital as an important driver of the formation of IB. We propose that the accumulation of education capital precedes research capital, especially in cases where a new academic field emerges as a phenomenological process. Second, we extend Cummings and Cummings' (2022) claim that the ascendance of a new academic field depends on the pioneering group's power linked to accumulated education and research capital. Specifically, we illustrate that resources are mobilized from practice through network capital, a point we reflect on in our discussion. Third, we observe a weak linkage between the breadth of teaching case content in the early 1960s and the subsequent theoretical development in IB from the 1970s onwards and propose that the foundation for the legitimization of a new academic field weakens if the formative period is dominantly based on education capital.

### **THE RISE OF IB AS A NEW ACADEMIC FIELD**

An academic field consists of a community of scholars “who identify themselves as such and who interact and are familiar with each other's work” (Cole, 1983: 130). In the ascending phase of the field, the search for a collective identity is expressed in the creation of new professional associations, new journals and other publication outlets, and new educational programs and academic positions (Engwall et al., 2018). An academic field is considered formed when a critical number of major universities establish positions within the field's domain, grant tenure based on peer evaluations by its members, and let its members supervise graduate students (Hambrick & Chen, 2008: 34).

The rise of a new academic field is tied to power derived from different forms of capital created through research and teaching, reflecting practice in the field's formative period. Such capital is referred to as research capital and education capital (Cummings & Cummings, 2022). Research capital is the result of the creation of conceptualized and theorized knowledge and the legitimacy it

achieves in the academic community. Education capital “derives from the field’s effectiveness in educating business practitioners [and] facilitates their social networking,” and can be converted into economic and reputational gains (Cummings & Cummings, 2022: 615). While Cummings & Cummings (2022) refer to a spill-over effect between education and research capital, Hambrick & Chen (2008) mention the complexity of the relationship. On the one hand, demand from students for new knowledge may act as an internal force that increases the likelihood and speed of achieving the status of an academic field. On the other hand, the growth of the demand from students could also act as a constraint since it may limit researchers’ time for conceptual development if teaching demand exceeds the faculty’s capacity.

Hambrick & Chen (2008) discuss the development from an aspiring community of scholars with a shared interest, to a new academic field. Based on a study of the rise of strategic management – with additional (but cursory) analyses of the rise of IB and social issues in management (SIM) – their model depicts that the rise from an aspiring informal community of scholars to an academic field requires the existence of three elements. First, a differentiation from other fields based on a claim that a core of important problems cannot be solved by status quo, i.e. already existing entities (Merton, 1973). Second, the mobilization of resources. The effect of the mobilization depends on whether the actors involved have common interests in creating a new field, and whether external demands support the initiatives. Third, the aspiring community must also build legitimacy with a broader academic community through persuasion and emulation. Fields with high legitimacy attract more members, partners, and resources than those with low legitimacy (Rynes & Brown, 2011).

### **Differentiation**

Buckley (2011) supports Hambrick and Chen’s claim that IB research became differentiated from other disciplines. While the rise of IB research was anchored in disciplines that already existed in the first part of the 20th century, principally economics, it was differentiated by focusing on research topics that were peripheral to the then dominant neo-classical theory of international trade such as foreign direct investment (FDI), cartels, international capital markets, international firms, imperialism, and international competitiveness.

In the formative period, several business schools took initiatives that contributed to differentiate and shape the new field. At HBS, the first course in managing foreign operations appeared in 1953, followed by the appointment in 1958 of its two first professors in IB, Lincoln Gordon and Raymond Vernon (Fayerweather, 1986: 3). In 1956, Columbia University was the first major business school to inaugurate an IB program (Fayerweather, 1994: 19). In 1959, Indiana University offered both an MBA and a DBA program with a strong IB focus. Executive programs in IB related topics were also offered by institutions such as Columbia University, De Paul University, Syracuse University, American University, University of Pittsburgh, Michigan State University, and Thunderbird School of Global Management. In the UK, the Administrative Staff College at Henley offered courses in managing international operations in the Commonwealth (Dustan & Makanowitzky, 1960: 23-25).

Despite the differentiation taking place from the mid-1950s, the development of a distinct collective identity that characterizes a new academic field was, as Patvardhan, Gioia, and Hamilton (2015) observed as a general trend, not a linear process. In its founding period, IB was vaguely defined and “embraced nearly every idea or publication on foreign countries or international economy that could be of interest to international businessmen” (Wright, 1970: 110). Although Wright (1970) excluded international economics unless it was related to problems of international firms as part of his definition of IB, others regarded economics as a key building block of IB. Stephen Hymer’s (1960/1976) PhD dissertation from MIT, “The international operations of national firms: a study of direct foreign investment” (from 1960, but first published in 1976), is considered the genesis of international business theory. Hymer’s dissertation was distinctly within economics, supporting the view of economics as a core discipline in early IB (e.g. Caves, 1998). Similarly, the British economist John Dunning’s (1958) book on American investments in the British manufacturing industry, has been characterized as the first research that specifically dealt with international business (Buckley, 2011). A content analysis of 642 papers in *Journal of World Business* (JWB) from 1965-1974 shows that more than 42 percent were categorized as “others”, including finance, economics, geography, and demography, followed by approximately 27 percent within “international/global business” (Harvey &



Moeller, 2016).<sup>1</sup> The strong position of the group “others” among the papers in the first decade, gives an indication of economics as a strong discipline in the formative phase of IB. However, the group includes several disciplines, illustrating the great variety of disciplines that contributed to forming IB.

Shenkar (2004) questions the strong dominance of economics as the core of early IB, and argues that IB is a multidisciplinary field, which in addition to economics draws upon disciplines such as sociology, anthropology, and political science. Mira Wilkins (1997) mentions several inspirational sources to early IB before Hymer’s dissertation, such as the work of Edith Penrose (1956, 1959) – also an economist – and John Fayerweather (1959, 1960). Penrose’s position within IB is supported by Engwall et al.’s (2018) bibliometric study showing that the most influential publications before 1970 within IB until 2014 were Hymer (1960/1976) and Penrose (1959), followed by Vernon (1966) and Kindleberger (1969). Fayerweather, one of the founders of the Association for Education in International Business (AEIB) in 1959, renamed in 1972 as the Academy of International Business (AIB), also drew on economics, but his focus was on cross-cultural management (Fayerweather, 1959, 1974, 1994).

Economics was one of the disciplines from which IB diversified regarding research, but the impression of its role in the development of the IB field is mixed. Reports on teaching IB in the period, however scant, suggest limited attention to economics. A survey initiated and published by AEIB in 1970, covering 510 IB courses in 111 US business schools, reveals a different picture than the claimed dominance of economics in the research output. As shown in Table 1, general and advanced IB courses covered several aspects of the new academic field. International marketing, management, and finance had relatively strong positions, while economics was weakly represented.

< Table 1 in here >

### **Mobilization of Resources**

Hambrick and Chen (2008) mention the increasing complexity and internationalization of American corporations in the 1970s as an external supportive condition for mobilizing resources to develop the academic fields of strategic management and IB. According to this argument, the supportive condition

should be defined in a temporal and spatial context given the global expansion of US corporations in the 1950s and 1960s (Wilkins, 1974).

We suggest that especially two aspects of the American internationalization process were relevant as sources for the mobilization of resources. First, the internationalization of US businesses, shifting toward a stronger focus on forming MNEs in the 1950s and 1960s (Wilkins, 1974), was a source for providing actors within the aspiring academic community with new and unexplored empirical knowledge that needed to be conceptualized. Second, the US business schools that hosted most of the members of the aspiring academic community were also internationalizing themselves. The internationalization of US business schools was expressed through an increased number of teaching projects with international partners (Engwall & Kipping, 2013), hundreds of US professors being sent abroad to teach at business schools all over the world (McGlade, 1998), the exporting and implementation of executive education as a new educational model (Amdam, 2020), as well as the establishment of foreign business schools as subsidiaries of US business schools (Amdam & Benito, 2022).

### **Building Legitimacy**

Existing knowledge about the early development of IB shows elements of differentiation and mobilization of resources. Legitimacy building has primarily been perceived as an internal process where the development of a shared identity may be constrained by the heterogeneity of the disciplines that scholars within an aspiring community are already rooted in (Hambrick & Chen, 2008: 49). The legitimacy process is also characterized by how the pioneers in the field develop structural systems and procedures linked to accepted norms for academic work, using the legitimacy of their leaders or their abilities to produce research results (Rynes & Brown, 2011). However, the aspect of legitimacy is less explored beyond the contributions of new journals, publications, and associations to legitimization by convincing the academic community of the relevance of the aspiring community.

New associations, academic journals, and university programs and positions legitimized the differentiation of IB. The same year as AEIB was created in 1959, the journal *The International*

*Executive* – from 1998 known as *Thunderbird International Business Review* (TIBR) – was launched with Fayerweather as the editor. The original purpose of the journal was to summarize and report “current books and over 150 periodicals, noting all material basic to management of international operations” (*The International Executive*, 1959, Vol 1(1): i). Initiatives were also taken outside of the US. In Germany, the journal *Management International Review* (MIR), a journal with a wide scope but with some articles related to international business, was launched in 1961 (Oesterle & Wolf, 2011). Still, it is generally accepted that in this period, the richest and broadest processes that led to the creation of a new academic discipline took place in the US (Engwall et al., 2018). In 1970, AEIB launched the *Journal of International Business Studies* (JIBS), trailing the first journal fully dedicated to IB, *Columbia Journal of World Business*, in 1965; from 1996, known as *Journal of World Business*.

### **Implications for Studying Accumulation of Education Capital in the Formative Period of IB**

How did the production of teaching cases develop education capital in its formative period, when the perception of what constructed the new field was still vague and mixed? Consensus that the focus of IB should be on those unique issues that arose when businesses crossed national boundaries did not emerge until late 1963, when US scholars that taught IB had their first meeting (Robock, 2003). Research on pioneering teaching activities such as developing teaching materials is virtually non-existent, and the reports that were published around 1970 targeted teaching in the last part of the 1960s (Boddewyn & Nath, 1970; Fayerweather, 1974; Terpstra, 1970; Towl, 1970; Wright, 1970). However, the accumulation of education capital was especially important in the context of US business schools in the 1950s and 1960s since teaching new fields such as IB, strategic management and organization studies was commonly carried out by practitioner-oriented faculty. Although the reliance on practitioner-oriented faculty was challenged from the late 1950s, and gradually changed by the scientific drive strongly supported by the Ford Foundation (Augier & March, 2011), we anticipate that education capital was nevertheless central.

Another important reason for focusing on teaching materials is the role of AEIB. The association was established primarily as a forum to discuss and develop pedagogical experiences and ideas on teaching IB. Given education capital’s close links to practice (Cummings & Cummings,

2022), and the novelty of practical experience from different parts of the world experienced by the rapidly expanding US MNEs, we propose that new knowledge emerging from practice may also have contributed to build legitimacy.

## **METHODS**

Since research on the ascendance of new academic fields has not explored *how* the pioneering group connected to and mobilized new resources (Hambrick & Chen, 2008), beyond suggesting that the effect of the mobilization depends on the infrastructure of social ties among early pioneers and forums for developing ideas (Davis & Thompson, 1994), it is worth studying who produced the cases and their contexts. Because both the practice field and business schools hosting case writers internationalized to new countries, research on the production of cases should have a spatial dimension. This also connects to the argument that space is a key uniqueness of IB as a discipline (Aguinis & Gabriel, 2022; Beugelsdijk, 2022; Casson & Li, 2022; Eden & Nielsen, 2020).

### **Data Sources**

To explore how IB was taught in the formative years of IB, we have analyzed information from a collection of annotated overviews of 536 teaching cases gathered by a project financed by the Ford Foundation and organized by HBS in 1964. We reduced the number of cases to 489, since 10 of the 536 cases were teaching notes that supported other cases, and 37 were sub-cases that we interpreted as belonging to other cases. The fact that the content of IB teaching before 1964 is hardly studied makes it relevant to explore the content of the cases. For each case, the collection provides the abstracts and keywords, and information such as the name of the case, the name of the course which the case was meant to support, disciplinary subjects, countries it covered, both regarding for example home and host country of an MNE, and the name and the university affiliation of the scholar(s) who had written the case. These qualities enable us to explore the role of US MNEs as a supportive condition and the existence of transnational academic networks as sources for the mobilization of resources and building legitimacy. The information was collected by the project staff at HBS and printed in a report with limited circulation (Lindfors, 1964).<sup>2</sup> This report had been referred to in the early scholarly debates

about the content of early IB (Boddewyn & Nath, 1970; Towl, 1970), but to our knowledge never analyzed. The HSB case writing project was later followed by a new project financed by the Ford Foundation from 1965 to explore cases about the broader field of business administration that US professors used internationally. However, the 1889 cases that were collected in the new project had a much wider academic scope than IB (Towl, 1970).<sup>3</sup>

We expect that the role of US MNEs as a supportive condition for the formation of IB as an academic field is expressed both in the content and the locations of the activities described in the cases in the way that the content and locations in the cases reflect patterns in the internationalization of US business. Further, we expect that the role of institutional and personal transnational networks of business schools as a source for mobilizing resources and legitimization is expressed in the number and character of cases that involved business schools outside the US.

### **Methodological Reflections**

There are some methodological challenges related to the use of this inventory of cases as a historical source. One challenge is representability. Not all business schools used teaching cases in their educational programs. As Charles T. Horngren, the accounting professor who came to Stanford Graduate School of Business in 1966 with an MBA from HBS and a PhD from Chicago University, remembers the mid-1960s: “HBS did case teaching; Chicago had lectures focusing on ‘abstract conceptual frameworks’, and Stanford did both” (Jaedicke, Solomon, & Horngren, 1991). Hence, while the case teaching method was widely shared in the US and spread internationally in the 1960s (Boddewyn & Nath, 1970), we are aware that our analysis has limitations since it does not cover programs and courses without case teaching.

The aim of the project organized by HBS was to collect all kinds of relevant cases regardless of who had produced them. Project members gathered information outside HBS by collecting information on existing cases from the Ford Foundation, Intercollegiate Case Clearing House, AACSB, and by sending questionnaires to publishers and libraries, and to collect information from “hundreds of faculty members around the world” (Lindfors, 1964: x). As a result, the project received

information on cases written at 42 business schools and management development centers in 18 countries in Africa, Asia, Europe, Oceania, South and North America including the US (Table 2), with HBS as the largest producer (see Tables 2 and 3). All the cases were written in English.

< Table 2 in here >

< Table 3 in here >

Another challenge is related to when the cases were written. We do not have information on the publication date of the cases, but 307 of 489 cases contain information about when the narrative in the case took place. One historical case on the Medici family covered the Renaissance. Among the others, 11 percent of the cases refer to the period 1947-54, 46 percent to 1955-59, and 42 percent to 1960-63. This means that most of these cases are about events before IB was regarded as an established discipline. The project managers who collected the cases were aware of this situation and mentioned that it was difficult to decide which cases should be included. There were three main criteria: First, a case should have a focus on “multinational business”. It could be difficult to decide what this meant, but “traditional work in international trade and foreign exchange” was not included. Second, the cases should come from all over the world, but the aim was primarily to collect cases that would be useful for the use in the US. This shows that the project aimed at supporting the internationalization of US firms abroad. Third, the cases should be available for use also outside the university where they were produced (Lindfors, 1964: ix-xi).

The third challenge is related to location. As Table 2 shows, the data includes information about the business schools that produced the cases. However, the location of the production of the case does not necessarily reflect the geographical dimensions in the case story. For example, two professors at IMEDE in Switzerland wrote a case on how British Aluminum (UK) maneuvered in relation to another player in this industry, Reynolds Metal (USA) (Lindfors, 1964: Case 4F58). In this instance, we categorize UK as the “Focus country”, and US as the “Observation point”. Typically, our categorization of “Focus country” reflects what the case inventory mentions as “Geographical location of the case”. However, in 36 cases the case inventory does not mention any geographical location, and

we therefore determined the location based on reading the abstracts. The categorization of “Observation point” is based on case abstract information.

Finally, there are some challenges regarding how to analyze the content of the cases. While the country and university of origin of the cases could be determined from the abstracts, we needed to interpret further details available for each case. Following Towl’s (1970: 110) observation that “professors of business administration even in the same country often have different terms for the same thing or idea, or use term for different things and ideas”, we decided to categorize the content of the cases based on our own interpretation of the information about each case. In the research process, the three authors of this paper – two professors of international business and one professor of business history – discussed the information from each case one-by-one and categorized the disciplinary content according to the AIB Discipline Interest Code 2019, category A to Q.<sup>4</sup> In addition to the name of the case, the name of course the case was meant to support, and information on subjects, the information in the case inventory included a short abstract, typically from two to seven sentences. We used this information to prepare ourselves individually before we met and discussed typically 50-100 cases per meeting. When we had different opinions on which disciplinary category a case belonged to, we discussed until we reached an agreement. In some cases, the category was not clear, or the case covered several categories. In those cases, we added up to two categories for our classification called “additional subjects”.

Categorizing the content of the cases offered some challenges. Previous research on the disciplinary content in the formative period of IB focusing on the research output has categorized the content in quite different ways, which reflects that the definition of IB has been floating. Wright (1970: 110-11) proposed that IB (1) concerns firm-level business activities that crosses national boundaries, and (2) concerns the interrelationships between the operations of firms and the international or foreign environments in which they operate. Nehrt, Truitt, and Wright (1970) categorized the disciplinary boundaries of IB into five areas: International business strategy and structure, functional aspects of international business, international business and business environments, cultural factors, and others. This categorization is also used by Engwall et al. (2018:

1080). In contrast, Vernon (1994) categorized IB as comprising three areas: International trade, multinational enterprises, and comparative business systems. Further, Doh et al. (2016) in their introduction to the 50 year anniversary special issue of JWB claim that “the bulk of IB and international management research” (p. 2) are captured within four main areas: Environmental, Policy and Stakeholders; Strategy, Growth and Expansion, Culture, Leadership and Talent, and finally, Governance, Alliances, and Technology. In the same issue, Harvey and Moeller (2016) group JWB-articles in seven “themes”: Strategy management, International management, Ethics, Global environmental issues and sustainability, International/multinational/global marketing, International/multinational/global business, and finally, Other (finance, economics, geography and demographic-related topics).

This heterogeneous practice of defining IB makes comparison difficult. The sources for categorization are seldom mentioned explicitly (e.g. Harvey & Moeller, 2016), and if they are, the sources are the keywords mentioned in the publications (Engwall et al., 2018). This is suitable for journal articles that include keywords. In our case, the use of keywords is problematic because the keywords that are mentioned in the cases are replicas of keywords mentioned by the producers of each case, and the project has reproduced these “without any attempt at classification” (Lindfors, 1964: x).

## **TEACHING CASES IN THE MULTINATIONAL ERA**

In the 1950s and 1960s, US-based MNEs expanded exponentially all over the world. While Canada due to its closeness to the US initially had the position as the main recipient of US FDI, the period was characterized by the growth of Western Europe as a preferred region for US MNEs to invest. From 1955 to 1970, US total outward FDI increased with 180 percent, while US FDI in Western Europe increased with 460 percent, inflation taken into account (Schaufelbuehl, 2016: 882). In 1960, 35.1 percent of US FDI went to Canada, 26.1 percent to Latin America, and 21 percent to Europe. Ten years later, Europe received 31.4 percent, Canada 29.2 percent and Latin America 18.9 percent (Wilkins, 1974: Table xiii.2).<sup>5</sup> In 1969, Europe surpassed Canada as a recipient of US FDI (Bonin & de Goey, 2009: 19; Wilkins, 1974: 370-384). The growth in Europe, was especially strong in the



member states of the European Common Market, and from 1955 to 1970 the growth was six-fold for the original six member countries, primarily to France and West-Germany. There was also a strong growth of US FDI to Switzerland due to the country's low taxes, which attracted US holding companies like Du Pont to establish units from where they managed the operations in other European countries. UK's position as host country for US MNEs, being outside the Common Market at the time, weakened despite an overall growth in FDI values. In the period when most of the cases were written (1956-1962), France's and West Germany's shares of total US FDI in Western Europe increased from 33 to 43 percent, while UK's share decreased from 46 to 43 percent (Schaufelbuehl, 2016: Figure 1). As a report from the Council for International Progress in Management noticed in 1960, this expansion of US MNEs represented a huge market for training managers abroad (Dustan & Makanowitzky, 1960: 11-17).

This "massive wave of US business abroad in the years 1955-1970" (Wilkins, 1974: 395) with thousands of US firms engaging in FDI, represented a transformation of US capitalism as well as transformation of the market for business schools. More graduates prepared to work abroad, and executive programs attracted more participants from MNEs. In addition, the processes was accompanied by the internationalization of American business education especially to Western Europe, through projects that sent US professors to teach at foreign business schools (McGlade, 1998), support for foreign professors to visit US business schools (Amdam & Dávila, 2021), support to establish new business schools such as INSEAD and Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad (Kumar, 2019), joint educational programs, and even by establishing and operating subsidiaries of US business schools abroad (Amdam & Benito, 2022). As Gail M. Oxley, the first professor of IB at Stanford Graduate School of Business with a key position in Stanford's efforts to develop a new business school (ESAN) in Peru, said at the first US conference on teaching IB: "I think there's a substantial carry-over from experiences [...] in Peru" (Robock & Nehrt, 1964:94).

### **The Transnational Case Production Networks**

The aim of the HBS case writing project was to collect and make available teaching cases for new courses on multinationals taught in the US (Lindfors, 1964: iv), but this ethnocentric ambition did not

prevent the project from collecting cases written in other countries. As shown in Table 2, the cases were produced in 18 different countries, of which Switzerland (163), Iran (40), Canada (37), Israel (22), and India (10) stand out in addition to the US (172). At first sight, the international distribution of case-production to all continents may be surprising, except for Canada due to the geographical closeness. The identification of the professors who produced the cases, and the business schools to which they were affiliated helps explain the geographical distribution (see Table 3). Our analysis shows strong transnational networks linking US business schools and professors to actors in other countries. These networks were primarily institutional but also included personal networks. All these networks can be regarded as a specific form of capital which we denote network capital.

< Table 4 in here >

As Table 4 illustrates, all 163 Swiss cases were developed at IMEDE in Lausanne (later a part of IMD), a business school established by Nestlé in 1957. Surprisingly, no cases dealt with Nestlé, but IMEDE cooperated very closely with HBS from the very beginning on teaching programs and by organizing visits from US (David & Schaufelbuehl, 2015). The importance of IMEDE in this context is an expression of the fact that Switzerland was perceived as “unique ... in its role of teaching business administration to young executives whose companies or organizations are especially active in international operations”,<sup>6</sup> and a hub to reach the European market. For example, out of 50 students in an IMEDE class in 1967, only ten students were from Switzerland. 12 were from Scandinavian countries, six from Germany, six from Italy, and the rest from various other countries.<sup>7</sup> From the mid-1950s, HBS sent several of its professors to teach and write cases at IMEDE (Amdam, 2020). Several of these HBS professors were active in HBS internationalization process, such as Francis Aguilar (chairman of HBS international strategy committee 1965-1971), Kenneth Andrews, Harry L. Hansen, Edmund P. Learned, and Ralph Z. Sorenson.

In Iran, all the 40 cases were written at the Industrial Management Institute, University of Teheran. In 1960, Stanford Graduate School of Business had been approached by E.W. Berlin, General Managing Director of Iranian Oil Operation Company (IOOC), to set up a summer school for executives in IOOC and other firms.<sup>8</sup> Stanford sent three professors to teach this program in

cooperation with the new Industrial Management Institute, where Professor Gail M. Oxley administrated the first management program.<sup>9</sup> All cases were written by a contracted consultant, Harland A. Riker, Jr. from George Fry & Associates (Lindfors, 1964).

33 of the 37 cases from Canada were written at the University of Western Ontario, where HBS had since 1948 sent three to four professors every year to teach cases at an executive program,<sup>10</sup> and local faculty dominated by HBS graduates were required to write cases (Beamish, 1993; McKenzie-Sanders, 1993). In Israel, the cases were written within a project financed by the US government to support the assistance from the New York University to develop business administration education at the Hebrew University and the Israel Institute of Technology.<sup>11</sup> Some of the cases were written by professors who had studied in the US, like Yair Aharoni who had a doctorate in IB from HBS (Aharoni, 1966). In India, nine of the cases were produced at the Administrative Staff College of India (ASCI) where the Ford Foundation had been strongly involved from 1958 in moving from traditional lecture teaching to the case method, including appointing in 1960 Andrew R. Towl, the first director of Case Development at HBS, as a technical expert at ASCI (Kumar, 2019). Eight cases were written at the University College at Ghana, where HBS gave “modest help” to establish a new program in Ghana.<sup>12</sup> The cases were written by James S. Lipscomb, who after his return from Ghana became the director of the International Teachers Program (ITP) at HBS before Ford Foundation appointed him as head of their office in Egypt.<sup>13</sup> ITP was a one-year program for foreign young scholars (primarily from developing countries) who came to HBS to be trained for teaching positions in their home countries. Stanford had a similar program, which was defined as a “pipeline” for getting access to cases, and foreign participants were required to send a local case before entering the program (Robock & Nehrt, 1964:114). In Egypt, seven cases were written at the National Institute of Management Development, where Ford Foundation from 1961 sponsored a project to support a top management program at the institute, including writing cases especially about “the problems of the adaption of the practice of management to the needs for the Arab World.”<sup>14</sup> The six cases from Keio University in Japan were written by local faculty members. Two of the cases were co-authored by HBS professor Stanley

Miller, who in 1962 “returned to Harvard, having spent almost a year developing case materials at Keio” (Alden, 1962: 7).

These observations show that the production of teaching cases took part within a transnational community of business schools that were linked together by several programs and initiatives to promote US based management education (Amdam, 2020). These networks were strongly anchored in institutional agreements between some US business schools and/or the Ford Foundation and the US government, and foreign business schools. In Egypt, the case-writers focused on problems of adapting management practices to local needs<sup>15</sup>, a purpose that seems representative for case writing in developing countries. In Europe, however, the aim was also to write cases to collect experiences abroad and repackage the information in a US business school context with the purpose of supporting the expansion of US MNEs in various countries, including those where the cases were produced. This motive is expressed in a report from the business school IMEDE in Switzerland to the Ford Foundation in 1959. The Secretary General of IMEDE, Georges A. Fiechter, reported:

“Needless to say, we are especially pleased to have our cases used in the States since this means the beginning of a feed-back process through which Europe can start paying back some of the debt we owe to American business education.”<sup>16</sup>

### **The Geography of the Cases**

As noted in our methods section, the geographical characteristics of the case-content has two dimensions: The geographical focus of the case, and the observation point (i.e., the home country of the MNE or other actors who act, or plan to act, in the focal country). For example, in a case on how the US company Rice Instrument runs into difficulties in government negotiations when establishing production in India (Lindfors, 1964: case 3G25), India is in focus while we define the US as “Observation point”. The geography of cases reflected the purpose of collecting cases for the use in the US. In 120 cases, the US was the explicit observation point, followed by Canada and Switzerland with 16 and 14 cases respectively (see Appendix 1). However, 261 cases lack an explicit international dimension, and focus on domestic challenges, such as the case about the Norwegian firm Moderne

Klaer and the organization of its production departments and the sales organization for the domestic market (Lindfors, 1964; case 3G66). Given the idea that the HBS project should collect cases for the use in the US, we interpret the inclusion of these cases as an expression of an idea that it was useful for US business to learn about business operations and its contexts in other countries, and that this could happen through cases about that country regardless the case's focus on international topics or not. In that respect, the project used a wider definition than Wright (1970), who excluded studies of business activities in foreign firms, such as Turkish professors' studies of marketing in Turkey. In addition to the 261 cases that focused on non-international topics in any country and were providing background information on that country for an outsider, 57 had a general international perspective without explicitly mentioning the case's observation point.

The geographical spread of the cases mirrored that of US firms' internationalization with an increasing expansion in Europe with UK, France, and Germany as the main recipients of US FDI in the same period (Schaufelbuehl, 2016). 196 cases focused on Europe including Israel, followed by 107 focusing on Asia, 49 on Latin America, 48 on North America, 24 on Africa, 2 on Oceania, and 63 that had a general international focus. Regarding the distribution across countries in Europe, 33 cases focused on France, 26 on UK, 20 on Germany, 18 on Switzerland, and 18 on Italy. 17 cases dealt with several or all European Economic Community (EEC) countries as one entity. Outside Europe, 40 cases focused on Iran, 30 on Canada, 27 on the Philippines, 21 on Japan 21, and 16 on Mexico (see Appendix 1 for a detailed overview).

The rather high number of cases on USA's neighbor countries Canada (30) and Mexico (16 out of 49 cases on Latin America) support the impression of a high degree of association between the geographical distribution of the cases and the pattern of US FDI in the period. This trend was modified by geopolitical factors in some Asian countries where US made strong efforts to be present politically, including supporting the activities of US business schools in countries such as Iran (40 cases), India (12) and the Philippines (27). All cases with the Philippines in focus were written by a HBS professor who taught regularly at the Asian Institute of Management at Baguio, a business school operated by HBS in the period (Amdam, 2020).

## **The Content**

As Wilkins (1974) argues, the expansion of US MNEs from the mid-1950s was characterized as a combination of continuation and transformation. The FDIs continued to have a focus on manufacturing, advanced technology, and unique products. For example, in 1963, 36.7 percent of US FDIs were in manufacturing, 33.5 percent in petroleum, 8.3 percent in mining, 8.1 percent in trade, and 5.1 percent in public utilities including transport (Wilkins, 1974: table XIII.1). This pattern was also reflected in the cases; 71.5 percent of the cases that we can relate to a specific industry addressed topics within manufacturing with the fabrication of metal products, machinery, and equipment as the dominating sub-group (see Table 5). If we follow the hypothesis that the cases reflected trends in US businesses' internationalization, we should expect that the cases also reflected processes that transformed existing practices in business.

< Table 5 in here >

The increasing presence of US MNEs in Europe was followed by changes in how US MNEs organized their operations. Moving from exporting to FDI led to larger and more complex units in the host country, typically subsidiaries with internal organizational hierarchies (Bonin & de Goey, 2009). This trend was strengthened by organizational innovations in the parent organization, such as the integration of subsidiaries in global organizational structures based on worldwide production divisions or area divisions (Stopford & Wells, 1972). The trend in this period to enter into joint venture partnerships with local partners (Wilkins, 1974, 2009) contributed to making the foreign operations more complex and demanding. These changes also challenged MNEs' adaptability in the various host countries, both concerning culture and legal structures, a trend which was strengthened by a general tendency among US MNEs to move from natural resource seeking to market seeking activities (Wilkins, 2009).

Based on these processes, we assume that the teaching cases reflected a shift in focus away from international trade and economics to topics related to new organizational functions and managerial challenges.

Indeed, our content analysis of the cases shows a significant trend toward management and functional subjects (see Table 6). The representation in the cases of functional subjects such as marketing (23.1 percent) and HRM (18. percent) as well as general management (15.7 percent) and strategy (9.8 percent) – or business policy – as the main subject, creates an impression that the cases are a collection of resources to support the expansion and adaptability of US MNEs, especially in Europe. Economics and finance were the main subjects in 17.4 percent of the cases (finance: 11.7 percent; economics: 5.7 percent). In this perspective, the only surprising result is the very low number of cases within law (only five cases), given the need for adapting to foreign legal systems. However, this may to some extent be due to a larger number of cases dealing with accounting and taxation (5.3 percent), and international relations and political science (2 percent). For example, IMEDE developed a taxation case on the Italian firm Bombacci S.p.A that focused on how to deal with official vs. unofficial sales and secret bank deposits given the tax system in Italy (Lindfors, 1964: Case 4F54). IMEDE also developed an international relations and political science case on how a large Swiss aluminum company had to deal with political risk when establishing in French Guinea (Lindfors, 1964: Case 5G59).

Some of the cases also touched upon other disciplines beyond their main subject. We have categorized these as additional subjects I and II. As indicated in Table 6, including them does not change the broad picture we have painted.

<Table 6 in here >

## **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

This study presents new knowledge about the rise of IB as a new academic field. It reveals that a key source for writing cases was experiences from firms that internationalized, which emphasizes the phenomenological dimension of IB in its early phase. With this study we paint a more varied picture of disciplines to which IB was connected. We demonstrate that educational material had a stronger focus on management and organization disciplines, and weaker on economics than expected from previous studies that have emphasized research output. For example, in their study of JWB during the

1965-75 period, Harvey and Moeller (2016) argue that economics had a strong position. However (and in line with some overlooked studies from the early 1970s on the content of IB courses), we expose that IB was strongly rooted in general management and functional disciplines such as marketing (see Table 1). We have also shown that the process of writing cases involved a broader movement of scholars than those who actively published or were active in AEIB. By involving more than two hundred scholars (204 identified) at 42 business schools in 18 countries, a network of geographically spread resources were mobilized by collecting data and cases from a great variety of places and contexts due to the existence of various networks linked to the internationalization of US enterprises and US business schools. Hence, we challenge the claim by Hambrick and Chen (2008: 37) that the process of developing a new academic field is driven by a tight group with a limited number of interests that are clearly articulated.

This study also exposes how the development of IB was interlinked with the internationalization of US corporations and US business schools. Pioneers within the aspiring new academic field were able to mobilize experiences and information from foreign business operations by drawing upon rich institutional networks of foreign business schools with cooperative agreements with US business schools and/or the Ford Foundation and the US government, as well as personal networks with academics who were located – either permanently or as visitors – in countries that were highly relevant for the expansion of US business, or position in the Cold War (such as India and Israel). The access to business experiences as a supporting condition for mobilizing resources when developing education capital was dependent on the existence of these networks. Hence, while the development of strong transnational business networks provided resources to support the growth of US FDI (Schaufelbuehl, 2016), academic institutions developed similar networks in parallel to support both the internationalization of educational institutions and the internationalization of business. This also shows that the aim of the project was not to diffuse US business models and ideas to the world, but primarily to collect information from the world and repackage the information in a US business school context with the purpose of supporting US MNEs expansion in different countries, including those countries where the cases were produced.



These findings invite some reflections both regarding the understanding of IB as an academic field and on how to analyze and conceptualize the development of new academic fields. First, we show the central role of developing education capital in the formative period of IB as an academic field. The production of teaching cases influenced both resource mobilization and legitimacy building. Hambrick and Chen (2008) argue that the growth of US MNEs was a supporting condition for mobilizing resources to the development of a new academic field. Given the large number of business schools and academic scholars involved in writing teaching cases on multinationals, we suggest that what emerged within the pedagogical domain was something more than merely an appendix to the development of research and the institutionalization of IB in academic positions, new associations, and new journals. It was an arena where the mindset and interest in topics that became integrated in the new IB field were shaped among large groups of academics who have largely been overlooked in the existing literature about the rise of IB. Thus, our analysis uncovers unused sources to understand the creation of a shared identity that led to the ascent of IB as an academic field. The large group of participants gave strength and legitimacy to the process, as did the internationalization of US business. In the case of IB the accumulation of education capital preceded research capital. This chronological order is illustrated by Raymond Vernon, who at the first meeting of IB teachers in the US in 1963 stated that at HBS, research is “curiously lagging”, and “that the next major stage of our research in the international field is going to be rather different” (Robock & Nehrt, 1964: 18). Future research should further explore if and how the creation of education capital precedes research capital when a new academic field in general emerges as a phenomenological process.

Second, the active use of existing networks in developing teaching cases leads us to propose network capital as a concept to explore how a pioneering group mobilizes resources to develop a new academic field. Here we draw upon another discipline that has a special dimension – economic geography – and define network capital as investments in calculative relations through which organizations gain access to knowledge to enhance expected returns (Hugging & Thompson, 2014: 512). In this way, we augment the theoretical frameworks of Hambrick and Chen (2008) and Cummings and Cummings (2022). While research capital and education capital constitute the power to

gain legitimacy within the academic community, network capital helps explain *how* the resources to the education capital are mobilized. We also propose that strong networks with access to new business experiences may compensate for the lack of theorization and conceptualization (Hambrick & Chen, 2008) as a tool to gain legitimacy.

Third, our study raises the question if the education capital creation process that preceded the development of research capital had implications for establishing IB's legitimacy as an academic field. Issues for further research would be whether, and how, the pioneering case writing process created an arsenal of knowledge that served as an important source for theory development, and whether the considerable scope of subjects had an impact on the direction of research when research activities increased from the mid-1960s. Given the breath and variety of topics in the cases, we do not observe a clear linkage between the early case production and the theory development process in the 1970s, when economics had a strong position (Engwall et al., 2018; Buckley & Casson, 2021). Research on such matters may also provide insights about the further development of IB after the mid-1960s. Hambrick & Chen (2008) assert that IB met difficulties from the 1980s due to an absorbing process from other academic fields due to weak institutionalization and the fact that many scholars were also linked to other fields than IB. The high number of scholars involved in case writing indicates that developing education capital was not only preceding the accumulation of research capital, but also a key form for capital beyond the formative period. On that basis, we propose that the legitimization of a new academic field is more fragile if the formative period is primarily based on education capital than on research capital. These observations suggest a need for further work on the relationships between research, education, and network capital in the evolution of new academic fields.

## REFERENCES

- Aguinis, H., & Gabriel, K. P. (2022). International business studies: Are we really so uniquely complex? *Journal of International Business Studies*, 53(9): 2023-2036.
- Aharoni, Y. 1966. *The foreign investment decision process*. Boston, MA: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.
- Alden, V. R. 1962. Japan: A vital partner in the Far East, *Harvard Business School Bulletin*, 38(1): 6—11.

- Amdam, R. P. 2020. The internationalization of executive education, 1945-1970. In T. d. S. Lopes, C. Lubinski, & H. Tworek (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to the makers of global business*: 125-137. London: Routledge.
- Amdam, R. P., & Benito, G. R. G. 2022. Opening the black box of international strategy formation: How Harvard Business School became a multinational enterprise. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 21(2): 167-187.
- Amdam, R. P., & Dávila, C. 2021. Making managers in Latin America: The emergence of executive education in Central America, Peru, and Colombia. *Enterprise & Society*, doi:10.1017/eso.2021.25
- Augier, M., & March, J. G. 2011. *The roots, rituals, and rethoric of change: North American business schools after the Second World War*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Beamish, P. W. (1993). Internationalization as strategic change at the Western Business School (Canada). In S. T. Cavusgil (Ed.), *Internationalizing business education: Meeting the challenge*: 153-166. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- Beugelsdijk, S. (2022). Capitalizing on the uniqueness of international business: Towards a theory of place, space, and organization. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 53(9): 2050 – 2067.
- Boddewyn, J., & Nath, R. 1970. Comparative management studies: An assessment. *Management International Review*, 10(1): 3-11.
- Bonin, H., & de Goey, F. (Eds.). 2009. *American firms in Europe 1880-1980: Strategy, identity, perception and performance*. Geneve: Librairie Droz.
- Buckley, P. J. 2011. The theory of international business pre-Hymer. *Journal of World Business*, 46(1): 61-73.
- Buckley, P. J., & Casson, M. (2021). Thirty years of International Business Review and International Business Research. *International Business Review*, 30(2): 101795.
- Buckley, P. J., & Lessard, D. R. 2005. Regaining the edge for international business research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36(6): 595-599.
- Casson, M., & Li, Y. (2022). Complexity in international business: The implications for theory. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 53(9): 2037-2049.
- Caves, R. E. 1998. Research on international business: Problems and prospects. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 29(1): 5-19.
- Cole, S. 1983. The hierarchy of the sciences? *American Journal of Sociology*, 89(1): 111-139.
- Cummings, T., & Cummings, C. 2022. Language and the evolution of academic fields: The case of organization studies. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 21(4): 598-623.
- David, T., & Schaufelbuehl, J. M. 2015. Transatlantic influence in the shaping of business education: The origins of IMD, 1946–1990. *Business History Review*, 89(1): 75-97.
- Davis, G. F., & Thompson, T. A. 1994. A social movement perspective on corporate control. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39(1): 141-173.
- Doh, J. P., Luthans, F., & Slocum, J. 2016. The world of global business 1965–2015: Perspectives on the 50th anniversary issue of the Journal of World Business: Introduction to the special issue. *Journal of World Business*, 51(1): 1-5.
- Dunning, J. H. 1958. *American investment in British manufacturing industry*. London: Allan & Unwin.
- Dustan, J., & Makanowitzky, B. 1960. *Training managers abroad*. New York: The Council for International Progress in Management.
- Eden, L., & Nielsen, B. B. (2020). Research methods in international business: The challenge of complexity. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 51(9): 1609-1620.
- Engwall, L., & Kipping, M. 2013. The internationalization of international management education and its limitations. In D. Tsang, H. H. Kazeroony, & G. Ellis (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to international management education*: 319-343. London and New York: Routledge.
- Engwall, L., Pahlberg, C., & Persson, O. 2018. The development of IB as a scientific field. *International Business Review*, 27(5): 1080-1088.
- Fayerweather, J. 1959. *Executive overseas: Administrative attitudes and relationships in a foreign culture*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Fayerweather, J. 1960. *Management of international operations, text and cases*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Fayerweather, J. 1974. The birth of the AEIB. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 5(2): 69-80.
- Fayerweather, J. 1986. A history of the Academy of International Business from infancy to maturity: The first 25 years. *South Carolina Essays in International Business* 6:1-61.
- Fayerweather, J. 1994. A personal Odyssey through the early evolution of international business pedagogy, research and professional organization. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25(1): 1-44.
- Hambrick, D. C., & Chen, M.-J. 2008. New academic fields as admittance-seeking social movements: The case of strategic management. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(1): 32-54.
- Harvey, M. G., & Moeller, M. 2016. A brief commentary on the past, present and future trajectory of the Journal of World Business. *Journal of World Business*, 51(1): 6-9.
- Hawkins, R. G. 1984. International business in academia: The state of the field. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 15(3): 13-18.
- Huggins, R., & Thompson, P. (2014). A network-based view of regional growth. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 14(3), 511-545.
- Hymer, S. H. 1976. *The international operations of national firms: A study of direct foreign investment*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jaedicke, B, E. Solomon, & C. Horngren (1991). Video-interview made by Stanford Graduate School of Business, <https://purl.stanford.edu/sy634zr9215>, retrieved May 18, 2022.
- Kindleberger, C. P. 1969. *American business abroad*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Kumar, A. 2019. From Henley to Harvard at Hyderabad? (Post and neo-) colonialism in management education in India. *Enterprise & Society*, 20(2): 366-400.
- Lindfors, G. V. 1964. *Bibliography, cases and other materials for the teaching of multinational business*. Boston, MA: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.
- McGlade, J. 1998. The big push: The export of American business education to Western Europe after the Second World War. In L. Engwall, & V. Zamagni (Eds.), *Management education in historical perspective*: 50-65. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- McKenzie-Sanders, D. (Ed.) (1993). *Learning to lead: Western Business School 1923-1993*. London, Ontario: Western Business School.
- Merton, R. K. 1973. Social conflict over styles of sociological work. In R. K. Merton (Ed.), *The sociology of science: The theoretical and empirical investigations*: 47-69. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Nehrt, L. C., Frederick Truitt, J., & Wright, R. W. 1970. International business research: Past, present, & future. *International Executive*, 12(4): 9-11.
- Nielsen, B. B., Welch, C., Chidlow, A., Miller, S. R., Aguzzoli, R., Gardner, E., Karafyllia, M., & Pegoraro, D. 2020. Fifty years of methodological trends in JIBS: Why future IB research needs more triangulation. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 51(9): 1478-1499.
- Oesterle, M.-J., & Wolf, J. 2011. 50 Years of Management International Review and IB/IM research. *Management International Review*, 51(6): 735-754.
- Patvardhan, S. D., Gioia, D. A., & Hamilton, A. L. 2015. Weathering a meta-level identity crisis: Forging a coherent collective identity for an emerging field. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(2): 405-435.
- Penrose, E. 1956. Foreign investment and the growth of the firm. *Economic Journal*, 66(262): 220-235.
- Penrose, E. 1959. *The theory of the growth of the firm*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Robock, S. H. (2003). Indiana University as a pioneer in the internationalization of business education. In A. M. Rugman (Ed.), *Leadership in international business education and research*: 3-18 (Research in Global Strategic Management, Vol. 8). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Robock, S. H., & Nehrt, L. C. (1964). *Education in international business proceedings*. Bloomington, IN: Graduate School of Business, Indiana University.
- Rynes, S. L., & Brown, K. G. 2011. Where are we in the "long march to legitimacy?" Assessing scholarship in management learning and education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(4): 561-582.
- Schaufelbuehl, J. M. 2016. The transatlantic business community faced with US direct investment in Western Europe, 1958-1968. *Business History*, 58(6): 880-902.

- Shenkar, O. 2004. One more time: International business in a global economy. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 35(2): 161-171.
- Stopford, J. M., & Wells, L. T. 1972. *Managing the multinational enterprise: Organization of the firm and ownership of the subsidiaries*. London: Longman.
- Terpstra, V. 1970. University education for international business. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 1(1): 89-96.
- Towl, A. R. 1970. Professional questions raised by the comparative index of teaching materials for international business. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 1(1): 97-107.
- Vernon, R. 1966. International investment and international trade in the product cycle. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 80(2): 190-207.
- Vernon, R. 1994. Contributing to an international business curriculum: An approach from the flank. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25(2): 215-227.
- Wilkins, M. 1974. *The maturing of multinational enterprise: American business abroad from 1914 to 1970*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wilkins, M. 1997. The conceptual domain of international business. In B. Toyne, & D. Nigh (Eds.), *International business: An emerging vision*: 31-50. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- Wilkins, M. 2009. US business in Europe: An American perspective. In H. Bonin, & F. de Goey (Eds.), *American firms in Europe: Strategy, identity, perception and performance (1880-1980)*: 35-67. Geneva: Librairie Droz.
- Wright, R. W. 1970. Trends in international business research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 1(1): 109-123.
- Wright, R. W. & Ricks, D. A. 1994. Trends in international business research: Twenty-five years later. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 25(4): 687-701.

**Consulted archives:**

FA = Ford Foundation archives, Rockefeller Archives Center, Terrytown, NY

HBS = Harvard Business School archives, Boston, MA

SC = Stanford University archives, Palo Alto, CA

Table 1. IB courses in 111 US business schools, 1970 (Terpstra, 1970).

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Number</b>
International marketing	95
General international business	94
International management	78
International finance	61
Advanced international business	57
Area studies	36
Comparative	36
Economics	27
Accounting	17
Law	13
Transportation	12
Industrial relations	6
Miscellaneous	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>510</b>

Table 2. The countries where the cases were produced.

<b>Country</b>	<b>Number of cases</b>
Australia	1
Canada	37
Chile	4
Egypt	7
Ghana	8
Greece	2
Hawaii	1
India	10
Iran	40
Israel	22
Japan	8
Kenya	2
Mexico	5
Norway	3
Switzerland	163
Taiwan	1
UK	3
USA	172
Unknown	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>489</b>

Table 3. The universities where the cases were produced.

<b>University/institution</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Number of cases</b>
Administrative Staff College	India	9
American University	USA	1
Aoyama Gakuin University	Japan	1
Columbia University	USA	4
Harvard University	USA	116
Hebrew University	Israel	20
Hitotsubashi University	Japan	1
IMAN	Mexico	5
IMEDE	Switzerland	163
Indian Institute of Management	India	1
IMI, University of Tehran	Iran	40
INSORA	Chile	4
Israel Institute of Productivity	Israel	2
Keio University	Japan	6
Laval University	Canada	1
Lehigh University	USA	1
Louisiana State University	USA	1
Manhattan College	USA	1
Marquette University	USA	1
National Chengchi University	Taiwan	1
National Institute of Management Development	Egypt	7
New York University	USA	1
Northeastern University	USA	1
Northwestern University	USA	13
Norwegian School of Economics	Norway	3
Royal Technical College of East Africa	Kenya	2
Stanford University	USA	15
Syracuse University	USA	1
The Polytechnic	UK	3
University of Tulsa	USA	1
University of Western Ontario	Canada	34
University of Alberta	Canada	2
University of Melbourne	Australia	1
University of Mississippi	USA	1
University of California, Berkeley	USA	10
University College of Ghana	Ghana	8
University of Hawaii	Hawaii	1
University of Michigan	USA	1
University of Rhode Island	USA	1
University of Wichita	USA	1
Washington University	USA	1
Unspecified	Greece	2
<b>Total</b>		<b>489</b>

Table 4. Transnational networks in the production of teaching cases

<b>Case-producing business school</b>	<b>Institutional networks to:</b>	<b>No of cases</b>	<b>Institutional networks</b>	<b>Personal networks</b>
IMEDE, Switzerland	Harvard Business School	163	1957: Institutional agreement, which included an HBS advisory committee with the main function to recruit faculty. Dean Thomas Graves 1960-64 came from HBS	1957-1966: 55 professors, from US business school, most of them from HBS taught at IMEDE for 1-2 years
Industrial Management Institute, University of Teheran, Iran	Stanford Graduate School of Business	40	1961: Institutional agreement initiated by Iranian Oil Operating Company, IOOC	All cases were written by Harald A. Riker. Jr. from George Fry & Associates. Project leaders: Prof. Gail Oxley, Stanford's first professor of IB
University of Western Ontario, Canada	Harvard Business School	33	1948: Institutional agreement to send HBS professors to teach executive programs	Several HBS professors
Hebrew University and Israel Institute of Technology	New York University and US government	20	1957: Agreement to send scholars to USA and US professors to teach in Israel sponsored by US International Cooperation Association (ICA)	Most of the cases were written by scholars with PhD studies from USA, including Aharoni, HBS, Weinshall, HBS, and Levtoy, NYU
Administrative Staff College, India	Ford Foundation	9	1958: Ford Foundation project to introduce case writing and teaching	1960: Andrew R. Towl, the first director of Case Development at HBS, appointed a technical expert in case writing at ASCI for two years
University College of Ghana	Harvard Business School	8	1959: HBS gave "modest help to new programs"	James Lipscomb, member of HBS's program committee for training international professors, wrote all the cases
National Institute of Management Development, Egypt	Ford Foundation	7	1959: Ford Foundation sponsored a case development project	Several professors from US business schools. Project leader: Lipscomb, HBS, based in Cairo in 1963
Keio University, Japan	Harvard Business School	6	1957: Institutional agreement. Keio sent 14 teachers to HBS for training 1959-65	Stanley Miller, HBS, co-authored 3 cases

Sources: Information compiled from different archival series from the Ford Foundation, Harvard Business School, and Stanford Graduate School of Business,



Table 5. The industry profile of the cases.

ISIC categories		Main groups	Sub-groups
0	Unknown	75	75
1	Agriculture, hunting, forestry and fishing	7	
	11 - Agriculture and hunting		4
	12 - Forestry and logging		1
	13 - Fishing		2
2	Mining and Quarrying	19	
	22 - Crude petrol and gas production		10
	23 - Metal ore mining		7
	29 - Other Mining		2
3	Manufacturing of products	296	
	30 - Unspecified		2
	31 - Food, beverages and tobacco		37
	32 - Textiles, apparel and leather		36
	33 - Wood products incl furniture		6
	34 - Paper, paper products, printing, publishing		3
	35 - Chemicals, petroleum, coal, rubber, plastic		42
	36 - Non-metallic mineral, excl prod. of petroleum		9
	37 - Basic metal industries		22
	38 - Fabricated metal products, machinery and equipment		137
	39 - Other industries		2
4	Electricity, gas, water	0	0
5	Construction	6	6
6	Wholesale, retail trade, restaurants, hotels	31	
	61 - Wholesale trade		11
	62 - Retail trade		8
	63 - Restaurants and hotels		12
7	Transport, storage, communication	34	
	71 - Transport and storage		28
	72 - Communication		6
8	Finance, insurance, real estate, business services	13	
	81 - Financial institution		7
	83 - Real estate and business services		6
9	Community, social and personal services	8	
	91 - Public administration and defence		5
	93 - Social and related community services		1
	95 - Personal and household services		2
Total		489	489

Table 6. The content of the teaching cases.

<b>Subjects</b>	<b>Main Subject</b>	<b>Add subject I</b>	<b>Add subject II</b>
A Economics	28	14	
B Finance	57	16	1
C Accounting & Taxation	26	22	1
D Organization	17	17	1
E Management	77	24	3
F Business Policy	48	25	1
G Marketing	113	21	2
H Human Resources & Industrial Relations	88	12	1
I Law	5	2	
J International Relations & Political Science	10	8	2
K Social Issues	3	6	1
L Economic & Business History	4	7	2
M Country or Area Study	2	6	4
N Industry/Sectoral Study	7	4	
O Policy-oriented Study	4	9	2
P Education & IB		2	
<b>Total</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>21</b>

Appendix 1. The geography of the teaching cases.

	Focus of the case	Observation point	No outside observation point
<i>Country not specified</i>	63	57	
General	58	57	
Developing countries	2		
Pacific Coast	2		
Transatlantic	1		
<i>North America</i>	48	136	
Canada	30	16	21
USA	17	120	42
Hawaii	1		
<i>Latin America</i>	49		
Latin America	8		
Argentina	2		
Brazil	6		
Chile	4		4
Colombia	4		
French Guinea	2		
Guatemala	1		
Mexico	16		
Peru	1		4
Puerto Rico	1		
Venezuela	2		
Virgin Islands	2		
<i>Europe</i>	196	34	
Europe/EEC	24	5	
North Europe	1		
Belgium	4		
Denmark	5		
France	33	5	
Germany	20	1	
Greece	2		1
Israel	21	1	20
Italy	18		
Netherlands	2	4	
Norway	6		3
Russia	1		
Sweden	5		
Switzerland	18	14	94
Turkey	10		
UK	26	4	3

<i>Africa</i>	24		
Africa	7		
Egypt	6		6
Ghana	8		8
Kenya			2
Libya	1		
Nigeria	1		
Rhodesia	1		
<i>Asia</i>	107	1	
Ceylon	2		
India	12		8
Indonesia	2		
Iran	40		35
Japan	21	1	8
Korea	1		
Pakistan	1		
Philippines	27		
Taiwan	1		1
<i>Oceania</i>	2		
Australia	2		1
<i>No explicit outside observation point</i>		261	
<b>Total</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>261</b>

## NOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> Followed by international management, leadership and HRM (19.6%), international/global marketing (4.2%), environmental and sustainability issues (3.1%), strategic management (3.0%) and ethics (0.5%). In the period 1995-2004, the group “others” had dropped to 21.9 percent.

<sup>2</sup> The report is available at Harvard University Library.

<sup>3</sup> For an analysis of the US professors who were involved in Latin America base on this new project, see Amdam & Dávila, 2021. See Terpstra (1970) for an overview of some other projects that tried to capture the content and profile of IB teaching and research in the US in the late 1960s.

<sup>4</sup> A. Economics; B. Finance; C. Accounting & Taxation; D Organization; E Management; F Business Policy; G Marketing; H Human Resources & Industrial Relations; I Law; J International Relations and Political Science; K Social Issues; L Economic & Business History; M Country or Area Study; N Industry/Sectorial Study; O Policy-Oriented Study; P Education & IB; Q Research Areas Not Covered.

<sup>5</sup> Asia received 7.8 (7.1), Africa 3.4 (4.5), and Oceania 3.2 (4.5) percent in 1960 (1970).

<sup>6</sup> IMEDE Brochure 1961, Log Files, 1957-1976, reel L-71, FA734.

<sup>7</sup> A. Robinson to Mariam K. Chamberlain, 8 May 1967, Log Files, 1957-1976, Reel L-220, FA734. Among the 501 members of the alumni organization from 1958-69, 110 were from Switzerland, 93 from the US, and 64 from UK; *Size Up Bulletin*, March 1968, p. 1, box 48, E67.40.81, Vertical Files HBS.

<sup>8</sup> Dean Ernest C. Arbuckle, Stanford Graduate School of Business to Vice Provost Robert J. Wert, Stanford University, February 3, 1961, box 36, folder 18, SC216.

<sup>9</sup> *Stanford News*, Press release, March 26, 1964, Box 36, Folder 18, SC2116 and April 12, 1992, box 24, folder 223, SC1136.

<sup>10</sup> HBS Annual report on international activities, 1960, appendix 2; box 1, Committee on International Activities, 1966-1970, Division of International Activities HBS

<sup>11</sup> The New York University Program (May 24, 1957 to August 31, 1960). Final Report under the term of a contract between the United States International Cooperation Administration and New York University; see [www.pdf.usaid.gov/pdf\\_docs/PDACX166.pdf](http://www.pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PDACX166.pdf) (Retrieved Sept 14, 2021).

<sup>12</sup> Interim report to the Policies and Program Committee from the Task Force Committee on International Management Training, May 1959, box 1, Hansen report 1963, section 1. 4. Division of International Activities HBS.

<sup>13</sup> See memo regarding ITP from James S. Lipscomb to Harry L Hansen, director of the Division for International Activities, HBS, April 24, 1963, appendix VII. 10 in Memo from Harry Hansen, Nov 13 1963, box 1, Division of International Activities HBS. See also [www.case.edu/ech/articles/l/lipscomb-james-samuel](http://www.case.edu/ech/articles/l/lipscomb-james-samuel) (retrieved Nov 3, 2021)

<sup>14</sup> Report on Organization and Staffing of the Management Development Institute, April 29, 1961, p. 7; Catalogued reports, 631, box 33, FA739A.

<sup>15</sup> Report on Organization and Staffing of the Management Development Institute, April 29, 1961, p. 7; Catalogued reports, 631, box 33, FA739A.

<sup>16</sup> Georges A. Fiechter to Tomas H. Carroll, Vice President, Ford Foundation, December 1, 1959, Reel L-71, file 59-315, FA734.