

INSTITUTIONAL AND NEO-INSTITUTIONALISM THEORY IN THE INTERNATIONAL MANAGEMENT OF ORGANIZATIONS

José G. Vargas-Hernández

Universidad de Guadalajara

Centro Universitario de Ciencias Económicas Administrativas

Periférico Norte 799 Edificio G-306 - Zapopan, Jalisco C.P. 45100; Mexico

E-mail: josevargas@cucea.udg.mx

ABSTRACT

The aim of this paper is to analyze the theoretical methodological construction of institutional and neo-institutionalism theories as reality explanations of international management phenomena in organizations. It starts off from the assumption that institutional and neo-institutionalism theories of international management of organizations have evolved in parallel form to the prevalent scientific paradigms of that time. In this paper it is shown that the theoretical methodological developments of the institutional and neo-institutional theories have fluctuated.

KEY WORDS: International management, institutionalism, neo-institutionalism

INTRODUCTION

During the last years, when the processes of economy globalization advance quickly, epistemic thinking and the openings to new conversations and new approaches to the production of theory in the field of international management, is emphasized. The management academics try to codify their epistemological and theoretical methodological researches to follow the steps of the developed scientific paradigms within the multi-paradigmatic world of the organizational theory in favor of a consensus and a technical certainty. The high quality of the research implies scientific

studies of the global phenomena - local (glocal) with the objective of building theories that can imply, explain and predict the specific phenomena and to relate them with the local social and cultural context.

The methodological theoretical construction of explanations of the reality of the phenomena of the international management of the organizations has evolved, subject to the paradigms of the science that prevail at the same time. The economy institutionalism sustained in the pure theories of the economy rationality, that of the main agency and the transaction costs, among others, motivated the analyses of the international management of the organizations, at a time in which the operations of the multinational corporations expand. The neo-institutionalism arises with historical, sociological focuses and of the rational election that determine the processes of the international management of institutional reformation, during the phase of most expansion. The reactions to the institutional tendencies are expressed in the ways of the constructivism, the interpretive critic's perspective and the postmodernist within the field of international management.

The ideas and the theories become popular or unpopular at a certain time, not because they are more to less truth, but because the value systems that support them, are activated or suppressed by institutional or ecological developments (Hofstede, 1980:323). To identify the best transferable practices in a predetermined and categorical way with a society or specific culture, it is a problematic situation from the perspective of the main theories of international management.

Institutional theory

The institutionalism of the first half of the XIX century had a descriptive orientation and it used inductive reasoning. The old institutionalism of Commons (1950) considers that the existent institutions at a certain time represent imperfect and pragmatic solutions to past conflicts. In this way, the institutional history is a selection process on a group of institutional practices on a group of alternatives in a process of taking pragmatic decisions that involve the discovery through research and negotiation of what is the best practice in the current circumstances of interests, organized in conflict, to impose their collective will between the groups and on the individuals.

The institutionalist describe the institutions as government's action in the organizational fields. The institutions are considered as the agents' resources and rational actors to obtain the

achievement of their objectives. The institutions are outlines, norms and human devised regulations that allow and constrain the behavior of the social actors and make social life predictable and significant (Scott, 2001; North, 1990, DiMaggio and Powell, 1991). Political sociology and institutionalism of the political science conceptually founded the notion of good government, pushing the setting-up of democratic governability processes and the analysis of the policy informalization processes. Good government, essence of the democratic governability, is centered in the formulation processes and public policies, creative and regulators of institutions and mechanisms that allow the collective actors, to agree, negotiate and assume functions of surveillance on the public environment.

There exists an emergent consensus that relations the values, common ideas, principles and norms that are sustained by state and non state institutions that are involved in the corporate governability. The institutionalization of the principles of corporate governability through the emission of codes has an impact on the integrated institutional nets that try to regularize the expectations. The institutionalism instruments are applied to the political science in the analysis of the breakup processes as an unavoidable action of Latin American social differentiation. Political sociology describes the complexity and fragility of the insertion of civil society into the public environment and it heads the critics towards the neo-liberal development pattern imposed by the state.

There is an ample consensus that the institutional theory offers a powerful approach for the study of the international management, it has been surprising that little time has been spent in the discussions on what kind of approach is the most appropriate. A growing number of academics of international management are applying the institutional theory to the study of the multinationals, as it provides a rich theoretical foundation to examine a wide range of critical topics and it allows the theory in multiple levels of essential analysis for the research of the multinationals. As critical approaches to the international management they gain importance in the literature of organizational studies, (Peltonen, 2006), the researchers end up being increasingly conscious that the theory about the differences of power among the units of the multinational, between west and non-west is essential to determine the contested nature of the processes of international management.

Some of the fundamental applications of the institutional theory within the literature of international management, includes the conceptualization of the national environments in terms of regulatory, normative and cognitive pillars introducing such constructors such as institutional profiles of the country, to conceptualize the transformation processes in large scale of the national systems, through the notions of institutional transition, rising and imperfection, to explain the systems of comparative national business, based on institutional involvement, to explain the similarities in the practices through the organizations that are of isomorphic pressures, to explain the restrictions in the diffusion and institutionalization of practices in the organizations through frontiers and multinational units and to explain the relationships between the multinationals and their environment hosts based on the notions of legitimacy and the possibility of what is foreign.

Organizational institutionalism examines the adaptations and conformations of the organizations to the pressures of the institutional environment to get legitimacy (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983, 1991; Scott, 2001). These authors have analyzed the diffusion of institutions among organizations in settlements through evolutionary processes of variation, selection and retention of typically practical institutions and organizational forms.

The role of the social agents, within the context of the consistent multinationals, with the old institutionalism, the actor's preferences are influenced by the socialization processes. They imply norms and values that arise in national or localized places. An implication of the markets within the institutional and ideological context is that they are not constructions of abstract and historical economy theory, but rather they can never be free. The institutional context provides opportunities to explore the construction of the theories more than an exploitative orientation where constructors, theories and methods applied, are already accepted.

There are various articles in literature related with institutionalism that are instructive to develop more forms of treating such theoretical topics as the emergency of the institutions, how the organizations give meaning to their complex institutional environments, how the organizations actively position themselves within the meta, meso and intra fields, how the agency takes place, how the agency is implied, which they are the motivational forces that guide the organizational similarity and how the organizations survive, given the complexity of the social limitations they face. One cannot count on the external ones for believable commitments (Williamson, 1996:50)

they should be monitored, a conclusion that the economy of the transaction costs share with the theory of the agency where the agents are seen as self-interested parts (Kim, Prescott and Kim, 2005).

Culture does not play an outstanding role in these theories and is only incorporated in some of the suppositions. These theories have been eclipsed in recent years by the economy transaction costs (Williamson, 1975, 1985) that has become in the predominant theoretical basis. Cultural distance emerged as measure and metaphor at the same time as the theory of transaction costs (Williamson, 1979). The metaphors, the theories and the methods can have a symbiotic existence. The unconditional acceptance of the metaphor of cultural distance was encouraged by the prevalence of the theories of transaction costs and the agency, narrow and positive. Critics of the cultural reductionism of the theory of cultural distance, advance the notion of institutional distance (Kostova and Roth, 2002), as an alternative form of measuring the similarities and differences between the regulatory, cognitive and normative institutions. Clearly the cultural orientation from this organization perspective, as the result of a market flaw, exempt of any power ramification, (Hofstede, 1983, 1993, 1994, 1996), the costs transaction theory, does not treat directly with the culture or the foreign investment.

Some parallelisms are evident between the hegemony concept and the isomorphic stability of the institutional theory. In both, the social order is seen as contingent in a balance of the coerced pressure of rules and more consensual forces of norms, cognitive reference frameworks, and ideas that are thought to be had. The construction processes or of challenges to the hegemony correspond to the political pattern of the action, in the organizational fields, (Fligstein, 1997:398), who points out the importance of the actors to maintain an image of lack sense of themselves to frame the matters in the forms that resonate with the interest conceptions in order to build more ample coalitions. The pattern of collective action emphasizes the importance of conflict, power and policies in its implications in the institutional innovation. Alvarez, Mazza, Pedersen and Svejnova (2005) have advanced to a complex theory of the action.

These concepts incorporated to the studies of the institutional change, still promise greater research developments for the institucionalists. The institucionalists analyzes the conflict, power and policies in the institutional change. They also describe the intentional efforts of the institutional

actors that affect the institutional change. Institutional change is defined as a difference in form, quality or state in time in an institution. The change in an institutional arrangement can be determined, observing the arrangement in two or more points in the time in a group of institutional dimensions.

The processes of institutional change are frequently political processes of mobilization of campaigns to legitimize the social and ethnological innovation in the organizations. Braithwait and Drahos /2000) propose processes models of institutional change, considering that change is a characteristic precipitated by the occurrence of the significance or dysfunction of an event that causes the appreciation or threatens the new opportunity. Clemens and Cook (1999), developed a theoretical treatment of institutional change that integrates structural, ecological, and dialectical processes models of change and they argue presenting empiric evidences, that the institutions do not always reproduce dependably, depending on variables as the characteristics of the social nets, learning of the actors, contradictions and multiplicity of institutions, etc. The institutional arrangements, in those that the institutional change takes place, as well as in the efforts of the social activists, and of the technological entrepreneurs that encourage these changes.

The field concept derives from the attention from the institutional theory to the behavior of the organizations within the interrelated nets. The organizational fields consist of regulator agencies, professional societies, consumers, suppliers, and organizations that produce goods and similar services that exhibit different game rules, relational nets, and resource distributions, (Rao, Morril, and Zald, 2000: 251). The institutional theories explain the convergence and stability in the fields in terms of isomorphic regulative forces, cognitive and normative. The institutional theoretical, have emphasized the conflicting nature of the response of the actors on the structures and processes of the field, (Macguire et al, 2004). Hoffman's (1999: 352) analysis on environmental practices in competition and the discursive reference framework, emphasizes how the constituent fields are frequently armed with opposed perspectives more than with common rhetorical in a process that can likened more towards institutional war than an isomorphic dialogue.

The challenges to institutionalism within the context of the multinationals, respond more to the meso analysis level and less to the meta and intra levels. Therefore, the alternative is to mix the levels of the institutional processes which are more outstanding than the meso level. It is more

appropriate under conditions of institutional ambiguity and contradictions than the meso level and although it is valid, it is less so, when it is applied at the meta and intra analysis levels, due to the environment of traditionally weak international business. Since the meso level is exactly where most of the research of the multinationals is made, the multinationals should be considered in the research of international management and to be involved less in the parochial matter and more in the construction of a sophisticated theory, intellectually within the institutional perspective, which requires multidisciplinary approaches and an ontological change of pure positivism and of empiricism. The institutional theory is seen as the source of the theoretical developments, while international management is relegated to the role of the application of these ideas.

Phillips and Tracey (2009) criticize that the new developments in the institutional theory have been ignored by the academics of the international management, when these developments present important ideas that can provide better answers to institutional matters, in the research of the multinational corporations. Kostova, Roth and Dacin (2008), formally question the current formal applications in the research of multinationals, through a group of provocations, which respond to the limits of the context of the multinationals in the institutional theory, particularly the new perspective that has been dominating the research of international management.

It is questioned if the institutional theory is useful for the research in international management, and if these ideas are valid within the context of the multinationals which apply and which need to be modified and require more development. Recognizing these distinctions, Kostova and Zhaheer (1999), offer a special theory on the genuineness of the multinationals, arguing that it is necessary because the multinationals emphasize the condition of complexity, in legitimating the external environment, the intra-organizational environment and the legitimating processes.

The academics can ask themselves which is the best conceptualization that recognizes the areas of institutional life of multinational corporations by means of a point of view of a more developed organizational field, and aims at concrete notions in which the field notion is reconsidered to incorporate the new roles of diverse and more distributed actors, the topics of the agency and the contextualization, the cognitive tools such as scripts, outlines and typifications. The theory suggests that the organizational field is a useful concept to understand the institutional environment that multinational corporations face in the institutional contexts in which they operate

(Phillips and Tracey, 2009:170). To treat with these topics is the primary form in that international management should be able to apply and to move towards the perspective of institutional theory.

It has been criticized that institutional theory has been applied to the study of the multinational corporations. Kostova, Roth and Dacin (2008) they consider that the research has come short in determining the theoretical implications of the context of the multinationals, and the use of the distinction of the organizations maintains a potential to strengthen the construction of the theory in this area, but the nature of the multinationals elevates fundamental questions about the validity of this perspective for this context, specifically the significant things, that are the notions of organizational field, isomorphism, genuineness and disconnection when they are considered to the multinationals.

The currents of the liberal institutionalism and constructivism challenge the realistic interpretation. The institutional engineering that impels liberalism is very suggestive. Liberal institutionalism differs from the realists in the prospects for the creation and maintenance of the regime. For the liberal, the regimens is frequently created by the States, they share mutual topics strongly in specific thematic areas (Zacher and Sutton, 1998:3). These regimens can modify the preferences of the State by means of the creation of forums for international negotiation as mechanisms for the resolution of conflicts. But the liberal institutions are neither perfect nor coherent in their rules, norms, laws, customs, traditions, moral uses, etc. In the liberal institutions they mix legality and legitimacy, laws and morality, the norms and the customs, etc., which derive in some occasions in economy, political and social dysfunction. The currents of liberal institutionalism and constructivism challenge the realistic interpretation. Liberal institutionalism differs from the realists in the prospects for the creation and maintenance of the regime. For the liberals, the regimens are created by the States; they frequently share mutual topics strongly in specific thematic areas (Zacher and Sutton, 1998:3).

However due to the many limitations, the academics should not abandon the institutional theory as a perspective, although the academics in international management should move away from the few institutional basic ideas, that have been used continually and indiscriminately. These ideas have limited the validity and require a serious theoretical reconsideration of the multinationals. Kostova, Roth and Dacin (2008) suggest that the basic notions of fields,

isomorphism's, disconnection and genuineness need to be modified, given the nature of the multinationals and they propose that the academics in international management should develop applications of the most sophisticated institutional theory, for the study of the multinationals by means of the incorporation of a more ample institutional literature.

Neo-institutionalism

Neo-institutionalism that agglutinates historical, sociological and rational election focuses, appears at the beginning of the last decade as a group of rules that determine the processes of institutional reformation starting off from the frameworks of incentives and restrictions imposed on the behaviors of the different agents and economy, social and politicians actors for the formulation and installation of public policies and that have an impact in the results measured in terms of growth and development. The first interpretations of the theory of the new institutionalism were focused directly on isomorphism and legitimating, but a significant body of the most recent works, has demonstrated a strong and sustained interest in agency and change. Oliver (1991) reorients the lack of attention to the human agency to the early neo-institutionalism, it combined the institutional theory, with the resources dependence theory, to develop typologies of strategic answers to the pressures of the environment.

Neo-institutionalism studies the features of the economy institutional structures that facilitate the development of the peoples. According to Burgos Silva (2002), the neo-institutionalism economy analysis, defines the artificial institutionalism and economy development, it questions rights as instruments of the economy development and it recognizes the informal institutions and promotes institutional mechanisms considered as good. The neo-institutionalism theory argues that the importance of the normative reference framework and the behavior rules to guide, constrain, and create power within the organizations, those that are considered, consist of cognitive structures, activities, normative and regulative that give meaning to the social behavior. The analyses in political science from the perspective of the new institutionalism starting off from the rational election of the individuals, to the incentives that they offer the institutions, understood as the rules that prescribe, outlaw and allow the behaviors.

The neo-institutionalism emphasizes the institutions that define the behavior of the actors in

front of its social media. The neo-institutionalism economy analyzes the flaws of the mechanisms of the State and its inefficacies. The neo-institutionalism economy demonstrates the deficiencies and inabilities of the State as a governability mechanism, and coordination that guarantees the agreements and commitments on property. Neo-institutionalism economy relates in an inextricable way economy and politics and it analyzes the flaws of the mechanisms of the State and its inefficacies. According to the neo-institutionalism theory of the economy, underdevelopment has been the result of the State's flaws to provide the structures of necessary governance to guarantee the institutions that bolster the development of the peoples. Neo-institutionalism recommends a strong State but limited in its functions. The content of the State is only to guarantee to the market the possibility to exercise its function without blocking its work and to protect it from other people's interferences (Estefanía, 2002).

The role of the values is central to the old institutionalism but the neo-institutionalism is guided more towards the cognitive processes. Greenwood and Hinings (1996:1022) summarize this change pointing out that the old institutionalism emphasizes the topics of influence, coalitions and the competition values were central, together with the power and the informal structures and the new institutionalism that emphasizes the genuineness, involvement of the organizational fields and the centrality of the classification, routines, scripts and outlines. The new institutionalism assists the organizational fields as analysis units. The institutional processes can give certain stability to the organizational fields, although these are always evolving and they are not static, solving by means of socially negotiated consent the interpretation differences.

The model of institutional design sustained in the neo-institutionalism theory, (Barley and Tolbert, 1997) and the adapted human agency of the structuring model, argue that the actors can consciously choose to revise more than to reply the existent institutions. New institutionalism is based on a methodological individualism that is based in the principle that, all the results of the human actions are explained by the individual action whose interactions in the structures, legitimize the institutions. This methodological individualism tends to motivate the individuals in function of their actions. The neo-institutionalism seeks to order the public sphere under an outline of institutions guided more to the private classification that annihilates all pretense of economy, social and political equality, starting off from the supposition that they have already been obtained

by the democratic régime. Between the neo-institutionalism focus and that of democratic regulation, emerges the governability concept as an existent relationship between the processes of free market and the processes of democracy. Neo-institutionalism is based more on deductive reasoning and is expressed in two big focuses: in the election of the governance structures of the private actors' deprived in a certain environment, that becomes the object of economy analysis and in the institutional change in function of the effects that the different institutional environments have in the economy and in the development of institutions with the support of shared mental models and ideologies.

Most of the academics of international management have a narrow point of view on the institutional theory centered more on neo-institutionalism (Meyer and Rowan, 1977) and using the concepts of organizational field, genuineness, isomorphism and mechanisms of international pressures. The neo-institutionalism model essentially maintains that organizational survival is determined by the alignment degree with the organizational environment and therefore, the organizations have to fulfill the external organizational pressures.

A revision to the applications of the institutional theory in international management identifies the topics that have been studied and the main institutional ideas used, which has been dominated by a narrow subset of institutional ideas that first come from neo-institutionalism. If a nominal quantity of agencies are allowed, neo-institutionalism suggests that the incorporation of institutional elements allows the organizational actors to take the organization as legitimate and therefore, encouraging its probability of survival.

Similar conclusions are derived from Lawrence and Phillips' work (2004) who suggest that institutional change in the form of arrangements of the new institutionalism is not only of the macro historical exogenous context, but also of the institutional action of the entrepreneurs. The concept of institutional entrepreneurs is central to the new institutionalism theory, but it remains institutional to the institutional analysis in international management. This concept has relevance for the multinationals which wish to operate in different contexts and they should end up being a main topic in international management. The internationalization brings the power of the enterprises as agents of institutional change.

Kostova and Dacin (2009) argue that the international management academics have been

using a very narrow subset of neo-institutionalism ideas that do not have the potential to manage the complexity of the context of the multinational ones and they do not reflect the new developments in the institutional theory. Kostova, Roth and Dacin (2008:997) say that the academics of international management are based on a point of view of the institutional dynamics of the theory of the new institutionalism, that essentially sustains that the survival of the organization is determined by the alignment degree with the institutional environment while it allows a nominal quantity of the agency, the institutionalist suggest that the incorporation of the sent elements, allows the organizational actors to behave to the organization as legitimate and therefore encouraging the possibilities of survival. This criticism refers to a version of the institutional theory.

Kostova, Roth and Dacin (2008:1003) conclude that the theory of the new institutionalism, just as it is constituted at the moment, is not appropriate for the study of the multinationals and they provide specific criticisms. (Greenwood and Hinings, 1996:1024) propose that the old and the new can be combined in order to provide a model of change, that connects the organizational context with the dynamic intra-organizational. Kostova, Roth and Dacin (2008) develop a group of provocations that challenge the validity of the traditional neo-institutionalism and they offer ideas in a more novel theory, based on the integration of the old one and the new institutionalism. All the units in the multinationals can be seen as belonging to the same intra-organizational institutional field which controls within the frontiers of the enterprise. This field can be stronger in exercising influence on the members; this is on the multinational subunits that the traditional external field discussed in the neo-institutionalism. Kostova, Roth and Dacin (2008) they contend that the multinationals be involved in less disconnections and ceremonials than those suggested typically by the neo-institutionalism. Kostova, Roth and Dacin (2008) consider that theoretically these conditions are understood better if the ideas of the old institutionalism mix with the neo-institutionalism points of view. Opposed to the neo-institutionalism on static, results, knowledge and the domain and continuity of the environment, the old institutionalism is focused on the dynamics, the construction of the social change, and values and it emphasizes a point of view dominated by the agency (Hirsch and Lounsbury, 1997:406).

Phillips and Tracey (2009) present the recent developments of the neo-institutionalism theory

and they suggest that it is not that the theory of the new institutionalism is not relevant to the international management as it is to the form of the institutional theory adopted in the first ideas of the new institutionalism and especially that of Scott (1995). One should not abandon the neo-institutionalism perspective, but rather to converge with many sociologists and it is suggested that the old institutionalism and the new institutionalism should be brought together for the study of the multinationals, introducing elements for an approach that can be considered as an initial replica to Kostova, Roth and Dacin's (2008) provocations, and as the foundations of a more refined theory about the multinationals.

Phillips and Tracey (2009) build on the recent developments of the institutional theory to question Kostova, Roth and Dacin's (2008) arguments and they criticize their discussion on the concept of the organizational field and they argue for the utility of the concept of the institutional entrepreneur and they agree that the conceptualization of institutionalism theory, in international management, is inadequate but they suggest some alternative forms of thought.

The academics of international management ignore the call to integrate the old and the new institutionalism that can represent a promise for the study of the multinational corporations (Greenwood and Hinings, 1996). Phillips and Tracey (2009) suggest that the researchers of international management benefit from the emergence of the mixture of the two currents, the old and the new institutionalism, focused on how the actors exercise the agency to create neo-institutionalism structures and to alter the existent ones that are diffuse through the organizational fields. They summarize this position pointing out that a more sustained consideration of the recent work of institutional theory that treats with the agency and the institutional change, as well as with isomorphism and the genuineness.

Phillips and Tracey (2009) consider as important points that the international management should benefit of the recent work of the institutional theory, the concept of organizational field provides a framework of useful reference and the study of the multinationals benefits in more developed and consistent form the use of the concept, and the concept of institutional enterprise is central in the theory of the new institutionalism but it remains marginal in the institutional analyses of international management. These three points imply a consistent point of view about the intellectual relationship between the fields of institutional theory and international management.

Phillips and Tracey (2009:169) suggest that the international management researchers benefit from the recent advances in institutional theory.

Phillips and Tracey (2009) suggest that the necessities of the researchers of international management are to take an ample point of view on the institutionalism theory and its recent developments in order to reflect the ample research body that has arisen since Scott's works (1995) and that the first institutionalists, such as Meyer and Rowan (1977) and DiMaggio and Powel (1983) integrate a same concern for the agency and the change with genuineness, stability and isomorphism. These recent works integrate a similar concern of the agency and the change and they focus their attention in the symbolic dimensions of the institutions and emphasize a symbolism of roots of social constructivism of the institutional theory, which are theoretical developments that have a great potential for the researchers of international management and to understand the institutional dimensions of multinational corporations.

Kostova and Dacin (2009) propose that the recent neo-institutionalism ideas, such as the active agency, institutional enterprise, strategy of speech and institutional contradictions and the practices, keep the promise for the international management, but the application of the recent institutional work is only a part. These efforts of the institutional enterprises to the fields of change frequently meet with resistances of the dominant fields defined by McAdam and Scott (2005: 17) as those individuals, groups and organizations whose actions and interests the field tends to solve. Especially instructive is the work on institutional enterprise (Lawrence and Phillips, 2004), rhetoric and discursive strategies (Suddaby and Greenwood, 2005), and institutional contradictions and practices, as well as the theory on the creation of institutional environments.

Due to the conceptual distinction, the context of the multinationals should be used to develop new institutional ideas. Kostova and Dacin (2009) consider that the academy of international management should use the only context of the multinationals to question the suppositions of the frontier conditions of the traditional institutional theory, creating the possibilities of new significant developments in the institutional thought, in such a way that one, not only returns something better to the literature but rather also generates something new that enriches the theoretical perspective employed.

A critic to neo-institutionalism is that it designs institutional arrangements with optimum

approaches of installation in the more developed countries, which are seriously questioned by the path dependence to be adapted in the less developed countries. It is questionable in the neo-institutionalism economy theory, the fact that the dysfunctional institutions that do not reach good levels, remain during a long time and in a prolonged underdevelopment, due fundamentally to causes of self-reinforcement mechanisms in processes of dependence of resources. The theory of the dependence of resources relates the action to the power pointing out that the organization that controls resources, of which other organizations are dependent, is able to influence these other ones.

CONCLUSIONS

In this paper it has been demonstrated that the research of international management, sustained in the institutional theories and neo-institutionalism has evolved in agreement with the evolution of the epistemological conceptions which sustain the methodological theoretical foundations of the science. These conceptions establish their domain as paradigms of the scientific explanations of the reality of the phenomena, and they reach their maturity at the same time in which they have a greater influence in the research activities of the administrative sciences in the international environment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Please refer to articles Spanish bibliography.