



EDEN DOCTORAL SEMINAR ON CULTURAL STUDIES IN COMPARATIVE EMPIRICAL BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT STUDIES

May 29-31, 2024

Day 1

09.00 – 09.30 Introduction and registration

09.30 – 10.30 Fundamental Assumptions in Cross Cultural Management Research (Mikael Søndergaard/Ute Stephan)

Cross cultural management research begins with the observations that theories and evidence from one country need not apply elsewhere, that cultural geography includes countries, civilizations larger than countries, and within-country regions, and that generalized theory and local experience complement one another.

Readings:

Hofstede, G. (1980). Motivation, leadership, and organization: Do American theories apply abroad? *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 9, no. 1, 42-63.

Huntington, S.P. (1993). The clash of civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*, 72, 3, 22-49.

Morris, M.W., Leung, K., Ames, D. & Lickel, B. (1999). Views from inside and outside: Integrating emic and etic insights about culture and justice judgment. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 781-796.

10.30 – 10.45 Break

10.45 – 12.00 Cross Cultural Management Research Sources: Psychology (Ute Stephan/Mark F. Peterson)

The psychological sources of cross-cultural management research include the innovation of adapting societal theories of values to organize disparate studies of attitudes, recognizing the non-consciously embraced aspects of thought, and making applications to management topics.

Readings:

Rokeach, M., (1968). A theory of organization and change within value-attitude systems, *Journal of Social Issues*, 24 (1), 13 – 33.

Kitayama, S., & Park, J. (2010). Cultural neuroscience of the self: Understanding the social grounding of the brain. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 5(2-3), 111-129.

Stephan, U. (2022). Cross-cultural innovation and entrepreneurship. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*.

12.00 – 13.00 Lunch

13.00 – 14.15 Cross Cultural Management Research Sources: Anthropology (Mikael Søndergaard)

Anthropology, the original home of cultural research, provides cross-cultural management scholarship with insights about basic culture concepts, ways of studying culture, and considerations about justifying the dependability of qualitative analyses.

Readings:

Mead, M. (1954). Cultural discontinuities and personality transformation. *Journal of Social Issues*, Supplement No. 8, 3- 15.

Cluckhohn, F.R. (1950). Dominant and substitute profiles of cultural orientation: Their significance for the analysis of social stratification. *Social Forces*, 28, 376-393.

Bluedorn, A.C. (1998). An interview with anthropologist Edward T. Hall. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 7,(2), 109 - 115

Clifford, J. (1983). On ethnographic authority. *Representations*, 2, 132-143.

14.15 - 14.30: Break

14.30– 15:45 Cross Cultural Research Management Sources: Sociology (Mark F. Peterson/Ute Stephan)

Sociological conceptualizations and analyses of culture have sought explanations for qualities of larger scale societies and more industrialized societies than those that anthropologists traditionally study. In so doing, sociologists have developed questionnaire-based research methods and culture explanations based on modernization.

Readings:

Swidler, A., (1986). Culture in action: Symbols and strategies, *American Sociological Review*, 51,2, 273 – 286.

Inglehart, R. & Baker, W.E. (2000). Modernization, cultural change, and the persistence of traditional values, *American Sociological Review*, 65, 19- 51.

Kaufman, J. (2004). Endogenous explanation in the sociology of culture. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 335–57.

15.45 – 16.00 Break

16.00 – 17.30 Culture’s Consequences (Mikael Søndergaard)

Distinctive country characteristics had been a topic of interest to organization scholars at least since WWII, but scholarly dissatisfaction with ad hoc concepts and explanations for these differences grew through the 1970s. Hofstede offered what proved to be an influential framework for country culture analysis that did much to shape the field.

Readings:

Child, J. (1981). Culture, contingency and capitalism in the cross-national study of organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, JAI Press Inc., vol. 3, 303-356.

Hofstede, G. (2001, 2003). Values and culture, in *Culture’s Consequences: International differences in work-related values*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1-40.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G.J., & Minkov, M., Chapter 2, in *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*, 3rd edition, New York; McGraw-Hill, USA, 2010, 27 – 47.

Day 2

08.30- 9.45: Comparative Organizational Research since Hofstede (Mark F. Peterson)

Although very influential in organization studies and other fields, Hofstede’s framework has been continuously modified by analyzing geographical areas larger than countries and by using alternative ways to represent culture dimensions similar to some of his.

Readings:

Sondergaard, M. (forthcoming), Hofstede's Consequences 1980 – 2022, in *Hofstede's Consequences, Cultural Matters in Management*, Malaga, S., Erten, C., Bell, R., Claes, M.T., Yazici, S., Karabag., A., (eds)., Routledge.

Ronen, S. & Shenkar, O. (2013). Mapping world cultures: Cluster formation, sources and implications. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 44, 867 – 897.

Minkov, M. & Kaasa, A. (2021). A test of the revised Minkov-Hofstede model of culture: Mirror images of subjective and objective culture across nations and the 50 US States. *Cross Cultural Research*, 55(2-3), 230-281.

Beugelsdijk, S. & Welzel, C. (2018). Dimensions and dynamics of national culture: Synthesizing Hofstede with Inglehart. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 49(10), 1469-1505.

9.45 - 10.00 Break

10.00 – 11.00 GLOBE (Ute Stephan/Mikael Søndergaard)

Among several efforts to build on and overcome perceived limitations in Hofstede's framework, PROJECT GLOBE has been the most influential despite several limitations.

Readings:

Javidan, M. et al. (2006). Conceptualizing and measuring cultures and their consequences: A comparative review of GLOBE's and Hofstede's approaches, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37, 897 – 914.

Hofstede, G. (2006). What did GLOBE really measure? Researchers' minds versus respondents' minds, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37, 882 – 896.

Stephan, U. & Pathak, S. (2016). Beyond cultural values? Cultural leadership ideals and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing* 31 (5), 505-523

11.00 -11.45 Theorizing Societal Values and Personal Values: Level of analysis (Mark F. Peterson)

Most management approaches to analyzing societal culture design country-level measures that derive from individuals' responses to questionnaires. Hofstede, GLOBE, and several other frameworks explained that individual-level and country-level measurement structures (e.g., reliabilities and factor structures) differed, lack of careful theorizing about how individuals are influenced by societal culture has generated considerable confusion about levels of analysis.

Readings:

Peterson, M.F. & Barreto, T.S. (2014). The like it or not proposition: Implications of societal characteristics for the cultural expertise and personal values of organization members, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35, 8, 1134-1152.

Peterson, M.F., & Barreto, T.S. (2018). Interpreting societal culture value dimensions. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 49(9), 1190-1207.

11.45 - 12.45 Lunch

12.45-13.45 SVS and Tightness (Ute Stephan/Mikael Søndergaard)

The first two afternoon sessions cover other potentially useful culture dimension frameworks. The Schwartz Value Survey (SVS) approach to assessing societal culture has strongly influenced cross-cultural psychology for several decades and is the basis for several management studies by Ralston and colleagues. Unlike the Hofstede and GLOBE approaches, SVS research started as an analysis of personal values and has carefully comparing personal values with

societal values developed from the same data set. Gelfand and colleagues' study of cultural tightness and looseness builds from Triantis's earlier conceptualization of individualism and collectivism.

Readings:

Ralston, D.A. et al. (2011). A 21st century assessment of values across the global workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 104, 1-31.

Schwartz, S. (2006). A Theory of Cultural Value Orientations: Explication and Applications, *Comparative Sociology*, 5(2-3), 137-182. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1163/156913306778667357>

Gelfand, M. J., Raver, J. L., Nishii, L., Leslie, L. M., Lun, J., Lim, B. C., ... & Yamaguchi, S. (2011). Differences between tight and loose cultures: A 33-nation study. *Science*, 332(6033), 1100-1104.

Be sure to also read the online supplemental material for Gelfand et al. (2011). at <https://www.science.org/action/downloadSupplement?doi=10.1126%2Fscience.1197754&file=gelfand.som.pdf>

13.45 – 14.30: Aggregating Personal Values and Psychological Dimensions (Ute Stephan/ Mark F. Peterson)

Other potentially useful culture measures that rarely appear in business research derive societal culture measures from personality characteristics and measures of the self to further document and explain why societies have sufficient influence on individuals to construct aggregate measures.

Readings:

McCrae, R.R., & Terracciano, A. (2005). Personality profiles of cultures: Aggregate personality traits. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 89(3), 407-425.

Vignoles, V.L., Owe, E., Becker, M., Smith, P.B., Easterbrook, M.J., Brown, R., et al. (2016). Beyond the 'East-West' dichotomy: Global variation in cultural models of selfhood. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 145(8), 966–1000.

14.30 – 14.45 Break

14.45 – 15.45 Methodology in Comparative Organizational Study: Multilevel Modeling (Mark F. Peterson/ Ute Stephan)

Level of analysis issues extend beyond the differences between individual and societal level measures to issue of how best to model relationships between levels. To deal with such issues, multilevel modeling is increasing used, especially in strategy applications of culture characteristics, and the proliferation of different, not fully appreciated methods are generating new issues.

Readings:

Peterson, M.F., Arregle, J.L., & Martin, X. (2012). Multilevel models in international business research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 43, 451-457.

Bliese, P. D., Maltarich, M.A. & Hendriks, J.L. (2018). Back to basics with mixed-effects models: Nine take-away points. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 33, 1-23.

Peterson, M.F. (2021). Experiences in promoting MLM submissions to JIBS. Presentation for the Multilevel Methods (MLM) in International Business Research: Utility and new Insights, 2nd Webinar in the AIB RM SIG Webinar Series, May 19, 2021. Revised August 10, 2021.

15.45 – 16.00 Break

16.00 – 17.00 Boundaries Defining Cultural Units of Analysis (Mark F. Peterson/Mikael Søndergaard/Ute Stephan)

The use of countries as the primary level of analysis for culture research in business has long produced questions about the correspondence of countries with cultural groups and whether some alternative cultural groupings, notably within-country cultural regions, might be more useful.

Readings:

Keating, M. (2008). A quarter century of the Europe of regions. *Regional and Federal Studies*, 18(5): 629-635.

Peterson, M.F., Søndergaard, M., Kara, A., (2018) Traversing cultural boundaries in IB: The complex relationships between explicit country and implicit cultural group boundaries at multiple levels, *Journal of International Business*, 49(8): 1081–1099.

Kara, A., Peterson, M.F. & Søndergaard, M. (2021). Seeking and explaining culturally meaningful within-country regions: A functional, institutional, and critical event analysis. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 21(3), 507-544.

Day 3

08.30– 10.00 Adjusting Culture Scores and Measuring Distance (Mark F. Peterson)

Once decisions are made about which culture dimension framework is most useful for a particular research application, other choices are needed about whether to update the framework, adjust measures for country culture heterogeneity, or to instead study cultural distance between countries.

Readings:

Tang, L., & Kaveos, P. (2008). A framework to update Hofstede's cultural value indices: Economic dynamics and institutional stability. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 39, 1045–1063.

Bagchi, K., Hart, P. & Peterson, M.F. (2004). IT Product adoption and the influence of national culture. *Journal of Global Information Technology Management*, 7 (4), 29-46.

Beugelsdijk, S., Ambos, B. & Nell, P.C. (2018). Conceptualizing and measuring distance in international business research: Recurring questions and best practice guidelines. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 49(9), 1113-1137.

Siganos, A., & Tabner, I. T. (2020). Capturing the role of societal affinity in cross-border mergers with the Eurovision Song Contest. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 51(2), 263-273.

10.00 – 10.15 Break

10.15 – 11.15 Discussion Panel: Do's and Don'ts in Publishing Culture-Related Research

(Mark F. Peterson/Ute Stephan/Mikael Søndergaard)

11.15 – 12.15 Presentations

Feedback based on video-based presentations and discussion points sent by participants prior to the workshop

12.15 – 13.15 Lunch

13.15 – 17.30 Presentations of participants' papers

Feedback based on video-based presentations and discussion points sent by participants prior to the workshop

17.30 – 18.00 Evaluation & End