Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

Innovative Trends in Culture in International Business Literature: Toward Multiparadigmatic and Nonlinear Studies of Culture

Taran Patel

Grenoble Ecole de Management, Univ Grenoble Alpes ComUE, Grenoble, France

Abstract: Culture in International Business (CIB) literature has traditionally been dominated by the objectivist tradition, resulting in the following three problems: (1) grounded in the realist ontology, these studies detach culture from its social context, (2) since every paradigm has "blind-spots," an excessive reliance on one paradigm results in a body of knowledge that is partial at best, and (3) such studies oversimplify culture by reducing it to linear cause–effect relations. Consequently, some scholars have shifted from this dominant trend toward multiparadigmatic studies of culture, some of which are grounded in post-positivism and facilitate nonlinear and asymmetrical analyses of culture. This conceptual article offers four examples of multiparadigmatic studies of culture, which, it argues, offer more innovative insights into cultural phenomena than is possible through monoparadigmatic and linear cause–effect studies. Insights gleaned from this article are geared toward CIB scholars, but they are just as relevant to scholars in other management subdisciplines.

Keywords: complexity theory; multiparadigmatic research; objectivism; paradigm crossing; paradigm incommensurability; paradigm integration; post-positivism; subjectivism

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary literature on Culture in International Business (CIB) is dominated by studies grounded in the objectivist paradigm that usually explore linear cause–effect relations between culture and other variables. As an illustration, between 1980 and 2014, the *Journal of International Business Studies* (JIBS) published 206 articles on culture, and 22 of them were cited more than 100 times. Most of these 22 articles were grounded in the concept of national culture (Hofstede 1980; Hofstede and Bond 1988) or concepts derived therefrom (e.g., cultural distance [Shenkar 2001]) and explored culture's effect on organizational outcomes (e.g., MNC performance or knowledge transfer between alliance partners) in a linear and symmetric fashion. These 22 articles collectively garnered 4,562 citations, and of these 22 articles, 15 empirical articles were all grounded in the objectivist paradigm (Burrell and

Address correspondence to Taran Patel, Grenoble Ecole de Management, Univ Grenoble Alpes ComUE, 12 rue Pierre Sémard, 38003 Grenoble, France. E-mail: taran.patel@grenoble-em.com

www.m

Morgan 1979). Some studies combined qualitative and quantitative methodologies (e.g., Morosini, Shane, and Singh 1998), but they did so in the objectivist tradition, and qualitative tools simply served a secondary support function.

The objectivist paradigm's dominance in CIB literature is problematic for three reasons. First, there is a fundamental misalignment between the basic assumptions of the objectivist tradition and the nature of social sciences. Objectivist scholars, with their realist ontology, have assumed (cultural) reality is a static entity that can be measured accurately. Conversely, other scholars (e.g., Redding 2005) have maintained the social world is in a state of constant flux and that attempts to understand it in terms of variables maintaining mutual static relations are misapplied to social sciences. Thus, scholars, such as Wallerstein (1996), have advocated breaking down the barriers between the "natural" and the "social" worlds and called for seeing both as complex (Urry 2005). Based on this same assumption of static reality, objectivist studies often overlook the significance of history in how cultures come into being (Redding 2005), rendering cultural phenomena ahistorical and psychologically unaware (Guttormsen 2015). Objectivist scholars, especially adherents to the positivistic epistemology, assume only one possible answer to a research question and offer broad nomothetic cultural generalizations at national, regional, societal, or organizational levels. This treats culture as if it exists in a vacuum—dissociated from the social context within which it emerges.

Second, the continued dominance of one paradigmatic tradition (here, objectivism) has affected the kind of knowledge, which is produced and transmitted (see Douglas's 1986 "thought worlds" and Knorr Cetina's 1999 "epistemic cultures") in CIB literature. The tools that scientists choose to use are not neutral (Gigerenzer 1991); therefore, culture scholars who adhere to different paradigmatic schools form part of different cultural systems (Rohner 1984), each of which conceptualizes culture differently and has its own realms of knowledge (Rayner 1991). Each cultural system organizes knowledge to ensure its own reproduction and survival (Delbridge and Fiss 2013), and it attempts to socialize new entrants into its own tradition. Scholars from different paradigmatic schools have distinct ways of organizing knowledge, leading them to focus on certain kinds of questions and neglect others (Johnson and Cassell 2001) and causing blind spots to emerge in the schools' cultural knowledge (Lowe, Moore, and Carr 2007). Because every paradigmatic school has its own strengths and weaknesses, an excessive reliance on any one paradigmatic tradition results in a distorted (partial, at best) understanding of culture over time and a neglect of those topics that do not "fit" into the realms of dominant traditions. This observation is also true of extant CIB literature.

Third, culture studies grounded in the objectivist paradigm oversimplify an otherwise complex construct (Tayeb 2001) by reducing it to mathematical formulae and linear cause–effect relations (Whitley 1999) and ignoring that culture represents a "complex whole, which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, custom and any other capabilities and habit acquired by man [person] as a member of society" (Tylor 1871/1920: 1). These studies rely on symmetric tests involving correlations or regression analysis to deconstruct the culture's complex whole and report on the "net effect" of each part's impact on the dependent variable in question (Ferguson, Megehee, and Woodside 2015). However, relationships between variables may also be nonlinear (Urry 2005), and the same cause can produce different effects in

diverse circumstances. Similarly, Gladwell (2002) explained after a certain threshold point, even minor changes in the controlling variables can bring about a major system change. Such "tipping points" result in unexpected structures and events (Urry 2005, 5). Therefore, outcomes may arise from the coming together of multiple causal factors, not just one; and the same causal factors may lead to different (even contradictory) outcomes in different contexts (see Ordanini, Parasuraman, and Rubera 2014 as cited in Ferguson, Megehee, and Woodside 2015). Thus, assuming linear cause–effect relations between individual cultural dimensions and other variables may be overly simplistic and needs to be replaced by more complex and systemic thinking.

Scholars have realized the limitations of overly relying on the objectivist paradigm in CIB literature, and some have called for combining different paradigmatic lenses (see Maruyama 2004) to counter this dominant influence; they advocate a shift from *monoparadigmatic* to *multiparadigmatic* studies. Monoparadigmatic studies adopt a single paradigmatic lens to consistently guide the research exercise; however, multiparadigmatic research deliberately uses divergent paradigmatic lenses to contrast their varied representations and explore plurality and paradoxes characterizing social realities (Lewis and Kelemen 2002).

In subsequent sections of this article, studies that combine two or more paradigms to study a culture-related problem are referred to as *classic multiparadigmatic studies of culture*. Among these innovative thinkers, there is a distinctive group of scholars (e.g., Hsu, Woodside, and Marshall 2013; Ferguson, Megehee, and Woodside 2015) who have resorted to using the post-positivistic paradigm to study culture. Samdahl (1999) describes post-positivism as research that uses qualitative data with a belief in the importance of subjective reality, but without abandoning tenets of conventional positivism. By resorting to post-positivist paradigm, this group of scholars has shifted from simplistic linear cause–effect studies to nonlinear and asymmetrical analyses of culture. In subsequent sections of this article, such work is referred to as "*post-positivistic studies involving non-linear and asymmetrical analyses of culture*." While most extant literature on the topic has focused selectively on "classic multiparadigmatic studies of culture," extolling their many virtues (e.g., Martin, 1992; Lewis and Grimes 1999; Lewis and Kelemen 2002; Sullivan and Daniels 2008), our present endeavor not only builds on this literature, but also exposes the unique benefits of hitherto less-known "post-positivistic studies involving nonlinear and asymmetrical analyses of culture."

In the next section, the term "paradigm" is defined and different scholarly perspectives on the topic are outlined. Then the paradigmatic terrain of traditional CIB literature is mapped. Next, the article outlines some illustrative cases of innovative cultural studies—some of which are examples of classic multiparadigmatic studies, while others are post-positivistic studies involving nonlinear and asymmetrical analyses of culture. The discussion of these illustrative cases is preceded by an elaboration of their theoretical underpinnings, followed by an exposition of their comparative advantages over conventional cultural research. The hope is that such illustrative cases will encourage contemporary scholars to follow the example set by these experts and engage in more innovative studies of culture, while also encouraging practitioners and managers to engage in more pluralistic thinking when faced

with culture-related problems. The article ends with a brief discussion of its theoretical contributions, practical implications, limitations, and suggestions for future research.

INTRODUCING PARADIGMS AND DOMINANT PARADIGMATIC TRADITIONS IN CULTURE IN BUSINESS (CIB) LITERATURE

Paradigms: Definition and varied perspectives

To define paradigms, three basic terms—ontology, epistemology, and methodology—are introduced. Ontology, the theory of being, denotes assumptions about the nature of reality (Lewis and Kelemen 2002) and implies developing strategies to illuminate the components of people's social reality: what exists, what it looks like, the units that make it up, and how these units interact with each other (Blaikie 1993, 6). In contrast, epistemology, the theory of knowledge, represents researchers' assumptions to understand a phenomenon of interest and what forms of knowledge are considered scientific (Burrell and Morgan 1979) to justify the criteria that knowledge must satisfy to be called knowledge rather than beliefs (Blaikie 1993, 7). Finally, methodology is how one attempts to obtain knowledge about the real world. The net that contains the researcher's ontological, epistemological, and methodological premises is a paradigm; therefore, it is "a basic set of beliefs that guides actions" (Guba 1990, 17).

Scholars' different definitions of paradigms consequently led to varied understandings of how close-knit the components comprising a paradigm are. For instance, Burrell and Morgan (1979) adopted a restrictive paradigm conceptualization, defining them as tightly coupled, distinct ideologies, ontologies, epistemologies, and methodologies guiding the work of scholarly communities. In a different vein, Kuhn (1970, 175) defined paradigms as an "entire constellation of beliefs, values, techniques and so on shared by members of a given community." Similarly, Romani, Primecz, and Topçu (2011) defined a paradigm as a disciplinary matrix (Kuhn 1996, 182) created by various components (metaphysical parts, symbolic generalizations, exemplars, and values), some of which illustrate continuity and change during scientific revolutions. Consequently, both similarities and differences exist between paradigmatic traditions: some scholars adopt a purist perspective (e.g., Burrell and Morgan 1979), others a more pragmatic approach, allowing for the use of more than one specific paradigm, be it influenced by the ontology and/or epistemology of other paradigms (Ponterotto 2005).

Introducing two main paradigmatic traditions: Objectivism and subjectivism

The broad philosophy of science evokes two main paradigmatic traditions: objectivism and subjectivism. Objectivist scholars assume rationalization and control, and are focused on establishing causal relations through hypothesis testing. For them, reality can be objectively measured, and relations between different variables can be assessed in a linear cause-effect fashion. The objectivist tradition is characterized by a realist ontology, positivistic/functionalist/social constructivist epistemology, and nomothetic methodologies. In line with the realist ontology, scholars treat reality as tangible, stable, and deterministic in its relations among

constituent parts (Arbnor and Bjerke 1997). Those inspired by the functionalist epistemology consider the organization to be functionally effective if it achieves its goals through rational decision making (Karataş-Özkan and Murphy 2010), while those who follow the positivistic and/or social constructivist mindset assume that there is one possible answer to a research question, and offer broad generalizable results that apply across varied contexts. This last observation is in line with the nomothetic methodology of the objectivist tradition.

The subjectivist tradition is characterized by nominalist ontology, non-positivist epistemology, and idiographic methodology (Burrell and Morgan 1979). The nominalist ontology implies that subjectivist scholars treat each reality as distinct, not universal. The non-positivistic epistemology includes works grounded in interpretivism, social constructionism, and post-modernism. Interpretative and social constructionist discourses treat sensemaking individuals as engaged participants and co-creators of social structures (Zickar and Carter 2010). Social constructionists argue that knowledge and truth are socially generated, not simply discovered by organizational members (Karataş-Özkan and Murphy 2010). Post-modernists focus "on the processual as opposed to structural character of human institutions" (Cooper and Burrell 1988, 100), view organizations as disjointed, incoherent narratives, and aim to expose the pervasive and fluid nature of power relations in contemporary society. Finally, unlike the objectivist tradition's nomothetic methodology, the subjectivist tradition's idiographic methodology aims to treat each studied phenomenon as "specific" and to understand the unique phenomenon's meaning within its context.

Mapping the paradigmatic terrain in traditional CIB literature

As previously explained, a major part of contemporary CIB literature is embedded within the objectivist traditions (e.g., the works of Hofstede 1980; Taras, Rowney, and Steel 2009). In part, this is explained by the fact that contemporary cross-cultural management studies largely originated in North America and were strongly influenced by social psychological models that lay behind monocultural management studies (Tung 2006). Social psychology has been strongly positivist, and although social anthropologists have reacted strongly against this positivism, their cross-cultural and multicultural analyses have been more or less ignored by business and management scholars (see Moore 2006; Lauring and Selmer 2009; Caprar 2011 for exceptions). Social anthropology's ethnographic, descriptive, and interpretive styles were not easily built into the positivist models that dominated business and management studies' journals, and its concentration on single examples (ethnographies) did not lead to generalizing or predictive conclusions required for management journals or conferences (Chapman 1996; Bjerregaard, Lauring, and Klitmøller 2009). This explains, in part, the continuing dominance of the objectivist tradition in CIB literature.

These objectivist culture scholars, guided by their realist ontology, view culture as a measurable stable, independent, and objective phenomenon (Yaganeh, Su, and Chrysostome 2004). Functionalist culture scholars (e.g., Denison 1990) represent cultures as static and therefore comparable (Schultz and Hatch 1996) across similar entities and managerially usable to facilitate desired changes (Schein 1992). However, positivistic cultural scholars

offer broad nomothetic cultural generalizations at national, regional, societal, or organizational levels by measuring culture via instruments that quantify values, assumptions, or practices along varied cultural dimensions (Taras, Rowney, and Steel 2009) and produce nomothetic outcomes. Some of these studies focus on cultural differences between entities (e.g., nations) and their impact on organizational outcomes (Gelfand, Erez, and Aycan 2007) in a symmetric and linear fashion. Others focus on objectively measuring national culture's effect on business outcomes, such as online purchase behavior (Moon, Chadee, and Tikoo 2008), perceived service quality (Ladhari et al. 2011), and teenage shopping behavior (Gentina et al. 2014). Furthermore, some corporate culture literature (Denison and Mishra 1995; Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner 1997) and cross-cultural psychology literature (e.g., Leung et al.'s 2002 work on social axioms) also follow the objectivist tradition.

Within CIB literature's subjectivist tradition, interpretivist scholars have engaged in the ongoing, interrelated, cyclic processes of interpretation, sensemaking, understanding, and action to comprehend how cultures are constructed (Hatch 1993). By rarely exploring discontinuities in sensemaking, they produce organizational ethnographies that are, at best, static representations of dynamic processes (Schultz and Hatch 1996). Alvesson's (1990) work questioning the notion of a homogenous and unifying corporate culture illustrates the interpretivist tradition, as does Moore's (2015) discussion of managerial reality as porous, organic, and discursive and of organizations as connected with both local and global social and political processes, but both divided and integrated by these processes. For other interpretivist scholars, organizations represent the construction and deconstruction of meaning, as opposed to static and stable entities (Gray, Bougon, and Donnellon 1985), and organizational culture is a dynamic set of assumptions, values, and artifacts, with meanings that may be shared by members of a social unit, but only temporarily (Ogbonna and Harris 2002). In contrast, social constructionists (e.g., Schwandt 2000) have proposed that organizations are historically and culturally unique sites, where members collectively engage in the social construction of reality. For these scholars, culture constitutes an ongoing interpretation process, rather than a stable structure of values and norms that can be measured at a point in time (Yaganeh, Su, and Chrysostome 2004). Lastly, as followers of the subjectivist tradition, post-modernists have little tolerance for rigid categorizations of social practices, ideologies, or institutions; instead, they focus on social reality's situational, contingent, and provisional nature (Karataş-Özkan and Murphy 2010). For these scholars (e.g., Robertson and Swan 2003), claims of clarity, consensus, and consistency are oversimplifications of today's organizations, and ambiguity is an integral feature of organizational culture (Martin 2004).

Section conclusion

Despite increasing subjectivist studies, CIB literature is dominated by the objectivist tradition (see Chapman et al. 2008). Therefore, our previous assessment of the objectivist dominance in *JIBS* is further supported from a broader review of CIB literature. This dominance of the objectivist tradition in culture studies has led to three problems. First, grounded in the realist ontology, such studies often detach culture from its social context. Second, because every

paradigm has its own strengths and weaknesses, over time, an excessive reliance on any one paradigm (here, objectivism) results in cultural knowledge that is, at best, partial. Finally, such studies oversimplify an otherwise complex construct by reducing it to mathematical formulae and linear cause-effect relations. Having recognized these problems, some scholars have called for breaking away from this dominant tradition, and this has led to an innovative stream of CIB literature involving multiparadigmatic cultural studies emerging. Four illustrations of such innovative studies are presented next.

Illustrative cases of innovative culture studies

This section is divided into two subsections. The first subsection introduces classic multiparadigmatic studies of culture; the second focuses on post-positivistic studies involving nonlinear and asymmetrical analyses of culture. Each subsection offers a brief theoretical background of relevant literature, then outlines two pertinent empirical examples, and ends with a brief discussion of the benefits these studies offer over monoparadigmatic (objectivist) studies.

Classic multiparadigmatic studies of culture

Theoretical background

When faced with different paradigmatic options, scholars assume one of three metatheoretical positions: (a) paradigm incommensurability, (b) paradigm integration, or (c) paradigm crossing (Schultz and Hatch 1996). Paradigm incommensurability recognizes the distinctions between different paradigms and emphasizes the need to maintain them (Burrell and Morgan 1979). Its proponents believe the differences in the ontologies, epistemologies, and methodologies of different paradigms make it impossible to overcome the barriers between them, and thus with little possibility of effective communication between different paradigmatic tradition adherents, scholars should refrain from attempting to cross paradigmatic boundaries. Romani, Primecz, and Topçu (2011) referred to this metatheoretical position as isolationist (e.g., Scherer 1998), or protectionist, and explained that this metatheoretical position asserts paradigms' function is to preserve and perpetuate their own scientific practices. From this perspective, it is true that paradigms "are not so much complementary as competing" (Hassard and Kelemen 2002, 344, as cited in Romani, Primecz, and Topçu 2011).

The second metatheoretical position, paradigm integration, is diametrically opposed to the paradigm incommensurability position. From this position, it is possible to not only minimize the differences between different competing paradigms but also integrate their varied contributions (Willmott 1993). Romani, Primecz, and Topçu (2011) cited Pfeffer (1993) and Donaldson (1998) as advocates of this position. Pfeffer (1993) argued that a field of study cannot be expected to produce knowledge in a cumulative and developmental manner without a minimum degree of member consensus about research questions and methods. The paradigmatic integration perspective encourages dominant paradigms' integration and treats

diversity of research paradigms as a mark of lack of scientific maturity in that field (Romani, Primecz, and Topçu 2011).

Finally, the third position is paradigm crossing, in which of interest is how different paradigms may engage with one another, despite their differences. "From this position, the researcher recognizes and confronts multiple paradigms, rather than ignoring them as in the integrationist position, or refusing to confront them as in the incommensurability position" (Schultz and Hatch 1996, 5). Favoring this metatheoretical position, Romani, Primecz, and Topçu (2011) acknowledged the need for multiple paradigms and their varied ontological and epistemological standpoints because each paradigm offers only a partial understanding, but combining paradigms can allow researchers to gain richer knowledge on a given subject. Scholars adopting this metatheoretical position, therefore, prefer to engage in multiparadigmatic studies. The works of Hassard (1991) and Romani, Primecz, and Topçu (2011) fall within this category.

Illustrative cases

Case (a). Hassard (1991) used four paradigmatic lenses to explore different aspects of a British fire station employees' work-related behaviors: job motivation (functionalism), work routines (interpretivism), management training (radical humanism), and employment relations (radical structuralism). By bracketing each paradigmatic tradition and exploring the problem from different paradigmatic traditions (independently from one another), Hassard produced authentic first-hand-experience paradigm accounts.

The functionalist part of the study, which relied on Job Characteristics Theory and the Job Diagnostic Survey, used a survey instrument to assess the firefighters' motivation at different career stages (on probation, considered "qualified," and with over 15-years' experience). The findings showed that the Motivating Potential Score (MPS) of the firefighter's job was lower than other public service jobs. In itself, this was not a problem because the low MPS score reflected low scores on two of the five MPS components, autonomy (a natural outcome of the fire department's paramilitary nature) and task identity (firefighters are expected to work in emergency teams, not individually).

The interpretive part of the study involved conducting an ethnomethodology based on non-participant observation and unstructured and informal discussions with the firefighters and revealed their interpretation of cultural reality had an inherent instability component. Regular work-day tasks (e.g., maintaining equipment) were well-structured, but these did not coincide with the firefighters' real work, which was determined by emergencies. The data also revealed that probationers and promotion-oriented firefighters were more vigilant in executing their repeat tasks, but older firefighters had a much more laid-back attitude toward the same tasks.

The radical humanistic part of the study followed Clegg and Dunkerley's (1980) critical view of management studies. Relying on ethnographic data collected by attending training programs and interviewing selected trainers and participants, this part of the study revealed that the course material used during training programs allowed organizations to tightly control the message communicated to the trainees. Trainers selectively used teaching material

that reinforced the hegemony of the organization and emphasized the message that the loyalty of firefighters should reside in the command structure of the Fire Service rather than with rank-and-file firefighters. The organization's dominant culture was thus reproduced and reinforced by acceptable management theories.

Hassard (1991) used the radical structuralist approach to explore labor relations in the British Fire Service, especially focusing on a regular working-day's struggles. For the British Fire Services, working time was historically one of the most contentious issues between unions, employees, and the state. Firefighters' working hours had undergone reductions and were closer to the national averages of other kinds of manual labor, and systems were implemented that focused on greater control over work processes and increased productivity. This indirectly led to more formalization of roles and the recruitment of both skilled and peripheral semi-skilled work force.

To conclude, the functionalist part of Hassard's study saw the "organized" world characterized by certainty, but the interpretive part engaged in discovering the "life world" of social construction (Schutz 1967). The first part involved statistical correlations; the second part focused on a web of human relationships. As Hassard (1991: 288) aptly put it, the interpretive part of the research "de-concretizes the view of organizational reality created in the first paradigm; it suggests that (Fire Service) organization is a cultural phenomenon which is subject to a continuous process of enactment." Further, unlike the radical humanist approach, which examines the reproduction of hegemony through management training, the radical structuralist approach reveals the labor force's, the capital's, and the state's concrete actions in the labor processes, and the focus remains on the structural conflict not functional integration. It highlights the fire-fighting labor process's crisis points and describes state agencies' role in seeking to mediate contradictory forces and restore system equilibrium. Thus, Hassard's (1991) multiparadigmatic study demonstrates how differing frameworks contribute to our understanding of organizational behavior and how contrasting images of the subject matter emerge when researchers base their investigations upon incommensurable sets of metatheoretical assumptions.

Case (b). Romani, Primecz, and Topçu (2011) conducted a bi-paradigmatic study of bicultural interactions between Japanese and Swedish medical researchers using the *Kulturstandard* method. Like Schultz and Hatch (1996), Romani, Primecz, and Topçu (2011) subscribed to the paradigm-crossing perspective. Following the later works of Kuhn (1990) cited in Weaver and Gioia (1994), they drew parallels between paradigms and languages and argued that the lack of a common language between two groups of people does not mean that members of these two groups cannot communicate with or learn from each another. As such, conducting multiparadigmatic studies is like learning a new language.

Using the Critical Incident Technique (CIT) and semi-structured interviews, Romani, Primecz, and Topçu (2011) collected critical incidents (CIs) from respondents about their unexpected encounters with members of another culture. Then, these CIs were narrated to a cultural expert with knowledge about the other culture. Next, cultural schemas, or standards, were identified, which were confirmed/disconfirmed through supporting references from extant literature. Romani et al. used the interplay between positivism and interpretivism to conduct their bi-paradigmatic study through a three-step process. First, separate analyses

were conducted independently in accordance with each paradigm; second, the analyses were contrasted and compared to indicate possible improvements and potential for paradigm interplay; third, the analyses were placed in interaction with one another, revealing implications for theory development. Their work showed that the findings from the positivistic and interpretivistic analyses not only enrich and complement one another but also lead to possible identification of theoretical constructs that were not the initial focus of the study. In the present case, the *leader's authority* emerged as a construct resulting from the interaction between the positivist and interpretivist analyses.

Focus on the leader's authority signifies a significant shift in the conversation and is therefore a venue for interplay strategy, moving the focus from the Kulturstandards to the leader's authority. This interplay strategy reveals the connection between two cultural dimensions (see Hofstede 1980): power distance and masculinity/femininity in the framework of leadership authority. Power distance is based upon the acceptance of an unequal repartition of power, and masculinity indicates this repartition is toward achievement, but femininity implies that it is toward concerns for the social environment. While power distance signifies the exercise of power, masculinity/femininity explains its legitimacy. Thus, the two Kulturstandards (power distance and masculinity/femininity) are part of the same theoretical leadership authority framework, and the interplay strategy thus allows for the enrichment of this theoretical framework. As Romani, Primecz, and Topçu (2011) explained, the interplay is considered successful only if it respects both types of analyses (here, positivistic and interpretive), and it generates new theoretical contributions.

Benefits of classic multiparadigmatic studies of culture

Past literature is replete with references to classic multiparadigmatic studies' many advantages, such as allowing cultural scholars to contrast the varied representations of different paradigms and explore plurality and the paradoxes characterizing social realities (Lewis and Kelemen 2002) and to investigate questions that may appear logical by themselves, but are contradictory when juxtaposed with one another (Sullivan and Daniels 2008). They offer frame-breaking experiences to scholars (Lewis and Grimes 1999) and enable them to explore questions long neglected for want of suitable paradigms (Martin 1992). Multiparadigmatic studies are also believed to foster a more comprehensive portrait of organizational reality (Lewis and Kelemen 2002) and to shed more light on organizational-life tensions (Hassard 1991).

Nevertheless, the two illustrative studies in this subsection underline some key advantages of classic multiparadigmatic studies of culture. Hassard's (1991) study shows that exploring different aspects of a research problem through diverse paradigmatic lenses helps researchers acquire a more multifaceted and pluralistic understanding of the topic than is feasible through monoparadigmatic studies. Contrasting images of the subject matter emerge when researchers base investigations upon incommensurable sets of metatheoretical assumptions. Using multiple paradigms exposes organizational actors' divergent viewpoints rather than simply offering prescriptions from a few dominant elites (Hassard 1991; Lewis and Grimes 1999). In contrast, Romani et al.'s (2011) bi-paradigmatic study reveals that such studies allow for the

emergence and enrichment of new theoretical concepts as an outcome of the interplay between the two (or more) paradigms. By increasing researchers' reflexivity, multiparadigmatic studies lead to new perspectives, more innovative and creative research outcomes, and more innovative theory-building than monoparadigmatic studies (Romani, Primecz, and Topçu 2011).

Post-positivistic studies involving nonlinear and asymmetrical analyses of culture

Theoretical background

To better appreciate this innovative stream of literature, one needs a basic understanding of complexity theory. Complexity theory investigates emergent, dynamic, and self-organizing systems that cannot be reduced to elementary laws of simple processes. In these systems, the interaction between parts is far more fundamental than the parts themselves, and relations between variables can be nonlinear and accompanied by abrupt switches, resulting in the same "cause" producing different "effects." Further, any new order emerging from a process of change is itself far from equilibrium (Capra 1996). At the heart of the discussion of complexity is the notion of emergence. As Urry (2005, 5) put it, "It is not that the sum is greater than the size of its parts—but that there are systems effects that are different from their parts." Complexity focuses on how a system's components interact spontaneously with one another to develop collective properties or patterns. Also, when a system passes a particular threshold point, even minor changes in key variables lead to significant switches. These switches lead to unexpected structural changes, and their properties may become different from underlying elementary laws. Thus, the notion of complexity explains both order and disorder within all physical and social phenomena.

Complexity theory has four basic principles: equifinality, causal asymmetry, contrarian case, and necessary versus sufficient principles. The equifinality tenet holds the same outcome can occur through different recipes or combinations of antecedents (Woodside 2014). The causal asymmetry principle suggests the recipes that indicate the negation of an outcome condition are not mirror opposites of recipes indicating a positive response for the same outcome (i.e., the same antecedent condition can contribute to positive *and* negative versions of the same outcome [Ferguson, Megehee, and Woodside 2015]). The contrarian case principle suggests that when researchers obtain a main result for the relation between a configural recipe and outcome, there are always cases that do not fit in the main effect. Studying contrarian cases increases understanding of the relationship in question (Ferguson, Megehee, and Woodside 2015). The final principle of complexity theory is the necessary versus sufficient tenet, which proposes that high scores for a simple antecedent condition may be necessary but is not sufficient for a high score on the outcome (Woodside 2014).

The increasing realization that culture represents a "complex whole" (Tylor 1871/1920) and that social and cultural realities are complex and dynamic, not simple and static, has led to culture scholars' increasing dissatisfaction with objectivist linear and symmetric studies. By using symmetric tests involving correlations or regression analysis, objectivist studies

deconstruct the ingredients in a culture's complex whole and simply report on the "net effect" of each ingredient's impact on the dependent variable in question (Ferguson, Megehee, and Woodside 2015). Scholars dissatisfied with such practices have adopted a post-positivistic stance and, drawing inspiration from complexity theory, choose to address culture in a configural, nonlinear, and asymmetrical way. Two illustrations of such studies follow.

Illustrative cases

Case (a). Ferguson, Megehee, and Woodside (2015) explored the relationship between culture and tipping behaviors across countries in the restaurant and taxicab service industries. Other scholars exploring the topic (Lynn, Zinkhan, and Harris 1993; Lynn and Lynn 2004) have conducted symmetric and linear studies between individual cultural dimensions (see Hofstede 1980) and their impact on tipping behaviors. For instance, Lynn, Zinkhan, and Harris (1993) reported a statistically significant positive relationship with tipping for power distance and masculinity, a positive relationship for uncertainty avoidance, and a significantly negative association for individualism.

In contrast, Ferguson, Megehee, and Woodside (2015) chose not to study each cultural dimension's effect separately on tipping behaviors; they instead adopted a post-positivistic paradigm and explored the impact of alternative complex cultural wholes (cultural combinations or recipes) on tipping behaviors across countries. Using the fuzzy-set Qualitative Comparative Analysis (FsQCA), they showed that several recipes of cultural dimensions affect tipping behaviors and that asymmetric relations exist between antecedent conditions and tipping behaviors (and negation of tipping behaviors). Further, Hofstede's four cultural values alone do not accurately indicate the tipping frequency (or its negation) across the restaurant and taxicab service industries. Including other contextual variables such as gross domestic product (GDP), religiosity, and the Gini Index, along with Hofstede's dimensions, helps to create better models explaining tipping behaviors across countries. They also show that while high religiosity results in high tipping behavior in restaurants and low religiosity results in low tipping behaviors in restaurants, the same is not true for taxicab services. In fact, high religiosity is an ingredient in the negation of taxicab tipping practices. This finding supports the causal asymmetry tenet of complexity theory: tipping behavior models are not mirror opposites of models of negation of tipping behaviors.

Case (b). Hsu, Woodside, and Marshall (2013) explored culture's impact on consumer consumption patterns during international travels (in Australia and the United States). Additionally, they compared the usefulness of four alternative theories of culture proposed by Hofstede, Inglehart, Schwartz, and Steenkamp to explain consumers' consumption patterns. Like the previous example, this study tested the configural perspective of cultural influences rather than separately testing the net effects of individual cultural dimensions. In other words, rather than exploring the impact of individual cultural dimensions on consumers' consumption behavior, these authors argued that it makes better sense to configure high, medium, and low values of each of the four dimensions against one another. Doing this would result in 81 configurations or combinations, and Hsu, Woodside, and Marshall (2013)

contended that using these to understand consumer consumption behaviors is more meaningful than studying the net effect of one of the four cultural dimensions by itself. This is because culture is a "whole" and cannot always be meaningfully segregated into its components.

Hsu et al.'s (2013) study revealed that Schwartz's theory was theoretically and empirically more useful inin explaining consumption patterns in international travels than the other three cultural theories. Using the FsQCA, Hsu et al. showed that the configuration of cultural values better explained consumer consumption behaviors in international travels than net effects of individual values. The study also showed that cultural configurations influence consumer behaviors more strongly for first-time vacation travelers than for repeat travelers. In the latter case, it is the combination of GDP and the distance between the country of origin and the tourism destination that better predict consumer consumption patterns than cultural configurations. Their findings also revealed differences between Western and Eastern travelers' consumption patterns and that cultural influences on consumption patterns do not change with the respondent's age.

Benefits of post-positivistic studies involving nonlinear and asymmetrical analyses of culture

The two nonlinear asymmetric studies of culture cited here offer four advantages over the dominant logic of linear symmetrical testing in CIB literature. First, asymmetric studies of culture provide evidence to support that culture is a complex and holistic construct and that combining cultural dimensions better explains cultural realities than individual cultural dimensions. Scholars performing such asymmetrical studies (see Woodside 2014) find within the same data set, a variable can have a positive, negative, or indifferent relationship with another variable depending on the other antecedent conditions present. Therefore, conducting configural analysis, or modeling multiple realities, is required. Woodside (2013) compared and contrasted the use of symmetric and asymmetric analysis to show that symmetric tests rarely match reality except for testing the association of two or more items to measure the same construct, and asymmetric tests reflect realities better (see also Woodside, Prentice, and Larsen 2015). Gigerenzer (1991) and McClelland (1998) also demonstrated the value of using asymmetric tests to both advance theory and provide useful empirical models of the occurrence of multiple realities (Woodside 2014).

Second, one of the many drawbacks of the dominant trend in traditional CIB literature particularly stands out: traditional CIB literature tends to distance itself from the context in which the cultural reality unravels (Woodside 2014). Citing Simon (1990, 1), Woodside (2014) explained that context is one of two blades of human decision making; the structure of the task environments is the other. Woodside (2014), therefore, called for cultural researchers to reintegrate "the context" back into their discourses. This section's two illustrative cases combine cultural configurations with other demographic and contextual variables, such as GDP, religiosity, age, or industry sector, to explain varied outcomes. In so doing, these scholars reconnect the discussed cultural phenomenon within its social and cultural context.

Third, the dominant linear and symmetric logic in CIB literature pays little attention to contrarian cases (i.e., within a given data set, there are always some cases where the main relationship does not hold or the relationship's direction is the reverse of the main relationship between the two variables). This is consistent with objectivist studies' nomothetic methodology that focuses on generating broad generalizable results. In contrast, rather than ignoring these contrarian cases, scholars engaging in nonlinear asymmetric studies of culture call for greater detailed study of them because they potentially offer interesting insights. Thus, these scholars step away from the nomothetic tendency of objectivism and draw attention to both the emerging patterns and the contrarian cases that do not fit within these emerging patterns.

Fourth, another drawback of the symmetric-based logic is it is less informative and less theoretically useful than the alternative logic of asymmetric testing (Woodside 2014). As Mintzberg and Campbell (1979) explained, researchers tend to collect data that fit into neat categories in their computers, but they are ignorant of what these data actually mean for their organizations (Woodside 2014). "The result is a sterile description of organizations as categories of abstract variables instead of flesh-and-blood processes. And theory building becomes impossible" (Mintzberg and Campbell 1979, 586). A rote application of specific methods or tests leads to scholars neglecting the complexities that are inherent in cultural realities. But, by using asymmetric analysis, it is possible to model alternate configurations of antecedent conditions to explain an outcome and thus model multiple realities. As the first illustrative case cited reveals, engaging in asymmetric analysis produces a much richer and holistic understanding of a phenomenon than past monoparadigmatic studies on the same topic.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Theoretical contributions

This conceptual article offers two principal contributions to the CIB literature and one ancillary contribution to general management literature.

First, three drawbacks of overreliance on the objectivist tradition and conducting simplistic linear cause–effect studies of culture are presented. Such studies lead to (a) detaching culture from the context in which it emerges, (b) compromising the quality and richness of cultural knowledge, and (c) oversimplifying the culture construct by overly focusing on linear cause–effect relations. Consequently, such objectivist studies (including those published in *JIBS* between 1980 and 2014) remain hypo-deductive, reductionist, essentialist, acontextual, ahistorical, and non-meaning based (following from Guttormsen 2015). In our understanding, these studies may well support statistical analysis and numerical results, but they remain divorced from reality and are characterized by the illusion that exactitude can be achieved at the expense of depth (following from Chapman 1996). However, other scholars have rejected this objectivist dominance and engage in either classic multiparadigmatic or post-positivistic nonlinear asymmetric studies of culture, both offering distinct advantages over the dominant objectivist logic in CIB literature. This present article not only offers convincing empirical,

innovative multiparadigmatic studies of culture examples but also highlights the benefits of these over monoparadigmatic and linear symmetric studies in hopes of inspiring contemporary culture scholars to engage in similar innovative endeavors.

Second, this article offers arguments to overcome possible resistance toward multiparadigmatic cultural studies. Notwithstanding increasing calls for multiparadigmatic cultural research in past decades (Yaganeh, Su, and Chrysostome 2004), most multiparadigmatic studies (except Schultz and Hatch 1996; Ybema 1996) to date have focused on topics other than culture (e.g., see Spender 1998 on the complementarity of knowledge forms, and Karataş-Özkan and Murphy (2010) on organizational learning). The rarity of multiparadigmatic cultural studies may partially be explained by the fact that scholars are often socialized into specific paradigmatic communities and encouraged to follow their own communities' norms and practices (Becker 1996). Consequently, combining paradigms requires them to challenge deep-seated biases in favor of monoparadigmatic (usually their own "home" paradigm) studies. As one colleague put it, "Using a paradigm is like wearing a pair of glasses. You wear a pair of glasses because it helps you see the world more clearly. But you cannot wear more than one pair of glasses at the same time! Doing this would completely blur your vision." Such viewpoints can be changed by offering empirical evidence to support that multiparadigmatic studies, far from "blurring the vision," offer richer insights than monoparadigmatic studies into a cultural phenomenon. Extending the eyeglass metaphor, dual paradigm studies can be likened to bifocal glasses and multiparadigmatic studies to varifocal glasses. Engaging in multiparadigmatic studies does not imply individuals must wear multiple pairs of glasses simultaneously, but only that they remain open to using bifocal or varifocal glasses when complex and emergent realities present themselves. Another basis of resistance against multiparadigmatic studies in general might arise because basic research exercises such as articulating the research problem and selecting appropriate data collection tools are engrained within specific paradigms; so, escaping their paradigm-embeddedness is not easy (Lewis and Grimes 1999). This article's illustrative studies expose exactly how to overcome operational problems in conducting multiparadigmatic cultural studies. FsQCA proves to be a particularly promising tool for such studies.

Finally, the dominance of the objectivist tradition and the paucity of pluralistic thinking identified in CIB literature are also observed in the broader management literature (see Redding 2005). This trend has led to many conceptual and methodological concerns among management scholars. For instance, in their *Academy of Management Review* (*AMR*) editorial comment, Delbridge and Fiss (2013) admitted that articles published in *AMR* tend to be largely governed by causal linkages and formal analytical approaches in the objectivist tradition. This continued dominance of the net-effect thinking or general linear reality has led to considerable homogeneity in management research published in *AMR* and to an impoverished understanding of the phenomena being explored. Delbridge and Fiss (2013), therefore, called for plurality of paradigms and styles of theorizing in management studies. Similarly, in his editorial comment in the *Journal of Business Research*, Woodside (2013) recommended a move from symmetric toward asymmetric thinking regarding data analysis and theory crafting. Therefore, management scholars in subdisciplines other than CIB may also benefit from the illustrative studies and insights offered in the present article.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS FOR MANAGEMENT EDUCATION AND FOR MANAGERS

As discussed earlier, a major proportion of CIB literature is embedded within the objectivist tradition. This implies that many culture-related modules taught in business school programs (MBA, PhD, etc.) may have been guided predominantly by the objectivist logic, and professors have reinforced the same tradition in which they themselves have been trained. This may have led to contemporary managers and culture researchers being overly influenced by the objectivist tradition and having little tolerance for or appreciation of other paradigmatic traditions. Following the arguments presented in this article, we recommend incorporating more multiparadigmatic thinking and training in culture-related modules taught in business schools and encouraging pluralistic thinking among future managers and culture researchers. Scholars trained in this tradition would more likely view a cultural problem from a variety of perspectives. They might also explore the underlying "how" and "why" questions in more depth and rely on more configural explanations instead of looking for simplistic and superficial cause-effect relations between two or more variables. With such pluralistic and complex thinking, both managers and culture scholars could go beyond the currently popular simplistic, essentialist, acontextual, and ahistorical approach to culture.

LIMITATIONS

The present article suffers from three limitations. First, although it offers some examples of innovative studies in CIB literature, it neither comprehensively covers the literature on multiparadigmatic cultural studies nor reveals any new insights for operationalizing such studies (except those used in the four illustrative studies). Some literature on operationalizing multiparadigmatic research strategies exists (Schultz and Hatch 1996; Lowe, Moore, and Carr 2007), but more work is required in this direction (Lewis and Kelemen 2002). Further, although the article does shed some light on the usefulness of the FsQCA as a method of data analysis and theory building, a detailed elaboration of that is beyond the scope of this article.

Second, this article is grounded in the assumption that by offering examples of innovative culture studies, culture scholars can be encouraged to challenge the dominant objectivist logic. However, there could be factors other than the paucity of good examples that may influence scholars' motivation to challenge dominant logics in their respective subdisciplines. As Delbridge and Fiss (2013) explained, powerful forces of patronage, socialization, and exclusion ensure the reproduction of certain ways of theorizing over others. Therefore, under the present pressures of "publish or perish," unless editorial bodies and reviewers of respected journals demonstrate support for innovative studies that challenge dominant logics, scholars may refrain from such efforts.

Third, although we present multiparadigmatic studies as a way forward in CIB research, engaging in such studies is not without its own challenges. This research requires scholars to learn about other paradigms and corresponding methodologies. Scholars must also carefully

reflect on the impact that engaging in multiparadigmatic research will have on their reputations within their "home" communities because those who adhere to the standards of more than one group could be perceived as having waning loyalty towards one's "home" community or as a researcher with unclear paradigmatic affiliations.

There are also practical challenges in designing and implementing multiparadigmatic studies because exploring a problem from different paradigmatic lenses requires a sophisticated research design (see Bradshaw-Camball and Murray 1991; Graham-Hill 1996). In contrast, companies prefer functionalistic studies with clear questions and that promise clear solutions to managerial problems. Consequently, negotiating access into organizations for multiparadigmatic studies could prove to be difficult (Hassard 1991); however, this challenge may be partially overcome if researchers continue to offer rich and applicable solutions to participating organizations for their varied problems, but without burdening organizational decision makers with the complexity of multiparadigmatic research designs.

Suggestions for future research

This article's introductory section offered a tentative assessment of paradigmatic preferences of CIB scholars in *JIBS*. This revealed a dominance of the objectivist tradition in this journal, which was subsequently confirmed through a review of broader CIB literature. Future empirical studies could conduct a more thorough assessment of the paradigmatic preferences of CIB scholarship across other journals. This assessment could either use pragmatics (see Barley, Meyer, and Gash 1988) or clearly articulated codes and multiple coders; this would result in a more complete picture of scholars' paradigmatic preferences of CIB than is presented in this article. Similarly, a more comprehensive coverage of multiparadigmatic studies of culture, which will not only shed light on different ways of engaging in multiparadigmatic culture studies, but also indicate directions where more innovative studies are needed, is desired.

Second, this article has revealed the advantages of engaging in nonlinear asymmetric culture studies. In particular, Ferguson, Megehee, and Woodside's (2015) study shows the added value of nonlinear asymmetric culture studies over linear symmetric studies (e.g., Lynn, Zinkhan, and Harris 1993). In another study (one without a cultural focus), Woodside, Prentice, and Larsen (2015) reanalyzed in a nonlinear asymmetric fashion data collected for an earlier linear symmetric study of gambling behaviors (Prentice and Woodside 2013) and showed their nonlinear asymmetric study provided a richer understanding of gamblers' appreciation of casinos than their earlier linear symmetric study had. Such studies provide evidence of asymmetric studies' advantages over symmetric studies, and they are not limited to culture topics. We hope this empirical evidence will encourage more scholars to engage in nonlinear asymmetric studies both in CIB and other management subdisciplines.

Third, while the present article briefly introduces complexity theory as the theoretical basis of studies grounded in the asymmetric logic, more needs to be done to develop this theory. Sterman and Wittenberg (1999, 338) proposed as follows

> Developing the full potential of complexity theory, especially in social sciences, requires more rigorous theory development and fewer popular articles extolling the virtues of the "new paradigm," more studies testing the new theories and fewer anecdotal claims of efficacy, greater development of tools tailored for particular contexts, and fewer claims of universality. Without such rigor, social scientists face the danger that, despite its high potential, "complexity theory" will soon be discarded, perhaps prematurely, as yet another unfortunate case of physics envy. (cited in Woodside 2014)

Therefore, more cultural studies grounded in complexity theory, particularly those testing the theory and reinforcing its rigor and credibility, are desired. In the same way, future studies elaborating the merits of methods such as FsQCA and offering other tools of data analysis and theory building for nonlinear asymmetric studies of culture are also needed.

Another innovative trend has emerged in CIB literature that this article has not investigated: combining more than one theoretical lens to explore a cultural problem. One example of this trend is Meyerson and Martin's (1987; see also Martin 2004) exploration of corporate culture change through three different theoretical lenses: integration, differentiation, and fragmentation. In the same way, Ybema (1996) used Martin's (1992) integration-differentiation lens and dramaturgical metaphors to expose the cultural dynamicity, complexity, and contradictions in a Dutch amusement park. Hsu et al.'s (2013) work, offered as an example in this article, also compares different theoretical frameworks to assess the impact of culture on consumers' consumption patterns in international travels. Although this article has not sufficiently elaborated on this trend, future scholars may direct their attention toward it.

CONCLUSION

As Gummesson (2008, 16, cited in Woodside 2014) aptly pointed out, "Reality is complex whether we like it or not." This is just as true for cultural studies as for other subdisciplines in management. Engaging in multiparadigmatic studies of culture allows us to better apprehend this complex reality, thereby resulting in a much richer understanding of the cultural phenomenon in question compared to objectivist studies grounded in the linear symmetric logic. While the innovative works cited in this article are not necessarily "better" or "more appropriate" than conventional studies, they do lead to more innovative outcomes (following Romani, Primecz, and Topçu 2011). Engaging in multiparadigmatic studies of culture represents one innovative trend in the CIB literature, but there may be other innovative trends this article does not cover; therefore, the present article should be considered as a simple (and nonexhaustive) effort to highlight some innovative studies in CIB literature that help counter the dominant objectivist logic. As such, this article represents a modest attempt to help scholars break out from long-established orthodoxies in the CIB field (Lewin 2004). Nevertheless, its aim is not to delegitimize extant research. Rather, the intention is simply to "relegetimize pluralism" (Ghoshal 2005, 78).

REFERENCES

Alvesson, M. 1990. "Organization: From Substance to Image?" *Organization Studies* 11 (3):373–94. doi:10.1177/017084069001100303

Arbnor, I., and B. Bjerke. 1997. *Methodology for Creating Business Knowledge*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Barley, S. R., G. W. Meyer, and D. C. Gash. 1988. "Cultures of Culture: Academics, Practitioners and the Pragmatics of Normative Control." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 33 (1):24–60. doi:10.2307/2392854

Becker, H. 1996. The Epistemology of Qualitative Research. In *Essays on Ethnography and Human Development*, edited by R. Jessor, A. Colby, and R. Schweder, 53–71. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bjerregaard, T., J. Lauring, and A. Klitmøller. 2009. "A Critical Analysis of Intercultural Communication Research in Cross-Cultural Management: Introducing Newer Developments in Anthropology." *Critical Perspectives on International Business* 5 (3):207–28. doi:10.1108/17422040910974695

Blaikie, N. 1993. *Approaches to Social Enquiry*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bradshaw-Camball, P., and V. V. Murray. 1991. "Illusions and Other Games: A Trifocal View of Organizational Politics." *Organization Science* 2 (4):379–98. doi:10.1287/orsc.2.4.379

Burrell, G., and G. Morgan. 1979. *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Capra, F. 1996. *The Web of Life*. London: Harper Collins.

Caprar, D. 2011. "Foreign Locals: A Cautionary Tale on the Culture of MNC Local Employees." *Journal of International Business Studies* 42 (5):608–28. doi:10.1057/jibs.2011.9

Chapman, M. 1996. "Preface—Social Anthropology, Business Studies, and Cultural Issues." *International Studies of Management and Organization* 26 (4):3–29. doi:10.1080/00208825.1996.11656692

Chapman, M., H. Gajewska-De Mattos, J. Clegg, and P. J. Buckley. 2008. "Close Neighbours and Distant Friends—Perceptions of Cultural Distance." *International Business Review* 17 (3):217–34. doi:10.1016/j.ibusrev.2008.01.007

Clegg, S., and D. Dunkerley. 1980. *Organizations, Class and Control*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Cooper, R., and G. Burrell. 1988. "Modernism, Postmodernism and Organizational Analysis: An Introduction." *Organization Studies* 9 (1):91–112. doi:10.1177/017084068800900112

Delbridge, R., and P. Fiss. 2013. "Editors' Comments: Styles of Theorizing and Social Organization of Knowledge." *Academy of Management Review* 38 (3):325–31. doi:10.5465/amr.2013.0085

Denison, D. 1990. *Corporate Culture and Organizational Effectiveness*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Denison, D. R., and A. K. Mishra. 1995. "Toward a Theory of Organizational Culture and Effectiveness." *Organization Science* 6 (2):204–23. doi:10.1287/orsc.6.2.204

Donaldson, L. 1998. "The Myth of Paradigm Incommensurability in Management Studies: Comments by an Integrationist." *Organization* 5 (2):267–72. doi:10.1177/135050849852007

Douglas, M. 1986. *How Institutions Think*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Ferguson, G., C. Megehee, and A. Woodside. 2015. "Cultural Recipe Explanations of Consumer Tipping Behavior." Working Paper No. 17., Australia: Curtin School of Business, Bentley.

Gelfand, M., M. Erez, and Z. Aycan. 2007. "Cross-Cultural Organizational Behavior." *Annual Review of Psychology* 58 (1):479–514. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085559

Gentina, E., R. Butori, G. M. Rose, and A. Bakir. 2014. "How National Culture Impacts Teenage Shopping Behavior: Comparing French and American Consumers." *Journal of Business Research* 67 (4):464–70. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.03.033

Ghoshal, S. 2005. "Bad Management Theories Are Destroying Good Management Practices." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 4 (1):75–91. doi:10.5465/amle.2005.16132558

Gigerenzer, G. 1991. "From Tools to Theories: A Heuristic of Discovery in Cognitive Psychology." *Psychological Review* 98 (2):254–67. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.254

Gladwell, M. 2002. *Tipping Points: How Little Things Can Make a Big Difference*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Co.

Graham-Hill, S. 1996. Small Business Strategy: A Multiparadigm Perspective. Lexington, KY: Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky.

Gray, Barbara, Michel G. Bougon, and Anne Donnellon. 1985. "Organizations as Constructions and Deconstructions of Meaning." *Journal of Management* 11 (2):83–98. doi:10.1177/014920638501100212

Guba, E.G. ed. 1990. *The Paradigm Dialog*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gummesson, E. 2008. "Extending the Service-Dominant Logic: From Customer Centricity to Balanced Centricity." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 36 (1):15–7. doi:10.1007/s11747-007-0065-x

Guttormsen, D. 2015. "Looking Forward by Looking Back: A Transdisciplinary Self/Other Perspective on Intercultural Expatriate Research." In *The Routledge Companion to Cross-Cultural Management*, edited by N. Holden, S. Michailove, and S. Tietze, 651–69. London: Routledge.

Hassard, J. 1991. "Multiple Paradigms and Organizational Analysis. A Case Study." *Organization Studies* 12 (2): 275–99. doi:10.1177/017084069101200206

Hassard, J., and M. Kelemen. 2002. "Production and Consumption in Organizational Knowledge: The Case of the 'Paradigms Debate." *Organization* 9 (2):331–55. doi:10.1177/1350508402009002911

Hatch, M. J. 1993. "The Dynamics of Organizational Culture." *Academy of Management Review* 18 (4):657–93. doi:10.5465/amr.1993.9402210154

Hofstede, G. 1980. *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G., and M. Bond. 1988. "The Confucius Connection: From Cultural Roots to Economic Growth." *Organizational Dynamics* 16 (4):5–21. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(88)90009-5

Hsu, S. Y., A. G. Woodside, and R. Marshall. 2013. "Critical Tests of Multiple Theories of Cultures' Consequences: Comparing the Usefulness of Models by Hofstede, Inglehart and Baker, Schwartz, Steenkamp, as Well as GDP and Distance for Explaining Overseas Tourism Behavior." *Journal of Travel Research* 52 (6):679–704. doi:10.1177/0047287512475218

Johnson, P., and C. Cassell. 2001. "Epistemology and Work Psychology: New Agendas." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 74 (2):125–43. doi:10.1348/096317901167280

Karataş-Özkan, M., and W. Murphy. 2010. "Critical Theorist, Postmodernist and Social Constructionist Paradigms in Organizational Analysis: A Paradigmatic Review of Organizational Learning Literature." *International Journal of Management Reviews* 12 (4):453–65. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2370.2009.00273.x

Knorr Cetina, K. 1999. *Epistemic Cultures: How the Sciences Make Knowledge*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kuhn, T. S. 1970. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 2nd ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Kuhn, T. S. 1990. "Dubbing and Redubbing: The Vulnerability of Rigid Designation." In *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science, Scientific Theories*, edited by C. W. Savage, vol. 14, 298–318. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Kuhn, T. S. 1996. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 3rd ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Ladhari, R., F. Pons, G. Bressolles, and M. Zins. 2011. "Culture and Personal Values: How They Influence Perceived Service Quality." *Journal of Business Research* 64 (9):951–7. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2010.11.017

Lauring, J., and J. Selmer. 2009. "Expatriate Compound Living: An Ethnographic Field Study." *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 20 (7):1451–67. doi:10.1080/09585190902983215

Leung, Kwok, Michael Harris Bond, Sharon Reimel de Carrasquel, Carlos Muñoz, Marisela Hernández, Fumio Murakami, Susumu Yamaguchi, Günter Bierbrauer, and Theodore M. Singelis. 2002. "Social Axioms: The Search for Universal Dimensions of General Beliefs about How the World Functions." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 33 (3):286–302. doi:10.1177/0022022102033003005

Lewin, A. Y. 2004. "Letter from the Editor." *Journal of International Business Studies* 35 (2):79–80. doi:10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400079

Lewis, M., and A. Grimes. 1999. "Metatriangulation: Building Theory from Multiple Paradigms." *Academy of Management Review* 24 (4):672–90. doi:10.5465/amr.1999.2553247

Lewis, M., and M. Kelemen. 2002. "Multiparadigm Inquiry: Exploring Organizational Pluralism and Paradox." *Human Relations* 55 (2):251–75. doi:10.1177/0018726702055002185

Lowe, S., F. Moore, and A. Carr. 2007. "Paradigmapping Studies of Culture and Organization." *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* 7 (2):237–51. doi:10.1177/1470595807079389

Lynn, M., G. M. Zinkhan, and J. Harris. 1993. "Consumer Tipping: A Cross-Country Study." *Journal of Consumer Research* 20 (3):478–88. doi:10.1086/209363

Lynn, M., and A. Lynn. 2004. "National Values and Tipping Customs: A Replication and Extension." *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research* 28 (3):356–64. doi:10.1177/1096348003256605

Martin, J. 1992. *Cultures in Organizations: Three Perspectives*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Martin, J. 2004. "Organizational Culture." Research Paper No. 1847. In *The Blackwell Encyclopedic Dictionary of Organizational Behavior*, edited by N. Nicholson, P. Audia, and M. Pillutla, 2nd ed.. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Maruyama, M. 2004. "Peripheral Vision, Polyocular Vision, or Subunderstanding?" *Organization Studies* 25 (3): 467–80. doi:10.1177/0170840604043001

McClelland, D. C. 1998. "Identifying Competencies with Behavioral-Event Interviews." *Psychological Science* 9 (5):331–9. doi:10.1111/1467-9280.00065

Meyerson, D., and J. Martin. 1987. "Cultural Change: An Integration of Three Different Views." *Journal of Management Studies* 24 (6):623–47. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6486.1987.tb00466.x

Mintzberg, H., and C. G. Campbell. 1979. "An Emerging Strategy of 'Direct' Research." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 24 (4):582–9. doi:10.2307/2392364

Moon, J., D. Chadee, and S. Tikoo. 2008. "Culture, Product Type, and Price Influences on Consumer Purchase Intention to Buy Personalized Products Online." *Journal of Business Research* 61 (1):31–9. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.05.012

Moore, F. 2006. "Strategy, Power, and Negotiation: Social Control and Expatriate Managers in a German Multinational Corporation." *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 17 (3):399–413. doi:10.1080/09585190500521359

Moore, F. 2015. "Towards a Complex View of Culture: Cross-Cultural Management, 'Native Categories,' and Their Impact on Concepts of Management and Organization." In *The Routledge Companion to Cross-Cultural Management*, edited by N. Holden, S. Michailove, and S. Tietze, 97–111. London: Routledge.

Morosini, P., S. Shane, and H. Singh. 1998. "National Cultural Distance and Cross-Border Acquisition Performance." *Journal of International Business Studies* 29 (1):137–58. doi:10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490029

Ogbonna, E., and L. Harris. 2002. "Organizational Culture: A Ten-Year, Two-Phase Study of Change in the UK Food Retailing Sector." *Journal of Management Studies* 39 (5):673–706. doi:10.1111/1467-6486.00004

Ordanini, A., A. Parasuraman, and G. Rubera. 2014. "When the Recipe Is More Important than the Ingredients: A Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) of Service Innovation Configurations." *Journal of Service Research* 17 (2):134–49. doi:10.1177/1094670513513337

Pfeffer, J. 1993. "Barriers to the Advance of Organizational Science: Paradigm Development as a Dependent Variable." *Academy of Management Review* 18 (4):599–621. doi:10.5465/amr.1993.9402210152

Ponterotto, J. 2005. "Qualitative Research in Counseling Psychology: A Primer on Research Paradigms and Philosophy of Science." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 52 (2):126–36. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.126

Prentice, C., and A. G. Woodside. 2013. "Problem Gamblers' Harsh Gaze on Casino Services." *Psychology & Marketing* 30 (12):1108–23. doi:10.1002/mar.20670

Rayner, S. 1991. "A Cultural Perspective on the Structure and Implementation of Global Environmental Agreements." *Evaluation Review* 15 (1):75–102. doi:10.1177/0193841X9101500105

Redding, G. 2005. "The Thick Description and Comparison of Societal Systems of Capitalism." *Journal of International Business Studies* 36 (2):123–55. doi:10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400129

Robertson, M., and J. Swan. 2003. "Control—What Control? Culture and Ambiguity within a Knowledge Intensive Firm." *Journal of Management Studies* 40 (4):831–58. doi:10.1111/1467-6486.00362

Rohner, R. 1984. "Toward a Conception of Culture for Cross-Cultural Psychology." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 15 (2):111–38. doi:10.1177/0022002184015002002

Romani, L., H. Primecz, and K. Topçu. 2011. "Paradigm Interplay for Theory Development: A Methodological Example with the Kulturstandard Method." *Organizational Research Methods* 14 (3):432–55. doi:10.1177/1094428109358270

Samdahl, D. M. 1999. "Epistemological and Methodological Issues in Leisure Research." In *Leisure Studies*, edited by E. L. Jackson and T. L. Burton, 119–32. State College, PA: Venture.

Schein, E. 1992. *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Scherer, A. 1998. "Pluralism and Incommensurability in Strategic Management and Organization Theory: A Problem in Search of a Solution." *Organization* 5 (2):147–68. doi:10.1177/135050849852001

Schultz, M., and M. Hatch. 1996. "Living within Multiple Paradigms: The Case of Paradigm Interplay in Organizational Culture Studies." *Academy of Management Review* 21 (2):529–57. doi:10.5465/amr.1996.9605060221

Schutz, A. 1967. *The Phenomenology of the Social World*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Schwandt, T. 2000. "Three Epistemological Stances for Qualitative Inquiry: Interpretivism, Hermeneutics, and Social Constructionism." In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln, 2nd ed., 189–213. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Shenkar, O. 2001. "Cultural Distance Revisited: Towards a More Rigorous Conceptualization and Measurement of Cultural Differences." *Journal of International Business Studies* 32 (3):519–35. doi:10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490982

Simon, H. A. 1990. "Invariants of Human Behavior." *Annual Review of Psychology* 41 (1990):1–19.

Spender, J. 1998. "Pluralist Epistemology and the Knowledge-Based Theory of the Firm." *Organization* 5 (2): 233–56. doi:10.1177/135050849852005

Sterman, J. D., and J. Wittenberg. 1999. "Path Dependence, Competition, and Succession in the Dynamics of Scientific Revolution." *Organization Science Special Issue: Application of Complexity Theory to Organization Science* 10 (3):322–41.

Sullivan, D., and J. Daniels. 2008. "Innovation in International Business Research: A Call for Multiple Paradigms." *Journal of International Business Studies* 39 (6):1081–90. doi:10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400400

Taras, V., J. Rowney, and P. Steel. 2009. "Half a Century of Measuring Culture: Review of Approaches, Challenges, and Limitations Based on the Analysis of 121 Instruments for Quantifying Culture." *Journal of International Management* 15 (4):357–73. doi:10.1016/j.intman.2008.08.005

Tayeb, M. 2001. "Conducting Research across Cultures: Overcoming Drawbacks and Obstacles." *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* 1 (1):91–108. doi:10.1177/147059580111009

Trompenaars, F., and C. Hampden-Turner. 1997. *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Diversity in Global Business*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Tung, R. 2006. "North American Research Agenda and Methodologies: Past Imperfect, Future— Limitless Possibilities." *Asian Business & Management* 5 (1):23–35. doi:10.1057/palgrave.abm.9200148

Tylor, E. 1871/1920. *Primitive Culture*. New York, NY: J. P. Putnam's Sons.

Urry, J. 2005. "The Complexity Turn." *Theory Culture and Society* 22 (5):1–14. doi:10.1177/0263276405057188

Wallerstein, I. 1996. *Open the Social Sciences: Report of the Gulbenkian Commission on the Restructuring of the Social Sciences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Weaver, G. R., and D. A. Gioia. 1994. "Paradigms Lost: Incommensurability versus Structurationist Inquiry." *Organization Studies* 15 (4):565–90. doi:10.1177/017084069401500404

Whitley, R. 1999. *Divergent Capitalisms: The Social Structuring and Change of Business Systems*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Willmott, H. 1993. "Strength Is Ignorance; Slavery Is Freedom: Managing Culture in Modern Organizations." *Journal of Management Studies* 30 (4):515–52. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6486.1993.tb00315.x

Woodside, A. G. 2013. "Moving beyond Multiple Regression Analysis to Algorithms: Calling for Adoption of a Paradigm Shift from Symmetric to Asymmetric Thinking in Data Analysis and Crafting Theory." *Journal of Business Research* 66 (4):463–72. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.12.021

Woodside, A. G. 2014. "Embrace Perform Model: Complexity Theory, Contrarian Case Analysis, and Multiple Realities." *Journal of Business Research* 67 (12):2495–503. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2014.07.006

Woodside, A. G., C. Prentice, and A. Larsen. 2015. "Revisiting Problem Gamblers' Harsh Gaze on Casino Services: Applying Complexity Theory to Identify Exceptional Customers." *Psychology & Marketing* 32 (1):65–77. doi:10.1002/mar.20763

Yaganeh, H., Z. Su, and E. Chrysostome. 2004. "A Critical Review of Epistemological and Methodological Issues in Cross-Cultural Research." *Journal of Comparative International Management* 7 (2):66–86.

Ybema, S. 1996. "A Duck-Billed Platypus in the Theory and Analysis of Organizations: Combinations of Consensus and Dissensus." In *Contradictions in Context: Puzzling over Paradoxes in Contemporary Organizations*, edited by W. Koot, I. Sabelis, and S. Ybema, 39–61. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit Press.

Zickar, M., and N. Carter. 2010. "Reconnecting with the Spirit of Workplace Ethnography: A Historical Review." *Organizational Research Methods* 13 (2):304–19. doi:10.1177/1094428109338070