Critical cross-cultural management studies: what's missing?[1]

Terence Jackson

Critique is integral to good social science. It is not something apart. It is therefore difficult to write about critical cross-cultural management studies as something that stands apart from mainstream cross-cultural management studies (CCMS). Certainly CCMS started off in this critical vein with Hofstede's (1980) question 'Do American theories apply abroad?' and Boyacigiller and Adler's (1991) critique of the parochial nature of American management theory and its historical and geographic context within the economic dominance of America after the second world war. It provided a critique of the assumption of a universal application of American management theory and practice. Yet CCMS over the last few decades grew up into a subject area less than critical, largely ignoring its global context and failing in its inclusiveness.

Rather than being a chapter on what is critical cross-cultural management studies, I look at this from the perspective of what CCMS should look like if it fulfilled its mission to be a critical voice within management studies and the social sciences as a whole. Unfortunately those critical elements within CCMS have trailed behind the wider social sciences rather than leading and contributing to a critical understanding of human thought and interaction. This chapter is an account of what is missing, why CCMS has failed to live up to its critical mission, and what it needs to do about it. Fundamental to what is lacking in CCMS is the question of what culture is.

A question of culture

Culture comprises all that is made and imagined by the human race. This follows the view of the early anthropologist Tylor (1871) of culture being 'that complex whole which involves knowledge, beliefs, art, morals, law, customs and other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society' and Herskovits' (1948) definition, the 'human-made part of the environment'. This does not concur with the restrictive view drawn more recently from American cultural anthropology and propagated by Hofstede's pioneering work of the

---

[1] Submitted as 'Critical cross-cultural management studies' as a chapter in the forthcoming book Szkudlarek, B., Osland, J., Caprar, D. and Romani, L (eds) SAGE Handbook of Contemporary Cross-Cultural Management, London: Sage. This is a pre-edited copy and should be cited as follows: <Jackson, T. (2018) Critical cross-cultural management studies: what's missing? Accessed at [URL]. Accessed on [date]>

symbolic or abstract aspects of culture (e.g. values and beliefs). For example, the prominent cultural anthropologist Geertz (1973:89) sees culture as 'an historically transmitted pattern of meaning embodied in symbols of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means which men communicate'.

Rather, culture comprises political and economic institutions, structures and processes, and the dynamics that have ensured the spread and dominance of certain geographically originated cultural forms throughout the globe. It comprises associated power relations, and those aspects that contribute towards the nature of those relations including economic, military and political factors. These are not part of the natural world. They have been, are being, created by human imagination, interaction and action. Our knowledge of the world, science, social science, cross-cultural management studies are all part of 'culture'. This 'content' of culture is also the context within which we explore human thought and action (as meaningful behaviour) as social scientists, and through which we make sense of it. CCMS examines the management and organisation aspects of this. Critical CCMS makes sure that this is done inclusively and contextually.

Social science, since its inception, has struggled with this dilemma: that the content of what it studies is also the context, and the context is also the content of its subject matter. This subject matter cannot therefore be studied in the same way as the natural sciences. Positivism has, though, tended to prevail in CCMS following the success of Hofstede's work, and an apparent dominance of cross-cultural psychology within CCMS. Critique within CCMS, which focuses within the sub-discipline rather than towards management studies generally, has tended to centre around the shortcomings of the positivist, comparative approach taken by Hofstede (e.g. McSweeney, 2002). Only recently has critique become more focused on the context of CCMS and has relied heavily on Postcolonial Theory (PCT) to deliver this critique (e.g. Jack and Westwood, 2009; Mahadevan, 2017).

Hence Jack and Westwood, 2009: 3) assert that '…these academic management disciplines are Western and Eurocentric discourses (knowledge systems and associated institutional practices) that exhibit historical as well as contemporary resonances with what we might call "the colonial project" - that is, the formal expansion, conquest and colonial occupation by Western European powers of multiple nations in Africa, the Caribbean, Latin America, South and Both-East Asia and Oceania…'. Yet I would contend that the geopolitical context that supports and positions this critique may be outdated, restricting although not downgrading the original legitimacy of this critique (Jackson, 2012b). More recent work (reflected in Mahadevan's, 2017, book) includes a more thoroughgoing concern with power dynamics, an issue that seems largely ignored by Jack and Westwood, 2009). The outdated connection between context (geopolitical relations) and content (PCT as critique) here underscores the importance of considering this important interface in the critical social sciences.

Although this critical strand, which appears led by Critical Management Studies (CMS), is developing within CCMS, it appears to be missing a wider contextual and inclusive

perspective. Adler, Forbes and Willmott's (2008: 119) outline of CMS appears to suggest a moral element in its reasoning, when they write

> *The common core is deep skepticism regarding the moral defensibility and the social and ecological sustainability of prevailing conceptions and forms of management and organization. CMS's motivating concern is neither the personal failures of individual managers nor the poor management of specific firms, but the social injustice and environmental destructiveness of the broader social and economic systems that these managers and firms serve and reproduce.*

This is a legitimate concern, and I think this begs the question, 'whose purpose does management studies serve' which is particularly important when looking at the incorporation of indigenous knowledge for example into mainstream knowledge, but tends to restrict the discussion to what is seen as morally or politically right. This does lead to a consideration of the relationship between power and knowledge. The consequences 'inherent in the exercise of power is the unintended constitution of an Other that resists efforts to exclude or suppress it' (Adler, Forbes and Willmott, 2008: 131) is perhaps what has led to the Postcolonial Theory stream within critical management studies to be adopted by critical CCM scholars.

Although aimed at providing a wider, critical, context for CCMS, it fails to encapsulate the major issues that are missing from CCMS that the subject area needs to embrace to provide a more critical approach to its content. Above, I have referred to the context being also the content of its study. I now look at what this means in terms of these missing elements.

What is missing from a critical framework for CCMS?

There are (at least) six interconnected elements that are missing from CCMS that can be listed briefly as follows:
– The context and meaning of culture
– The political nature of CCMS
– The wider geopolitical context and how this changes critical theory
– The majority world, including the informal economy
– An inclusive regard for indigenous knowledge
– The cultural nature of objectively formulated constructs such as 'race'

I will now look at each of these elements in turn.

Culture in context

Asserting that extant cross-cultural management studies are mainly context free may sound a controversial statement as a number of authors have alluded to the need to consider context (Soderberg & Holden, 2002) and contextualisation of our work (Brannen, 2004). Brannen (2004: 601) appears to be talking about the 'contextual basis of systems of signification' with a focus on the symbolic aspect of culture, whereas Soderberg & Holden (2002: 107) asserts

that in CCMS 'culture' refers to 'something "soft", human, unquantifiable, difficult to account for in rational terms and provided with a label of convenience'. In other words, CCM scholars have tended to be vague about their meaning of culture but have tended to see it as 'a relatively stable, homogenous, internally consistent system of assumptions, values and norms transmitted by socialisation to the next generation" (p. 107). I am not so concerned here with the essentialising nature of this (for which Soderberg & Holden, 2002, and others have criticised the work of Hofstede and subsequent comparative studies) but with the restrictive conceptualising of 'culture' that excludes a large part of Herskovits' (1948) 'human-made part of the environment', and excludes a consideration of context as also the content of what we study.

By context I mean the global, historical, cultural, and politically relational circumstances through which we live and work. This makes a difference to the way we contextualise our work. The supposed dichotomy between institutionalist approaches and culturalists approaches not only constitutes an artificial divide between CCM scholars (who are concerned only with symbolic cultures) and those concerned with social structures and institutions, it prevents a proper framing of the subject area of CCMS as well as affecting the content itself.

Sorge (2004) believes that the two approaches (institutionalist and culturalist) should be complementary. He refers to Giddens (1986) in saying that individual behaviour and social structure are reciprocally constituted: that is, normative customs that are instituted to be binding are kept in place by acting individuals. Sorge (2004) believes that such an integrative approach will consider both the construction of actors, that is people with values, preferences and knowledge, and the construction of social and societal systems as reciprocally related to an extent that they cannot be separated from each other.

Jack Goody (1994), a prominent British social anthropologist, points to the dichotomy in the American tradition of *cultural* anthropology between 'cultural studies' concerned with symbols and meaning, and the social (social structures, organizations etc). He maintains that in the European tradition, of *social* anthropology this dichotomy is not readily accepted, and has tended to treat these two categories as virtually synonymous. Certainly this is reflected in Tylor's (1871) classic definition of culture cited above and in Firth's (1951) view where culture is seen as the content of social relations, not as some distinct entity. Hence the institutional context both shapes meaning, and is shaped by it. Both are what can be described as culture. Institutions are cultural constructs with rules that are applied in society, and they also shape and are shaped by values, which are part of the meaning systems of society. Thus, there is an integral relation between the overall context and the content of what we study. This is reflected in economic relations highlighted by Marxist analysis.

Kelly (2014), for examples, points to the cultural differences theories of those such as Hofstede downplaying the role of 'social structure and economic influences upon culture' (p. 359). He points to Stuart Hall's 'reinterpretation of Marxism'. Here '..culture is the realm in which a contest of ideas takes place. These ideas are themselves influenced by the positioning of their proponents within the social structure' (Kelly, 2014: 359) This assertion indicates that to

understand culture we need to understand the social context within which ideas are formulated. Factors such as social class, race and gender influence ideas, communication and culture.

Following on from Kelly's account, it is important to comprehend Hall's (1996) understanding of ideology as this is relevant to an understanding of culture in context and as context.

He writes:

> *By ideology I mean the mental frameworks—the languages, the concepts, categories, imagery of thought, and the systems of representation—which different classes and social groups deploy in order to make sense of, define, figure out and render intelligible the way society works. (Hall, 1996: 26)*

The reference to mental frameworks is reminiscent of Hofstede's 'software of the mind' or 'culture as mental programming', but Hofstede (1991) is talking about 'culture'. Hall is talking about 'ideology'. In this sense I believe they are talking about the same thing. But in the positivist view (i.e. Hofstede's) we take culture as it is, what we can measure. In the critical, Marxist, view what Hofstede and others call 'culture' is only part of the totality of a more inclusive concept of 'culture'. This narrow view should be subject to far more examination. For example, 'individualism' in a society is an ideology. But also Hofstede appears to be talking about a whole country, whereas Hall (1996: 26) is speaking about 'different classes and social groups'. Both may be right in a way when viewing this from a Marxist perspective as one class's ideology may be accepted within the whole nation. In this sense 'ideology' is understood as the 'false consciousness' of Frederik Engels.

Hall (1996) remarks that although no theory of ideology exists fully packaged in the works of Marx and Engels where it had quite an ad hoc theorising, our current understanding of this term is much wider: 'We now use it to refer to all organised forms of social thinking' (p.26). Marxist concepts of ideology suggest that there is an integral relationship (dialectic) between structure and ideas, between the social-economic and the ideological, between the institutional and 'cultural'. This is not purely a deterministic relationship. The realm of ideas does not deterministically follow the socio-economic. There is an interaction between the ideological and socio-economic, such that particularly the dominant ideas of the ruling class (for example, the more or less universal acceptance of neoliberalism as a government doctrine) actually affect the socio-economic arrangement in a very real and practical way (austerity - with all its practical consequences could not be enforced if people did not accept this dominant idea). Hence, one way that 'ideology' may be conceived is as a universal truism: according to Hall (1996: 32), 'Marx called them the eternalization of relations which are in fact historically specific; and the naturalization effect— treating what are the products of a specific historical development as if universally valid, and arising not through historical processes but, as it were, from Nature itself'. So, ideas and 'culture', are a product of time and space (there was life before, and hopefully after, the ultra-individualism of neoliberalism).

To develop a critical CCMS, there is a need to understand this relationship between context and content. The wider context is an economic and political one dominated by a particular

global economic system. Although one could challenge Marxism as a blueprint for socialism, Marx provided one of the most acute analyses of capitalism. Yet this brings me to the next element that appears lacking in a critical CCMS, the analysis of the political nature of cross-cultural management.

The political nature of cross-cultural management

Many cross-cultural management scholars appear unconcerned with the political nature of their work, or indeed the political nature of management itself, and of cross-cultural management in particular. Of the social sciences, management studies appears to be one of the most conservative. Management, as a practice, largely supports the status quo and existing power structures within society, whereas cross-cultural management is designed to make the most effective use of those existing structures internationally. It supports the dominant ideology because that is its main focus, or the dominant 'culture' within largely the dominant parts of the world. For Marx and Engels (1979):

> *The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas: i.e., the class which is the ruling material force of society is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, consequently also controls the means of mental production, so that the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are on the whole subject to it.*

If, as CCM scholars, we are at once studying ideology (i.e. 'culture') and supporting and reproducing that ideology, a critique of this needs to be incorporated into our scholarship. Hofstede (1991) warned that our own cultural background may colour the way we study culture and that we need to be introspective about this. We also need to be aware of the overall context of what we are studying and the accumulated knowledge of what we are studying. In simple terms this is the intrinsic relation between institutions and ideology. In more complex and critical terms this is the relationship between a political-economic structure and the dominant ideas about this.

As a field that focuses internationally, incorporates international dynamics and globalisation, extant CCMS often provides weak analyses of these processes. For example, cultural crossvergence has developed as an important concept (Ralston, 2008; Priem et al, 2000), bringing together opposing views of globalization, namely convergence and divergence theories. The former assumes that all societies are following the same (western) trajectory under the unifying process of globalisation (from Kerr, Dunlop, Harbison and Myers, 1960), as they embrace capitalism, technology, global brands, management education, financial aid and so on. The latter, divergence thesis, asserts that national cultures continue to be a primary influence on values, beliefs and attitudes despite these globalising forces. This thesis is supported by the comparative studies of Hofstede and others. The third perspective, that of cultural crossvergence, suggests that culture and industrialization will interact to produce new

value systems, such as in the case of Hong Kong (for example, integrating Chinese, British, American and other cultural aspects) from where this theory initially developed.

Yet this theory, as others within CCMS, completely misses the importance of, and the role of, power relations within a global dynamic (Jackson, 2011). Crossvergence is seen, implicitly, as a consequence of interaction of equals, rather than subject to unequal relations on a global world stage. This is related to the next element that appears missing from a critical CCMS, that of the geopolitical context of our subject matter.

The geopolitical context

One of the most prominent streams of critical thought in cross-cultural management studies that appears to address the issue of the relevance of the geopolitical context in understanding power relations as well as the political nature of what we do is that of Postcolonial Theory (PCT) (e.g. Jack and Westwood, 2009).

Said (1978), Spivak (1988) and Bhabha (1994) have provided the seminal works in the development of PCT. Said has focused on 'orientalism' or the power relations between colonizer and colonized and the representation of the 'East' by the West in both derogatory and exotic terms, and questioned whether the dominant knowledge produced in the West is in fact disinterested, and being in alliance with imperial interests. Spivak has focused more on the gendered nature of this relationship and the way postcolonial discourse has essentialized notions of identity (representing 'the other' by, for example categories of gender or race) and questioned the ability of 'the subaltern' to then speak of themselves in any authentic terms and pointing to their lack of agency, yet seeing this as a space for resistance. Bhabha has focused on the hybrid nature of the 'Third Space' culturally created by this power dynamic, through attempts of the colonizers to make the colonized mimic them, and through the resistance of the colonized.

These various foci within PCT have informed critiques of mainstream theories in development studies (e.g. Mohan, 2002) in organization studies (Prasad, 2003) and more recently in international management studies (Jack, Calás, Nkomo & Peltonen, 2008; Frenkel, 2008; Özkazanç-Pan, 2008).

Postcolonial Theory can be used to understand much of what has been regarded as the cultural aspects of global interaction. It tells us that not only the West's representations of 'the other' colour how we see, and research, and manage people and organizations in 'developing' countries, but that 'the other' adopts and internalizes such representations. This leads to a wholesale adoption of Western education, knowledge and technology, together with the disparaging of local approaches and solutions. This also leads to a kind of 'false consciousness' in the Marxist sense, so that local people have lost their authentic voice (in Spivak's, 1988, terms they cannot speak, as such). This has implications for the way scholars research these 'subjects', in the projection of Western representations of 'the other', and the way these representations are reflected back to Western researcher.

Hence PCT has been useful. For example, it has encouraged more indigenous lines of research, stimulated by work such as that of Smith (1999), which goes beyond a simplistic distinction between etic and emic (Peterson & Pike, 2002) research. Yet PCT is hampered by its situation in time and place. These temporal and spacial dimensions are changing. How do we understand new South on South relationships in a new global dynamic? For example the relationships of Chinese MNCs in Africa with local employees and communities cannot be understood critically as colonial or postcolonial relationships (Jackson, 2012b), as they also cannot be understood by more mainstream scholarship, such as in the field of expatriation (Jackson and Horwitz, 2017).

Apart from issues of time and place PCT is also weak on interrogating the economic context within which organizations and individuals operate. Capitalist modes of production have a profound affect on what these actors do and the way thy interact (as well as what we study and how we study it). Marxist analysis, for example, provides one of the most acute critical understanding of this context yet is seldom employed in critical cross-cultural management scholarship. Although Marxism provides us with an understanding of culture as ideology, a concept borrowed in PCT, both Marxism and PCT does not go far enough in understanding the economy as another facet of culture, which can be analysed from a cultural perspective (as in the case of work in the area of economic anthropology that has traditional focused on 'primitive' economic systems, but more recently provided a critique of capitalism and, for example, the 2008 financial crisis: Hann & Hart. 2011). As discussed above, much of extant cross-cultural management studies is restrictive in what is included as 'culture', following Hofstede and mainly the American school of cultural anthropology focusing on symbolic culture (software of the mind: Hofstede, 1991) rather than the more inclusive European social anthropological view of culture which includes institutions, systems, processes and structures created by societal interaction. The economy is one such process, which is largely ignored as part of extant studies of cross-cultural management, nor does this tend to figure in more critical analyses.

PCT also is not very informative overtly on power in its application to CCMS, another dimension of the context of cross-cultural management, and again one that is largely ignore by Jack and Westwood's (2009) application of PCT to CCMS, for example 'power' is not indexed in their book, yet is given prominence in more recent critical texts (e.g. Mahadevan, 2017). This explicit absence in PCT is surprising in view of its concerns with globalisation and interaction with the local. This should connect directly with the concept of power and how, in interaction, power is a major influence on how culture and cultural interactions themselves are formulated.

The real discussion of the ability of PCT to properly analyse such relationships within a geopolitical context has taken place outside critical CCMS, which has been a late-adopted of PCT. For example, Mohan (2002:157) working within the discipline of development studies gives an idea of how PCT provides a more subtle critique of power dynamics, by suggesting that PCT 'alerts us to the epistemic violence of Eurocentric discourses of the non-West and the possibilities of recovering the voices of the marginalized' but warns that 'much of this abstracts

cultural processes away from material conditions and is unable to stand outside (or suggest alternatives to) the dominant epistemological frameworks against which they argue'.

PCT is likely to have run its course, while hardly getting started in critical cross-cultural management studies, which has failed to absorb major strands of the debate let alone contribute to them. While PCT has contributed well to analyses of North-South global relations, it does badly in theorising South-South relations. As we see in the next section below, this may be a result of CCMS mainly ignoring the Majority World. The dynamics of China in Africa, for example is revealing of the way geopolitical dynamics are changing, moving away from the prominence of North-South (or West-East) interactions, towards a growing prominence of BRICS countries within the Majority World. These are the cultural interfaces that are becoming more pertinent to an expanded concept of what cross-cultural management scholars should study.

It may seem odd that although an argument can be put that PCT is outmoded as a theory that can drive critical cross-cultural management theory forward, Marxism can provide the basis of not only developing critical theory but also mainstreaming more critical theories within cross-cultural management studies and make them more relevant to the modern globalised world.

Chibber (2013) sees postcolonial theory as largely arising to prominence as a consequence of 'the general disorganization of labor and the Left, which created the conditions for postcolonial theory to flourish', adding that 'after the decline of the labor movement and the crushing of the Left in the 1970s, there wasn't going to be any kind of prominent theory in academia that focused on capitalism, the working class, or class struggle.' So, PCT took its place as a radical theory focusing on oppression, but leaving out class struggle, and being developed in academia rather than from any bottom-up popular movement.

Whether or not Marxism is a good blueprint for socialism is not the point (Donham, 1999). Its critique and understanding of the nature of the economic, political and cultural context within which organizations and individuals largely function within a globalised world is unmatched. Its continued relevance today is increasingly evident, yet this overtly political statement still appears at odds with a 'scientific' study of cross-cultural management within academia.

Why a critical analysis is needed of this system, within which we purport to understand how cross-cultural values and interaction work, has become more apparent. Globalisation under a capitalist system appears to affect our international and domestic interactions. Assumptions of universalism and institutional isomorphism, for example, are being challenged by cross-cultural management scholars. Yet this is from a very weak theoretical base that needs a critical strengthening. This involves examining context, as highlighted above. If we are looking at 'culture' we still have to consider any theory about it in context. The context is capitalism. Yet this does not only form a context but is integral to what we call culture, and therefore part of the content we study: this could be called a paradox, or dialectic, depending on one's philosophical perspective.

To recap on the discussion above, culture comprises all meaningful action, structure, values and ideas among human society. The world context for this is a global capitalist system that needs to be understood as part of the culture that we study (in its interaction between, simplistically, global and local). Without understanding this context, which comprises culture, it is difficult to understand the phenomenon that we purport to study. Culture is at once the context of our study, and the subject of our study.

Marx's account of socio-economic class based on the means of production may seem outdated. Yet this is only because the means of production has changed and concentrated in the hands of fewer very high net worth individuals. One of the consequences of the 2007-8 economic crash is that fewer workers are actually directly employed in traditional employment, exemplified by the growth of the so-called gig economy. A recent McKinsey Global Institute report (Marston, 2016) estimated that in the US and most of Europe up to 30% of the working population work this way. So, far from the wage labourer being a thing of the past, labour costs, as the main cost of the means of production, are being driven down by these measures, governments are mainly sanctioning them, and the difference between capital and labour is becoming more acute rather than fading away. Again, the gig economy in developed, western countries is largely ignore as a context for cross-cultural management studies, yet increasingly it is becoming part of the cross-cultural management landscape.

Yet it is not just the nature of work, and the nature of the economic context that cross-cultural management scholars are ignoring, it is the wider influence of geopolitical and geo-economic relationships on the mass movement of expatriates/migrants that we are also not incorporating into our study. This, again. is largely because the overall global context is being ignored, or perhaps misrepresented.

If we site cross-cultural management studies within the social sciences, where it belongs, like all social scientists we are contributing to an understanding of how (and why) society works. A critical Marxist analysis helps us to understand this, but also it helps us to understand why we are only studying a very small section of global society. What is our aim? What are we trying to understand? Our scholarly objectives may change if we introduce this type of critical analysis. Whose interests are we serving? Why is this relevant?

As management largely supports the status quo and existing power structures within society, whereas cross-cultural management is designed to make the most effective use of those existing structures internationally, this has also led to a neglect of contexts comprising the larger proportions of the world population. Hence the Majority World, or what is often referred to pejoratively as 'developing' countries is largely neglected in our studies (estimated to be 80 per cent of the Globe: Punnett, 2004). For example, Aycan (2006) has pointed to the negative way that paternalism has been painted in leadership studies, or simply ignored, where this may form the most prominent leadership style in many non-western contexts, and seen as positive in these contexts. This cannot possibly be understood if these wider global contexts are simply ignored in extant CCMS.

Management and organization has also been neglected in the informal economies mostly within the majority world where it comprises the largest proportion of national economies, as discussed under. Few management scholars have attempted to understand and learn from this major sector of the economy, and to absorb this learning into the body of knowledge and literature we call cross-cultural management studies, despite its importance. I now turn to this next element that is missing from a critical CCMS.

Embracing the majority world

The concentration of CCMS predominantly on the Minority World ensures that the sub-discipline is missing a substantial body of knowledge both spatially and temporally.

Spatially, a large proportion of what we are missing from the Majority World can be terms 'indigenous'. According to Peredo and McLean (2010) indigenousness is a majority view, with an estimated 300-500 million people occupying around 20% of the world's landmass. Rather than the prevailing assumption, where this is considered in the international management literature (e.g. Tsui, 2004), indigenousness does not just mean 'local'. It is a function of power and colonisation (Smith, 1999). It is marginalized within mainstream knowledge and culture (Wiessner, 1999). It is dynamic rather than a static artefact (Briggs and Sharp, 2004) constantly producing new knowledge and social forms within a changing cultural interface (Jackson, 2011). It is also a political concept (Smith, 1999) and probably a reason why it is avoided by mainstream international and cross-cultural management scholars (Jackson, 2013, has suggested such scholars use 'endogenous' instead, if they want to stay safe from politics).

The under-representation of indigenous knowledge in management scholarship leads to a lack of diversity in terms of:
– Knowledge sources (what do we know and how do we know it?)
– Idea- and concept-generation (how do we think about what we know and how do we formulate this into theories and knowledge?)
– Consequences and impact on diverse communities within a global world (are our theories and subsequent practices appropriate to the diverse organizational and social communities with which businesses and international managers come into contact?).

Jackson (2013) has identified the informal economy as a major site for indigenous knowledge and practice, and quotes Cheru (2002: 48-9) as saying the informal economy is ".. a dynamic and enduring force that has shaped African cities", representing "..an alternative society, with parallel social and religious institutions alongside the official ones" and "..a node of resistance and defiance against state domination". Again, the under-representation (if not completely ignoring) of this part of the world economy in cross-cultural management studies is surprising, as the informal economy forms a huge percentage of total economies in the Majority World. It represents 82% of total employment in South Asia and 72% in sub-Saharan Africa. In the latter 74% of all women in non-agricultural trades are employed or run their own firms in the informal economy. For South Asia the figure is 83%. Cross-cultural management scholars

could learn much here (for example, exploring different forms of leadership, including matriarchal forms of leadership).

Communities in the informal economy are often persecuted or ignored. Their voice is weak and they have little influence over policy that affects them. Being ignored by management scholars is probably the least of their problems, yet this is a huge omission from our scholarship, and from our attempts to understand knowledge in the global arena.

In terms of what cross-cultural management scholarship is missing temporally, our sub-discipline appears to be ignoring, as stated above, global power dynamics (Jackson, 2011; 2012b; 2014): the way the world is changing and the implications for what we study and how we study it. The way the world looks today has been the result of the geopolitical dynamics of imperialism and colonialism.

These dynamics are changing. Ancient civilisations are again coming to the fore (e.g. China, India). Former colonies are taking over organizations and acquiring huge investments in the countries of the former colonisers. Former dominant economies that shaped the world are now being shaped by countries of the global South: the majority world. Changing geopolitics have the potential to change and reshape knowledge, including management knowledge (Jackson, 2012b). Even critical international and cross-cultural management scholars who have engaged with such ideas as Postcolonial Theory (e.g. Jack and Westwood, 2009), a theory sited in place and time, are now out of time and out of place (by about 20 years). New (critical) theories within CCMS are not being developed to cope with the new geopolitical landscape, one which is dependent not on North-South interaction (or West-East), but South on South interactions, which are quite different and have different antecedents and dependencies such as those involving China or India in Africa (Jackson, 2012b). PCT is proficient at analysing North-South dynamics and dependences, but to use this analysis on, for example China in Africa relationships is erroneous. At the same time PCT is very much a Western theory, despite its Eastern variants (such as the Subaltern Studies from India: e.g. Guha & Spivak, 1988). Critical CCMS should be looking at what affects China's dominance in the world will have on management and organizational knowledge.

Yet, temporally, there is another aspect that cross-cultural management scholarship appears to ignore: the effect of changing technology on communication, knowledge and culture. This connects fundamentally to the integration of indigenous and Majority World knowledge and practice into our scholarship, and connects to the way we can view indigeneity as a dynamic, rather than a static artefact. The problem of its weak voice and agency may also be overcome by such changes (Jackson, 2013). This is because the nature of knowledge sharing appears to be changing through the opposition of two trends:
– A tendency towards more elitism in scholarly knowledge. Scholarship itself, increasingly, is considered the preserve of academic elites, mostly in Western Europe and North America, produced increasingly in elite universities, and published in elite scholarly journals that appear far removed from the diversity and changing nature of management and organizational knowledge of the Majority World. This is what drives many cross-cultural

management scholars in their quest to publish in these top journals and to have access to these elite institutions. Yet the failure to properly acknowledge the other (not necessarily directly opposite, and perhaps complementary) trend does a disservice to scholarship, including within a critical CCMS.

– A trend towards the propagation of unmediated knowledge through digital technology appears to be pulling in the opposite direction. Social media may have the potential to provide better representation of under-represented and marginalized knowledge. The Arab Spring is a much cited example of the power of digital media in communicating a message that otherwise might not have been heard (Klischewski, 2014). According to Facebook (2014) "… there are 100 million people coming to Facebook every month across the African continent, with over 80% on mobile." This may have the potential to democratise knowledge and scholarship.

Once indigenous knowledge is freed from its time and place constraints it becomes relevant. If it is seen as positioned at a certain time (precolonial) and place (the developing world), it is easy to compartmentalise it, exclude it from global discourse. It then remains the preserve of anthropologists and human rights lawyers.

Social media itself is subject to manipulation, exclusion and to power relations within society. For example there are questions over the value of hashtag activism – a substitute for social action rather than an action in itself. But also there is the potential for democratisation of knowledge. By implication this involves democratising and integrating indigenous knowledge in global discourse. This leads to a consideration of the next element missing from a critical CCMS.

Including indigenous knowledge

The tools available to us as researchers are also available to our 'subjects'. The means of communicating knowledge from the research we do is available to those it may benefit. This involves getting indigenous research right: asking the questions, whom will the research benefit? and how? This is an agenda setting question concerning the involvement of our 'subjects' not just as subjects, but being involved in setting the agenda for research. It also involves a decision about how we communicate our research and to whom. Social media may provide a means of not only influencing policy makers through communicating our results, and not just our colleagues, but those we are researching.

The indigenous New Zealand researcher Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) makes the point that indigenous research is cross-cultural research, when she marries up indigenous research for and by indigenous peoples and research about indigenous peoples and knowledge when she talks about doing research in '..the cross-cultural context', outlining the types of questions that need to be answered such as:
– Who defines the research problem?
– For whom is this study worthy and relevant?
– Who says so?

- What knowledge will the community gain from this study?
- What knowledge will the researcher gain from this study?
- To whom is the researcher accountable?

Since her writing in 1999, we may now have a better grasp of the tools available to further democratise our research (or as Smith, 1999, puts it 'decolonize' our research). Yet CCMS as a profession is struggling to catch up. It has been wrong-footed in both time and space. Not only has it not taken account of changing global dynamics, it has missed out a large part of the Globe. One of the reasons this has happened is because it has not taken account of developments in the wider social sciences. Not only does it not take account of a huge proportion of the world's population, it has not developed the theory and research methods to understand the diversity and power relation involved. Gender roles are an example.

While Smith (1999) argues, from a perspective that the West has largely defined and shaped concepts of the indigenous through 'othering', that colonialism disrupted gender relations among indigenous people, by denying the role of women in such areas as chiefdoms and spiritual roles, this in itself may be anachronistic. Often Western feminist concepts of the role of women are imposed on ideas of 'the other'. The nature of veiling in many Muslim societies is viewed negatively, rather than looking at the nature of gendered knowledge in Muslim societies and what it can contribute to global discourse (Jackson, 2011). Here, as Smith (1999: 45) has suggested in other contexts, 'Western concepts of race intersect in complex ways with concepts of gender….. Ideas about gender difference and what that means for a society can be…traced back to the fragmented artefacts and representations of Western cultures, and to different and differentiated traditions of knowledge'.

It seems that when the 'indigenous' can be safely compartmentalized in place and time it can be easily conceptualized and confined. Once it starts to seep out into the mainstream it becomes a threat to dominant discourses. In this way a view that indigeneity is a majority rather than a minority phenomenon is problematic for dominant discourses.

Until cross-cultural cross management scholars can embrace this, the discipline will remain in the realm of cultural comparison and cross-cultural competences and serve the purposes of the powerful in the Minority World.

Yet, here, I return to my starting point, to the question of what culture is, as this point alone determines what is included and what is excluded from a critical CCMS. The issue of race is one that is avoided, sidestepped or misinterpreted by CCM scholars, yet can easily be incorporate within a critical CCMS that includes a wider concept of culture.

The question of race; now you see it, now you don't

There is a problem with race in CCMS as a subject largely ignored, or assumed. There is a lack of research in this area, and it does not fit easily into existing (and perhaps safe) research agendas. It vaguely exists in the area of 'diversity' but most scholars are reluctant to tackle it

head on. It does not easily fit with concepts of 'culture'. It may be regarded as a 'political' issues and best to be avoided. Yet 'race' is one of the most pertinent factors in the modern, globalised world. It is anchored in a very dark heritage connected with the slave trade, and debates in psychology in the 1970s around differential intelligence of white and black people (Eysenck, 1971) are still implicit if not overt as they were then. They still raise their heads in issues such as migration. And they are power laden. We cannot understand them if we do not have a concept of power dynamics in our cross-cultural scholarship. Theorising about race and racism is often lacking in the cross-cultural management literature. Yet it is an area that highlights race as a cultural product.

Mahadevan (2017: 91) tells us that

> *'..people tend to speak of "race" in North American contexts, of "ethnicity" in Western Europe, and of "migration background" in countries such as Germany wherein the category "race" is historically laden and national identification is rooted in presumed ethnic homogeneity… this reminds us that the labels wherein we frame difference are linked to our own cultural glasses, even on a scholarly level'*

She reminds us that in international management we implicitly reference the 'white, heterosexual, western, middle/upper class, able man'.

In many cross-cultural studies American-ness is assumed as an homogenous whole. 'Others' are different, and to be compared with the American norm. Even Hofstede's challenge 'do American theories apply abroad?' Makes this implicit assumption. There are few contemporary studies by management scholars from other countries that specifically examine American management from a (cross)cultural perspective. In other words, American culture is largely 'invisible'.

This is not in itself strange, as America is a dominant economy within the world, and most management academics are in the US. But the assumption in management studies of a unified 'culture' is curious given the history of the US, despite the 'melting pot' thesis. One of the few explicitly cross-cultural studies of America (Stewart and Bennett, 1991) feels able to describe the American culture as an homogeneous whole, for example: 'Americans naturally assume that each person is not only a separate biological entity, but also a unique psychological being and a singular member of the social order. Deeply ingrained and seldom questioned, the dominant American self, in the form of individualism, pervades action and intrudes into each domain of activity.' (p. 129).

It is these types of assumptions, of invisible cultures, that have been challenged by Whiteness Studies. For example McDermott and Samson (2005) write:

> *'Much of the research on white racial identity during the past ten years has focused on how whiteness, and the privileges associated with whiteness, remain invisible to many whites, especially those with limited interracial contact (….).*

Instead, whiteness is normative (....), an unexamined default racial category. Although many nonwhites, especially African Americans, are confronted with their race on a daily basis (....), many whites do not think of themselves as really having a race at all. In this respect, white is an unmarked identity, such as heterosexual or middle-aged (....)'. (p. 248: original authors extensive references in this quotations have been removed).

Frankenberg (2001) accentuates the situational nature of whiteness, noting that changes in American society has brought racial groups more into contact with each other, urging that the idea of whiteness as invisible should be changed. America, like Britain and countries in Western Europe have changed significantly over the last few decades, rendering both the concept of one American identity, and the basis of cross-cultural studies such as Hofstede's, GLOBE and others almost facile. It is interesting that in the more recent GLOBE study (House et al, 2004), South African samples are taken of both White and Black, and in Canada samples are taken from English and French speakers, yet the much larger USA is taken as one sample. In the 2000 US census, out of a total population of nearly 249 million, 75.1 percent said they were white or Caucasian, 21.36 per cent (60 million) claimed German descent, 12.3 percent said they were black or of African America descent, and 12.5 percent Hispanic. Three point six percent were Asian (United States Census Bureau, 2000).

CCMS has a history of ignoring race, either by assuming it (as suggested by Whiteness Studies) or by avoiding it as a politically sensitive subject. Yet 'race' is a subject that is ripe for study by CCM scholars, as the historian Painter (2010: ix) asserts: 'race is an idea, not a fact'. It is a cultural construct, rather than a biological one and a product of power dynamics over several centuries. Similar to other cultural constructs, such as 'Africa' (Ahluwalia, 2001: 13) 'race' is a Western invention. It is power-laden, and should be studied as such. In doing so, Mahadevan (2017) talks about 'reading between the lines', or as Jacques Derrida (1978) termed it 'deconstruction'. This involves examining the binaries, or dichotomies, we use in conceptualizing race (white/black), the power relations from which this is drawn and its power implication, the implied superiority/inferiority as they are in cross-cultural management theory that involves difference (individualism/collectivism, low-high power distance).

In conclusion, race is not the same as culture, but it is culturally determined with power dynamics in play. Yet it is often neglected in our research agendas, perhaps as it is not seen as relevant, or maybe seen as too political. In some ways this is surprising as we are familiar with the issues of racial stereotyping and with racial prejudice in the workplace and elsewhere. But, in others ways, this neglect is not surprising, as the idea of 'race' is not included in the assumed scope of 'culture' in the CCMS literature.

Yet as CCM scholars are beginning to take a critical note of the issues of doing business with 'others' where stereotyping and more subtle factors come into play, there is a growing need to incorporate a critical concept of race. As CCMS broadens its subject matter to include areas such as issues of management in international development (e.g. Claeyé & Jackson, 2011) which is still rife with power dynamics, patronising attitudes and inappropriate actions and

policies, which appear to stem from the colonial heritage of world powers, there is a growing need to develop this critical understanding.

This involves a clearer definition and description of race as an historical and therefore a cultural construct: there is nothing black and white about race other than the categories that others have imposed. There is a need for a clearer understanding of the power dynamics at play and the intrinsic political nature of our subject area: we are dealing with relationships between people, and therefore it goes with the territory. We need to be more strongly introspective about our own work and the concepts and categories we use, We need to be clearer about the overall context within which we work and how it affects who we are, what we think and what we do. The idea of race is part of our culture. It needs to be interrogated and understood by scholars who are equipped to study culture in an international and global world of work.

Facing the challenges

Critique is central to how social science has evolved over the decades. As an applied social science CCMS has done little to contribute to this critique or indeed to the evolution of social sciences as a whole. It has failed to live up to its critical mission following the pioneering work of Hofstede and others who pointed to the geographically restrictive nature of extant management studies. This may have been in part through the restrictive nature itself of Hofstede's theory, particularly in the way it restricted the scope of 'culture'. This may not have been an inherent fault in the nature of the theory (I do not think it was intended as a general theory of culture) but in its subsequent application by noncritical CCM scholars and journal editors. Hence the key issue identified in this chapter is a prevailing concept of culture that militate against a broader application and mainstreaming of CCMS. Scholars have failed to grapple with the associated issue of the context of our studies also being their content: one of the main paradoxes addressed by critical social science. This chapter therefore focused on what was missing from a critical CCMS, rather than reviewing critical cross-cultural management studies as a separate, and perhaps esoteric, stream or movement within CCMS.

The way extant cross-cultural management studies have evolved over the decades may only be relevant to a small section of the population, within a narrowly defined sector of business, in restrictive geographical regions, yet often purporting to offer universal knowledge in such areas as the extent of cultural values and their variation, the nature of competencies (intelligence) to work across country cultures, the nature of cross-cultural interactions, the cultural issues of working as expatriates, cross-cultural issues of (mainly western) MNCs operations including mergers and acquisitions, negotiating across cultures (usually west-west, or west-east), working in multicultural teams, leadership behaviour and styles across country cultures, and conflict management across cultures.

Methodological developments in our field start with highlighting the context of our studies. This involves bringing in knowledge from the regions and sectors that extant cross-cultural management studies neglect, and which can contribute significantly to understanding globalisation and its effects. Most importantly this involves widening the scope and definition

of 'culture' to be more inclusive. Critical scholars can then help to bring some of the following to the fore in what we study and how we study it.

– Learning from, and also benefiting, the majority world rather than ignoring it

– Learning from economic sectors that have been neglected by extant scholarship. This is especially the informal economy. There is a parallel between this large sector, and indigenous management and organisation. This is not intrinsically seen as politically important, is neglected, but nonetheless has potentially a significant contribution to make to issues such as food security, as well as general development issues in majority world countries.

– Dealing with the 'human-made part of the environment'. This does not just mean being able to analyse concepts such as 'race' as a cultural construct, but also looking at 'economy' as a cultural construct. In so doing this not only brings this, and other 'institutions' within our focus as the context of our work (e.g. capitalism as context of globalization, affecting such issues as indigeneity and lack of voice) but as the content of our study.

– Understanding the political nature of our study. This goes with our context of study being also our content or subject of study. The political nature of management, cross-cultural management and the way we study these cannot be avoided.

By incorporating these issue into its scholarship CCMS may yet be able to fulfil its original critical mission as an applied social sciences, mainstreaming its work, and making significant contributions to a critical understanding of human thought and interaction.

References

Adler, P. S., Forbes, L. C., & Willmott, H. (2008). 3. Critical Management Studies. *Academy of Management Annals*, 1, 119–179.

Ahluwalia, P. (2001) *Politics and Post-Colonial Theory: African Inflections*, London: Routledge.

Aycan, Z. (2006). Paternalism: towards conceptual refinement and operationalization, in K.S. Yang, K. K. Hwang and U. Kim (Eds.) Scientific *Advances in Indigenous Psychologies: Empirical, Philosophical and Cultural Contributions*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 206, 445-66

Bhabha, H. K. (1994) *The Location of Culture*, New York: Routledge

Boyacigiller, N.A. and Adler, N.J. (1991), "The parochial dinosaur: organizational science in a global context", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 262-90.

Brannen, M Y (2004) When Mickey Loses Face: Recontextualization, Semantic Fit, and the Semiotics of Foreignness, *Academy of Management Review*, 29(4), 593–616.

Briggs, J. and Sharpe, J. (2004) Indigenous knowledge and development: a postcolonial caution, *Third World Quarterly*, 25(4), 661-76

Cheru, F. (2002) *African Renaissance: Roadmaps to the Challenge of Globalization*, London: Zed Books.

Chibber, V. (2013) *Postcolonial Theory and the Spector of Capital*, London: Verso

Cooke, Bill and Kothari, Uma (2001) *Participation: The New Tyranny?* London: Zed Books.

Claeyé, F., & Jackson, T. (2011) Project delivery in HIV/AIDS and TB in Southern Africa: The cross- cultural management imperative. *Journal of Health Organization and Management*. 25(4): 469-86.

Facebook (2014) https://www.facebook.com/business/news/connectIng-100-million-people-in-africa, accessed 29 June 2018

Derrida, J (1978) *Writing and Difference*, (Trans. A. Bass), London: Routledge

Donham, D L (1999) *History, Power, Ideology: Central Issues in Marxism and Anthropology*, University of California Press

Eysenck, H J (1971) *Race, Intelligence and Education*, London: Temple Smith

Frenkel, M. (2008). The multinational corporation as a Third Space: rethinking international management discourse on knowledge transfer through Homi Bhaba, *Academy of Management Review*, 33(4), 924-942

Geertz, C (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York: Basic Books.

Giddens, A (1986) *The Constitution of Society*,Berkeley and Los Angeles:University of California Press.

Goody, J. (1994) Culture and its boundaries: a European perspective, in R. Borofsky (ed) *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*,New York: McGraw-Hill, pp. 250-61.

Guha, R and Spivak, G C (Eds) (1988) *Selected Subaltern Studies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Hall , S. (1996) The problem of ideology: marxism without guarantees, in D Morley and K-H Chen, *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, London: Routledge, pp.24-45

Hann, C and Hart, K (2011) *Economic Anthropology: History, Ethnography, Critique*, Cambridge, UK: Polity

Herskovits M J (1948) *Man and His Works: The Science of Cultural Anthropology*, New York: Knopf.

Kelly, W (2014) Applying a critical metatheoretical approach to intercultural relations: the case of US-Japanese communication, chapter 23 in M K Asante, Y Miike and J. Ying (Eds) *The*

Global Intercultural Communication Reader, 2nd edition, New York and London: Routledge, 2014, pp 357-73

Mohan, G (2002) Beyond participation: strategies for deeper empowerment, in B. Cooke and U Kothari (Eds.), *Participation: The New Tyranny?,* London: Zed Books, 2002: 153-167.

Hofstede, G. (1991) *Culture and Organizations: Software of the Mind*, London: McGraw-Hill

House, R, Hanges P J Javidan, M and Dorfman, P W, (2004) *Leadership, Culture and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*, Thousand Oaks: Sage

Jack, Gavin and Westwood, Robert. (2009) *International and Cross-cultural Management Studies: A Post- colonial Reading*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jack, G.A., Calás, M. B., Nkomo, S. M., & Peltonen, T. (2008). Critique and International Management: an uneasy relationship? *Academy of Management Review*, 33(4), 870-884.

Jackson, T. (2011) From Cultural Values to Cross-cultural Interfaces: Hofstede Goes to Africa, *Journal of Organization Change Management*, 24(4): 532-58.

Jackson, T. (2012b). Postcolonialism and organizational knowledge in the wake of China's presence in Africa: interrogating South-South relations. *Organization*, 19(2), 181–204.

Jackson, T. (2012a) Cross-cultural management and the informal economy in sub-Saharan Africa: implications for organization, employment and skills development, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(14): 2901-16,

Jackson, T. (2013) Reconstructing the Indigenous in African Management Research: Implications for International Management Studies in a Globalized World, *Management International Review*, 53(1):13-38.

Jackson, T. (2014) Employment in Chinese MNEs: Appraising the Dragon's Gift to sub-Saharan Africa, *Human Resource Management*, 53(6), 897-920

Jackson, T and Horwitz, F. (2017) Expatriation in Chinese MNEs in Africa: A Paradigm Shift? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1284882

Kerr, C., Dunlop, J. T., Harbison, F. H. and Myers, C. A. (1960) *Industrialism and Industrial Man*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Klischewski, R. (2014). When virtual reality meets realpolitik: Social media shaping the Arab government-citizen relationship, *Government Information Quarterly*, 31(3), 358–364.

McDermott, M. & Samson, F. L. (2005) White racial and ethnic identity in the United States, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 31:245–61

McSweeney, B. (2002) Hofstede's model of national cultural differences and their consequences: A triumph of faith – a failure of analysis, *Human Relations*, 55(1): 89–118.

Mahadevan, J. (2017) *A Very Short, Fairly Interesting and Reasonable Cheap Book About Cross-Cultural Management*, London: Sage

Marx, K and Engels, F (1976) "The ruling class and the ruling ideas." In *Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels: Collected Works, vol. 5*, pp. 59–62. Translated by Richard Dixon. New York: International Publishers, 1976

Marston, R (2016) 'Gig' economy all right for some as up to 30% work this way, BBC News online 10 October 2016, accessed at http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-37605643 20 January 2018

Mohan, Giles (2002) 'Beyond Participation: Strategies for Deeper Empowerment', in B. Cooke and U. Kothari (eds) *Participation: The New Tyranny?*, pp. 153–67. London: Zed Books.

Özkazanç-Pan, Banu (2008) International Management research meets "The rest of the world", *Academy of Management Review*, 33(4), 964-974.

Painter, N. I. (2010) *The History of White People*, New York: W W Norton

Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M. (2010). Indigenous development and the cultural captivity of entrepreneurship, *Business & Society*, 52(4), 592–620.

Peterson M F and Pike, K L (2002) Emic and etics for organizational studies: a lesson in contrasts from linguistics, *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 2002, 2(1), 5-20

Prasad, A (ed) (2003) *Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis: A Critical Reader*, London: Palgrave Macmillan

Punnett, B.J. (2004), "The developing world: toward a managerial understanding", in Lane, H.W., Maznevski, M.L., Mendenhall, M.E. and McNett, J. (Eds), *Handbook of Global Management*, Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 387-405.

Priem, R. L., Love, L. G. and Shaffer, M. (2000) Industrialization and values evolution: the case of Hong Kong and Guangzhou, China, *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 17(3), 473-92.

Ralston, David A. (2008) 'The Crossvergence Perspective: Reflections and Projections', *Journal of International Business Studies* 39(1): 27–40.

Said, E (1978/1995) *Orientalism*, London: Penguin

Smith, L T (1999) *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, London: Zed Books.

Søderberg, A-M and Holden, N (2002) Rethinking Cross Cultural Management in a Globalizing Business World, *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 2(1): 103-121

Sorge, A (2004) Cross-national differences in human resources and organization, Chapter 5 in A-W Harzing and J Van Ruysseveldt, *International Human Resource Management*, London: Sage, 2004: 117-140.

Spivak, G. C. (1988) Can the subaltern speak?, in C Nelson and L Grossberg (eds) *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, Basingstoke, UK: MacMillan, 1988, pp. 271-313.

Stewart, E. C. and Bennett, M. J. (1991) *American Cultural Patterns: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*, 2nd Edition, Boston: Intercultural Press

Taylor, H (2002) Insights in participation from critical management and labour process perspectives, chapter 8 in Cooke, Bill and Kothari, Uma (2001) *Participation: The New Tyranny?* London: Zed Books. Pp. 122-138

Tsui, A S (2004) Contributing to Global Management Knowledge: A Case for High Quality Indigenous Research, *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 21, 491–513.

Tylor, E B (1871) Primitive Culture, cited in C Levi-Strauss (1963) (Trans. Jacobson, C and B G Schoel), *Structural Anthropology*, Harmondsworth: Penguin

United States Census Bureau (2000) US Census 2000, http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html (accessed 29 June 2018)

Wiessner, S. (1999). "Rights and Status of Indigenous Peoples: A Global and Comparative and International Legal Analysis" *Harvard Human Rights Journal*, Vol. 12, Spring, 57-128.