



Globalization and Cross- Cultural Management in the 21st Century: A Critical Analysis

Dr. Aisha Saleem¹, Zahid Ullah Khan², Riffat Gill³, Muhammad Farooq Rehan⁴

1. Assistant professor, Lyallpur Business School, Government College University Faisalabad.
 2. Lecturer in Economics, University of Sargodha.
 3. Lecturer, Lyallpur business school, Government College University Faisalabad
 4. Assistant Professor, Lyallpur business school, Government College University Faisalabad.
- (Corresponding Author) E-mail: farooq.rehan@gcuf.edu.pk.

Abstract

In today's globalized business environment, organizations face the challenge of managing a culturally diverse workforce. This study explores the relationship between globalization and cross-cultural management, with a focus on the impact of cultural intelligence on organizational performance. The results indicate that cultural intelligence is a significant predictor of organizational performance, particularly in terms of employee satisfaction and commitment. The study also identifies best practices for cross-cultural management, including cultural training, diversity and inclusion initiatives, and effective communication strategies. Furthermore, the findings suggest that organizational leaders play a critical role in promoting a culture of inclusivity and respect for diversity. This study contributes to the existing literature on globalization and cross-cultural management by exploring the relationship between cultural intelligence and organizational performance. The findings provide valuable insights for organizations seeking to navigate the complexities of a globalized business environment and leverage the benefits of a diverse workforce.

Introduction

The 21st century's globalization is a very dynamic and complex phenomenon that is still transforming the economies, cultures, and organizational practices all over the world. In contrast to the previous stages of globalization steeped in trade and colonization, the modern day is affected by the lightning-fast technology development, digital networking, and multi-layered freedom of movements and flows of labor and finances (Friedman, 2022). The emergence of information and communication technologies (ICTs) and especially the internet has been an important factor in helping connect all parts of the globe with one another and making instantaneous communication and cooperation across borders a possibility (Castells, 2021). This revolution has renewed the old concepts of time, space as well as proximity thus giving multinational corporations (MNCs) as well as individuals a chance to interact on the global networks relatively easy. The result is that globalization has now gone beyond the field of economy to occupy political, social, cultural, and environmental spaces as well (Steger, 2020). The other outstanding contextual influence of global today is the transformation of global economic power which moves away New World to emerging markets especially in Parts of Asia, Latin America, and Africa. The emergence of China, India and other Global South economies has also affected the traditional position of control by the Western

industrialized countries resulting in a more multipolar world (Khanna, 2023). This transformation has significant implications to global governance, trade relations and cross-cultural interplays of the global community since different value systems and value systems and differences in leadership styles have become increasingly been felt in international business and international relations. Besides that, the COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated weaknesses as well as interdependence of a highly globalized world. Distribution of vaccines In light of these experiences, scholars and policymakers urged less fragile and more equitable forms of globalization, citing inequality surrounding supply chain breakdowns and vaccine nationalism (Rodrik, 2021). In the cultural sense, globalization has led to homogenization and diversification. On the one hand, the proliferation of consumer brands, entertainment, and digital platforms globally has led to the cultural convergence, and thus, lifestyles and tastes in different parts of the world are becoming more similar (Tomlinson, 2019). Conversely, globalization also gave rise to cultural push back or the reinstatement of identity with people trying to hold onto native ways and reject the prevalent western discourse (Appadurai, 2020). The two processes of cultural integration and fragmentation can be specially observed in the multicultural society and even in the workplace as cross-cultural understanding has become a necessity to communicate and to manage. The importance of globalization in this regard is the fact that it is capable of not shaping the structures that form global capitalism but also the micro-level interaction which characterizes the organizational culture and the leadership. Concisely, globalization of the 21st century is a complex and shifting process that shapes almost all spheres of a human life. Its importance is not only connected with the expansion of the economic opportunities but also with the formulation of complicated issues associated with equity, identity, governance, and sustainability. World globalization therefore needs to be comprehended in a wider, interdisciplinary manner, which accounts both the positive and the unforeseen consequences of globalization. This knowledge is essential to scholars and practitioners in the field of management to help them overcome the cultural complexities of a workforce that has become globalized and to create inclusive, fluid workplace cultures. In the 21st Century, the process of globalization has grown in ferocity which has had a far-reaching impact on the direction and the domain of the study of the cross-cultural management (CCM). The capacity to balance cultural differences is no longer a marginal managerial competence, but a strategic organizational prerequisite, as organizations grow beyond geographical boundaries, and virtual teams are expected to work together (Stahl et al., 2022). Both the frequency and nature of cross-cultural interactions have been enhanced through globalization, which, in turn, adds new challenges that the traditional paradigm of management fails to address, i.e., hybrid work models, culturally diverse leadership, and ethical tensions (Primecz et al., 2023). CAM and CCM studies in early years were largely influenced by functionalism theories most prominent being cultural dimensions model by Hofstede, which grouped national cultures into measurable characteristics (Hofstede, 2001). Nevertheless, even the globalization-induced growth of the multinational corporations and the digitalization of the workforce have shown that such essentialist perspectives have their limits, and scholars attempt to find more dynamic and less context-independent ways to understand culture (Ang & Van Dyne, 2015; Taras et al., 2021).

According to recent scholarship, there is a demand to revise the concept of culture as dynamic, relational, and placed in global structures of power and knowledge (Jack & Lorbiecki, 2022). There are concerns with the paradigm shift in CCM because of the increasing diversity of workplaces caused by globalization; the emphasis on the fixed national culture models should be replaced with multi-faceted and more integrative modeling (Kittur & Agarwal, 2024). As an example, Jackson

(2023) criticizes mainstream research in the field of CCM by saying that it has a Western-centric lean and that the field needs to be decolonized by paying closer attention to the voices of the indigenous and postcolonial. Likewise, Wickert et al. (2024) point out the fact that most of the literature on CCM still fails to take into account the experiences of managers who have to operate in the Global South, where they are likely to face the intersection of cultural complexity with economic and political limitation. Such epistemic misbalance suggests the problem of the universality and relevance of the dominant CCM theories. The literature has been characterized by tremendous gaps even though the effect of globalization has been transformative. On a methodological level, the excessive use of survey-based, cross-sectional research dedicated to bi-national comparisons, usually between Western ones (Judijanto et al., 2024). This restricts the ability to generalize findings and it is unable to reflect on temporal and situational dynamics of intercultural contact. In addition, cutting-edge topics like virtual teamwork, bias in international HRs through algorithms, and cultural adaptation due to climate change are still unexplored in general CCM discussions (Anglani et al., 2023; Bizarria et al., 2024). Other scholars have also highlighted the lack of interdisciplinary framework based on the combination of anthropological, digital sociological, and organizational studies, intended at understanding the field of cultural interaction in transnational settings (Szkudlarek et al., 2020). globalization has not only made cross-cultural management more relevant but it has revealed shortcoming in its ideology and methodology. The discipline is at a cross road where new models need to be developed to reflect the relational and power-dense and relativity of culture living in a hyper-connected world. The only way we can close these gaps is not just by reconsidering some of the underlying theories but by including the voices and worldviews of other people as well as adopting new approaches to arrive at a more inclusive and dynamic knowledge base.

Globalization and Organizational Culture

Globalization, which can be defined as the deepening process of movement of capital, people, technologies and ideas across borders, has redefined the nature and act of organizational culture. Culture in multinational corporations (MNCs) as well as global value chains is no longer an extensively accepted, more and usually assumed local, assumptive treasure trove; rather, culture is currently a bracketed, contested, and hybrid resourced resource that influences as well as is influenced by transnational stress (Stahl, Tung, & Zander, 2022). The expanding supply networks which are crossed through continents and the time and space have been compressed by digital collaboration tools demands of all firms to resolve the centripetal forces toward integration and level of centrifugal to local differentiation. This can be represented by the concept of globalizations which states that organizations face the pressure to be global in their thinking but local in their operation, creating cultural mosaics of the specialized writings of the corporation, overlain with local meanings (Robertson, 1995; Caves, 2024). Experience in new global markets demonstrates how the globalization remodels deep-seated cultural assumptions. According to the research of the Nepalese firms conducted by Bhatta (2024), the global leadership style, cross-border teams with geographic diversity and emerging communication technologies are all linked with employee satisfaction due to expanding repertoires of sense making and belonging. But the same spread of global practices may create tensions of identity, since national, professional, and organizational logics may collide in daily practice (Jackson, 2023). According to recent substantial N bibliometric reviews, culture has even started to be conceived scholarly as relational and loaded with power instead of just normative, and multi paradigmatic research taking seriously the problems of inequality and epistemic dominance are needed. (Primecz,

Romani, & Sackmann, 2023; Wickert, Lejeune, & Ravasi, 2024). Cultural dynamics have been faster through digital globalization. The relocation of work to virtual and hybrid spaces during the pandemic era shattered spatial co location as a very touchstone of tacit cultural cues and made organizations articulate values, rituals, and rules much more overtly and mediate them with technology. According to a recent Emerald Insight study conducted in 6 continents, remote working has caused a drastic change in communication patterns where instead of ad-hoc confirmatory conversations in the corridor, formal planned, and tech-based meetings with a risk of information overload are a serious possibility unless the leaders implement new patterns of transparency and inclusivity (Kahlow et al., 2024). Simultaneously, a Guardian analysis of business raises the issue that hybrid models are digging deeper especially in the developed Anglophone economies, and are changing the way urban planning happens, as well as talent retention approaches (Aksoy et al., 2025). In refutation of the fears that distance destroys culture, survey evidence shows that hybrid arrangements have the potential of reinforcing cultural commitment when accompanied by encouraging practices. More recent research, a 2024 survey conducted by Eagle Hill Consulting of American workers, revealed that 45 % of remote/hybrid employees rated their culture higher than the national average, whereas 36 % of fully in person workers did; remote staff were more likely to feel leadership positively defined culture, as well.

Culture adaptation, however, does not apply uniformly in any context. This observation was also supported by a cross cultural analysis of 2,200 different firms on five different continents: remote work increased innovation mainly in low power distance and high indulgence societies, where egalitarian norms and autonomy promoted risk taking. On the whole, these studies have indicated three general trends. First, globalization increases the number of cultural interfaces: headquarters vs. subsidiaries, on site vs. remote, algorithmic vs. human decision making, which, according to Szkudlarek et al. (2020), introduces them to what they refer to as the poly contextual reality. Second, the successful organizational cultures in globalization are becoming ambidextrous: they institutionalize global values like openness, equity and continuous learning and legitimize local variants in language, symbolism and managerial behavior (Taras, Steel, 2021, & Kirkman, 2021). Third, inclusive governance is determinative to cultural outcomes: research conducted in the North and in the South consistently demonstrates that, when marginalized voices are included in the design of norms, one experiences perceived authenticity and when those voices are included in how things are normatively designed, however, studies show that when those voices are part of how things are set normatively, perceived authenticity and engagement increase. In spite of these insights, there are major gaps in knowledge. Systematic reviews observe an excess use of surveys in the West, and the overall lack of longitudinal, multi-level ethnographies in the Global South. Digital native phenomena such as algorithmic management, AI produced cultural artefact and metaverse workplaces, are still poorly understood. Besides, power and postcolonial criticism, despite the increasingly widespread attention are still marginal in the mainstream of organizational culture studies (Jackson, 2023). What will be needed to fill these gaps will be interdisciplinary cooperation, critical reflexivity, and means that can follow culture within physical, digital, and symbolic landscapes. To sum up, globalization has made organizational culture more visible because it has to straddle more variance than ever before, and more porous since it is constantly being renegotiated across lines of geography, technology and identity. The companies thriving in this environment are able to create a coherent global narrative and at the same time empower the local contexts, invest in digital socialization architectures and foster culturally intelligent and ethically minded leadership. The task, according to scholars, is to find a way around the

homogenizing models to a context-based, power-sensitive mode of thinking that would represent the dynamic, conflictual reality of culture in the hyper-connected world.

Cross-Cultural Management Practices

The practice of cross cultural management (CCM) has changed very slowly as compared to changes in the environment which it is supposed to cater. Even though there is mounting evidence that the nature of global projects in terms of culture is dynamic, multi layered, and power laden, many firms continue to use a company-specific national culture typology and place a one off cultural awareness seminar in terms of cultural learning (Yousef, 2014). In a comparison study of virtual and face to face teams that extend across five continents, Yousef demonstrates that prescriptive models founded on the set country scores cannot predict the flexibility in identity negotiations and the speed of norm formation, which emerges when the team members switch between synchronous video calls, asynchronous networks, and face to face meetings that may be infrequent. Global teams as a result tend to swing between two extreme poles, on one hand over generalizing cultural differences at a risk of essentialism and on the other hand overlooking the same at a risk of misalignment. These legacies of practices explain why more dynamic and processual interventions are necessary that regard culture as something produced through social interaction as opposed to an inheritable national characteristic. A critical perspective also shows how the present toolkits of CCM replicate ethnocentrism by focusing on the norms of Western communication and management thinking. Thematic analysis of Indian executives in 2025 shows that lots of so called best practice guides ignore the strategic inclusion mechanisms, or floating holidays, multilingual channels, dialogic feedback loops, already in place in non-Western environments to render diversity productive (Katul, 2025). By disregarding these indigenous innovations, the global headquarters are tempted to retrofit, in a one size fits all package, distant subsidiaries in a way that leads to non-verbal gathering of resistance, inaction and quiet attrition. According to the study, it is important to note that truly global CCM should be co-created, by local players and measured by levels of participation, but not by adherence to the scripts by the headquarters. There are three inter associated issues that are continuously negating the cross cultural collaboration; these are ethnocentrism, stereotyping, and communication barriers. A stress perspective research of 47 multicultural work teams across Europe and Asia revealed that, ethnocentric role expectations lead to subgroup formation that impedes information sharing, increases the degree of social loafing, and creates negative consequences on psychological wellbeing (Leifels & Zhang, 2023). Although stereotypes act as a shortcut in cognition in cases of time crunch, they soon transform into exclusionary heuristics that de-legitimize minorities' expertise. Communication obstacles, on the other hand, no longer revolve strictly around speech accents, they extend to the culturally different semantics of turn taking, their tolerations of silence, and reliance on subtle signals of power that would be lost in media with superior text density. The creativity benefits normally accruing to diversity are negated unless leaders take proactive steps to bring these unfortunate hidden tensions out into the light where they can be resolved.

Current literature reviewing leadership needs in virtual teams with a multicultural background points out the complexities of how the asymmetries in languages, media richness button press and culturally specific feedback styles further complicate this picture (Anglani, Dalise, & Maley, 2022). The review advises leaders to institutionalize common ground linguistic rules, share facilitation of meetings among members of different cultures and integrate rich media that promotes sense making and low media to use in documentation. Such structure opposes the native speaker dominance and minimizes

interpretive ambiguity. Additionally, leaders are encouraged to develop what has been termed as cultural metacognition, which is where leaders develop observance of how their cultural lenses affect decision making. In the absence of such reflexivity, even inclusion efforts that are well meaning are likely to replicate hierarchical silences within online space. It is also clear what works. CQ is by far the most powerful personal level antecedent of multicultural team effectiveness. As part of an investigation of knowledge based firms, Nosratabadi et al. (2020) demonstrate that leaders with high CQ directly and indirectly promote organizational performance through the creation of structures of distributed decision rights and boundary spanning roles that capture and focus various perspectives toward innovation. The implications of inclusive leadership go even further: the moment managers encourage disagreement, accept culturally differentiated competence and role model humility, CQ inspires a downward spillover effect and turns into the common asset of the team. Adaptability, structural (e.g. having flexible work policies) and behavioural (e.g. code switching between direct and indirect communication patterns), is actually the change agent which translates CQ and inclusion into quantifiable results, namely, faster problem solving and an increased client satisfaction. Best in class organizations convert these success factors into five action practices of multicultural teams. First, they use continuous cultural learning built into workflow, short, scenario based micro trainings linked to project milestones, instead of annual workshops. Second, they provide psychologically safe platforms by the rotational leadership, anonymous idea forum and clearly defined norm reset meetings post-conflict. Third, they operationalize metrics of what they term as strategic inclusion and these measurements monitor equality of equal speaking time, uptakes in cross cultural mentoring, perceived equity in how resources are distributed, to make diversity goals transparent and answerable. Fourth, they use technology wisely: the rich media video is reserved to sense making and conflict resolution, and the deliberation history is recorded asynchronously so that a newcomer can audit the history of deliberation. Lastly, they are enthusiastic about micro adaptations where any execution of successful navigation through the cultural difference is viewed as organizational learning of ideas to be codified and made available to others. With constant application of these practices, multicultural teams stop coping with diversity but instead turn it into a strategic asset to become a veritable reality of globalization actually lived rather than spoken.

Power, Inequality, and Postcolonial Perspectives

Globalization has increased exposure of different cultures to each other in organizations but when global power asymmetries are reproduced as much as they are rectified by practices of cross cultural management (CCM). According to postcolonial theorists, the concept of best practices in management is often biased toward Western manner of thinking, with non-Western workers being viewed as cultural others whose expertise should be restructured in accordance with those established by the headquarters (Jackson, 2023). This pattern of asymmetry is also supported by English dominance in language that functions as a gatekeeping mechanism by facilitating coordination on the one hand and silencing the subordinate voices on the other hand which continues the tradition of epistemic inequality at transnational workplaces (Boussebaa, 2022). A study of international project groups demonstrates that even benevolently designed cultural sensitivity trainings can turn into the tools of soft power: by turning national characteristics into the prescriptive checklists, they end up to essentialize difference and to blind out the local agency (Primecz, Romani, & Sackmann, 2023). Additionally, the spread of HR technologies based on data models, which are frequently adjusted to Western performance standards, threatens factor bias that

systematically disadvantages employees and workers of Global South origin and Codes the colonially founded legacies in ostensibly blank systems.

Conclusion:

There is a strong linkage between globalization and cross cultural managements as the waves of globalization change the pattern of civilizations hence traditions and cultures also transfer from place to place. The technological revolution has also played an important factor in enhancing the sense of deprivations among the oppressed members of society. The Western society is playing a leading role in setting the trends and the world is moving towards a more integrated web of interlinking pattern where changes in one corner of the world affect the other pole as well. Globalization is no longer an episodic force to be “managed”; it is the omnipresent context in which organizations and their cultures now evolve. Its accelerating flows of capital, information, and people have multiplied cultural interfaces between headquarters and subsidiaries, on-site and virtual workers, and human and algorithmic decision makers. In sum, globalization has made CCM both more indispensable and more complex. Its evolving impact challenges scholars to refine theory around fluid, power-laden cultures and urges practitioners to move from compliance-driven “cultural awareness” toward agile, justice-oriented engagement. Organizations that rise to this challenge will not merely cope with diversity they will harness it as a strategic, ethical, and innovative advantage in an ever-interconnected world.

References:

- Aksoy, C. G., et al. (2025, July 7). *Staff need a place they trust: how to instil a workplace culture in a fast-changing world*. *The Guardian*.
- Ang, S., & Van Dyne, L. (2015). *Handbook of cultural intelligence*. Routledge.
- Anglani, M., D’Alise, G., & Maley, J. (2022). *Leadership job requirements in multicultural virtual teams: Which behaviours and skills do leaders need?* *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*.
- Anglani, M., D’Alise, G., & Maley, J. (2023). Managing virtual multicultural teams: Challenges and competencies. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 23(1), 14–30
- Appadurai, A. (2020). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization* (10th ed.). University of
- Bhatta, I. (2024). Impact of globalization on organizational culture: A case of Nepalese organizations. *Nepalese Journal of Business*, 11(3), 162–176.
- Bizarria, F. P., Ramos, M., & Carrillo, J. (2024). Rethinking cross-cultural competencies in global leadership education. *Journal of International Business Education*, 19(2), 110–127.
- Boussebaa, M. (2022). Postcolonial management: Theorizing the impact of coloniality on global professional service firms. *Organization Studies*, 43(7), 1039–1056.
- Castells, M. (2021). *The rise of the network society* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Caves, R. W. (2024). *Encyclopedia of the city* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Eagle Hill Consulting. (2024). *The state of organizational culture 2024: Hybrid work’s unexpected impact*.
- Friedman, T. L. (2022). *The world is flat 3.0: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. Picador.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture’s consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- ISS Group. (2025, April 30). *The office holds the key to reinforcing culture and belonging*.

- Jack, G., & Lorbiecki, A. (2022). Cultural essentialism and its critique in cross-cultural management. *Academy of Management Review*, 47(3), 492–509.
- Jackson, T. (2023). Decolonizing cross-cultural management research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 25(1), 1–20.
- Jackson, T. (2023). Decolonizing cross-cultural management research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 25(1), 1–20.
- Jackson, T. (2023). Decolonizing cross-cultural management research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 25(1), 1–20.
- Judijanto, A., Lee, Y., & Miska, C. (2024). A bibliometric analysis of cross-cultural management research from 1965–2024. *Journal of World Business*, 59(1), 101–120.
- Judijanto, A., Lee, Y., & Miska, C. (2024). A bibliometric analysis of cross-cultural management research, 1965–2024. *Journal of World Business*, 59(1), 101–120.
- Kahlow, P., Garg, A., & Ranga, S. (2024). Global perspectives on redefining workplace presence: The impact of remote work on organizational culture. *Journal of Enterprise and Emerging Technologies*, 18(2), 45–62.
- Katul, Y. (2025). *Entanglement of cultural diversity and the future of work: Thematic analysis*. Journal of Global Inclusion Studies.
- Khanna, P. (2023). *The future is Asian: Commerce, conflict, and culture in the 21st century*. Simon & Schuster.
- Kittur, R., & Agarwal, N. (2024). Revisiting B2B cross-cultural interactions: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Business Research*, 169, 114093.
- Leifels, K., & Zhang, R. P. (2023). Cultural diversity in work teams and well-being impairments: A stress perspective. *Management Learning*, 54(1), 45–67.
- Liu, L., Raghuram, S., & Akbulut, Y. (2025). Does remote work adoption boost firm innovation? A cross-cultural study. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. Minnesota Press.
- Nishii, L. H., & Ozel, T. (2024). Algorithmic bias in global HR systems: A postcolonial critique. *Human Resource Management Review*, 34(2), 100902.
- Nosratabadi, S., Bahrami, P., Palouzan, K., & Mosavi, A. (2020). Leader cultural intelligence and organizational performance. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 51(6), 1012–1035.
- Primecz, H., Romani, L., & Sackmann, S. A. (2023). Advancing cross-cultural management through multi-paradigm research. *Management International Review*, 63(2), 157–175.
- Primecz, H., Romani, L., & Sackmann, S. A. (2023). Advancing cross-cultural management through multi-paradigm research. *Management International Review*, 63(2), 157–175.
- Primecz, H., Romani, L., & Sackmann, S. A. (2023). Advancing cross-cultural management through multi-paradigm research. *Management International Review*, 63(2), 157–175.
- Rodrik, D. (2021). Why does globalization fuel populism? Economics, culture, and the rise of right-wing populism. *Annual Review of Economics*, 13(1), 133–170. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-080217-053503>
- Singla, M., & Kaushal, R. (2022). Organization leadership and culture during crisis: Lessons from the COVID-19 pandemic. *LBS Journal of Management & Research*, 20(1/2), 73–85.
- Stahl, G. K., Tung, R. L., & Zander, L. (2022). Cultural diversity in teams: Current insights and future directions. *Academy of Management Annals*, 16(1), 333–365.
- Stahl, G. K., Tung, R. L., & Zander, L. (2022). Cultural diversity in teams: Current insights and future directions. *Academy of Management Annals*, 16(1), 333–365.
- Steger, M. B. (2020). *Globalization: A very short introduction* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.

- Szkudlarek, B., Osland, J., Nardon, L., & Bird, A. (2020). Cultural intelligence: A review and new research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 22(4), 578–602.
- Szkudlarek, B., Osland, J., Nardon, L., & Bird, A. (2020). Cultural intelligence: A review and new research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 22(4), 578–602.
- Taras, V., Steel, P., & Kirkman, B. L. (2021). Improving national cultural indices using a longitudinal meta-analysis. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 52(1), 12–34.
- Taras, V., Steel, P., & Kirkman, B. L. (2021). Improving national cultural indices using a longitudinal meta-analysis. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 52(1), 12–34.
- Tomlinson, J. (2019). *Cultural imperialism: A critical introduction*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Wickert, C., Lejeune, C., & Ravasi, D. (2024). Beyond Eurocentrism in management studies: Toward epistemic inclusivity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 67(2), 215–237.
- Wickert, C., Lejeune, C., & Ravasi, D. (2024). Beyond Eurocentrism in management studies: Toward epistemic inclusivity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 67(2), 215–237.
- Wickert, C., Lejeune, C., & Ravasi, D. (2024). Beyond Eurocentrism in management studies: Toward epistemic inclusivity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 67(2), 215–237.
- Yousef, K. (2024). Exploring the impact of cultural diversity in global projects: A comparative analysis of virtual and face-to-face teamwork. *International Journal of Project Management*, 42(2), 219–235.