Positive Intercultural Management in the Fourth Industrial Revolution
Managing cultural otherness through a paradigm shift

C Barmeyer
CH Mayer

Abstract
The authors argue that a paradigm shift in intercultural management is needed to withdraw from a problem-oriented perspective – stressing the differences and difficulties of intercultural interactions – and foster a solution-oriented, positive psychology perspective, taking PP1.0 and PP2.0, the first and second wave of positive psychology, into account. This Positive Intercultural Management (PIM) perspective thereby provides new directions to intercultural management during the Fourth Industrial Revolution.

The article contributes to fill the void of PIM by demonstrating and promoting the positive, complementary and synergistic experiences in intercultural management interactions.

On the basis of negotiated culture and intercultural synergy, the article provides and discusses positive factors contributing to PIM, like interculturally competent actors; organisational structures such as intercultural tandems; and negotiated processes mediated by boundary spanners. It further addresses previously discussed challenging issues, such as cultural othering and awareness in intercultural management.

Practical implications relate to key actors in PIM, such as managers or consultants, who need to change the perspective from problem-focused to solution-orientated PIM in international and global management contexts, to steer intercultural negotiation processes to promote complementarity and synergy.

Keywords: Intercultural Management, Positive Psychology (PP1.0 and PP2.0), organizational management, negotiated culture, cultural complementarity, intercultural synergy, boundary spanning, intercultural tandem/dyads

1. Introduction

Over several decades, Cross-Cultural and Intercultural Management (CCM; ICM) research has developed into a highly relevant field that has spawned important research of a both conceptual and empirical nature (Phillips and Sackmann, 2015).

Describing the development of the field, Sackmann and Phillips (2004) distinguish three streams of research: Firstly, the *Cross-national Comparison* stream assumes an equivalence of nation-state and culture. Culture is here considered as a given and immutable individual characteristic. Therefore, generalizations, clustering as well as

1

cross-national testing of organizational theories, processes and practices are possible. Secondly, the *Intercultural Interaction* stream considers culture as socially constructed. National, organizational and sub-cultures, as well as identity are important contextualised aspects. New cultures are constructed through interaction, emerge and are negotiated. Thirdly, the *Multiple Cultures* stream views culture as a socially-constructed collective phenomenon that recognizes the complexity of personal identity in organizational settings, e.g. the multiplicity of cultures. The salience of any cultural group depends on the particular case, taking cultural differences and similarities into account.

Sackmann and Phillips' classification of research shows that role concepts and work practices of managers are increasingly shaped through dynamic, multiple cultures, forms of cooperation and work-setting cultures which result from hybrid meanings and actions (Brannen and Salk, 2000; Person *et al.,* 2016; Mayer *et al.,* 2017). They are constructed and negotiated (Spencer-Oatey and Franklin, 2009) by representatives from various cultural groups.

In this article, it is argued that the cross-cultural and intercultural management perspective further should be anchored in a positive psychology approach which most functionally takes the solution-orientation, a strong constructive value base and the positive approach to intercultural management into account (Mayer *et al.,* 2019). This seems to be particularly valid in the context of the rapid changes within the Fourth Industrial Revolution. Recently, it has been argued that for the future and new workplaces within the context of the Fourth Industrial Revolution (4IR), particularly PP1.0 and PP2.0 approaches can be very valuable and need to be considered when exploring concepts of digitalisation, artificial intelligence, future workplace skills, smart technologies, as well as abilities of employees, for example, driving innovative and creative management within international management contexts forward (Mayer, 2019). This article adopts this previously mentioned perspective and builds on it further.

Thr Fourth Industrial Revolution is particularly based on the idea that within the 21 century workplaces, employees and organizations experience a shift towards the use of technological equipment, increased digitalisation, growing interconnection of employees and organizations across the globe, constant information trade and new systemic approaches to deal with and manage the new complexities of work (Hecklau *et al.,* 2016). Schwab (2017) has pointed out that the Fourth Industrial revolution does reshape economic, social, cultural and human interaction and it is assumed here that CCM and ICM will need new, in-depth and positive approaches to deal with the new complexity of automised production, human-machine interation, increasing diverse wrokforces who all aim for smart work solutions (Bloem *et al,* 2014; Eberhard *et al.,* 2017). The authors further take note of Nikitina and Lapina (2017) who argue that in the Fourth Industrial Revolution new managerial skills and comptences are needed to proceed forward. It is argued here that a positive CCM and ICM driven actively by employees and managers contributes positively to managing the Fourth Industrial Revolution and the workplaces successfully.

2. The problem-orientation in CCM and ICM research

Fontaine (2007), in the Anglo-American tradition, differentiates between the concepts *cross*-cultural (CCM) and *inter*-cultural management (ICM). In French (Chevrier, 2003)

and German-speaking (Mahadevan 2017) scientific contexts, however, the concept of CCM includes both, comparative *and* intercultural aspects of culture on organisations and management. Mahadevan (2017, p. 3) underlines this difference: "The term *cross-cultural* ('across cultures') implies a cultural comparison [...]. Coversely, *inter*-cultural ('between cultures') refer[s] to interactions between representatives of different cultures and the possibility of overcoming those differences."

Building on the insights of social constructivism (Berger and Luckmann, 1966), interculturality is defined as a dynamic process of joint construction and negotiation of meaning and action (Brannen and Salk, 2000; Romani *et al.*, 2011; Mayer, 2019). Based on this social constructivist perspective and as according to Sackmann and Philipps (2004), ICM is here understood in terms of the interactionist CCM perspective which includes actors of different cultural backgrounds who work together in mutual communication, adaptation and learning processes.

Since its inception, research in CCM has been dominated by an interest in differences caused by culturally influenced values, norms and practices in work-relations (Hofstede, 1980; House *et al.*, 2004; 2014) and by the difficulties and challenges these differences may cause (French, 2015). This problem-focussed view has been demonstrated most recently (e.g. Stahl and Tung, 2015; Cameron, 2017). In a content analysis of articles published over a period of almost 20 years in the *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal (CCM)*, Stahl and Tung (2015, 400) find an imbalance in theoretical assumptions between research on the negative over the positive role of culture. They present how the problems and disadvantages are highlighted and their advantages and innovative potential are largely disregarded.

Numerous approaches understand interculturality as a dynamic, reciprocal, unforeseeable and contextualized process rather than attributing irritations and misunderstandngs solely to national cultural influences (e.g. Bjerregaard *et al.*, 2009; Treichel and Mayer, 2011). Nevertheless, there is a significant problem-orientation within ICM research (Stahl *et al.*, 2017) in which interculturality is often defined by actors' cultural differences and thus their diverging perceptions of meaning and interpretation (Spencer-Oatey and Franklin 2009). Intercultural interactions are frequently captured in forms of critical incidents (critical incident technique, CIT, Flanagan, 1954) which are *per se* defined as positive and/or negative/ effective and/or ineffective, but are, when collected in emprirical studies mainly referring to as problematic and/or even conflictual intercultural situations, which derive from diverging expectations, norms and interpretations of actors of different cultural backgrounds. With regard to this problem-oriented tradition, the emphasis on differences and problems dominates research in International Business (IB), ICM and CCM research (e.g. Mayer, 2011) due to the fact that negative experiences are often experienced accompanied by strong emotions and that the need for change and for finding solutions is emphasised. Stahl and Tung (2015, 395) explain with regard to CCM:

> *While there are suggestions in the literature that cultural diversity can offer meaningful positive opportunities to individuals, groups, and organizations, we argue – and demonstrate empirically – that the problem-focused view of cultural diversity is by far predominant in research on culture in International Business. In other words, we know much less about the positive dynamics and outcomes associated with cultural differences than we know about the problems, obstacles,*

3

and conflicts caused by them.

Based on 244 articles published in the *Journal of International Business Studies (JIBS)*, Stahl and Tung (2015) categorized the articles related to culture and interculturality as theoretical papers, empirical papers with theoretical assumptions and empirical papers with empirical results with either a negative, neutral/mixed or positive perspective on cultural differences: Only 4 % of the theoretical papers, 5 % of the empirical papers with theoretical assumptions and 7 % of empirical papers with empirical results consider posotive effects of cultural diversity (Stahl and Tung, 2015, 397). Addionally a content analysis of 400 papers from 18 years of research in *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal (CCM)* showed even to a lesser degree positive or constructive effects of ICM in total. In empirical studies no positive effects of ICM were found at all. The studies identified by Stahl and Tung (2015) which identify culture as neutral or positive variables, are usually quantitatively oriented or meta-studies, but do not include case studies which rather focus on the negative aspects of CCM and ICM. Cameron (2008, 2017) highlights that, still, social scientists view and analyse negative phenomena rather than positive ones, due to the fact that they exert a stronger or at least more visible influence on social systems and interactions. Negative phenomena and results, such as those experienced in cross-border mergers or management interactions, receive increased attention, because they appear more interesting (Margolis and Walsh, 2003). ICM research is strongly influenced by Western European and North American thinking and is therefore based on a rather linear logic that emphasises contrasts and polarities (good vs. bad) rather than emphasizing holisticness (Fang, 2012).

Therefore, constructive and positive aspects in CCM and ICM are hardly represented in management books, such as in Peterson and Sondergaard's (2008) four-volume *Foundations of Cross-Cultural Management*, which includes 'classics' from five decades of research. It only contains one article on constructive aspcts in CCM, namely Adler's paper on cultural synergy (1980, 2008). The same is true for the *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Management,* edited by Gannon and Newmann (2002). Here, again, it is Adler (1980, 2008) who contributed the chapter on intercultural synergy. In the *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Management Research* by Smith, Peterson and Thomas (2008), there are no contributions mentioning the positive effects of interculturality, just as there are none in the *Cambridge Handbook Culture, Organizations, and Work* by Baghat and Steers (2009), in Jack and Westwood's *International and Cross-Cultural Management Studies. A Postcolonial Reading* (2009), in Thomas and Peterson's *Cross-Cultural Management* (2015) or Holden, Michailova and Tietze's *Routledge Companion to Cross-Cultural Management* (2015).

3. Constructive and positive aspects in CCM and ICM research

A few exceptions which emphasise constructive and positive aspects in intercultural management, however, exist: Adler (1980, 2008), Barmeyer and Franklin (2016) and Barmeyer and Davoine (2019), Chevrier (2003), d'Iribarne (2007), Fang (2012), Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars (2000), Harris (1994) and Moran and Harris (1983) as well as Primecz et al. (2011) deal explicitly with dynamic, mostly complementary intercultural construction and co-construction of meaning and action in CCM and ICM.

The constructive and enriching aspects of cultural diversity - which may result from the interaction of differing experiences, perspectives and skills of interactants - are largely neglected (Stahl *et al.*, 2017). Only a few studies take the importance of diversity and interculturality in management research into account from a positive psychology perspective (Mayer, 2011). Therefore, it has been emphasised recently that CCM and ICM approaches focus on this perspective and explore new and constructive ways to define the value of cultural differences, interculturality, cultural and diversity to reach a more balanced and holistic view of culture within the management discipline (Stahl *et al.*, 2017). Cameron (2017) points out that the priorisation of positive factors in CCM leads to an increasingly positive performance, flourishing, growth and achievement which should be acknowledged. Stahl et al. (2017) highlight that a void in research is given and that more research is needed to strengthen this approach, focusing on positive aspects in individuals, organisations and management processes (Luthans, 2002; Seligmann, 2002; Mayer, 2011). This article aims at taking this discourse further by including aspects promoted by PP1.0 and PP2.0 perspectives.

While in the PP1.0 movement, the focus was primarily on measuring and studying the optimal functioning of humans (Seligman, 2001), aiming to redress the imbalances in psychological research and practice from the negative bias as well as error, mistake and failure analysis towards to exploration of the solution-orientation and positive aspects (Mayer, Vanderheiden and Oosthuizen, 2019; Vanderheiden and Mayer, 2020), Joseph (2015) has described that positive psychologist have endeavoured to apply the positive psychology perspective in various workplaces, management and organizations. This perspective is growth-orientated, and aims at enhancing relationships, change views towards specific issues and describe positive changes in the life philosophy which impacts positively on work. During the past years, however, positive psychology – here named as PP1.0 – has increasingly been criticised to be too uncritical and too positive. Wong (2011) has therefore developed the second wave of positive psychology (PP2.0), emphasising that research and practice must always take the negative and positive into account. Mayer, Vanderheiden and Oosthuzizen (2019) have therefore mentioned that the PP2.0 movement is more nuanced, taking the ambivalent nature of individuals and organizations into sight, explorings the dark and shadow sides to transform their constructive potential into positive functioning for self and others. It is argued in this article that the PP2.0 perspective is highly valuable for research in CCM and ICM, when the core values of PP2.0, such as virtue, meaning, resilience and well-being (Wong, 2011; Ivtzan *et al.,* 2016), become the base for intercultural interaction and cooperation in management and organization.

4. Positive Foundations in Cross-Cultural and Intercultural Management

Approaches to PIM emphasise intercultural synergy, diversity management and critical management studies (e.g. Barmeyer and Mayrhofer, 2008; Özbilgin, 2008; Mahadevan and Mayer, 2017).
Empirical studies dealing with intercultural synergy, hardly define organisations as a whole, but rather focus on specific situations, such as mergers and acquistions (Brock, 2005; Harrison *et al.*, 1991). Further, intercultural synergy concepts are mainly applied in research on small social systems or sub-systems within organisations, such as teams (Adler, 2008; Gabriel and Griffiths, 2008; Stahl *et al.*, 2010).

In diversity management (DM) research, which has recently received scant attention in ICM (e.g. Cox, 1993; Özbilgin and Chanlat 2017, Özbilgin et al. 2019), very few contributions increase the importance and understanding of the features and effects of constructive and positive interculturality. DM discourses have rather been restricted, uncritical and slightly simplistic (Mahadevan and Mayer, 2017).

Finally, critical management studies have emphasised the need for increased research towards the deconstruction of stereotypic concepts of culture and of "the other" in management theory and practice and have emphasised the need for the reconstruction of identities, new cultural descriptions in management research, including critical views on culture, cultural difference, minority and majority concepts and cultural constructs within the context of power relations (Mayer and Flotman, 2017). However, here the perspective is rather drawn to a reconstruction of cultural concepts in general than to a specific positive or constructive framework of ICM.

In parallel to these perspectives, Positive Organisational Scholarship (POS) (Cameron and Caza, 2004) has been described as valuable in CCM and ICM. POS consciously centers on positive phenomena of interpersonal and structural dynamics within organizations. Thereby, it focuses on positive phenomena, which often follow problems and crisis in organisations. These crises are viewed from a positive perspective due to the fact that they trigger (organizational) learning and feedback positively into organisations (Cameron, 2008). This perspective supports the advancement of PIM and can be seen as a pillar of PIM through highlighting heliotropism (the natural tendency of living systems towards the positive energy - Drexelius, 1627 in Cameron, 2017), the change in perspective from negative to positive views in various cultural contexts and its constructive impact regarding performance (Cameron, 2017). Muckelbauer (2016, 39) highlights that often the heliotropic paradigm is not easily accepted in cultural sciences, since it is founded in natural sciences and the image that "plants move towards the sun". However, the author argues that nature and culture are not that distingued from each other and therefore it can be easily argued that not only plants turn to the light and the positive, but also humans and that this is why positive rhetoric can support a positive attitude amongst humans. The authors take this argument and expand it to the CCM and ICM fields to highlight that a paradigm shift towards the positive is naturally and culturally valid.

According to Kuhn (1962), further paradigm shifts are continuously taking place in ICM research. These paradigm shifts can be assigned to three areas:
- from static towards linear dynamic concepts of culture (Fang, 2006; Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars, 1997).
- from national cultures towards multiple cultures (Sackmann and Philips, 2004; Tung, 2008; Zander and Romani, 2004)
- from decontextualised etic research towards contextualised emic research (Bjerregaard *et al.*, 2009; Stahl and Tung, 2015)

Previous research has emphasised that the *fourth* paradigm shift concerns the change from problematic interculturality to constructive interculturality (Adler, 1980; Barmeyer and Franklin 2016). In this article we argue for this fourth shift to become a core aspect in contemporary, future and visionary ICM research and practice to foster development and learning. Adler's (1983) perspective - to classifying management research into culture and interculturality whilst introducing a synergistic management form that views all cultural differences and similarities as resources - is thereby

promoted. The authors further on support Cameron's (2017) perspective, emphasising cultural and interculturality as fundamental constructive concepts that need *per se* recognition in management research and practice and that can be captured through the PP2.0 perspective, taking the negative and the positive into account, while transforming the negative towards constructive growth and development of individuals and organizations.

In the following, we will focus on the discussion of two constructive concepts within the context of culture and synergy: *negotiated culture* (Brannen, 1998), and *intercultural synergy* (Adler 1980, 2008) and their impact on intercultural management theory and practice.

4.1 Negotiated culture

Brannen (1998) developed a dynamic approach to interculturality known as negotiated culture, which even acquires greater substance in an empirical study with Salk (2000): Based on research within a German-Japanese joint venture, including Strauss' (1978) concept of "negotiated social order", Brannen and Salk (2000) develop the negotiated culture approach. In order to perform tasks in social systems, actors create, stabilise and alter social structures through ongoing negotiation processes. In intercultural situations, people from different cultural backgrounds interact and thereby create new "negotiated" cultures through the recombination and modification of cultural characteristics and meanings:

„'Negotiate' is used as a verb to encourage us to think of organizational phenomena as individual actors navigating through their work experience and orienting themselves to their work settings. Focusing on culture as a negotiation includes examining the cognitions and actions of organizational members particularly in situations of conflict, because it is in such situations that assumptions get inspected. 'Negotiation' is identified in the construction and reconstruction of divergent meanings and actions by individual organizational actors." (Brannen, 1998, 12).

Negotiated culture is based on an anthropologically oriented interpretative and social constructivist concept of culture (Geertz, 1973; d'Iribarne, 2009; Romani, 2008): According to this concept, culture is dynamic and constituted by the interactive (re-) production of patterns of meaning and interpretation, which are defined by a specific group of individuals (Yagi and Kleinberg, 2011). Meaning is not simply 'transmitted', but is (re-)agreed upon (or co-constructed). The results and consequences of (intercultural) interactions cannot be foreseen and arise as a new jointly negotiated culture in continuous communication, reciprocal learning and knowledge acquisition (Bjerregaard *et al.*, 2009).

In order to deal with interculturality, according to Brannen and Salk (2000, 478) four options exist, which are changing, continuously developing and dynamic:
(1) division of labour: each cultural group acts for itself and there is little interaction between the different cultural groups;
(2) compromise by one group: one cultural group adapts to the other and modifies its own work practices;
(3) the middle-way between both groups: mutual adaptation and integration processes take place on both sides through negotiation; and
(4) Innovation by both groups: cultural differences are enriched by intercultural,

complementary work processes and work results.

In addition, the negotiated culture approach takes specific contextual determinants such as history, power relations as well as culture-specific knowledge and the complexity of the relationships into account (Bjerregaard *et al.*, 2009; Brannen and Salk, 2000, 458). Various empirical case studies (Brannen and Salk, 2000; Clausen, 2007; Saint-Léger and Beeler, 2012) illustrate how structurally and contextually influencing factors, together with individual cultural characteristics, are crucial for the development of constructive organizational and work cultures.

4.2 Intercultural synergy
A second constructive concept, which is complementary to that of negotiated culture is intercultural synergy. Whereas negotiated culture focuses on emerging processes, intercultural synergy mainly centers on the reinforcement of results.

Intercultural synergy arises through the combination and complementary interaction of different cultural elements, e.g. individuals, with different attitudes, values, modes of thought and behaviour within a system, which, through mutual purposeful reinforcement, ensure that the achievements of the system are of higher quality than the sum of their individual elements within the system (Maslow, 1964). The resources and strengths of diversity are used, serving as a basis for multiple perspectives and creativity, as well as facilitating new unexpected solutions and improved results (Moran and Harris, 1983). These additional values are the result of establishing a complementary relationship among 'cultural others' and their respective viewpoints and advantages. Increased benefits are created by permitting and supporting the generation of a synergistic relationship among cultural othernesses. Adler (1980, 172) highlights:

> *Cultural synergy is […] a process in which organization policies and practices are formed on the basis of, but not limited to, the cultural patterns of individual organization members and clients. Culturally synergistic organizations create new forms of management. […] This approach suggests that cultural diversity be neither ignored nor minimized, but rather viewed as a resource in the design and development of organisations.*

As Barmeyer and Franklin (2016, 203) show, "meanings and actions are co-constructed and negotiated in social interaction. As a result of the differing culturally influenced perspectives, values and practices of the interactants, these meanings and actions have at least the potential to be creative and innovative." Intercultural synergy then represents the desired "positive" and constructive aspect of interculturality which uses cultural diversity as a resource and a potential for constructing creativity and mental health and well-being (Mayer and Boness, 2013). Synergy is thereby understood as a creative synthesis and as a social process of human development (Maslow, 1964).

The best-known concept of intercultural synergy is originated by Adler (2008, 118). Relating to Thomas' (1974) similarities in conflict handling orientations, intercultural synergy is depicted as one feature of a matrix of five basic intercultural behavioural strategies which can also be understood as action options and results: Cultural Avoidance, Dominance, Accomodation, Compromise, and Synergy.

Generally, the impact of the concept of intercultural synergy on management practice seems limited. Thus, there are various options to deal with interculturality: avoidance,

conflict, adjustment, compensation and constructive development or solution (Adler, 2008; Brannen and Salk, 2000). Interculturality can be expressed across the continuum of problematic, through neutral to complementary-synergystic processes: It is, further on, a constructive resource which, when combined with cultural diversity, can show effect on organisations and their members, for example in the form of learning and innovation, market leadership or employee satisfaction.

The concepts of interculturality and intercultural synergy are surely not free from the influence of socio-cultural and contextual interests and power and are particularly in critical focus in postcolonial studies (Jack and Westwood, 2009), Critical Management Studies (Alvesson and Willmott, 2012), and studies of organizational sociology (Crozier and Friedberg, 1977). The power relations have to be understood in connection to concepts as dominance, micro-politics, or hidden agendas (Mense-Petermann, 2006) which all impact on negotiated culture and intercultural synergy. Thereby, three emergent cultural anthropological approaches need to be taken into account (Bjerregaard *et al.*, 2009, 214): firstly, the interrelationships between culture and the local context; secondly, the specific motivations and interests of the actors which allow culture to emerge, and, thirdly, the communication strategies of the involved actors. Interculturality thus arises through the combination of culture, the actor and the context of communication.

Both approaches, negotiated culture and intercultural synergy, are additionally based on conceptual research frameworks and have one fact in common: they aim at perceiving and respecting existing polarities and opposites in social systems, such as organizations, whilst dealing with them in a creative manner (Fang, 2012; Hampden-Turner, 1990, 2000). Equally, they assume that culture and interculturality are dynamically negotiated among actors within their respective context. Cultural specifics are therefore not denied or downplayed, but rather accepted and integrated.as showing in the applied perspectives in the following.

5. Factors enhancing Constructive Intercultural Management

Based on of organizational research (Miles et al. 1978; Galbraith 1995) and on a limited number of intercultural case studies of the aerospace company Airbus (Barmeyer and Mayrhofer 2008), the European television broadcaster Arte (Barmeyer *et al.,* 2019), the French-German high-speed train provider (Barmeyer and Davoine 2019), the French-Japanese automobile manufacturer Renault-Nissan (Korine *et al.* 2002; Stahl and Brannen, 2013) and the Israeli-Arab West Eastern Divan Orchestra (Barenboim and Said, 2002) the French-Canadian Cirque tu Soleil (Riiser, 2010), three positive factors contributing to PIM have been identified (Barmeyer 2018):

(1)   interculturally competent actors;
(2)   structures such as intercultural tandems; and
(3)   negotiated processes mediated by intercultural boundary spanners.

These positive factors will be exposed in the following.

5.1. Interculturally competent actors

A first favourable factor of PIM lies in the actors working in organisations, especially their *resources*, i.e. *skills* and *competences*. Research has shown that especially intercultural competence plays a major role in the success of intercultural interactions (Barmeyer and Davoine, 2012; Bennett, 2015; Dinges and Baldwin, 1996; Fink and Mayerhofer, 2009; Spencer-Oatey and Franklin, 2009), as well as in healthy organizations (Mayer, 2011).

Intercultural competence is understood - as defined by Spitzberg and Chagnon (2009) - as the ability of a person to understand values, ways of thinking, communication rules and behavioral patterns in various cultural contexts, in order to communicate their own positions transparently in intercultural interactions and thus to act in a culture-oriented, constructive and effective way. It enables a person to conduct appropriate intercultural interactions to achieve personal or professional goals. Intercultural competence further includes an awareness of one's own culturally influenced values and behaviour, knowledge of specific contexts, the understanding and appreciation of the logic and peculiarities of different cultural systems and the ability to accept divergent views and standpoints and to integrate them into a complementary synthesis (Barmeyer and Franklin, 2016).

Ethnorelative views and orientating oneself in different cultural contexts requires continuous analysis and rethinking of one's own situations, that is, a constant active observation of one's own behavior. Likewise, meta-cognition (Earley and Ang, 2003) enables individuals to ponder which available strategies are helpful and which are not and thus to learn from experience. It is described as "knowledge and control of cognition" (Ang and Van Dyne, 2008, 4) or "learning to learn" (Earley *et al.*, 2006, 6) and describes the ability to train and implement cognitive strategies for the acquisition and development of coping strategies (Ng and Earley, 2006, 7). Thereby, meta-cognition becomes am important competence in intercultural competence and supports the individuum to manage him-/herself in dynamic social systems whilst actively participating to mindfully create and balance social systems.

Especially bi- or multicultural persons, who often have internalized more than just a linguistic and cultural reference system (Brannen and Thomas 2010), can contribute to the realization of PIM. Due to their insider/outsider intermediate position, they can put themselves in different systems of meaning and action and can better adopt neutral metapositions than people who have only grown up in a socialisation context. They are important actors in multinational companies that take new social contexts into account, such as hybridization tendencies and dynamic multiple cultures as intercultural boundary spanners (Fitzsimmons et al. 2011). Fitzsimmons, Lee and Brannen (2013) see these individuals as global leaders who are able to constructively address challenges such as diversity, complexity and uncertainty. Therefore, they manage and develop complex systems, such as organisations in the Forth Industrial Revolution. This requires a high degree of mutual acceptance and the willingness to accept and value differences, i.e. different cultural specifics, as strengths.

5.2. Balanced structures: intercultural tandems

A second beneficial factor relates to *structures*, especially *intercultural tandems* (e.g. Barmeyer and Davoine 2019). The metaphor of the tandem as a bicycle for two people originated from culturally different groups representing people, who "experience"

different languages and cultures during a common journey, for example at work. The figurative use of the term originates from pedagogy and foreign language research (Kötter, 2003; Little, 2001). Tandems move through mutual reinforcement of their cyclists' energy and in management contexts may be concerned with the constant mutual negotiation and sharing of ideas, strategies, objectives, positions and interests, as well as with organisational procedures and processes. Intercultural tandems, through their collaboration, combine knowledge from different systems, give each other advice and can thus be understood as a unit of intercultural learning.

Tandems are common in leadership positions in non-commercial organizations, such as the health sector (Chreim, 2015), education (Scholz and Stein, 2014), arts (Reid and Karambayya, 2009) or public transportation (Barmeyer and Davoine, 2019). However, they can also be found in international profit organizations (Barmeyer and Mayrhofer, 2008).

Tandem constellations create advantages for international organizations (Chreim, 2015; Reid and Karambayya, 2009). They enable companies, firstly, to ensure a balance of interests and power; secondly, to join different perspectives and competencies; and thirdly, to allow actors to make use of both (national) social networks to gain information or to prepare for decision-making. Double leadership teams lead to an equality of involved departments, societies, countries etc. and help to mitigate or even avoid one-sided effects of dominance and power.
However, tandem structures also come with disadvantages. Firstly, there is a potential for (manifest) conflict that can arise through divergent objectives, role conflicts, interests and opinions, approaches, as well as through different personalities. Secondly, competition in tandem tandem actors might be in the context of career development. As with the matrix organization (Laurent, 1983), dual leadership might be experienced as confusing by employees and therefore needs very clear boundaries of management tasks and roles (Reid and Karambayya, 2016) . Finally, the creation and maintenance of tandem structures in organizations binds significant financial resources and organizations need to be willing to invest into these structures to experience the long-term effects.

5.3. Negotiated processes: intercultural boundary spanning
A third factor that enhances PIM concerns *processes:* specialists and managerial staff working at their interfaces play a key role in international organizations. Interfaces can be understood as units of different systems that lead to interdependencies and the requirement for continuous reciprocal coordination. Research describes the central function of actors at interfaces as boundary spanning, i.e. the cross-linking of different units or boundaries (Barner-Rasmussen *et al.*, 2014, Schotter *et al.*, 2017). Beechler *et al.* (2006, 122) define boundary spanning „as the creation of linkages that integrate and coordinate across organizational boundaries."

Boundary spanning is primarily defined by thinking and acting within an awareness of interdisciplinarity in roles as intercultural mediators, to enable integrative action through exchange and understanding between cultural systems: „Boundary spanning facilitates division of work for solving complex organizational problems." (Hsiao *et al.*, 2012, 464).
These mediation processes presuppose familiarity with each other and with several (social) systems, their languages, their inherent cultural meanings, rules and logics

(Barner-Rasmussen *et al.*, 2014; Yagi and Kleinberg, 2011). Organizational processes and practices can be improved by means of intercultural mediation, as well as through alternative solutions (Mayer and Louw, 2012). Whereas Beechler et al. (2006) show that in general boundary spanning roles are embedded in formal organizational positions – e.g. expatriates or subsidiary managers – Barner-Rasmussen et al. (2014) identify highly effective boundary spanners across all organizational levels.

Despite the great heterogeneity of international organisations (private-public, economic-artistic, large-small, bicultural-multicultural etc.) certain commonalities that are conducive to PIM can be found across case studies, such as the fact that they have succeeded in combining cultural differences in a creative way so that they are successful in their activities, with their products and services (Barmeyer and Franklin 2016). The following table 1 summarises the three positive factors of PIM and establishes a link with the 4th Industrial Revolution.

Factors	Description	Realization in Organizations	4IR context
Interculturally competent actors	Adopting an open, tolerant and ethnorelativist attitude	Development of an appropriate ability to act through cognitive and emotional understanding of culture and systems	Strengthened ability to adjust to the new workplaces, remote workplaces, human-machine interaction, and globalized work environment
Balanced structures: intercultural tandems	Balancing of asymmetries in interests, decision-making and power through the use of dual functions	Sharing central resources and knowledge through recourse to respective (national) social networks	Adjusting to the power shifts going along with the 4IR or, if necessary, critical evaluating and contributing to managing power shifts. Ability to work in network structures with multiple actors of various backgrounds
Negotiated processes: intercultural boundary spanning	Promoting information, communication and cooperation by actors who act as mediators across sectors, languages and cultures	Improvement and establishment of commonly accepted processes and working practices	Necessary focus on synergy and PIM through the creating of new concepts of meaning and global leadership to address the challenges of the future

Table 1: Enhancing PIM factors

As emphasised by Nikitina and Lapina (2017) that the 4IR requires new managerial skills and comptences, the authors here contribute that PIM could meaningfully

contribute to the constructive managing of the workplaces in the 4IR changes, as indicated in Table 1.

6. Conclusion and recommendations

This article is limited to a conceptual approach CCM and ICM concepts, contributing the idea to take PP1.0 and PP2.0 aspects into consideration when developing PIM concepts and applications. Surely, the authors do consider that the ideas and concepts presented are anchored in Western cultural perspectives.

In conclusion, PIM is based on dynamic development processes, new impulses and concepts, which influence each other to increase mutually stimulation and intercultural empowerment through a strong positive value base and a specific paradigm shift in intercultural management research by using a constructivist concept of culture which relates to concepts of negotiated culture and intercultural synergy within the frame of enhancing virtues, meaning, resilience and well-being in individuals and organizations.

The process of PIM firstly takes existing cultural differences into account and contrasts them without judgement; secondly, it combines them in a dynamic and processual understanding of interculturality; and thirdly, it enables the creation of complementary or even synergystic collaboration, based on a PP1.0 and PP2.0 focus, exploring the optimal human functioning while transforming consciously the challenges and negatively experienced aspects into positive individual and organizational growth and development.

Future research needs to expand the knowledge on cultural complementarity and intercultural synergy in individuals and organizations, taking PP1.0 and PP2.0 aspects and values into account when conducting empirical research designs – thereby inclduing rather marginalized cultural perspectives in management research.

In terms of managerial implications, key actors in CCM and ICM, such as managers or consultants, need to adopt to the necessary paradigm shift in 4IR contexts which will balance their views and expand their perspectives in intercultural negotiation processes to promote complementarity and synergy.

HRM structures and processes need to advance PP1.0 and PP2.0 perspectives for organizations to stay agile, meaningful, resilient and well in diverse, globalised and fast-moving processes. A PIM culture needs to be established to manage the shift in 4IR workplaces towards higher degress of digitalisation, smart processes, artificial intelligence and remote workplaces which live of globalised day-and-night cooperation and interactions. This calls directly for positive approaches towards CCM and ICM to understand and manage these cooperations and make them even more meaningful and healthy – not only in theory, but also in practice.

References

Adler, N.J. (1980), "Cultural Synergy: The Management of Cross-Cultural Organizations", in Burke, W. and Goodstein, L.D. (Eds.), *Trends and Issues in Organizational*

Development: Current Theory and Practice, Pfeiffer & Company, San Diego, pp. 163–184.

Adler, N.J. (1983), "A Typology of Management Studies Involving Culture", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 29–47.

Adler, N.J. (2008), *International Dimensions of Organizational Behavior*, South Western, Cincinnati.

Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H. (2012), *Making sense of management. A critical Introduction.*, Sage, London.

Ang, S. and van Dyne, L. (2008), *Handbook of cultural intelligence. Theory, measurement, and applications*, M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, New York.

Bhagat, R. S. and Steers, R. M. (Eds.) (2009), *Cambridge handbook of culture, organizations, and work*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Barenboim, D. and Said, E. (2002), *Parallels and paradoxes: Explorations in music and society*, London.

Barmeyer, C. and Franklin, P. (2016), *Intercultural Management. A case-based approach to achieving complementarity and synergy*, Palgrave, London.

Barmeyer, C./Davoine, E (2019), "Facilitating intercultural negotiated practices in joint ventures: The case of a French–German railway organization" *International Business Review*, Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 1-11

Barmeyer, C., Davoine, E., and Stokes, P. (2019), "When the 'well-oiled machine' meets the 'pyramid of people' Role perceptions and hybrid working practices of middle managers in a binational organization – ARTE" *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595819869729

Barmeyer, C. (2018), *Konstruktives Interkulturelles Management*, UTB/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.

Barmeyer, C. and Davoine, E. (2012), "Le développement collectif de compétence interculturelle dans le contexte d'une organisation binationale: le cas ARTE", *Gérer & Comprendre*, Vol. 107, pp. 63-73.

Barmeyer, C. and Mayrhofer, U. (2008), "The contribution of intercultural management to the success of international mergers and acquisitions: An analysis of the EADS group", *International Business Review*, Vol. 17, pp. 28–38.

Barner-Rasmussen, W., Ehrnrooth, M., Koveshnikov, A. and Mäkela, K. (2014), "Cultural and language skills as resources for boundary spanning within the MNC", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 45, pp. 886–905.

Beechler, S., Sondergaard, M., Miller, E.L. and Bird, A. (2006), "Boundary Spanning", in Lane, H.W., Maznevski, M.L., Mendenhall, M.E. and McNett, J. (Eds.), *The Blackwell Handbook of Global Management: A Guide to Managing Complexity*, Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 121–133.

Bennett, J.M. (2015), *The Sage encyclopedia of intercultural competence, A Sage reference publication*, SAGE Publications, Inc; Credo Reference, Thousand Oaks, California, Boston, Massachusetts.

Berger, P.L. and Luckmann, T. (1966), *The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, Doubleday, New York.

Bhagat, R.S. and Steer, R.M. (2009), *Cambridge Handbook of Culture, Organizations, and Work*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Bjerregaard, T., Lauring, J. and Klitmøller, A. (2009), "A critical analysis of intercultural communication research in cross-cultural mangament introducing newer developments in Anthropolgy", *Critical perspectives on international business*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 207–228.

Bloem, J., van Doorn, M., Duivenstein, S., Excoffier, S., Maar, R. & van Ommeren, E. (2014). Groningen: Line Up boek en media bv. https://www.sogeti.com/globalassets/global/special/sogeti-things3en.pdf

Brannen, M.Y. (1998), "Negotiated Culture in Binational Contexts: A Model of Culture Change Based on a Japanese/American Organizational Experience", *Anthropology of Work Review*, Vol. 18 No. 2/3, pp. 6–17.

Brannen, M.Y. (2011), "Using multiple case studies to generalize form ethnographic research", in Piekkare, R. and Welch, C. (Eds.), *Rethinking the Case Study in international Business and Management Research*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp. 124–145.

Brannen, M.Y. and Thomas, D.C. (2010), "Bicultural Individuals in Organizations: Implications and Opportunity", *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 5-16.

Brannen, M.Y. and Salk, J. (2000), "Partnering across borders: negotiating organizational culture in a German-Japanese joint venture", *Human Relations*, Vol. 52 No. 4, pp. 451–487.

Brock, D.M. (2005), "Multinational acquisition integration: the role of national culture in creating synergies", *International Business Review*, Vol. 14, pp. 269–288.

Cameron, K.S. (2008), "Paradox in positive organizational change", *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, Vol. 44 No. 1, pp. 7–24.

Cameron, K.S. (2017), "Cross-cultural research and positive organizational scholarship", *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 13–32.

Cameron, K.S. and Caza, A. (2004), "Contributions to the discipline of positive organizational scholarship", *The American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 47 No. 6, pp. 731–739.

Chevrier, S. (2003), *Le Management interculturel*, PUF, Paris.

Chreim, S. (2015), "The (non)distribution of leadership roles: Considering leadership practices and configurations", *Human Relations*, Vol. 68 No. 4, pp. 517–543.

Clausen, L. (2007), "Corporate Communication Challenges: A "Negotiated" Culture Perspective", *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 317–332.

Cox, T. (1993), *Cultural Diversity in Organizations. Theory, Research and Practice*, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco.

Crozier, M. and Friedberg, E. (1977), *L'acteur et le système*, Le Seuil, Paris.

Dinges, N. and Baldwin, K.D. (1996), "Intercultural Competence. A Research Perspective", in Landis, D. and Bhagat, R.D. (Eds.), *Handbook of Intercultural Training*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 106–123.

D'Iribarne, P. (2007), *Successful Companies in the Developing World. Managing in Synergy with Cultures*, Afd.

D'Iribarne, P. (2009), "National Cultures and Organisations in Search of a Theory: An Interpretative Approach", *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 309–321.

Drexelius, J. (1627), *The Heliotropium, or Conformity of the Human Will to the Divine: (Trans. by R.N. Shutte)*, The Devin-Adair Company, New York.

Earley, P.C. and Ang, S. (2003), *Cultural intelligence. Individual interactions across cultures*, Stanford Business Books; Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.

Earley, P.C., Ang, S. and Tan, J.-S. (2006), *CQ. Developing cultural intelligence at work*, Stanford Business Books, Stanford, CA.

Eberhard, B., Podio, M., Pérez Alonso, A., Radovica, A., Avotina, L., Peiseniece, L., Caamaño Sendon, M., Gonzales Lozano, A., & Solé-Pla, J. (2017). Smart work: The

transformation of the labour market due to the fourth industrial revolution (I4.0). *International Journal of Business and Economic Sciences Applied Research,* 10(3), 47-66.

Fang, T. (2006), "From onion to ocean: Paradox and change in national cultures", *International Studies of Management & Organization*, Vol. 35 No. 4, pp. 71–90.

Fang, T. (2012), "Yin Yang: A New Perspective on Culture", *Management and Organization Review*, Vol. 8, pp. 25–50.

Fink, G. and Mayerhofer, W. (2009), "Cross-cultural competence and management – setting the stage", *European Journal of Cross-Cultural Competence and Management*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 42–65.

Fitzsimmons, S. R., Lee, Y.-T. and Brannen, M. Y. (2013), "Demystifying the myth about marginals: implications for global leadership", European Jorunal of International Management, Vol. 7 No. 5, pp. 587-603.

Fitzsimmons, S. R., Miska, C., Stahl, G. (2011), "Multicultural employees: Global business' untapped resource." *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 199-206.

Flanagan, J. C. (1954), "The critical incident technique", *Psychological bulletin, Vol.* 51 No.4, p. 327.

Fontaine, R. (2007), "Cross-cultural management: six perspectives", *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 125–135.

French, R. (2015), *Cross-cultural management in work organisations,* 3rd edition, Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development, London.

Gabriel, Y. and Griffiths, D.S. (2008), "International Learning Groups: Synergies and Dysfunctions", *Management Learning*, Vol. 39 No. 5, pp. 503–518.

Galbraith, J. R. (1995), *Designing organizations*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Gannon, M. J. and Newman, K. (Eds.) (2002), *The Blackwell handbook of cross-cultural management* (Vol. 6), Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.

Geertz, C. (1973), *The Interpretation of Cultures*, Hutchinson, London.

Granovetter, M. (1985), "Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 91 No. 3, pp. 481–510.

Hampden-Turner, C. (1990), *Charting the Corporate Mind: Graphic Solutions to Business Conflicts*, The Free Press, New York.

Hampden-Turner, C. (2000), "What we know about cross-cultural management after thirty years", in Lynch, D. and Pilbeam, A. (Eds.), *Heritage and Progress. From the Past to the Future in Intercultural Understanding*, LTS, Bath, pp. 17–27.

Hampden-Turner, C. M., & Trompenaars, F. (2000). *Building cross-cultural competence: How to create wealth from conflicting values*. Yale University Press.

Hampden-Turner, C. and Trompenaars, F. (1997), "Response to Geert Hofstede", *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 149–159.

Harris, P. R. (2004): "European leadership in cultural synergy". *European Business Review.* Vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 358-380.

Harrison, J.S., Hitt, M.A., Hoskisson, R.E. and Ireland, R.D. (1991), "Synergies and postacquisition performance: Differences versus similarities in resource allocations", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 17, pp. 173–190.

Hecklau, F., Galeitzke, M., Flachsa, S., & Kohl, H. (2016). Holistic approach for human resource management in Industry 4.0. Procedia CIRP, 54, 1–6.

Hofstede, G. (1980), *Culture's consequences. International differences in work-related values*, Sage, Beverly Hills.

Holden, N., Michailova, S. and Tietze, S. (Eds.) (2015), *The Routledge Companion to Cross-Cultural Management*, Routledge, London, New York.

House, R.J., Dorfman, P.W., Javidan, M., Hanges, P.J. and Sully de Luque, M. F. (2014), *Strategic Leadership across cultures*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

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

Hsiao, R. L., Tsai, D. H. and Lee, C. F. (2012), "Collaborative knowing: The adaptive nature of cross-boundary spanning", *Journal of management studies*, Vol. 49 No. 3, pp. 463-491.

Ivtzan, I., Lomas, T., Hefferon, K., & Worth, P. (2016). *Second wave Positive Psychology.* London: Routledge.

Jack, G. and Westwood, R. (2009), *International and Cross-Cultural Management Studies. A Postcolonial Reading*, Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Joseph, S. (Ed.). (2015). *Positive psychology in practice: Promoting human flourishing in work, health, education, and everyday life*. Hoboken: Wiley.

Korine, H., Asakawa, K. and Gomez, P.-Y. (2002), "Partnering with the unfamiliar: Lessons from the case of Renault and Nissan", *Business Strategy Review*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 41–50.

Kötter, M. (2003), "Negotiation of meaning and codeswitching in online tandems", *Language Learning and Technology*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 145–172.

Kuhn, T.S. (1962), *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago University Press, Chicago.

Laurent, A. (1983), "The cultural diversity of western conceptions of management", *International Studies of Management & Organization*, Vol. 13 No.1-2, pp. 75-96.

Lichtenberger, B. and Naulleau, G. (1993), "French-German Joint Ventures: Cultural Conflicts and Synergies", *International Business Review*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 197–307.

Little, D. (2001), "Learner autonomy and the challenge of tandem language learning via the Internet", in Chambers, C. and Davies, G. (Eds.), *Information and Communications Technologies and Language Learning: A European Perspective*, Swets and Zeltlinger, Lisse, pp. 29–38.

Luthans, F. 2002. The need for and meaning of positive organizational behaviour. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23, 695-706.

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

Mahadevan, J. and Mayer, C.-H. (Eds.). (2017). *Muslim Minorities, Workplace Diversity and Reflexive HRM,* Routledge, London.

Margolis, J.D. and Walsh, J.P. (2003), "Misery loves companies. Rethinking social initiatives by business", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 48 No. 2, pp. 268–305.

Maslow, A. H. (1964), "Synergy in the society and in the individual", *Journal of Individual Psychology*, Vol. 20 No. 2, p.153-164.

Mayer, C.-H. (2011), *The meaning of sense of coherence in transcultural management*, Waxmann, Münster.

Mayer, C.-H. (2019a). *Trainingshandbuch Interkulturelle Mediation und Konfliktmanagement. Didaktische Materialien zum Konpetenzerweb.* Münster: Waxmann.

Mayer, C.-H. (2019b). Key factors of Creativity and the Art of Collaboration in Twenty-First-Century workpaces. Coetzee, M. (ed.) *Thriving in Digital Workplaces: innovations in theory, research and practice.* Cham, Switzerland: Springer Nature, pp. 147-166.

Mayer, C.-H. and Louw, L. (2013), Managing cross-cultural conflict in organizations. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management,* Vol. 12, No. 1, 3-8.

Mayer, C.-H. and Boness, C.M. (2013), *Creating mental health across cultures. Coaching and training for managers*, Pabst Publishers, Lengerich.

Mayer, C.-H. and Flotman, A.-P. (2017). Chapter 4. Constructing identity. Implications for reflexive HRM. In Mahadevan, J. & Mayer, C.-H. (Eds). *Muslim Minorities, Workplace Diversity and Refelxive HRM.* London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. pp. 61-76.

Mayer, C.-H., Boness, C.M. and Louw, L. (2017). Perceptions of Chinese and Tanzanian employees regarding intercultural colloboration. *South African Journal of Human Resource Management, 15*, 11 pages. doi:10.4102/sajhrm.v15i0.921.

Mayer, C.-H., Vanderheiden, E. and Oosthuizen, R. (2019). Transforming shame, guilt and anxiety through a salutogenic PP1.0 and PP2.0 counselling framework. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 29*(1), 436-452.

Mense-Petermann, U. (2006), "Micro-political or intercultural conflicts? An integrating approach", *Journal of International Management*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 302–317.

Miles, R. E., Snow, C. C., Meyer, A. D., and Coleman Jr, H. J. (1978), "Organizational strategy, structure, and process", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 546-562.

Moran, R. and Harris, P.R. (1983), *Managing Cultural Synergy*, Gulf Publishing Co, Houston.

Muckelbauer, J. (2016). Implicit paradigms of Rhetoric. Aristotelian, Cultural and Heliotropic. In Barnett, S. and Boyle, C. (eds.). *Rhetoric through everyday things* (pp. 30-41). Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Ng, K.-Y. and Earley, P.C. (2006), "Culture + Intelligence: Old Constructs, New Frontiers", *Group & Organization Management*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 4–19.

Nikitina, T. and Lapina, I. (2017). Managerial competenves development in the context of the Fourth Industrial revolution. SCEE Proceedings 2017 (pp. 151-152). http://feem.rtu.lv/wp-content/uploads/sites/64/2016/04/SCEE2017-Proceedings.pdf#page=151

Özbilgin, M. (2008), "Global diversity management", in Smith, P.B., Peterson, M.F. and Thomas, D.C. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Cross-Cultural Management Research*, Sage, Los Angeles, pp. 379–396.

Özbilgin, M., and Chanlat, J. F. (Eds.). (2017), *Management and diversity: Perspectives from different national contexts*, Emerald Group Publishing.

Özbilgin M., Bartels-Ellis F., and Gibbs P. (Eds.) (2019), *Global Diversity Management, Management for Professionals*, Springer.

Person, K., May, M.S., and Mayer, C.H. (2016). The Meaning of Work for South African Women: A Phenomenological Study. *Journal of Psychology in Africa, 26*(2), 134-140.

Peterson, M.F. and Sondergaard, M. (2008), *Foundations of Cross-Cultural Management*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Phillips, M. and Sackmann, S. (2015), "Cross-Cultural management rising", in Holden, N., Michailova, S. and Tietze, S. (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Cross-Cultural Management*, Routledge, London, New York, pp. 8–18.

Primecz, H., Romani, L. and Sackmann, S. (Eds.) (2011), *Cross-Cultural Management in Practice. Culture and Negotiated Meanings*, Edward Elgar, Northampton.

Reid, W. and Karambayya, R. (2009), "Impact of dual executive leadership dynamics in creative organizations", Human Relations, Vol. 62 No. 7, pp. 1073–1112.

Reid, W. and Karambayya, R. (2016), "The shadow of history: Situated dynamics of trust in dual executive leadership", *Leadership*, Vol. 12 No 5, pp. 609-631.

Riiser, S. (2010), "National Identity and the West-Eastern Divan Orchestra", *Music and Arts in Action*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 19–37.

Romani, L. (2008), *Relating to the Other. Paradigm Interplay for Cross-Cultural Management Research*, Stockholm School of Economics (Institute for International Business), Stockholm.

Romani, L., Sackmann, S. and Primecz, H. (2011), "Culture and negotiated meanings: the value of considering meaning systems and power imbalance for cross-cultural management", in Primecz, H., Romani, L. and Sackmann, S. (Eds.), *Cross-Cultural Management in Practice. Culture and Negotiated Meanings*, Edward Elgar, Northampton, pp. 1–18.

Sackmann, S. and Phillips, M. (2004), "Contextual Influences on Culture Research: Shifting Assumptions for New Workplace Realities", *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 370–390.

Saint-Léger, G. and Beeler, B. (2012), "Emergence d'une culture négociée dans le cadre des projets ERP", *Management & Avenir*, Vol. 3 No. 53, pp. 54–71.

Scholz, C. and Stein, V. (2014), *The Dean in the University of the Future*, Mering Hampp, München.

Schwab, K. (2017). *The Fourth Industrial Revolution.* New York: Crown Business.

Seligman, M.E.P. 2002. Positive psychology, positive prevention and positive therapy. In C.R. Snyder and S.J. Lopez. (Eds.), Handbook of positive psychology (pp. 410-421). New York: Oxford University.

Smith, P.B., Peterson, M.F. and Thomas, D.C. (Eds.) (2008), The Handbook of Cross-Cultural *Management Research*, Sage, Los Angeles.

Schotter, A.P., Mudambi, R., Doz, Y.L., and Gaur, A. (2017), "Boundary spanning in global organizations", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 54 No. 4, pp. 403-421.

Spencer-Oatey, H. and Franklin, P. (2009), *Intercultural Interaction. A multidisciplinary approach to Intercultural Communication*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Spitzberg, B.H. and Changnon, G. (2009), "Conceptualizing Intercultural Competence", in Deardorff, D.K. (Ed.), *The SAGE Handbook of Intercultural Competence*, SAGE Publications, Inc, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 2–52.

Stahl, G.K. and Brannen, M.Y. (2013), "Building Cross-Cultural Leadership Competence: An Interview With Carlos Ghosn", *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 519–531.

Stahl, G.K., Maznevski, M.L., Voigt, A. and Jonsen, K. (2009), "Unravelling the effects of cultural diversity in teams: A meta-analysis of research on multicultural work groups", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 41, pp. 690–709.

Stahl, G. K., Mäkelä, K., Zander, L. and Maznevski, M. L. (2010), "A look at the bright side of multicultural team diversity", Scandinavian Journal of Management, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp. 439-447.

Stahl, G.K., Miska, C., Lee, H.-J. and Sully de Luque, M. F. (2017), "The upside of cultural differences: Towards a more balanced treatment of culture in cross-cultural management research", *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 2–12.

Stahl, G.K. and Tung, R.L. (2015), "Towards a more balanced treatment of culture in international business studies: The need for positive cross-cultural scholarship", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 46 No. 6, pp. 391–414.

Strauss, A. L. (1978), *Negotiations: Varieties, contexts, processes, and social order*, Jossey-Bass Inc Pub, San Francisco.

Stumpf, S. and Zeutschel, U. (2000), "Synergy effects in multinational work groups: What we know and what we don´t know", in Mendenhall, M.E., Kühlmann, T.M. and Stahl, G.K. (Eds.), *Developing global business leaders: Policies, processes, and innovations*, Quorum Books, Westport, pp. 175–194.

Thomas, D.C. and Peterson, M.F. (2015), *Cross-Cultural Management. Essential concepts*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Thomas, K. W., and Kilmann, R. H. (1974). *Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument*. Mountain View, CA: Xicom, a subsidiary of CPP.

Treichel, D. and Mayer, C.-H. (2011), *Lehrbuch Kultur. Lehr- und Lernmaterialen zur Vermittlung kultureller Kompetenzen*, Waxmann, Münster.

Tung, R.L. (2008), "The cross-cultural research imperative: The need to balance cross-national and intra-national diversity", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 39 No. 1, pp. 41–46.

Vanderheiden, E. and Mayer, C.-H. (2020). Mistakes, errors and failure. Navigating Potentials. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

Wong, P. T. P. (2011). Positive psychology 2.0: Towards a balanced interactive model of the good life. *Canadian Psychology*, *52*(2), 69–81.

Yagi, N. and Kleinberg, J. (2011), "Boundary work: An interpretive ethnographic perspective on negotiating and leveraging cross-cultural identity", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 42 No. 5, pp. 629–653.

Zander, L. and Romani, L. (2004), "When nationality matters. A study of departmental, hierarchical, professional, gender and age-based employee groupings' leadership preference across 15 countries", *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 291–315.