

Organizational Disalignment and Normative Tension in Multicultural Work Environments: A Review of Value Conflict Mechanisms

Mochamad Irfan

Mayjen Sungkono University of Mojokerto, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 18 April 2023

Revised 21 May 2023

Accepted 23 June 2023

Key words:

Value conflict,

Multicultural organizations,

Normative divergence,

Intercultural communication,

Power asymmetry,

Institutional legitimacy,

Cross-cultural management.

ABSTRACT

This literature-based study investigates how value conflicts emerge and manifest within multicultural organizational environments. Drawing on research from intercultural management, cross-cultural psychology, and organizational behavior, the analysis reveals that such conflicts arise from deeply embedded differences in normative systems related to leadership, communication, time orientation, authority, and ethical reasoning. These divergences influence how individuals interpret organizational expectations, interpersonal interactions, and institutional legitimacy. The review identifies specific sites where value misalignment becomes visible, including performance evaluation, feedback mechanisms, team rituals, and policy design. Furthermore, it highlights how unacknowledged value conflicts contribute to relational disengagement, perceived injustice, and latent resistance. Through critical examination of power dynamics, institutional responses, and cultural symbolism, the study shows that value conflict is not merely a matter of interpersonal tension but a structural phenomenon with significant implications for organizational sustainability. The findings advocate for more reflexive, inclusive, and pluralistic approaches to policy and leadership in culturally complex settings. Ultimately, the study provides a theoretical and practical framework for understanding the relational architecture of value-based conflict in diverse institutions.

INTRODUCTION

In contemporary organizational landscapes, diversity has become a structural reality rather than a voluntary attribute. As organizations expand across borders and integrate talent from varied national, ethnic, and ideological backgrounds, the presence of multiple value systems within a single institutional framework becomes inevitable. While such plurality enhances creativity and decision-making range, it simultaneously introduces the potential for value-based dissonance (Mitchell et al., 2016). The friction between cultural expectations, communication codes, and ethical assumptions creates conditions where differing interpretations of behavior, hierarchy, and purpose collide. In multicultural environments, these divergences often surface not as logistical issues but as existential disagreements about what ought to matter within the organization (Tamunomiebi & Ehior, 2019).

Within multicultural settings, values are not isolated preferences; they function as organizing principles that guide perception, judgment, and behavior (Liu, 2019). When individuals from differing value systems work in proximity,

normative disalignment can manifest in work styles, conflict resolution approaches, or leadership expectations (Gelfand et al., 2012). As noted by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998), value systems define how individuals relate to rules, authority, time, and risk. When these frameworks remain implicit or unexamined, misunderstandings multiply, trust deteriorates, and cooperation becomes strained. These value discrepancies may appear minor on the surface, yet their cumulative effect often determines whether collaboration flourishes or fractures, as even small misalignments can gradually erode trust, communication and shared purpose over time (Jaeger et al, 2016).

The literature reflects that multicultural organizations are especially vulnerable to internal conflict when leadership fails to mediate or reconcile competing value frameworks. Hofstede (1991) proposed that dimensions such as individualism versus collectivism or uncertainty avoidance serve as fundamental predictors of organizational behavior. When policies or managerial decisions align with one cultural logic while alienating others, perceptions of exclusion or unfairness grow (Bansal, 2017). Such

* Corresponding author, email address: irfanmoc@gmail.com

perceived misalignment does not always erupt into overt conflict but may fester as latent dissatisfaction, passive resistance, or disidentification. The management of value divergence, therefore, is not ancillary to organizational health—it is constitutive of it (Fairholm, 2015).

Particularly within global firms, humanitarian organizations, and international academic institutions, value conflicts emerge not from hostility but from sincere commitment to competing goods (Mills, 2005). For instance, a North American emphasis on autonomy and initiative may clash with an East Asian orientation toward harmony and deference. In such environments, behavior coded as assertive by one employee may be interpreted as disrespectful by another. These tensions intensify when compounded by organizational demands for performance, innovation, and adaptation (Smith et al., 2017). As Thomas and Peterson (2004) emphasized, success in multicultural organizations depends not only on technical competence but on the ability to recognize, interpret, and navigate normative ambiguity. Understanding the structure and expression of value conflict is thus essential for any institution operating across cultural boundaries.

Across the literature, value conflict is acknowledged as a persistent undercurrent in multicultural organizations, yet theoretical clarity and applied frameworks remain inconsistent (Erciyes, 2019). Researchers such as Bochner and Hesketh (1994) have noted that organizational studies tend to focus on surface-level interactions while neglecting the deeper axiological roots of conflict. Moreover, many models emphasize behavioral adaptation without fully addressing the emotional and moral costs of suppressing one's value commitments (Ghiat, 2020). As a result, organizational interventions often remain procedural rather than transformative. There exists a clear need to interrogate how value conflicts are perceived, expressed, and either suppressed or reconciled within multicultural institutional settings.

Compounding this issue is the methodological fragmentation across disciplines. While psychology, anthropology, and management science have all contributed insights into intercultural dynamics, their paradigms frequently lack conceptual integration. Hofstede's cultural dimensions, while widely cited, have been critiqued for essentialism and lack of dynamism. Meanwhile, critical perspectives highlight how power asymmetries shape whose values are deemed legitimate or deviant within organizations (Anderson & Brion, 2014). Without a coherent interdisciplinary framework, the field struggles to capture the full complexity of value-related conflict in multicultural systems.

Another recurring limitation is the underrepresentation of employee perspectives from non-dominant cultural groups (Gabor & Buzzanell, 2012). Much of the research is still filtered through Western epistemologies, often focusing on how minorities can adapt to organizational norms rather than how institutions can accommodate plurality. This imbalance narrows the analytical lens and risks reproducing cultural hierarchies under the guise of integration. Understanding value conflict, therefore, demands a reversal of this orientation: to center experiences of dissonance and explore them not as barriers but as diagnostic signals of organizational incongruence (Ashforth et al., 2014).

The centrality of values to organizational functioning and identity makes their conflict especially consequential. Unlike disagreements over methods or metrics, value divergence challenges what is seen as legitimate, ethical, and desirable. It affects how authority is exercised, how success is defined, and how relationships are managed. In multicultural environments where alignment cannot be assumed, these conflicts often become silent forces shaping morale, retention, and institutional coherence. Unpacking how these conflicts are experienced, interpreted, and processed by members is essential for developing sustainable, inclusive, and reflective organizational cultures.

This study seeks to examine how value conflict emerges, is experienced, and managed in multicultural organizations by reviewing and synthesizing existing scholarly literature. The objective is to identify the principal dimensions of conflict, explore the cultural and institutional conditions that produce them, and assess how organizations respond to such dissonance. The findings are expected to contribute to theoretical development and practical understanding of cross-cultural dynamics in contemporary institutions.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study adopts a structured literature review as its methodological foundation to explore how value conflict arises and manifests within multicultural organizational environments. A literature review is particularly suited for subjects where existing research spans multiple disciplines and where theoretical integration is needed to clarify key constructs. Hart (1998) emphasized that such a method enables critical synthesis, allowing researchers to interrogate assumptions, compare conceptual frameworks, and identify latent contradictions across a corpus of scholarly work. The review approach employed here facilitates the consolidation of insights from intercultural

communication studies, organizational psychology, and international management research. By mapping the contours of value dissonance, its underlying causes, and observable expressions, the study aims to construct a coherent analytical narrative that reflects both empirical findings and conceptual development.

Source materials were selected using thematic relevance and methodological robustness as primary criteria. Academic databases were used to identify peer-reviewed journal articles, theoretical essays, and comparative case studies published in the last three decades. Following Jesson, Matheson, and Lacey's (2001) model for systematic review, the materials were categorized according to recurring concepts such as intercultural misalignment, normative dissonance, and moral incongruence. Key search terms included "value conflict," "multicultural organizations," "intercultural management," "workplace diversity," and "cultural value systems." Special emphasis was placed on literature that included first-person accounts, ethnographic observation, and cross-cultural analysis to ensure that the selected works reflected both structural patterns and lived experience. The final set of sources was reviewed for conceptual clarity, methodological transparency, and theoretical contribution.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Value conflicts within multicultural organizations arise through the intersection of diverse normative systems that coexist within the same institutional space (Gronwald, 2017). These conflicts are not incidental but structurally embedded in environments where members possess divergent worldviews regarding hierarchy, communication norms, authority, individual responsibility, and collective obligation (Gelfand et al., 2008; Zhou, 2013). According to Hofstede (1991), these normative differences are rooted in deeply internalized cultural dimensions such as power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and long-term orientation, all of which shape how individuals interpret their roles and relationships at work. When these underlying assumptions are not explicitly addressed, they surface in subtle yet pervasive ways—misaligned expectations during decision-making processes, discomfort in feedback exchanges, or incompatible assumptions about what constitutes fairness or respect (Hamdorf, 2002). These frictions disrupt interpersonal trust, erode cohesion, and challenge the coherence of organizational identity (Durac, 2017).

Manifestation of value conflict can be traced to the friction between organizational norms and cultural expectations of its members (Tamunomiebi & Ehior, 2019). Employees who enter an organization with culturally informed expectations about leadership, feedback, punctuality, and conflict resolution may find themselves marginalized when dominant organizational norms invalidate or ignore their preferences (Zafar et al., 2023). Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) observed that dilemmas emerge most acutely when values are not explicitly negotiated but presumed to be shared. For instance, in a multicultural team where consensus-building is the dominant decision style, members from cultures that prize decisive leadership may interpret the process as inefficient or indecisive. Conversely, employees from cultures that favor harmony may experience direct critique or competition as confrontational or even hostile (Gelfand, 2012). When left unresolved, such experiences often culminate in silent withdrawal, reduced participation, or turnover, rather than open conflict (Koyuncu & Chipindu, 2020).

Another dimension through which value conflict emerges is in the differential attribution of meaning to common workplace practices (Horton et al., 2014). Acts such as speaking up in meetings, questioning superiors, or requesting personal accommodations carry different connotations across cultures. Thomas and Peterson (2004) highlighted that employees from hierarchical societies may refrain from public dissent, interpreting such actions as insubordination, while employees from egalitarian cultures may view the same actions as expressions of engagement and responsibility. Conflicting interpretations can cause misjudgments in performance evaluation and informal reputations (Bourguignon & Chiapello, 2005). A well-intentioned act may be seen as insubordinate or disruptive by one group and as proactive and competent by another. This ambiguity becomes even more pronounced when communication styles—such as indirectness versus assertiveness—are mismatched, leading to chronic misunderstanding and relational tension within teams (Morley et al, 1997).

Value conflict further emerges through discrepancies in time orientation and task prioritization (Freund & Tomasik, 2021). Employees from polychronic cultures, where multitasking and relational flexibility are common, may find themselves at odds with organizational routines rooted in monochronic frameworks that emphasize punctuality, linear task completion, and rigid scheduling. These divergent approaches often produce friction in collaborative settings where

deadline pressure and task ownership require aligned expectations (Ghiat, 2020). According to Hall (1983), time perception is not merely a logistical matter but a cultural construct embedded in assumptions about respect, reliability, and work ethics. When one employee interprets delayed response as disrespect while another views strict punctuality as inflexible, the resulting tension reflects more than poor coordination—it reveals conflicting value systems regarding what constitutes professional integrity (Bousalham, 2022).

Another prominent site of value conflict lies in the contrasting conceptualizations of hierarchy and authority. Employees from cultures with high power distance may expect deference, formality, and clearly demarcated roles, while their peers from low power distance backgrounds may value informality, flat structures, and participatory governance (Nakonecha, 2014). Hofstede (1991) indicated that these divergent attitudes influence everything from how individuals address superiors to how they interpret the legitimacy of decision-making processes. In a multicultural setting, an employee who bypasses hierarchical chains to express dissent or propose innovation may be viewed as insubordinate by one manager and proactive by another (Reade & Lee, 2016). These evaluative inconsistencies generate ambiguity, stress, and potential favoritism, undermining cohesion and organizational justice (Liu, 2019).

Language and discourse conventions also serve as mediums where value-based misalignment becomes visible. While the functional use of language is often addressed in cross-cultural training, less attention is paid to its symbolic dimensions (Kramsch, 2011). For example, directness in communication, use of silence, emotional expressiveness, and humor are all culturally encoded and tied to values regarding sincerity, respect, and dignity. Bochner and Hesketh (1994) noted that misreading these cues may result in perceived insensitivity or inauthenticity. In meetings, a lack of verbal feedback may be interpreted as disengagement by one group and deep reflection by another. The misalignment of such signals—particularly in high-stakes discussions—can lead to unwarranted judgments about competence, loyalty, or emotional maturity (Ghiat, 2020).

Organizational rituals and symbolic practices constitute another domain where value tensions materialize (Islam & Sferrazzo, 2022). Ceremonies, recognition systems, and team-building activities often carry implicit assumptions about what is worthy of celebration or reward. Employees from

cultures emphasizing collective achievement may feel alienated in systems that highlight individual performance metrics (Dugguh & Dennis, 2014). Conversely, those who associate success with personal merit may undervalue shared accomplishments or view collective rewards as unfair. Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) argue that without inclusive design, such rituals inadvertently privilege dominant cultural logics, thereby reinforcing asymmetrical recognition and perpetuating marginalization. Over time, such symbolic dissonance fosters a sense of cultural estrangement (Peterson, 2021).

Ethical ambiguity within organizational policies and practices frequently exacerbates value conflicts among members of diverse workforces. Organizations increasingly operate across borders, bringing together individuals whose understandings of key constructs—such as ethical leadership, fair compensation, and appropriate negotiation—reflect deep cultural conditioning. For instance, what one culture considers fair and principled may seem arbitrary or even unethical to another (Nurmalasari & Nuraini, 2021). As Jahansoozi (2006) observed, some groups may view procedural transparency as the highest ethical imperative, believing that clear rules and open communication foster trust and legitimacy. In contrast, others may privilege relational loyalty or communal welfare, seeing close interpersonal bonds or group-oriented benefit as the core ethical concern. These contrasting priorities form the root of many misunderstandings and value clashes within multicultural organizations (Mujtaba, 2015).

This diversity of ethical expectations becomes particularly pronounced during moments of ethical decision-making, a phenomenon highlighted by Thomas and Peterson (2004). In multinational settings, policies are often designed by headquarters with a certain value system in mind, but their implementation and enforcement can vary dramatically across sites. Local managers may interpret or apply policies in ways that better align with prevailing cultural norms, creating inconsistencies and sometimes even conflicting expectations. As a result, employees are often placed in situations where they must navigate ambiguous ethical terrain, seeking to balance adherence to formal rules with respect for deeply held personal or cultural values. Such situations foster ethical dissonance, as described by Yang et al. (2022), wherein employees feel tension between the expectations of the organization and their own internalized standards of right and wrong.

The consequences of ethical ambiguity and resulting dissonance are far-reaching. Employees may experience internal conflict, struggle to maintain engagement, or resort to covert resistance—finding ways to work around policies they perceive as incompatible or unjust. In some cases, persistent exposure to conflicting ethical signals can lead to moral disengagement, where employees detach from the organization's values or their roles within it. Over time, this erodes trust, undermines compliance, and weakens the moral fabric of the organization (Liu, 2019). Ultimately, when ethical expectations remain ambiguous and unresolved, both organizational cohesion and individual integrity are put at risk.

Leadership behavior becomes a flashpoint for value conflict when expectations regarding authority, mentorship, and accountability diverge. In some cultures, leaders are expected to embody wisdom, paternal guidance, and moral authority (Wong, 2013). In others, leadership is viewed through a lens of facilitation, horizontal coordination, and team empowerment (Muller et al., 2018). When leadership behavior does not align with culturally anchored expectations, it can trigger disillusionment, withdrawal, or skepticism among employees. Misalignment in leadership perception affects not just performance but also trust, retention, and professional development aspirations (Tamunomiebi & Ehior, 2019). A manager viewed as impartial and effective by one subgroup may be seen as aloof or authoritarian by another, leading to uneven buy-in and relational fragmentation (Cross & Parker, 2004).

Performance evaluation and feedback mechanisms further illustrate how value divergence shapes workplace dynamics. Cultures that favor indirectness and relational preservation may find Western-style appraisal systems—characterized by frankness, quantification, and individual ranking—alienating or even offensive (Obijiofor & Hanusch, 2017). Employees may interpret critical feedback as a personal attack rather than developmental guidance (Chan & McAlister, 2014). Conversely, employees from cultures valuing assertiveness may perceive feedback avoidance as evasive or disingenuous. Bochner and Hesketh (1994) pointed out that without adaptive mechanisms, such evaluations become sites of disempowerment rather than growth, eroding morale and exacerbating intergroup tension.

Recruitment and onboarding practices often reflect value assumptions that go unacknowledged (Caldwell & Peters, 2018). Job interviews that prioritize self-promotion, linear storytelling, or

hypothetical performance may disadvantage applicants from collectivist or high-context cultures who value humility, modesty, and narrative nuance. Once hired, orientation programs that foreground organizational efficiency over cultural integration may produce early disaffection (Brannen & Peterson, 2009). Hall (1983) asserted that cultural misalignment at entry points often shapes long-term identification and satisfaction. When newcomers feel pressured to assimilate rather than be understood, value dissonance is internalized as alienation, and organizational identity fails to accommodate pluralism (Liu, 2019).

Power asymmetries exacerbate the manifestation of value conflict by dictating whose values are institutionalized and whose are delegitimized (Coleman et al., 2010). Minority voices may be excluded not through overt rejection but through epistemic silencing—where their frameworks are treated as irrelevant, impractical, or disruptive. Thomas and Peterson (2004) suggested that such exclusion is often masked by procedural neutrality, yet it manifests in meeting agendas, promotion criteria, and policy design. Over time, this produces a normative monoculture that erodes diversity at the level of meaning and principle, even as surface-level inclusion is preserved. In such climates, value conflict does not erupt but simmers as quiet disidentification (Tamunomiebi & Ehior, 2019).

Institutional responses to value conflict often determine whether organizations evolve or ossify. When value dissonance is acknowledged and openly explored, it can serve as a catalyst for learning and innovation. However, when conflict is dismissed or bureaucratized into rigid policy, it mutates into resentment. Hofstede (1991) warned that without cultural reflection, organizations default to ethnocentric norms disguised as neutrality. Reflexive leadership, intercultural dialogue, and inclusive policy design become essential conditions for transforming value conflict from a liability into a generative force. Organizations that fail to invest in this transformation tend to experience recurring crises of engagement, retention, and coherence.

CONCLUSION

The emergence and manifestation of value conflicts in multicultural organizational environments are shaped by intricate layers of cultural, institutional, and interpersonal divergence. These conflicts are embedded within communication patterns, time orientation, leadership expectations, ethical reasoning, and decision-making structures. As shown in the literature, value misalignment does not

surface merely as disagreement over procedures, but as competing interpretations of legitimacy, justice, and meaning within the organizational setting. When values remain implicit or unexamined, they produce friction that undermines cohesion, trust, and collaboration. Value conflict, therefore, is not a peripheral issue but a fundamental determinant of organizational resilience and adaptability in diverse workforces.

Organizations that operate across cultural boundaries must recognize that value conflict cannot be reduced to behavior management or training sessions. It reflects deeper normative incongruities that shape identity, belonging, and moral orientation. Without addressing these dimensions, surface-level harmony may mask emotional disengagement, epistemic marginalization, or silent withdrawal. Addressing value conflict requires institutions to rethink their assumptions about neutrality, professionalism, and inclusion. By cultivating organizational cultures that make space for value pluralism, institutions enhance both innovation and cohesion, allowing cultural complexity to become a strength rather than a liability.

To respond constructively to value conflict, institutions should develop mechanisms that encourage reflective dialogue, intercultural literacy, and shared norm formation. Leadership development programs should include training in normative interpretation, power awareness, and relational sensitivity. Moreover, evaluation systems should be adapted to recognize diverse expressions of competence, respect, and collaboration. Future research should explore how organizational structures themselves can be reimagined to support normative inclusivity, and how silent or institutionalized forms of value suppression can be uncovered and transformed into spaces of shared negotiation.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, C., & Brion, S. (2014). Perspectives on power in organizations. *Annu. Rev. Organ. Psychol. Organ. Behav.*, 1(1), 67-97.
- Ashforth, B. E., Rogers, K. M., Pratt, M. G., & Pradies, C. (2014). Ambivalence in organizations: A multilevel approach. *Organization Science*, 25(5), 1453-1478.
- Bansal, A. (2017). A revelation of employee feelings of alienation during post-mergers and acquisition: An outcome of perceived organizational justice. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 30(3), 417-439.
- Bochner, S., & Hesketh, B. (1994). Power distance, individualism/collectivism, and job-related attitudes in a culturally diverse work group. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 25(2), 233-257.
- Bourguignon, A., & Chiapello, E. (2005). The role of criticism in the dynamics of performance evaluation systems. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 16(6), 665-700.
- Bousalham, Y. (2022). Against Shared Values: "Disadherence" and "Gaps" as Fruitful Ingredients of Organizational Culture. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2022, No. 1, p. 13179). Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2022.13179abstr act>
- Brannen, M. Y., & Peterson, M. F. (2009). Merging without alienating: Interventions promoting cross-cultural organizational integration and their limitations. *Journal of international business studies*, 40, 468-489.
- Caldwell, C., & Peters, R. (2018). New employee onboarding—psychological contracts and ethical perspectives. *Journal of Management Development*, 37(1), 27-39.
- Chan, M. E., & McAllister, D. J. (2014). Abusive supervision through the lens of employee state paranoia. *Academy of management review*, 39(1), 44-66.
- Coleman, P. T., Kugler, K., Mitchinson, A., Chung, C., & Musallam, N. (2010). The view from above and below: The effects of power and interdependence asymmetries on conflict dynamics and outcomes in organizations. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 3(4), 283-311.
- Cross, R. L., & Parker, A. (2004). *The hidden power of social networks: Understanding how work really gets done in organizations*. Harvard Business Press.
- Darmawan, D. (2021). Implementation of Agile Project Management in a Dynamic Business Environment, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 275 - 280.
- Dugguh, S. I., & Dennis, A. (2014). Job satisfaction theories: Traceability to employee performance in organizations. *IOSR journal of business and management*, 16(5), 11-18.
- Durac, L. (2017). Determinant Aspects of Organisational Behaviour, from the Perspective of Multiculturalism. *Anuarul Universitatii „Petre Andrei” din Iasi/Year-Book „Petre Andrei” University from Iasi, Fascicula: Asistenta Sociala, Sociologie, Psihologie/Fascicle: Social Work, Sociology, Psychology*, 19, 61-72.
<https://doi.org/10.18662/UPASW/03>
- Erciyas, E. (2019). A new theoretical framework for multicultural workforce motivation in the context of international organizations. *Sage Open Journal*, 9(3), 1-12.

- Fairholm, G. W. (2015). *Failures of Workplaces in Multiple Competitive Cultures*. In *Overcoming Workplace Pathologies: Principles of Spirit-Based Leadership* (pp. 55-72). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-17154-8_5
- Freund, A. M., & Tomasik, M. J. (2021). Managing conflicting goals through prioritization? The role of age and relative goal importance. *Journal Plos one*, 16(2), 1-20.
- Gabor, E., & Buzzanell, P. M. (2012). From Stigma to Resistant Career Discourses: Toward a Co-Cultural Career Communication Model for Non-Dominant Group Members. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 21(3), 1-17.
- Gelfand, M. J., Leslie, L. M., & Keller, K. M. (2008). On the etiology of conflict cultures. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 28, 137-166.
- Gelfand, M. J., Leslie, L. M., Keller, K., & de Dreu, C. (2012). Conflict cultures in organizations: How leaders shape conflict cultures and their organizational-level consequences. *Journal of applied psychology*, 97(6), 1131-1147.
- Ghiat, B. (2020). Conflicting values in organizations: Local versus intruder managerial values. *Journal of Emerging Economies and Islamic Research*, 8(2), 28-39. <https://doi.org/10.24191/JEEIR.V8I2.8352>
- Gronwald, K.-D. (2017). *Conflict Management in International Projects*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-53150-1_7
- Hall, E. T. (1983). *The dance of life: The other dimension of time*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Hamdorf, D. (2002). *Towards managing diversity: cultural aspects of conflict management in organizations*.
- Hariani, M., R. Mardikaningsih, D. Darmawan, & M. Irfan. (2021). Strategies for Developing Perceived Support for Employees in Diverse Work Environments. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 81 – 88.
- Hart, C. (1998). *Doing a literature review: Releasing the social science research imagination*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Horton, K. E., Bayerl, P. S., & Jacobs, G. (2014). Identity conflicts at work: An integrative framework. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 35(1), 6-22.
- Islam, G., & Sferrazzo, R. (2022). Workers' rites: Ritual mediations and the tensions of new management. *Journal of Management Studies*, 59(2), 284-318.
- Jaeger, A. M., Kim, S. S., & Butt, A. N. (2016). Leveraging values diversity: The emergence and implications of a global managerial culture in global organizations. *Management International Review*, 56, 227-254.
- Jahansoozi, J. (2006). Organization-stakeholder relationships: exploring trust and transparency. *Journal of management development*, 25(10), 942-955.
- Jesson, J., Matheson, L., & Lacey, F. M. (2001). *Doing your literature review: Traditional and systematic techniques*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Koyuncu, A. G., & Denise Chipindu, R. (2020). How cultural differences influence conflict within an organization: A case study of Near East University. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 8(1), 112-128.
- Kramsch, C. (2011). The symbolic dimensions of the intercultural. *Language teaching*, 44(3), 354-367.
- Liu, M. (2019). How power distance interacts with culture and status to explain intra-and intercultural negotiation behaviors: A multilevel analysis. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 12(3), 192-212.
- Mardikaningsih, R. & M. Hariani. (2022). Integrating Diversity and Sustainability in Organizations: How to Impact Performance, Corporate Competitiveness, and the Creation of Inclusive Work Environments, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(2), 77 – 84.
- Mills, K. (2005). Neo-humanitarianism: the role of international humanitarian norms and organizations in contemporary conflict. *Global Governance*, 11, 161-183.
- Mitchell, R. K., Weaver, G. R., Agle, B. R., Bailey, A. D., & Carlson, J. (2016). Stakeholder agency and social welfare: Pluralism and decision making in the multi-objective corporation. *Academy of Management review*, 41(2), 252-275.
- Morley, D. D., Shockley-Zalabak, P., & Cesaria, R. (1997). Organizational communication and culture: A study of 10 Italian high-technology companies. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 34(3), 253-268.
- Mujtaba, B. G. (2015). *Management Ethics and Social Responsibility Amid Diversity Across Nations*. <https://doi.org/10.2174/2352633501501010006>
- Müller, R., Sankaran, S., Drouin, N., Vaagaasar, A. L., Bekker, M. C., & Jain, K. (2018). A theory framework for balancing vertical and horizontal leadership in projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 36(1), 83-94.
- Nakonechna, N. (2024). Comparative Analysis of Corporate Culture in EU Countries. *Public Administration and Law Review*, (1 (17)), 43-55.

- Nurmalasari, D., & R. Nuraini. (2021). The Role of Local Communities in Biodiversity Conservation Challenges and Integration of Local Wisdom with Modern Science, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 99 – 104
- Obijiofor, L., & Hanusch, F. (2017). *Journalism across cultures: An introduction*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Patterson, A. F. (2021). "It Was Really Tough" – Exploring the Feelings of Isolation and Cultural Dissonance With Black American Males at a Predominantly White Institution. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 23(1), 55-77.
- Reade, C., & Lee, H. J. (2016). Does ethnic conflict impede or enable employee innovation behavior? The alchemic role of collaborative conflict management. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 27(2), 199-224 <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCMA-09-2014-0071>
- Sajjapong, T. & M. Irfan. (2022). Understanding Communication Practices for Managing Global Teams Across Diverse Cultural Frameworks, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(2), 267 – 272.
- Smith, W.K., Erez, M., Jarvenpaa, S., Lewis, M. W., & Tracey, P. (2017). Adding complexity to theories of paradox, tensions, and dualities of innovation and change: Introduction to organization studies special issue on paradox, tensions, and dualities of innovation and change. *Organization Studies*, 38(3-4), 303-317.
- Tamunomiebi, M. D., & Ehior, I. E. (2019). Diversity and ethical issues in the organizations. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 9(2), 839-864 <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/V9-I2/5620>
- Thomas, D. C., & Peterson, M. F. (2004). *Cross-cultural management: Essential concepts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1998). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in global business*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Wong, K. C. (2013). Culture and moral leadership in education. In *Leading Schools In A Global Era* (pp. 106-125). Routledge.
- Yang, N., Lin, C., Liao, Z., & Xue, M. (2022). When moral tension begets cognitive dissonance: An investigation of responses to unethical pro-organizational behavior and the contingent effect of construal level. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 180(1), 339-353.
- Zafar, H., Danish, M., Mir Sadaat Baloch, D. M. S., & Bashir, S. (2023). The Impact of Cultural Factors on Organizational Behavior: A Case Study of Balochistan. *Onomazein* 33(1), 121-154.
- Zhou, Y.-F. (2013, September 13). Cross-Culture Management in the Era of Multi-value. *International Conference on Business Computing and Global Informatization*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/BCGIN.2013.125>