Globalization: Current Issues and Future Research Directions

Maddy Janssens (iD),[1] William W. Maddux[2] and ToTran Nguyen[1]

1 KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium
2 University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC, U.S.A.

Abstract

In this paper, we propose a research agenda for psychologists in general, and scholars of culture and negotiations in particular, to address the key challenges of dealing with an increasingly globalized world from a psychological perspective. Building on an understanding of globalization in terms of cultural and subjective matters, we propose three research domains in which psychology scholars can contribute to a further understanding of our global society: (a) the effects of global contact on cognition and behavior; (b) hybridization and human agency; and (c) new forms of cooperation. In each domain, we start with a particular key tenet within the globalization or cosmopolitan literature and then develop research questions that connect human experience and human behavior with globalization. We conclude with research implications.

> Globalization is not a process taking place somewhere far away in some exotic place. Globalization is taking place in Leeds as well as in Warsaw, in New York, and in any small town in Poland. It is just outside your window, but inside as well. It is enough to walk down the street to see it (Bauman, 2006).

Introduction

Globalization is a fundamental aspect of 21st century society. Indeed, it would not be much of a stretch to say it may be the defining issue of our current age. Technological advances have made it just as easy to connect with someone halfway across the world as someone halfway down the hall. Increasing contact with people from other cultures, and our increasing interdependence with the rest of the world, means that globalization is redefining how we think about business, society, and even our own basic humanity as fellow denizens of a single shared planet. However, there is relatively little research investigating how globalization is affecting us psychologically (Arnett, 2002; Gelfand, Lyons, & Lun, 2011; Marsella, 2012). This noticeable lack of research may be inherently linked to the fundamental nature of psychology itself, as it tends to focus on individual-level behavior and its determinants as circumscribed by the immediate situational context, leaving more complex, systems- and macro-level notions for other disciplines (Marsella, 2012).

Thus, part of the challenge for scholars may be the inherent complexity of globalization. Indeed, globalization has almost as many definitions as there are academic disciplines. As described by the globalization scholar Jan Nederveen Pieterse (1994, p. 161): "In economics, globalization refers to economic internationalization and the spread of capitalist market relations [...] In international relations, the focus is on the increasing density of interstate relations and the development of global politics. In

sociology, the concern is with increasing worldwide social densities and the emergence of 'world society'. In cultural studies, the focus is on global communications and worldwide cultural standardization, as in CocaColonisation and McDonaldisation, and on postcolonial culture. In history, the concern is with conceptualizing 'global history'...." Globalization is thus a complex, multifaceted phenomenon, which may further explain why psychology has focused more on specific globally oriented problems like poverty, migration, war, or natural disasters, rather than on globalization per se (Marsella, 2012).

Psychology's limited focus on globalization offers an opportunity for new groundbreaking research that applies the useful lenses of psychological theories to better understand the challenges of globalization. In this paper, we propose a research agenda for psychologists in general, and scholars of culture and negotiations in particular, to address the key challenges of dealing with an increasingly globalized world from a psychological perspective. After all, we agree with globalization scholars (Nederveen Pieterse, 1994; Robertson, 1992) and cosmopolitan scholars (Delanty, 2012b; Irving & Glick-Schiller, 2015) that globalization necessarily involves human experience and human behavior. Psychology is thus well-positioned to theorize about key elements of the globalization processes, for example, consciousness, self-awareness, identity, loyalty, and the changing nature of interpersonal and intergroup contact in times of intensified connectivity.

In particular, we propose three research domains in which psychology scholars can contribute to a further understanding of our global society: (a) the effects of global contact on cognition and behavior; (b) hybridization and human agency; and (c) new forms of cooperation. In each domain, we start with a particular key tenet within the globalization or cosmopolitan literature and then develop research questions that connect human experience and human behavior with globalization. We conclude with four research implications: (a) developing a multidisciplinary understanding of globalization; (b) viewing culture and identity as dynamic processes; (c) moving beyond the dichotomy of local versus global; and (d) conducting reflective research.

Understanding Globalization: Individuals as Co-Drivers of Globalization

The few extant articles on globalization in psychology define globalization more "structurally" than psychologically. For example, Gelfand et al. (2011, p. 841) define the concept as "the rapid diffusion of economic, political, and cultural practices across national borders," and Marsella (2012, pp. 460–461) identifies the drivers of globalization as "all events, forces, and changes that are transnational, transcultural, and transborder, especially: capital flow, ownership, trade, telecommunications, transportation, political and military alliances, and international agencies." Such definitions emphasize an understanding of globalization that tends to view the individual as "outside" the process of globalization.

In this paper, we suggest that psychology scholars conceptualize globalization as fundamentally about individuals and their behaviors as co-drivers of the increasing diversity of society. Consistent with the work of globalization scholars (Nederveen Pieterse, 1994; Robertson, 1992) and cosmopolitan scholars (Delanty, 2012a; Delanty & Inglis, 2011), we emphasize two conceptualizations of globalization. First, globalization refers to a state of being more conscious of the world as whole (Robertson, 1992). Second, it refers to new self–other relations in light of global connectivity (Delanty, 2012b). Both ideas suggest a more central role for psychology in research on globalization.

Although definitions within global studies remain quite diverse, globalization scholars like Robertson, Tomlinson, and Scholte all emphasize that "one consequence of globalization is a heightened awareness of the world as a single place, an interconnected and networked space of human activity" (Rumford, 2008, p. 134). Robertson's (1992, 1995) pioneering work on "global consciousness" especially highlights that the world is not only becoming more connected but that people also increasingly are becoming aware that this is the case. So, with globalization comes an intensification of the consciousness of the world as an interconnected whole. Although acknowledging that "world formation"

has been going on for many hundreds or even thousands of years, Robertson (1992) stresses that what has changed over time is the scope and depth of consciousness of the world as a single place. Or as stated by Friedman (1995, p. 70), the essential character of globalization resides in "the consciousness of the global, that is, individual consciousness of the global situation, specifically that the world is an arena in which we all participate." Whereas consciousness of a world arena might create positive experiences and opportunities such as the possibility of new cultural contacts, learning new insights, or broadening one's horizon, as recent political events have made clear, the awareness that the world is an interconnected whole has also resulted in negative dynamics. Some people are clearly more resistant than others to particular elements of being interconnected with different others and instead prefer emphasizing national sovereignty and protectionism, in order to better insulate themselves for foreign forces beyond their immediate control.

Importantly, this view of globalization, as "*awareness* of the global human condition" (Robertson, 1992, p. 183), takes the concept beyond the realm of the technical or the economic to "cultural and subjective matters." This fundamentally psychological view of globalization signals the potential capability of humanity to act upon the global human condition (Nederveen Pieterse, 1994). It focuses attention on agents and bottom-up processes that actively use and transform ideas, goods, relationships, and technology within and beyond the locale in which they are situated. It abandons the top-down understanding of globalization that imposes the hegemonic (capitalistic) economic and (Western) cultural model onto the periphery of the world—homogenizing globalization. Global consciousness then is not only an outcome of the process but is also a motor of globalization (Rumford, 2008).

A second conceptualization of globalization comes from cosmopolitan studies, where scholars, mostly of philosophy and sociology, discuss self–other relations in light of current global connectivity (Delanty, 2012b; Delanty & Inglis, 2011; Featherstone, 2002). Although cosmopolitanism is often equated with Diogenes' declaration "I am a citizen of the world," cosmopolitan studies offer a much wider, interdisciplinary range of perspectives on how the process of globalization is irreversibly transforming the very nature of the social world, self–other relations, and the place of states within that world (Brown & Held, 2010; Delanty, 2009).

Some cosmopolitan scholars explicitly take a normative stance, emphasizing how encounters with cultural others may offer possibilities for learning and transformation. For instance, central in Delanty's view is that a "cosmopolitan spirit sought to encourage people to relativize their own culture in light of the encounter with the other,... to challenge all kinds of narrow patriotism and to open up the political community to a wider understanding of human community" (Delanty & Inglis, 2011, pp. 2–3). This view orients us to the idea that globalization brings transformational possibilities which emerge out of the logic of the encounter, exchange, and dialogue, with the aim to extend the horizons of people, societies, organizations, and institutions (Delanty, 2012b). From this normative stance, cosmopolitanism concerns processes of learning, self-reflection, and self-transformation through moments of openness when the self or the local meets the other or the global.

Other cosmopolitan scholars take a less normative stance and argue the need to focus empirically on "the processes by which the cosmopolitan perspective replaces the national in people's everyday lives" (Beck, 2004, p. 139). These scholars highlight the need to explore the dynamics of the possibilities and constraints of human beings living in an uncertain global world (Beck, 2004; Beck & Sznaider, 2006). They encourage attention to the contexts and situations where people make choices about how to engage with and act toward other human beings, and the complex consequences that ensue. This understanding of globalization highlights the necessity of studying "the social processes and complex moral shifts that are necessary for moments of mutual connection and relationality to emerge or be denied within social and cultural context" (Irving & Glick-Schiller, 2015, p. 6).

Importantly, both cosmopolitan stances highlight the notions of identity and loyalty. They point to the possibility of multiple forms of belonging and identity. Rather than seeing cosmopolitanism as merely an allegiance to the world community as opposed to national community, cosmopolitanism

involves a reframing of identities, loyalties, and self-understanding in ways that have no clear direction (Delanty, 2006). This argument follows that of Appiah (2005) who argues that cosmopolitans are people who construct their lives from whatever cultural resources to which they find themselves attached. Rather than understanding cosmopolitanism as belonging to the world (as Diogenes), this view of cosmopolitanism emphasizes belonging to the world *in a particular way*.

Understanding globalization beyond its structural components reveals key components of globalization that are at the core of the discipline of psychology. Due to increasing global connectivity, the notions of consciousness, awareness, belonging, identity, learning, contact, and change are becoming more crucial to understanding globalization from a psychological perspective. Culture and negotiation scholars are well positioned here to understand the fundamental psychological issues that arise when bringing people together from different parts of the world and seeking common ground for complex issues.

Toward a Research Agenda

Embracing these two conceptualizations of globalization, we propose a research agenda with three exemplary areas. For each area, we highlight a key theme from the globalization or cosmopolitan literature and discuss opportunities for research from a psychological perspective.

Effects of Global Experience on Cognition and Behavior

Emerging research demonstrates how global experiences affect the ways we think about and behave in the world around us and how these experiences have both positive and negative consequences depending on the specifics of one's experience (Hong & Cheon, 2017). At the societal level, globalization has clearly brought with it positive changes, such as increased GNP and national wealth, exposure to new ideas and customs, increased quality of life, and sense of global solidarity with humanity. Yet, it has also led to greater division between rich and poor, exploitation of labor forces, loss of national sovereignty to foreign powers and multinational corporations, and English language penetration to the detriment of local languages (Marsella, 2012). Clearly, globalization has intensified the natural human dilemma of how to balance competition and cooperation (Galinsky & Schweitzer, 2015), not only with other individuals, but also with other groups, cultures, and societies (Chiu, Gries, Torelli, & Cheng, 2011).

At the psychological level, the main benefits of globalization currently point to positive effects of global exposure on specific skills like creativity (Godart, Maddux, Shipilov, & Galinsky, 2015; Leung & Chiu, 2010; Leung, Maddux, Galinsky, & Chiu, 2008; Lu, Hafenbrack, et al., 2017; Maddux & Galinsky, 2009; Maddux, Hafenbrack, Tadmor, Bivolaru, & Galinsky, 2014; Tadmor, Galinsky, & Maddux, 2012). For example, research shows that people who have experience living or working in foreign countries are more creative than people without such experiences (Godart et al., 2015; Maddux & Galinsky, 2009). Interestingly, although extensive foreign *travel* does *not* have a significant and reliable impact on creativity, longitudinal, experimental, and correlational evidence suggests experiences traveling to many different countries do seem to increase individuals' general sense of trust in humanity (Cao, Galinsky, & Maddux, 2014).

However, a key finding from this line of research on creativity is that positive effects of global experience do not develop automatically, based on global exposure alone. To benefit psychologically from global experience, individuals must also undergo some sort of deeper psychological transformation to derive lasting creative benefits (Godart et al., 2015; Tadmor et al., 2012). Examples of such transformations that lead to creativity include (a) adapting to the new culture (Maddux & Galinsky, 2009), (b) undergoing a relatively deep learning experience about the new culture (Maddux, Adam, & Galinsky, 2010), (c) incorporating the new culture into their identities (Tadmor et al., 2012), and/or (d) developing deep relationships with people from other cultures. Importantly, many of these experiences make individuals more integratively complex—meaning they can not only understand multiple sides of an

issue but also conceptually integrate those different perspectives (Tadmor & Tetlock, 2006)—and it may be this enhanced integrative complexity that is a key mechanism in producing heightened levels of creativity following global experiences (Maddux et al., 2014; Tadmor et al., 2012). Thus, superficial global experiences do not seem to lead to lasting creative benefits, but deep global experiences do.

Global experience, however, can backfire under certain circumstances. For example, when living in many different countries, individuals are exposed to a variety of different moral codes, and as a result, their willingness to engage in immoral behavior increases (Lu, Quiodbach, et al., 2017). In addition, explicitly negative global experiences can have lasting negative effects, and correlational and experimental work is showing that such negative experiences can increase prejudice and discrimination toward foreign cultural groups (Affinito, Maddux, Antoine, & Gray, unpublished).

Finally, research is revealing negative psychological consequences associated with the societal-level changes brought about by globalization. Some research suggests globalization is increasing economic equality (Keller & Olney, 2017), and there is evidence that the structural characteristics of inequality— for example, divisions of class, status, and wealth—are associated with less prosocial behavior and a lack of empathy with others (Piff, Kraus, Côté, Cheng, & Keltner, 2010). In general, threats to one's fundamental identity and prevailing cultural worldview also can lead to decreased tolerance for those with diverse perspectives (Greenberg, Solomon, & Pyszczynski, 1997).

Thus, it is clear that globalization and its concomitant effects on individual psychology and broader society is a double-edged sword. Positive, transformational experiences produce psychological benefits such as creativity and generalized trust, while negative experiences harm morality and attitudes toward outgroup members. We propose then that a key question for the future research involves better understanding of the specific aspects of global experiences that can determine whether individuals subjectively perceive their own experiences of globalization as a blessing or a curse. Examples for future research include the following:

(1) Study the specific conditions of cross-cultural contact that determine whether the experiences are conceptualized and/or experienced as positive or negative. When and why are certain experiences positive and transformative for some people but not others?

(2) Study the specific psychological mindsets that can increase tolerance for other cultural groups and also the specific identity processes that can lead to common understanding. Frameworks from the intergroup relations literature (Brewer, 2007) may serve as an inspiration and roadmap. (See also paper by Cohen and Halevy in this special issue).

(3) Continue to study the psychological effects of structural changes (i.e., inequality) that are exacerbated by globalization, particularly ways to minimize the negative consequences.

Hybridization and Human Agency

A second research area relates to Delanty's view of cosmopolitanism and stems from viewing globalization as a process of hybridization that gives rise to a global mélange of different cultural elements (Nederveen Pieterse, 1994, 2001, 2009). Scholars who emphasize hybridization—as well as other related concepts such as collage, mélange, hodgepodge, bricolage, creolization, mongrelization, and syncretism (Hannerz, 1996)—focus on the bottom-up processes and agency of individuals that lead to novel phenomena. Prototypical examples of such new phenomena are "Thai boxing by Moroccan girls in Amsterdam, Asian rap in London, Irish bagels, Chinese tacos and Mardi Gras Indians in the United States" (Nederveen Pieterse, 1994, p. 169), or "Mexican schoolgirls dressed in Greek togas dancing in the style of Isidora Duncan" (Rowe & Schelling, 1991, p. 161) This implies that globalization with its cultural experiences is not about cultural synchronization or McDonaldization (homogenization), nor about a "clash of civilizations." Rather, globalization may give rise to novel combinations of cultural elements.

Hybridization is a synonym for mix; it is a "cross-category process" (Nederveen Pieterse, 1994, p. 171) "in which forms become separated from existing practices and recombine with new forms in new

practices" (Rowe & Schelling, 1991, p. 231). This process of cultural mixing is not a new process, it is as old as history, but "the pace of mixing accelerates and its scope widens in the wake of major structural changes, such as new technologies that enable new phases of intercultural contact" (Nederveen Pieterse, 2001, p. 222). Importantly, if hybridization can both transform and preserve identity, then it may also mitigate conflict, and therefore be an antidote against the increasing spread of conflicts bred by cultural misunderstanding (Nederveen Pieterse, 2009).

Studies demonstrate that individuals can have an identity that is inherently global in nature, with two (biculturals) or even more (polyculturals) cultures at the fulcrum of their sense of self (Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martinez, 2000; Morris, Chiu, & Liu, 2015). Some research suggests that biculturals can switch seamlessly back and forth between different cultural perspectives, and so perceive and interpret the world through different cultural lenses depending on which culture is psychologically salient at a particular time (Hong et al., 2000). However, more recent work challenges the idea that only one cultural influence is active when individuals are switching back and forth. This work suggests that parts of many different cultural influences could be simultaneously salient, especially given that many cultural practices have mixed cultural histories and result from a melange of many different cultural elements (Morris et al., 2015).

Negotiation scholars are well situated to develop this hybrid perspective, as their fundamental theories attend to both integrative and distributive elements of interdependent decision-making. For example, a "fusion model of collaboration" in global teams challenges team members to find ways to let their differences in process or priorities coexist or fuse together, in order to produce creatively realistic and/or integrative team decisions (Brett, 2014; Janssens & Brett, 2006). This fusion teamwork process was designed to resemble the process of hybridization, which engages in a dialogue concerning cultural and political differences.

Existing research on bicultural individuals and identities can also contribute to future investigations of how people can develop a global identity while retaining their local identity (Arnett, 2002). Strikingly, psychology researchers tend to assume that such dual identity causes anxiety and confusion, while from a cosmopolitan view, multiple identities and loyalties should have the opposite effect of reducing anxiety and confusion in a globalizing world. Being cosmopolitan means being competent in "mak[ing] one's way into other cultures, through listening, looking, intuiting and reflecting" (Hannerz, 1990, p. 239), in addition to being skilled at maneuvering through systems of meaning.

Future research may thus involve critical assessments of hybridization or "particular kinds of human experiences that arise as a result of new ways of seeing the world" (Delanty, 2012a, p. 336). Inspired by Neederveen Pieterse (2001, 2009), we suggest that scholars:

(1) Study individuals living and working in hybrid spaces in the global landscape—ethnically mixed neighborhoods, global virtual teams, and global cities—and examine their human experiences compared to those living and working in homogeneous spaces.
(2) Study people's differential capacities for maneuvering between different identity and meaning systems.
(3) Clarify the terms or conditions under which cultural interplay and crossover take place.
(4) Study how hybrid identities not only create anxiety, confusion, and marginalization, but also effective cultural integration and/or skills to resolve culturally conflicting situations.
(5) Investigate the extent to which different varieties of hybridization are able to change power asymmetries and create more equal relations.

New Forms of Cooperation

A third research domain starts from the acknowledgment that globalization magnifies the problems that affect all people and that require large-scale human cooperation (Buchan et al., 2009), leading to the

emergence of new, mixed forms of cooperation (Brown & Held, 2010; Nederveen Pieterse, 1994). The emergence of new transnational phenomena and realities such as various nonstate political actors (from Amnesty International to the World Trade Organization), the paradoxical emergence of global protest movements against globalization, or the hesitant formation of multinational states (like the European Union) indicate that the process of globalization leads to new forms of organizing and belonging, which deserve both theoretical and empirical study (Beck & Sznaider, 2006; Delanty, 2009). These new forms of global organization offer culture and negotiations scholars new research sites for studying how, for example, people's global consciousness or identity can generate new levels of collaboration and cooperation.

Cooperation between stakeholders is not new (Gray & Purdy, 2018). Over the past decades, we have seen increasing research on collaboration between diverse yet interdependent stakeholders from different sectors, such as business, government, and nonprofit. Collaboration has become the go-to approach to addressing global problems that are "wicked" or that are "ill-defined, ambiguous, and contested, and feature multilayered interdependencies and complex social dynamics" (Termeer, Dewulf, Breeman, & Stiller, 2015, p. 680). What is new is that globalization has accelerated at least some people's ability to connect to global concerns as well as their access to opportunities to cooperate with very different people, thereby building the psychological basis for global change.

Although traditional, multilateral organizations such as the United Nations (UN) continue to play a central role in organizing collective action across the globe, more local institutions and actors are mobilizing to drive bottom-up change. Gray and Purdy observe "partnerships often result when local instantiations of global issues arise and collaboration is required to respond" (2018, p. 16). Global challenges, such as environmental degradation from climate change, may prompt urgent collaboration among polities as they become more visible; however, this top-down response is not the only possibility. New forms of cooperation may emerge and evolve through the confluence of multiple concerns and networks intersecting within a local population. In one case, when an "emerging category of 'climate change refugees'" touched an antiracist local organization in Manchester, U.K., the result was joint action with yet another group, a cultural research institute, which then evolved into a partnership between a local university and a refugee support organization. The climate change training program that emerged was fueled by not only this partnership but also various "multiple local, national and transnational networks" (Glick-Schiller, 2015, p. 110). Through dialogue and interactions over time, the participants discovered and engaged in more shared concerns than just climate change (Glick-Schiller, 2015).

For this third research domain, globalization paradoxically highlights the importance of local context, not only in terms of how organizing emerges bottom-up but also in terms of what globalization means in the local context, for diverse stakeholders working toward a collective vision. Given this, we propose that scholars:

(1) Study the conditions in which cooperation or conflict form, when local instantiations of global problems emerge (Gray & Purdy, 2018).

(2) Study how, in new forms of cooperation, the tension between stakeholders' feelings of interdependence and their shared global consciousness shapes the processes of interaction and communication.

(3) Study a variety of new forms of cooperation, comparing and contrasting their processes of interaction and communication and the way they use distributive versus integrative negotiation strategy to address global problems.

Research Implications

A Multidisciplinary Understanding of Globalization

A key implication of our proposed research agenda is the necessity of a multidisciplinary understanding of globalization. We have made the case for moving our understanding of globalization beyond the

dominant technical and economic perspectives to psychology. Here, we offer ways to integrate perspectives across disciplines that we hope will allow scholars to capture the meaning of globalization in their research. By borrowing and integrating ideas from other disciplines, culture and negotiation scholars can find new inspiration, through identifying novel constructs and modes of theorizing. We suggest two approaches.

The first approach is to turn to other traditional disciplines such economics, sociology, and political science. Psychology scholars can discover and apply theoretical perspectives and concepts from these disciplines to build richer explanations of globalization processes. New insights can also be generated through multidisciplinary dialogue at different points in the research process, by liaising with scholars from these fields and incorporating their voices.

The second approach, which we advocate, is to turn to postdisciplinary fields such as global studies and cosmopolitan studies, both of which are distinct domains of inquiry into the condition of globalization. These fields uniquely offer a framework of interpretation with reference to concepts such as bordering and connectivity (Rumford, 2008), among others. Cosmopolitanism, a concept taken up by an exceptionally wide range of disciplines, importantly provides a plural framework to think about the extension of the moral and political horizons of people, societies, organizations, and institutions.

Culture and Identity as a Dynamic Processes

Currently, psychological research on culture tends to assume that people's cultural identities are directly linked to the cultural group to which they belong. This assumption is based on traditional definitions in which cultures are associated with packages of meanings distinctive to collectivities and territories (Hannerz, 1996). The most well-known example here is the work by Hofstede in which culture is seen as a collective software in people's minds, imprinting distinct values and behavioral patterns. Further, by this definition, intercultural encounters are considered to be a confrontation between two or more group-based fixed identities.

Within the current global reality, however, people might not opt for what may have seemed to be "their" culture; the notion of hybridization is an excellent example of this. As Morris et al. (2015, p. 631) indicate, "individuals' relationships to cultures are not categorical but rather are partial and plural." A perspective that treats "national identity as merely the passive embodiment of a predetermined cultural template" (Ailon-Souday & Kunda, 2003, p. 1074) may not be sustainable in the globalizing future. Rather, to understand culture and identities, one needs to take into account the freedom that members have in defining what national belonging means, in shaping this identity (Ailon-Souday & Kunda, 2003; Witte, 2012).

As cultural repertoires may be open to new potentialities (Hannerz, 1996), culture researchers may want to revisit their current conceptualizations of culture and identity; they could consider both notions as dynamically constructed in a particular setting, in relation to particular other individuals and through a particular language. Examples of studies that conceptualize cultural identity as a social construct have studied how organizational members in a multinational company draw on and deploy presumed cultural differences to create a sense of cultural distance and resistance (Ailon-Souday & Kunda, 2003; Ybema & Byun, 2009). Here, national identity constitutes a symbolic resource that is actively mobilized by members for certain social and political goals. Taking culture and identity as socially constructed, the concepts become fluid and numerous rather than essentialized and naturalized. Taking a perspective of socially constructed cultural identity may allow researchers to understand the lack of consistency among persons who supposedly to belong to the "same culture." Instead, researchers might investigate how individuals make different selections and combinations, remaking themselves depending on context.

Beyond the Dichotomy of Local versus Global

A third implication for research is revisiting our understanding of the local, and relatedly, the use of the dichotomy local versus global. Early globalization scholars already indicated the pitfalls of casting the idea of globalization as inevitably in tension with the idea of localization. Robertson (1995) coined in this regard the term "glocalization," emphasizing that what is to be included under the notion of the global should be treated very comprehensively. "The global is not in and of itself counterposed to the local. Rather, what is often referred to as the local is essentially included within the global" (Robertson, 1995, p. 35). Robertson thus conceived the relationship between the local and global as entwined or indistinguishably related. This perspective of fusing the local and the global "interlaces worldwide similarity with cross-national variation" (Drori, Höllerer, & Walgenbach, 2013, p. 3). "The so-called global is a collage of local practices, behaviors, and tastes, while the so-called local is increasingly constructed within the scripts drafted by global forces" (Drori et al., 2013, p. 5).

Following this understanding of "glocalization," a particular site or location of study—a neighborhood, organization, and country—is never only "local" but rather always already a combination of local and global. This perspective is a call for researchers to abandon the assumption that a particular space is homogeneous. Rather, in this era of globalization, researchers need to develop a sense that the local and the global are interconnected, that processes of globalization also work in local settings (and can perhaps best be observed there), and that globalization can work from the inside-out or bottom-up (Robertson, 1995).

Reflective Research

The final implication is the necessity of reflective research, which attends to our role as scholars in shaping how globalization is understood. Alvesson and Sköldberg (2009) define reflective research as being comprised of "careful interpretation and reflection." Scholars engage in an interpretive process as they conduct research, which implies that certain elements are highlighted while others are not. Thus, we suggest that the dialogue on globalization will benefit from greater awareness of the "perceptual, cognitive, theoretical, linguistic, (inter)textual, political and cultural circumstances that form the backdrop to—as well as impregnate—[our] interpretations" (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2009, p. 9), especially as the base of scholars becomes more diverse and more multidisciplinary.

We highlight two steps proposed by Alvesson and Sköldberg (2009)—related to interpretation and reflection—for scholars to consider. Firstly, scholars can acknowledge that they play an integral role in the interpretation of globalization and cultural processes. They bring their assumptions and stances toward globalization into their studies; they may perceive globalization as being, for example, a blessing or a curse, or a fixed or a dynamic phenomenon, or a top-down or bottom-up process. In turn, this can shape the questions that they ask. To better acknowledge their role, scholars can make their assumptions more explicit and share with readers the processes by which they developed their hypotheses and/or conclusions.

Secondly, scholars can reflect on "the political-ideological character of their research," because "what is explored, and how it is explored, can hardly avoid either supporting (reproducing) or challenging existing social conditions" (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2009, p. 11). In this spirit, scholars can be more explicit about how their political or ideological tendencies shaped their research process. More importantly, early reflection can give scholars the opportunity to design their research process in ways that support this aim. For example, building a research team with more diverse voices or ensuring that research participants have a stronger descriptive role would not only lead to more equitable work but also help produce richer data that allows for a deeper understanding of globalization and those involved. By conducting more reflective research, we, as scholars, can use our research to contribute to improving the human condition in new, creative ways.

References

Ailon-Souday, G., & Kunda, G. (2003). The local selves of global workers: The social construction of national identity in the face of organizational globalization. *Organization Studies*, *24*, 1073–1096. https://doi.org/10.1177/01708406030247004

Alvesson, M., & Sköldberg, K. (2009). *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sage Publications.

Appiah, K. A. (2005). *The ethics of identity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Arnett, J. J. (2002). The psychology of globalization. *American Psychologist*, *57*, 774–783. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.57.10.774

Bauman, Z. (2006). The unwinnable war: An interview with Zygmunt Bauman. *Eurozine*. Retrieved from www.eurozine.com/articles/2006-12-13-bauman-en.html

Beck, U. (2004). Cosmopolitical realism: On the distinction between cosmopolitanism in philosophy and the social sciences. *Global Networks*, *4*, 131–156. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-0374.2004.00084.x

Beck, U., & Sznaider, N. (2006). Unpacking cosmopolitanism for the social sciences: A research agenda. *The British Journal of Sociology*, *57*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2006.00091.x

Brett, J. (2014). *Negotiating globally*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brewer, M. B. (2007). The importance of being we: Human nature and intergroup relations. *American Psychologist*, *62*, 728. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.8.728

Brown, G. W., & Held, D. (Eds.) (2010). *The cosmopolitanism reader*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Buchan, N., Grimalda, G., Wilson, R., Brewer, M., Fatas, E., & Foddy, M. (2009). Globalization and human cooperation. *Proceedings at the National Academy of Science*, *106*, 4138–4142. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0809522106

Cao, J., Galinsky, A. D., & Maddux, W. W. (2014). Does travel broaden the mind? Breadth of foreign experiences increases generalized trust. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *5*, 517–525. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550613514456

Chiu, C. Y., Gries, P., Torelli, C. J., & Cheng, S. Y. (2011). Toward a social psychology of globalization. *Journal of Social Issues*, *67*, 663–676. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01721.x

Delanty, G. (2006). The Cosmopolitan imagination: Critical cosmopolitanism and social theory. *British Journal of Sociology*, *57*(1), 25–47. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2006.00092.x

Delanty, G. (2009). *The cosmopolitan imagination: The renewal of critical social theory*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511642227

Delanty, G. (2012a). A cosmopolitan approach to the explanation of social change: Social mechanisms, processes, modernity. *The Sociological Review*, *60*, 333–354. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2012.02076.x

Delanty, G. (Ed.) (2012b). *Routledge handbook of cosmopolitanism studies*. Oxon, UK: Routledge.

Delanty, G., & Inglis, D. (Eds.) (2011). *Cosmopolitanism: Critical concepts in the social sciences*. London, UK: Routledge.

Drori, G. S., Höllerer, M. A., & Walgenbach, P. (2013). The glocalization of organization and management: Issues, dimensions and themes. In G. S. Drori, M. A. Höllerer, & P. Walgenbach (Eds.), *Global themes and local variations in organizations and management: Perspectives on glocalization* (pp. 3–24). New York, NY: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203139486

Featherstone, M. (2002). Cosmopolis: An introduction. *Theory, Culture and Society*, *19*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1177/026327640201900112

Friedman, J. (1995). Global system, globalization and the parameters of modernity. In M. Featherstone, S. Lash, & R. Robertson (Eds.), *Global modernities* (pp. 69–90). London, UK: Sage.

Galinsky, A., & Schweitzer, M. (2015). *Friend & foe: When to cooperate, when to compete, and how to succeed at both*. New York, NY: Crown Business.

Gelfand, M. J., Lyons, S. L., & Lun, J. (2011). Toward a psychological science of globalization. *Journal of Social Issues*, *67*, 841–853. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01731.x

Glick-Schiller, N. (2015). Diasporic cosmopolitanism: Migrants, sociabilities and city making. In A. Irving & N. Glick-Schiller (Eds.), *Whose cosmopolitanism? Critical perspectives, relationalities and discontents* (pp. 103–120). New York, NY: Berghahn.

Godart, F., Maddux, W. W., Shipilov, A., & Galinsky, A. D. (2015). Fashion with a foreign flair: Professional experiences abroad facilitate the creative innovations of organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, *58*(1), 195–220. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.0575

Gray, B., & Purdy, J. (2018). *Collaborating for our future: Multistakeholder partnerships for solving complex problems*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198782841.001.0001

Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., & Pyszczynski, T. (1997). Terror management theory of self-esteem and cultural worldviews: Empirical assessments and conceptual refinements. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 29, pp. 61–139). Atlanta, GA: Academic Press.

Hannerz, U. (1990). Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture. *Theory, Culture and Society*, *7*, 237–251. https://doi.org/10.1177/026327690007002014

Hannerz, U. (1996). *Transnational connections: Culture, people, places*. London, UK: Routledge.

Hong, Y., & Cheon, B. K. (2017). How does culture matter in the face of globalization? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *12*, 810–823. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617700496

Hong, Y.Y., Morris, M.W., Chiu, C.Y., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist*, *55*(7), 709. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.7.709

Irving, A., & Glick-Schiller, N. (2015). *Whose cosmopolitanism? Critical cosmopolitanism, relationalities and discontents*. Oxford and New York: Berghahn.

Janssens, M., & Brett, J. M. (2006). Cultural intelligence in global teams: A fusion model of collaboration. *Group & Organization Management*, *31*, 124–153. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601105275268

Keller, W., & Olney, W. W. (2017). *Globalization and executive compensation* (No. w23384). National Bureau of Economic Research. http://doi.org/10.3386/w23384

Leung, A. K. Y., & Chiu, C. Y. (2010). Multicultural experience, idea receptiveness, and creativity. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *41*, 723–741. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022110361707

Leung, K. Y., Maddux, W. W., Galinsky, A. D., & Chiu, C. Y. (2008). Multicultural experience enhances creativity: The when and how. *American Psychologist*, *63*(3), 169–181. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.3.169

Lu, J. G., Hafenbrack, A. C., Eastwick, P. W., Wang, D., Maddux, W. W., & Galinsky, A. D. (2017). "Going Out" of the box: Close intercultural relationships spark creativity, workplace innovation, and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*, 1091–1108. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000212

Lu, J. G., Quiodbach, J., Gino, F., Chakroff, A., Maddux, W. W., & Galinsky, A. D. (2017). The dark side of going abroad: How broad foreign experiences increase immoral behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *112*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000068

Maddux, W. W., Adam, H., & Galinsky, A. D. (2010). When in Rome. . . Learn why the Romans do what they do: How multicultural learning experiences facilitate creativity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *36*(6), 731–741. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167210367786

Maddux, W. W., Affinito, S., Antoine, G., & Gray, K. (2018). The effects of negative culture exposure on prejudice. Working paper.

Maddux, W. W., & Galinsky, A. D. (2009). Cultural borders and mental barriers: The relationship between living abroad and creativity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *96*, 1047–1061. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014861

Maddux, W. W., Hafenbrack, A. C., Tadmor, C. T., Bivolaru, E., & Galinsky, A. D. (2014). Expanding opportunity by opening your mind: Multicultural engagement predicts job offers through longitudinal increases in integrative complexity. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *5*, 608–615. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550613515005

Marsella, A. (2012). Psychology and globalization: Understanding a complex relationship. *Journal of Social Issues*, *68*, 454–472. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2012.01758.x

Morris, M. W., Chiu, C. Y., & Liu, Z. (2015). Polycultural psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *66*, 631–659. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010814-015001

Nederveen Pieterse, J. (1994). Globalization as hybridization. *International Sociology*, *9*(2), 161–184. https://doi.org/10.1177/026858094009002003

Nederveen Pieterse, J. (2001). Hybridity, so what? *Theory, Culture & Society*, *18*(2–3), 219–245. https://doi.org/10.1177/026327640101800211

Nederveen Pieterse, J. (2009). *Globalization and culture: Global mélange*. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Piff, P. K., Kraus, M. W., Côté, S., Cheng, B. H., & Keltner, D. (2010). Having less, giving more: The influence of social class on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *99*, 771. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020092

Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization. Social theory and global culture*. London, UK: Sage.

Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization: Time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity. In M. Featherstone, S. Lash, & R. Robertson (Eds.), *Global modernities* (pp. 25–44). London, UK: Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446250563

Rowe, W., & Schelling, V. (1991). *Memory and modernity: Popular culture in Latin America*. London, UK: Verso.

Rumford, C. (2008). *Cosmopolitan spaces: Europe, globalization, theory*. New York, NY: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203891438

Tadmor, C., Galinsky, A. D., & Maddux, W. W. (2012). Getting the most out of living abroad: Biculturalism and integrative complexity as key drivers of creative and professional success. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *103*, 520–542. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029360

Tadmor, C. T., & Tetlock, P. E. (2006). Biculturalism: A model of the effects of second-culture exposure on acculturation and integrative complexity. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *37*(2), 173–190. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022105284495

Termeer, C. J., Dewulf, A., Breeman, G., & Stiller, S. J. (2015). Governance capabilities for dealing wisely with wicked problems. *Administration & Society*, *47*, 680–710. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399712469195

Witte, A. E. (2012). Making the case for a post-national cultural analysis of organizations. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *21*(2), 141–159. https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492611415279

Ybema, S., & Byun, H. (2009). Cultivating cultural differences in asymmetric power relations. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, *9*, 339–358. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595809346600

Maddy Janssens, is a Professor of Organization Studies at the Faculty of Economics and Business, KU Leuven, Belgium. Her current research works with diversity and inclusion in the creative industries, and with cosmopolitanism in order to consider how global connectivity is translated into ethical and political issues in global organizations.

William W. Maddux, is a Professor of Organizational Behavior at the Kenan-Flagler School of Business, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. His research focuses on how globalization and multicultural experiences affect a variety of psychological processes relevant for organizations, including creativity, leadership, morality, and decision-making.

ToTran Nguyen, is a PhD Candidate at the Faculty of Economics and Business, KU Leuven, Belgium. Her research focuses on how knowledge, power, and emotion shape interactions in social partnerships and contribute the complexity of global collaboration.