

# Global Perspectives on Soft Power Management in Business

Kannapat Kankaew  
*Burapha University International College, Thailand*

A volume in the Advances in Logistics,  
Operations, and Management Science (ALOMS)  
Book Series



Published in the United States of America by  
IGI Global  
Business Science Reference (an imprint of IGI Global)  
701 E. Chocolate Avenue  
Hershey PA, USA 17033  
Tel: 717-533-8845  
Fax: 717-533-8661  
E-mail: [cust@igi-global.com](mailto:cust@igi-global.com)  
Web site: <http://www.igi-global.com>

Copyright © 2023 by IGI Global. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored or distributed in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, without written permission from the publisher. Product or company names used in this set are for identification purposes only. Inclusion of the names of the products or companies does not indicate a claim of ownership by IGI Global of the trademark or registered trademark.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Kannapat Kankaew, 1973- editor.

Title: Global perspectives on soft power management in business / edited by  
Kannapat Kankaew.

Description: Hershey PA : Business Science Reference, [2024] | Includes  
bibliographical references. | Summary: "This edited book gathers the  
scholars' ideas, theories, definitions, and how to manage, design, and  
integrate soft power sustainably"-- Provided by publisher.

Identifiers: LCCN 2023034550 (print) | LCCN 2023034551 (ebook) | ISBN  
9798369302507 (hardcover) | ISBN 9798369302514 (paperback) | ISBN  
9798369302521 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Soft power (Political science)--Economic aspects. |  
International economic relations. | Management.

Classification: LCC HF1359 .G5765 2024 (print) | LCC HF1359 (ebook) | DDC  
337.068--dc23/eng/20231005

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2023034550>

LC ebook record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2023034551>

This book is published in the IGI Global book series Advances in Logistics, Operations, and Management Science (ALOMS) (ISSN: 2327-350X; eISSN: 2327-3518)

British Cataloguing in Publication Data

A Cataloguing in Publication record for this book is available from the British Library.

All work contributed to this book is new, previously-unpublished material. The views expressed in this book are those of the authors, but not necessarily of the publisher.

For electronic access to this publication, please contact: [eresources@igi-global.com](mailto:eresources@igi-global.com).

# Table of Contents

<b>Preface</b> .....	xviii
<b>Chapter 1</b> A Study on the Interaction Between Mainland ASEAN States and China After the Cold War: Centered on the GMS Mechanism.....	1
<i>Yuhong Li, Nanjing University, China</i>	
<i>Xiaoya Ni, Institute of International Relations, China</i>	
<b>Chapter 2</b> Analysing Foreign Direct Investment in Singapore Through Soft Power.....	26
<i>Raneem Ghazi Aldeki, Al-Sham Private University, Damascus, Syria</i>	
<b>Chapter 3</b> Cultural Alchemy: Fengcha Tradition in Tea Retailing in Contemporary China .....	45
<i>Junhong Ma, University of Alberta, Canada</i>	
<b>Chapter 4</b> Enhancing National Reputation and Competitiveness in the Global Market Through the Use of Soft Power: A Case Study Approach to Asia and Oceania Airlines.....	74
<i>Colin C. H. Law, Hong Kong Shue Yan University, Hong Kong</i>	
<i>Eliver Lin, HKU SPACE Po Leung Kuk Stanley Ho Community College, Hong Kong</i>	
<i>Candace Fu, Hong Kong Metropolitan University, Hong Kong</i>	
<b>Chapter 5</b> Evaluation of Soft Power in Terms of Leadership: A Bibliometric Analysis.....	102
<i>Safa Acar, Siirt University, Turkey</i>	
<b>Chapter 6</b> Exploring the Causal Relationship Model of Foreign Tourists' Behavior and Soft Power Creation in Gastronomy Tourism: A Case Study in Thailand.....	126
<i>Panee Suanpang, Suan Dusit University, Thailand</i>	
<i>Sippanan Nuanla-ong, Bangkok University, Thailand</i>	
<i>Sureeporn Thanyaki, Suan Dusit University, Thailand</i>	

## **Chapter 7**

Impact of the Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Tax on the South African Sugar Industry: Implications for Navigating Stakeholder Relations and Power Dynamics ..... 152

*Ncebakazi P. Latsha, University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa*

*Cecile Naomi Gerwel Proches, University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa*

*Nikita Singh, University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa*

## **Chapter 8**

India Building Its Nation Brand Soft Power Through Its Global Organizations in the 21st Century 171

*Mitrajit Biswas, O.P. Jindal Global University, India*

## **Chapter 9**

Normative and Regulatory Dimensions of Institutional Culture ..... 178

*José G. Vargas-Hernandez, Budapest Centre for Long-term Sustainability, Hungary*

*Omar C. Vargas-González, Tecnológico Nacional de México, Ciudad Guzmán, Mexico*

## **Chapter 10**

Organizational Socio-Intercultural Anthropology ..... 197

*José G. Vargas-Hernandez, Budapest Centre for Long-term Sustainability, Hungary*

*María F. Higuera-Cota, Universidad Autónoma de Sinaloa, Mexico*

*Omar C. Vargas-González, Tecnológico Nacional de México, Ciudad Guzmán, Mexico*

## **Chapter 11**

Rapacious Capitalism? Considering the Ride-Hailing Application Business in Jakarta, Indonesia .. 218

*Yoshifumi Azuma, Ritsumeikan University, Japan*

*Dian Wahyu Utami, BRIN, Indonesia*

## **Chapter 12**

Role of Soft Power in Tourism Development: A Bibliometric Analysis of the Past Decade ..... 245

*Nisha Kumari, Department of Entrepreneurship, GITAM University (Deemed),*

*Visakhapatnam, India*

*Mukesh Kondala, Department of Operations, GITAM University (Deemed), Visakhapatnam, India*

## **Chapter 13**

Soft Power and the Olympics: Opportunities and Challenges ..... 261

*Sureyya Yigit, New Vision University, Georgia*

## **Chapter 14**

Solidarity Liquor: Community Wisdom Development for the Growth of Social Business in Thailand ..... 277

*Sarun Widtayakornbundit, Kasetsart University, Thailand*

<b>Chapter 15</b>	
Stirring Up Soft Power: The Role of Chinese Cuisine in China’s Cultural Diplomacy .....	292
<i>Mohamad Zreik, Independent Researcher, Lebanon</i>	
<b>Chapter 16</b>	
Sustainable Economy: Strategies and Indicators of the Post-Global Transition.....	307
<i>Denis Ushakov, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, Thailand</i>	
<i>Daria Ivanova, Rostov State University of Economics, Rostov-on-Don, Russia</i>	
<b>Chapter 17</b>	
Synergy as a Smart Solution: Achieving Positive/Smart Synergy in Teamwork.....	335
<i>Mario Bogdanović, Istrian University of Applied Sciences, Croatia</i>	
<b>Chapter 18</b>	
The Conceptualization of Corporate Social Responsibilities as Soft Power of Firms: The Implication of Business Diplomacy .....	358
<i>Anh Tuan Tran, Budapest Business University, Hungary</i>	
<b>Chapter 19</b>	
The Effect of Soft Power on the Selection of a Touristic Destination .....	374
<i>Mustafa Aksoy, Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University, Turkey</i>	
<i>Gül Seçil Tahmaz, Oklahoma City Community College, USA</i>	
<b>Chapter 20</b>	
The Synergy of Human Resource Management, Corporate Social Responsibility as an Organizational Soft Power and Sustainable Performance.....	389
<i>B. S. Patil, Dayananda Sagar Business School, India</i>	
<i>M R Suji Raga Priya, Dayananda Sagar Business School, India</i>	
<b>Chapter 21</b>	
The Tao of Soft Power: Applying the Wisdom of the Tao Te Ching in Contemporary Diplomacy ..	414
<i>Van Thanh Tien Nguyen, Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam</i>	
<i>Thi Minh Nhut Vo, National Kaohsiung University of Science and Technology, Taiwan</i>	
<i>Van Chinh Truong, Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam</i>	
<b>Chapter 22</b>	
The Use of Food in Cinema as a Soft Power Instrument.....	425
<i>Serkan Şengül, Sakarya Applied Science University, Turkey</i>	
<i>Merve Uçkan Çakır, Van Yuzuncu Yil University, Turkey</i>	

**Chapter 23**

The West African Social Media “Jollof Rice War”: Unintentional Projection of West African Culinary Soft Power..... 443

*Samuel Nani, University of Cape Coast, Ghana*

**Compilation of References** ..... 460

**About the Contributors** ..... 529

**Index**..... 534

# Chapter 9

## Normative and Regulatory Dimensions of Institutional Culture

**José G. Vargas-Hernandez**

*Budapest Centre for Long-term Sustainability, Hungary*

**Omar C. Vargas-González**

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6089-956X>

*Tecnológico Nacional de México, Ciudad Guzmán, Mexico*

### **ABSTRACT**

*The purpose of this study is to analyze the normative and regulatory dimensions of institutions and culture. The analysis is supported by the institutional theoretical framework proposed to distinguish conceptual distinctions between normative, regulatory, and cultural dimensions of institutions which can be used strategically as background of theoretical assumptions and in decision making leading to categorization. The method employed is the meta-analytic-descriptive and reflective based on the conceptual, theoretical, and empirical literature review. It is concluded that the regulatory, normative, and cultural dimensions are relevant dimensions of institutions. More studies use multiple either formal, informal, regulatory, normative, and cultural dimensions, among others, drawing into conclusions.*

### **INTRODUCTION**

An institution refers to repetitive and taken-for-granted social behavior supported by normative and cognitive systems giving meaning to social exchange and allowing self-reproduction of social order (Greenwood et al. 2008). Institutions are the sets of explicit and implicit norms and rules that structure social interactions, stabilize patterns of behavior, and rise normative expectations (Crawford & Ostrom, 1995; Hodgson, 2006; Azari & Smith, 2012). Institutions are a set of rules of the game in society, which can be formal and informal. Formal institutions are the spirit of contracts, economic rules, political systems, on the other hand, the informal institutions are norms, customs, practices, etc.

DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3693-0250-7.ch009

## ***Normative and Regulatory Dimensions of Institutional Culture***

Institutionalism is an intellectual normative source to analyze values used to support the integrative and empirical approach to moral inquiry, transparent communication and normative underpinnings that provides practical contributions to society (Thacher, 2015)

Institutions are distinguished as the ones creating equilibria and stability through the understanding of individual preferences to optimize behavior at a given time and achieve the best results, and as rules or norms. Institutions as a set of norms or rules refer to shared beliefs among individuals creating an interactive behavior pattern among them to choose what is right or wrong to do (Crawford & Ostrom, 1995). Institutions are guided regulatory normative and cultural-cognitive elements related to symbols, behaviors, activities, and resources which are responsible for restricting actions, acting by empowering activities and actors.

Institutions tend to regulate the pictures of reality for the actions and participations of subjects in society. Actions and actors are interpreted as the common knowledge circulating among all subjects in society (Selznick, 1957). Institutions enable the ability to navigate social environments by shared expectations for norms of behavior facilitating predictions of actions and releasing the cognitive burden of time-consuming deliberations (Gatens, 1998; Patalano, 2007).

Institutional theory argues that institutions constitute norms, beliefs, social orders, systems of power and domination, inequalities, etc. (Barley & Tolbert, 1997; Creed et al., 2014; Friedland & Alford, 1991; Suchman, 1995). There are some theoretical efforts to unite the normative and descriptive paradigms leading to normative research intensify the description of the institutional contexts (Harris & Freeman, 2008; Nielsen & Massa, 2013; McLeod et al., 2016). An institutional theoretical framework proposed by Campbell (1998, 2004) distinguish conceptual distinctions between normative and cognitive which can be used strategically as background of theoretical assumptions and in decision making leading to categorization in cognitive, normative, background assumptions and public sentiments.

Institutional research using symbolic interactionism specify the extent of people embeddedness and constrained by societal structures, humanizing institutional structures and to analyze the experience of people in institutions and their emotional experiences about the institutional norms, conformity and hegemony achieved through practices taken for granted (Hallett & Ventresca, 2006b; Calhoun, 2001). Value-oriented research intends to fill the gap that distinguishes business from ethical concerns and separates descriptive and normative matters built on the argument that inseparable values are intertwined with the institutional context (Harris & Freeman, 2008; Freeman, 1994; Newbert, 2018; Wicks, 1996).

According to Scott (2008), the regulatory, normative, and cultural-cognitive pillars are the institutional elements have basis of submission, social obligations, and guaranteed practices. Institutions are related to non-mobile factors such as the socio-cultural, legal, ethical, political, administrative, etc. Institutions are cultures of communication with specific valuable, complementary insights of agency conceptualizations of strategic calculation, social adaption, imitation, and social construction. Affairs and scandals are social and political transformative exposing the constructed, provisional, and contingent nature of the dominant normative frameworks testing institutional, emotional, and symbolic investments.

A descriptive approach to study on values analyzes cognitive, regulative, and normative institutional conditions such as values, norms that have further or hinder effects on corporate social responsibility (CSR) engagement. Institutional elements are the regulatory, cultural-cognitive, and normative, which together with resources ad activities achieve stability and meaning to social life. These elements of institutional nature have equal weight to support social practices (Greenwood et al., 2008; Scott, 2008).

Bases of legitimacy are the legally sanctioned, morally governed and culturally supported. The mechanisms can be coercive, normative, and mimetic. Indicators are the rules, laws, and sanctions. Certifica-



tion, accreditation common beliefs, logic of shared action and isomorphism. Traditional institutional determinants are those most widely used to focus on the quality of institutions, such as enforcement of regulations, corruption indexes, environmental stringencies, bureaucracy (Kim & Aguilera, 2016).

To analyze the theoretical framework approaches on institutional determinants applied in different regions, the studies should include references to local institutions, institutional development, regulations, institutional culture, and politics, etc. Local institutional economic institutions may confront international pressures to new financial transactions, technologies, accounting standards and banking procedures reforms to comply with international regulations. Institutional pressure occurs at the normative, mimetic, and coercive forces.

Among the normative approaches to research on values is the Cobb et al. (2016) who approaches microfinance from a normative perspective the poverty alleviation conducting a descriptive analysis on the logics of development, although does not analyze the values underlying these logics. The tensions inherent in mismatching the financial institutions and the political and social norms. Global companies use global financial markets with portfolio and foreign institutional shareholders to fund growth invoking instances to discipline corporations for behaviors conflicting with global norms in investment communities.

Institutional distance captures the regulative, normative and cognitive constructs between economies, operationalizing as the institutions supporting the market (Gubbi, Aulakh, Ray, Sarkar, & Chittoor, 2010). The institutional profiles combining regulatory, normative and cognitive institutions and institutional distance is analyzed (Kostova, 1996). Formal institutions as the enforcement of rules supporting the market are different that the informal institutional distance such as the differences between shared values, norms, practices and interpretation frames (Abdi and Aulakh, 2012). The institutional distance between countries is the difference between their regulatory, cognitive, and normative institutions (Kostova, 1996).

Results of meta-analysis using samples of multiple home and host countries lead to the conclusion that there is a non-significant relationship between the unidimensional, formal and regulatory institutional distances and firm performance providing statistical concerns for potential dangers of direct effects caused by research designs (Brouthers et al., 2016; Harzing & Pudelko, 2016; van Hoorn & Maseland, 2016). Cultural distance research has matured as an inquiry field (Cuypers, Ertug, Heugens, Kogut, & Zhou, 2018).

This study has the purpose to analyze the normative and regulatory dimensions of institutions and culture. The analysis is supported by the institutional theoretical framework proposed to distinguish conceptual distinctions between normative, regulatory and culture dimensions of institutions which can be used strategically as background of theoretical assumptions and in decision making leading to categorization. In the first part of the study, it is analyzed the regulatory and normative dimensions leading to the analysis of institutions and culture. Finally, the study reaches some conclusions.

## **REGULATORY AND NORMATIVE DIMENSIONS**

An institution is defined as formal or informal rules-coercion created by individuals to regulate their social interactions (Holanda, 2003). Institutions are cognitive, regulative, and normative structures with processes, practices and activities providing meaning to social behaviors (Haak-Saheem, Festing & Darwish, 2016). The normative institutional element is related to prescription, evaluation, and obligation of members, defining obligations and social rights, and providing guidelines for actions to submit to social context. Institutions tend to favor common beliefs, values, and moral conceptions (Scott, 2008). Institu-

## ***Normative and Regulatory Dimensions of Institutional Culture***

tions are taken for granted repetitive social behaviors supported by normative and cognitive systems making sense of social exchanges leading to given repetition and self-reproduction of the social order (Powell & DiMaggio, 1991).

The normative mechanism refers to the prescriptive and obligatory set of expectations, values and norms created and developed in the social system. Descriptive conditions as, for instance, normative institutions and the associated values under which firms engage in CSR. However, the research does not examine normatively what qualifies as socially responsible behavior in the first place (Campbell, 2007). Activism values dignity to combat the value of respect for the Mafia, perpetuating the practice of paying protection. The study describes the system of paying protection money as morally reprehensible from a normative standpoint (Vaccaro, Palazzo, 2015).

The institutional normative structure of Merton fills the Weber's concept of *Eigengesetzlichkeit* with content (Hallonsten, 2022) which is instructive for similar explication of institutional logics. infrastructures, technologies, formal and informal socioeconomic and political institutions, social norms, etc. (Lin, 2001). Institutional logics reflect the values, norms, ideas, beliefs, and meaning systems guiding the behavior of actors (Scott, 2012). Institutionalized social embeddedness consistent with appropriate regulations and legitimate rules. Sources of institutional logics identify some factors such as strategy, authority, legitimacy, identity, norms, attention, etc. (Thornton, 2004; Thornton et al., 2012).

Research suggests that contextual space in existing institutions is relevant in precluding generation of conditions for institutional change considering factors such an industry deregulation as building systems to foster infrastructure development creating recent problems and interests and stability on the market (Noll & Owen, 1983). Institutional change theories can be policy change theories in stipulated rules assigning normative rights and responsibilities to institutional actors to provide public third party enforcement (Streeck & Thelen 2005). Actors are favored by institutional norms and rules reinforcing and stabilizing socioeconomic and political dominance (Pierson, 2000; Seto et al. 2016). The institutional regulatory element institutes in each context actions of restriction and behavior training through governed processes by rules, monitored actions and punitive or compensatory sanctions.

Institutional change processes have differences in the integration of new institutional norms and practices influences by changes in human resources and volunteers to advance practices and meanings demonstrating the complemented implementation of qualitative and quantitative research methods and strategies focusing on structures, practices, and outcomes in institutional theory. These methods combine participant observation, intensive interviews, and archival records (Townley, 2002; Zilber, 2002).

Operationalization of the institutional regulatory elements is conducted through formal and informal mechanisms (Scott, 2008). Regulations arrange roles of new actors entering the field in a hybrid logic increasingly institutionalized. Anticipated shame actions normalize force. The sense of shame reproduces and maintains institutional arrangements through connecting self-regulation, discipline, and enactment of institutional prescriptions (Creed, 2014). Recognition is a term used to derive from the ability of individuals to see themselves as another self-sense normative imperative to intrinsic worth to persons regardless their institutional status (Honneth, 1992; Taylor, 1992). The term recognition derives from the ability of people to see themselves as another sense of self, as the intrinsic normative imperative to every person.

The concept of actor hood questions how institutions regulate the actions institutional actors and people invested in institutional order. Re-arrangement of the local actor structure to mitigate institutional complexity, such as the design of build-operate business model responsible for planning, designing, implementing, and operating systems and their compliance with local regulatory framework. Recent

institutional normative analysis on business and society on values in institutional contexts consider the descriptive subjects. The Deweyian pragmatism and the institutionalism of Selznick supports business and society researchers to combine a normative philosophical and descriptive social science research on values manifest in practices and their consequences.

Values are separated from facts to focus research on regulative and cognitive aspects of institutional life. Under an inattentive approach to research on values Chandler (2014) analysis the external monitoring of corporate ethical conduct in relation to implement regulative formal ethics, although he does not approach the descriptive and normative values of these programs. The different institutional approaches to analyze and apply values diverge on the descriptive methodology and business and society research integrate both the descriptive and normative approaches.

The institutional normative perspective to research on values in interactions between business and society employs a normative methodology to conduct a descriptive investigation. Institution is a humanly devised constraint based on repeated human interactions considered as the rules of the game formed by formal and informal behavioral norms and the way to enforce them (North, 1988).

Institutional internal diversity considering there are others assuming norms and critically reflecting gendered and racialized affects flow within the institutional space creating feelings of belonging and isolation of the place (Ahmed, 2017, 2012; Puwar, 2004). Parliamentary procedures and gender norms document the capacity to maintain the authority and credibility of female legislators (Hawkesworth, 1998).

Neoliberal imaginaries construct universities institutions to produce job-ready applicants are considered as sites of sexual subject formation in which epistemic friction practices enable to challenge and reshape sexual norms and behaviors. Policy reforms in universities lead to entrenching rather than meliorating damaging sexual imaginaries to encourage sexual assault on campus considering a relationship between the sexual imaginary and formal institutions (Hush, 2019).

Theorizing on emotions fuse personal experience and institution in as process regulating the self-sense of a person and the institutional order that inhabits. These processes have two components, the self-regulation, and the other authorization. An institutional perspective of interpersonal emotions considers shame as a disciplinary function of conformity to institutional norms enabling to internalize them (Creed et al. 2014). The multi-directional institutional relationship between institutions and negative emotions motivating institutional shaping and development arrangements and performances of the emotional normative landscape.

Conceptualization of emotions in institutional analysis focusing on the relationship between emotions, institutional norms, and actor roles (Voronov, 2014; Voronov & Yorks, 2015). Emotions enhance the analysis of institutional processes for further social control encouraging self-control of individual behavior in accordance with social norms despite the evident rewards and punishment (Shott, 1979). Social norms emerge and dissipate while pro-environmental practices are institutionalized to achieve long-term stability, creating positive feedbacks, whereby institutions enable sustainable practices cementing sustainable pathways (Young, 2015).

Self-regulations are related to policing and channeling the behavior of a person based on vigilant and intersubjective surveillance which facilitates the ongoing experience as the competent institutional actor (Creed et al., 2014). Emotional competence engages people in self-regulation, performance and elicit other authorization as the competence of institutional actors.

Emotional intelligence facilitates social interactions in agency, while emotional competence is the capacity to belong and inhabit institutional order underlining processes of self-regulation, other-authorization and disciplines the social behavior inhabiting institutional orders. The emotive competence ac-

### ***Normative and Regulatory Dimensions of Institutional Culture***

complished by the performing role of actor hood must be authentic and natural, authorized as appropriate by the institution in terms of private and public loci to enable self-regulation and other authorization.

Emotional competence is an institutional motivator and enabler of authorization, self-regulation, and institutional ideas and ethos. Emotional competence authorizes actor hood at lived experience enabling people to regulate private emotional experiences with institutional ideals and ethos expressed through emotional displays. The actor hood processes require self-regulation, external authorization institutionally appropriate and enabling conditions for these processes. Emotional competence can be private to engage in self-regulation, and public to elicit authorization, the deemed naturalness and authenticity of emotions within an institutional order.

Other analysis focusing on formal regulative aspects are conducted to examine the institutional environment and the degree of commitment of top management to formal corporate ethics (Weaver et al. 1999). Management set the values work explicit to contribute to solve normative issues (Etzion & Gehman, 2019). Normative assessment of values in institutional context for management research (George et al. 2016). The institutional context factors and their relationships with other variables may affect cognitive and regulatory frameworks expanded on the strategic talent management process. The regulatory mechanism is reflected on the national context dimension of laws, rules and regulations aimed to promote and enhance a more functional set of behaviors while restricting others (Haak-Saheem, Festing & Darwish 2016).

From the institutional perspective, normative and regulatory institutions transcend governments (North, 1990). Government institutions regulate the operations of markets and constraint the conditions of live wildlife and species that threaten diversity and public health (Aguirre et al. 2020). Institutional configurations result from different regional contexts and endowments, power, and regulations such as fiscal control (Cantwell & Mudambi, 2005; Nachum & Zaheer, 2005; Mudambi et al., 2018). The advocacy coalitions tend to be in structurally weak position for institutional reasons, and hard for external groups as independent regulators other than the government.

Implementing a normative concept of education sustainable development have many challenges in institutionalizing in educational systems with a long life perspective, institutional engagement, and communication (Mogren, 2019; UNESCO, 2019). Non-elite higher education institutions privately owned are regulated by government but remain managed through funds, trusts, social associations, and societies facing quality concerns but aimed shoulder the responsibility of educating students resulting from the burgeoning demography catching up the passive massification and economic disadvantaged backgrounds. This segment of higher education institutions of low institutional ranking has consistent problems in low-quality teaching leading to the students to earn degrees that are bereft the value in labor market resulting in unemployed graduates (Altbach, 2014).

Operationalization and measurement concerns of institutional distance have an initial convergence of formal and regulatory at country-level constructs. The legitimacy of multinational enterprises (MNEs) is supported by the legal and regulatory frameworks to implement managerial processes, practices and activities leading to more trustworthy image (Meyer and Peng 2015). Multinationals from emerging markets expand aggressively in global competitive markets to operate under different institutional regulation frameworks and economic systems (Fortune, 2018).

Formal distance has apposing results to regulatory distance and unidimensional operationalization of institutional distance. A single index is used to measure institutional distance focusing on regulations and laws which reflect the societal rules of the game (Zhou et al. 2016).

Institutional ownership advantages encompassing institutional infrastructure as the set of standards, regulations and incentives created internally and imposed externally, have effects on the stakeholder attitudes, behaviors and decision making. The enforcement of modernization and collectivization reforms have disturbed the institutions regulating the interactions between the socio-ecological systems.

The institutional pressure occurs at the levels of normative, mimetic, and coercive. Large collectivist societies with relations relying on strong group ties, trust is crucial to foster cooperation as the citizen belief in the ability of institutions to regulate the interactions and provide incentives for pro-social behaviors (Andriani, & Sabatini 2015; Kumlin & Rothstein, 2005). Trust, normative consensus, and meaningful freedom in liberal democratic societies critically reflected on emotional ideals binding us.

## **INSTITUTIONAL CULTURE**

The notion of institutional culture provides a theoretical framework for future research and analysis of institutions (Higgins, 2013). The cultural institutional approach provides insights into the reform challenges facing multilateral agencies. A challenge facing with cultural institutional approach is the provision of causal mechanism and the types of cultural beliefs shaping policy-making perception, interests, and reform strategies.

The cultural-cognitive institutional element is connected to the socially constructed reality aligned to cultural knowledge in a subjective interpretation subject shaped by external concerns and interaction between shared actions of actors (Scott, 2008). Institutional culture as knowledge of the self, reinforces individual frozen knowledge while the knowledge of other assumes personal examination that others make about each other.

The institutional cultural-cognitive mechanism is the mimetic dimension in the institutional theory involving shared dominant values, norms and conceptions shaping social life among the individuals who are members of a social group. The inattentive approach to study values addresses the research question by a description of institutional cultural-cognitive conditions such as collective shared values and beliefs common logics of action, and regulative institutional conditions such as laws and regulations. Collective action and diffusion of new rules, norms and sustainable practices from the bottom up create institutional reforms to reinforce sustainable practices (Davis et al. 2018).

Institutional culture is a multi-faceted concept converging in culture theoretical frameworks leading toward a consistent theory on cultural distance and its effects (Hofstede, 1980; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004; Schwartz, 1994, 1999; Peterson & Barreto, 2018). Institutional culture cannot be equated with informal institutions and cognitive and normative approaches based on the framework of Scott.

Formation and possibility between tacit or explicit rules determine what to teach and do such as tacit institutional cultures and traditions to explore to gain institutional knowledge or explicit and enforced in the case of disciplinary knowledge subject to approval and endorsement. The invented traditions are the governed practices by accepted rules and a ritual of symbolic nature seeking to inculcate values and behavioral norms implying continuity with the past including revolutions and progressive movements that have their own relevant past breaking with the past (Hobsbawm & Ranger, 1988). The explicit rules of institutional cultures and traditions and tacit rules for institutional knowledge formation may not necessarily separated between explicit and tacit types of knowledge of all existing practices, values and institutions in terms of their fitness (DoE, 1997; DoE, 2008)

## ***Normative and Regulatory Dimensions of Institutional Culture***

The institutional context of organizations is a notion for a comprehensive environmental conception including the economic and socio-cultural dimensions (Guarido Filho & Machado-da-Silva, 2001). Institutional complexity in transition of institutional processes addresses the niche-regime interactions which may succeed or may fail with the actors' proactive involvement to reconcile incompatible cultural demands in contestations (Rosenbloom & Rinscheid, 2020; Yuana et al., 2020). A cultural institutional approach explains failures of actors to reform institutions. Individual actors at the bottom up are personal agency and cultural dopes (Hallett, & Hawbaker, 2021).

The traditional theory of institutions is no clear and affording little agency of actors who are trapped within iron cage in cultural dolts beholden and embedded in the institutions (Suddaby, 2016; DiMaggio & Powell, 1983) related of stable institutions that become destabilized.

Institutional perspectives are the alternative to culture in institutional distance in national contexts encompassing the cultural, regulatory and cognitive elements (Kostova, 1996, 1997; Scott, 1991). Cultural-cognitive dimension supports the cultural distance of an institutional environment (Gaur et al. 2007). Institutional distance has been operationalized as cultural distance measured by the cultural distance index of Kogut and Singh (1998) capturing the cognitive and normative dimensions (Jensen and Szulanski 2004).

The institutional eclectic paradigm is an approach that lay the foundations for an institutional approach advancing beyond the traditional institutional and economic determinants to enable the transition from national to regional and local strategies based on the ownership, location, and internationalization of institutional resources, to overcome institutional and cultural distances. The institutional conversion theory advantage is the ability to explain the reform actors within multilateral agencies to take advantage strategically of international pressures to pursuing institutional reforms and changes, increasing legitimacy and influence.

The social constructionist and cultural perspective of institutional change enact institutions as models of order. The use of a causal relationship with institutional change theory organizes the complex interplay between exogenous and endogenous conditions, reform strategies and agency interests (Gómez, 2012; Gómez, 2011). Institutional reforms must attend emotional socialization and not only emotions from past abuses leading to transitional mechanisms for the formation of contextual emotions expressed in culturally sensitive responses (Mihai, 2016).

Institutional logics is related to the cultural belief socially shared shaping cognition and behaviors which can provide meanings for socially shared symbols and practices leading to institutional legitimation (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012). Cultural religious groups tend to prioritize their systems of beliefs, values, norms, expectations over adopting other institutions and policy systems that are more effective.

Cultural beliefs among economic trade groups shapes the emergence of trade institutions, coordination between traders and merchants who share expectations and safeguard institutional designs at the expense of crowding out effective alternatives (Greif, 1994). Conservative cultural belief systems within government and public institutions shape the enduring condemnatory inefficient welfare programs and laws, meanwhile informal cultures of corruption hamper the legal institutions reform (Morone, Hellfire Nation, 2004; Helmke, Levitsky, 2004).

The concepts more related to the notion of informal institutions, according to North (1990, 1991) are the guanxi in china (Xin & Pearce, 1996) networked capitalism as keiretsu in Japan (Dyer, 1996), Latin American and East Asia business groups (Guillén, 2002; Khanna & Palepu, 2000; Kim, Kim &

Hoskisson, 2010), social capital (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Putnam, 1993). These concepts are less related to cultural value dimensions framework of Hofstede (1980) and Schwartz (1994, 1999).

The design and implementation of management systems, processes and practices are affected by the socio-cultural and institutional context. Institutional and cultural environmental at macro level has an impact on talent management at internal level. Social inequalities are embedded in a broad socio-cultural environment reinforced by micro institutional processes (MIT Report, 1999; National Academy of Sciences (US), 2006). Institutional persistence is related to the instantiation, reproduction, and modification of institutional practices through habit, culture, knowledge, routines, emotions, and motivations of actors (Jarzabkowski, Matthiesen, & Van de Ven, 2009).

Differences in formal and informal institutional distance are expressed in formal governance regulations and informal cultures affecting the market and efficiency seeking foreign direct investments (Slangen & Beugelsdijk, 2010). Informal distance is measured by the cultural dimensions of Hofstede (1980, 2001), and other alternative cultural frameworks used by others researchers. The indexes of Hofstede represent values of cultural dimensions while the cognitive institutional aspect captures the taken for granted practices in society. The cultural indexes measure informal institutions. Measuring variables of informal institutions through the cultural dimensions of Hofstede are related to regulatory and formal institutional variables on range and scale from unfavorable to favorable, weak to strong and poor to rich cultural values across borders.

Cultural distance measure by Hofstede cultural dimension as the measure of informal distance is debatable because culture does not captures the idea of informality as the substitute for weak formal institutions conceived by North (1990, 1991). The negative effect of institutional distance on performance is negative on subsidiary performance than the performance of the multinational corporations which is a consistent finding on cultural distance (Beugelsdijk et al., 2018).

Cultural values differ across countries and cannot substitute formal institutions. The cultural distance index proposed by Kogut and Singh's (1988) intends to substitute poor rule of law investment freedom. Cultural distance index substitutes the poor rule of law and low investment freedom.

Special economic zones are related with differences between the institutional and cultural distance and institutional dysfunctions (Gao et al. 2018).

Civil societal approaches aiming to institutional change analysis reform and change processes within political democratic institutions may not have the same influence in multilateral agencies allowing the dissatisfactions of civil societal actors with social welfare policies striving to build partnerships (Ebrahim & Herz, 2007; Woods, & Narlikar, 2001). Civic movements use formal and informal institutions to funnel interest and establish coalitions with actors seeking institutional change and reforms taking place when policy making is socially embedded and influenced by civil society (Weir, 2006).

Institutional endemic violence and torture may become normalized within a subculture through the attachment of positive feelings to the protected nation and ethnic group and negative feelings towards the enemy or expansion and exploitation (Huggins, Haritos-Fatouros, & Zimbardo, 2002; Haritos-Fatouros, 2003; Celermajer, 2018; Cooper, Ezzamel, & Willmott, 2008).

A competent cultural system has the capacity for cultural self-assessment to become conscious of the inherent cultural interaction dynamics, values diversity, develops adaptation and institutionalize cultural knowledge (Cross et al. 1989). The cultural competence model is being criticized to be ineffective because equalize oppressions under the multicultural veil, furthers institutional racism by promoting a color-blind mentality (Razack & Jeffery, 2002; Schiele, 2007; Yee, 2005).

## ***Normative and Regulatory Dimensions of Institutional Culture***

The implementation of multicultural education programs can be examined using a qualitative thematic analysis under the institutionalist approach aimed to organize the data set, identify, analyze, and describe the patterns. The thematic analysis method includes flexibility and accessibility for finding patterns, interpreting the data, and producing qualitative analyses at institutional policy development (Hayes, 2000). Quality in institutions of education has been perennial topic to evaluate economic and non-economic education values given the economic, social, cultural, and institutional perspectives. The accreditation agency is an institution with a defined set of norms and rules to which institutions of education must conform in various areas of learning (Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2015).

## **CONCLUSION**

The analysis of this study on the normative and regulatory dimensions of institutions and culture, supported by the institutional theoretical framework proposed to distinguish conceptual distinctions used strategically as background of theoretical assumptions and in decision making leading to categorization. The study concludes that the regulatory, normative and culture are relevant dimensions of institutions, and more studies use multiple either formal or informal dimensions among others, drawing into conclusions.

Institutions, structures, and culture domains are all interrelated. Institutions impose constraints that define legal, moral, and cultural boundaries separating legitimate and illegitimate activities to sustain activities and actors. Actors are more than simply abstract entities that have distinct intersubjective formations resulting from institutional orders with actors enacting the institutional norms. An intersectional stance in institutions becomes an opportunity for a cultural outcome facilitating the manifestation of equity. Institutional shifts and structures of actors vary from the affective and imaginative aspects in accordance with the economic, geographic location, political and cultural dimensions.

Normative assumptions are the public sentiments called as ideologies that determine a wide range of actions perceived as acceptable by decision making. Political, legal, and normative institutional interventions might have transformative potentials considering the institutional design and capacities to promote a more just society by controlling predictable behaviors. Institutions develop potential variations and shifts over time regarding institutional norms and practices with respect to their autonomy.

More studies use multiple either formal, informal, or regulatory, normative, and cognitive dimensions drawing into conclusions. The institutional pressure can be normative and mimetic which have some moderating negative impacts. Institutional pressure has a positive effect on supply chain relationship management, sustainable supply chain design and coercive pressure. The design of informal institutions has robust effects on normative institutional distance due to the conceptualization of formal and informal institutional distance, directionality of formal distance and neutrality of informal distance.

Further research on institutional change theories regarding conversion, displacement, and delegitimation is needed to explain why and how these agencies can be transformed. Agents sustain institutions to reproduce them, and institutions does not disappear if the individual thoughts and practices diverge from the established norms. Research on emotions should fill some gaps to provide motivational theories, advance cultural perspectives beyond identities, interactions, and involvement in political action on social movements.



## REFERENCES

- Abdi, M., & Aulakh, P. S. (2012). Do country-level institutional frameworks and interfirm governance arrangements substitute or complement in international business relationships? *Journal of International Business Studies*, 43(5), 477–497. doi:10.1057/jibs.2012.11
- Adler, P., & Kwon, S. W. (2002). Social capital: Prospects for a new concept. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(1), 17–40. doi:10.2307/4134367
- Aguirre, A. A., Catherina, R., Frye, H., & Shelley, L. (2020). Illicit wildlife trade, wet markets, and COVID-19: Preventing future pandemics. *World Medical & Health Policy*, 12(3), 256–265. doi:10.1002/wmh3.348 PMID:32837772
- Ahmed, S. (2012). *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. Duke UP.
- Ahmed, S. (2017). *Living a Feminist Life*. Duke UP.
- Altbach, P. G. (2014). India's higher education challenges. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 15(4), 503–510. doi:10.1007/12564-014-9335-8
- Andriani, L., & Sabatini, F. (2015). Trust and Prosocial Behaviour in a Process of State Capacity Building: The case of the Palestinian territories. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 11(4), 823–846. doi:10.1017/S1744137414000575
- Azari, J. R., & Smith, J. K. (2012). Unwritten Rules: Informal Institutions in Established Democracies. *Perspectives on Politics*, 10(1), 37–55. doi:10.1017/S1537592711004890
- Barley, S. R., & Tolbert, P. S. (1997). Institutionalization and structuration: Studying the links between action and institution. *Organization Studies*, 18(1), 93–117. doi:10.1177/017084069701800106
- Beugelsdijk, S., Kostova, T., Kunst, V. E., Spadafora, E., & van Essen, M. (2018b). Cultural distance and firm internationalization: A meta-analytical review and theoretical implications. *Journal of Management*, 44(1), 89–130. doi:10.1177/0149206317729027 PMID:30443095
- Brouthers, L. E., Marshall, V. B., & Keig, D. L. (2016). Solving the single-country sample problem in cultural distance studies. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 47(4), 471–479. doi:10.1057/jibs.2016.15
- Calhoun, C. (2001). Putting emotions in their place. In J. Goodwin, J. M. Jasper, & F. Polletta (Eds.), *Passionate politics: Emotions and social movements* (p. 4557). University of Chicago Press. doi:10.7208/chicago/9780226304007.003.0003
- Campbell, J. L. (1998). Institutional analysis and the role of ideas in political economy. *Theory and Society*, 27(3), 377–409. doi:10.1023/A:1006871114987
- Campbell, J. L. (2004). *Institutional Change and Globalization*. Princeton University Press. doi:10.1515/9780691216348
- Campbell. (2007). Why would corporations behave in socially responsible ways? An institutional theory of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3), 946–967.

## **Normative and Regulatory Dimensions of Institutional Culture**

- Cantwell, J., & Mudambi, R. (2005). MNE competence-creating subsidiary mandates. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(12), 1109–1128. doi:10.1002/mj.497
- Celermajer, D. (2018). *The Prevention of Torture: An Ecological Approach*. Cambridge UP. doi:10.1017/9781108556583
- Chandler, D. (2014). Organizational susceptibility to institutional complexity: Critical events driving the adoption and implementation of the ethics and compliance officer position. *Organization Science*, 25(6), 1722–1743. doi:10.1287/orsc.2014.0927
- Cobb, Wry, T., & Zhao, E. Y. (2016). Funding financial inclusion: Institutional logics and the contextual contingency of funding for microfinance organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(6), 2103–2131. doi:10.5465/amj.2015.0715
- Cooper, D. J., Ezzamel, M., & Willmott, H. (2008). *Examining 'Institutionalization': A Critical Theoretic Perspective*. In *Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. Sage.
- Council for Higher Education Accreditation. (2015). *Accreditation serving the public interest*. Available at: [www.chea.org/pdf/chea-at-a-glance\\_2015.pdf](http://www.chea.org/pdf/chea-at-a-glance_2015.pdf)
- Crawford, S. E., & Ostrom, E. (1995). A grammar of institutions. *The American Political Science Review*, 1995(89), 582–600. doi:10.2307/2082975
- Creed, W. E. D., Hudson, B. A., & Okhuysen, G. A. (2014). Swimming in a sea of shame: Incorporating emotion into explanations of institutional reproduction and change. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(3), 275–301. doi:10.5465/amr.2012.0074
- Cross, T. L., Bazron, B. J., Dennis, K. W., & Isaacs, M. R. (1989). *Towards a culturally competent system of care*. <https://spu.edu/~media/academics/school-of-education/Cultural%20Diversity/Towards%20a%20Culturally%20Competent%20System%20of%20Care%20Abridged.ashx>
- Cuypers, I. R. P., Ertug, G., Heugens, P. P. M. A. R., Kogut, B., & Zou, T. (2018). The making of a construct: Lessons from 30 years of the Kogut and Singh cultural distance index. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 49(9), 1138–1153. doi:10.1057/41267-018-0181-5
- Davis, T., Hennes, E. P., & Raymond, L. (2018). Cultural evolution of normative motivations for sustainable behaviour. *Nature Sustain*, 1(5), 218–224. doi:10.1038/41893-018-0061-9
- de Holanda, L. A. (2003). *Formação e institucionalização do campo organizacional do turismo no Recife-PE. Dissertação (Mestrado em Administração)*. Centro de Ciências Sociais Aplicadas, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco. Disponível em: <https://repositorio.ufpe.br/handle/123456789/1157>
- DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160. doi:10.2307/2095101
- DoE (Department of Education). (1997). *White paper 3: A programme for higher education transformation*. Government Gazette, No. 18207, 3.

- DoE (Department of Education). (2008). *Report of the ministerial committee on transformation and social cohesion and the elimination of discrimination in public higher education institutions (the Soudien Report)*. Government Printer.
- Dyer, J. H. (1996). Does governance matter? Keiretsu alliances and asset specificity as sources of Japanese competitive advantage. *Organization Science*, 7(6), 649–666. doi:10.1287/orsc.7.6.649
- Ebrahim, A., & Herz, S. (2007). *Accountability in complex organizations: World Bank responses to civil society*. Harvard Business School.
- Etzion, D., & Gehman, J. (2019). Going public: Debating matters of concern as an imperative for management scholars. *Academy of Management Review*, 44(2), 480–492. doi:10.5465/amr.2018.0016
- Fortune. (2018). *Fortune Global 500*. Retrieved December 12, 2018, from <https://fortune.com/global500/list/>
- Freeman, R. E. (1994). The politics of stakeholder theory: Some future directions. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 4(4), 409–421. doi:10.2307/3857340
- Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions. In W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 232–263). University of Chicago Press.
- Gao, B., Xiangge, L., Shan, L., & Debin, F. (2018). How power distance affects online hotel ratings: The positive moderating roles of hotel chain and reviewers' travel experience. *Tourism Management*, 65, 176–186. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2017.10.007
- Gatens, M. (1998). Institutions, Embodiment, and Sexual Difference. In *Gender and Institutions: Welfare, Work, and Citizenship*. Cambridge.
- Gaur, A. S., Delios, A., & Singh, K. (2007). Institutional environments, staffing strategies, and subsidiary performance. *Journal of Management*, 33(4), 611–636. doi:10.1177/0149206307302551
- George, G., Howard-Grenville, J., Joshi, A., & Tihanyi, L. (2016). Understanding and tackling societal grand challenges through management research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(6), 1880–1895. doi:10.5465/amj.2016.4007
- Gómez, E. J. (2011). An alternative approach to evaluating, measuring and comparing domestic and international health institutions: Insights from social science institutional theories. *Health Policy (Amsterdam)*, 2011(101), 1–11. doi:10.1016/j.healthpol.2010.08.020
- Gómez, E. J. (2012). Exploring the Utility of Institutional Theory in Explaining International Agency Stasis and Transformation. *Health Policy and Planning*, 2012(28), 1–9.
- Greenwood, R. (2008). Introduction. Academic Press.
- Greif, A. (1994). Cultural beliefs and the organization of society: A historical and theoretical reflection on collectivist and individualist societies. *Journal of Political Economy*, 1994(102), 912–950. doi:10.1086/261959

### **Normative and Regulatory Dimensions of Institutional Culture**

- Guarido Filho, E. R., & Machado-da-silva, C. L. (2001). An influência de valores ambientais e organizacionais sobre a aprendizagem organizacional na indústria alimentícia paranaense. *RAC*, 5(2), 33-63.
- Gubbi, S. R., Aulakh, P. S., Ray, S., Sarkar, M. B., & Chittoor, R. (2010). Do international acquisitions by emerging-economy firms create shareholder value? The case of Indian firms. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41(3), 397–418. doi:10.1057/jibs.2009.47
- Guillén, M. F. (2002). Imitation, inertia, and foreign expansion: South Korean firms and business groups in China, 1987–1999. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(3), 509–525. doi:10.2307/3069378
- Haak-Saheem, W., Festing, M., & Darwish, T. (2016). International Human Resource Management in The Arab Gulf States – An Institutional Perspective. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28(18), 2684–2712. doi:10.1080/09585192.2016.1234502
- Hall, P. A. (1993). Policy paradigms, social learning, and the state. *Comparative Politics*, 25(3), 275–296. doi:10.2307/422246
- Hallett, T., & Hawbaker, A. (2021). The Case for an Inhabited Institutionalism in Organizational Research: Interaction, Coupling, and Change Reconsidered. *Theory and Society*, 2021(50), 1–32. doi:10.1007/11186-020-09412-2
- Hallett, T., & Ventresca, M. J. (2006b). Inhabited institutions: Social interactions and organizational forms in Gouldner’s “patterns of industrial bureaucracy.” *Theory and Society*, 35(2), 213-236. doi:10.1007/11186-006-9003-z
- Hallonsten, O. (2022). On the essential role of organized skepticism in science’s internal and lawful autonomy (Eigengesetzlichkeit). *Journal of Classical Sociology*, 22(3), 282–303. doi:10.1177/1468795X211000247
- Haritos-Fatouros, M. (2003). *The Psychological Origins of Institutionalized Torture*. Routledge.
- Harris, J. D., & Freeman, R. E. (2008). The impossibility of the separation thesis. A response to Joakim Sandberg. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 18, 541–548.
- Harzing, A.-W., & Pudelko, M. (2016). Do we need to distance ourselves from the distance concept? Why home and host country context might matter more than (cultural) distance. *Management International Review*, 56(1), 1–34. doi:10.1007/11575-015-0265-4
- Hawkesworth, M. (2005). Engendering Political Science: An Immodest Proposal. *Politics & Gender*, 1(1), 141–156. doi:10.1017/S1743923X0523101X
- Hayes, N. (2000). *Doing psychological research*. Open University Press.
- Helmke, G., & Levitsky, S. (2004). Informal institutions and comparative politics: A research agenda. *Perspectives on Politics*, 2004(4), 725–740. doi:10.1017/S1537592704040472
- Higgins, J. (2013). Institutional culture as keyword. In J. Higgins (Ed.), *Academic freedom in a democratic South Africa. Essays and interviews on higher education and the humanities* (pp. 99–140). Wits University Press.
- Hobsbawm, E., & Ranger, T. (Eds.). (1988). *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge University Press.

- Hodgson, G. (2006). What Are Institutions? *Journal of Economic Issues*, 40(1), 1–25. doi:10.1080/00213624.2006.11506879
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's recent consequences: Using dimension scores in theory and research. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 1(1), 11–17. doi:10.1177/1470595801111002
- Honneth, A. (1992). Integrity and disrespect: Principles of a conception of morality based on the theory of recognition. *Political Theory*, 20(2), 187–201. doi:10.1177/0090591792020002001
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Sage.
- Huggins, M. K., Haritos-Fatouros, M., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2002). *Violence Workers: Police Torturers and Murderers Reconstruct Brazilian Atrocities*. U of California. doi:10.1525/9780520928916
- Hush, A. (2019). The Imaginary Institution of the University: Sexual Politics in the Neoliberal Academy. *Angelaki*, 24(4), 136–150. doi:10.1080/0969725X.2019.1635833
- Jarzabkowski, P., Matthiesen, J., & Van de Ven, A. H. (2009). Doing which work? A practice approach to institutional pluralism. In T. B. Lawrence, R. Suddaby, & B. Leca (Eds.), *Institutional work: Actors and agency in institutional studies of organizations* (pp. 284–316). Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511596605.011
- Jensen, R., & Szulanski, G. (2004). Stickiness and the adaptation of organizational practices in cross-border knowledge transfers. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 35(6), 508–523. doi:10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400107
- Khanna, T., & Palepu, K. G. (2000). The future of business groups in emerging markets: Long run evidence from Chile. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(2), 268–285. doi:10.2307/1556395
- Kim, H., Kim, H., & Hoskisson, R. E. (2010). Does market orientated institutional change in an emerging economy make business groups affiliated multinationals perform better? An institutional based view. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41(7), 1141–1160. doi:10.1057/jibs.2010.17
- Kim, J. U., & Aguilera, R. V. (2016). Foreign location choice: Review and extensions. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 18(2), 133–159. doi:10.1111/ijmr.12064
- Kogut, B., & Singh, H. (1988). The effect of national culture on the choice of entry mode. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 19(3), 411–432. doi:10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490394
- Kostova, T. (1996). *Success of the transnational transfer of organizational practices within multinational companies* [Ph.D. dissertation]. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.
- Kostova, T. (1997). Country institutional profile: Concept and measurement. Best paper proceedings of the academy of management, 180–184.
- Kumlin, S., & Rothstein, B. (2005). Making and Breaking Social Capital: The impact of welfare-state institutions. *Comparative Political Studies*, 38(4), 339–365. doi:10.1177/0010414004273203

## **Normative and Regulatory Dimensions of Institutional Culture**

Lin, N. (2001). *Social capital: a theory of social structure and action*. Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511815447

Mahoney, J., & Thelen, K. (Eds.). (2010). *Explaining Institutional Change*. Cambridge University Press.

McLeod, M. S., Payne, G. T., & Evert, R. E. (2016). Organizational ethics research: A systematic review of methods and analytical techniques. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 134(3), 429–443. doi:10.1007/10551-014-2436-9

Meyer, K. E., & Peng, M. W. (2015). Theoretical foundations of emerging economy business research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 47(1), 3–22. doi:10.1057/jibs.2015.34

Mihai, M. (2016). *Negative Emotions and Transitional Justice*. Columbia UP.

Mogren, A. (2019). *Guiding Principles of Transformative Education for Sustainable Development in Local School Organisations Investigating Whole School Approaches through a School Improvement Lens*. Karlstad University Studies. Available at <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1368940/fulltext01.pdf>

Morone, J. (2004). *Hellfire nation: The Politics of Sin in American History*. Yale University Press.

Mudambi, R., Li, L., Ma, X., Makino, S., Qian, G., & Boschma, R. (2018). Zoom in, zoom out: Geographic scale and multinational activity. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 49(8), 929–941. doi:10.1057/41267-018-0158-4

Nachum, L., & Zaheer, S. (2005). The persistence of distance? The impact of technology on MNE motivations for foreign investment. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(8), 747–767. doi:10.1002/mj.472

National Academy of Sciences (US) National Academy of Engineering (US) & Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Maximizing the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering. (2006). *Biological, Social, and Organizational Components of Success for Women in Academic Science and Engineering*. National Academies Press (US).

Newbert, S. L. (2018). Achieving social and economic equality by unifying business and ethics: Adam Smith as the case of and cure for the separation thesis. *Journal of Management Studies*, 55, 517–544.

Nielsen, R. P., & Massa, F. G. (2013). Reintegrating ethics and institutional theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 115(1), 135–147. doi:10.1007/10551-012-1384-5

Noll, R., & Owen, B. (1983). *The Political Economy of Deregulation*. American Enterprise Institute.

North, D. (1988). Ideology and Political/Economic Institutions. *The Cato Journal*, 8(1), 15–28.

North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511808678

North, D. C. (1991). Institutions. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 5(1), 97–112. doi:10.1257/jep.5.1.97

Patalano, R. (2007). Imagination and Society: The Affective Side of Institutions. [Print]. *Constitutional Political Economy*, 18(4), 223–241. doi:10.1007/10602-007-9019-z

- Peterson, M. F., & Barreto, T. S. (2018). Interpreting societal culture value dimensions. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 49(8), 1190–1207. doi:10.1057/41267-018-0185-1
- Pierson, P. (2000). Increasing returns, path dependence, and the study of politics. *The American Political Science Review*, 94(2), 251–267. doi:10.2307/2586011
- Powell, W. W., & DiMaggio, P. J. (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. University of Chicago Press. doi:10.7208/chicago/9780226185941.001.0001
- Putnam, R. (1993). *Making democracy work. Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton University Press.
- Puwar, N. (2004). *Space Invaders: Race, Gender, and Bodies Out of Place*. Berg.
- Razack, N., & Jeffery, D. (2002). Critical race discourse and tenets for social work. *Canadian Social Work Review*, 19(2), 257–271. <https://caswe-acfts.ca/cswr-journal/>
- Report, M. I. T. (1999). *A Study on the Status of Women Faculty in Science – An Update of the 1999 Reports of the Committees on the Status of Women Faculty*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Rosenbloom, D., & Rinscheid, A. (2020). Deliberate decline: An emerging frontier for the study and practice of decarbonization. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 11(6), e669. doi:10.1002/wcc.669
- Schiele, J. H. (2007). Implications of the equality-of-oppressions paradigm for curriculum content on people of color. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 43(1), 83–100. doi:10.5175/JSWE.2007.200400478
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? *The Journal of Social Studies*, 50(4), 19–45. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1994.tb01196.x
- Schwartz, S. H. (1999). A theory of cultural values and some implications for work. *Applied Psychology*, 48(1), 23–47. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.1999.tb00047.x
- Scott, W. R. (1991). Unpacking institutional arguments. In W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis* (pp. 164–182). University of Chicago Press.
- Scott, W. R. (2008). *Institutions and organizations: ideas and interests* (Vol. 3). Sage Publications.
- Scott, W. R. (2012). Embedding the examination of multilevel factors in an organization field context. *JNCI Monographs*, 2012(44), 32–33. doi:10.1093/jncimonographs/lgs007 PMID:22623593
- Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in Administration*. Harper e Row.
- Seto, K. C., Davis, S. J., Mitchell, R., Stokes, E. C., Unruh, G., & Ürge-Vorsatz, D. (2016). Carbon lock-in: Types, causes, and policy implications. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 41(1), 425–452. doi:10.1146/annurev-environ-110615-085934
- Shott, S. (1979). Emotion and social life: A symbolic interactionist analysis. *American Journal of Sociology*, 84(6), 1317-1334. doi:10.1086/226936
- Slangen, A. H. L., & Beugelsdijk, S. (2010). The impact of institutional hazards on foreign multinational activity: A contingency perspective. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41(6), 980–995. doi:10.1057/jibs.2010.1

## **Normative and Regulatory Dimensions of Institutional Culture**

Streeck, W., & Thelen, K. (2005). Introduction: institutional change in advanced political economies. In W. Streeck and K. Thelen, *Beyond Continuity: Institutional Change in Advanced Political Economies* (pp. 1–39). Oxford University Press.

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 571–610. doi:10.2307/258788

Suddaby, R. (2016). Toward a historical consciousness: Following the historic turn in management thought: Unplugged – ‘carte blanche.’ *M@n@gement*, 19(1), 46–60. 10.3917/mana.191.0046

Taylor, C. (1992). *Multiculturalism and The Politics of Recognition: An Essay by Charles Taylor*. Princeton University Press.

Thacher, D. (2015). Perils of value neutrality. In *Research in the sociology of organizations: Vol. 44. Institutions and ideals: Philip Selznick’s legacy for organizational studies* (pp. 317–352). Emerald Group Publishing. doi:10.1108/S0733-558X20150000044012

The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism. (2008). Sage Publications.

Thornton, P., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The institutional logics perspective: A new approach to culture, structure, and process*. Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199601936.001.0001

Thornton, P. H. (2004). *Markets from culture: Institutional logics and organizational decisions in higher education publishing*. Stanford University Press. doi:10.1515/9781503619098

UNESCO. (2019). *Inclusion of ESD in school curricula and activities on course*. Available at <https://en.unesco.org/news/inclusion-esd-school-curricula-and-activities-course-0>

Vaccaro, A., & Palazzo, G. (2015). Values against violence: Institutional change in societies dominated by organized crime. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(4), 1075–1101. doi:10.5465/amj.2012.0865

van Hoorn, A. A. J., & Maseland, R. (2016). How institutions matter for international business: Institutional distance effects vs institutional profile effects. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 47(3), 374–381. doi:10.1057/jibs.2016.2

Voronov, M. (2014). Toward a toolkit for emotionalizing institutional theory. *Research on Emotion in Organizations*, 10, 167–196. doi:10.1108/S1746-979120140000010015

Voronov, M., & Yorks, L. (2015). “Did you notice that?” Theorizing differences in the capacity to apprehend institutional contradictions. *Academy of Management Review*, 40(4), 563–586. doi:10.5465/amr.2013.0152

Weaver, G. R., Treviño, L. K., & Cochran, P. L. (1999). Integrated and decoupled corporate social performance: Management commitments, external pressures, and corporate ethics practices. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(5), 539–552. doi:10.2307/256975

Weir, M. (2006). When does politics create policy? The organizational politics of change. In I. Shapiro, S. Skowronek, & D. Galvin (Eds.), *Re-thinking Political Institutions: The Art of the State* (pp. 171–186). New York University Press.



### ***Normative and Regulatory Dimensions of Institutional Culture***

Wicks, A. C. (1996). Overcoming the separation thesis: The need for a reconsideration of business and society research. *Business & Society*, 35, 89–118.

WTO. (2001). the IMF, and the World Bank. *International Social Science Journal*, 170, 170.

Xin, K. R., & Pearce, J. L. (1996). Guanxi: Connections as substitutes for formal institutional support. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(6), 1641–1658. doi:10.2307/257072

Yee, J. Y. (2005). Critical anti-racism praxis: The concept of Whiteness implicated. In S. Hick, J. Fook, & R. Pozzuto (Eds.), *Social work: A critical turn* (pp. 87–103). Thompson Educational Publishing.

Young, H. P. (2015). The evolution of social norms. *Annual Review of Economics*, 7(1), 359–387. doi:10.1146/annurev-economics-080614-115322

Yuana, S. L., Sengers, F., Boon, W., Hajer, M. A., & Raven, R. (2020). A dramaturgy of critical moments in transition: Understanding the dynamics of conflict in socio-political change. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 37(December), 156–170. doi:10.1016/j.eist.2020.08.009

Zhou, C., Xie, J., & Wang, Q. (2016). Failure to complete cross-border M&As: “To” vs. “From” emerging markets. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 47(9), 1077–1105. doi:10.1057/41267-016-0027-y