

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
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All work contributed to this book is new, previously-unpublished material.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.

Table of Contents

Preface	xviii
Chapter 1 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>	
Chapter 2 Analysing Foreign Direct Investment in Singapore Through Soft Power.....	26
<i>Raneem Ghazi Aldeki, Al-Sham Private University, Damascus, Syria</i>	
Chapter 3 Cultural Alchemy: Fengcha Tradition in Tea Retailing in Contemporary China	45
<i>Junhong Ma, University of Alberta, Canada</i>	
Chapter 4 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>	
Chapter 5 Evaluation of Soft Power in Terms of Leadership: A Bibliometric Analysis.....	102
<i>Safa Acar, Siirt University, Turkey</i>	
Chapter 6 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

Chapter 15	
Stirring Up Soft Power: The Role of Chinese Cuisine in China's Cultural Diplomacy	292
<i>Mohamad Zreik, Independent Researcher, Lebanon</i>	
Chapter 16	
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>	
Chapter 17	
Synergy as a Smart Solution: Achieving Positive/Smart Synergy in Teamwork.....	335
<i>Mario Bogdanović, Istrian University of Applied Sciences, Croatia</i>	
Chapter 18	
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>	
Chapter 19	
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>	
Chapter 20	
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>	
Chapter 21	
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>	
Chapter 22	
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 10

Organizational Socio-Intercultural Anthropology

José G. Vargas-Hernandez

Budapest Centre for Long-term Sustainability, Hungary

María F. Higuera-Cota

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8285-1076>

Universidad Autónoma de Sinaloa, Mexico

Omar C. Vargas-González

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

Tecnológico Nacional de México, Ciudad Guzmán, Mexico

ABSTRACT

The field of socio-intercultural anthropology has become increasingly relevant in the context of organizational culture. This study aims to analyze the interplay between socio-cultural anthropology and organizational culture. It starts with the assumption that the application of anthropological disciplines to organizations is having an impact on the socio-cultural expressions and manifestations within those organizations. The study takes an analytical-descriptive approach, delving into the theoretical and empirical literature related to the topic. In summary, the study provides important insights into the role of socio-intercultural anthropology in organizational socio-intercultural. It highlights how anthropological methodologies have influenced organizational culture and provides recommendations for future research and practice in this area.

INTRODUCTION

In today's interconnected and diverse world, understanding the complexities of social and cultural dynamics is critical for effective communication and collaboration in organizational settings. This is where socio-intercultural anthropology and organizational socio-intercultural come into play. Socio-intercultural anthropology is the study of cultural and social behavior and norms across different communities, while

DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3693-0250-7.ch010

organizational socio-interculture explores the intersection of culture and social structure within organizations. Both disciplines provide valuable insights into how individuals and groups interact with each other, as well as the impact of cultural differences on communication, decision-making, and overall organizational performance.

In this chapter, we will delve into the significance of socio-intercultural anthropology and organizational socio-interculture in the modern workplace, exploring their applications and implications for effective cross-cultural communication and collaboration. We will examine the importance of cultural intelligence and diversity training for organizational success, as well as the challenges and opportunities presented by a globalized and multicultural workforce.

The following section provides information on how anthropological methods can be applied in organizational settings to better understand and navigate cultural differences. Therefore, discussing the use of anthropological methods in organizational settings is essential to understanding the full scope and potential of socio-intercultural anthropology and organizational socio-interculture.

The following presents the theoretical framework for the study of socio-intercultural anthropology and organizational socio-interculture, describing the main concepts and approaches used in anthropological studies and their relevance to organizational socio-culture.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Organizations are social spaces or micro-societies where agents and actors conduct actions that represent reality. From an organizational perspective, identifying the different actors and agents involved who interact with each other is essential to establish the basis that allows for analyzing the integral processes of organizational systems in a sociocultural context.

Starting from the notion that recent organizational anthropology studies the categories and methods of social groups that contribute to enriching the anthropological perspective of organizations and entrepreneurs. Anthropology has studied and described the phenomenon of leadership in primitive societies, including the activities of leaders and the necessary personality traits, qualities, and attributes to conduct sociopolitical activities. Personal interaction with society and tolerance enhances the anthropological value and lead to mutual interactions with a non-unified socio-intercultural environment, resulting in socio-intercultural organizational dynamics.

Regarding this, Barret & Stanford (2016) describe organizational anthropology as a discipline that focuses on studying culture, behavior, and dynamics within an organization. Organizational anthropology uses the prediction of phenomena to anticipate and forecast future events.

Although the scientific nature of anthropology has been criticized due to the notion that science as a mode of inquiry is obsolete (Inga, 2021), organizational anthropology develops scientific theories grounded in functionalism and structuralism. For example, the theory of information goods, which is used to analyze the psychological adaptations of socio-intercultural learning by Henrich and Gil-White (2001), or the costly signaling theory, used to examine religious beliefs that decrease the costs of intra-group cooperation in ritual practices, explaining the emergence and evolution of small human groups to form large groups (Salali *et al.*, 2015).

Socio-intercultural anthropology is a discipline that focuses on the study of culture and human society. Although its scope is overly broad, in recent years there has been a great interest in applying its knowledge and methods in the organizational field. In fact, socio-intercultural anthropology can be especially use-

Organizational Socio-Intercultural Anthropology

ful in understanding organizational dynamics (Horowitz, Yaworsky, & Kickham, 2019), as it allows the analysis of cultural relationships and practices that occur within organizations, and how they influence decision-making, change management, conflict resolution, and the development of a strong corporate culture. In this context, the importance of socio-intercultural anthropology in organizational dynamics and its potential to contribute to improving the effectiveness and well-being of companies becomes evident.

EVOLUTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL ANTHROPOLOGY AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH SOCIO-CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Organizational anthropology is a discipline that has evolved over time and has been influenced by various currents and approaches, including socio-intercultural anthropology. Originally, anthropology focused on the study of human evolution, but as the discipline evolved, new areas of study, such as economic, political, and gender anthropology, were developed. In this sense, the dispute over the various anthropological approaches for the conceptual and theoretical analysis of anthropology applied to organizations is associated with the notion of anthropology as a science (Horowitz, Yaworsky, and Kickham, 2019).

Anthropology as a discipline includes socio-intercultural anthropology, physical anthropology, archaeology, and linguistics. In this context, organizational anthropology emerges as a specialization that focuses on the analysis of organizations as social and cultural entities, and how they influence work practices, human behavior, and decision-making in the workplace. In this sense, organizational anthropology has been enriched through its relationship with socio-intercultural anthropology, which focuses on the analysis of cultural diversity and cultural interactions in different contexts. According to Henrich & Gil-White (2001), organizational anthropology explains the basic norms of socio-intercultural development, functions, interactions, symbolic systems, etc.

The disciplines of anthropology, ethology, psychology, and sociology under a qualitative, historical, and analytical approach intersect with administrative and management science, organizational socio-intercultural, ethnology as knowledge work, organizations as society of organized communities, and psychology related to the psyche and personality in knowledge work behavior. The contemporary model of organizational anthropology (ARC) analyzes traditional knowledge production methods (Muthukrishna *et al.*, 2018). Together, these disciplines allow for a deeper understanding of the complexity of organizations and their relationship with the cultural environment in which they operate.

This study analyzes anthropological socio-intercultural and organizational socio-intercultural through a description of the methods of anthropology used in the study of organizations, to focus on the analysis of socio-intercultural anthropology and its interrelationships and implications with the socio-intercultural of organizations.

METHODS OF ANTHROPOLOGY IN ORGANIZATIONS

The field of organizational anthropology focuses on studying organizations from an anthropological perspective, using techniques and methodologies from the discipline to analyze and understand the social, cultural, and symbolic processes that occur within organizations.

Ethnography is one of the most used methodologies in organizational anthropology, which seeks to understand the practices and beliefs of actors involved in the organizational context. This technique is

based on participant observation and immersion in the environment, allowing for the exploration of social and cultural dynamics underlying organizational practices and how they affect individuals and groups within the organization. Additionally, ethnography questions the concept of meaning as how humans inhabiting a social space agree upon representation and actions, allowing for a deeper understanding of the human condition within the anthropological field (Augé & Colleyn, 2006). In summary, ethnography in organizational anthropology provides new epistemological and ontological approaches for analyzing the direct and indirect outcomes of organizations and their impact on society.

The ethnographic approach in organizational anthropology focuses on studying organizational events and practices as representations that contain invisible principles of social ordering (Mauksch, 2017). Qualitative research in this area is based on ethnography and uses techniques such as participant observation, informal conversations, and interviews to obtain detailed information about the organization. Interviewing is a fundamental method in ethnographic research. In organizational anthropology, the ethnographic methodology includes participant observation and epistemic perspective, allowing for the analysis of socio-cultural differences in organizational contexts at the global, national, regional, and local levels. This leads to the description of organizational socio-cultural diversity and entrepreneurship, based on the analysis of capacities, resources, and knowledge.

However, it is important to note that the process of transmitting knowledge in the anthropological perspective using ethnographic methodology requires full-time dedication to understanding the practices and beliefs of actors involved in the organizational context. Therefore, deep immersion in the field is required, which can be a long and demanding process, but provides a detailed and rich understanding of the social and cultural dynamics underlying organizational practices.

Organizational anthropology can also apply formal methods, such as componential analysis, which originate from linguistics and are used to study kinship relations, which are the basis for the formation of kinship algebra (Barnes, 1980). In organizational anthropology, componential analysis is used to understand the relationships and connections between members of an organization, decision-making processes, and the organizational culture itself. This method allows for the identification of interaction patterns among members of the organization, which can be of wonderful use in understanding the social and cultural dynamics of the organization and how they influence its functioning. The focus group is another technique used in organizational anthropology studies, aimed at studying complex social dynamics within organizations to address systematic organizational transformation processes.

Organizational anthropology uses both qualitative and quantitative techniques to analyze data. Quantitative techniques such as surveys and statistical analysis can be useful in complementing and deepening the understanding gained through qualitative techniques. However, some authors like Chibnik (1999) question the increasing use of statistical techniques in ethnographic analysis, arguing that it may lead to a turn towards more interpretive approaches in anthropology. Although anthropology is considered one of the least quantifying social sciences, statistical concepts have been used since its origins for data analysis (Driver, 1953).

Organizational anthropology uses quantitative tools for data management, such as descriptive statistics, correlational and bivariate models, hypothesis testing, and comparative models supported by software for statistical methods and quantitative techniques (Williams & Quave, 2019). Statistics are an integral part of anthropological research and are used as an approach to testing hypotheses on the topic (Madrigal, 2012). Research manuals in anthropology show the use of quantitative resources in designing questionnaires, constructing scales, and multivariate analysis (Bernard, 2011). The use of quantitative techniques in anthropology originates from a concern for behavioral descriptions (Johnson, 1978).

Organizational Socio-Intercultural Anthropology

In summary, the methods of organizational anthropology are based on a combination of qualitative and quantitative techniques, which allow for a deep and detailed understanding of the practices, beliefs, and values of organizations and their actors. The application of these techniques can be of immense help in addressing organizational issues and challenges from a culturally and socially contextualized perspective.

SOCIO-CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY AND ITS CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY OF ORGANIZATIONS

Anthropology had its origins in the colonial mentality of naturalists and travelers who adopted the positivist method to seek scientific explanations beyond religious principles. Anthropologist Tylor (1871) contributed to the consolidation of evolutionary principles in philosophy in anthropology. Evolutionary anthropology focuses on the study of human evolution. Originally, anthropology emerged in the 19th century to serve the colonial interests of empires and companies. Today, decolonization schools have been developed in Manchester and France that have proposed an alternative vision to anthropology, led by Max Glukman and Georges Balandier (Gravano, 2005a and 2008a, b).

In classical anthropology, culture is defined as a way of life. Therefore, anthropology is a science that focuses on cultural identities and cultural diversity (Geertz, 1996). Anthropological tools are useful for the study of socio-intercultural organizations.

There are similarities between peoples that anthropology, as a social science, seeks to understand through the analysis of scientific categories that can be applied to diverse cultures (Kuper, 2010).

Anthropology and ethnography focus on the technological dimension of organizations in public, private, and nonprofit sectors, adapting and improving existing technologies and adopting new ones (Roberts and Grabowski, 1996). For organizational theory, it is important to focus on the use of traditional technologies as a means for adaptation and to analyze variables such as collaboration, institutionalism, and entrepreneurship.

Technology occupies a principal place in organizational phenomena in companies, public organizations, and nonprofits, and can affect members' perception of various aspects surrounding technology and workspaces (Cloutier & Ravasi, 2020). Technology can be defined as the set of knowledge, processes, tools, and systems used in the creation and provision of goods and services, which can be used as input in another organizational system. The social construction of the meaning of technology considers it as an organizational anthropological category constructed through constant socio-technical and pragmatic transformations that transcend the application of science and artifacts. In addition, traditional technology can play a relevant role in the production process.

Organizational anthropology relates to other disciplines to provide tools for analyzing the organizational phenomenon, including organizational theory and socio-cultural studies. Socio-cultural analysis is used to construct reference frameworks for international, national, regional, and local actions.

Ethnography regards organizations as a socio-cultural formation and contributes to documenting differences in values, beliefs, social relations, and organizational practices (Urban & Koh, 2013). Organizational anthropology seeks to improve organizational practices to make them more human rather than dehumanizing, under the framework of universal principles of anthropology.

Although economics and organizations have been described as abiotic entities by psychology and industrial sociology involved in capitalist organizations, anthropology emphasizes the importance of people in the construction and functioning of organizations. Anthropological tools can contribute to the

study of organizational socio-cultural in generic and specific terms, incorporating variables related to the economy and the knowledge society, as well as new socio-cultural relationships constructed through information and communication technologies, including artificial intelligence, which can influence organizational change processes.

Socio-cultural anthropology has become increasingly relevant in the field of organizations, as it allows understanding the complex cultural and social interactions that take place in the workplace. As companies become more global and diversified, the ability to understand and manage cultural diversity becomes a key factor for the success of organizations. However, the application of socio-cultural anthropology in organizations also presents challenges and opportunities that must be carefully considered. In this section, some of these challenges and opportunities will be explored, with the aim of providing a better understanding of how socio-cultural anthropology can be effectively used in the business world.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES OF APPLYING SOCIO-CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY IN ORGANIZATIONS.

Socio-intercultural anthropology provides valuable tools for analyzing organizations, businesses, and business elites. The ethnographic method used in organizational anthropology allows for the analysis, interpretation, and explanation of socio-intercultural phenomena that occur within these entities, considering stakeholders within their context (Peña, 2008). Additionally, business, and organizational anthropology contributes to analyzing the dynamics of the historical-institutional context, organizations, companies, and entrepreneurs who are transforming the economic sector and social processes (Santos & Gortari 2021).

One of the challenges facing organizational anthropology is maintaining its relevance as organizational business elites are linked to regional conjunctural factors (Gessaghy, 2011). However, the contributions of organizational anthropology are fundamental to global studies of enterprise and entrepreneurship, particularly regarding reflection on socio-intercultural organizational issues.

Organizational anthropology can conduct experimental designs in science to evaluate hypotheses and formulate scientific theories, such as pure and quasi-experiments, pre and pseudo-experiments (Cash et al., 2016). These experimental designs are present in various research areas, from experimental and natural anthropology to racial categorization (Byrne et al., 1995; Harris et al., 1993). Furthermore, organizational anthropology can also use new methodologies provided by Marxism and critical analysis of power relations, such as institutional ethnography (Smith, 1986), which shows anthropology and ethnography confronting the conscious agent of economic exploitation (Clifford, 1988).

Another important opportunity for organizational anthropology is the possibility of using logical, mathematical, and computational methods linked to complexity theories, such as dynamic systems, complex adaptive systems, non-equilibrium, and chaos theory (Reynoso, 2006). These methods, models, and formal approaches in anthropology are useful in various areas, from self-regulated systems (Nadel, 1953, 1957) to artificial societies (Lansing, 2002, 2003).

In summary, organizational anthropology plays a crucial role in the analysis of organizations and businesses and offers valuable tools and methodologies to address the challenges and opportunities presented in this field.

The following section discusses the various positions on the nature of anthropology, leading to a discussion of the discipline and evolutionary anthropology. Next, it addresses how anthropology can be

useful for studying organizations and technology, including a discussion of the social construction of technology meaning and traditional technology. Finally, the text highlights the importance of adaptation and collaboration in the use of technology in organizations.

ANTHROPOLOGY AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH TECHNOLOGY AND ORGANIZATIONS

There are divergent positions regarding the nature of anthropology, as some consider it as a natural science of the human species, as in the natural sciences, while others see it as the study of socio-cultural phenomena, arguing the difficulties of applying theoretical methods of natural sciences to social phenomena that belong to different orders between the biological and socio-cultural dimensions (Silva Santisteban, 2018). In classical anthropology, culture is seen as a way of life. Anthropology is concerned with the study of cultural identities and expressed cultural diversity (Geertz, 1996). Anthropological tools are incredibly useful for the study of organizational socio-culture.

The origins of anthropology as a scientific discipline are found in the colonial mentality of naturalists and travelers who adopted the positivist method, seeking scientific explanations beyond the dogmatism of religious principles (Tylor, 1871) contributing to anthropology by consolidating the evolutionary principles of philosophy (Valentí, 2009). Evolutionary anthropology deals with the study of human evolution. Anthropology emerged in the mid-19th century to serve the colonial interests of empires and companies. The Manchester and French decolonization schools, as anthropological sources, were developed by Max Glukman and Georges Balandier (Gravano, 2005 and 2008a, b).

To understand similarities among peoples, anthropology is a science that analyzes how different other people are from us in scientific categories. Anthropological tools are incredibly useful for the study of generic and specific organizational socio-culture. Anthropological studies of organizations contribute to the theoretical framework and methods by incorporating variables related to the economy and knowledge society, new socio-cultural relationships built from information and communication technologies, and other technologies such as artificial intelligence, which contribute to organizational change processes. Global markets and trade liberalization have deepened the economy and organizations, but left people out, which has been criticized by psychology and industrial sociology that deal with capitalist organizations (Cloutier and Ravasi, 2020).

Technology is at the center of business, public, and non-profit organizational phenomena that articulate the members' meaning about certain aspects surrounding technology and workspaces (Cloutier & Ravasi, 2020). It is defined as the knowledge, processes, tools, and systems used in the creation and provision of goods and services that can be used as inputs in another organizational system. The social construction of meaning conceptualizes technology as an organizational anthropological category constructed on permanent socio-technical and pragmatic transformation to transcend the application of science and artifacts. Likewise, traditional technology plays a relevant role in the production process.

Technology is one of the organizational dimensions of human factors as part of the public, private, and non-profit space, adopting modern technologies, improving, and adapting existing ones. The nature of technology postulates categories of analysis to facilitate anthropological and ethnographic research on mechanical, physical, and human technologies (Roberts and Grabowski, 1996).

Technology is a control mechanism in organizational processes, including instruments and other elements. An area of research for organizational theory should focus more on the use of traditional tech-

nologies as a means of adaptation and analyzing aspects such as adaptation to the work environment, collaboration, institutionalization, and entrepreneurship.

Organizational studies and theory have placed organizational anthropology and socio-cultural relations in the need to resort to other disciplines to offer analysis tools for the organizational phenomenon. Socio-cultural analysis is a system of interaction of symbols that seeks to construct referential frameworks for international, national, regional, and local actions.

Ethnography addresses organizations as a socio-cultural formation, and ethnographic studies contribute to influencing corporations in the workplace through interactions and documentation that impact the socio-cultural exterior of organizations. Organizational anthropology documents differences in the areas of values, beliefs, social relationships, and practices (Urban & Koh, 2013). Organizational practices, which are increasingly accountable, become more dehumanized (Dufour, 1995) under the framework of the universality of anthropological principles. This can lead to more human organizations that lead to improvement rather than disruption of human dimensions.

In anthropological practice, ethnography, and translation in interpretivism do not objectify the total processes that are criticized for losing the Indigenous in contradictory relationships (Crapanzano, 1986). These processes are related to the perspectives of practical anthropology (Gravano, 1992), anthropological imagination (Gravano, 1995), and the concept of anthropology culture (Gravano, 2008b).

Anthropological imagination is an approach that aims to study the socio-cultural perspective of the analyst, which leads to questioning the objectivity of the reality studied. It is based on the premise that the analyst's introduction to reality to record their own vision can lead to the conceptual construction of an alienation relationship. An anthropological perspective is based on socio-cultural and environmental education processes that promote understanding between socio-economic differences, which can generate discrimination against individuals who converge on collective purposes and lead to organizational knowledge and learning (Cely-López & Gómez-Niño, 2016).

Applied anthropology is interested in the expectations of the population living in urban societies, which lead to sociocultural and socio-ecological continuities and ruptures, as well as symbolic and practical aspects. These expectations require processes to achieve the effectiveness of fair and egalitarian societies through collaboration. Applied anthropology in organizations contributes to, argues for organizational studies, and resolves milestones of the discipline developed from studies of simple societies to analyze the ideological, social, socio-intercultural, and technological environment of corporations and closed communities.

Mexican anthropology maintains a permanent level of identification with sociocultural insertion in the national context throughout history. It is oriented towards reflecting on new cross-cutting contexts through socio-intercultural relationships that lead many people to experience transitions from rural to large urban cities. This reflection led the discipline to action and to transcend the structuralist model to analyze the cultural change that occurs due to the loss or fusion of cultural tradition with the emergence of modern issues aimed at repositioning individuals in society.

The anthropology of modern worlds (Augé, 1995) focuses on the present and modernity. However, it may be criticized for being ahistorical culturalism and structural materialism. The crisis of representation and postmodernism reformulated anthropological practices, leading to a rejection of grand theories and a redefinition of the notion of theory that focuses on ethnography (Ellen, 2010).

Anthropology for management combines vision and practice in activities that serve an actor, which can generate dilemmas in traditional teaching and research activities and conceal the illusion of working for oneself, for students, or for neutral entities such as academia and science. Cross-cultural research analysis

Organizational Socio-Intercultural Anthropology

is based on anthropology and assigns a fundamental role to quantification (Murdock, 1967; Ember & Ember, 2009). Organizational research on business and gender has been based on critical perspectives of management. The study of organization and management has analyzed critical approaches to the past, present, and future in relation to organizational work and gender (Pullen et al. 2019).

METHODOLOGY

The objective of this study is to analyze the relationship between socio-intercultural anthropology and organizational socio-interculture, assuming that the application of anthropological disciplines in organizations is affecting sociocultural expressions within them. To achieve this, an analytical-descriptive method will be employed that involves reflection on theoretical and empirical literature related to the topic. The sources of information used will be bibliographic and documentary sources, such as scientific articles, books, and specialized publications in organizational and socio-intercultural anthropology.

The procedure will include a systematic review of the literature and a critical analysis of the information collected to identify the main concepts and theories relevant to the topic, as well as the methodologies employed by organizational anthropology in researching culture and socio-intercultural interaction in organizations. The expected results are a critical and rigorous analysis of the interaction between socio-intercultural anthropology and organizational socio-interculture, including the challenges and opportunities presented by its application in organizations and its impact on sociocultural expressions within them. It is important to note that this study will focus on the review of existing literature and will not include the conduct of empirical research, which limits the results obtained to the quality and quantity of information available in specialized literature.

REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL LITERATURE

In this section, the empirical literature on organizational anthropology and socio-cultural systems is analyzed. It examines how organizational anthropology has contributed to the analysis of the cultural dimensions of organizations and how it has positioned itself as an added value in organizational studies.

Organizational Anthropology and Its Application in the Study of Organizations and Corporate Culture

The term culture is polysemic and studies the complexity of organizational phenomena through various disciplines. Culture is a collective phenomenon originated by group interactions, creating shared products, and learning from common experiences of social units. The emergence of the cultural dimension in organizational studies is the synthesis of theoretical currents from anthropology and organization, considering the basic yet complex dimensions of human beings. The socio-intercultural dimensions contribute from a meta-theory as macro-reference concepts, intended for diagnosis that allows for organizing human social behaviors from a holistic organizational perspective, which leads to overcoming specialization problems and analyzing work phenomena in a specific social environment.

Organizational anthropology is a recognized specialty (Caulkins & Jordan, 2013). Other anthropological specialties include psychological anthropology (Casey & Edgerton, 2007), cognitive anthropology

(Kronenfeld et al., 2011), linguistic anthropology (Duranti, 2004), criminological anthropology (Schneider & Schneider, 2008), forensic anthropology (Boyd & Boyd, 2018), science anthropology (Nader, 2013), genetic anthropology (Gokcumen et al., 2011), psychiatric anthropology (Good, 1992), molecular anthropology (Stoneking, 2017), and neuroanthropology (Lende & Downey, 2012), among others.

The theory and methods of organizational anthropology are recognized as an added value in organizational studies (Harrison-Conwill, 2014). Theoretical systems contribute to science, based on principles that have broken with linear causality demonstrated by Malinowski (1944) and Mauss (1925), rather than primitive, underdeveloped, and elementary peoples and groups, leading to the creation of dynamic and complex economic and socio-intercultural systems. Organizational anthropology is a scientific knowledge that analyzes individual patterns of interaction with the socio-ecological and natural environment of various socio-intercultural systems. Organizational anthropology builds information to change organizational social functions that benefit society and calls attention to harmful effects (Urban & Koh, 2013).

Anthropological travels establish explicit connections between anthropology and the study of organizations (Kunda, 1986; Weeks, 2004). The analysis of the anthropology of organizations in complex societies is based on categories such as socio-interculture, cultural relativism, emic perspective, comparative methods, networks, among others, within the discipline.

Entrepreneurship is a topic of study in organizational anthropology that focuses on relationships from the perspectives of the elite and socio-economic history since the 1980s (Cerutti, 2003; Lomnitz and Pérez-Lizaur, 1993), placing categories of organizational culture, cultural relativism, emic perspective, networks, etc. Network analysis describes historical relationships with organizational anthropology and its contributions to the implementation of mixed methods approaches to global organization analysis.

Socio-intercultural systems of values and norms are part of specific social systems. Organizational anthropology is interested in the values and intangible assets of socio-interculture and institutional communication. The multidimensional value model is dominant in business organizations (Morden, 1999). Institutions are evaluated by organizational anthropology, which includes socio-intercultural, organizational, and environmental dialogic dynamics that have effects on organizational values, the work environment, relationships, and communications with stakeholders. The anthropological approach to organizations serves as a watchful eye on the interactions between evaluators and the evaluated (Hernández, 2012; Rivera, 2012). The organizational business is conceptualized from the perspective of new institutional theory as an institutional field formed by actors and organizations, including firms, clients, suppliers, consultants, activists, etc. (Baba, 2012).

Culture and organizations are theoretical elements of anthropology that aim to analyze, compare, and capture social reality to expand human discourse and natural human behavior (Geertz, 1992). The analysis of socio-intercultural and organizational anthropology disciplines, management, and social accounting from the perspective of socio-intercultural anthropology contributes to understanding reality, solving related problems, and valuing the theoretical elements and relationships of organizational elements (Cely-López & Gómez-Niño, 2016). Organizational anthropology includes contributions from culture and socio-interculturality.

From a historical perspective, the Hawthorne Western Electric Co. experiment between 1927 and 1932 used methodology from anthropology and management for the development of the theoretical and conceptual framework of the socio-intercultural organizational movement in management. The Hawthorne experiment is the foundational myth in the analysis of industrial society, conducted between 1927 and 1932, and is considered a relevant anthropological analysis characterized by a linguistic and functionalist orientation to related issues such as monotony and job satisfaction in productivity (Chapple, 1953;

Organizational Socio-Intercultural Anthropology

Menéndez, 2006). Research related to human relations in management, introduced by Mayo, led to a theory considered opposite to the scientific management paradigm held by Taylor, which dominated the organizational scene during the last century.

Anthropological studies on organizations, businesses, and entrepreneurs use the comparative method to analyze and explain similarities for local environments of companies embedded in global value chains, processes, and references that affect organizational structures, socio-cultural references, and technological innovations. The conscious organizational structure creates expectations among its members related to organizational behavior. Socio-cultural anthropology focuses on characterizations of societies. Cultural and socio-cultural anthropology and socio-educational relationships developed in organizational contexts contribute to administrative and social accounting sciences.

From a theoretical perspective, the conceptual framework of socio-culture implies the reformulation of ideas that govern organizational paradigms, moving from being universalist, linear, homogenizing, etc., to being improved in organization and society. A socio-cultural conceptual framework integrates management into organizational studies and the adoption of sociology, psychology, and anthropology to enhance human relationships in the organizational system and not to perform a positive analysis of variables seeking to improve quality and productivity. The ethics of organizational management can be analyzed as knowledge and as practice.

In institutional analysis, the anthropological approach of hyperdeduction and hyperinduction is linked to various fields and means of socio-cultural action, as proposed by Rosaldo (1991), associated with the concept of dialectical negativity according to Lourau (1979). The aim of administration is to put organizations to work to manage social action.

The purpose of anthropology and socio-culture is to broaden human discourse, provide practical guidance and moral progress, and construct a theoretical framework. Scholars of organizational anthropology agree to assign socio-cultural qualities in which there is approval. Socio-cultural anthropology studies socio-cultural manifestations such as beliefs, myths, customs, ceremonies, dress, music, dialects, etc. In social anthropology academic programs, the sources of the theoretical framework are based on Durkheim and Marxism, focusing more on the essentialist socio-cultural-historical phenomenological approach in topics such as popular socio-culture and folklore addressed by essentialist functionalism.

Social anthropology has some stigmatized objects of study, such as the analysis of Aboriginal and traditional populations, which freeze historical development with contradictions that lead to the search for another perspective to analyze traditional popular socio-cultures. However, topics related to traditional popular socio-cultures are considered reactionary and conservative. Social anthropology has shifted the object of study towards the urban and the construction of alterity based on ethnographic methodology.

Anthropology studies alterity and others by implication in the past and non-modernity. Present Anthropology studies the world of the past and alien to society (Althabe, 1999). Organizational facilitation from organizational anthropology methodology supported by the ethnographic method based on the category of socio-culture as a project for recording articulated reality and epistemological construction of alterity.

The anthropological perspective of socio-culturalism is the basic principle for achieving collective objectives, an instrument used for satisfaction of needs. Socio-cultural ecology applies tools from anthropology and biology to create knowledge of social organizations and analyze the interrelationships between the forces that shape them. The socio-cultural ecology of people, framed by anthropology, is linked to incentives with creativity in customs, literature, and arts as systems of social control of power. The anthropological organizational development model includes the socio-culturalism of people and the climate of the organizational environment.

An organizational analysis that includes socio-culturalism and productivity aimed at making it more productive must be supported by organizational anthropology (Ortega, 2012). Organizational anthropology stands out for the socio-cultural symbolic horizons in diverse contexts designed to operate, reproduce, and historicize human and social life. A theoretical focus of sources of organizational anthropology must specify relevant aspects and define meanings that guide research, such as socio-culturalism and organizational socio-culturalism.

In relation to the anthropology of markets, which includes organizational anthropology, it is a socio-cultural approach for market agents. The functions of ethnomarketing are developed from a socio-cultural approach and organizational anthropology is included to be applied by different market agents. Theoretical and practical guidelines are established for the anthropology of markets for the application of ethnomarketing functions (Baquero, 2006).

Organizational anthropology has focused on managing sociocultural problems in complex societies beyond pre-industrial and non-industrial communities (Trujillo, 2010). The dialectical articulation that goes from research to the facilitation processes of organizational anthropology in terms of methodological contributions aims to transform or improve human interrelationships at work in organizations, according to the perspectives of the organizational actors who exchange institutional power between socio-interculturality of otherness in the circularity of management. Organizational anthropology aims to compare workers' behavior in anthropological terms, such as the relationship between work and organizational violence (Urrea and Celis, 2016).

Organizational anthropology contributes to the development of human resources, supported by ethnographic methodology, to generate decisions about the value of socio-cultural relationships in specific organizational contexts and solve organizational problems to increase productivity. The contributions of organizational anthropology, socio-interculture, and socio-interculturality are to identify the dynamics of socio-intercultural, socio-intercultural, and socio-educational relationships in specific organizational contexts. The elements of organizational anthropology are treated to explain and analyze socio-interculturality and the organizational climate.

The characterization of the concerns that gave rise to organizational anthropology in Mexican and Spanish organizations to become influential entities in their own socio-intercultural transformation processes (Trujillo, 2010). Organizational anthropology in Mexico appreciated the relationship between socio-interculture and population groups in concerns of migration and modernization with new forms of organization with capitalist changes in socio-intercultural and material work that cannot be separated from symbolic production.

Applied anthropology in organizational studies in Mexican public entities based on interview and participant observation techniques (Llanque, 2002) around socio-intercultural variables of the industry established comparative considerations in regional perspectives on the culture of work (Durand, 1986). The intervention practices in organizational anthropology include management and action anthropology, participatory action research, social marketing, etc. (Barfield, 2000), which are evident in the transition from anthropological studies to urban studies associated with population growth that affects traditional ways of life and concentration in poverty, which has repercussions on anthropological concerns (Gipolla, 2003).

ORGANIZATIONAL SOCIO-INTERCULTURE

The organization creates symbolic artifacts expressed in beliefs, values, ideologies, traditions, rituals, ceremonies, stories, myths, and imaginaries, which lead to the creation and development of meaning and identity in organizational socio-interculture. Organizations, companies, and corporations are narratives of their identity and vision of community, expressing who they are, what they do, where they are going in addition to their products and services (Sánchez, 1997). The organizational paradigm of Toyotism is based on the community as social constructions with an adaptable and flexible response to external changes and internal problems.

Organizational anthropology is an attractive academic and research perspective considering the socio-intercultural symbolic manifestations that influence the scientific assumptions that lead to anthropological disciplines in the study of organizational culture. Organizational socio-interculture is an evolving phenomenon that transforms among and within groups.

Organizational socio-interculture is analyzed from an organizational anthropological perspective according to the semiotic concept supported by a network system of meanings that can be interpreted and negotiated by organizational actors (Wright, 2005; Gonnet, 2012). Interactions and transactions within the network consolidate organizational goals (González and Basaldúa, 2007). Organizational socio-interculture has two different perspectives: the managerialist vision and the socio-anthropological vision that is supported by symbolic interactionism (Wright, 2005; Gonnet, 2012). Management introduced the concept and theoretical approach to organizational socio-intercultural concerns with Ochi, Schein, Smircich, Hatch, Peters & Waterman, Hofstede, Abravanel, Allaire, Firsirotu, Deal & Kennedy, Aktouf, among others.

The organization creates symbolic artifacts expressed in beliefs, values, ideologies, traditions, rituals, ceremonies, stories, myths, and imaginaries, which lead to the creation and development of meaning and identity in organizational socio-interculture. Organizations, companies, entities, and corporations are narratives of their identity and vision of the community, expressing who they are, what they do, where they are going in addition to their products and services (Sánchez, 1997). The organizational paradigm of Toyotism is based on the community as social constructions with adaptable and flexible responses to external changes and internal problems.

Organizational anthropology is an attractive academic and research perspective considering the socio-intercultural symbolic manifestations that influence scientific assumptions that lead to anthropological disciplines in the study of organizational culture. Organizational socio-interculture is an evolving phenomenon that transforms among and within groups.

Organizational socio-interculturality is analyzed from an anthropological perspective of organizations according to the semiotic concept supported by a system of networks of meanings that can be interpreted and negotiated by organizational actors (Wright, 2005; Gonnet, 2012). Interactions and transactions within the network consolidate organizational objectives (González and Basaldúa, 2007). Organizational socio-interculturality has two different perspectives: the managerialist vision and the socio-anthropological perspective that is supported by symbolic interactionism (Wright, 2005; Gonnet, 2012). The management introduced the concept and theoretical approach for socio-cultural organizational concerns with Ochi, Schein, Smircich, Hatch, Peters & Waterman, Hofstede, Abravanel, Allaire, Firsirotu, Deal & Kennedy, Aktouf, among others.

The concepts of organizational socio-interculturality and facilitation are defined by a system of representations and practices sustained by values, beliefs, symbols, and rituals, in collective processes

and institutional action that pursue specific objectives in specific contexts, synthesized as the way of doing things (Gravano, 1992, 1997, 2000) approached from organizational anthropology (Wright, 1994).

Applied organizational anthropology provides the concept of organizational socio-interculturality with the implications between the articulations of facilitation and research representations and practices. Changes in the mindset of socio-interculturality lead to effective participatory and facilitation processes of organizational socio-interculturality and management, facilitating the emergence of ruptures aimed at fulfilling the objectives of the process.

Organizational socio-culture was expanded through research during the 1980s, with an incursion of other disciplines different from anthropology from the field of organizational anthropology, introducing anthropological terminology related to organizational culture. Organizational socio-culture is supported by anthropology, psychology, sociology, ethnology, linguistics, among other social sciences.

Anthropology has entered corporate or organizational socio-culture, confirming the existence and management of symbolic resources in identity, images, visions, and scenarios integrated into organizational processes, adding values. The perspective of organizational anthropology is related to the countercultural characterization of administration and management.

From the perspective of organizational anthropology, the concept and practices of socio-intercultural management and administration are based on cultural differences in work interrelationships and their acceptance. Socio-interculturality is the relationship between diverse groups that accept the differences of their cultures (Gauthey, Ratiu, Rodgers, and Xardel, 1988, García de la Torre, 2007). Organizational socio-culture implies sociocultural organizations that arise from human beings pursuing a purpose to establish values and norms that guide collective behavior, leading to weaving social imaginaries (Cáceres-Rubio and Villacrés Chaparro, 2010). Studies of organizational socio-culture and socio-intercultural anthropology have an impact on management from the perspective of the work environment.

The expansion of the dimensions of organizational culture highlights anthropological and cultural contributions to organizational studies and theoretical approaches and their relationships. Theoretical perspectives on culture and organizational socio-culture are related to influencing individual behavior in organizations. The design of a diagnostic tool to identify and characterize organizational behavior leads to developing conceptual and methodological options related to organizational climate and socio-culture. Time appeals to the logic of management, as this has influences on organizational behavior.

Organizational climate and socio-culture are present in the functions and actions of members in any organization, driven by resources and playing an active role in the formulation and implementation of strategies, systems, and structures that can be learned and developed.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of anthropological socio-interculturality and organizational socio-interculturality, based on the assumption that the study of applied anthropological disciplines to organizations is leading to an influence on the organizational socio-intercultural manifestations and expressions of anthropology, concludes that organizational socio-interculturality has been influenced by both the ethnographic and quantitative methodology used by organizational anthropology.

Organizations produce goods and services and disseminate socio-intercultural values that are received by society. Anthropological studies contribute to analyzing the socio-intercultural specificities of organizations. Social and organizational anthropological research unites individuals with society and nature

Organizational Socio-Intercultural Anthropology

in a variety of forms of coexistence, developing organizational culture. Organizational anthropology contributes to companies and organizations in the socio-intercultural analysis to explain social values and processes, the notion of elites, and the role of entrepreneurship.

The analysis of human behavior in the organizational environment and management sciences should be approached from interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research approaches based on the use of organizational anthropology with the joint unification of knowledge in organizational socio-intercultural analysis. Reflexive hermeneutics and holistic analysis of best organizational practices require that organizational anthropology and socio-intercultural knowledge be expanded and deepened through interdisciplinary processes to support active design, formulation, and implementation of continuous organizational improvement.

Anthropological analyses of socio-intercultural organizations add to other social science disciplines in the construction and transformation of external and internal social relations. The contributions of organizational anthropology have been developed from other disciplines such as management, psychology, sociology, etc., to be applied to the analysis of human relations and technological processes in organizations. Anthropological theory in organizations contributes categories of analysis, themes, methods, and tools for the study of organizational and business phenomena.

Methods in organizational anthropological and socio-intercultural analysis involve the development and transfer of knowledge and technology between organizations, companies, and entrepreneurship. Organizational anthropology and socio-interculturality as a science can use formal, logical, mathematical, and computational methods.

The analysis of organizational anthropology and socio-interculturality challenges the methodology of the regional context framework for business analysis that leads to transformation processes within global systems as an approach to opportunities and threats in a global context. Global economic interconnection, knowledge transfer, and socio-interdisciplinary work are methodological challenges of organizational anthropology and socio-intercultural analysis that extend to other social analyses with difficulties in isolating groups for analysis. Anthropological organizational socio-intercultural studies increase the incidence of global interconnection, building a world system, and analyzing the social problems of local communities.

In summary, organizational anthropology has significantly influenced the understanding of socio-intercultural manifestations and expressions in organizations. Its ethnographic and quantitative methods have allowed for analyzing the socio-intercultural specificities of companies and better understanding the social values and processes that occur within them. Organizational anthropology has also contributed to improving the management and design of companies through the application of best practices and understanding of internal and external social relations. However, to continue advancing in organizational socio-intercultural analysis, it is necessary to address the methodological challenges that arise in a global context and promote an interdisciplinary approach that allows for a more comprehensive understanding of organizational and business phenomena.

REFERENCES

- Althabe, G. (1999). Hacia una Antropología del presente. In *Antropología del presente* (pp. 11–21). Edicial.
- Augè, M. (1995). *Antropología de los mundos contemporáneos*. Gedisa.

- Augé, M., & Colleyn, J.-P. (2006). *Qué es la antropología*. Paidós.
- Baba, M. (2012). Anthropology and business: influence and interests. *Journal of Business Anthropology*, 1(1), 20-71.
- Baquero, A. F. (2006). Comentario sobre el Primer Congreso Latinoamericano de Antropología. *Memorias. Revista Digital de Historia y Arqueología desde el Caribe*, (4).
- Barfield, T. (Ed.). (2000). *Diccionario de Antropología*. Siglo XXI Editores.
- Barnes, J. (1980). Kinship studies: Some impressions of the current state of play. *Man*, 15(2), 293–303. doi:10.2307/2801672
- Barrett, J., & Stanford, P. (2006). Prediction. In S. Sarkar & J. Pfeifer (Eds.), *The philosophy of science: An encyclopedia* (pp. 585–599). Academic Press.
- Bernard, H. (2011). *Research methods in anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. AltaMira Press.
- Boyd, C., & Boyd, D. (2018). *Forensic anthropology*. Wiley. doi:10.1002/9781119226529
- Byrne, B., Harris, M., Consorte, J., & Lang, J. (1995). What's in a name? The consequences of violating Brazilian emic color-race categories in estimates of social well-being. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 51(4), 389–397. doi:10.1086/jar.51.4.3630144
- Cáceres-Rubio, F., & Villacrés-Chaparro, M. (2010). *Cultura organizacional y las fusiones empresariales*. Facultad de Psicología, Universidad de La Sabana. Disponible en: <http://intellectum.unisabana.edu.co/bitstream/handle/10818/4045/131294.pdf?sequence=1>
- Casey, C., & Edgerton, R. (Eds.). (2007). *A companion to psychological anthropology*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Cash, P., Stanković, T., & Štorga, M. (2016). *Experimental design research*. Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-33781-4
- Caulkins, D., & Jordan, A. T. (Eds.). (2013). *A Companion to Organizational Anthropology*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Cely-López, C. L., & Gómez-Niño, O. (2016). An anthropological perspective of organizations from sociocultural characterization, management, and social accounting. The case of a tertiary education institution. *Cuadernos de Contabilidad*, 17(43).
- Cerutti, M. (2003) Los estudios empresariales en América Latina ¿el debate interminable? *Boletín de Historia Económica*. Disponible en: https://www.audhe.org.uy/Boletin_Audhe/Boletin_2/Boletin_02_Cerutti.pdf
- Chapple, E. D. (1953). Applied anthropology in industry. In A. L. Kroeber (Ed.), *Anthropology Today*. Chicago University Press.
- Chibnik, M. (1999). Quantification and statistics in six anthropology journals. *Field Methods*, 11(2), 146–157. doi:10.1177/1525822X9901100205

Organizational Socio-Intercultural Anthropology

Clifford, J. (1988). *The Predicament of Culture*. Harvard U Press.

Cloutier, C., & Ravasi, D. (2020). Identity trajectories: Explaining long-term patterns of continuity and change in organizational identities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 63(4), 1196–1235. doi:10.5465/amj.2017.1051

Crapanzano, V. (1986). Hermes' dilemma: the masking of subversion in ethnographic description. In J. Clifford (Ed.), *Writing culture: the poetics and politics of ethnography* (pp. 51–76). University of California Press. doi:10.1525/9780520946286-005

Driver, H. (1953). Statistics in anthropology. *American Anthropologist*, 55(1), 42–59. doi:10.1525/aa.1953.55.1.02a00040

Dufour, P. (1995). Techno-Globalism and the Challenges to Science and Technology Policy. *Daedalus*, 124(3), 219–235.

Durand, J. (1986). *Lo obreros del Río Grande*. Colegio de Michoacán.

Ellen, R. (2010). Theories in anthropology and 'anthropological theory.'. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 16(2), 387–404. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9655.2010.01631.x

Ember, C., & Ember, M. (2009). *Crosscultural research methods*. AltaMira Press.

García de la Torre, C. (2007). Estudios sobre identidad y cultura en las organizaciones en América Latina. *Cuadernos de Administración*, 38, 21-51. Disponible en: <http://bibliotecadigital.univalle.edu.co/bitstream/10893/2151/1/ESTUDIOS%20SOBRE%20LA%20IDENTIDAD%20Y%20LA%20CULTURA.pdf>

Gauthey, F., Ratiu, I., Rodgers, I., & Xardel, D. (1988). *Leaders sans frontières: Le défi des différences*. McGraw-Hill.

Geertz, C. (1992). *La interpretación de las culturas*. Gedisa.

Geertz, C. (1996). Anti-antirrelativismo. In C. Geertz (Ed.), *Los usos de la diversidad* (pp. 93–127). Paidós.

Gessaghi, V. (2011) La experiencia etnográfica y la clase alta. ¿Nuevos desafíos para la antropología? *Boletín de Antropología y Educación*. Disponible en: <https://es.scribd.com/document/423538599/Laexperiencia-etnografica-y-la-clase-alta-nuevos-desafios-para-la-antropolog>

Gipolla, C. (2003). *Historia económica de la Europa preindustrial*. Crítica.

Gokcumen, Ö., Gultekin, T., Alakoc, Y., Tug, A., Gulec, E., & Schurr, T. (2011). Biological ancestries, kinship connections, and projected identities in four central Anatolian settlements: Insights from culturally contextualized genetic anthropology. *American Anthropologist*, 113(1), 116–131. doi:10.1111/j.1548-1433.2010.01310.x PMID:21560269

Gonnet, J. P. (2012). Cultura, organizaciones y antropología. Una revisión crítica. Avá (Posadas), *Revista de Antropología*, 21, 1-20. <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=169030268008>

- González, C., & Basaldúa, M. (2007) La formación de redes sociales en el estudio de actores y familias. Perspectiva de estudio en historia y antropología. In *Redes. Revista Hispana para el Análisis de Redes Sociales* (pp. 1-27). Disponible en: <https://revistes.uab.cat/redes/article/view/v12-n1-gonzalez-basaldua>
- Good, B. (1992). Culture and psychopathology: Directions for psychiatric anthropology. In T. Schwartz, G. White, & C. Lutz (Eds.), *New directions in psychological anthropology* (pp. 181–205). Cambridge University Press.
- Gravano, A. (1992). Antropología Práctica, muestra y posibilidades de la Antropología Organizacional. *Publicar en Antropología y Ciencias Sociales*, 1, 95-126.
- Gravano, A. (1995). La imaginación antropológica; interpelaciones a la otredad construida y al método antropológico. *Publicar en Antropología y Ciencias Sociales*, 4(5), 71-91.
- Gravano, A. (1997). La cultura organizacional como herramienta de mejoramiento. In *El marco del trabajo humano, distintas corrientes en el análisis institucional y organizacional* (pp. 71–76). Area de Estudios e Investigación en Ciencia, Cultura y Sociedad, Cultura de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires.
- Gravano, A. (2000). Plan urbano ambiental: el proceso participativo del plan. Anexo 4. Buenos Aires: GCBA.
- Gravano, A. (2005). *El barrio en la teoría social*. Espacio Editorial.
- Gravano, A. (compil.). (2005a). *Imaginario de la ciudad media: emblemas, fragmentaciones y otredades urbanas, estudios de Antropología Urbana*. FACSO y SCYT de la UNICEN: Consejo Editor de la UNICEN.
- Gravano, A. (2008a). *¿Vecinos o ciudadanos? el fenómeno NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard) o SPAN (Sí, Pero No Aquí) del imaginario urbano en un proceso de participación social y su tratamiento desde la facilitación organizacional antropológica*. Trabajo presentado en II Congreso de la Asociación Latinoamericana de Antropología (ALA), Universidad de Costa Rica, Simposio “Imaginario urbanos y participación social.”
- Gravano, A. (2008b). La cultura como concepto central de la Antropología. In *Apertura a la Antropología, alteridad, cultura, naturaleza humana*. Proyecto Editorial.
- Harris, M., Consorte, J., Lang, J., & Byrne, B. (1993). Who are the whites? Imposed census categories and the racial demography of Brazil. *Social Forces*, 72(2), 451–462. doi:10.2307/2579856
- Harrison-Conwill, G. (2014). Informal ethnography in the corporate workplace: Applying foundational research methods in professional life. *Practical Anthropology*, 36(2), 17–21. doi:10.17730/praa.36.2.4g331p0142864nl6
- Henrich, J., & Gil-White, F. (2001). The evolution of prestige: Freely conferred deference as a mechanism for enhancing the benefits of cultural transmission. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 22(3), 165–196. doi:10.1016/S1090-5138(00)00071-4 PMID:11384884
- Hernández, B. (2012). La selección de personal, algunas consideraciones frente a sus prácticas. *Semestre Económico*, 15(31), 173–186. doi:10.22395eec.v15n31a7

Organizational Socio-Intercultural Anthropology

Horowitz, M., Yaworsky, W., & Kickham, K. (2019). Anthropology's science wars: Insights from a new survey. *Current Anthropology*, 60(5), 674–698. doi:10.1086/705409

Inga, S. M. (2021). The Seven epistemological myths of anthropology *Rev. Epistemol. Psychol. Science. Soc.*, 4, 89-103.

Johnson, A. (1978). *Quantification in cultural anthropology*. Stanford University Press.

Kronenfeld, D., Bennardo, G., De Munck, V., & Fischer, M. (Eds.). (2011). *A companion to cognitive anthropology*. Wiley-Blackwell. doi:10.1002/9781444394931

Kunda, G. (1986). *Engineering culture: Control and commitment in a high-tech corporation*. Temple University Press.

Kuper, A., & Marks, J. (2010). Anthropologists unite! *Nature*, 470(7333), 166–168. doi:10.1038/470166a PMID:21307914

Lansing, S. (2002). 'Artificial societies' and the social sciences. *Artificial Life*, 8(3), 279–292. doi:10.1162/106454602320991864 PMID:12537687

Lansing, S. (2003). Complex adaptive systems. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 32(1), 183–204. doi:10.1146/annurev.anthro.32.061002.093440

Lende, D., & Downey, G. (Eds.). (2012). *The encultured brain: An introduction to neuroanthropology*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology. doi:10.7551/mitpress/9219.001.0001

Llanque Ferrufino, R. J. (2002). Redes sociales y cultura organizacional en entidades públicas. *Revista de Antropología Experimental*, 2. <http://www.ujae.es/huesped/rae/rae-02.pdf>

Lomnitz, L., & Pérez-Lizaur, M. (1993). *Una familia de la élite mexicana, parentesco, clase y cultura 1820-1890*. Alianza Editorial.

Lourau, R. (1979). *El análisis institucional*. Amorrortu.

Madrigal, L. (2012). *Statistics for anthropology*. Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139022699

Malinowski, B. (1944). *A scientific theory of culture and other essays*. University of North Carolina Press.

Mauksch, S. (2017). Managing the dance of enchantment: An *ethnography* of social entrepreneurship events. *School Organization*, 24(2), 133–153. doi:10.1177/1350508416644511

Mauss, M. (1925). The gift: Forms and functions of exchange in archaic societies. New York: Norton Library.

Menéndez, E. (2006). Participación social en salud: las representaciones y las prácticas. In E. Menéndez (Ed.), *Spinelli, H.: Participación social ¿para qué?* (pp. 81–115). Lugar Editorial.

Morden, T. (1999). Models of National Culture – Management Review. *Cross Cultural Management*, 6(1), 19–44. doi:10.1108/13527609910796915

Murdock, G. (1967). *Ethnographic Atlas*. University of Pittsburgh Press.

- Muthukrishna, M., Doebeli, M., Chudek, M., & Henrich, J. (2018). The cultural brain hypothesis: How culture drives brain expansion, sociality, and life history. *PLoS Computational Biology*, *14*(11), e1006504. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006504 PMID:30408028
- Nadel, S. (1953). Social control and self-regulation. *Social Forces*, *31*(3), 265–273. doi:10.2307/2574226
- Nadel, S. (1957). *The theory of social structure*. The Free Press of Glencoe.
- Nader, L. (Ed.). (2013). *Naked science: Anthropological inquiry into boundaries, power, and knowledge*. Routledge.
- Ortega, R. (2012). *Antropología Organizacional* (L. O. Vargas, Entrevistador). Academic Press.
- Peña, W. (2008). La etnografía, una metodología apropiada al diagnóstico de la responsabilidad social empresarial. *Univ. Empresa*, *7*(15), 177-183. Disponible en: <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/1872/187214457008.pdf>
- Pullen, A., Lewis, P., & Ozkazanc-Pan, B. (2019). A critical moment: 25 years of gender, work and organization. *Gender, Work and Organization*, *26*(1), 1–8. doi:10.1111/gwao.12335
- Reynoso, C. (2006). *Complejidad y caos: Una exploración antropológica*. Editorial Sb.
- Rivera, L. (2012). Hiring as cultural matching: The case of elite professional service firms. *American Sociological Review*, *77*(6), 999–1022. doi:10.1177/0003122412463213
- Roberts, K., & Grabowski, M. (1996). Organizations, Technology and Structuring. In *Handbook of Organization Studies* (pp. 409-423). Sage.
- Rosaldo, R. (1991). *Cultura y verdad, nueva propuesta de análisis social*. Grijalbo.
- Salali, G., Whitehouse, H., & Hochberg, M. (2015). A life-cycle model of human social groups produces a U-shaped distribution in group size. *PLoS One*, *10*(9), e0138496. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0138496 PMID:26381745
- SánchezE. (1997). <http://uam.academia.edu>
- Santos, M. J., & de Gortari, R. (2021). Familia y empresas un análisis desde la antropología social. *Telos: Revista de Estudios Interdisciplinarios en Ciencias Sociales*, *23*(3), 728–746. doi:10.36390/telos233.14
- Schneider, J., & Schneider, P. (2008). The anthropology of crime and criminalization. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *37*(1), 351–373. doi:10.1146/annurev.anthro.36.081406.094316
- Silva Santisteban, F. (2018). *Antropología*. Biblioteca de la Universidad de Lima.
- Smith, D. (1986). Institutional ethnography: A feminist method. *Resources for Feminist Research*, *15*(1), 6–13.
- Stoneking, M. (2017). *An introduction to molecular anthropology*. Wiley.
- Trujillo, J. T. E. (2010). Anthropology in Mexico and Spain: Industry, work, and organizations. *Journal of Anthropology and Sociology: Turns*, *12*, 197–226.

Organizational Socio-Intercultural Anthropology

Urban, G., & Koh, K. (2013). *Ethnographic research on modern business corporation*. *Annual Review Anthropology* (Vol. 42). Estados Unidos.,

Urrea, F., & Celis, J. (2016). Los estudios laborales en Colombia entre 1993 y 2014. In *Los estudios laborales en América Latina. Orígenes, desarrollo y perspectivas*. Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana – Iztapalapa y Anthropos Editorial.

Valentí, S. (2009). *Ideólogos, teorizantes y videntes*. Edward Burnett Tylor Recuperado 26/06/2018 de: <https://www.filosofia.org/aut/svc/index.htm>

Weeks, J. (2004). *Unpopular culture: The ritual of complaint in a British bank*. University of Chicago Press.

Williams, L., & Quave, K. (2019). *Quantitative anthropology*. Elsevier.

Wright, S. (Ed.). (2005). *Anthropology of organizations*. Routledge.