CROSS-CULTURAL MANAGEMENT:
A Multi Disciplinary Approach

Editors

Ogunbameru O. A. (Ph.D)
Adisa A. L. (Ph.D)
Adekeye D. S. (Ph.D)

CHAPTER 6

CULTURE AND GLOBALISATION

OYEKOLA Isaac Akintoyese

Chapter Objectives

After studying this chapter, readers should be able to:

- define culture and identify its characteristics,
- explain the two types of culture,
- understand what socialisation means,
- define globalisation,
- highlight the advantages and disadvantages of globalisation,
- identify various levels of analysing globalisation,
- outline the three possibilities of cultural analysis of globalisation and explain the contributions of scholars to each thesis.

Chapter Outline

- Introduction
- Culture: Definition, characteristics, and types
- Globalisation: definition, advantages and disadvantages
- Culture and globalisation: convergent, divergent and combination theses
- Chapter Exercises
- References

Introduction

Much attention has been drawn to the issues surrounding globalisation and culture in recent times especially since the beginning of the 21st century. The major concerns have been on the effects of globalisation in creating and preventing 'world culture' as well as on the contribution of culture in facilitating globalisation process. It should be noted from the onset that globalisation is both the cause and the consequence of cultural

diversities and cultural similarities. Therefore, the continuous widespread of cultures generates three possibilities. First, powerful culture dominates frail ones thereby giving room for stronger culture to reign while 'killing' weaker ones (convergent thesis). Second, cultural interaction leaves the distinctiveness of each culture untouched (or unaffected) thereby creating real gap among cultures of the world (divergent thesis). Third, cultural mixture engenders unique culture (combination thesis). To address these, the chapter begins with the general explanation of culture and globalisation before discussing the three possibilities of cultural spread across the globe.

Culture

The term is used in countless number of ways and definitional consensus of the concept was vague for years. Not until Edward B. Tylor's definition in the nineteenth century, scholars could not arrive at one general acceptable definition of culture. Even till now, culture remains one of the English words that is difficult to define and as a result, it remains contested. Culture is in a continuous state of fluctuation, change and development, and the understanding of the term has defied consensus among Sociologists and Anthropologists consequent upon the disagreement on what to include and what to exclude from the definition (Dam, 2006; Vesajoki, 2002). Anthropologist Edward Taylor's definition of culture will suffice to begin with in an attempt to provide workable definition of the term.

Tylor (1920, 1871), broadly defines culture as 'that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society. The distinctiveness of a group is revealed through their culture and it encompasses the totality of their being including perception, values, knowledge, language, customs, laws, symbols, material products, interactions with others and behaviours shared by a group of people that are dynamic and heterogeneous. Culture provides guidelines for people. Without these guidelines, society

will be in a chaotic state. Culture therefore defines people's way of life including their contributions and expectations in the society. Cultural contacts have been evident since human beings began to migrate to different culture. These continued interactions among societies had shaped culture and culture in turn had provided guidelines for human interaction. In other words, the dialectical relationship that exist between culture and human interaction has suggested only three possibilities – cultural similarities, cultural divergence and cultural hybridization – for the present and future world.

The role of socialisation in the continuity of any culture cannot be underrated as it helps to transfer culture from one generation to another. Simply put, the process of learning culture in any society is called socialisation. Every society defines means through which culture is passed down from generation to generation. This makes ways of acquiring and passing knowledge unique to every culture. For instance, the way a Yoruba elder will gather younger ones under a tree and teach them folktales, proverbs and myths differs from how a British tutor will organise a classroom, guided by rules and regulations, to pass knowledge to younger pupils.

Characteristics of culture
Culture possesses certain characteristics and these include:
- *Culture is Dynamic:* Culture changes through human interaction. For example, from the use of wood to the use of gas as means of cooking.
- *Culture is Transmissible:* Culture is capable of being passed to other generation. For instance, the idea of wearing clothes and many of the knowledge we have today were passed down to us.
- *Culture is Cumulative:* Culture is ongoing, depending on new challenges and opportunities. For instance, from the experience of manual world to digital world or from the knowledge of flat earth to spherical earth.
- *Culture is Adaptive:* Culture evolves over time. As humans grow, so does culture. For instance, knowledge is added to

accumulated ones as days go by and future coming to reality.

- *Culture is Relative:* Culture differs from one region to another. For instance, incest as a taboo in Yorubaland is not a taboo in other regions such as Egypt where incest is mandated to preserve royal family.
- *Culture is Social in Character:* Culture can be communicated. It is part and parcel of us. For instance, the act of teaching younger children how to write shows social nature of culture, as it involves interaction.

Types of Culture

Culture has two components: material and non-material. Material culture refers to all man-made products that can be seen and touched including the paper with you, the laptop you operate on, the cup you use to take water, the house you live in, and many other visible materials around you created by man. As it will soon be explained, it is majorly the material culture that champions the globalisation process. On the other hand, non-material culture refers to all aspects of human life that can neither be seen nor touched such as laws, beliefs, language, norms, and values. In fact, this type of culture controls human life more.

Globalisation

Globalisation is simply the spread of culture across nations. Boli and Lechner (2001), define globalisation as the expansion of worldwide flows of material objects and symbols, and the proliferation of organisations and institutions of global reach that structure those flows. In other words, it refers to the interchange of views, values, norms and practices across nations of the world. As much as it is somewhat difficult for Anthropologists to arrive at an all-encompassing definition of culture, so it is for scholars to give a convergent meaning of globalisation. This is because globalisation is an inter-disciplinary concept creating diversities of views among academics. It is no longer a doubt that globalisation has put a landmark, at least, in one part of every discipline and more importantly, every culture. Although the concept of globalisation

attracts serious attention in recent times, it is barely fresh in human history. Its manifestation in this present dispensation differs markedly from the way it was in the early times.

In ancient times, people hardly moved beyond few cultures probably because of small scale production and poor means of transportation. During the Middle Ages however, it requires days or months to trade with distant cultures across the known areas of the globe. Modern age globalisation can be said to have started with the Industrial Revolution in the late 18th century. Now, it only requires few seconds to learn about the culture of other nations of the world. Greater connection now exists among (Post-)modern people of the world than they previously were. It is easier for one nation to spread democracy to other nations and for crude oil to be sold to other parts of the world than ever before. All these are the outcome of globalisation which has become a major tidal wave that cannot be stopped. Although some see these as threats to some nations, it is not without its own advantages.

Advantages of Globalisation
- *Globalisation Brings about Cultural Proximity:* Globalisation brings cultures together. People, companies and organisations in different nations can live and work together. Goods, money and ideas can be exchanged faster and cheaper than ever before. Modern Information and Communication Technology such as the Internet, cell phones or satellite TV has made this possible.
- *Globalisation Encourages Trading:* With growing globalisation, trades among nations have been made very easier than ever before in human history. A Chinese company can produce goods in Nigeria and then sell in Ghana. Multinational companies have branches around the world bringing foreign goods to the locales (or extending local goods to the foreigners).
- *Globalisation Encourages Comparative Cost Advantage:* Globalisation has made it possible for countries to specialise more in the goods they can produce at cheaper

prices: this is comparative cost advantage. For instance, if Nigeria can produce rice higher than the price of imported one, it is advisable for her to specialise in another product(s) that can be produced at cheaper price and resort to importing rice. This act is only made possible through globalisation.

- *Globalisation Reduces Prices of Goods:* Consequent upon comparative cost advantage being adopted by nations of the world, goods and services are sold at cheaper rates. As a result, consumers also benefit from globalisation. This is due to the fact that rational consumers would seek for the goods with low prices.

- *Globalisation Increases the Quality of a Product:* As a result of high competition**,** companies try to get the attentions of their customers through the production of high quality products. Not that local competition cannot enrich the quality of product, rather, global competition improves the quality the more. This is only made possible through globalisation. Therefore, not only does globalisation reduces prices, it also increases quality.

- *Globalisation Provides Larger Market:* In fact, the search for market led to the desperate navigation of the Europeans and the eventual discovery of New World. With globalisation, sellers have opportunities of selling their products not only at the local markers, but also at the international markets, thereby extending seller's territory and by implication, increasing profit margin.

- *Globalisation Provides Employment Opportunities:* This can be considered one of the major benefits of globalisation. This is because multinational companies establish branches in (almost) all parts of the world. People can work in these companies, transfer to another company, both within and outside the country, thereby further encouraging globalisation and in turn, encouraging more job opportunities. With globalisation, more jobs can be created.

- *Globalisation Makes Education Easier and Faster:* People can learn easier, faster and more conveniently in this modern age globalisation. Apart from the importance of Internet in acquiring knowledge across the world, people can as well easily move to other countries to seek for knowledge. This has encouraged cultural globalisation since people from different parts of the world come together to exchange knowledge. The beneficiaries to this importance of globalisation are mostly people from developing countries who travel abroad in search of better educational opportunities.

- *Globalisation Enhances Communication:* Before now, communication among people was limited by space. However, the invention of communication technology such as the Internet, cell phones, *et cetera* and its eventual spread across the globe has made it possible for the happenings in one locality to easily be communicated to the other. Moreover, global communication, like never before, has made life easier and better especially while considering its importance in relationship, business, among other aspects of life. It should be noted that without globalisation, these communication technologies would not have been possibly spread across the globe.

Disadvantages of Globalisation

- *Globalisation Creates Unemployment:* Although it is true that globalisation provides employment opportunities, it also causes unemployment in industrialised countries because firms move their factories to places where they can get cheaper workers. In the process of employing workers at cheaper prices, under-employment is being created. In like manner, in the process of moving factories to other places, people find it difficult to get jobs. Either way, people's conditions are not always palatable, as firms move their factories from one location to another.

- *Globalisation Causes Environmental Problems:* With globalisation, firms now find it more convenient to build

their factories in places that are more suitable for their establishment without considering the adverse effects of their existence in such environment. For instance, trees need to be cut down before factories are built; thereby leading to deforestation: a condition that is highly detrimental to humanity. Of course, one thing is more important to these companies: profit. Whether they perform their social responsibilities or not is not germane to them.

- *Globalisation brings about the Underdevelopment of Third World Countries and Development of First World Countries:* In his book *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa,* Walter Rodney (1972) puts forward many arguments on how the development of some nations was made possible through the underdevelopment of others. In other words, 'developed' countries have continued to develop at the detriment of the 'underdeveloped' countries. This case of the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer came about as a result of globalisation. Many countries in Africa, Central America and Asia are more at loosing ends; although this may change in the nearest future.

- *Globalisation Causes Health Problems:* With easy exportation and importation of humans, animals, and plants, from one nation to the other, diseases and other health problems can easily be spread alongside. Globalisation has also led to incursion of diseases especially deadly ones such as HIV/AIDS and Ebola.

- *Globalisation Increases Inequality:* One of the problems of the twenty-first century is increasing inequality, not only between individuals, but also among nations of the world. Capitalism which benefits bourgeoisie to the disadvantage of the proletariat is now happening at the global level. Wealth are now concentrated at the centre, while the periphery continues to receive crumbs. It is the general feeling that for capitalists, globalisation is a great benefit, while for workers, it is hell. This issue of inequality has reached its climax so much that it has been included as one

of the Sustainable Development Goals (SGDs) to be achieved in not-too-distant future.

- *Globalisation Erodes Cultural Authenticity:* Erosion of cultural authenticity is one of the complaints levied against globalisation. For example, the authors of the report on *Alternatives to Economic Globalisation* claim that 'Corporate logos replace authentic local cultures as the primary source of personal identity' (see also Patrick, Howard, & Matthew, 2000). Also, Manfred (2003) decries McDonaldization and asserts that in the long run, the McDonaldization of the world amounts to the imposition of uniform standards that eclipse human creativity and dehumanize social relations. Globalisation is perpetrating a kind of cultural genocide on the world—that the largest, most dominant cultures are becoming larger and more dominant at the expense of many others. With an objective examination of the current world, few will disagree that global culture has had tremendous effects on local cultures; only time will tell the extent of such impacts.

Culture and Globalisation

Economic and political explanations of globalisation will not suffice to capture the real essence of globalisation. Vesajoki (2002), once agreed that globalisation cannot continue to be exclusively defined in terms of economic and political development; rather, its social and cultural effects must also be addressed. Therefore, and after thorough review of literature, globalisation can be analysed economically, politically and culturally (see also Ritzer, 2011). This chapter's attention shall however be drawn to cultural analysis of globalisation. At this level of analysis, global interaction of cultures can produce three possibilities: cultural homogenization, cultural heterogenization and cultural hybridization.

Cultural Homogenisation (or Convergent Thesis)

The preaching of this thesis is simple – all cultures are heading toward sameness. In other words, globalisation spreads culture to

other parts of the world. As cultures interact, one lives and the other dies (just as weaker iron bends for the other when they meet). The prevailing culture survives until stronger one sets it down. Continuous cultural contacts result in fewer dominant cultures until one powerful culture finally dominate all cultures throughout the whole world. It is based on the idea that globalisation is leading to increasing uniformity throughout the world (Ritzer, 2011). This argument seems simple, it is a continuous process especially as we see the world converging towards 'global capitalism', 'McDonaldization', and 'world culture' (Boli & Lechner, 2005). At its extreme, globalisation becomes 'Westernization', especially 'Americanization' (de Grazia, 2005; Marling, 2006).

Indeed, there had been global flow of cultures for centuries. Nonetheless, it was only in the second part of the nineteenth century that a worldwide cultural intricate took an organised dimension to constitute an evolving world culture. Boli and Lechner (2001), consider the primary locus of this nascent world culture to be Europe, especially the powerful Western European countries whose empires extended to most corners of the globe. This early version of world culture was spread by agents such as missionaries, traders, military expeditions, colonialists, intellectuals, and travelers. Nevertheless, in the 1970s, the content of world culture increasingly changed from Anglo-European to USA domination. By the 1980s, world-cultural structuration had produced largely standardised global models for an enormous range of activities in science, medicine, health, business, technology, even recreation and leisure (sports, tourism, and entertainment for examples). The outcome is a powerful force towards cultural homogenisation, a kind in which every culture is looking like one culture. What follow is the major proponent of this thesis.

McDonaldization

George Ritzier (1983) championed this thesis in his article entitled *The McDonalization of Society*. According to him, McDonalization means the process by which the principles of fast-food restaurant

(McDonald), with its origin in America, come to dominate more sectors of the world. While Max Weber focuses on bureaucracy and the rationalization of the West, George Ritzer emphasises fast-food restaurant and the McDonaldization of the world, leading to growing cultural uniformity. What are actually spreading are McDonaldization's basic principles: efficiency, calculability, predictability, technological control, and irrationality of rationality.

- *Efficiency* is employing best possible means to achieve desired end. In a McDonaldizing society, both employees and customers act efficiently; in fact, one's efficiency triggers efficiency from the other. Rules and regulations guide the efficiency of both employees and customers. For instance, employees serve meals and customers eat their meals efficiently.

- With *calculability*, McDonaldization emphasises quantity, rather than quality. Every activity is under watch; no waste of time. Both employees and customers are on fast lane. As time is allotted to every meal to be prepared, customers have time-limit to spend in the restaurant. Even if customer desire to stay longer, there are measures in place to ensure such impossibility; although without customers' knowledge. The rationale behind this is that any waste of time reduces profitability.

- In a McDonaldised system, the actions of both employees and customers are *predictable*. There are routines to follow. Customers are welcomed and thanked when leaving, following a script. Customers know when, where and how to seek for assistance and employees know how to respond to customers' requests. This makes behaviours pretty much the same geographically and historically.

- Moreover, employees' and customers' actions are also under great control, through *technological control*. Machines determine when fries are done and customers may not be able to request for well-done fries.

- Finally, the principle of *irrationality of rationality* emphasises the shortcomings of both employees and customers that unavoidably accompany McDonaldization.

In an attempt to achieve efficiency (best possible means), inefficiency often sets in (such as long queue). Ritzer (2011), identified dehumanization (of both employees and customers) as the ultimate form of irrationality.

Current trend in the world indeed shows that 'McDonald's restaurants', along with its principles, have spread to virtually all over the world and many sophisticated McDonaldized firms (outside of the fast-food industry) have had success globally.

Grobalization

Ritzer (2011), differentiated between 'nothing' (lacking unique content) and 'something' (rich in distinctive form); and defined grobalization as simply globalisation of 'nothing'. He agrees that the world is heading towards sameness but that the content of such increasing homogeneity is empty. In other words, not all aspects of culture are being replaced by dominant cultures. The aspects being conquered are mostly the ones that are not rich in content. According to him, globalisation of 'something' are more likely to conflict with some cultures' local contents.

Conversely, globalization of 'nothing' are less likely to conflict with local contents. The reason being that grobalization is easier to replicate and relatively inexpensive to reproduce. He identified *'nonspaces'* (structures that are largely empty of content e.g. shopping malls being found in many countries such as Shoprite); *'nonthings'* (objects such as debit card that work virtually same way for all its users all over the world), *'nonpeople'* (employees in customer care service who interact with customers in much almost the same way all over the world, relying on scripts); and *'nonservcies'* (or the services provided by ATMs where customers do all the work required to obtain the service) as good examples of grobalization. Since these are present in more and more countries, then we have the indication of grobalization of nothing in particular and of increasing cultural homogenisation in general.

Cultural Heterogenisation (or Divergent Thesis)

This thesis emphasises continuous cultural differentialism as globalisation becomes more evident in human history. World culture is not only a homogenizing force; it also engenders and supports diversity and differentiation (Boli & Lechner, 2001). Lasting differences exist among cultures and these have capacity of standing in opposition to one another. Since core culture is largely, if not entirely, unaffected by globalisation (Ritzer, 2011), the influence of one culture on the other only occur on the surface. The proponents of this thesis therefore are not stressing cultural passivity, rather, they argue that only the core cultures remain unaffected by the waves of globalisation. Ritzer (2011), identifies two major currents of the 21st centuries that support this cultural heterogenisation, or what Samuel Huntington called 'clash of civilizations.' One is the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, and the subsequent wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Second is the increasing multiculturalism, leading to the vast differences and enmity between majority and minority populations in both the United States (largely the growth of the Hispanic population) and western European countries (largely the growing Muslim populations).

Divergent view of cultural globalisation was recognised lately. According Boli and Lechner (2001), up till 1970s, most academic analysts interpreted globalisation as essentially equivalent to homogenizing Americanization. Since then however, cultural heterogenisation has gained scholars' attentions as cultures continue to mix with other cultures. Subsequent sections discuss the key proponents of this thesis.

Samuel Huntington

Harvard University Professor Samuel Huntington's *Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (1996), is arguable the most famous and controversial example of this thesis. In one of his articles, Huntington writes:

> *"...The fundamental source of conflict in this new world will not be primarily ideological or primarily*

economic. The great divisions among humankind and the dominating source of conflict will be cultural. ...the principal conflicts of global politics will occur between nations and groups of different civilizations. The clash of civilizations will dominate global politics." (Huntington, 1993).

Huntington defines a civilisation as the highest cultural grouping of people and the broadest level of cultural identity people have. According to him, contact among civilisations for the past 3000 years (1500BC – 1500AD) was limited but intense. However, after 1500AD till just before the First World War, the West was dominating the global scene. Clash (especially in terms of political ideologies) between civilisations started when other civilisations revolted against and desired to put forth alternative measures to the increasing spread of Western domination. With the decline in the communist ideology, Huntington posited that 'clash around the world now centres on religion, cultures and ultimately civilisations' (see Ritzer, 2011:582). Huntington divides the world into major cultural groups including Western, Confucian, Japanese, Islamic, Hindu, Slavic-Orthodox, Latin American, and African civilisations. What lies at the heart of his thesis is the idea that future world will be divided, not along economic and political lines, but along rifts between these competing cultures of the world. Two of these can be identified. First is the Sinic civilisation resulting in increasing (economic) power of the East over the West. Seeing the current development, very few will disagree on the view that the economy of the East will overtake that of the West in not too distant future. Second is the rebirth of Islam resulting in global revitalization of religion. This is capable of standing against modernisation. Huntington foresees the declining power of the West if: first, it fails to reaffirm its identity as a Western, instead of multi-civilisational nation; and second, if it fails to renounce universalism and accept only Western civilisation.

Benjamin Barber

Another most significant contribution to the divergent thesis is Benjamin Barber's (1992) *Jihad vs. McWorld*. He identified four imperatives that make up the dynamic of McWorld: Market, resource, information-technology and ecological imperatives. These imperatives are unique not only to one culture, but to virtually all cultures of the world. *Market imperative* emphasises the desire for one market (especially after the Renaissance up till the writings of Karl Max and Vladimir Lenin on world capitalism), whereby nations of the world meet to trade. *Resource imperative* sees the need for interdependence of nations as a result of their inability to meet all their needs independently: this (will) eventually leads to the forming of global interaction. *Information-technology imperative* is becoming more universalizing. The production and propagation of virtually all aspects of culture have been supported by the use of machines (computer in particular). The outcome of these imperatives bring about *ecological imperative* whereby environmental problems are being experienced worldwide.

Although the title of his work might suggest the resurgence of Jihad or Holy War (1804–1811), what was in the heart of Barber was nothing of such, rather 'the rebellion of embattled peoples and cultures worldwide against the imposition of aggressive Western mercantilism, denoted by Barber as 'McWorld' (John, 2004). Barber (1992), describes McWorld as anti-politics of globalism (involving) the bureaucratic, technocratic, and meritocratic, focused on the administration of things – with people, however, among the chief things to be administered.' Jihad is Barber's antithesis of McWorld, emphasising local identity, sense of community, and solidarity among neighbours and countrymen. The downside of Jihad is that it is intensely nationalist, parochial, and exclusionary (SUNY LEVIN Institute, 2013). Therefore, unlike Huntington who sees clashes between civilisations, Barber sees the battle as one between Jihad (or anti-globalising movement tied together by core traditional values) and McWorld (or the forces of globalisation).

Barber is deeply cynical of reform efforts that merely fiddle at the margins of globalisation. Many governments and academics are inclined to try to ameliorate problems on a case-by-case basis. As an alternative, Barber speculates,

> *"The most attractive democratic ideal in the face of the brutal realities of Jihad and the dull realities of McWorld will be a confederal union of semi-autonomous communities smaller than nation-states, tied together into regional economic associations and markets larger than nation-states.... The Green movement adage 'think globally, act locally' would actually come to describe the conduct of politics."*

Note here the difference between Huntington's and Barber's thinking. While the former sees lasting conflict occurring between nations and groups of different civilisations, the later sees these groups (e.g. semi-autonomous communities) forming confederal union that will champion 'democratic ideal in the face of the brutal realities of Jihad and the dull realities of McWorld'. Barber concludes that the successful evolution of democracy from pre-democratic states can only be accomplished if the nascent nations are protected from the corrosive effects of both Jihad and McWorld.

Tyler Cowen

Cowen (2002), also recognises heterogeneity over time as a kind to which protectors of "authentic" culture seem hostile. The core message of Tyler Cowen is that globalisation promotes diversity and it gives people greater opportunity to express their 'creative inspiration'. Without the spread of culture across the globe, diversity (within culture) will not be possible since people will be limited by the choices presented to them by their 'authentic' culture. However, when one culture has contact with alien or new culture, diversities (within culture) grows but that of across culture shrinks. Cultural globalisation tends to favour diversity within culture, but block diversity across cultures. This kind of diversity

must therefore be experienced by other group(s) for it to be significant; otherwise, it stands the chance of being nugatory. According to Palmer (2004), mere diversity that is not experienced by anyone is by itself of no value to human life. What this means is simple: diversity will be beneficial only when members of other groups experience such diversity.

Thomas Friedman

In his book *The Lexus and the Olive Tree,* Friedman (2000) sees globalisation as a ground system that has come to replace the Cold War system (unfriendly political relationship especially between United State of America [USA] and Union of Soviet Socialist Republic [USSR]) with which he evinces the relationship between the two world super powers (USA and USSR). According to him, this globalisation integrates markets, nation-states and technologies to a degree never experienced before. He makes observations about the likely conflict between '*the Lexus'* and '*the Olive Tree*'. Lexus represents sustenance, progress and modernisation writ large. The Olive Tree signifies our roots and identities. He sees this conflicting interaction between *the Lexus* and *the Olive Tree* to be the effect of the present form of globalisation. Some people think globalisation is a choice and that it can be reversed, that is not true for Thomas Friedman. According to him, globalisation, especially this contemporary form, is inevitable, unlike the earlier forms of globalisation where choice was possible among the concerned agents.

Friedman (2000) identified two groups in this new system: countries and states are but one group of shaping entities, the other being what he called super market (key global financial centres) and super empowered individuals who carry enough weight to have global influence of their own. The success of the former therefore depends largely on the driving force of the latter. As a globalist, Friedman argues, one needs to understand politics, culture, national security, financial markets, technologies and environmental aspects. All these have effects of a golden straitjacket on government, in which economic matters take

primacy over all others including politics: this is 'anti-politics of globalism.' The golden straitjacket is the defining political-economic garment of this globalisation era. Here, when a country puts on its golden straitjacket, its economy get bigger and its politics grow smaller.

Thomas Friedman did not fail to suggest a way forward for maximal use of this Golden Straitjacket. Successful participation in this new global system requires adherence to this new set of competitive rules, the Golden Straitjacket. In other words, 'to fit into the Golden Straitjacket a country must either adopt, or be seen as moving toward, the following golden rules: making the private sector the primary engine of its economic growth, maintaining a low rate of inflation and price stability, shrinking the size of its state bureaucracy, maintaining as close to a balanced budget as possible, if not a surplus, eliminating and lowering tariffs on imported goods, removing restrictions on foreign investment, getting rid of quotas and domestic monopolies, increasing exports, privatizing state-owned industries and utilities, deregulating capital markets, making its currency convertible, opening its industries, stock and bond markets to direct foreign ownership and investment, deregulating its economy to promote as much domestic competition as possible, eliminating government corruption, subsidies and kickbacks as much as possible, opening its banking and telecommunications systems to private ownership and competition and allowing its citizens to choose from an array of competing pension options and foreign-run pension and mutual funds'. When all these are put together, then a country can have fitted Golden Straitjacket yielding economic expansion with narrow political alternatives.

Cultural Hybridization (Combination Thesis)
While some scholars argue for the obliteration of local cultures in place of more dominant one – convergent thesis; others decry such claim, instead, accentuate the increasing relevance of local cultures leading to perpetual disparity between cultures – divergent thesis. Still some others favour creative adaptation, as local cultures

integrate new cultural elements while retaining their core cultures – hybridization thesis (see Appadurai, 1996; Boli & Lechner, 2001). This mixture of global and local cultures produces 'unique hybrid cultures that are not reducible to either the local or the global culture' (Ritzer, 2011, p. 588). Roland Robertson (2001) calls this process "*glocalization*".

Major Proponent

The work of Arjun Appadurai (1996), truly open academics' eyes to the possibility, and even the reality, of cultural combination thesis. Global situation is interactive rather than singly dominated (Jason & Rebecca, 2011) or distinctively differentiated. We no longer see the continuous possibility of Americanization, Japanization or Inedonesianization; rather we now have AmeriChina, ChinaNiger or even AmeriJapanChina. Global flow of culture takes on distinctive meaning after contact with local cultures. This is exactly Appadurai's argument in his explanation of his new vocabulary – *'-scapes'*. He explains dialectical theory of globalisation in his cultural flow studies. According to him, these *-scapes* carry on different meanings as they land on different geography (or more specifically different culture). This is made possible because of the fluidity, irregularity and variability of the *–scapes* as they flow across the globe or even over other *-scapes*.

In '*Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimension of Globalization',* Appadurai (1996) describes five "landscapes" through which '*– scapes*' flow on a global scale. He sees global flow, not as homogenizing force, but as ever changing and flowing ethno-, techno-, finance-, media- and ideo- (all) -scapes. *Ethnoscapes* constitute ever moving refugees, tourists, immigrants, exiles, guest-workers and other moving persons. *Technoscapes* involves the flow of both mechanical and informational technology across borders that were previously resistant to such movement. *Finanscapes* refers to the flow of capital: through currency markets, national stock exchanges, and commodity speculations, swiftly across nation-states. *Mediascapes* is the transmission and production of information around the world as well as the images

that these media disseminate. *Ideoscapes* like mediascapes, are concatenations of images, especially and largely political images, often produced by states or by very strong movement that wish their voices to be heard. It should be noted that in Appadurai's landscapes, (virtually) no nation has control over these flows. Also, these global flows occur not only through the landscapes but also increasingly in and through the *disjunctures* among them (Ritzer, 2011:590). Although these –*scapes* flow across the world thereby tending towards producing a homogenised world; the –*scapes* have different effects in various cultures, leading to heterogenised world. This eventually results in the creation of unique combined cultures in different nations across the globe.

Chapter Exercises
1. What are the roles of culture in the contemporary world societies?
2. The benefits of globalisation outweigh its defects. Discuss.
3. Explain the three possibilities of cultural spread across the globe with special emphasis on the major proponents of each thesis.

REFERENCES
Alternatives to Economic Globalization [A Better World is Possible], *A Report of the International Forum on Globalization*, p. 71.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization.* Menneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Barber, B. R. (1992). Jihad vs McWorld. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 269(3), 53-65.

Boli, J. and Lechner, F. J. (2001). Globalization and World Culture. *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences*. Elsevier Science Ltd.

Boli, J. and Lechner, F. J. (2005). *World Culture: Origin and Consequences.* New York: Blackwell.

Cowen, T. (2002). *Creative Destruction: How Globalization is Changing the World's Cultures*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, p. 15.

Dam, S. (2006). *Legal Systems as Cultural Rights: A Rights' Based Approach to Traditional Legal Systems Under the Indian Constitution,* 16 Ind. Int'l and Comp. L. Rev. 295, 311.

Friedman, T. (2000). *Understanding Globalization: The Lexus and the Olive Tree*. New York, USA: Anchor Books, a division of Random House, Inc.

de Grazia, V. (2005). *Irrespective Empire: America's Advance through Twentieth-Century Europe*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, Belknap Press.

Huntington, S. P. (2006). *The Clash of Civilization and the Making of World Order*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Huntington, Samuel P. (1993). The Clash of Civilization. *Foreign Affairs*, 72(3), 22.

Jason, L. P. and Rebecca, S. (2011). Revisiting Appadurai: Globalizing Scapes in a Global World – the Pervasiveness of Economic and Cultural Power. *International Journal of Innovative Interdisciplinary Research*, Issue 1. University of Central Lansashire, United Kingdom.

John, N. C. (2004). Benjamin R. Barber's "Jihad vs McWorld". *Book Reviews*. http://www.axisoflogic. come/artman/publish/article_13740.shtml. Nov 19,01:42.

Manfred, B. S. (2003). *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 71.

Marling, W. H. (2006). *How American is Globalization?* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Palmer, T. G. (2004). Globalization and Culture: Homogeneity, Diversity, Identity, Liberty. *Occasional Paper 2*. The liberal Institute of the Friedrich Naumann Foundation, Truman-Haus, Berlin.

Patrick, O'Meara, Howard, D. M. and Matthew, K. (2000). *Culture Wars, The Economist*, September 12, 1998, reprinted in *Globalization and the Challenges of a New Century*, ed. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. pp. 454-460.

Ritzer, G. (1983). The McDonalization of Society. *Journal of American Culture,* 6, 100-107.

Ritzer, G. (2011). *Sociological Theory*. Eight Edition. New York: McGraw Hill.

Robertson, R. (2001). Globalization Theory 2000+: Major Problematics. In George Ritzer and Berry Smart (eds.) Handbook of Social Theory. London: Sage. 458-471.

Rodney, W. (1972). *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. Abuja: Panaf Publishing, Inc. Nigeria by arrangement with Howard University Press, Washington D. C.

SUNY LEVIN Institute (2013). *Culture and globalization*. A project of SUNY LEVIN Institute. www.globalization101.org.

Tylor, E. (1920; 1871). *Primitive Culture*. New York: J. P. Putnam Sons.

Vesajoki, F. (2002). *The Effect of Globalization on Culture: A Study of the Experiences of Globalization among Finnish Travellers*. Cultural Anthropology Masters Thesis, University of Jyvaskyla, Department of Ethnology, Jyvaskyla.

Cite:

Oyekola, I. A. (2018). Culture and Globalisation. In O. A. Ogunbameru, A. L. Adisa & D. S. Adekeye (Eds.), *Cross-Cultural Management: A Multi Disciplinary Approach* (pp. 81-102). Ile-Ife, Nigeria: Obafemi Awolowo University Press.

About the Book

The book, *Cross-cultural Management: A Multidisciplinary Approach,* provides an astounding acuity into the understanding of management across culture and disciplines. The book argues that management goes beyond just running an entity, and that cross-culture does not necessarily mean international culture. Rather, the existence of cultural differences within and between countries usually make managers to experience cross-cultural challenges. Therefore, the rationale of the twenty-seven chapters in the book is to contribute to the field of cross-cultural management and to demonstrate how cultural diversity is best managed.

Organisations believe in diversity because it can help them to tackle diverse set of problems. The book therefore employs scholars of varied disciplines to demonstrate that cultural differences can be an asset, and not necessarily a liability.

The book aids management practices among managers in general, and especially those working across culture. The book also serves as a guide to policy makers seeking to address cross-cultural issues. The general public can also gain good knowledge of the challenges and remedies of cross-cultural management through the book.