This is a repository copy of *Within, in-between, out-of-bounds? Locating researcher positionalities in multicultural marketplaces*.

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Within, in-between, out-of-bounds? Locating researcher positionalities in multicultural marketplaces

Eva Kipnis[1], Gaye Bebek[2], Aurélie Brőckerhoff[3]

Forthcoming in: Journal of Business Research

[1] Corresponding author: Sheffield University Management School, The University of Sheffield, Conduit Road, Sheffield, S10 1FL, UK. Email: Eva.Kipnis@sheffield.ac.uk.

[2] De Montfort University Department of Economics and Marketing, De Montfort University, Leicester, UK. Email: gaye.bebek@dmu.ac.uk.

[3] Centre for Trust Peace and Social Relations (CTPSR), Coventry University, IV5 Innovation Village, Cheetah Road, Coventry, CV1 2TL. Email: Aurelie.Broeckerhoff@coventry.ac.uk.

Within, in-between, out-of-bounds? Locating researcher positionalities in multicultural marketplaces

Abstract

Culturally heterogenous and globally interconnected societies represent complex and fluid research fields, in which the multiple and dynamic identity affiliations of researchers intersect with those of research collaborators, contributors and with wider contextual factors. These intersections can shift and distort researchers' cultural positionality stances. Researcher positionality dynamics and complexities thus pose unique benefits and challenges to epistemological, methodological and ethical aspects of contemporary cultural research within consumer realities. Yet, marketing and consumer research literature lacks frameworks that denote and explicate the dynamic and complex nature of researchers' cultural positionalities. This paper examines the potential implications of cultural positionality complexity and dynamics for cultural research and develops sensitizing considerations for determining and operationalizing cultural positionalities in individual and collaborative research in multicultural marketplaces.

Within, in-between, out-of-bounds? Locating researcher positionalities in multicultural marketplaces

1. Introduction and Motivation

The seminal article by Craig and Douglas (2006) foretold the profound challenge of conceptually characterizing, studying and engaging with the culturally complex and fluid environments of contemporary consumer markets. The fields of marketing and consumer research, as well as marketing practice and education, are called upon to recognize that many market environments have evolved into multicultural marketplaces (Demangeot et al., 2019). A multicultural marketplace is characterized by intra-national cultural heterogeneity, inter-spatial, inter-community and inter-personal interconnectedness. As multiple cultural meanings systems co-exist, interact and intertwine, gradual yet ongoing change to existing or new, emerging cultural entities and realities occurs (Cleveland, 2018; Demangeot et al., 2015a, 2015b; Morris et al., 2015). In the context of consumer cultures, these conditions manifest as individuals and communities harboring, negotiating and enacting multiple cultural affiliations (Khan et al., 2018; Kipnis et al., 2019; Rogan et al., 2018). They situate these affiliations within imagined and real, transterritorialized (transcending geopolitical locales' boundaries), deterritorialized (de-coupled from geopolitical locales) and (re)territorialized (linked to geopolitical locales) cultural meanings systems and spaces – such as, for example, transnational diaspora, transcultural religion and global citizenship; or national, regional, and urban/rural communities (Askegaard et al., 2005; Cruz et al., 2018; Kumar & Steenkamp, 2013; Strizhakova et al., 2008).

The contextual shift to multicultural marketplaces requires frameworks and methodological approaches that enable researchers to operate – conceptually and empirically – across cultural and spatial borders as they examine how differential situatedness of people's cultural realities impacts their engagement in consumption. A burgeoning stream of recent

studies re-appraises established theoretical lenses and advances new frameworks to make sense of consumer cultures in these culturally complex and dynamic market landscapes. Bartsch et al. (2016) comprehensively review constructs reflecting positive consumer dispositions towards non-local cultural entities (foreign countries, global culture) to offer a decision-making framework for selecting constructs relevant to the frame (e.g., global vs country) and scope (e.g., general vs consumption) of the research problem. Castilhos et al. (2017) and Giovanardi and Lucarelli (2018) delineate characteristics of spatiality for studying cultural dynamics and actor relationships in consumer markets, offering frameworks for selecting and applying dimensions relevant to a given study's focus, to 'sail through' different types of space conceptions (Giovanardi & Lucarelli, 2018). These advances provide theoretical navigation to understand and ontologically situate consumption phenomena across the heterogenous, interconnected and fluid landscapes of multicultural marketplaces. Yet, extending Giovanardi and Lucarelli's (2018) metaphor of sailing, having a compass on board is not all that makes a ship sail; the ship's crew (in our case, the researchers) also determine the route and conditions of a research journey. In this paper, we contribute to the endeavors of equipping marketing and consumer scholars with tools for theoretical and methodological orientation when studying contemporary consumer cultures by unpacking the complexities of how researchers frame and operationalize their cultural positionalities in multicultural marketplace contexts.

Researcher cultural positionality (RCP) denotes an identity standpoint(s) of a given researcher as belonging (or not) to a given cultural community, entity and/or space. Explicit determination and management of RCP is necessary as cultural (non)belonging shapes the "ontological and epistemological stance, a starting point for action" towards focal cultural phenomena and engagement with research fields, having potential to produce blind spots, biases or contestations in how the researcher deploys cultural knowledge (Leitner et al., 2008 p.163). Extant guidelines for delineating and managing RCP in marketing and consumer studies are predominantly based on determinations of researchers' (non)native or (non)local

identity status in relation to nation states (Buil et al., 2012; Engelen & Brettel, 2011). However, cultural heterogeneity and global interconnectedness render such determinations unhelpful. By virtue of living and working in multicultural marketplaces, researchers are perhaps even more likely than their research subjects to negotiate complex cultural affiliations (Craig & Douglas, 2011). Hence, RCP requires a multidimensional reading to account for both social and spatial aspects of cultural situatedness and (non)belonging (Roudometof, 2005; Sheppard, 2002). Furthermore, because RCP "emerges relationally, through connections and interactions with differently positioned subjects" (Leitner et al., 2008 p.163), some complexities emerge as researchers juxtapose the multiple cultural imaginaries and codes they experience themselves and discover from other multicultural marketplace actors (Thompson et al., 2013). Hence, a lack of a framework that enables a comprehensive appreciation of these complexities can be detrimental to cultural marketing and consumer research.

The initial motivation for this paper emerged as two of the authors reflected upon the experience of conducting a qualitative study that examined sociocultural factors at play in illicit drug markets in Kazakhstan. This experience served as a critical incident (Flanagan, 1954) that alerted us to both the evolved complexity and dynamic nature of RCP in multicultural marketplaces and the value of critical epistemological awareness about the psychological (occurring through how a researcher (re)defines her/his (multi)cultural affiliations) and relational (occurring through interactions with research collaborators, subjects, contexts) sources of such complexity and dynamics for studying consumer cultures. Taking this incident as a starting point, we embarked on re-examining the notion of RCP for contemporary cultural marketing and consumer research. The paper presents the outcomes of this endeavor and is organized as follows. First, we briefly detail the incident and approach of inquiry that followed. Then, through a multi-stage multidisciplinary critical review of the literature (Grant & Booth, 2009), we contrast perspectives on RCP in the marketing literature with those in other social science fields. This illuminates RCP evolution as influenced by

contextual complexities characteristic of multicultural marketplaces. Next, extending the theory of socio-spatial relations (Leitner et al., 2008) and the concept of socio-spatial positionality (Sheppard, 2002) into the context of multicultural marketplaces, we develop a model of Researcher Cultural Positionality (RCP) dynamics, to comprehensively distill and characterize the emerged RCP forms and theorize the factors impacting their complexity and shifting nature. We build on our findings to outline how they can be practically utilized as a toolbox of sensitizing considerations for leveraging RCP dynamics in multicultural marketplaces' research methodologies. We encourage researchers to consider their cultural positionalities and how they are operationalized methodologically as a performative engagement with social realities that are multidimensional and can evolve depending on place and social relations (Ozanne & Fischer, 2012). We conclude with a discussion of how a critical anticipation of RCP complexity and dynamics can foster nuanced insight into consumer experiences of multicultural marketplaces.

2. Critical incident and research approach

The critical incident that served as a catalyst to this study occurred when two of this paper's authors worked on a large-scale multidisciplinary international research project examining transnational illicit drug trade chains. As consumer research scholars, we provided input into the overall program concerning the socio-psychological drivers of engagement in drug-related practices (production, trafficking, consumption) and of the responses to counter-narcotic intervention communications. Our team focused on investigating cultural influences at play in drug-related practices in Kazakhstan – one of the study locations – to explore the transnational and localized influences that may impact them. The research design was a multi-method qualitative study integrating in depth interviews with participants representing a range of stakeholders including international and national organizations, social activist movements, and general public; workshop discussions; and collection of communication materials and reports.

The two authors were involved in the Kazakhstan study from inception to completion, both as academics at the time related to a British university albeit with different backgrounds and relationships to the researched context. In order to 'keep each other honest' (Bartunek & Louis, 1996), we aimed to anticipate and address the possible effects of these differences. One researcher was born and raised in Kazakhstan, albeit at the point of the study being permanently resident in the UK for 5 years with a bi-national (Kazakhstan-UK) family. At the outset we reasoned that her 'native' status would provide contextualized conceptualization and ability to engage with study participants on the sensitive topic of our inquiry. The other research team member had never been to Kazakhstan, nor been exposed to its culture; but had prior multicultural exposure having grown up in Germany in a multi-cultural household and having lived in the USA and Australia prior to moving to the UK where she had been resident for 4 years. We expected that her 'non-local' status and multicultural experiences would provide greater contextual and analytical distance and an ability to navigate cultural differences. However, the reality of conducting the study transpired to differ from these expectations throughout the research process.

Although we anticipated that a 'native status' and the ability to speak the lingua franca by one researcher would render her in closer proximity to the context and actors we engaged with during the study, various factors mitigated this. Some research participants expressed a lack of trust in her 'other' (e.g., UK) cultural links. For example, study participants expressed views on her bearing a responsibility to represent a particular perspective. Conversely, the 'non-local' researcher was perceived a more legitimate representative of a Western university not privy to these responsibilities. She was able to establish a closer rapport, but lacked common linguistic and contextual ground. As such, our positions in relation to participants were dynamic, and at times the circumstances of these shifts were uncomfortable to experience, both for us and for the actors we engaged with. Furthermore, our collaboration was subject to instances of tensions as we enacted different stances when examining our

discoveries. The 'native' researcher was situated in the research field's historic national background but her ethnic proximity to study actors varied given Kazakhstan's intra-national diversity (at least six major ethnic groups co-reside in Kazakhstan – CIA, 2017). The 'non-local' researcher prompted interrogation of whether this posed potential contextualization differences, particularly for recognizing subnational (rituals and cultural codes) and transnational (religion) influences meaningful to the ethnic groups the 'native' researcher did not belong to. Several times we had debated potential contextual myopia by the 'native' vs lack of situated understanding by the 'non-local' researcher when interpreting contextual background, as well as verbal and non-verbal expressions and events experienced in the field.

As we reflected on these experiences, we questioned the reasons and mechanisms underlying the distorted nature of our cultural affiliations in relation to the study's context and participants, as well as the tensions this ambiguity evoked. As such, we derived three interrelated considerations applying to cultural research in consumer realities beyond our current project: 1) established categorizations of RCP familiar to scholars may be incomplete for characterizing complex identity positions from which they operationalize inquiries in culturally heterogenous market contexts; 2) inquiry development and execution would benefit from critical anticipation of RCP tensions and shifts that can be imposed by experiences of cultural heterogeneity and fluidity within multicultural marketplaces; and 3) RCP shifts can be instigated by complexities of individual researcher's affiliations and their juxtapositions against participants' and collaborators' perspectives.

Motivated by these considerations, we conducted an integrative critical review of the literature to derive methodological insights for operationalizing positionality in environments characterized by culturally heterogeneity and interconnectedness (Grant & Booth, 2009; Torraco, 2016). Contrary to systematic summative approaches, an integrative critical review synthesizes "representative literature on a topic in an integrated way such that new frameworks and perspectives on topics are generated" (Torraco, 2016 p.404). Following this approach, we

sourced literature via two online searches utilizing keywords and reference lists: 1) a search of marketing literature providing 'best practice' recommendations on cultural research methodologies, focusing particularly on sources that outline principles and practices addressing researcher positionality; and 2) a multidisciplinary search of the literature concerned with researcher positionality, sourcing a sample of journal publications focused on positionality in culturally heterogeneous environments. In the remainder of the paper, we draw on the synthesis of the review findings to unpack the complexity of RCP in multicultural marketplace contexts and to develop a framework for critically anticipating and practically addressing RCP complexity and dynamics in multicultural marketplace research methodologies[4].

3. Understanding researcher cultural positionality in multicultural marketplace

3.1 What is cultural positionality and why is it important in cultural research?

Researcher positionality denotes a researcher's psychological and sociocultural links to their research fields (Merton, 1972). In the context of cultural inquiry it is underpinned by the concept of cultural identity affiliations. For clarity, we acknowledge that issues of positionality can relate to other facets of social identity (such as gender or class) and are not exclusive to cultural research. The term 'researcher cultural positionality' (RCP) is used to emphasize focus on cultural identity affiliations informing positionality. Attention to RCP evolved from the extensively documented relationship between one's self-links to social groups and understanding of reality (Fishbein, 1963; Triandis, 1989). Early literature establishes that knowledge production is informed and can be shaped by researcher's cultural identity affiliations – e.g., whether s/he shares (or not) characteristics with a cultural group and system that is subject of inquiry (Merton, 1972). It thus proposes that possessing (or not) cultural

---

[4] Owing to space limitations, only key sources are presented for the readers' reference. Full bibliographies are available from the corresponding author on request.

identity affiliations situates a researcher in proximity (inside) or distance (outside) position to cultural reality focal to a given inquiry.

More recent research argues that characteristics qualifying a person to be an insider to a certain culture require further nuancing (Vora et al., 2018). There are arguments that contextual factors such as history, interpersonal relations, geography, cultural heritage or national policies facilitate cultural proximity and membership (Holliday, 2010; Yampolsky et al., 2013). Similarly, researchers also argue for intercultural skills and abilities, for instance bilingualism (Ringberg et al., 2010), internalizing cultural schemas and meaning systems in cognition (Hong et al., 2000; Lücke et al., 2014), and self-identification with a culture as integral to one's identity (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005; LaFromboise et al., 1993). Others highlight that cultural insideness or belonging can be situationally-primed (Okamura, 1981; Stayman & Deshpande, 1989; Zmud & Arce, 1992). Among all these considerations, commonly highlighted indicators can be summarized as lived experience of a given context and self-determined identification (or not) with cultural system(s) within a context. Lived experience refers to first-hand, mundane and intimate knowledge of cultural realities within spatial settings, while self-determined identification signals psychological significance assigned to particular cultural entities present in a given space (Kearney, 2020; Ward & Geeraert, 2016; Derickson, 2015). A cultural insider is thus someone who has acquired first-hand experience of 'being in' a culture and has developed a sense of belonging that goes beyond competences for engaging with and interpreting experiences of others.

Neither 'inside' nor 'outside' stances are rendered with "monopolistic or privileged access to social truth" (Merton, 1972 p.36). Table 1 defines and contrasts the benefits and risks insider and outsider stances can pose across three broadly-defined phases of the research process (adapted from Burgess & Steenkamp, 2006): theorizing and learning, acquisition of meaningful data, and data analysis. Such synthesized view highlights that either stance affords a range of unique advantages but can bias the development of research questions/hypotheses,

design of research instruments and interpretation of findings. For example, although proximity to a context suggests ease of explicit contextualization in the theorizing phase, it can paradoxically detract from cultural assumptions in a theory or model and result in contextual myopia (Tsui et al., 2007). Conversely, contextual distance can result in over-emphasis on and exoticization of difference (McNess et al., 2015). An 'insider' stance can minimize superficial or socially biased responses and widen participation from certain populations (Greene, 2014; Yaprak, 2003), but obscure power relations with participants, resulting in response biases (Ganga & Scott, 2006; Ross, 2017). It can lead to cultural brokering in analysis due to cultural sensitivity to the ingroup. The 'outsider' stance can lead to reality negotiation due to misunderstanding an unknown context (Jacobs-Huey, 2002; Savvides et al., 2014).

------Insert Table 1 about here------

As Table 1 shows, explicit recognition of advantages and limitations of either 'inside' or 'outside' stance and the deployment of methodological mediating techniques are central to operationalizing RCP (Craig & Douglas, 2001). However, marketing and consumer studies lag behind in reconsidering insider-outsider epistemology to account for the contextual shift towards multicultural marketplaces.

3.2 How cultural heterogeneity and interconnectedness challenge insider-outsider epistemology

Extant methodological best practice guidelines on cultural studies in marketing and consumer research literature sourced by our review predominantly situate the notions of insider and outsider in national/ethnic cultures and present them as static stances grounded in fixed cultural belonging. Consequently, recommendations for mitigating epistemological challenges and blind spots associated with RCP are mostly limited to managing fixed cultural proximity or distance. For example, Engelen and Brettel (2011) recommend that "studies on a [national] culture A and a culture B should be conducted twice, once from the perspective of a researcher from culture A and once from a researcher from culture B" (p.522). Buil et al. (2012), while

acknowledging that national culture is not always the relevant unit of cultural analysis, recommend "use of multicultural research teams and international collaboration" (p.232) without elaborating on how RCP is to be determined in this case. Other sources follow similar suit, recommending cultural immersion (extended visits, language courses) by non-local/native researchers (Polsa, 2013; Malhotra et al., 1996) and ensuring input of local/native research collaborators and/or assistants during all research stages for triangulation of insider/outsider perspectives through which invoked theoretical assumptions, empirical generalizations and boundary conditions can be interrogated (Craig & Douglas, 2001; Malhotra et al., 1996).

Conversely, literature across social science fields, including sociology (Biesla et al., 2014; Muhammad et al., 2015; Oriola & Haggerty, 2012), education (Lee et al., 2018; McNess et al., 2015; Milligan, 2016), anthropology (Hannerz, 2006; Jacobs-Huey, 2002; Narayan, 1993), and migration studies (Benson, 2014; Nowicka & Cieslik, 2014; Ryan, 2015) increasingly points out that insider-outsider epistemology does not fare well in contemporary cultural research, whether operationalized within or across national boundaries. In particular, this body of literature illuminates the complexity and dynamic nature of RCP as impacted by researchers' (multi)cultural identification and intersections with a multitude of heterogenous transterritorial, deterritorial and intraterritorial cultural systems and perspectives. Scholars are encouraged to denaturalize such established notions as nationality and ethnicity while recognizing that "the unstable, mobile, and shifting locations and identifications" (Nowicka & Ryan, 2015 p.12) of their inquiries render insider-outsider RCP demarcations inadequate, for the following two reasons (Lee et al., 2018; Schiller et al., 2006; Wiederhold, 2015).

First, many researchers continuingly navigate multiple cultural affiliations and lived experiences. A large proportion of scholars in western institutions (mainly USA and/or Western Europe) are not native to these contexts and many of them conduct research in both their new 'host' and 'home' countries (Craig & Douglas, 2011). Furthermore, many national contexts are superdiverse in composition and transnationally interconnected (Morris et al.,

2015; Nowicka & Ryan, 2015; Vertovec, 2007). As acculturation and multiculturalism research demonstrates, continuingly navigating multiple cultural systems shapes self-links to culture-of-origin and other, possibly multiple, affiliations develop through experiences of mobility/migration (whether it is an individual who migrates or an individual interacts with other migrant individuals or groups), family/friendship, and participation in global cultural community/ies (Askegaard et al., 2005; Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005; Morris et al., 2015; Yampolsky et al., 2013). For researchers, multicultural identity affiliations can pose pertinent distortions to one's insideness or outsideness in a given inquiry.

Specifically, migration researchers point to the problems associated with taking a nationality/ethnicity lens as it neglects subjective deconstruction and reconstruction of these notions in the process of migration. These subjective identity re-negotiations potentially place a given researcher as an insider to migrants retaining their 'origin' identification and as an outsider to those assimilated into 'host' culture, and vice versa (Nowicka & Cieslik, 2014; Ryan, 2015). Anthropology research highlights the difficulty for mixed ancestry scholars to assign themselves as carriers of one indigenous knowledge or complete outsiders to certain cultural perspectives (Jacobs-Huey, 2002; Kubica, 2016; Narayan, 1993). Instead, these researchers span and transrelate between multiple cultural facets of identity (Narayan, 1993). Conversely, race researchers suggest that spatially-grounded cultural knowledge of historical events and experiences may place a researcher at an ambiguous position to those they research, despite sharing their ethnoracial characteristics (Hordge-Freeman, 2015).

Second, scholars engaged in transnational work highlight that academic nomadism complicates matters of situating researchers' 'home' country/culture and can challenge the notion of being inside or outside of cultural systems and communities (McNess et al., 2015). Indeed, by virtue of study, academic appointments, visiting professorships/adjunct positions, etc an average scholar may move multiple times and for various lengths of time across continents or countries (Lee et al., 2018; Wiederhold, 2015). Drawing parallels with studies

uncovering plurality of cultural identity development among individuals experiencing such cosmopolitan mobility, researcher identity affiliations can be difficult to place.

Research into identities of global nomads and third culture kids (e.g., individuals who spend a significant part of their development years in a culture other than parents' culture(s) and/or experience multiple mobilities in adult life – Pollock & Van Recken, 1999; Turner, 1990) indicates that cultural identities of these individuals can evolve as either of two variants: 1) encapsulated marginality – a 'rootless' cultural identity externalizing all primary constituent components (national/ethnic/locale links) from sense of cultural self (Holliday, 2010); and 2) constructive marginality – a unique multicultural identity embracing the dynamic liminality in-between all constituent components (Bardhi et al., 2012). Worldviews resultant from such cultural hybridity can range from alienation orientation – a sense of discomfort with and difficulty to relate to persons and cultural systems that don't share hybridity knowledge and experiences, to a minimization orientation – a sense of 'commonality of difference' between cultural systems and the ability to leverage these commonalities (Greenholtz & Kim, 2009).

In sum, the wider social science research fields consider cultural research to have evolved to encompass studying 'down, up, sideways, through, backwards, forwards, away and at home' (Hannerz, 2006). Concurrently, these studies point to researchers' cultural affiliations and resultant RCP evolving to encompass a continuum of 'insideness-outsideness-marginality'. Accounting for these trends is pertinent for marketing and consumer scholars considering that cultural heterogeneity and interconnectedness are two key characteristics of multicultural marketplace – a place-centered market environment where consumers, brands and organizations embodying multiple different cultures co-exist and interact with each other and multiple cultures in other places (Demangeot et al., 2015). Nascent studies point to growing intricacies in how consumer cultures converge, diverge and evolve through a multiplicity of consumer ethnicities (Visconti et al., 2014), global, local and (multi)cultural identities (Kipnis et al., 2019; Wamwara-Mbugua et al., 2008; Zhang & Khare, 2009), orientations (Kipnis et al.,

2012; Sharma, 2010; Tam et al., 2016) and dispositions towards cultural meanings of brands and experiences (Diamantapoulos et al. 2019; Galalae et al., 2020; Sharma, 2019). Furthermore, researchers are increasingly encouraged to recognize that a multiplicity of cultural perspectives and experiences coexist and interact in any marketplace, and to see it as their responsibility to conscientiously 'give voice' to these diverse perspectives and experiences (Demangeot et al., 2019; Hutton & Heath, 2020; Ozanne & Fischer, 2012; Tadajewski & Brownlie, 2008).

Such conscientization is particularly necessary as several studies spotlight blind spots and shortcomings in extant marketing and consumer cultural frameworks. These include simplistic operationalizations of pertinent culture constructs (such as race – see Grier et al., 2018), omission of (often non-western) cultural contexts (Hill & Martin, 2014; Jafari et al., 2012; Sheth, 2011) and lack of focus on intra-national cultural diversity and the role of consumption in facilitating relationships between cultural groups (Cleveland, 2018; Luedicke, 2015). Hence, a more intricate view of RCP forms and their epistemology in the conditions of cultural heterogeneity and interconnectedness can be valuable for illuminating under-examined or newly-emergent perspectives.

4   A theoretical framework for locating RCP in culturally heterogeneous and interconnected landscapes

4.1 A socio-spatial re-conceptualization of RCP dynamics

Although often operating differing terminologies, recent positionality literature sourced in our review provides ample valuable insights into individual experiences of RCP distortion and fluidity from insider to outsider stances and vice versa. For example, Srivastava (2006) recounts that, when conducting a study in India, she – "a Canadian of parents from the Indian diaspora at the time attached to what was considered an elite British university" (p.211) – reconciled both insider and outsider positionalities as she spanned between multiple languages

and cultural milieu. Cui (2015) contextualizes her RCP of a Chinese-origin UK-based researcher conducting fieldwork in China through Confucian cultural values and reflects on how her interpersonal relationships and field interactions shifted her RCP along an insider-associate-outsider continuum. Comparative accounts demonstrate how a researcher sharing national and ethnic affiliations with a given community situationally experienced moments of outsideness through their professional identity, while the researchers denoted an outsider by virtue of demographic background were redefined a partial insider in interaction with study actors through the lens of shared political relationships and positions (Baser & Toivanen, 2018; Ergun & Erdemir, 2010). Accounts of conducting research with multicultural collaborators document intersecting cultural identity constituents of team members thrown in flux or in opposition during the research process (Muhammad et al., 2015; Swadener & Mutua, 2008).

Divergencies of the above accounts are explicable because they draw on identity affiliations that are multi-faceted, gradually dynamic, and balance the core constituents against situational influences (Kleine & Kleine, 2000; Okamura, 1981). They also recount a multitude of factors contributing to RCP shifts as experienced in a particular research endeavor. Taken together, these accounts highlight that one given researcher in one cultural site can experience varying degrees of insideness/outsideness/marginality as dimensions of their RCP and that these variations can be dynamic as researchers navigate different location(s) and/or origin/heritage/imaginary cultural affiliations. However, overlaps in terminology and the lack of a comprehensive framework that denotes the emerged RCP forms and explicates the mechanisms underlying RCP shifts may challenge scholars' anticipation and management of RCP in contemporary multicultural marketplaces.

The theory of socio-spatial relations (Jessop et al., 2008; Leitner et al., 2008) originating in geography is helpful for coherently capturing RCP complexities and explicating the mechanisms underlying its' dynamics. It shows that: 1) sociocultural and spatial aspects are polymorphous in shaping social realities; and 2) in globalized landscapes, space, and – by

extension – socio-spatial dynamics are multidimensional. For example, Leitner et al. (2008) distinguish place (sites where people live, work and practice their social relations); scale (structures and relations of power and authority); networks (interactions in spaces – whether physical or virtual); and mobility (material or virtual movability of individuals or objects through space-time), as inter-related dimensions of space. These works also highlight that any research inquiry needs to take into account the socio-spatial positionality of actors in relation to each other. Hence, this theory is highly relevant to apply for examining RCP in the context of multicultural marketplaces, since multicultural marketplaces by definition are space-centered, culturally heterogenous and interconnected with other cultural systems and places.

Sheppard (2002), first to coin the concept of socio-spatial positionality, draws directly from the literature on the positions of researchers as informed by their social/cultural identities, discussed in Section 2. He argues that omission of spatial perspectives on positionality weakens studies of cultural dynamics and globalization outcomes: "Place […] cannot be adequately understood without considering the complex positionalities that link people and places with one another and that create heterogeneity in a place […]. The construction of scale inevitably involved shifts in positionality. Processes that connect distant places more closely both reduce differences in their positionality and enhance the importance of aggregate scales. Networks and positionality adopt a similar relational approach, although much contemporary thought on networks downplays positional inequalities within networks." (Sheppard, 2002 p.319). Both prominent socio-spatial relations frameworks incorporate Sheppard's (2002) positionality concept; it is an additional analytical dimension in Leitner et al.'s (2008) framework, while Jessop et al.'s (2008) theorization of space acknowledges its value.

Sheppard's conceptualization is broader than RCP as it draws attention to the variable positionality of different social actors. Yet, it expands the dimensionality of RCP by enabling the consideration of researchers' affiliations in relation to the social and spatial characteristics of the cultural entities and contexts they study. With this in mind, we synthesized

categorizations (e.g., Banks, 1998; Chavez, 2008) and reflective RCP accounts to map RCP

forms according to their social and spatial situatedness (Table 2). This exercise enabled us to

distil factors affecting RCP shifts as psychological (pertaining to determination and negotiation

of (multi)cultural affiliations by a researcher her/himself) and relational (pertaining to

(re)determination of affiliations through interactions) tensions. This map informed the

development of Researcher Cultural Positionality Dynamics model (Figure 1).

---- Insert Table 2 and Figure 1 about here ----

The model delineates cultural identity-informed stances that can be assumed by and/or

attributed to researcher(s). It conceptualizes RCP as evolving along two principal trajectories

and theorizes psychological and relational tensions as displacement/emplacement mechanisms

underlying the RCP dynamics. The first trajectory evolves within the boundaries of insideness

and outsideness, rendering it a continuum rather than dichotomy (Dwyer & Buckle, 2009;

Greene, 2014). Our model distinguishes six following forms of RCP within this continuum.

The Total indigenous insider and the Total outsider RCP forms represent the early

insider/outsider stance conceptions. They are defined in Section 3.1 and Table 1, and we do not

elaborate on these further here. Partial insider / indigenous associate denotes locale-based

researchers(s) who partially share identity affiliations with research participants (such as local-

born mixed-ethnic/race researchers, or researchers of a particular ethnic affiliation conducting

work across cultural groups within their culturally-heterogenous locale). Returning insider /

outsider from within delineates homecoming researcher(s) who share historic national/ethnic

locale-situated identity with participants and context. Adopted outsider / external insider

denotes researcher(s) who do not share ancestral links with participants, but by virtue of spatial

socialization share affiliative social identification (Jiménez, 2010).

These three RCP forms share a characteristic of partial emplacement of researcher's

identity within a given research field constructed via a lens of national/ethnic and/or locale-

situated affiliations. Their in-between status assumes that the extent of their partial cultural

distance is mitigated by routine culture (re)adjustments, enabling a natural mobilization and leveraging of both inside and outside stances. However, this very in-betweenness can be a source of researcher's identity displacement, as instigated by: 1) psychological tensions, such as a sense of torn self, resultant from contradictions in reconciling worldviews situated in different cultural systems (Jafari & Goulding, 2008) or of misplaced self, resultant from a misguided mobilization of an insider or outsider stance; and 2) relational tensions, e.g., others-imposed expectations to one's worldviews and behaviors that grant, or – if not fulfilled – deny cultural proximity (Labaree, 2002; Mullings, 1999).

Partial insiders/indigenous outsiders are documented to experience displacement in contexts where social or political inequalities and tensions between the researchers' (sub)cultures are salient (Chaudhuri, 2018; Dwyer & Buckle, 2009; Maxwell et al., 2016). In returning insiders, displacement is attributed to culture shock over re-entering an evolved context (Chamove & Soeterick, 2006) that challenges their static, historically construed sense of connection to 'home culture' actors and context (Schütz, 1945). Their acquired different culture experience(s) and association(s) can generate others-imposed assumptions of lost indigenous identity, suspicions or prejudice concerning their allegiances and motivations (Baser & Toivanen, 2018; Ergun & Erdemir, 2010) and/or feelings of discomfort due to the impossibility of slipping into the norms and patterns they once knew (Bielsa et al., 2014; Zhao, 2017). Adopted outsiders/external insiders experience displacement as the loss of insider privileges (Cruz, 2008; Muhammad et al., 2014) when they mobilize both an affiliative insider dimension of their identity to gain trust and an outsider dimension to maintain a degree of distance (Chavez, 2008; Labaree, 2002). Or, when overly-mobilizing insider status, they observe a loss of the objectivity conferred by the outsider status (Savvides et al., 2014).

Boundary spanner outsider / situational associate, the final form of RCP on the insideness-outsideness continuum represents non-local researcher(s) whose identities are situated within the constructive marginality variant of culturally hybrid identity. Although this

RCP lacks either social or spatial emplacement within culture(s) and locale(s) under study, boundary spanners possess intercultural empathy – a skill of seeing the world as others experience it and of navigating differences by leveraging universal commonalities (McNess et al., 2015). Intercultural empathy enables situational emplacement, e.g., 'becoming more familiar' than an average foreigner (Farrer, 2010) while 'remaining outside' which can mitigate the lack of contextual knowledge and enhance externally-ascribed trust (Wray & Bartolomew, 2010). Despite possessing this skill, boundary spanners can still experience displacement when they impose commonalities that are in discordance with participants' perceptions.

The second trajectory of RCP dynamics distinguished in our model is the 'out-of-bounds', situated in the encapsulated marginality variant of culturally hybrid identities. These identities are 'rootless', - detached from spatial and/or social links - and situated in imagined spaces and communities (Benson, 2014; Kumar & Steenkamp, 2013; Sőkefeld, 2006). The first 'out-of-bounds' RCP is the Transnational race/ethnic diaspora associate, denoting non-local researchers who share racial/ethnic identity markers but lack locale-situated experiences in the research field. It prioritizes uniqueness of experiences shared through social (e.g., racial/ethnic) networks over the identification of an individual with the place s/he calls 'home' (Blunt, 2007). Mobilizing an 'imagined homeland' of racial/ethnic belonging may evoke: 1) psychological emplacement tensions whereby a researcher struggles to reconcile the imagined attachment to a community with the lack of shared historic and locale-situated codes (Farrer, 2010); and 2) relational emplacement tensions whereby perceptions of a researcher's inability to place the race/ethnic discourse in context dissolve cultural proximity (Benson, 2013).

Finally, the World citizen RCP captures a researcher's translocal and transcultural identification. It implies focus on the global culture imaginary and on the dividends and superordinate privileges associated with its membership (Groves & O'Connor, 2017). Differences in global culture mythology or tensions between the worldviews concerning the privileges of world citizenship can lead to emplacement tensions, in particular where global

culture is defined through mobilizing hegemonic notions of "Western imaginary" (Cayla &
Arnould, 2008, p.88) versus conceptions of translocal cultural community contributing and
sharing symbols, models of lifestyle and behaviors (Iwabuchi, 2010; Kipnis et al., 2014).

4.2 Implications of evolved RCP epistemology in multicultural marketplace research fields

RCP complexity and dynamics present epistemological implications germane to marketing and
consumer cultural research. Our review illuminated that different socio-spatial emplacement of
researchers' cultural affiliations can reveal or conceal new or evolved cultural phenomena
within people's realities. Stances situated in affiliations with specific culture(s) and locale can
mask the phenomena that transcend these boundaries, such as mobilization of racialized,
diasporic, or shared experience-based (for instance, refugee or global/cosmopolitan) identities
(Milligan, 2016; Nowicka & Ryan, 2015; Runfors, 2016). Conversely, stances situated in a
translocal/transcultural view can suppress the view on the voluntary and/or involuntary
fractures within cultural groups emerging through spatially-grounded differences in
vulnerabilities, motivations, and dynamics of values and identification (Bueltmann et al., 2014;
Pasura, 2012). Such epistemological blind spots in multicultural marketplaces can manifest in
overly-romanticized conceptions of what motivates consumer (multi)cultural dispositions and
behaviors (Galalae et al., 2020) and illusions of equitable access to consumption resources
within and across multicultural marketplaces (Hill & Martin, 2014; Saren et al., 2019).

It appears that, by determining and operationalizing RCP from a socio-spatial
perspective, researchers can harness their cultural affiliations in a more nuanced and precise
manner, thus gaining the ability to transrelate between different degrees of cultural proximity
or distance when delineating, contextualizing and interrogating culture-informed consumption
phenomena. However, RCP shifts through displacement/emplacement can pose a range of
philosophical, methodological and ethical trials and dilemmas.

Our synthesis of RCP accounts reveals that psychological tensions arise from researchers navigating their multicultural affiliations. They can: a) affect abstraction and differentiation between specificity and universality of assumptions and notions; b) impact contextual objectivity (for instance, returning insider and transnational race/ethnicity researchers are cautioned of the 'lures of diaspora' whereby one can construct a negotiated reality through romanticized conceptions/interpretations); and c) pose semantic difficulties related to switching sociocultural and linguistic milieu (Bielsa et al., 2014; Srivastava, 2006). In turn, relational tensions arise as RCP misaligns either socially or spatially with (multi)cultural affiliations of 'the researched'. This can challenge the stability of researcher's legitimacy with study contributors (Jacobs-Huey, 2002; Kremakova, 2014). While only documented by a handful of studies, relational tensions arising from RCP differences with collaborating researchers also impact: a) approaches to sense-making (focus on differences vs similarities); b) ontological and epistemological delineations of the object(s) and methods of inquiry; c) perceptions of and trust in each other's viewpoints, motivations and priorities; and d) agency, power and ethical decisions made in a research endeavor (Easterby-Smith & Malina, 1999; Freeman & Gahungu, 2013; Muhammad et al., 2015; Von Glinow et al., 2004). Hence, to leverage RCP dynamics in multicultural marketplaces, marketing and consumer research methodologies require tools that sensitize scholars to potential nuances of their RCP in a cultural study and enable critical anticipation of its shifts and associated tensions.

5. **A practical toolbox of sensitizing considerations for leveraging RCP dynamics in marketing and consumer research methodologies**

As shown above, techniques and strategies grounded in a dichotomous, fixed view on insideness or outsideness may be insufficient for addressing the socio-spatial variations of a researcher's affiliations with multiple cultural realities co-present within and across multicultural marketplace research fields. Operationalizing a dynamic view of RCP can be a

valuable, method-transcending technique for engaging multiple, potentially previously under-recognized perspectives (Ozanne & Fischer, 2012; Tadajewski & Brownlie, 2008). We argue that leveraging RCP dynamics has relevance for studies employing either qualitative or quantitative designs, for the following reasons. First, greater precision in specifying the focal cultural constructs and attention to their socio-spatial characteristics are called upon in either methodological traditions, for enhancing conceptual clarity and/or appropriate measurement (Bartsch et al., 2016; Giovanardi & Lucarelli, 2018; Yaprak, 2003). Determining one's RCP during these considerations can reveal potential biases and omitted phenomena and/or consumer populations. Second, either designs often involve interactions with collaborating researchers, field assistants and participants; quantitative designs can also incorporate collaboration of experts, particularly in scale development (Craig & Douglas, 2001). Examining RCP of all involved in a given research endeavor can help foresee potential tensions and prepare for their management. Finally, while methodological pluralism is still relatively rare in marketing and consumer research, its use is increasingly encouraged (Davis et al., 2011; Polsa, 2013). With scholars likely to more routinely utilize different methods in future enquiries, cognizance of RCP dynamics is increasingly pertinent. Our review has highlighted a scarcity of methodological developments concerned with addressing RCP complexity and dynamics in consumer and marketing literature. We acknowledge that the review may have omitted developments that have emerged and been implemented in the individual practices of consumer/marketing scholars, but have not been communicated in their research outputs. Given this lack of publicly available resources regarding RCP complexity and dynamics in extant methodological guidelines, insights from our review can help the next generations of scholars in our discipline to orient themselves in the landscapes of contemporary multicultural marketplaces.

Table 3 summarizes how RCP insights distilled in our review can be utilized as a set of sensitizing considerations for methodologically operationalizing and addressing RCP

dynamics. While we discuss potential techniques in the three stages of research process, we highlight that the majority of RCP thinking must happen in the theorizing stages of the research process. Careful planning for possible RCP dynamics at the outset of a study will avoid some of the challenges we have outlined throughout the paper, but also prepare researchers to respond quickly and effectively to RCP tensions as they emerge in the field and in subsequent analysis. The left cell of Table 3 details epistemological considerations for determining the RCP(s) of researcher(s) and for anticipating potential tensions and blind spots. The middle cell signposts how sections of this paper can be applied in conjunction with other techniques as tools for managing RCP-associated challenges. The right cell summarizes practical implications. We offer these considerations as a toolbox from which researchers can select those relevant to their study.

---- Insert Table 3 about here ----

Locating one's cultural stance(s) in a given consumer culture inquiry is no longer as straightforward as demarcating situatedness 'inside' or 'outside' a given context. Although experiences of cultural border crossing(s) and cultural identity (re)adjustment(s) may have equipped researchers with competences for working at different and shifting degrees of cultural proximity/distance to diverse and multiple milieus, tensions conferred by the multidimensionality of socio-spatial situatedness in a given study require critical anticipation and management. Because RCP dynamics are facilitated performatively as the research process proceeds through one's interactions with others (collaborators, participants), the impact of these interactions should also be anticipated and addressed (Ozanne & Fischer, 2012).

We recommend that researchers comprehensively locate their and (if relevant) collaborators' social and spatial RCP dimensions, to tease out psychological and relational tensions 'from within' a research inquiry that may facilitate emplacement/displacement, both prior to embarking on and throughout a study. To this end, combining the socio-spatial RCP map, Researcher Cultural Positionality Dynamics model and an understanding of the benefits

and risks associated with insideness, outsideness, or marginality stances with personal and/or heteroglossic introspection approaches can be useful. Personal introspection is a self-interview "applying multiple, explicit, question frames" to acquire and confirm "conscious and unconscious thoughts" by a researcher (Woodside, 2004 p.987); heteroglossic introspection is a 'multi-voice' self-interview by a group of researchers (Gould & Maclaran, 2003).

Introspection should be focused on considering a) the social and spatial dimensions of individual RCP in relation to a consumption phenomenon in a given multicultural marketplace and b) whether transrelating between cultural meanings' systems and affiliations or interacting with co-researchers instigate RCP tensions. Such focused examination can identify plural conceptual and analytical stances, highlight under-recognized perspectives, power/privilege imbalances and potential sources of RCP shifts as impacted by tensions 'from within' researcher(s) as inquiry instrument(s). Researcher(s) collaboratively operationalizing RCP in multiple urban, regional, or national locales, can gain a 'naturalized pre-understanding' (Samuels, 1996) of each other's perspectives and anticipate relational tensions through xenoheteroglossic introspection – a method developed for multiple geographically-dispersed researchers, to generate "insights about the researcher's subjective [cultural] stance and his/her relation to the cultural stances of his/her research partners" (Minowa et al., 2012 p.485).

Other potentially useful tools include profiling of researcher(s) cultural orientations utilizing frameworks and tools previously developed for determining and segmenting cultural orientations of consumers (Cleveland & Laroche, 2007; Kipnis et al., 2019; Zhang & Khare, 2009; Sharma, 2010). This exercise can provide contextualized insights into researcher(s) stance(s) to the inquired consumption phenomena. As these tools have been derived via different empirical (qualitative/quantitative) routes, it may be of interest to integrate them for maximum elucidation. Greenholtz and Kim (2009) provide a useful template for a one-participant study methodology involving psychometric profiling of a cultural hybrid utilizing an intercultural development measure followed up with qualitative elaborations. Dialogical

methods (Frank, 2005), pioneered by the Transformative Consumer Research movement, can also facilitate pluralist approaches to conceptualization. Pluralist philosophies are relevant to leveraging RCP complexity and dynamics since they advocate for a combination of epistemological stances with the rationale that an exhaustive study of a phenomenon allows researchers to recognize and give voice to a multitude of actors and perspectives (Hutton & Heath, 2020; Ozanne & Fischer, 2012; Whittemore et al., 2001). Incorporating voices of stakeholders, by combining dialogical and participatory action methods, can be another fruitful avenue for anticipating psychological and relational displacement/emplacement tensions early on (Milligan, 2016; Ozanne & Saatcioglu, 2008), although recent accounts caution against overestimating its ability to mitigate power imbalances (Muhammad et al., 2015).

To assist the management of RCP dynamics in data acquisition, introspective and profiling approaches guided by socio-spatial RCP map, Researcher Cultural Positionality Dynamics model and benefits and risks associated with insideness, outsideness, or marginality stances can be continued in combination or as stand-alone tools for determining RCP situatedness and shifts in relation to (co)researchers, contributors (experts, field assistants) and participants. Introspection tools that might be useful here are visuals or vignettes (Broderick et al., 2011; Mannay, 2010), which can be profiled by (co)researchers and interrogated with the contributors following a laddering technique (Reynolds & Gutman, 2001). Such joint interrogations have shown promise for unpacking contributors' reasoning and viewpoints on meanings and experiences emerging in data collection (Easterby-Smith & Malina, 1999).

Overall, as Table 3 shows, profiling stances of all facilitating data acquisition can help elicit under-recognized differences in socio-spatial situatedness, elucidate anticipated/experienced tensions conferred by stances' juxtapositions and pinpoint mitigating strategies. For example, profiling socio-spatial situatedness of experts can tease out whether divergences in their opinions pertain to their differing stances (insideness, outsideness, marginality) in relation to the inquired cultural phenomena. Profiling stances of field assistants

in relation to (co)researchers and participants can identify whether they require training for engaging with participants and/or experts and indicate relational displacement/emplacement that can be conferred by study participants' expectations. It is worth pre-planning switching of cultural milieus and languages by an individual researcher/assistant or switching of researcher/assistant as a lead in data collection for managing RCP dynamics effectively.

Finally, in the data analysis phase, checking RCP stance(s) assumed during analysis and examining whether and why RCP shifts occurred is important. This examination can identify whether a researcher consciously transrelated between different socio-spatial stances and perspectives to maximize nuanced comprehension and elicitation of context-specific emergent meanings and observations, or whether the shifts were driven by displacement/emplacement tensions, potentially producing unequal representation or omission of perspectives on inquired phenomena or brokered/negotiated interpretations. It is also worth triangulating with RCP introspections in previous stages and map the study's socio-spatial situatedness throughout the research journey, to reveal whether and why additional perspectives have emerged.

6. Conclusion

The contextual shift of market environments towards multicultural marketplace is coming into sharper focus, challenging how we make sense of consumer realities. This paper has shown the restrictiveness of the RCP paradigm currently prevalent in consumer and marketing research for determining socio-spatial standpoints from which researchers invoke and interpret multiple cultural meanings and systems co-present in a multicultural marketplace. Critical engagement with RCP dynamics can enhance our field's epistemological alignment with the complexity of (multi)cultural belonging and lived experiences in multicultural marketplaces. By developing a theoretically-grounded framework for comprehensively distinguishing complex RCPs and recognizing tensions in RCP dynamics this paper extends prior cultural methodology literature.

It is important to acknowledge the limitations of this paper. First, our review sought to elicit prevalent perspectives on forms and management of RCP, it should thus not be treated as representative of the entire disciplinary field. For example, conducting a systematic review of extant empirical studies concerned with consumer culture(s) to examine whether and how RCP(s) were operationalized practically, could have provided a disciplinary 'state-of-the-art' overview and potentially uncovered emerging advancements. Further, the model of Researcher Cultural Positionality Dynamics (Figure 1) requires contextualizing to consumer/marketing research. Therefore, more methodological accounts detailing approaches for operationalizing RCP forms in consumer/marketing studies are needed. Given the relative scarcity of accounts from scholars integrating quantitative methods in their designs across social science literatures, despite selected accounts showing value of comprehensively engaging RCP across qualitative and quantitative methodologies, such endeavors would be particularly useful (Greene, 2014; Ryan, 2015). They can offer best practices tailored specifically to quantitative work.

We hope to have shown that delineating and addressing RCP dynamics can support addressing the concerns over heteroglossia and polycontextuality deficiencies in cultural marketing and consumer research (Askegaard & Linnet, 2011; Hill & Martin, 2014; Thompson et al., 2013). While our focus was on providing recommendations for leveraging RCP dynamics in the context of academic research, future contributions can develop applications for marketing practice. Recent works (e.g., Demangeot et al., 2019, 2015b; Visconti, 2015) highlight the importance of addressing the interplay between consumers' cultural and place affiliations in such marketing decisions as space designs, targeting, positioning and category management. Hence, techniques to contrast managers' and consumers' cultural positionality viewpoints may be helpful for avoiding positioning and communications mishaps. By more precisely recognizing and accounting for socio-spatial positionalities in multicultural marketplaces, marketing researchers and practitioners can engage more critically and meaningfully with cultural complexities experienced by their beneficiaries.

References

Askegaard, S. & Linnet, J.T. (2011). Towards an epistemology of consumer culture theory: phenomenology and the context of context. *Marketing Theory*, *11*(4), pp.381-404.

Askegaard, S., Arnould, E. J., & Kjeldgaard, D. (2005). Postassimilationist Ethnic Consumer Research: Qualifications and Extensions. *Journal of Consumer Research, 32*(1), pp. 160-170.

Banks, J.A. (1998). The lives and values of researchers: Implications for educating citizens in a multicultural society. *Educational Researcher, 27*(7), pp.4-17.

Bardhi, F., Eckhardt, G. M., & Arnould, E. J. (2012). Liquid relationship to possessions. *Journal of Consumer Research, 39*(3), pp. 510-529.

Bartsch, F., Riefler, P. & Diamantopoulos, A. (2016). A taxonomy and review of positive consumer dispositions toward foreign countries and globalization. *Journal of International Marketing, 24*(1), pp.82-110.

Bartunek, J., & Louis, M. R. (1996). *Insider/outsider team research* (Vol. 40). Sage Publications, Inc.

Baser, B. & Toivanen, M. (2018). Politicized and Depoliticized Ethnicities, Power Relations and Temporality: Insights to Outsider Research from Comparative and Transnational Fieldwork. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 41*(11), pp. 2067-2084.

Benet-Martínez, V., & Haritatos, J. (2005). Bicultural identity integration (BII): Components and psychosocial antecedents. *Journal of Personality, 73*(4), pp. 1015-1049.

Benson, M. (2014). Negotiating privilege in and through lifestyle migration, In: *Understanding lifestyle migration*, pp. 47-68, Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Benson, M.C. (2013). Postcoloniality and privilege in new lifestyle flows: The case of North Americans in Panama. *Mobilities, 8*(3), pp.313-330.

Bhopal, K. (2001). Researching South Asian women: issues of sameness and difference in the research process. *Journal of Gender Studies, 10*(3), pp.279-286.

Bielsa, E., Casellas, A. & Verger, A. (2014). Homecoming as displacement: An analysis from the perspective of returning social scientists. *Current Sociology, 62*(1), pp.63-80.

Blunt, A. (2007). Cultural geographies of migration: mobility, transnationality and diaspora. *Progress in human geography, 31*(5), pp.684-694.

Broderick, A., Demangeot, C., Adkins, N. Ferguson, N., Henderson, G., Johnson, G., Kipnis, E., Mandiberg, J., Mueller, R., Pullig, C., Roy, A. & Zúñiga, M. (2011). Consumer Empowerment in

Multicultural Marketplaces: Navigating Multicultural Identities to Reduce Consumer Vulnerability. *University of St. Thomas, Minnesota,* Marketing Faculty Publications. *50.*

Buil, I., de Chernatony, L., & Martínez, E. (2012). Methodological issues in cross-cultural research: An overview and recommendations. *Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing, 20*(3-4), pp. 223-234.

Bueltmann, T., Gleeson, D. T., & MacRaild, D. M. (2014). Invisible Diaspora? English Ethnicity in the United States before 1920. *Journal of American Ethnic History, 33*(4), pp. 5-30.

Burgess, S. M., & Steenkamp, J. B. E. (2006). Marketing renaissance: How research in emerging markets advances marketing science and practice. *International Journal of Research in Marketing, 23*(4), pp. 337-356.

Caretta, M. A. (2015). Situated knowledge in cross-cultural, cross-language research: a collaborative reflexive analysis of researcher, assistant and participant subjectivities. *Qualitative Research, 15*(4), pp. 489-505.

Castilhos, R. B., Dolbec, P. Y., & Veresiu, E. (2017). Introducing a spatial perspective to analyze market dynamics. *Marketing Theory, 17*(1), 9-29.

Cayla, J. & Arnould, E.J. (2008). A cultural approach to branding in the global marketplace. *Journal of International Marketing, 16*(4), pp.86-112.

Chamove, A.S. & Soeterik, S.M. (2006). Grief in returning sojourners. *Journal of Social Sciences, 13*(3), pp.215-220.

Chaudhuri, S. (2018). *Insider, Outsider or Somewhere in Between: Issues and Challenges in the Sociological Study through Qualitative and Mixed Methods in a Religious Minority Community in India*, Paper presented at 2018 World Conference on Qualitative Research, October, Lisbon, Portugal.

Chavez, C. (2008). Conceptualizing from the inside: Advantages, complications, and demands on insider positionality. *The Qualitative Report, 13*(3), pp.474-494.

Cleveland, M. (2018). Acculturation to the global consumer culture: Ten years after and agenda for the next decade. *Journal of Global Scholars of Marketing Science, 28*(3), pp.257-271.

Cleveland, M. & Laroche, M. (2007). Acculturation to the global consumer culture: Scale development and research paradigm. *Journal of Business Research, 60*(3), pp.249-259.

Craig, C. S. & Douglas, S. P. (2001). Conducting international marketing research in the twenty-first century. *International Marketing Review, 18*(1), pp.80-90.

Craig, S. C. & Douglas, S. P. (2006). Beyond National Culture: Implications of Cultural Dynamics for Consumer Research. *International Marketing Review, 23*(3), pp. 322-342.

Craig, C. S. & Douglas, S. P. (2011). Assessing cross-cultural marketing theory and research: A commentary essay. *Journal of Business Research,64*(6), pp. 625-627.

Crouch, M. & McKenzie, H. (2006). The logic of small samples in interview-based qualitative research. *Social science information, 45*(4), pp.483-499.

Cruz, M.R. (2008). What if I just cite Graciela? Working toward decolonizing knowledge through a critical ethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry, 14*(4), pp. 651–658.

Cruz, A.G.B., Seo, Y., & Buchanan-Oliver, M. (2018). Religion as a field of transcultural practices in multicultural marketplaces. *Journal of Business Research, 91*, 317-325.

Cui, K. (2015). The insider–outsider role of a Chinese researcher doing fieldwork in China: The implications of cultural context. *Qualitative Social Work, 14*(3), pp. 356-369.

Davis, D.F., Golicic, S.L., & Boerstler, C.N. (2011). Benefits and challenges of conducting multiple methods research in marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 39*, pp. 467-479.

Demangeot, C., Broderick, A.J. & Craig, C.S., (2015a). Multicultural marketplaces: New territory for international marketing and consumer research. *International Marketing Review, 32*(2), pp. 118-140.

Demangeot, C., Broeckerhoff, A., Kipnis, E., Pullig, C., Visconti, L. M. (2015b). Consumer mobility and well-being among changing places and shifting ethnicities, *Marketing Theory, 15*(2), pp. 271-278.

Demangeot, C., Kipnis, E., Pullig, C., Cross, S.N.N., Emontspool, J., Galalae, C., Grier, S.A., Rosenbaum, M.S. & Best, S.F. (2019). Constructing a Bridge to Multicultural Marketplace Well-Being: A Consumer-Centered Framework for Marketer Action. *Journal of Business Research*, *100*(7), pp. 339-53.

Derickson, K. (2015). Urban geography I: locating urban theory in the urban age. *Progress in Human Geography 39*(5), pp. 647-657.

Dhillon, J. K. & Thomas, N. (2019). Ethics of engagement and insider-outsider perspectives: issues and dilemmas in cross-cultural interpretation. *International Journal of Research and Method in Education, 42*(4), pp. 442-453.

Diamantopoulos, A., Davvetas, V., Bartsch, F., Mandler, T., Arslanagic-Kalajdzic, M. & Eisend, M. (2019). On the Interplay Between Consumer Dispositions and Perceived Brand Globalness: Alternative Theoretical Perspectives and Empirical Assessment. *Journal of International Marketing, 27*(4), pp. 39-57.

Drake, P. (2010). Grasping at Methodological Understanding: A Cautionary Tale from Insider Research. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education, 33* (1), pp.85–99.

Dwyer, S. C. & Buckle, J. L. (2009). The space between: On being an insider-outsider in qualitative research. *International journal of qualitative methods, 8*(1), pp. 54-63.

Easterby-Smith, M. & Malina, D. (1999). Cross-cultural collaborative research: Toward reflexivity. *Academy of Management Journal, 42*(1), pp. 76-86.

Engelen, A. & Brettel, M. (2011). Assessing cross-cultural marketing theory and research. *Journal of Business Research, 64*(5), pp.516-523.

Ergun, A. & Erdemir, A. (2010). Negotiating insider and outsider identities in the field: Insider in a foreign land; outsider in one's own land. *Field Methods, 22*(1), pp.16-38.

Farrer, J. (2010). 'New Shanghailanders' or 'New Shanghainese': Western Expatriates' Narratives of Emplacement in Shanghai. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 36*(8), pp. 1211-1228.

Fishbein, M. (1963). An investigation of the relationship between beliefs about an object and the attitude toward that object. *Human relations, 16*(3), pp. 233-239.

Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *Psychological bulletin, 51*(4), pp. 327.

Fox, J. W. (1989). On the rise and fall of Tulans and Maya segmentary states. *American anthropologist, 91*(3), pp.656-681.

Frank, A.W. (2005). What Is Dialogical Research, and Why Should We Do It? Keynote Address: Sixth International Advances in Qualitative Methods Conference. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(7), pp.964-974.

Freeman, K. A. & Gahungu, A. (2013). Small Group Dynamics in Cross-Cultural Collaborative Field Research: Voices from the Field. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 8*(2), pp.77-94.

Fuller, D. (1999). Part of the action, or 'going native'? Learning to cope with the 'politics of integration'. *Area, 31*(3), pp.221-227.

Galalae, C., Kipnis, E. & Demangeot, C. (2020). Reassessing positive dispositions for the consumption of products and services with different cultural meanings: a motivational perspective. *Journal of Business Research, 115*, pp.160-173.

Ganga, D. & Scott, S. (2006). Cultural insiders and the issue of positionality in qualitative migration research: Moving across and moving along researcher-participant divides. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 7*(3).

Giovanardi, M., & Lucarelli, A. (2018). Sailing through marketing: A critical assessment of spatiality in marketing literature. *Journal of Business Research, 82*, 149-159.

Gould, S., & Maclaran, P. (2003). Special Session Summary Tales We Tell About Ourselves and Others: Heteroglossic Perspectives on Introspective Self-Report Applications in Consumer Research,, in E - European Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 6, Darach Turley and Stephen Brown, eds., Provo, UT: *Association for Consumer Research*, pp. 72-75.

Grant, M.J. & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: An analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information and Libraries Journal, 26*(2), pp. 91-108.

Greene, M. J. (2014). On the inside looking in: methodological insights and challenges in conducting qualitative insider research. *The Qualitative Report,19*(29), pp. 1-13.

Greenholtz, J. & Kim, J. (2009). The cultural hybridity of Lena: A multi-method case study of a third culture kid. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 33*, pp.391-398.

Grier, S.A., Kevin D.T. & Guillaume D. J. (2018). Re-imagining the marketplace: addressing race in academic marketing research. *Consumption Markets & Culture, 22*(1), pp. 91-100.

Groves, J.M. & O'Connor, P. (2017). Negotiating global citizenship, protecting privilege: western expatriates choosing local schools in Hong Kong. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, pp.1-15.

Hannerz, U. (2006). Studying down, up, sideways, through, backwards, forwards, away and at home: Reflections on the field worries of an expansive discipline, in S. Coleman and P. Collins (eds.), *Locating the field: Space, place and context in anthropology,* Oxford, Berg, pp. 23-41.

He, J. & van de Vijver, F. (2012). Bias and equivalence in cross-cultural research. *Online readings in psychology and culture, 2*(2), p.8.

Hill, R.P. & Martin, K.D. (2014) Broadening the Paradigm of Marketing as Exchange: A Public Policy and Marketing Perspective. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* 33(1), 17–33.

Holliday, A. (2010). Complexity in cultural identity. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 10*(2), pp. 165-177.

Hong, Y-y., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C-y., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist, 55*(7), pp. 709–720.

Hordge-Freeman, E. (2015). Out of Bounds?: Negotiating Researcher Positionality in Brazil. *Bridging Scholarship and Activism: Reflections from the Frontlines of Collaborative Research*, pp.123-133.

Hutton, M., & Heath, T. (2020). Researching on the edge: emancipatory praxis for social justice. *European Journal of Marketing, Vol. ahead-of-print* No. ahead-of-print.

Iwabuchi, K. (2010). De-Westernization and the governance of global cultural connectivity: A dialogic approach to East Asian media cultures. *Postcolonial Studies, 13*(4), pp.403-419.

Jacobs-Huey, L. (2002). The natives are gazing and talking back: Reviewing the problematics of positionality, voice, and accountability among native anthropologists. *American Anthropologist, 104*(3), pp.791-804.

Jafari, A. & Goulding, C. (2008). We are not terrorists! UK-based Iranians, consumption practices and the torn self. *Consumption, Markets and Culture, 11*(2), pp.73-91.

Jafari, A., Firat, F., Süerdem, A., Askegaard, S., & Dalli, D. (2012). Non-western contexts: The invisible half. *Marketing Theory, 12*(1), pp. 3–12.

Jessop, B., Brenner, N., & Jones, M. (2008). Theorizing sociospatial relations. *Environment and planning D: society and space*, *26*(3), 389-401.

Jiménez, T.R. (2010). *Replenished ethnicity: Mexican Americans, immigration, and identity.* University of California Press.

Kearney, S. (2020). *Understanding the Lived Experiences of People with Disabilities: Assessing the Legacy of Para-Sport Events in Host Countries*. PhD thesis, Coventry University, UK.

Khan, A., Lindridge, A., & Pusakrikit, T. (2018). Why some South Asian Muslims celebrate Christmas: Introducing 'acculturation trade-offs', *Journal of Business Research, 82*, pp. 290-299.

Kipnis, E., Demangeot, C., Pullig, C. & Broderick, A. J. (2019). Consumer Multicultural Identity Affiliation: Reassessing identity segmentation in multicultural markets. *Journal of Business Research, 98*, pp. 126-141.

Kipnis, E., Broderick, A.J. & Demangeot, C. (2014). Consumer multiculturation: consequences of multi-cultural identification for brand knowledge. *Consumption Markets & Culture, 17*(3), pp.231-253.

Kipnis, E., Emontspool, J. & Broderick, A. J. (2012). Living Diversity. Developing a Typology of Consumer Cultural Orientations in Culturally Diverse Marketplaces: Consequences for Consumption. *Advances in Consumer Research, 40,* pp. 427-435.

Kleine, R.E. & Kleine, S.S. (2000). Consumption and self-schema changes throughout the identity project life cycle. *ACR North American Advances, 27*, pp. 279-285.

Kremakova, M. I. (2014). Trust, access and sensitive boundaries between 'public' and 'private': a returning insider's experience of research in Bulgaria. *Sociological Research Online, 19*(4), pp.12.

Kubica, G. (2016). How Native Is My Native Anthropology? Positionality and the Reception of the Anthropologist's Work in Her Own Community–A Reflexive Account. *Cargo Journal, 14*(1-2).

Kumar, N. & Steenkamp, J.B.E. (2013). Diaspora marketing. *Harvard Business Review, 91*(10), p.127.

Labaree, R.V. (2002). The risk of 'going observationalist': negotiating the hidden dilemmas of being an insider participant observer. *Qualitative research, 2*(1), pp.97-122.

LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H.L.K., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological Impact of Biculturalism: Evidence and Theory, *Psychological Bulletin, 114*(3), pp.395-412.

Lee, S.J., Liu, S. & Ham, S. (2018). Negotiating, Shifting, and Balancing: Research Identities in Transnational Research In *Annual Review of Comparative and International Education 2017*, Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 119-138.

Leitner, H., Sheppard, E., & Sziarto, K. M. (2008). The spatialities of contentious politics. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 33*(2), pp.157-172.

Lücke, G., Kostova, T., & Roth, K. (2014). Multiculturalism from a cognitive perspective: Patterns and implications. *Journal of International Business Studies, 45*(2), pp. 169-190.

Luedicke, M. K. (2015). Indigenes' responses to immigrants' consumer acculturation: a relational configuration analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research, 42*(1), pp.109-129.

Malhotra, N. K., Agarwal, J. & Peterson, M. (1996). Methodological issues in cross-cultural marketing research: A state-of-the-art review. *International marketing review, 13*(5), pp. 7-43.

Mannay, D. (2010). Making the familiar strange: can visual research methods render the familiar setting more perceptible?. *Qualitative Research, 10*(1), pp.91–111.

Maxwell, M. L., Abrams, J., Zungu, T. & Mosavel, M. (2016). Conducting community-engaged qualitative research in South Africa: memoirs of intersectional identities abroad. *Qualitative Research, 16*(1), pp. 95-110.

McNess, E., Arthur, L. & Crossley, M. (2015). 'Ethnographic dazzle' and the construction of the 'Other': revisiting dimensions of insider and outsider research for international and comparative education. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 45*(2), pp.295-316.

Merton, R. K. (1972). Insiders and outsiders: A chapter in the sociology of knowledge. *American journal of sociology, 78*(1), pp. 9-47.

Milligan, L. (2016). Insider-outsider-inbetweener? Researcher positioning, participative methods and cross-cultural educational research. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 46*(2). pp.235-250.

Minowa, Y., Visconti, L.M., & Maclaran, P. (2012). Researchers' introspection for multi-sited ethnographers: A xenoheteroglossic autoethnography, *Journal of Business Research, 65*(4), pp. 483-489.

Morris, M. W., Chiu, C., and Liu, Z. (2015). Polycultural Psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *66*(1), pp. 631–659.

Muhammad, M., Wallerstein, N., Sussman, A. L., Avila, M., Belone, L. & Duran, B. (2015). Reflections on researcher identity and power: The impact of positionality on community based participatory research (CBPR) processes and outcomes. *Critical Sociology, 41*(7-8), pp. 1045-1063.

Mullings, B. (1999). Insider or outsider, both or neither: some dilemmas of interviewing in a cross-cultural setting. *Geoforum, 30*(4), pp.337-350.

Nakata, C. & Huang, Y. (2005). Progress and promise: the last decade of international marketing research. *Journal of Business Research, 58*(5), pp.611-618.

Narayan, K. (1993). How native is a native anthropologist?. *American anthropologist, 95*(3), pp. 671-686.

Nowicka, M. & Cieslik, A. (2014). Beyond methodological nationalism in insider research with migrants. *Migration Studies, 2*(1), pp.1-15.

Okamura, J. Y. (1981). Situational ethnicity. *Ethnic and racial studies, 4(4)*, pp. 452-465.

Oriola, T. & Haggerty, K.D. (2012). The ambivalent insider/outsider status of academic 'homecomers': Observations on identity and field research in the Nigerian Delta. *Sociology, 46*(3), pp.540-548.

Ozanne, J.K. & Fischer, E. (2012). Sensitizing Principles and Practices Central to Social Change Methodologies, In: David G. Mick, Simone Pettigrew, Cornelia Pechmann, and Julie L. Ozanne (eds.), *Transformative Consumer Research for Personal and Collective Wellbeing*, Routledge: NY, pp.89-106.

Ozanne, J.L. & Saatcioglu, B. (2008). Participatory Action Research. *Journal of Consumer Research, 35*, pp.423-439.

Pasura, D. (2012). A fractured transnational diaspora: The case of Zimbabweans in Britain. *International Migration, 50*(1), pp.143-161.

Pelzang, R. & Hutchinson, A. M. (2017). Establishing cultural integrity in qualitative research: Reflections from a cross-cultural study. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 17*(1).

Phillips, D.L. (1971). *Knowledge from what? Theories and methods in social research.* Rand McNally, Chicago.

Plakoyiannaki, E., Wei, T. & Prashantham, S. (2019). Rethinking qualitative scholarship in emerging markets: Researching, theorizing, and reporting. *Management and Organization Review, 15*(2), pp. 217-234.

Pollock, D. C. & Van Reken, R. E. (1999). *Third culture kids: The experience of growing up among worlds*, Intercultural Press, Yarmouth.

Polsa, P. (2013). The crossover-dialog approach: The importance of multiple methods for international business. *Journal of Business Research, 66*(3), pp. 288-297.

Reynolds, T. J. & Gutman, J. (2001). *Laddering theory, method, analysis, and interpretation. Understanding consumer decision making: the means-end approach to marketing and advertising strategy*. Lawrence Erlbaum, London, pp. 25-52.

Ringberg, T., Luna, D., Reihlen, M., & Peracchio, L. 2010. Bicultural-bilinguals: The effect of cultural frame switching on translation equivalence. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management, 10*(1), pp. 77-92.

Rogan, D., Piacentini, M., & Hopkinson, G. (2018). Intercultural Household Food Tensions: A Relational Dialectics Analysis, *European Journal of Marketing, 52* (12), 2289-311.

Rose, G. (1997). Situating knowledges: positionality, reflexivities and other tactics. *Progress in human geography, 21*(3), pp. 305-320.

Ross, L. E. (2017). An account from the inside: Examining the emotional impact of qualitative research through the lens of insider research. *Qualitative Psychology, 4*(3), p. 326.

Roudometof, V. (2005). Transnationalism, cosmopolitanism and glocalization. *Current sociology, 53*(1), pp.113-135.

Ryan, L. (2015). Inside and Outside of What or Where? Researching Migration Through Multi-Positionalities. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research,16*(2).

Runfors, A. (2016). What an ethnic lens can conceal: the emergence of a shared racialised identity position among young descendants of migrants in Sweden. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 42*(11), pp. 1846-1863.

Samuels, D. (1996). "These Are the Stories That the Dogs Tell": Discourses of Identity and Difference in Ethnography and Science Fiction, *Cultural Anthropology, 11*(1), pp. 88-118.

Saren, M., Parsons, E., & Goulding, C. (2019). Dimensions of marketplace exclusion: representations, resistances and responses, *Consumption Markets & Culture, 22*(5-6), pp. 475-485.

Savvides, N., Al-Youssef, J., Colin, M. & Garrido, C. (2014). Journeys into Inner/Outer Space: reflections on the methodological challenges of negotiating insider/outsider status in international educational research. *Research in Comparative and International Education, 9*(4), pp. 412-425.

Schiller, N.G., Çaglar, A. & Guldbrandsen, T.C. (2006). Beyond the ethnic lens: Locality, globality, and born-again incorporation. *American ethnologist, 33*(4), pp.612-633.

Schütz, A., (1945). The homecomer. *American Journal of Sociology, 50*(5), pp.369-376.

Sharma, P. (2019). Research directions & implications. In: P. Sharma (Ed.), *Intercultural Service Encounters: Cross-cultural Interactions and Service Quality.* Palgrave Pivot, Springer International: Switzerland, pp.75-96.

Sharma, P. (2010). Measuring personal cultural orientations: scale development and validation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 38*(6), pp.787–806.

Sheppard, E. (2002). The spaces and times of globalization: Place, scale, networks, and positionality. *Economic geography, 78*(3), pp. 307-330.

Sheth, J.N. (2011). Impact of emerging markets on marketing: Rethinking existing perspectives and practices. *Journal of Marketing, 75*(4), pp.166-182.

Sinkovics, R.R., Jean, R.J.B. & Kim, D. (2016). Guest editorial: Advancing the international marketing research agenda with innovative methodologies. *International Marketing Review, 33*(3).

Srivastava, P. (2006). Reconciling multiple researcher positionalities and languages in international research. *Research in Comparative and International Education, 1*(3), pp.210-222.

Stayman, D. M., & Deshpande, R. (1989). Situational ethnicity and consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *16*(3), 361-371.

Strizhakova, Y., Coulter, R.A. & Price, L.L. (2008). Branded Products as a Passport to Global Citizenship: Perspectives from Developed and Developing Countries. *Journal of International Marketing, 16*(4), pp. 57-85.

Swadener, B.B. & Mutua, K. (2008). Decolonizing performances: deconstructing the global postcolonial, In: Denzin N.K. et al. (eds) *Handbook of Critical Indigenous Methodologies*. SAGE, Thousand Oaks, pp. 31–43.

Tadajewski, M., & Brownlie, D. T. (Eds.). (2008). *Critical marketing: contemporary issues in marketing*. Wiley.

Tam, J. L. M., Sharma, P. & Kim, N. (2016). Attribution of success and failure in intercultural service encounters: the moderating role of personal cultural orientations. *Journal of Services Marketing, 30*(6), pp.643–658.

Thompson, C. J., Arnould, E. & Giesler, M. (2013). Discursivity, difference, and disruption: Genealogical reflections on the consumer culture theory heteroglossia. *Marketing Theory, 13*(2), pp.149-174.

Torraco, R. J. (2016). Writing Integrative Literature Reviews: Using the past and present to explore the future. *Human Resource Development Review, 15*(4), pp.404-428.

Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological review, 96*(3), pp. 506.

Tsui, A. S., Nifadkar, S. S. & Ou, A. Y. (2007). Cross-national, cross-cultural organizational behavior research: Advances, gaps, and recommendations. *Journal of management, 33*(3), pp. 426-478.

Turner, V. (1990). Liminality and community, In Alexander J. C. and Seidman S. (Eds.), *Culture and society: Contemporary debates,* Cambridge University Press, New York, pp. 147-154.

Vertovec, Steven (2007). Introduction: New Directions in the Anthropology of Migration and Multiculturalism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30* (6), pp. 961-78.

Visconti, L., Jafari, A., Batat, W, Broeckerhoff, A., Dedeoglu, A.O., Demangeot, C., Kipnis, E., Lindridge, A., Penaloza, L., Pullig, C., Regany, F., Ustundagli, E., & Weinberger, M.F. (2014). Consumer ethnicity three decades after: A TCR agenda, *Journal of Marketing Management, 30*(17-18), pp.1882-1922.

Visconti, L.M. (2015). Emplaced ethnicity: The role of space(s) in ethnic marketing, In Jamal A., Penaloza, L., & Laroche, M. (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Ethnic Marketing*, Routledge, Abingdon, pp.85-99.

Von Glinow, M. A., Shapiro, D. L. & Brett, J. M. (2004). Can we talk, and should we? Managing emotional conflict in multicultural teams. *Academy of Management review, 29*(4), pp. 578-592.

Vora, D., Martin, L., Fitzsimmons, S.R., Pekerti, A.A,. Lakshman, C., & Raheem, Salma (2018) Multiculturalism within individuals: a review, critique, and agenda for future research. *Journal of International Business Studie*s. ISSN 0047-2506.

Wamwara-Mbugua, L. W., Cornwell, T. B. & Boller, G. (2008). Triple acculturation: The role of African Americans in the consumer acculturation of Kenyan immigrants. *Journal of Business Research, 61*(2), pp. 83-90.

Ward, C., & Geeraert, N. (2016). Advancing acculturation theory and research: The acculturation process in its ecological context. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 8*(April), pp. 98-104.

Whittemore, R., Chase, S.K. & Mandle, C.L. (2001). Validity in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Health Research, 11*(4), pp. 522-537.

Wiederhold, A. (2015). Conducting fieldwork at and away from home: shifting researcher positionality with mobile interviewing methods. *Qualitative Research, 15*(5), pp.600-615.

Woodside, A.G. (2004). Advancing From Subjective to Confirmatory Personal Introspection in Consumer Research, *Psychology & Marketing, 21*(12), pp.987-1010.

Wray, S. & Bartholomew, M. (2010). Some reflections on outsider and insider identities in ethnic and migrant qualitative research. *Migration Letters, 7*(1), p.7.

Yampolsky, M. A., Amiot, C. E., & de la Sablonnière, R. (2013). Multicultural identity integration and well-being: A qualitative exploration of variations in narrative coherence and multicultural identification. *Frontiers in Psychology, 4*(March), pp. 1-15.

Yaprak, A. (2003). Measurement problems in cross-national consumer research: the state-of-the-art and future research directions, in Jain S. C. (Ed.) *Handbook of research in international marketing,* Edward Edgar, Cheltenham, pp. 175-89.

Zhang, Y. & Khare, A. (2009). The Impact of Accessible Identities on the Evaluation of Global versus Local Products. *Journal of Consumer Research, 36*(3), pp. 524-537.

Zhao, Y. (2017). Doing fieldwork the Chinese way: a returning researcher's insider/outsider status in her home town. *Area, 49(*2), pp. 185-191.

Zmud, J., & Arce, C. (1992). The ethnicity and consumption relationship. *ACR North American Advances*.

Zinn, M. B. (1979). Field research in minority communities: Ethical, methodological and political observations by an insider. *Social Problems, 27*(2), pp. 209-219.

Table 1: Key benefits and risks of insider and outsider stance for cultural research process

Research Process Phase (adapted from Burgess & Steenkamp, 2006) / Key considerations (adapted from Malhotra et al., 1996)	Insider Positionality		Outsider Positionality		Selected references
	Benefits	Risks	Benefits	Risks	
Theorising and learning: • Comparability and transferability of underlying assumptions and theoretical explanations • Empirical generalizations • Self-reference criterion cognizance: critical engagement with own cultural status	• Contextualisation of theory: assessment of relevance and meaning of extant constructs 'from within', as situated in sociocultural context • Representation of indigenous voice: identification of assumptions precluded 'from outside' of the context	• Context myopia: omission of context-specific assumptions resultant from implicitness of context in researcher's mind	• Theorisation of context: explicit recognition of context-specific phenomena to formulate/extend theories from context	• Ethnographic dazzle: over-emphasis on what is unfamiliar (exoticisation and reification) rather than uncovering what is similar • Failure to understand the logic of arguments in context	McNess et al. (2015); Pelzang & Hutchinson (2017); Plakoyiannaki et al. (2019); Tsui et al. (2007); Fuller (1999); Fox (1989); Zinn (1979)
Acquisitions of meaningful data: • Units' of analysis comparability • Data acquisition equivalence (translation, sampling, measurement) • Interviewer, respondent, interview cultural background	• Understanding legitimacy and relevance of data collection approaches • Overcoming translational and linguistic barriers in instrument(s) design and fieldwork • Awareness of sociocultural norms	• Researcher bias – over-rapport with and adoption of uncritical approach to the researched population and its actions • Response bias resultant from other social fissures (class, gender etc) affecting researcher-population	• Critical approach to the researched population and its actions	• Failure to access and/or establish rapport/credibility with researched population resultant from culture-informed perceptual differences of topics and/or (non)verbal expressions • Response bias resultant from researcher-	Kremakova (2015); Ganga & Scott (2006); Craig & Douglas (2001); Yaprak (2003); Jacobs-Huey (2002); He & Van de Vijver (2012); Fuller (1999); Rose

	and meanings (courtesy, hospitality, time etc) • Gaining access to and credibility/rapport with researched population	dynamics and obscuring issues of power		population power imbalance • Sampling bias – inaccessibility of certain populations resultant from cultural barriers or non-acceptance of data collection method(s) • Instrument bias - inability to express and empirically grasp phenomena resultant from linguistic barriers	(1997), Ross (2017);Greene (2014)
Data analysis: • Level of analysis • Data comparability and equivalence of interpretation	• Nuanced comprehension of emergent meanings and observations	• 'Cultural brokering' interpretation bias: sensitivity to how to represent the uncovered cultural intricacies	• Elicitation of context-specific emergent meanings and observations	• 'Negotiated reality' interpretation bias: misinterpretation resultant from unawareness of 'performance' aspects in populations' behaviours	Crouch & McKenzie (2006); Jacobs-Huey (2002); Craig & Douglas (2001); Zinn (1979); Phillips (1971); Labaree (2002); Savvides et al. (2014); Drake (2010); Dhillon &Thomas (2019)

Table 2: Conceptual map of socio-spatial RCP forms

Form of RCP	Social (national/ethnic/racial) and spatial facets of cultural identity shared with study actors		Factors affecting RCP shift(s)	Illustrative studies
	Social	**Spatial**		
Total indigenous insider	**Full**: shares national/ethnic/racial identity/background	**Full**: shares locale situatedness as that of origin and residence	Other identity facets (e.g., class, age, gender) outside of mapping exercise remit	Wray & Bartolomew 2010; Chavez, 2008; Banks 1998
Partial insider/indigenous associate	**Partial**: shares selected facets of national/ethnic/racial identity/background	**Full**: shares locale situatedness as that of origin and residence	• **Psychological tensions**: misplaced self – misjudged mobilization of position in relation to study actors; torn self – contradictions in worldviews situated in different cultural systems • **Relational tensions**: worldview/behavioral expectations from study actors; social or political tensions between cultures/subcultures within locale	Chavez, 2008; Beiu-Betts, 1994; Mullings, 1999; Maxwell et al., 2016; Dwyer & Buckle, 2009; Chaudhuri, 2018
Returning insider/outsider from within (homecomer)	**Partial**: shares national/ethnic/racial identity/background	**Partial**: shares locale situatedness historically, e.g., as that of origin, but not of residence	• **Psychological tensions**: culture shock – sense of distance from 'home' due to difference between imagined (historic) and current socio-cultural context of the homeland; torn self – contradictions in worldviews situated in cultural systems of 'home' and current locale • **Relational tensions**: worldview/behavioral expectations from study actors; assumptions of lost indigenous identity, e.g., perceived changes to affiliations and allegiances	Labaree, 2002; Srivastava, 2006; Cui, 2015; Ergun & Erdemir, 2010; Bielsa et al., 2014; Zhao, 2017; Baser & Toivanen, 2018
Adopted outsider/external insider	**Affiliative**: does not share ancestry but is socialized and integrated in the culture of study actors	**Partial**: shares locale situatedness as that of residence, but not of origin	• **Psychological tensions**: misplaced self – misjudged mobilization of cultural status • **Relational tensions**: worldview/behavioral expectations from study actors; lack of trust – suspicions of motivations; perceptions of appropriation rather than genuine engagement	Banks, 1998; Bhopal 2001; Labaree, 2002; Chavez, 2008; Cruz, 2008; Swadener & Mutua, 2008; Muhammad et al., 2014; Savvides et al., 2014
Boundary spanner outsider – situational associate	**Situational**: does not share ancestry but can cross boundaries through intercultural empathy	**None**: does not share locale situatedness	• **Psychological tensions**: emphasis on commonalities detracts from unique culture characteristics • **Relational tensions**: dissonance on worldviews (commonalities versus differences) with study actors	Wray and Bartholomew, 2010; Farrer, 2010; McNess et al., 2015; Ergun & Erdemir, 2010; Milligan, 2016
Total outsider	**None**: no shared national/ethnic/racial background; a cultural stranger	**None**: does not share locale situatedness; an interested tourist/visitor	• **Psychological tensions**: preconceived ideas about the community • **Relational tensions**: lack of credibility and access	Banks, 1998; Caretta, 2015; Chavez, 2008; Bhopal, 2001; Mullings, 1999; Baser & Toivanen, 2018
Transnational race/ethnic diaspora associate	**Full**: shares ethnic/racial ancestry and identity	**None**: does not share locale situatedness	• **Psychological tensions**: dissonance with imagined/nostalgic attachment • **Relational tensions**: ascribed outsider status from participants	Farrer, 2010; Beiku-Betts, 1994; Benson, 2013; Hordge-Freeman, 2015
World citizen/ third culture kid	**Ambivalent**: may or may not share social and spatial situatedness but harbors a superordinate cultural identity – e.g., world belonging		• **Psychological tensions**: heightened self over other(s) • **Relational tensions**: ambivalence towards researcher's status by participants	Benson, 2013; Benson & O'Reily, 2013; Groves & Connor, 2017

Table 3: A toolbox of sensitizing considerations for addressing RCP dynamics in cultural research methodologies

Research process phase	Key RCP considerations	Possible techniques and tools	Practical implications
Theorizing and learning	How are my cultural affiliations situating me in this study? Does my RCP afford consideration of the inquired phenomena at proximity and distance (e.g., complex RCPs), and what are associated benefits and risks of each perspective? What emplacement/displacement tensions I can anticipate/am experiencing from negotiating and performing my RCP in relation to co-researchers and stakeholders? Are there under-represented/oppressed perspectives on the inquired phenomena; if so, is (and how) my RCP 'giving them voice'?	Conduct personal or heteroglossic introspections on RCP in relation to social and spatial situatedness to the inquired phenomena (Section 4.1, Table 2) and associated blind spots and advantages of held insideness, outsideness or marginality stances (Table 1, Section 3.2) Analyze introspections to identify potential psychological and/or relational tensions conferred by a given RCP and their implications for theoretical assumptions, contextual objectivity, sense-making lenses and motivations (Figure 1, Section 4.2) Dialogical conceptualizations (can include co-researchers and research stakeholders) Profile researchers' cultural orientations in relation to inquired phenomena utilizing consumer cultural profiling tools. Examples include personal cultural orientation profiling (Sharma, 2010), acculturation to global consumer culture (Cleveland & Laroche, 2007), global-local identity salience measures (Zhang & Khare, 2009) and consumer multicultural identity affiliation framework (Kipnis et al., 2019)	Development of naturalized 'pre-understanding', including under-represented perspectives Defining the social and spatial dimensions of the constructs mobilized in conceptualization Development of a pluralistic, nuanced understanding of the inquired phenomena/events to guide design Identifying philosophies and schools of thoughts to reflect on researcher (research team) RCPs and anticipating potential challenges stemming from psychological and/or relational emplacement/displacement

Acquisition of meaningful data	How is my RCP situating in relation to positionality of study contributors (experts, data collection assistants) and participants? How does my RCP impact on the ability to engage with/respond to interactions with study contributors and/or participants during data collection? What RCP or combination of RCPs would entail the most advantageous position to minimize anticipated biases and acquire rich, socio-spatially situated data?	Continue personal or heteroglosic introspection by (co)researchers when in the field, through introspective visuals (Mannay, 2010) and/or vignettes (Broderick et al., 2011) Invite personal introspective visuals (Mannay, 2010) and/or vignettes (Broderick et al., 2011) by study contributors (experts, field assistants) on their stance in relation to social and spatial situatedness of the inquired phenomena (Section 4.1, Table 2). Profile positionalities of researchers, contributors and participants in relation to each other (Muhammad et. al, 2015), to interrogate potential relational tensions and loci of power and privilege (Baser & Toivanen, 2018). Intercultural training (if required) Identify potential psychological and/or relational tensions conferred by contributors' stances and their implications for conceptual understanding and contextual objectivity (Figure 1, Table 1, Section 3.2). Collaboratively interrogate stance differences through laddering (Easterby-Smith & Malina, 1999; Reynolds & Gutman, 2001). Switch between cultural milieus (Bielsa et al., 2014) and/or languages (Srivastava, 2006) to mitigate emplacement/displacement tensions of mobilized position Switch (co)researcher/field assistant to leverage different RCP(s) through sequenced independent and collaborative data collection	Identifying potential factors triggering relational emplacement/displacement tensions that may bias instrument(s) and data collection Priming awareness of RCP-related worldview, power and and legitimacy with study contributors and/or actors Leveraging RCP dynamics for identification and incorporation of emergent context-specific phenomena or perspectives Mitigating emplacement/displacement tensions with study contributors and participants

Data analysis	Have I experienced RCP shifts in prior phases of research process? What were the tensions prompting these shifts? How do my RCP stance(s) and shifts (if experienced) inform interpretation of the data? Are perspectives represented by my RCP reflected in the findings in an equal manner? Do under-represented perspectives have voice in my analysis and interpretation?	Conduct sequenced independent analysis followed by joint checking of the RCPs assumed during analysis, focusing on emplacement/displacement tensions as potential sources of analytical bias Interrogate differences and potential biases arising through variation of socio-spatial stances (insideness, outsideness, marginality) in interpretations of derived meanings and observations (Table 1, Section 3.2) Examine whether RCP-related 'context surprises' affected interpretation Triangulate of interpretation/theorizing Map the study's socio-spatial situatedness	Exploring the level of contextual 'pre-understanding' or up-to-datedness with context-specific phenomena/factors and their evolution Awareness of RCP shifts in the researcher/the research team and their sources Recognition of potential drivers of interpretation bias stemming from RCP dynamics and emplacement/displacement tensions Reconciliation of divergent interpretations

Figure 1: Researcher Cultural Positionality Dynamics Model