

COMMUNITIES THAT ACCEPT OR RESIST SUPERCENTERS: A COMPARISON OF
CULTURAL DIFFERENCES

Dr. Patrick M. Hibbeler & Dr. Karl Hickerson

ABSTRACT

If organizations have intentions to enter a community, knowing the culture of that community may play a role in whether or not they are welcome. Community leaders that wish to welcome organizations into their midst may want to understand the type of culture they have and whether it will be a good fit with the organization they are seeking. Researchers may want to know what differences there are within communities that accept while others resist an organization's entry.

This study focuses on establishing a protocol from which community understanding can be researched and summarized to better analyze the values and culture of a community. In the future, it may be possible to refine the understanding between community and organization so that organizations and communities can select each other based upon the cultural fit between the organization and the community.

Two communities were studied using a multi-case study methodology across five cultural dimensions, using five sources of data. Eleven hypotheses were tested using case research as the primary analytical tool. Five hypotheses were supported (H1, H2, H7, H9, H11), two hypotheses received moderate support (H4 & H6), two hypotheses received partial support (H8, H10) and two hypotheses had little or no support (H3, and H5).

The findings showed that the two communities differed across four of five cultural orientations. The four orientations that produced differences were the cultural dimensions of *human activity*, *human relationships*, *time*, and *human nature*. The cultural dimension of *human relationship to nature* showed little or no difference. We conclude that the ability to predict a community's acceptance or resistance can be enhanced through the understanding of cultural orientations. Organizations, communities, and researchers will benefit by understanding the underlying community culture and its influence within the community at large.

INTRODUCTION

The supercenter first began in Europe and was originally called a "hypermarket" (Stone, 2002, p. 1). The supercenter assembles under one roof general merchandise, groceries, and a variety of services for a one-stop shop combination store (Stone, 2002). The addition of a grocery department increases traffic and has a filtering effect throughout the entire store (Beaumont, 1994; Colla & Dupis, 2002; Robbins, 1998; Stone, 2002).

This multi-case study seeks to understand if there are cultural differences between communities that accept and communities that reject a supercenter. Organizations often enter communities without regard for the differences in community culture. The first question is an organizational one: is it important for organizations to understand the culture of the community prior to entry in order to predict the potential for resistance? The second question is a practical one for the community. How do communities view their culture and the implications to either support or resist an outside organization? The third question is an academic one. Looking towards the future, can we create a method by which community culture can be assessed and thereby further studied to understand if cultural change takes place as a result of introducing a supercenter to a community?

Understanding the resistance by the community to an outside organization such as a supercenter can occur and have adverse and unexpected consequences to the organization. Examples of community resistance, such as opposition coalitions, adverse publicity and legal consequences, negative public opinion and political liabilities, can have far-reaching costs to the organization.

From a community perspective, does understanding the implications of potential resistance or acceptance affect how communities view potential new organizations that might be interested in entering the community? What is an organization's responsibility to communities that it holds power over? Large organizations represent power and therefore must have a moral purpose in order to make it legitimate to society as whole (Drucker, 1993; McWilliams, 2008; Perrow, 1986; Scott, 1998; Selznick, 1948). One cause for alarm may be the apparent disregard large organizations seem have in adapting to the community once they have successfully entered Perrow (1986) stated:

It is precisely the dominant organization or institution of our society that have not experienced goal displacement and have been able to institutionalize on their own terms- to create the environments they desire, shape the existing ones, and define which sections of it they will deal with-the failure to link organizations such as these with society is so alarming. (p. 175)

Thirdly, there is an academic question concerning the potential for organizations to change the community and its culture by displacing incumbents within the fabric of the community. Organizations from outside the community resist pressure to integrate into the community by claiming moral sovereignty from the community, a pattern of decisions that forms the "organizational imperative often lead to immoral outcomes, deception, corruption, exploitation and dominations" (Selznick, 1992, p. 242). If community culture is affected and changed, can we understand what that change is? Based on the differences between communities that accept or resist, the collected evidence can be used to compare and contrast future evidence from the same communities to see what changes did or did not occur.

Criteria for choosing an Organization to Study

To select a large and powerful organization three criteria were used in the selection process. The first consideration was that the organization should be convenient and accessible as a subject. A second consideration was that the organization has been the object of both academic

and practitioner interest. Thirdly, the subject should be a current phenomenon that up to this point has not been studied through a cultural lens. Wal-Mart was chosen as fulfilling all three of the criteria: it was accessible because of its multiple retail outlets, it has been the subject of both academic and practitioner interest, and lastly there has been little written about Wal-Mart from a cultural vantage point.

Prior Supercenter Research

The economic impact of Wal-Mart has been the primary focal point of the majority of authors on the subject. A brief summary and recognition of the many authors contributions to the understanding of the economic impact is listed below. The result of the economic impact to competing retailers is that they have had to accept lower levels of performance, lost sales, lower profits and, oftentimes, store closure (Arndt, Berner, Brady, Byrnes, France, Lowry, Palmer, & Zegel, 2003; Beaumont, 1994; Zwiebach, 2003; Woo, Huang, Epperson, & Cude, 2001).

Several authors have studied the economic changes that communities experience after a supercenter opens. The studies include the measurement of business closings, job relocation, loss of employee benefits, unemployment, loss of local business ownership, downtown deterioration, and incumbent sales decline (Arndt, et al. 2003; Beaumont, 1994; Bianchini, & Montgomery, 1988; Franklin, 2001; Habebsky, 2004; Jacques, Thomas, Foster, & Tunno, 2002; McGee, 1997; Miller, 2004; Muller & Humstone, 1996; Peterson & McGee, 2000; Quinn, 1998; Seiders, & Tigert, 1997; Seiders, Simonides, & Tigert, 2000; Shils, 1997; Stone, 1995, 2002; Woo, et al., 2001). Todd Robbins examined a small New England town's conflict and resistance among its members as it relates to the differing views of the town's identity. Different and opposing views of a Wal-Mart supercenter were divided between how the community members viewed the town in ambivalent terms. The conflicting sentiments of the community members were rooted in their differing views of "situations of place dependence, continuity, and authority" (Robbins, 1998, p. 170).

Value Orientations and Culture

Values are an important part of cultural understanding and sense making. Values are a reflection of "someone's original values, someone's sense of what ought to be as distinct from what is" (Schein, 1992, p, 19). The values are the "conceptual tools that are employed in order to maintain and enhance self-esteem" (Rokeach, 1973, p. 14). Values give an important theoretical means that helps to understand "who we are and what we are about" (Kahle, 1983, p. 52). *The Nature of Human Values* by Milton Rokeach (1973) provides a working definition of what constitutes values.

A value is an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end state of existence. A value system is an enduring organization of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or end-states of existence along a continuum of relative importance.
(p. 5)

Values act as a filtering process between attitudinal and normative information (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Kahle, 1983). Values and attitudes are reciprocal with values operating on an abstract level from attitudes. Values identify role congruence, self-esteem, awareness of choice,

degree of internal and external control, and sense of personal agency (Kahle, 1983; Rokeach, 1973).

Values in Organizational Research

Values have been shown to play an important part in the study and research of organizational culture. Various models using a competing values framework approach have been useful in identifying organizational culture, organizational effectiveness, and culture change (Cameron & Quinn 1999; Hooijberg & Petrock 1992; Quinn & Rohrbaugh 1981, 1983). Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv, & Sanders (1990) conducted a cross-cultural study of values. Hofstede (1993) further developed five bi-polar dimensions that aid in understanding how different nationalities view cultural values. Condon and Yousef (1981) utilized value orientations to delineate between intercultural communications, where, depending on the orientation, one cultural value might appear as abnormal in another culture. Edgar Schein (1992, 1999) took value orientations theory and applied its principles to the study of organizational culture and leadership through understanding that culture has multi-levels of artifacts, espoused values, and tacit assumptions (Schein, 1992, 1999).

Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) used competing values as a means of distinguishing culture between communities across five value orientation dimensions. The research revealed five separate “value orientations” that exist in society. The five value orientations are human activity, person-nature, human relationships, time orientation and human nature. Within each community there exists an evaluative process of the value orientations (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961, p 4). A dominant profile of the community culture is dependent upon numerous variants and alternate profiles that are useful in the understanding and comparison of communities. The combined elements form the nucleus of the cultural evaluative process by which choices are determined and decisions made (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961).

To summarize, culture helps to shape the evaluative process that helps humans make sense of and interpret their collective reality. The five essential value variations are consistent in all cultures, by comparing and contrasting the communities across the value orientations, differences between the communities will become apparent, thereby leading to understanding why some communities resist while others welcome supercenters.

HYPOTHESES

The Five Value Orientations

The five value orientations of Florence R. Kluckhohn and Fred L. Strodtbeck provide the underpinnings to the questions, answers and other critical evidence that can be compared and contrasted between the communities accepting or rejecting a supercenter. The first value orientation is human connection to activity. The “being orientation” (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck,

1961, p. 11), is the release of the individual's self-indulgence, such as spontaneous expression of pure self-gratification. The "being is becoming orientation" (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961, p. 11), is the self-containment of personal desire, meditation, and detachment. The focus is the development of "all aspects of the self as an integrated whole" (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961, p. 17). The final activity orientation is the "doing orientation" which focuses on creating one's own destiny (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961, p. 11).

A culture that values material possessions in such a way would lean towards the "being" value orientation of human activity, which stresses self-gratification and self-indulgence (Baudrillard, 1998; Slater, 1997). Communities that exhibit a "being is becoming" orientation would seem to be less inclined to support a supercenter based upon their holistic approach. The supercenter would likely be seen as a shift in community values, and therefore resistance against the supercenter would emerge. Rural communities have been known for their individualistic "doing" orientation and for carving out a living with their own hands. Communities with a stronger individualistic tendency will be less inclined to be supportive of an outside incursion of a supercenter. Based upon the Human Activity orientation three hypotheses are proposed.

Hypothesis 1. The "being" value orientation will be greater in communities that welcome a supercenter over communities that resist.

Hypothesis 2. The "being is becoming" value orientation will be greater in communities that resist a supercenter over communities that do not resist.

Hypothesis 3. The "doing" orientation will be greater in communities that resist a supercenter over communities that do not resist.

The second value orientation is the person-nature orientation. Person-nature is the relationship humans have to the natural surroundings. This orientation is subdivided into three subcategories: human's subjugation to nature, human harmony with nature, and human mastery of nature. Communities that have a closer association to nature will likely resist the alteration of the natural surroundings by the addition of a supercenter. Communities that do not have a strong association with their natural surroundings will have a greater likelihood to support the entry of a supercenter. Based upon the person-nature orientation the study proposes two hypotheses.

Hypothesis 4. Human's mastery over nature will be greater in communities that welcome a supercenter than communities that resist.

Hypothesis 5. Human's subordination to nature will be greater in communities that resist a supercenter than communities that do not.

Human Relationship Orientation

The relational orientation of human relationship is subdivided into three segments: lineal, collateral, and individualistic. Lineal relationships are those coming from biological age, generational, and cultural continuity. Collateral is being part of the social order.

Individualistic is the autonomy of the individual (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961). Communities, which put a higher value on collateral social networks and relationships, will perceive an outside organization as possibly changing the status quo and thereby will be more likely to resist the incursion. Along the same line, lineal orientations are those having to do with family and close relations, which in turn may be disrupted either directly or indirectly if large changes occur within the community. A community with a greater degree of lineal relations will be more likely to resist a supercenter based upon the perceived changes in family relationships. A community with strong individualistic orientation, on the other hand would be more inclined to support a supercenter lacking the collateral as well as lineal ties to social networks or family genealogy. Two hypotheses were developed from the Human Relationship orientation.

Hypothesis 6. Collateral and lineal value orientations will be greater in communities that resist supercenters than communities that do not.

Hypothesis 7. Individualistic value orientations will be greater in communities that accepted supercenters than communities that resisted.

Orientation to Time

Time orientation, also called the temporal focus, is a person's determination to focus on the present, past, or future (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961). Time is elemental to how humans determine "the orderliness of social life" (Schein, 1992, p. 106). Cultures make assumptions about time, depending upon their orientation to the future, present, or past. Communities that strongly identify with past and present time orientation will react against the incursion of a supercenter into the community. North American culture has been perceived as having a future orientation as opposed to a present or past orientation (Schein, 1992). Supercenters represent a step towards the future and an orientation towards change. Communities that have a greater value orientation towards the future will identify with the supercenter as a symbol of future, and change, positive progress for the community. The comparison of community orientation to time was tested by the following two hypotheses.

Hypothesis 8. Past and present value orientations will be greater in communities that opposed the arrival of a supercenter.

Hypothesis 9. Future value orientations will be greater in communities that did not resist the entry of a supercenter.

Human Nature Orientation

Human Nature orientation is belief in "the innate goodness or badness in human nature" (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961, p. 11). Depending upon the social unit or group culture, i.e., community, organization, or hierarchy, there is a tendency to view things as good, or evil, or a combination of both (Kluckhohn, & Strodtbeck, 1961; McGregor, 1957; Schein, 1992, 1999).

A fairly large amount of negative press about Wal-Mart has been published (Beaumont, 1994; Dicker, 2006, Franklin, 2001; Habebsky, 2004; Miller, 2004; Muller, & Humstone, 1996; Peterson, & McGee, 2000; Quinn, 1998; Robbins, 1998; Seiders, & Tigert, 1997; Seiders, Simonides, & Tigert, 2000; Shils, 1997; Stone, 1995, 2002).

Wal-Mart has been chronicled as the modern day rags-to-riches story of hard work, ingenuity, everyday low pricing, and competing in the marketplace has created an international following of the ways of Wal-Mart (Ghemawat & Mark, 2005; Henderson, 2002; Slater, 2003; Troy, 2006; Walton, 1991; Walton, & Huey, 1992; Walton, & Walton, 1987).

The net effect has been a framing in the minds of individuals, based upon their cultural disposition. Wal-Mart's acceptance or rejection will be dependent upon the communities' value orientation between good, evil, or in between. The prevailing value orientation will increase the ability to predict the acceptance or rejection of a supercenter's entry into the community. These considerations underlie the final two hypotheses.

Hypothesis 10. The value orientation belief that humankind is evil and the value orientation that human kind is a blend will be greater in communities that reject a supercenter over communities that accept.

Hypothesis 11. The value orientation that human kind is good will be greater in communities that accept a supercenter without resistance over communities that reject.

METHOD

Research Question

The main question the study sought to answer was what if any cultural differences exist in communities that fight to keep out supercenters and those that accept supercenters? The study contrasted the two communities across eleven hypotheses that were extended from prior theory. The study analyzed the two communities from four principal data sources. The four data sources utilized were closed ended interview questions, open ended interview questions, mined data from the open ended questions and evidence that came from archival data such as newspaper accounts, board meeting minutes and editorials related to the approval. Where applicable, community artifacts are presented as a secondary source of evidence.

The two contrasting communities chosen were Lake Saint Louis, Missouri and Jefferson, Wisconsin. Lake St. Louis is a bedroom community near a large metropolitan community. The population is 10,000 and the community has been in existence since 1966. Jefferson, Wisconsin is a rural community with a strong German heritage. The community of Jefferson was founded in 1836. Jefferson has a population of 7,300.

Lake Saint Louis, Missouri, and Jefferson, Wisconsin, offered very interesting contrasts. Lake St. Louis is a relatively new urban community that serves as a bedroom community for the Saint Louis metropolitan area. The city of Jefferson, the county seat of Jefferson County, is an old established community with an industrial past and a significant union following. Families in Jefferson counted their ancestry in the community by decades instead of years.

Lake Saint Louis was chosen as the community that accepted the Wal-Mart Supercenter. The three criteria used for choosing Lake St. Louis were; first Wal-Mart has never existed in the community prior to the supercenter, second the supercenter was not open for more than one year, and third a coordinated opposition to the supercenter never materialized. The community of Jefferson, Wisconsin, was chosen as the community to resist the supercenter. The criteria for choosing the supercenter were first, the community had to exhibit a coordinated coalition against the supercenter; second, there had never been a supercenter or Wal-Mart in the community; and, lastly, the community that resisted had been able to keep the supercenter out.

It became apparent that finding two perfect communities that was accessible on a modest research budget was going to be a daunting task. Finding a community that had little Wal-Mart influence became problematic. Lake St. Louis like many communities has a close proximity to several nearby communities that have a Wal-Mart. The proximity issue allowed Lake St. Louis residents direct and indirect contact with one of the nearby Wal-Marts. Jefferson had a long and sustained opposition to the Wal-Mart that spanned several years. Wal-Mart did succeed in getting the Jefferson Council approval; however, the data was collected prior to the ground breaking of the store when the conflict was still a recent memory.

Unit of analysis

The unit of analysis is two communities. The two communities were chosen based on their contrasting support and resistance to the entry of a Wal-Mart Supercenter. One of the questions asked of qualitative methodology is the systematic choosing of the locations and subjects for their divergence, versus a random sampling approach. Kathleen M. Eisenhardt (1989) stated in *Building Theories from Case Study Research*. “Thus the goal of theoretical sampling is to choose cases which are likely to replicate or extend the emergent theory. In contrast, traditional, within experiment hypothesis-testing studies rely on statistical sampling in which researchers randomly sample from the population.” (p. 537)

The choice of two communities with polar opposite behaviors towards supercenters offered the best opportunity to contrast the differences in the communities through a cultural lens (Eisenhardt, 1989). It is the intent to provide the purest representation of two communities that differed on their behavior towards the proposed arrival of a supercenter. The reality was that given limitations of time and money the two chosen were the best from a practical standpoint. The two contrasting communities chosen were Lake Saint Louis, Missouri and Jefferson, Wisconsin. Lake Saint Louis was chosen as the community that accepted the Wal-Mart Supercenter. There were three main criteria for choosing Lake St. Louis. The first concern was that the community that accepted would not be influenced by already having a Wal-Mart. Secondly, to minimize the influence of the supercenter it would not have been open for more than one year. Lastly, to provide the greatest contrast, a coordinated opposition to the supercenter never materialized. There were other communities considered as welcoming the supercenter. The other communities considered were Ottawa, Illinois, Grinnell, Iowa, and Flora, Illinois. However, in each of those communities the supercenter was a replacement for a Wal-Mart Discount store (Anonymous, 2006).

The community of Jefferson, Wisconsin, was chosen as the community to resist the supercenter. The criteria for choosing the supercenter were first, the community had to exhibit a coordinated coalition against the supercenter; second, there had never been a supercenter or Wal-Mart in the community; and, lastly, the community that resisted had been able to keep the

supercenter out. Other communities considered were Pine City, Minnesota, Mason City, Iowa, and Decorah, Iowa; however, by the time the research was to begin supercenters in each of the rejected communities had opened. It became apparent that a perfect community that was accessible on a modest research budget was going to be a daunting task. Jefferson was chosen because the supercenter, although having been approved, had not yet been built and the aftermath of the resistance by the “Coalition for a Better Jefferson” was still fresh within the community. The information on the communities that resisted was taken from the Sprawl-Busters web site (Norman, 2006).

Lake St. Louis is a bedroom community near a large metropolitan community. The population is 10,000 and the community has been in existence since 1966. Jefferson, Wisconsin is a rural community with a strong German heritage. The community of Jefferson was founded in 1836. Jefferson has a population of 7,300.

Lake Saint Louis, Missouri, and Jefferson, Wisconsin, offered very interesting contrasts. Lake St. Louis is a relatively new urban community that serves as a bedroom community for the Saint Louis metropolitan area. The city of Jefferson, the county seat of Jefferson County, is an old established community with an industrial past and a significant union following. Families in Jefferson counted their ancestry in the community by decades instead of years.

Pilot interview

The original 1961 questioner developed by Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck was considered however, a finer grained instrument was needed to better contrast the community differences as they related to Wal-Mart supercenters. Pilot interviews were conducted to determine the questions to be included in the interview guide. Four participants agreed to be interviewed; two females ages 53 and 73 and 2 males ages 27 and 55. The pilot interview process yielded 14 questions that were included in the interview guide. A second interview process to add open-ended questions was initiated. Questions were developed based upon the five value orientation dimensions. Three individuals participated in the pretest phase of the open response questions. The participants were two females, ages 26 and 52, and a 23-year old male. As a means of testing the questions, the technique of “cognitive interviewing” (Bradburn, Sudman, & Wansink, 2004, p. 120) was used to determine the reliability of the open-ended questions. The respondents were asked to restate in their own words the meaning of the questions and to verbalize the process they went through when answering the questions. The resulting process yielded six open-ended questions that were added to the interview guide for a total of 20 questions.

Evidence Collection

The Principal Investigator conducted initial interviews to address three issues. The first was to make contact with local informants to help locate access to archival data. The second was to get a feel for the community and the third was to get potential sources for the interview process. Two local informants were located in each community.

In Lake Saint Louis, the informants were instrumental in using the “snowball technique” which incorporates someone from inside the community to introduce the principal investigator to key persons who in turn introduce other individuals for interviewing. Telephone and email

contacts yielded 14 individuals who agreed to be interviewed. The interview sessions spanned a three-day period. Archival data that related to the Wal-Mart approval process for Lake Saint Louis council meeting minutes and newspaper archival data was collected from a key informant and the Saint Louis County Library respectively. In Jefferson, a cold calling approach was utilized. A sufficient number of names were gathered from the newspaper articles and Jefferson council minutes made the snowball technique unnecessary. The interview process for Jefferson was conducted at the community library. Of the 13 individuals interviewed, six were female. The average age was 57 with a range of 29 to 71 years of age. The average length of time in the community was 37 years with a range of 3 years to 71 years.

During the interview process, the subjects were given identifying numbers to protect their identity and a secure file was created. The University's informed consent form was read and signed by each interviewee. Prior to the interview beginning, any questions or concerns questions were answered by the principal investigator. Fourteen survey-style questions were asked and recorded on the interview guide. The final six open-ended questions were tape-recorded. The tape recordings were transcribed onto a word processor so that the interviews could be coded at a later time.

The six open-ended questions provided two sources of coded data. Five of the open-ended questions were specifically directed at a specific value dimension and were coded according to the value orientation direction chosen. The final question was designed to allow for open and free-flowing commentary. Each of the open-ended questions was mined for statements reflecting other cultural dimensions. The mined data was set as a separate data source and used accordingly. The mined data allowed for the reanalysis and reuse of the data so that "new themes" or "alternate interpretations" (Corti, Thompson, & Fink 2004, p 297) could be developed.

Data Coding

Decision rules were developed to provide consistency in the coding process and reduce influence by any one of the coders or principal investigator. Another decision rule was created to reduce the possible influence by allowing up to two quotes per individual to be included from archival data within an examination of evidence collected from a data source.

Prior to data analysis, the assistance of two college female coders was added to the project. Both coders were paid for their participation, half at the beginning and half at the end. Prior to beginning the coding process, each assistant was given a preparation guide. The preparation guide contained a review on the cultural dimensions, researcher bias, coding instructions and coding rules. The two coders were given a questioner that featured three parts: multiple choice, true-false, and short essays. The correct answer percentage of the two coders was 60% and 66% respectively, with a between coder agreement score of 47%. A follow-up meeting was held to go over the answers from the questioner. A second test was administered and both students improved their scores. The first student improved to a score of 70% correct and the second student improved to an 80% correct score. Agreement on answers between coders improved to 60%. A final meeting was held to return completed coded material and to discuss and answer any questions. Additional material was given to be coded and returned in two weeks. After the final material was returned, the coders were thanked and paid for their assistance in the project.

RESULTS

Data Sources

The summarized data from the coding process was placed into a “conceptually clustered matrix” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 127). The coded data was categorized into a matrix of the five cultural value categories using abbreviations by data source, dimension, dimension direction, and coder confirmation. Survey, open ended and mined data were separated as individual data sources. Archival data consisting of board meeting minutes, newspaper articles, and editorials were combined to form a single source.

Data Analysis

The summarized material was put into tables by accumulating the evidence in numerical points termed “counts of various phenomena” (Yin, 1994, p. 97). Survey answers were given a point for each answer and a half point if there was a split answer. Two-thirds agreement between the coders was necessary to award a point. The analytical process summarized the data into second order numbers as a percentage of the total responses for each dimension direction (Yin, 1994).

Where sufficient data is not present, the data source is placed in a subordinate supporting context where at least two other data sources support or reject the hypothesis. The hypothesis that relates to the tables is included for ease of reference. Community artifacts will be presented separately as a subordinate source of evidence. Additional evidence was gathered but it did not relate to any of the five dimensions. The additional evidence was consolidated using “pattern matching” (Yin, 1994, p. 106).

Tables 1A through 5B summarize the evidence from the four sources of material. Numerical tables are represented by the label A. Second order (percentage) tables are represented by the letter B. Triangulation of the data sources showing support or rejection for the hypothesis is explained accordingly. Strong support is where the four principal data sources converge in agreement with the hypothesis. Moderate support for a hypothesis is where three of four data sources converge in agreement of the hypothesis. Partial support is where a hypothesis has two nested theories and only one of the two is supported. Limited support for a hypothesis is where two of four data sources converge in agreement to the hypotheses. No support is where only a single data source supports the hypothesis.

H1 proposes that in communities that welcome a supercenter there will be a greater tendency towards the *being* value orientation than in communities that resist. It is reasoned that the greater availability of goods and services that the supercenter provides would align with cultural values that place a greater significance on personal gratification. In H2, it is proposed that the community that resists the supercenter will have a value orientation that subjugates personal gratification for the community’s greater good. H3 reasons that in communities that resist there will be greater orientation towards a doing orientation, which is symbolized by a can do attitude and willingness to accept and overcome challenges.

The activity orientation of Jefferson and Lake Saint Louis is compared in Tables 1A and 1B. In H1 the being value orientation is moderately supported as greater in Lake Saint Louis, compared to Jefferson, in three of the four data sources (survey, open ended and archival). Mined data was the single data source that did not support H1. There is moderate support for H2 that Jefferson has a greater orientation towards the *being is becoming* value orientation when

compared to Lake Saint Louis in three of four data sources (interview, open-ended, and mined data). H3 that Jefferson had a greater tendency towards the *doing* orientation than Lake Saint Louis yielded no support as a single data source (mined data) supported the hypothesis.

Table 1A
Human Activity Orientation
Survey and Coded Response Data

	<u>Survey</u>		<u>Open ended</u>		<u>Mined data</u>		<u>Archival</u>	
	Jeff.	LSL	Jeff	LSL	Jeff	LSL	Jeff	LSL
Doing	64	65.5	2	3.5	1	2	7	2
Becoming	26.5	15.5	7	1	2	2	4	2
Being	26.5	40	3	9	3	3	3	3
Total	117	121	12	13.5	6	7	14	7

Table 1B
Human Activity Orientation
Proportion of Total Responses

	<u>Survey</u>		<u>Open ended</u>		<u>Mined data</u>		<u>Archival</u>	
	Jeff.	LSL	Jeff.	LSL	Jeff.	LSL	Jeff.	LSL
Doing	0.55	0.54	0.17	0.26	0.17	0.29	0.50	0.29
Becoming	0.23	0.13	0.58	0.07	0.33	0.29	0.29	0.29
Being	0.23	0.33	0.25	0.67	0.50	0.43	0.21	0.43

H4 and H5 seek to understand if there are differences between communities in their relationship to their natural surroundings. The supercenter is the embodiment of technological advancement and Lake Saint Louis through its support of the supercenter is theorized to have a greater orientation towards mastery over nature. Jefferson a community more tightly dependent on its natural surroundings would conversely act to reject the supercenter as a manifestation of its subordination to nature. It is reasoned that the community that resists will have a greater affinity towards the natural surroundings and therefore will act to protect it by rejecting the supercenter. Tables 2A and 2B summarize the evidence from the four data sources for H4 and H5.

There appears to be moderate support for H4 that Lake Saint Louis has a orientation towards a mastery over nature in three data sources (survey mined data and archival). H5 has appears to have no or limited support for H5 that Jefferson has a greater orientation towards subordination to nature than Lake Saint Louis. Open ended and mined data were the two data sources that supported H5; however, there was only a 2% difference separating the two communities in the opened ended data source. Mined data was the single data source that showed reasonable support. Both survey and archival were nearly identical between the two communities.

Community artifacts as a secondary source of data did not lend support to either hypothesis H4 or H5. Support for the person nature orientation as a predictor was a split between H4 (having support) and H5 (little or no support). The use of the person nature

orientation should be considered relative to the community that accepted the supercenter, however as a predictor of resistance it did not demonstrate sufficient support to stand on its own and therefore should be considered with other dimensions.

Table 2A
Person Nature Orientation
Survey and Coded Response Data

	<u>Survey</u>		<u>Open ended</u>		<u>Mined data</u>		<u>Archival</u>	
	Jeff.	LSL	Jeff.	LSL	Jeff.	LSL	Jeff.	LSL
Subordinate	15.5	18	3	3	2	1	4	2
Over	40.5	46	4	1	1	2.5	3	1
With	21	15	6	10	0	0.5	4	0
Total	77	79	13	14	3	4	11	3

Table 2B
Person Nature Orientation
Proportion of Total Responses

	<u>Survey</u>		<u>Open ended</u>		<u>Mined data</u>		<u>Archival</u>	
	Jeff.	LSL	Jeff.	LSL	Jeff.	LSL	Jeff.	LSL
Subordinate	0.20	0.23	0.23	0.21	0.67	0.25	0.36	0.67
Over	0.53	0.58	0.31	0.07	0.33	0.63	0.27	0.33
With	0.27	0.19	0.46	0.71	0.00	0.13	0.36	0.00

H6 states that Jefferson the community that resists a supercenter will have a greater orientation towards *collateral* and *lineal* orientations. The expectation that friends and loved ones may be negatively impacted through the introduction of an outside entity like a supercenter will engender resistance to the supercenter arrival.

H7 states that Lake Saint Louis the community that accepts the supercenter will have an *individualistic* value orientation. It is reasoned that there will be less concern for those within the community that may or may not be affected since the community members with an *individualistic* orientation do not have a strong association with other members of the community.

Tables 3A and 3B summarize the four sources of evidence for the human relationship value orientation. H6 is moderately supported in both collateral and lineal value orientations. The collateral value orientation of H6 is moderately supported in three sources of evidence: survey, open ended and mined data. The lineal value orientation of H6 is moderately supported in three of four sources; survey, mined and archival.

There is support for H7 in three of four data sources. Lake Saint Louis showed a greater orientation towards individual values than Jefferson in survey, open ended, mined data and archival. Archival data showed a one-percentage difference between Lake Saint Louis over Jefferson on the *individual* second order values.

Table 3 A
Human relationship Orientation
Survey and Coded Response Data

	<u>Survey</u>		<u>Open ended</u>		<u>Mined data</u>		<u>Archival</u>	
	Jeff.	LSL	Jeff	LSL	Jeff	LSL	Jeff	LSL
Collateral	33	30	3	1	2	3	17	5
Lineal	33	30	2	4	3	5	10	
Individual	50	65	7	9	1	6	5	1
Total	116	125	12	14	6	14	32	6

Table 3 B
Human relationship Orientation
Proportion of Total Responses

	<u>Survey</u>		<u>Open ended</u>		<u>Mined data</u>		<u>Archival</u>	
	Jeff.	LSL	Jeff.	LSL	Jeff.	LSL	Jeff.	LSL
Collateral	0.28	0.24	0.25	0.07	0.33	0.21	0.53	0.83
Lineal	0.28	0.24	0.17	0.29	0.50	0.36	0.31	0.00
Individual	0.43	0.52	0.58	0.64	0.17	0.43	0.16	0.17

H8 states that *past* and *present* value orientations will be greater in the community that resists the supercenter. Communities that have an orientation towards the *past* and *present* will view the supercenter as potentially harmful, because it will be viewed as having a potential impact on the communities’ heritage and preservation efforts. H9 states that the *future* orientation will be greater in the community that accepts the supercenter. It is suggested that the community that accepts the supercenter has a *future* orientation that seeks growth through modernization and development in the community.

The summary of evidence for H8 and H9 are in Tables 4A and 4B. There is strong support for H8 where Jefferson had a greater *past* value orientation than Lake Saint Louis in all four data sources. The second part of H8 was not supported. It was predicted that the community resisting the supercenter would have a greater orientation towards the *present* than the community that accepted. Jefferson had one data source that supported the hypothesis of supercenter resistance and therefore H8 was partially accepted.

Three of the four data sources supported H9 where the community that welcomed the supercenter, Lake Saint Louis, had a greater orientation towards the *future* than Jefferson, the community that resisted the supercenter. The data sources that supported the Lake Saint Louis value orientation are survey, open ended, and archival. Additional artifact evidence supported the contrasting time orientations of the two communities. H8 was supported by Jefferson having a weeklong German Heritage festival, a historical society, and a revitalization project of the historic downtown. In a nod to future development and support for H9, Lake Saint Louis demolished the oldest commercial development called the Wharf to make way for the expansion of the St. Joseph Hospital and Cancer Center nearby. Lake Saint Louis has used the Wal-Mart Supercenter development as a catalyst for a life styles shopping center called “The Shops at Hawk Ridge”.

Table 4A
Human Time Orientation
Survey and Coded Response Data

	<u>Survey</u>		<u>Open ended</u>		<u>Mined data</u>		<u>Archival</u>	
	Jeff.	LSL	Jeff	LSL	Jeff	LSL	Jeff	LSL
Future	33	48	1	4	7	2	0.5	8
Past	45	29	6	1	5	1.5	6	
Present	33	47	5	9	3	1.5	2.5	
Total	111	124	12	14	15	5	9	8

Table 4B
Human Time Orientation
Proportion of Total Responses

	<u>Survey</u>		<u>Open ended</u>		<u>Mined data</u>		<u>Archival</u>	
	Jeff.	LSL	Jeff.	LSL	Jeff.	LSL	Jeff.	LSL
Future	0.30	0.39	0.08	0.29	0.47	0.40	0.06	1.00
Past	0.41	0.23	0.50	0.07	0.33	0.30	0.67	0.00
Present	0.30	0.38	0.42	0.64	0.20	0.30	0.28	0.00

H10 states the community that resists the supercenter will have a greater orientation towards human kind as *evil* or a *combination of good and evil*, than the community that accepts the supercenter. H11 states that the community that welcomes the supercenter will have a greater orientation towards viewing things as *good* over the community that resists.

Tables 5A and 5B summarize the data for H10 and H11. H10 is supported in all four of the data sources that human kind has a tendency towards evil. The second part of H10 showed no support for Jefferson having a greater orientation towards a combination of good and evil over Lake Saint Louis.

H11 was supported in three of four data sources that Lake Saint Louis had a greater orientation over Jefferson towards viewing human kind as good. The data sources supporting Lake Saint Louis’s orientation towards the future are survey, open ended, mined data. Archival data source for Lake Saint Louis did not report any evidence. Artifacts of the city council minutes supported Lake Saint Louis as a community that has an orientation towards good. In reviewing the council meetings over a period of several months of Wal-Mart discussions, there was no opposition posed against the Wal-Mart Supercenter or any other matter before the city council.

Table 5 A
Human nature Orientation
Survey and Coded Response Data

	<u>Survey</u>		<u>Open ended</u>		<u>Mined data</u>		<u>Archival</u>	
	<u>Jeff.</u>	<u>LSL</u>	<u>Jeff</u>	<u>LSL</u>	<u>Jeff</u>	<u>LSL</u>	<u>Jeff</u>	<u>LSL</u>
Good	45	56	3	6	0	1.5	7	
Evil	37	3	7	2	5	0.5	24	
Combination	34	62	3	6	1	2	4	
Total	116	121	13	14	6	4	35	

Table 5 B
Human nature Orientation
Proportion of Total Responses

	<u>Survey</u>		<u>Open ended</u>		<u>Mined data</u>		<u>Archival</u>	
	<u>Jeff.</u>	<u>LSL</u>	<u>Jeff.</u>	<u>LSL</u>	<u>Jeff.</u>	<u>LSL</u>	<u>Jeff.</u>	<u>LSL</u>
Good	0.39	0.46	0.23	0.43	0.00	0.38	0.20	
Evil	0.32	0.02	0.54	0.14	0.83	0.13	0.69	
Combination	0.29	0.51	0.23	0.43	0.17	0.50	0.11	

DISCUSSION

In the beginning, the research project set out to determine a single question of whether or not communities that accepted or resisted supercenters differed across five previously studied cultural dimensions. The results from the findings indicate that there exist cultural differences between the two communities on four of the five cultural dimensions studied. The findings were consistent across nine of the eleven hypothesis studied using between three to five sources of data depending upon the availability of evidence. The evidence showed that five hypotheses were supported, two hypotheses received moderate support, two hypotheses received partial support, and two hypotheses received no support.

The results from Tables 1A and 1B indicate that there was support for the communities of Lake Saint Louis and Jefferson differing along cultural lines for the activity dimension covered by H1 and H2. The predicted value orientations of Lake Saint Louis and Jefferson are the yin and yang of our human activity response. As a community, do we pursue a course of self-gratification (Lake Saint Louis) or do we forgo personal gratification for a greater good (Jefferson)? In Lake Saint Louis and Jefferson, the indication is that both communities across three of four data sources are oriented towards their respective value dimensions.

There is sufficient strength of evidence to predict that the community that supports the supercenter will have an orientation towards the being value orientation. The residents of Lake Saint Louis appeared to embrace the supercenter even if they were not going to personally shop there. The few concerns that employees are treated unfairly did not influence community resistance of the supercenter. The Jefferson community is oriented towards the being is becoming value orientation that they perceive is for the greater good of Jefferson. The residents acknowledge that a supercenter would lower prices and make shopping more convenient. However, the loss of local business, displacement of employees and fear of lowering wages all weighed heavily in the residents' decision to oppose the supercenter. H3 predicted that the doing value orientation in the community that resisted the supercenter would be greater than the community that accepted. Both communities had a similar tendency towards the doing orientation, therefore H3 is rejected as a predictor of a community's response to the addition of a supercenter in the community.

H4 and H5 predict that the communities that accept or resist the supercenter will demonstrate their respective orientation towards mastery over nature or subordination towards nature. Does the community strive to maintain and support nature as a part of its value system or does the community seek to exploit nature and have mastery over it? It was predicted that Lake

Saint Louis would have a greater degree of mastery over nature than Jefferson would. Jefferson was predicted to have a greater degree of subordination towards nature than Lake Saint Louis. In H4, the data sources for Lake Saint Louis showed some support in three of four data sources. In H5 Jefferson showed support in two of four data sources. However, the strength of the data lacks support, and therefore the person nature orientation as a predictor of community support or resistance should be considered in the context of other cultural predictors that demonstrated greater strength.

The comparison of Jefferson, a community with a long history, and Lake Saint Louis, a relatively new community, suggests the juxtaposition between lineal and collateral ties compared to an individualistic orientation. Within each community, there are relationship values that help to understand associations within the community. As a community, is there a tendency to see things on an individual basis (individualistic), through a group (collateral) or family (lineal)? H6 predicted that the community that resisted the supercenter (Jefferson) would have a greater collateral and lineal human relationship orientation than the community that accepted. Moderate support was reported for collateral human relationship in three of four data source. Moderate support was reported for lineal value orientation in three of four data sources. The findings suggest that a community with a high level of collateral and lineal orientation towards human relationships would be a predictor of whether or not the community resisted a supercenter. H7 predicted that the community that accepted the supercenter (Lake Saint Louis) would have a greater individualistic orientation than the community that resisted. H7 was moderately supported in three of four data sources. Individuality was an indicator of supercenter acceptance in Lake Saint Louis, where the community as a whole exhibited an orientation towards a go-it-alone approach to human relationships compared to Jefferson that exhibited a tendency in support of relationships.

H8 and H9 predicted that a community's value orientation towards time could be an indicator of whether or not that community will welcome or resist a supercenter. In H8, Jefferson would be a community that has a greater orientation towards the past and present than Lake Saint Louis. In H9, Lake Saint Louis is a community that has a future orientation and is looking to expand and grow. The community's predisposition towards a future orientation would be more likely to support new business than a community that resisted the supercenter. H8 and H9 sought to find if past, present, or future are indicators of whether or not a community's orientation towards time is a factor in accepting or rejecting a supercenter. Partial support was found for H8. Jefferson showed a past orientation in four of four data sources. The second part of H8 was not supported. The present value orientation in Jefferson was not greater than Lake Saint Louis.

H9 was supported in three of four data sources. Lake Saint Louis did have a greater orientation towards the future than Jefferson did. It stands to reason that the community that accepted the supercenter would have a greater orientation towards the future over a community that resisted the supercenter. The difference between Lake Saint Louis and Jefferson appears in how each community treats its historical structural artifacts. Lake Saint Louis demolished one of its few remaining original commercial buildings to make way for a new hospital cancer center. The citizens of Jefferson formed a downtown historical association that combined with a community program to revitalize the downtown and bring new business and investment into the community.

Does the community that accepts or resists a supercenter show a greater orientation towards human nature as good, evil, or a combination? A community's view of human nature as

either good or evil would be a predictor of how the community would support or resist the arrival of a supercenter. H10 and H11 suggests that by understanding how a community views the human nature orientation (good, bad, or combination) it can be a predictor of whether or not the community will accept or reject the arrival of a supercenter. In H10, it is predicted that Jefferson would have an orientation towards seeing the world as evil or a combination of good and evil that is greater than Lake Saint Louis. H10 was partially supported. In all four of the data sources Jefferson showed a greater tendency to see things as evil than Lake Saint Louis. The second part of H10 was not supported. Lake Saint Louis showed a greater tendency to see things as a combination in three of four data sources over Jefferson. H11 was moderately supported where Lake Saint Louis had a greater orientation towards seeing things as good in three of four data sources.

Study Limitations

Certain limitations of the study came about in the process of choosing the best two communities to study. The ideal community size of 3,000 to 6,000 population proved to be unrealistic from a practical standpoint, communities of this size are not sufficient to attract or sustain a supercenter.

In the community that resisted the supercenter, it was the intent to choose a community that refused the supercenter outright. From a practical standpoint given a modest budget and the need to have a community that was reasonably accessible, the choice of Jefferson was an acceptable alternative. When considering the length of conflict (over four years), the opposing coalitions, and the rural nature of the community were factors that gave Jefferson an advantage over other communities that were considered.

In the community that welcomed the supercenter, it was stipulated that the supercenter was to be open in the community a year or less. The initial visit to Lake Saint Louis was almost exactly a year after the Wal-Mart supercenter had opened. It is fair to argue that Lake Saint Louis, as a bedroom community to the city of Saint Louis, would not experience the same effect of a new store opening as a community that did not have the availability of retail location that the City of Saint Louis possess. The additional time that the study collected data past the one-year period was deemed a reasonable risk to assume.

SUMMARY

At the beginning of the project, a single question was posed. Are there cultural differences between communities that accept and communities that resist a Wal-Mart Supercenter? The study provided evidence that cultural differences exist between the two communities chosen for their reactions to the introduction of a supercenter. The communities differed across all or part of four of the five dimensions. The four dimensions that were supported by evidence of community differences are *activity*, *relationship*, *time*, and *human nature*. The *person-nature* dimension did not have sufficient analytical support to be considered a predictor of resistance or support for a supercenter.

The findings may not be generalizable across communities in other geographic locations, such as a community in Vermont or a community in Oregon. It could be suggested that in those communities the person nature orientation may be a more salient determinate towards acceptance or rejection than it has been in this study. Future research might also investigate separate directions within each orientation. For example, considering human nature orientation a bi-polar dimension may not yield the most important differentiation and predictability. Thus one might generate separate hypotheses for an orientation toward good and toward evil. Separate hypotheses may have yielded stronger support for evil as a determinate for resistance of a supercenter and no support for combination as a predictor of resistance in Jefferson.

While a single dimension does not make a persuasive case for the importance of cultural orientations, results illustrating differences for four of the five dimensions are compelling. The implication is that by understanding community values we can more accurately predict the community's acceptance or resistance of a supercenter. Organizations, communities, and researchers by understanding community values are better equipped to predict whether a community will accept or resist the arrival of a supercenter.

In summarizing the findings of the two communities, Lake Saint Louis is a community that has an orientation towards self-indulgence and self-gratification. It is a community that has a tendency towards the autonomy of the individual. It is a community that views itself in future terms and looks at the world with greater acceptance (good) over suspicion (evil). Jefferson is a community that as a whole looks towards the self-containment of personal desire for the greater good. It is a community that has greater tendency towards lineal and collateral relationships. Jefferson is a community with a historical past that it honors with rites and ceremonies. Lastly, it is a community that tends to view the world with greater suspicion (evil) than acceptance (good).

The study has three practical hypotheses that were underlying inquiries the study sought to answer. The first was an organizational question. If organizations such as Wal-Mart are seeking to expand and build, these results show that they should be aware of the culture of the community that they are entering. Time, money, and organizational reputation are important strategic assets and their prudent application may well warrant an understanding of community culture prior to future development within communities. If by understanding community culture, the organization prior to entry has a reasonable insight as to whether the community will accept or resist, then it can make an informed decision based upon that knowledge.

The second underlying inquiry has to do with the community leaders. If the leaders are aware of the type of values that underlie the community culture, then they can more effectively deal with conflicting proposals depending upon the particular cultural value system within the community.

The last underlying inquiry is a research question. The groundwork has been laid for future research. The study has created a "time one" data set from which to compare the communities over time. The research question that begs to be answered is, does an organization change community culture over time? The two communities in this study represent an opportunity to see if the entry of the supercenter changes community culture orientations over time.

REFERENCES

- Anonymous (January, 2006). <http://www.walmartfacts.com/articles/1543.aspx>, Wal-Mart.
- Arndt, M., Berner, R., Brady, D., Byrnes, N., France, M., Lowry, T., Palmer, T., & Zegel, S. (2003, October 6). Wal-Mart by the numbers. *Business Week*, 82-83.
- Baudrillard, J. (1998). *The consumer society myths and structures*. (2 ed.). London: Sage.
- Beaumont, C. E. (1994). How superstore sprawl can harm communities. Utica, NY, Houchen Bindery LTD.
- Bianchini, F. and J. Montgomery (1988). *City centres, city cultures: The role of the arts in the revitalization of towns and cities*. (M. Fisher and K. Worpole). Manchester, U.K., Heron House: 64.
- Bradburn, N., S. Sudman, et al. (2004). *Asking questions: The definitive guide to questionnaire design*. San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass.
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture*. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Colla, E. & Dupis M. (2002). Research and managerial issues on global retail competition Carrefour/Wal-Mart. *International journal of Retail and Distribution Management* 30(2), 103-111.
- Condon, J. C. & F. S. Yousef (1981). *An introduction to intercultural understanding*. Indianapolis: IN, Bobbs-Merrill.
- Corti, L., P. Thompson, et al., Eds. (2004). Preserving, sharing and reusing data from qualitative research: Methods and strategies. *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research*. London, Sage.
- Dicker, J. (2006). *The United States of Wal-Mart*. New York, NY: Penguin Group.
- Drucker, P. F. (1993). *Post-capitalist society*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review* 14(4), 532-550.

- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Franklin, A. W. (2001). The impact of Wal-Mart supercenters on supermarket concentration in U.S. metropolitan areas. *Agribusiness*, 17(1), 105-114.
- Ghemawat, P., & Mark, K. A. (2005, August 3). The price is right. *New York Times*.
- Habebsky, S. (2004). Superstores and the politics of retail distribution. *City and Community*, 3(2), 115-134.
- Henderson, T. (2002). Wal-Mart is us. *Stores* 84, 11, 8.
- Hooijberg, R., & Petrock, F. (1992). On culture change: Using the competing values framework to help leaders execute a transformational strategy. *Human Resource Management*, 32, 29-50.
- Hofstede, G., Neuijen, B., Ohayv, D. D., & Sanders, G. (1990). Measuring organizational cultures: A qualitative study across twenty cases. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, 286-316.
- Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive*, 7(1), 165-178.
- Jacques, P., Thomas, R., Foster, D., & Tunno, M. (2002). Wal-Mart or World-Mart a teaching case study. *Review of radical political economics*, 35(4), 513-533.
- Kahle, L. R. (Ed.). (1983). *Social values and social change*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Kluckhohn, F. R. (1958). Variations in basic values of family systems. *Social Casework* 39: 63-72.
- Kluckhohn, F. R., & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961). *Variations in Value Orientations*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson and Company.
- McGee, J. E., & Rubach, M. J. (1997). Responding to increased environmental hostility: A study of the competitive behavior of small retailers. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 13(1), 1-8.
- McGregor, D. M. (1957). *The human side of enterprise*. (2nd ed.). Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- McWilliams, G. (2008, January 8). The end of the Wal-Mart era. *The Wall Street Journal*, Retrieved January 16, 2008, from <http://articles.moneycentral.msm.com/>

Investing/Extra/TheEndOfTheWalMartEra.asps

- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Within-case displays: Exploring and describing*. In *Qualitative Data Analysis* (2nd ed.). pp. 90-142).
- Miller, G. (2004). Everyday low wages: The hidden price we all pay for Wal-Mart. *Washington: U.S. House of Representatives*.
- Muller, T., & Humstone, E. (1996). What happened when SPRAWL-MART came to town?. *Washington: The National Trust for Historic Preservation*.
- Norman, A. (October 2006). "Sprawl-busters." <http://www.sprawl-busters.com/victoryz.html>.
- Peterson, M., & McGee, J. E. (2000). Survivors of "W-day": An assessment of Wal-Mart's invasion of small towns retailing communities. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 28(4/5), 170-180.
- Perrow, C. (1986). *Complex organizations: A critical essay*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Quinn, R. E., & Rohrbaugh, J. (1981). A competing values approach to organizational effectiveness. *Public Productivity Review*, 122-140.
- Quinn, R. E., & Rohrbaugh, J. (1983). A spatial model of effectiveness criteria: Towards a competing values approach to organizational analysis. *Management Science*, 29(3), 363-377.
- Quinn, B. (1998). *How Wal-Mart is destroying America*. (1 ed.). Berkeley, CA: Ten Speed Press.
- Robbins, T. J. (1998). *Questioning the community question: Wal-Mart, place identity and a classic New England town*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, E. H. (1999). *The corporate culture survival guide* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Jossey-Bass.
- Scott, W. R. (1998). *Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems*. (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Seiders, K., & Tigert, D. J. (1997). Impact of market entry and competitive structure on store switching/store loyalty. *The International Review of Retail Distribution and Consumer Research*, 7(3), 227-247.

- Seiders, K., Simonides, C., & Tigert, D. J. (2000). The impact of supercenters on traditional food retailers in four markets. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution*, 28(4/5), 181-191.
- Selznick, P. (1948). Foundations of the theory of organizations. In J. M. Shafritz and J. S. Ott (ed.), *Classics of organizational theory*. Fort Worth, TX, Harcourt Brace: 127-137.
- Selznick, P. (1992). *The moral commonwealth: Social theory and the promise of community*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Shils, E. B. (1997). *The Shils report: Measuring the economic and social impact of the mega-retail discount chains on small enterprise in suburban and rural communities*. Philadelphia, PA: Kennedy Printing Company.
- Slater, D. (1997). *Consumer culture and modernity*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Polity Press.
- Slater, R. (2003). *The Wal-Mart decade*. New York: Portfolio.
- Stone, K. E. (1995). Competing with the discount mass merchandiser. *Ames, IA, Iowa State University*.
- Stone, K. E. (2002). The economic impact of Wal-Mart supercenters on existing businesses in Mississippi (700-12-02). *Mississippi State University Extension Service*, 11.
- Troy, M. (2006). Winning at Wal-Mart. *DSN Retailing Today*, 8-10.
- Walton, S., & Walton, J. L. (1987). *Wal-Mart, the first 25 years*. Bentonville, AR: Wal-Mart Training Department.
- Walton, S. (1991). *Wal-Mart a focus on retail with Sam Walton*. Bentonville: Wal-Mart Video Communications Production.
- Walton, S., & Huey, J. (1992). *Sam Walton, made in America*. New York: Doubleday.
- Woo, B.-J., Huang, C. L., Epperson, J. E., & Cude, B. (2001). Effect of a new Wal-Mart supercenter on local retail food prices. *Journal of Food Distribution Research*, 173-181.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods*. (Vol. 5). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zwiebach, E. (2003). *Wal-Mart sees no limits to ambitious expansion*. *Supermarket News*. 51(1), 64.

