

**University of Massachusetts Boston**

---

**From the Selected Works of Banu Ozkazanc-Pan**

---

2008

# International Management Research Meets "The Rest of The World"

Banu Ozkazanc-Pan, *University of Massachusetts - Amherst*



Available at: [https://works.bepress.com/banu\\_ozkazancpan/2/](https://works.bepress.com/banu_ozkazancpan/2/)

## NOTE

# INTERNATIONAL MANAGEMENT RESEARCH MEETS "THE REST OF THE WORLD"

BANU ÖZKAZANÇ-PAN  
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

I discuss the implications of postcolonial studies for examining and expanding the study of international management. First, I outline various debates and approaches within the postcolonial field. Following this, I summarize key theoretical concepts emanating from three seminal postcolonial scholars—Said, Spivak, and Bhabha—whose works have helped define the field. I rely on each of their lenses—Orientalism, gendered postcolonial subject, and hybridity, respectively—to discuss possibilities and new directions for international management research.

Imagine the vast heterogeneity of philosophies and approaches [to management] one would have to consider if the nature of modern scientific research were not determined by Western tradition (Roberts & Boyacigiller, 1984: 430).

Over the past twenty-five years, postcolonial studies have been a contemporary conversation across the social sciences considering the ongoing semiotic and material effects of Western colonial encounters with "the Rest of the world" (Said, 1981). As a field of inquiry, postcolonial studies are made up of the work of diverse theorists who have critiqued Eurocentric and Western representations of non-Western worlds and called attention to canonical knowledge that makes claims about the non-West (e.g., Achebe, 1988; Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 1995; Barker, Hulme, & Iverson, 1994; JanMohamed, 1985; Young, 2001). Borrowing from postmodern and poststructuralist traditions, postcolonial scholars have critiqued Enlightenment-based justifications (e.g., scientific progress) for colonial rule and problematized humanism-based approaches to knowledge (e.g., based on reason and rational "Man") as effacing alternative epistemologies (Gandhi, 1998; Harding, 1996; Loomba, 1998). Thus, postcolonial traditions have attempted to "provincialize" Western claims of "universal" knowledge (Prasad, 1997) and to recover "native" knowledge that may

have been effaced or marginalized under colonization (wa Thiong'o, 1981, 2006). Notwithstanding their calls to make non-Western knowledge available, postcolonial theorists also have warned that the "marginal" is a space for intervention against colonial imperatives, rather than an occasion to celebrate the native (Bhabha, 1990a).

At the same time, some scholars have suggested that postcolonial approaches that privilege text-based engagements with colonial discourse cannot address the past and present debilitating economic consequences of colonization. Borrowing from Marxist traditions, these theorists have engaged in class-based analyses to outline material effects of the base (economic conditions) on the superstructure (social, political, and cultural systems) under colonization and its past and present effects. Above all, they have called for disengagement from the economic consequences of colonization continuing under present-day global capitalism (Ahmad, 1992; Dirlik, 1997; McClintock, 1992). However, their calls for solidarity and activism on behalf of subjugated populations are not unproblematic. Of particular concern is whether the privileged "third world" academic researcher in the "first world" can speak for these populations (Spivak, 1988).

In addition to these concerns, there is continued debate within the field over what "postcolonial" means (Hall, 1996). To this end, Shohat (1992) proposed a temporal definition suggesting that, although colonialism and its effects are not over, "postcolonial" demarcates a historical

---

I gratefully acknowledge the helpful comments and suggestions of guest editor Stella Nkomo and the two anonymous reviewers for their guidance throughout the revision process.

period *after* colonization. However, this does not necessarily address the issue of which experiences are *truly* postcolonial, given the multiplicity of colonial regimes (e.g., France, Italy, Spain, United Kingdom) and the different regions, cultural practices, political formations, and economic conditions they encompass (Moore-Gilbert, 1997). Equally important are questions over which methods of analysis to employ, since Marxist positions call for a collective third world struggle whereas postmodern/poststructuralist traditions focus on language and assert the impossibility of such unified identities. Furthermore, some scholars suggest that even critical epistemologies emanating from the first world, such as postmodernism, are still an examination of "the Rest of the world" in Western terms (Radhakrishnan, 1994). In a broader sense, there is uneasiness that reliance on Eurocentric modes of analysis furthers Western hegemony and appropriates the third world for Western consumption (Appiah, 1991; Moore-Gilbert, 1997).

Accordingly, postcolonial scholars need to simultaneously employ *and* transform Western theoretical tools in the context of the third world. To this end, Prakash (1992) pointed out that subaltern studies scholars in India (e.g., Ranajit Guha) reformulated colonialist assumptions of Marxist thought in order to account for the "native" in class-based analyses. Likewise, while some postcolonial approaches utilize text-based analyses, they also stand apart from postmodern and poststructuralist positions, which are "critiques of modernity in the West by the West and, of necessity, themselves exclusionary of other forms of knowledge" (Calás & Smircich, 1999: 661). In effect, postcolonial studies stand as *non-Western* critiques and reformulations of Western approaches to knowledge and offer possibilities for expanding Western research traditions in the social sciences field.

Already, postcolonial studies have found resonance in the study of management, with scholars examining gender, organizational processes, and knowledge production. Guided by postcolonial concerns, such scholars have examined resistance identity formation in Malay women factory workers (Ong, 1987); have called attention to the silencing of the "Hispanic woman" in management texts (Calás, 1992); and have explored multiple conceptualizations of gender, race, and class in a Japanese-American binational firm (Hamada, 1995). More recently,

scholars have relied on postcolonial analysis in organization studies (e.g., A. Prasad, 2003a) to illustrate the colonial institutional origins of the management field (Frenkel & Shenhav, 2006; A. Prasad, 2003b) and to (de)familiarize Western management discourses on organizational control (Mir, Mir, & Upadhyaya, 2003), organizational culture (Cooke, 2003), organizational development (Holvino, 1996), and workplace resistance (Prasad & Prasad, 2003). Other scholars have highlighted the ways in which Western modernist epistemologies guide and limit organizational theorizing (Alvarado, 1996; Calás & Smircich, 2003; Ibarra-Colado, 2006).

In a similar vein, postcolonial approaches to international management (IM) also address the assumptions and limitations of Western management discourse, but they do so within the context of the non-West (Banerjee & Linstead, 2001; Cooke, 2004; Henry & Pringle, 1996). Guided by postcolonial concerns, scholars have outlined the ways in which Western epistemology dominates management knowledge (Jaya, 2001; A. Prasad, 2003b; Wong-Mingji & Mir, 1997) and colonizes representations of non-Western people (Kwek, 2003; Styhre, 2002) and non-Western management practices (Chio, 2005; Frenkel & Shenhav, 2003). Equally important, scholars focusing on IM research methodology have demonstrated that methods employed to study the non-West are "universalizing" and nonreflexive (Jack & Westwood, 2006; Westwood, 2001, 2004).

Taken together, these postcolonial works draw attention to the hegemony of Western epistemology and critique representations about the "other" in management discourses. In effect, postcolonial scholars demonstrate that, by making claims on behalf of the native, Western management knowledge appropriates the native as unknowledgeable (Banerjee, 2000; Banerjee & Linstead, 2004; Calás, 1992). Within the context of globalization, contributions to IM knowledge available from the non-West can become effaced if the West studies "the Rest" in the West's epistemological and methodological terms.

In this paper I offer a theoretical overview of postcolonial studies and discuss the possibilities available from distinct postcolonial frameworks for expanding the study of IM. I show that the analytic strength of postcolonial studies is the multiple lenses it presents for valuing non-Western knowledge and redirecting IM research. Although the postcolonial field is made

up of many scholars, Edward Said, Gayatri Spivak, and Homi Bhabha have been seminal in developing theoretical frameworks for bringing the non-West to bear on Western systems of knowledge. I outline their distinct analytic concepts—Orientalism, gendered postcolonial subject, and hybridity, respectively—and demonstrate how each offers new possibilities and directions for IM research. With this aim in mind, postcolonial concerns over hegemonic epistemologies require me to consider what kinds of knowledge claims I make in this paper.

Thus, as an exercise in postcolonial reflexivity, I articulate my position as a “third world” woman scholar writing in English within a “first world” business school location. Based on this, for whom do I speak and for whom *can* I speak? By voicing these concerns, I want to sustain an ongoing conversation within the IM field about the interconnections of research, researcher, and “the Rest of the world.” What postcolonial approaches bring to this conversation is an ethico-political dimension requiring scholars to examine how Western management knowledge and practices affect the third world (Gergen, 1995) and how non-Western contributions to IM knowledge can be valued. In short, postcolonial studies offer *possibilities for knowing and doing IM differently*.

## POSTCOLONIAL ANALYTIC FRAMEWORKS

Collectively, the works of Said, Spivak, and Bhabha are emblematic of postcolonial concerns over colonial encounters between the West and “the Rest of the world.” However, despite these scholars’ shared concerns over representations of the non-West in Western texts and the continued consequences of Western material domination, there are analytic differences among them in terms of how they address these issues.

### The Analytic Perspective of Edward Said

Edward Said is considered one of the key figures in postcolonial studies. His work has been seminal in highlighting the connections between Western knowledge and Western material interests. In particular, his theoretical framework—*Orientalism*—is a systematic examination of the different sites of Western knowledge production and their links to West-

ern political, economic, and military institutions of domination (1978, 1985, 1988, 1991, 1993a,b, 2000). Although Said focuses on the relationship between European colonial powers and the Middle East, *Orientalism* can be a theoretical tool for the broader study of historical power relationships and their consequences in the present day.

Expanding further on this idea, *Orientalism* can be summarized as the textual and material domination of the Orient made possible “by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it” (Said, 1978: 3). Guided by Foucault’s (1980, 1982) ideas on power/knowledge, Said outlines how the East becomes the discursive “Orient” through hegemony. To clarify, he relies on Gramsci’s (1971) notion of hegemony as a “lived system of meanings and values” that are “constitutive and constituting” of the world (Williams, 1977: 596) to trace the “normalization” of Western representations and knowledge claims about the East. He accomplishes this by illustrating how colonial discourse represents the East as backward, unable to change, inferior, and feminized, while it represents the West as progressive, advanced, and masculine. These representations produce a fictionalized Orient and are used to suggest there are “real” cultural differences between West and East. Said attempts to reverse these binary categories but, more important, he tries to show how Western academia is implicated in the production of Orientalized representations. Thus, one of Said’s key analytic contributions to postcolonial studies is demonstrating that *Western pursuit of knowledge is not disinterested*.

By analyzing the ways in which Western academic writing represents the East, Said shows how Western material domination of the non-Western world is intentional. Academic writers can claim epistemological authority over non-Western people by suggesting that they must be represented, for they cannot represent themselves. For Said, the hegemonic circulation of Orientalist academic and fiction writing in Western societies creates consent for Western military, political, and economic interventions in the East. In this sense, modes of representation that portray the West as advanced and the East as in need of advancing legitimize Western political and economic interventions in the East. Consequently, part of the postcolonial project

for Said is to challenge "the muteness imposed upon the Orient as object" (1985: 202) and, thus, to challenge the material dominance of the West.

Despite the significance of Said's work for the postcolonial field, Orientalism is not without its critics. One criticism is Said's sparse acknowledgement of predecessors in this line of postcolonial critical thinking. Another is that his analyses do not pay enough attention to resistance to Orientalism. Furthermore, Said's singular focus on the colonizer and colonial representations may work to further Western colonial discourse, rather than give voice to the colonized. In effect, his work may "mute" the very people and ideas he seeks to recover and represent. To his credit, Said has made an effort in his later works (e.g., 1993c) to address these criticisms and move beyond the divisive colonizer/colonized binaries toward relationships based on negotiation between different cultures. Perhaps the most powerful testament to his theoretical significance is that Western pursuit of knowledge is understood within the context of political and economic interests.

### The Analytic Perspective of Gayatri Spivak

Possibly the most challenging postcolonial theorist to depict, Spivak can be described as a deconstructionist Marxist feminist. By developing a distinct analytic lens—*gendered postcolonial subject*—based on Marxist and poststructuralist traditions, Spivak examines gendered texts and gendered global economic processes (1985a,b,c, 1987, 1988, 1990, 1996, 1999). Spivak's work is seminal because of her focus on the female postcolonial subject in British-ruled India and her strategic (mis)use of Western theoretical traditions to examine their limits in the study of the third world. To this end, she contends that Western feminist theories often speak of women as a universal category without reference to the specific historical, socioeconomic, and geopolitical realities female postcolonial subjects face. Thus, Spivak analyzes how the gendered postcolonial subject exists at the margins of Western feminist theories that attempt to represent all women.

In contrast to Said, who critiques feminized representations of the East, Spivak emphasizes the role of the female postcolonial not only in relation to Western feminist theories and texts but in material terms. By *strategically using es-*

*sentia*list categories (e.g., woman, race), she examines the material effects of colonization for the female postcolonial subject who is doubly subjugated by the colonizers and indigenous patriarchy. Within the context of present-day global capitalism, she deploys *strategic essentialism* to highlight the socioeconomic consequences of the gendered and racialized international division of labor for the female postcolonial subject. Concurrently, Spivak critiques epistemological interventions of Western academia into these global economic realities.

For Spivak, Western academic representations and claims on behalf of the third world subject follow imperialist tendencies. These Western interventions constitute *epistemic violence*, since they efface knowledge that would have been possible had the gendered postcolonial subject been allowed to speak about her experiences in her own terms. In addition, by homogenizing populations into fixed cultural identities (e.g., Indian), Western narratives marginalize differences in postcolonial conditions. Through *catachresis* (intentionally misappropriating ideas to reveal new spaces of meaning) and deconstruction, Spivak outlines possibilities for producing knowledge differently while disrupting essentialist conceptualizations of the third world subject. Relying on these techniques, she also questions taken-for-granted categories, such as "East" and "West," and, in contrast to Said, suggests that neither category exists as an ontological reality independent of attempts to represent them. Thus, she endeavors to subvert and displace binary concepts rather than reverse them.

Furthermore, in contrast to Said's homogenized notion of the colonizer in Orientalism, Spivak recognizes various differences in colonizing formations and examines the implications of these differences for the gendered postcolonial subject. Rather than focusing exclusively on colonial discourses, as Said does, she attempts to recover effaced knowledge through counterdiscourse and counterhegemonic sites. Yet she also points out that reclaiming the voice of the "other" is problematic. This is based on her (re)articulation of the *subaltern* (Gramsci, 1971) as that group of subjugated populations outside global capitalist processes. For Spivak, (1988), the subaltern are unable to speak for themselves and exist beyond the representational reach of Western and elite indigenous academ-



ics. Consequently, Spivak's subaltern do not have agency. Instead, Spivak employs the subaltern as a space to interrogate dominant conceptions of subject constitution and practices of subject positioning (Moore-Gilbert, 1997). Above all, and in contrast to Said and Bhabha, Spivak recognizes her own position and Western institutional location in the constitution of postcolonial subjects. In this sense, her analytic framework incorporates gender and reflexivity into postcolonial theorizing and thinking differently about the third world.

### The Analytic Perspective of Homi Bhabha

Bhabha's analytics borrow heavily from Fanon's (1965, 1967) psychoanalytic examination of the effects and consequences of the French colonization of the Caribbean and Algeria. Expanding on Fanon's analytics in the context of British colonial rule in India, Bhabha's contributions to postcolonial studies stem from his psychoanalytic engagement with concepts such as cultural differences, *hybridity*, *mimicry*, and *nation* (1990a,b, 1994). Similar to Said, Bhabha also sees binary oppositions (e.g., East/West) as attempts by the colonizer to create cultural differences. By claiming there are "real" differences between two cultures (e.g., Indian and British), the colonizer attempts to "know" the colonized and claim authority and power over them. However, in contrast to Said, who suggests such differences are created to dominate the East, and Fanon, whose psychoanalytic analyses depend on these very differences, Bhabha's concept of hybridity makes such distinctions impossible.

Hybridity challenges the rules by which Western texts create essential characteristics for people and rearticulates identities through the psychoanalytic concept of *liminality* or the in-between. Similar to Spivak's rejection of essentialism regarding gender and race, Bhabha suggests that the colonizer and colonized alike cannot claim to have an essential identity. Rather, identities exist in a state of ambivalence and cannot be determined or categorized despite the efforts of the colonizer. Bhabha points out that liminality offers sites of resistance to colonial imperatives, since the colonized can "look" back (e.g., question the identity assigned to him/her) or refuse the colonizer's gaze (e.g., refuse the identity assigned to him/her). Bhabha expands on these psychoana-

lytic dimensions and effects of domination through his concept of mimicry.

Mimicry emerges as the attempt of the colonizer to make the colonized copy the colonizer's culture. It is a form of discipline and surveillance that works at the level of the unconscious. Mimetic regimes, imposed on the colonized, work to define the colonized in the image of the colonizer. Yet ideas and practices have culturally based meanings such that imposing them mimetically or translating them "cross-culturally" may not be possible. Furthermore, to dominate lands and people by way of mimicry, the colonizer needs the colonized nation to be articulated as a homogeneous space. Bhabha illustrates how the nation is conceptualized based on ideas of national identity, sovereignty, and people. By narrating the nation through these modernist ideas, the colonizer effaces differences among populations and places diverse people under one geographic label. For Bhabha, these narratives reflect the political rationality and cultural authority of their authors and work to "erase any prior or originary presence of the nation-people" (1990b: 297). In effect, the colonizer claims authority over the past and present of colonized people.

Despite the significance of Bhabha's ideas for postcolonial studies, whether the textual realm offers a "true" space for resistance against colonial imperatives is questionable. In particular, whether hybrid subjects endanger the colonizer's gaze or disturb mimetic mechanisms of control can be debated (Moore-Gilbert, 1997). By conceptualizing resistance in epistemological terms, Bhabha does not address whether the colonized have political and economic agency. In addition, he relies on psychoanalytic analysis without examining its historical formation and racialized assumptions regarding the "native." Finally, Bhabha's silence on gender limits his theoretical framework within the context of the gendered global economy. However, notwithstanding these critiques, Bhabha's analyses complicate binary conceptualizations of culture and open up possibilities for reformulating identities and the study of management through hybridity.

### POSTCOLONIAL POSSIBILITIES AND NEW DIRECTIONS

In broad terms, postcolonial studies call attention to Western epistemological claims

about "the Rest of the world" in IM research. More important, the distinct analytic frameworks of Said, Spivak, and Bhabha each have

different implications for IM theory and research (see Table 1). In this section I expand on these implications and present postcolo-

**TABLE 1**  
**Postcolonial Positions Informing International Management**

Researcher	Postcolonial Theoretical Positions	Implications for IM Theory and Research
Said	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Orientalism: systematic examination of power relations between colonizer and colonized in Middle East based on cultural representations of the discursive Orient versus the "real East"</li> <li>• East categorized as unable to change, fixed in time, backward, inferior, and feminine in comparison to West</li> <li>• People of the East constructed in binary opposition to Western subjects</li> <li>• Western pursuit of knowledge not "disinterested": academic modes of representation in alliance with Western military, political, and economic structures</li> </ul>	<p>Theory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extend Orientalism lens beyond Middle East to consider how West dominates non-West epistemologically and materially in the present</li> <li>• Conceptualize West/non-West discursively <i>in relation</i> to each other rather than in the West's epistemological terms</li> <li>• Articulate non-West as knowledgeable and able to represent itself</li> </ul> <p>Research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acknowledge <i>historical and ongoing encounters</i> between West and non-West to study <i>contextualized</i> cultural differences</li> <li>• Examine whose interests may be served by IM knowledge production: individual, managerial, corporate, national</li> </ul>
Spivak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus on gender: textual gendering and female gendered postcolonial subject in British-ruled India and in international division of labor</li> <li>• Subject as decentered and critique of essentialist notions of identity</li> <li>• Categories such as gender (e.g., woman) and race (e.g., Asian) marginalize historical differences in postcolonial experiences</li> <li>• Strategic essentialism and catachresis to consider third world women in international division of labor</li> <li>• Subaltern as a space for counterhegemonic discourse related to reflexivity and agency</li> </ul>	<p>Theory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conceptualize IM through the lens of the gendered postcolonial female subject: third world women as an analytic lens</li> <li>• Represent third world women as coproducers of IM knowledge</li> <li>• Examine how gendering of other in IM takes place textually and enables researchers to make authoritative claims</li> </ul> <p>Research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study third world women as a significant part of globalization and the international division of labor</li> <li>• Articulate cultural differences based on diversity of historical experiences and living and working conditions in the third world</li> <li>• Study third world subjects in context of researcher reflexivity and subaltern agency</li> </ul>
Bhabha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examination of psychoanalytic aspects of colonial domination in British-ruled India</li> <li>• Hybridity: in-between and indeterminate subjects rather than culturally pure subjects</li> <li>• Mimicry: attempt by colonizer to make colonized copy colonizer's culture</li> <li>• Semiotic is site of resistance to colonizer attempts to homogenize and control colonized</li> <li>• Cultural difference as invention of colonizer: questions taken-for-granted authority of colonizer</li> <li>• Textual examination of nation-building process: political rationality and cultural authority</li> </ul>	<p>Theory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conceptualize identities as hybrid, relational processes rather than cultural/cognitive qualities of individuals</li> <li>• Examine how mimetic imposition of business ideas/practices (West on the Rest) and transfer of knowledge (West to the Rest) efface the non-West as knowledgeable</li> <li>• Articulate globalization through hybridization lens rather than convergence/divergence or global/local lens</li> </ul> <p>Research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examine hybrid management ideas/practices that emerge through encounters rather than static, nation-based cultural differences</li> <li>• Produce hybrid narratives: IM knowledge coproduced with knowledgeable other</li> </ul>

nial possibilities and new directions for the IM field.

Said's framework speaks directly to issues of power/knowledge between the "West" and "the Rest." Orientalism calls attention to connections among Western business schools, researchers, and the textual and material third world. In this sense Orientalism redirects the IM field by outlining how knowledge produced about the non-West at Western business schools has significant material consequences for the third world. To this end, some researchers have already begun to consider how they represent third world subjects (Bishop, 2005; P. Prasad, 2003; Prasad & Prasad, 2002; Smith, 2005). However, Said's theoretical insights raise questions as to whether "objective" knowledge about the other is possible, given that people are embedded in historical colonial/power relationships.

Consequently, Said's postcolonial framework requires a political and ethical commitment to examining epistemological assumptions guiding research (Jack & Westwood, 2006). For this purpose, Orientalism redirects IM research as "a clarified political and methodological commitment to the dismantling of systems of domination" (Said, 1985: 215). Such research agendas mean researchers consider what constitutes "legitimate" management knowledge and whose world view is presented as "international" management. Explicitly, postcolonial research agendas guided by Orientalism require continued political and ethical engagement with the epistemological and material consequences of IM research (e.g., Banerjee, 2000). For example, the following questions offer some possibilities for research into these topics:

- How did management ideas and practices developed in the West become normalized as universal theories for studying people and business under globalization?
- How might management knowledge produced at U.S.-based business schools follow Western multinational corporate interests and aid in the material domination of third world economies?
- What are the consequences of private financial donations and corporate involvement in business school curriculum development for business education, teaching, and research about the non-West?
- What material consequences do non-Western transition economies face by importing U.S.-based management and business school models?

Spivak's theoretical framework redirects the IM field in significantly different ways compared to Said's. Spivak suggests that "the production of theory is in fact a very important practice that is worlding the world in a certain way" (1990: 7). Consequently, her contributions to IM enable (re)formulation of IM theorizing and offer possibilities for valuing alternative knowledge. Specifically, Spivak's concern over reflexivity within a third world context requires IM scholars to carry out research that is mindful of self and context. In other words, postcolonial reflexivity requires researchers to be aware of their own institutional, epistemological, and political locations and how they constitute who and what they intend to study (Khan, 2005; Lal, 1996; Mohanty, 2003). In addition, researchers need to take into account the historical context of different colonial power relationships between nations in order to study present-day business people, management practices, and globalization. In this sense, Spivak redirects IM by inscribing both researchers and subjects in the research process.

Furthermore, IM research guided by Spivak's gendered postcolonial subject as an analytic framework no longer views gender as a variable but, rather, as a theoretical lens to examine the international division of labor. By strategically employing third world women as an analytic lens, scholars can analyze the consequences of regional trade agreements (e.g., NAFTA) and economic liberalization policies on third world women laborers. In addition, they can problematize why these "international business" women produce goods for global consumption but their voices are absent from IM research. Accordingly, Spivak's lens enables researchers to "see" third world women and to value their ideas as legitimate contributions to IM knowledge. However, Spivak warns that recovery of such knowledge is not the same as an "information retrieval process," nor is it necessarily possible. Recovery is the problematic intersection of researcher reflexivity and subaltern agency (e.g., Mir, Calás, & Smircich, 1999). Thus, the following are possible research questions following her framework:

- How do multinational corporate practices and policies affect the living and working conditions of third world women within the international division of labor?



- How might acknowledging Western economic dependence on third world women laborers change assumptions that the third world needs Western economic and management expertise in order to develop?
- If postcolonial subjects can represent themselves and their diverse cultural experiences in their own terms, how would the coproduction of knowledge between "researcher" and "subject" transform IM research?
- How might recognizing third world women as knowledgeable about international business reconfigure IM theory and research?

Finally, in the context of IM, Bhabha's framework speaks directly to issues of representation and the transfer of management knowledge. Specifically, his concept of hybridity opens up possibilities for representing business people who can identify with "multiple cultures" (Boyacigiller, Kleinberg, Phillips, & Sackmann, 2004) and for studying "globalization as hybridization" (Pieterse, 1994) of management ideas and practices. Hybridity reconfigures present-day international business people and management practices as in-between rather than pure and identifiable. By dismantling these ideas of cultural differences between people, hybridity allows for reformulation of IM research on identity and globalization.

Bhabha's framework also raises questions as to the transferability of management ideas/practices between West and non-West. In particular, his analyses call into question whether epistemological translation is possible. This relates directly to cross-cultural IM research since Western theoretical tools are often translated and employed in a non-Western context. Based on Bhabha's framework, the question is whether management theories based on Western epistemology make sense in the non-West, rather than whether particular management questionnaires can be translated accurately. To address these ideas, the following research questions offer some possibilities:

- How do present-day hybrid identities and management practices form in the context of historical colonial encounters?
- How does hybridity change the global/local dichotomy in IM research?
- What are the implications of hybridity for theorizing and researching management practices under globalization?
- What are the implications of hybridity for cross-cultural IM research?

In summary, the different analytic lenses available from postcolonial studies demonstrate that the production (e.g., business schools, researchers) and circulation (e.g., academic business journals, business education) of IM "knowledge" have material consequences for the non-West and non-Westerner. Consequently, I suggest that scholars (re)conceptualize the other as a legitimate contributor to "international" management knowledge rather than in Western management terms or in need of Western managerial expertise. By doing so, management researchers (including myself) can coproduce knowledge *with* "the Rest of the world" rather than *about* "the Rest of the world" and disrupt the hegemony of Western epistemology in IM research.

## REFERENCES

- Achebe, C. 1988. Colonialist criticism. In *Hopes and impediments: Selected essays 1965-1987*: 46-61. London: Heinemann.
- Ahmad, A. 1992. *In theory: Classes, nations, literatures*. New York: Verso.
- Alvarado, F. 1996. Concerning postmodernity and organizations in the third world: Opening a debate and suggestions for a research agenda. *Organization Science*, 7: 667-681.
- Appiah, K. A. 1991. Is the post- in postmodernism the post- in postcolonial? *Critical Inquiry*, 17: 336-357.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (Eds.). 1995. *The post-colonial studies reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Banerjee, S. B. 2000. Whose land is it anyway? National interest, indigenous stakeholders, and colonial discourses. *Organization & Environment*, 13: 3-38.
- Banerjee, S. B., & Linstead, S. 2001. Globalization, multiculturalism and other fictions: Colonialism for the new millennium? *Organization*, 8: 683-722.
- Banerjee, S. B., & Linstead, S. 2004. Masking subversion: Neocolonial embeddedness in anthropological accounts of indigenous management. *Human Relations*, 57: 221-247.
- Barker, F., Hulme, P., & Iversen, M. (Eds.). 1994. *Colonial discourse/postcolonial theory*. New York: Manchester University Press.
- Bhabha, H. K. 1990a. Introduction. In H. K. Bhabha (Ed.), *Nation and narration*: 1-7. New York: Routledge.
- Bhabha, H. K. 1990b. DissemiNation: Time, narrative, and the margins of the modern nation. In H. K. Bhabha (Ed.), *Nation and narration*: 291-322. New York: Routledge.
- Bhabha, H. K. 1994. *The location of culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Bishop, R. 2005. Freeing ourselves from neocolonial domination in research: A Kaupapa Maori approach to creating knowledge. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The*

- Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.): 109–138. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Boyacigiller, N. A., Kleinberg, J., Phillips, M. E., & Sackmann, S. A. 2004. Conceptualizing culture: Elucidating the streams of research in international cross-cultural management. In B. J. Punnett & O. Shenkar (Eds.), *Handbook for international management research* (2nd ed.): 99–167. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Calás, M. B. 1992. An/other silent voice? Representing “Hispanic woman” in organizational texts. In A. J. Mills & P. Tancred (Eds.), *Gendering organizational analysis*: 201–221. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Calás, M. B., & Smircich, L. 1999. Past postmodernism? Reflections and tentative directions. *Academy of Management Review*, 24: 649–671.
- Calás, M. B., & Smircich, L. 2003. At home from Mars to Somalia: Recounting organization studies. In H. Tsoukas & C. Knudsen (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of organization theory: Meta-theoretical perspectives*: 596–606. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chio, V. C. M. 2005. *Malaysia and the development process: Globalization, knowledge transfers and postcolonial dilemmas*. London: Routledge.
- Cooke, B. 2003. Managing organizational culture and imperialism. In A. Prasad (Ed.), *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis*: 75–94. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cooke, B. 2004. The managing of the (third) world. *Organization*, 11: 603–629.
- Dirlik, A. 1997. *The postcolonial aura: Third world criticism in the age of global capitalism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Fanon, F. 1965. *The wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Fanon, F. 1967. *Black skin, white masks*. New York: Grove Press.
- Foucault, M. 1980. *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977*. New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. 1982. The subject and power. In H. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*: 208–226. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Frenkel, M., & Shenhav, Y. 2003. From Americanization to colonization: The diffusion of productivity models revisited. *Organization Studies*, 24: 1537–1561.
- Frenkel, M., & Shenhav, Y. 2006. From binarism back to hybridity: A postcolonial reading of management and organization studies. *Organization Studies*, 27: 855–876.
- Gandhi, L. 1998. *Postcolonial theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gergen, K. L. 1995. Global organization: From imperialism to an ethical vision. *Organization*, 2: 519–532.
- Gramsci, A. 1971. Notes on politics. In Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith (Eds. & Trans.), *Selections from the prison notebooks*: 123–320. New York: International Publishers.
- Hall, S. 1996. When was “the post-colonial”? In I. Chambers & L. Curti (Eds.), *The postcolonial question: Common skies, divided horizons*: 242–260. New York: Routledge.
- Hamada, T. 1995. Inventing cultural others in organizations: A case of anthropological reflexivity in a multinational firm. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 31: 162–185.
- Harding, S. 1996. European expansion and the organization of modern science: Isolated or linked historical processes? *Organization*, 3: 497–509.
- Henry, E., & Pringle, J. 1996. Making voices, being heard in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Organization*, 3: 534–540.
- Holvino, E. 1996. Reading organization development from the margins: Outsider within. *Organization*, 3: 520–533.
- Ibarra-Colado, E. 2006. Organization studies and epistemic coloniality in Latin America: Thinking otherness from the margin. *Organization*, 13: 463–488.
- Jack, G., & Westwood, R. 2006. Postcolonialism and the politics of qualitative research in international business. *Management International Review*, 46: 481–501.
- JanMohamed, A. R. 1985. The economy of Manichean allegory: The function of racial difference in colonialist literature. *Critical Inquiry*, 12: 59–87.
- Jaya, P. S. 2001. Do we really “know” and “profess”? Decolonizing management knowledge. *Organization*, 8: 227–233.
- Khan, S. 2005. Reconfiguring the native informant: Positionality in the global age. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 30: 2017–2035.
- Kwek, D. 2003. Decolonizing and re-presenting culture’s consequences: A postcolonial critique of cross-cultural studies in management. In A. Prasad (Ed.), *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis*: 121–146. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lal, J. 1996. Situating locations: The politics of self, identity, and “other” in living and writing the text. In D. L. Wolf (Ed.), *Feminist dilemmas in fieldwork*: 185–214. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Loomba, A. 1998. *Colonialism/postcolonialism*. New York: Routledge.
- McClintock, A. 1992. The angel of progress: Pitfalls of the term “post-colonialism.” *Social Text*, 31/32: 84–98.
- Mir, R. A., Calás, M. B., & Smircich, L. 1999. Global technoscapes and silent voices: Challenges to theorizing global cooperation. In D. Cooperrider & J. Dutton (Eds.), *Organization dimensions of global change*: 270–290. London: Sage.
- Mir, R. A., Mir, A., & Upadhyaya, P. 2003. Toward a postcolonial reading of organizational control. In A. Prasad (Ed.), *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis*: 47–73. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mohanty, C. T. 2003. *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing*

- theory, practicing solidarity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Moore-Gilbert, B. 1997. *Postcolonial theory: Contexts, practices, politics*. New York: Verso.
- Ong, A. 1987. *Spirits of resistance and capitalist discipline: Factory women in Malaysia*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Pieterse, J. N. 1994. Globalisation as hybridisation. *International Sociology*, 9: 161–184.
- Prakash, G. 1992. Postcolonial criticism and Indian historiography. *Social Text*, 31/32: 8–19.
- Prasad, A. 1997. Provincializing Europe: Towards a postcolonial reconciliation: A critique of Baconian science as the last stand of imperialism. *Studies in Culture, Organizations, and Societies*, 3: 91–117.
- Prasad, A. (Ed.). 2003a. *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Prasad, A. 2003b. The gaze of the other: Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis. In A. Prasad (Ed.), *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis*: 3–43. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Prasad, A., & Prasad, P. 2003. The empire of organizations and the organization of empires: Postcolonial considerations on theorizing workplace resistance. In A. Prasad (Ed.), *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis*: 95–119. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Prasad, P. 2003. The return of the native: Organizational discourse and the legacy of the ethnographic imagination. In A. Prasad (Ed.), *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis*: 149–170. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Prasad, P., & Prasad, A. 2002. Casting the native subject: Ethnographic practice and the (re)production of difference. In B. Czarniawska & H. Hopfl (Eds.), *Casting the other: The production and maintenance of inequality in organizations*: 185–224. New York: Routledge.
- Radhakrishnan, R. 1994. Postmodernism and the rest of the world. *Organization*, 1: 305–340.
- Roberts, K. H., & Boycigiller, N. A. 1984. Cross-national organizational research: The grasp of the blind men. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 6: 423–475.
- Said, E. W. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Random House.
- Said, E. 1981. *Covering Islam: How the media and the experts determine how we see the rest of the world*. New York: Pantheon.
- Said, E. W. 1985. Orientalism reconsidered. *Cultural Critique*, 1: 89–107.
- Said, E. W. 1988. Representing the colonized: Anthropology's interlocutors. *Critical Inquiry*, 15: 205–225.
- Said, E. W. 1991. The politics of knowledge. *Raritan: A Quarterly Review*, 2: 17–31.
- Said, E. W. 1993a. Nationalism, human rights, and interpretation. In R. M. Polhemus & R. B. Henkle (Eds.), *Critical reconstructions: The relationship of fiction and life*: 251–268. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Said, E. W. 1993b. *Wild orchids and Trotsky: Messages from American universities*. New York: Penguin.
- Said, E. W. 1993c. *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Vintage.
- Said, E. W. 2000. The clash of definitions: On Samuel Huntington. In *Reflections on exile and other essays*: 569–590. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Shohat, E. 1992. Notes on the “post-colonial.” *Social Text*, 31/32: 99–113.
- Smith, L. T. 2005. On tricky ground: Researching the native in the age of uncertainty. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.): 85–107. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Spivak, G. C. 1985a. Feminism and critical theory. In P. A. Treichler, C. Kramarac, & B. Stafford (Eds.), *For almatmater: Theory and practice in feminist scholarship*: 119–152. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Spivak, G. C. 1985b. Scattered speculations on the question of value. *Diacritics*, 15(4): 73–93.
- Spivak, G. C. 1985c. Subaltern studies: Deconstructing historiography. In R. Guha (Ed.), *Subaltern studies IV*: 330–363. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Spivak, G. C. 1987. *In other worlds: Essays in cultural politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Spivak, G. C. 1988. Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture*: 271–313. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Spivak, G. C. 1990. The post-modern condition: The end of politics? Interview by G. Hawthorn. In S. Harasym (Ed.), *The post-colonial critic: Interviews, strategies, dialogues with Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak*: 17–34. New York: Routledge.
- Spivak, G. C. 1996. *The Spivak reader*. (Edited by D. Landry & G. Maclean.) New York: Routledge.
- Spivak, G. C. 1999. *A critique of postcolonial reason: Toward a history of the vanishing present*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Styhre, A. 2002. Constructing the image of the other: A postcolonial critique of the adaptation of Japanese human resource management practices. *Management Decision*, 40: 257–265.
- wa Thiong'o, N. 1981. *Writers in politics: Essays*. Exeter, NH: Heinemann.
- wa Thiong'o, N. 2006. *Ngugu wa Thiong'o speaks: Interviews with the Kenyan writer*. (Edited by R. Sander & B. Lindfors.) Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.
- Westwood, R. 2001. Appropriating the other in the discourses of comparative management. In R. Westwood & S. Linstead (Eds.), *The language of organization*: 241–282. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Westwood, R. 2004. Towards a postcolonial research paradigm in international business and comparative management. In R. Marschan-Piekkari & C. Welch (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research methods for international business*: 56–83. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

- Williams, R. 1977. Cultural theory. In *Marxism and literature*: 75–144. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wong-Mingji, D., & Mir, A. H. 1997. How international is international management? Provincialism, parochialism, and the problematic of global diversity. In P. Prasad, A. J. Mills, M. Elmes, & A. Prasad (Eds.), *Managing the organizational melting pot: Dilemmas of workplace diversity*: 340–364. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Young, R. J. C. 2001. *Postcolonialism: An historical introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

**Banu Özkazanç-Pan** (banu.pan@yahoo.com) is a Ph.D. candidate in management and organization studies at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Her current research interests include examining cross-cultural international management and entrepreneurship based on postcolonial perspectives.

Copyright of *Academy of Management Review* is the property of *Academy of Management* and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.