International business and management studies as an orientalist discourse
A postcolonial critique

Robert Westwood

*University of Queensland Business School, University of Queensland,
Brisbane, Australia*

Abstract

Purpose – This paper seeks to interrogate the international business and management studies (IBMS) discourse via postcolonial theory. It demonstrates the value of applying postcolonial theory as a critical practice with respect to that substantive domain.

Design/methodology/approach – The approach is to draw on the critical and intellectual resources of postcolonial theory and apply them in an interrogation of IBMS.

Findings – The paper shows the value of applying postcolonial theory to open up the discourse of IBMS, which is revealed to deploy similar types of universalistic, essentialising and exoticising representations to colonial and neo-colonial discourse. It is revealed to rely on functionalist orthodoxy, realist ontology and neo-positivist epistemology. Furthermore, it masks its own power effects, fails to make explicit its research commitments, especially its political and ethical ones, and remains deeply unreflexive.

Originality/value – The use of postcolonial theory in relation to organisation studies is in its infancy with only a limited number of studies directly related to that critical practice. This paper, then, is a contribution to an important, but emergent arena of scholarship. The interrogation mounted here points to a radical reconfiguration of the field and indications as to where that might take us are made.

Keywords International business, Business studies, Organizations

Paper type Conceptual paper

Introduction

In their *AMR* review and prospect paper, Calas and Smircich (1999) identified "four contemporary theoretical tendencies" that they suggest offer a way forward beyond postmodernism for organisation studies (OS): actor-network theory, feminist poststructuralism, narrative approaches, and postcolonial analysis. Whilst positively evaluating the contribution of postmodernism to OS, they see these four as "heir apparents" to it since, although emergent, they potentially offer the most significant contribution to critical theory development within the field. Applauding the challenges which postmodern analysis has provided in OS they maintain that poststructuralism is essentially a "critique of Western epistemology as a system of exclusions". Postmodernism impels a genuinely reflexive practice and recognition of the theorists/researchers" participation in the reproduction of knowledge-power discourses and their institutional consequences and material effects. It has revealed the conflation of subject and object in research practice, the construction of subject positions through these practices, and demanded reflection on the ethical and political commitments we make. The postmodern turn has also forced recognition of the

situated and historically, culturally, politically and ideologically informed location of all our theorising. These are all critical positions also found in postcolonialism, indeed, much postcolonialism is informed by poststructuralist thinking[1]. However, as Calas and Smircich (1999, p. 661) also note, poststructuralism is a critique of "modernity *in the West by the West*" and hence exclusionary of other locations of critique and forms of knowledge.

This paper takes up Calas and Smircich's assessment that postcolonialism provides a critical practice that has much to offer OS, but recognises that such a practice has, however, barely begun to be exploited and is pregnant with possibilities yet to be realised. However, we limit our exploration of the contribution of a postcolonial critique to the field of international business and management studies (IBMS) and view this as a natural location for such a critique whilst acknowledging the value of broadening it into OS more generally. The paper examines the potential for such a critical interrogation whilst recognising the work, albeit limited, already undertaken (e.g. Banerjee and Linstead, 2001; Prasad, 1997, 2003; Westwood, 2001, 2004). The examination will be partial in two respects. Firstly, postcolonialism is complex, extensive and diverse and a paper such as this cannot presume to be comprehensive and will be limited to pointing to some major areas of potentially valuable critique. Secondly, the paper will not attempt to review/summarise the extant postcolonially-informed literature critiquing IBMS. It will acknowledge that literature, gesture to its contribution and draw selectively upon it for illustrative purposes. The paper, then, offers one answer to the question posed by this special issue "What does it mean to be critical in relation to international business" by suggesting that postcolonialism offers a major location and resource for a critical perspective.

Postcolonialism (in brief)
Like postmodernism, the rubric postcolonialism covers a disparate set of positions and practices (Ashcroft *et al.*, 1998; Loomba, 1998; Slemon, 1994; Young, 2001). Also, as with "postmodern", "postcolonial" can be read from a temporal perspective – as a signifier of an epochal shift – but also as a mode of critique and form of intellectual practice. Young (2001, p. 57) offers semantic clarity by suggesting nuanced differences between the terms *"postcolonial", "postcoloniality"* and *"postcolonialism"*. The former he argues is a "dialectical concept that marks the broad historical facts of decolonization and the determined achievement of sovereignty – but also the realities of nations and peoples emerging into a new imperialistic context of economic and sometimes political domination" (Young, 2001, p. 57). It refers to that which comes after the direct rule of colonialism and imperialism, but also recognises a continued place within a latter-day imperialism of a "global system of hegemonic economic power". *Postcolonial* also refers to a transformed historical context, including the development of postcolonial culture(s) emergent in response to those historical and political transformations. *Postcoloniality* refers more concretely to the economic, political and cultural conditions "that determine the global system in which the postcolonial nation is required to operate" (Young, 2001, p. 57). Young then takes *postcolonialism* to mean the mode of critique theorised and mounted to challenge the conditions of postcoloniality. For him it is a theorisation, but also a political position that engenders active and concrete intervention. Thus, "It combines the epistemological

cultural innovations of the postcolonial moment with a political critique of the conditions of postcoloniality" (Young, 2001, p. 57).

Ashcroft *et al.* (2000) positions postcolonialism more simply, suggesting that it deals with the varied effects of colonialisation on societies and cultures. They are, however, very aware of the contestations and diversities under the rubric. Postcolonialism is also variously seen as an analysis of the language and discourse of imperialism, as a recovery of the silenced voice of those marginalised and oppressed through colonialism, or as a critique of the (imposed) notion of the nation state and debunking of the myths of development (Prasad, 1997, p. 289). Ashcroft *et al.* also recognise that the colonial experience and reactions to it have been exceedingly divergent and that seeking to capture that under the single label of postcolonialism risks a damaging and limiting homogenisation which violates the specificities of time and place. However, as they note, the use of postcolonialism as an analytic does not mean that localised practices, effects and responses cannot be attended to, nor that there is no value in assuming some commonality in the framing of the conditions of postcoloniality, nor in discourses of the postcolonial or the structures of the colonial project. The disputes and divergences notwithstanding, the "grounding of the term in European colonialist histories and institutional practices, and the responses (resistant or otherwise) to these practices on the part of all colonized peoples, remains fundamental" (Ashcroft *et al.*, 2000, p. 189).

Historically, "post-colonial" was applied after WWII to the post-independence era and particularly to signal a new and politicised reading of what some called Commonwealth literature or, more broadly, the New Literatures. This draws attention to postcolonialism's central analytic strategies being associated with the cultural productions and experiences of those in the postcolonial condition, and particularly cultural forms as reactions to colonialism/imperialism. This reflects a cultural turn in critical analysis that postcolonialism was part of and that was distinctive from other, materialist, neo-Marxist critiques of colonialism and imperialism (Krishnaswarmy, 2002). It was a distinction between a focus on the material conditions and consequences of colonialism (e.g. Ahmad, 1992) compared with an analysis of the cultural discourses of colonialism and their continued effects under conditions of postcoloniality. It is this perspective that informs the approach in this paper, although we would be cautious of drawing too sharp a dividing line between a discursive cultural analysis and a materialist analysis.

In adopting this position we conceive of IBMS as a discourse, situating it as having extensionality with other aspects of colonial or neo-colonial discourse, and thus as ripe for postcolonial discursive critique. In doing so we draw firstly upon Said's analysis exemplified in his seminal work of 1978 (Said, 1978), but which has come to have a broader critical scope than original encompassed by Said (e.g. Sardar, 1999). We therefore suggest the value of a critical reading of the discourse of IBMS that characterises it as in many respects repeating an orientalist practice, especially through its epistemological assumptions and modes of representation. However, we also explore how a postcolonialism critique of IBMS extends beyond Said's orientalist analysis. In doing so we have recourse to other leading postcolonial theorists, particularly Bhabha and Spivak.

We identify, drawing on Calas and Smircich (1999), a set of core critical issues that postcolonialism surface as the basis for a critical interrogation of IBMS to frame our discussion. They include:

- Orientalist representational practices;
- Sameness, homogenisation and universalising;
- Silencing the other;
- The politics of knowledge;
- The location of the researcher and reflexivity; and
- Business, imperialism and globalisation.

Before turning to these core problematics we will provide a brief account of the conditions for the emergence of IBMS as this helps provide an account of its discursive and institutional location and provides a framework against which a critique can operate.

Towards a postcolonial critique of IBMS

Conditions for the emergence of IBMS. It is common to locate IBMS's emergence post-WWII and within the US or – at least – the North Atlantic[2]. The pragmatic conditions for the emergence included the increasing penetration of corporations into overseas markets, and the need for knowledge about how to effectively function in them. A further concern was the state of development of overseas markets or potential markets for US trade. An additional pragmatic condition was international businesses role as a bulwark against Soviet international incursions. Thus, IBMS was embroiled from the outset in the concerns for economic development and the attendant discourses of 1950s and 1960s of modernisation, development and industrialisation (Bendix, 1964; Levy, 1966; Lewis, 1955). This development discourse displayed much continuity with colonialism and its assumptions. Critical postcolonial theory sees so-called "development" as a more or less direct continuation of colonialism (e.g. Sachs, 1992; Sardar, 1988), a continuity made concrete by showing that Post-WWII European and US development policy was organised by the same people and out of the same offices that had only recently overseen colonial administration (Cooper, 2002; Harding, 1996). Analysis also shows the deployment of Western "science" in the service of colonialism (Brockway, 1979; Harding, 1998; Sardar, 1988). This engagement included the appropriation, displacement, marginalisation or annihilation of the knowledge systems of the colonised (Harding, 1996, 1998; Kumar, 1991).

Concerns with development were central to IBMS's emergence and was institutionalised most notably in the *Inter-University Study of Labor Problems in Economic Development* (I-USLPED), a consortium of leading US universities[3]. It produced a stream of influential research through the 1950s and 1960s, most influential and certainly foundational for IBMS being the two books *Management and the Industrial World* (Harbison and Myers, 1959) *Industrialism and Industrial Man* (Kerr *et al.*, 1960). This work was strongly informed by the development/modernisation discourses but also by economic thinking equating economic efficiency and rationalism with social development. In addition, the intellectual *Zeitgeist* of the time also comprised a structural functionalist orthodoxy in sociology and anthropology

(Westwood, 2001). Structural functionalism was the paradigmatic platform for IBMS as it emerged and continues to be so (Redding, 2005).

This intellectual provenance encouraged a tendency towards universalism that has also persisted in the field (Kwek, 2003; Redding, 2005). It is exemplified in the industrialisation thesis – central to the I-USLPED group – which asserts an imperative in the industrialisation process impelling societies down a common path once industrialisation has been embarked upon. It was a common path that included not only common ways of organising industrial production and of industrial and economic development, but also common forms of organising, of management, as well as shifts towards common work regimes, work-related attitudes and values. These changes also brought about changes in the wider social formation, in socio-cultural structures and processes. The industrialisation thesis is accompanied by a convergence thesis: arguing for the convergence of industrialising economies to these common forms. As Farmer and Richman asserted, "As the general similarity of men everywhere is recognized, and as managerial and technological necessity presses all types of culture toward a common road, nations everywhere become more similar" (Farmer and Richman, 1965, p. 400). The argument has persisted, given fresh impetus latterly through the globalisation thesis.

These conditions for the emergence of IBMS as a discourse have a number of significant implications:

- The discourse of IBMS can be read as paralleling the discourse of colonialism, especially via its connection with the development and industrialisation discourses of the 1950s and 1960s.

- It is a discourse and a practice developed in the metropolitan centre, and particularly in the USA, and framed by the prevailing interests and ideology located therein. Its aim from the outset was to provide "knowledge" of other societies" business, organisation and management systems, and the cultures and social systems that support them, in order to be better able to transact with and control them.

- It is a specifically located discourse, historically, culturally, politically and ideologically as well as geographically, but represents itself as universal. Ideas and explanations from outside that privileged location are either refracted through the Western conceptual lens or else diminished, repressed or silenced.

- The discourse has been dominated paradigmatically by structural functionalism entailing a separation of object and subject, a belief in objective and value neutrality, a belief in a correspondence theory of truth and language, the adoption of unreflexive, positivisitic methods, and a neglect of the ethics and politics of research practice.

Having provided a brief outline of the conditions for the emergence of IBMS we now move to explore a postcolonial critique of it as discourse.

Orientalist representational practices. Although contentious, (Moore-Gilbert, 1997; Sardar, 1999) many see Said's (1978) "*Orientalism*" as the starting point for postcolonial theory (e.g. Prasad, 1997). Whatever the exact provenance of postcolonial theory, we argue that Said's orientalist analysis provides a device with which to interrogate IBMS discourse[4]. It provides a detailed analysis of the construction of

"the Orient" in the discourses of the West that both constitutes and enables cultural domination and hegemony. Through its representational practices the West constructed an imaginary Orient as it's other that both diminished that other whilst simultaneously producing a valorised and empowered construction of Self. Orientalism provides the West with an account of its others[5] as refracted through the lens of its own symbolic, theoretical, aesthetic, ideological and ethical codes in order to have a "knowledge" resource enabling it to cope with its difference, strangeness and threat, and ultimately to control it.

Said explores the power effects of orientalist discourse in establishing an ontological order and ethical structure that justified the West's colonial ambitions. Sardar argues that orientalism "... is so integrated with structures of economic and political power that it became handmaiden to colonialism ... Orientalism tries to demonstrate both how Europe invented the fiction of the Orient and the Orientals and how this representation was used as an instrument for control and subjugation in colonialism" (Sardar, 1999, p. 69)[6]. It was a discourse entirely constructed by and for the West and constituted a knowledge-power regime enabling it to apprehend and thereby control and dominate the Orient. Indeed, as Sardar (1999, p. 4) makes clear, there is no genuine attempt to know the other, rather "Orientalism is thus a constructed ignorance, a deliberate self deception, which is eventually projected on the Orient". The representations it delivered "...were deliberately concocted and manufactured as instruments to "contain" and "manage" these [other] cultures and civilizations" (Sardar, 1999, p. 4). We argue that IBMS shows continuity with orientalism, one which lies in its confrontations with the other and attempts to account for the other in terms palatable to Western audiences. It too is an entirely Western construction and as a practice has been conducted by the West in relation to its others from its inception in Post-WWII USA. Others' management and business systems are scrutinised by Western science, as manifest in IBMS, so as to deliver "knowledge" to Western audiences, primarily to enable those who need to economically transact with the other to better manage and control them and so enhance Western economic, and by extension political and cultural, power. More simply put, IBMS can be read as at the service of the imperialistic impulses of contemporary capitalism just as orientalism was at the service of colonialism.

Orientalism provided a rhetoric of motives for colonialism that continued to be deployed in the discourse of development in the 1950s and 1960s as the modernisation-development-industrialisation triumvirate was animating a nascent IBMS program. A careful reading of the foundational texts of IBMS – those of Harbison and Myers (1959) and Kerr *et al.* (1960) – reveal similar representational practices that divided the world into the modern, developed, industrialised and the pre-modern, under-developed and pre-industrial parts. The industrialisation and convergence theses constructed the other in the latter terms, justifying the imposition of Western solutions. It insists on a universalistic trajectory of development and salvation and constructs essentialising and exoticising representations of the other in support of these projects. It is to these representational practices that we now turn.

The West's representational strategies engage in reductionist practices in which the diversity and difference of the other is transduced into a limited typology or set of essential characteristics. This is, indeed, part of the process which reduces the difference of the other to a sameness. Western practice, whilst claiming to examine and

report on difference, actually avoids it by subjecting encountered differences to the "regime of the stereotype" (Bhabha, 1994), translating difference through the West's pre-existent codes and categories. The other is never understood or allowed to construct themselves in terms of their own codes and categories. Similar mechanisms are employed in IBMS whereby its theories and categories frame the other and provide the only legitimate account of the other (in terms of knowledge of their management and business systems). As with orientalism, there is, as Prasad (1997, p. 294) notes, an attempt "to reduce the menace of the difference of otherness by means of constituting the colonised (i.e. The other) in terms of images that are already familiar to the colonising consciousness". An example of this is Hofstede's (1980, 1991) cultural dimensionalising, which remains influential in culturalist accounts in IBMS (Leung *et al.*, 2005).

These representational practices load the Oriental with essentialised attributions configured as the binary opposite of those held to obtain in the Occident and typically the Occidental attributions are positively construed and those of the Orient negatively. Said (1978) provides a litany of such denigrating characteristics and Prasad (1997) offers a tabulated summary of such binaries that have persisted to characterise the Orient/Occident. Such binaries typically present conceptions of the Orient as suffering from a lack or deficiency and/or as a danger and a threat, although the range of images is extremely diverse. Both types of construction were used to justify Western colonial intervention – either to give the Orient that in which it was deficient – progress, modernity, civilisation, salvation - or to contain the threat, or both. The IBMS discourse is replete with essentialising and exoticising representations and Westwood (2001) has documented some of these. They were apparent at the outset, for example, in Harbison and Myers (1959) where one can find reference to the "authoritarian" Germans, the "paternalistic" Indians and the "unquestioning loyalty of the Japanese". This is typical of the essentialising throughout the IBMS literature where diversity, difference, and localised variability is reduced and homogenised into a uniform category and then specific behaviours, systems or structures are transduced to an effect of that category. As Parry (1987) notes, in essentialising practices the heterogeneity and difference of the other is overridden by totalising and stereotypical representations. IBMS has tended to "utilise reified categories like "the Italians", "the Japanese" or "the Chinese" as explanatory variables" (Punnett and Shenkar, 1996, p. 116). Thus, research might, based upon a limited, Western-constructed, empirical study, provide an account of a particular leadership style of, say, Indonesian managers. This is abstracted and reified to become an "Indonesian" leadership style as if all Indonesians behaved in this manner. In the process all variance and diversity are erased, as are any self-representations the other may want to mount. Furthermore, tautological arguments are now likely constructed wherein when a certain leadership behaviour is observed it is explained by reference to the person's ethnic category membership – the person behaved that way *because* they are Indonesians, and associated behaviours, say conflict-handling, are explained by reference to the operation of "Indonesian" leadership.

A scrutiny of almost any text in IBMS reveals essentialisms and/or exoticisms of these types. A perusal of core texts in the discourse reveals this. Innumerable research papers in the field exhibit similar essentialisms. Space precludes a full textual reading,

but even a cursory examination would yield examples to the reader[7]. For now a few examples will have to suffice:

> Japanese value congenial, known surroundings and seek to create an atmosphere of well-focused energy and disciplined good cheer (Harris and Moran, 1979, p. 301).

> However, in Japan or India a person is likely to make a promise to do something while knowing quite well that it cannot be kept (Phatak, 1983, p. 28).

> Latin American managers also prefer orderly customs and procedures to being adaptable and flexible (Nath, 1988, p. 249).

> Chinese culture places a priority on family loyalty and needs. The organizational culture of a Chinese family company closely reflects Chinese cultural values and the traditional teachings of Confucius (Mead, 1994, p. 309).

> This leads North Americans to live their lives by sacrosanct schedules. For others, such as some Arab and Latin cultures, time schedules are less critical (Lane *et al.*, 1997, p. 39).

> The leadership process used by Japanese managers places a strong emphasis on ambiguous goals. Subordinates are typically unsure of what their manager wants them to do (Hodgetts and Luthans, 2000, p. 410).

IBMS continues to engage in these essentialising practices mirroring orientalist discourse. Part of the essentialising impetus is the universalising tendency inherent in Western knowledge systems.

Sameness, homogenisation and universalising. Western science is a knowledge system that makes universality claims and has been promulgated globally, often suppressing and displacing other systems. The universalising tendency is embedded more broadly in the West's power-knowledge discourse practices and relates to its imperialistic and superiority positioning such that "Generations of Western historians, philosophers and sociologists have constructed their accounts in ways that claim universality, that claim to speak for all humanity – despite rank ignorance of large portions of that humanity" (Westwood, 2001, p. 247). Postcolonial theory, however, has shown Western science to be but one particular, historically situated form of knowledge (Harding, 1998; Nkomo, 1992) and how Western thought and practices were universalised in the colonial era and established as a norm or standard that others should adopt, emulate, be measured against, or be assimilated to (e.g. Parekh, 1997).

IBMS, like Western management and business theory in general, also tends towards universalism. It is a tendency inherent from the outset under the influence of the functionalist and essentialist intellectual resources upon which it drew in economics, sociology and anthropology. Apparent for example, in the earliest studies under the auspices of the I-USLPED as discussed and particularly in the industrialisation and convergence theses. IBMS's universalism has been noted and critiqued periodically since (Boyacigiller and Adler, 1991; Nkomo, 1992; Osigweh, 1989; Westwood, 2001), but remains part of current practice (Redding, 2005). There is an assumption that Western-derived epistemologies, methodologies, theories and methods are applicable across the world regardless of context. A consequence is the difficulty alternative conceptions not sharing those resources have in finding a legitimate space within IBMS. Research from outside the West is required either to deploy Western epistemologies, theories and methods or else locate and justify what it has to say in the

specificities of its local context and to radically circumscribe any generalising. There is
no such requirement for theory and research emanating from within the Western
centre, it is represented without societal or cultural contextualisation, as if it were
universal.

An important concomitant of this universalising urge that has engaged postcolonial
theory is the tendency to revert to representations of sameness in colonial discourse. As
a central postcolonial argument Spivak and Bhahba in particular have tackled this
reduction of differences to sameness. It is a practice, we suggest, apparent in IBMS. In
confronting the Other the Western researcher brings his/her ontological,
epistemological, theoretical and ideological resources and deploys these to capture
the other and construct representations of them. Inevitably the other is "translated"
through those resources and transduced into something locatable within them – into a
sameness that erases their difference. The difference and localised particularity of
others and their cultures are erased, smoothed over, homogenised or ignored. Spivak
and Bhabha have been concerned to preserve difference, not to conflate other to the
Same through a violence of representation. At times Spivak (1994) asserts the primacy
of the *tout autre*, or "absolute other", of the subaltern or the disenfranchised and
un-represented so as to ward off assimilation to the Same and sustain difference and
heterogeneity. Bhabha (1994) similarly seeks to resist the colonising discourse that
appropriates and erases identity through erasing difference and refers to the
"completely other": an other whose identity cannot be captured in translation. Cultural
differences, he argues, retain a fundamental incommensurability, which prevents the
simple type of translation that Western research presupposes.

Spivak (Spivak, 1994) implies that the (subaltern) other remains as an "inaccessible
blankness" incapable of being recuperated, and in fact functions as a signifier of the
limits of Western knowledge and discourse. That is valuable, but does little to
emancipate the subaltern from their material deprivations and political and social
disenfranchisements, something Spivak is also very aware of and works to find a
resolution. It is acknowledged that the Western researcher can do no other than view
and write the other from within his/her own particular discursive and cultural,
political, social and historical location; there is no innocent and disinterested location
outside of Self. Any representation, then, will be a "translation", one likely to reproduce
an essentialised other in compatibility with the world view of the researcher. Accepting
this apparent inevitability Spivak (1987) invokes the notion of *strategic essentialism* as
a device allowing at least some engagement with the other and facilitating an
emancipatory discourse and practice. She suggests that absolute otherness, or
complete heterogeneity, is an idealisation and that pragmatically the construction of
strategic essentialisms is necessary to achieve decolonisation and emancipation.
However, this is permissible only if we remain scrupulously vigilant about the status of
such essentialisms as pragmatic devices constructed only for their emancipatory
potential and that we never imagine them to be real representations of a real other.

There is an inescapable problematic in any confrontation with the other and in
finding ways to engage with them authentically and to make representations of them
that are not appropriative, universalising or essentialising. The research orientation
under a functionalist paradigm in IBMS amplifies these problems and leads to
unwarranted essentialisms and universalisms in which the difference of the researched
cultural world of the organisations and management it presumes to represent is

translated into a sameness, misrepresented, or silenced altogether. It is to the issue of silencing that we now turn.

Silencing the other. A significant part of postcolonial critique is revealing the exclusionary practices of Western power/knowledge regimes and resurfacing those silenced and marginalized. This section briefly points to how that critique can be used to similarly unearth those silenced in IBMS's representational practices. This relates to the previous issue since, as Nkomo (1992) argues, the suppression of others experiences is an effect of the desire for universal theorising.

We have already clarified that just as "Orientalism is not a construction from experience of the Orient. It is the fabulation of pre-existing Western ideas overwritten and imposed upon the Orient" (Sardar, 1999, p. 9), so IBMS is entirely a Western construction. Western dominance persists in that the conceptual and theoretical frameworks, as well as the notions of science and research that serve them, are ineluctably embedded in the West and in its political, economic, social, cultural and ideological discourses. In scrutinising and appropriating the business and management practices of others such frameworks are deployed and the outcomes are inevitably refracted through them. As with Orientalism, genuine knowledge of the other is not the aim, but rather the generation of representations enabling the West to construct an orientation towards the other that serves the West's interests. As orientalism provided the basis for colonial governmentality and control, so IBMS serves the interests of Western business management within imperialistic capitalism.

Such a practice typically engages in a separation of subject and object in the research process typical of the functionalist paradigm of IBMS. As Clegg *et al.* (1996) have argued more generally the subject is silenced in such a practice, but the silencing is more profound in orientalism and in IBMS. Said's (1978) orientalist analysis shows how the other is silenced, there is simply no voice for the oriental in Orientalisms representations, indeed, the other is "endowed with an "historical" subjectivity that is above all non-active, non-autonomous, with no sovereignty over itself" (Abdel-Malik, 1981, p. 77). IBMS, too, is not interested in genuine knowledge of the other and does not require any self-representations, rather the other is positioned as a passive "object" of study. The other is thereby silenced through not being allowed to auto-represent. Western-centred IBMS claims to speak for and on behalf of the other that it represents to itself.

Postcolonialism has been deeply concerned with this problem of "speaking on behalf of" others and it was identified by Clifford and Marcus (1986) as part of the crisis of legitimation in anthropology. The other is rendered silent by this presumption. The silence is more radical in consideration of the exclusionary power effects of the discourses of the centre relative to the periphery. Like all the West's knowledge discourses such as those of science, modernity and development, IBMS positions itself as a universal discourse of knowledge, truth and authority so that a location within it is a prerequisite for intelligibility. The other is refracted through the categories and theories available in Western discourse. Universalistic claims are made despite localised specificities and the claim to authority means that those on the periphery must either find a way to participate in the discourse or remain unintelligible. There is a double-bind here. Those outside the West, especially in the periphery, are condemned to either silence and unintelligibility, or, to find a voice they are compelled to go through Western discourse and its codes thereby constructing a fictive, distorted and

deformed representation of themselves and their life-worlds. Harding (1996, 1998) analysed how Western science has always worked this exclusionary-inclusionary practice, and did so at the service of colonialism. As a dominant and dominating discourse science, and now IBMS, appropriates and (mis-)represents the other, but more than that, it totally occupies a discursive space in which supposedly universal knowledge and truth claims can be made and those subject to its scrutiny – its "subjects" – are denied their difference and independent voice. Those outside are scrutinised, captured and re-presented, but their participation is circumscribed, subject to their sublimation to the defined rules of the game, including ontological, epistemological and methodological ones. Those unwilling or unable to conform have their versions of business and management marginalised, massively attenuated or simply ruled out and silenced.

The politics of alterity and the silencing of the other has most radically been addressed by Spivak (e.g. Spivak, 1987). She famously asked, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (Spivak, 1994) reflecting on the location of the subaltern[8] as ineluctably outside the significant discourses of society and outside of the "circuit of the international division of labour" (Spivak, 1987). Core to her concerns is whether the subaltern can find a way to auto-represent, or whether they are condemned either to silence or to being represented by others in distorting, appropriative and exploitative ways. According to Kanneth (1997, p. 275) "Her conclusion that: "The subaltern cannot speak" points to the structural inability of the written, Western text to give the other her own voice". Additionally, Spivak as noted, is concerned with the erasure of difference and the assimilation to sameness in the discourses of postcoloniality. The IBMS discourse participates in this as a power-knowledge discourse that translates the other into the regime of the stereotype and positions of intelligibility meaningful to the West. The other's difference and uniqueness is not honoured but is erased in translation.

An additional mode of silencing occurs when only those with whom the West has a current interest – usually economic, political or both – are taken into account and incorporated into the IBMS discourse. Thus, early IBMS exhibited an interest in the Soviet Union and its perceived expansionary project (Granick, 1954). A significant impetus occurred in the 1980s as Japanese business interests penetrated international markets and their business systems were subject to intense scrutiny by the Western academy. Wilkinson (1990), for one, has documented the West's various representations of Japan that tracks the trajectory of the West's engagement with Japan, whilst Mackerass (1989), albeit from a broader perspective, has analysed the West's varied images of China. Those with whom the West does not have a strategic economic engagement tend to be ignored, marginalized and silenced.

Seeking to give voice to the ignored and marginalized or to indigenous, non-Western self-accounts, encounters another level of difficulty. They face exclusion from the institutions and machineries of knowledge production and distribution of Western-centred IBMS. More concretely, the politics of research and publishing mean that any such voice is unlikely to get published and distributed. Such voices are confined to silence, or to pursuing localised and limited outlets which IBMS would typical discount. Again, a voice can only be obtained by submission to Western scrutiny, or by participating in the discourse and translating local and indigenous experience into the Western discursive frame.

The politics of knowledge. Young (1997, p. 127) says that "One of the most arresting aspects of Orientalism was Said's contention that seemingly impartial, objective academic disciplines had in fact colluded with, and indeed been instrumental in, colonial subjugation and administration. Orientalism provided powerful evidence of the complicity between politics and knowledge". Similar points about the imbrication of Western science in the colonial project have been made (Harding, 1996, 1998; Kumar, 1991; Sardar, 1988). Indeed, Harding (1996, p. 45) argues that Western scientific research was necessary for establishing and maintaining colonialism and slavery. Colonialism also facilitated the advance of science by providing new phenomena and problems to be described and explained, including new and different people and cultures. A science contributing significantly to colonialism was anthropology with its ethnographies that appropriated the other and represented them in narratives meaningful to Western audiences. It provided accounts of the colonial subject that enabled the coloniser to assume "knowledge" sufficient for administration and control. Said (1993, p. 159) in fact argues that "Of all the modern social sciences, anthropology is the one historically most closely tied to colonialism, since it was often the case that anthropologists and ethnologists advised colonial rulers on the manners and mores of the native people". In this sense, served by anthropology and other Western sciences, colonial discourse was effectively the "governmentalisation of culture" (Thomas, 1994). Western science and its other knowledge systems continue to be a part of the knowledge/power nexus that constitutes the asymmetrical structures of power and dominance that structure centre/periphery relations. Thus today, IBMS provides the centre with "knowledge" that serves the interests of its international capitalist and globalisation projects. The dominance of Western knowledge systems and "scientific" discourses entails other people's knowledge systems are appropriated, displaced, disparaged or annihilated. The current structures and politics of knowledge mean that local accounts of business and management outside the Western-dominated discourse struggle to be heard or find a space in that discourse, and remain excluded, marginalized or silenced.

There is, then, an asymmetry with respect to the discourses of science and knowledge with the West asserting a privileged position and maintaining dominance with others' knowledge systems, if acknowledged at all, not accredited as delivering valid knowledge. It is an assertion sustained in the face of analyses showing the historically, culturally, and ideologically situated nature of Western science as a local knowledge system occupying a relative position among others (Galison and Stump, 1996; Harding, 1996; Wong-Mingji and Mir, 1997). The dominance of Western knowledge systems and science is sustained within the context of wider economic and political power asymmetries. Reflecting on the construction of the "foreign" cultures into positions of disadvantage, Kanneth (1997, p. 273) says "...cultural translation is also a form of cultural domination, or rather, translation depends on the existing dominating stance of one politically and economically powerful culture over another". IBMS is part of the dominant Western knowledge system making impositions on the rest of the world, it is sustained by its location within the wider economic and political asymmetries, but also has its own discursive and institutional mechanisms to support and sustain its dominance.

There is an institutional apparatus, particularly that associated with the production and dissemination of management/business knowledge: universities and related

organisations, publishing institutions and processes, pedagogical and research practices, orthodoxies of management theory and practice and the academic training and socialisation that sustain them, the "business" of management education, plus business and management development and practice conducted in and through Western businesses. This might be referred to as the "intellectual technology of the discourse and has resonance with Foucault's notion of governmentality – "a procedure … aimed at knowing mastering and using" (Foucault, 1979, p. 143). Other's management styles and systems are made to submit to the West's "intellectual technology, it is deemed as the only viable technology for the production and dissemination of valid and "proper" knowledge about IBMS issues.

The institutional apparatus and intellectual technology of Western-dominated IBMS police the discourse ensuring that space is given only to that which it ratifies and which conforms to its frameworks. It is extremely difficult for any radically different perspective or account to penetrate and find a space in the discourse, particularly local and indigenous accounts of management and business practice from those outside the Western dominance and orthodoxy. Such perspectives or accounts are dismissed if not translated so as to fit with Western frameworks or refracted through the West's theoretical lens. The publishing apparatus is a particularly significant element of the institutional technology policing the discourse's boundaries, especially academic journal publishing and its explicitly controlled review process. The vast majority of IBMS-related journals are Euro-American and constitute a significant barrier to people outside that context (Thomas, 1994; Westwood, 2001). It has been shown, furthermore, that the bulk of published studies are by scholars from the Euro-American context (Thomas, 1994; Wong-Mingji and Mir, 1997). As a specific example, analysis of papers related to Chinese management practice showed 80 per cent of the authors of the most cited papers were from the USA, Canada or the UK. It is not just publishing regimes that police the discourse, the politics of knowledge also includes control of the research agenda, the questions asked, method and methodology, and of epistemology. As Westwood (2004, p. 69) says, this is "a recursive process since the delineation of agenda, theoretical approach and epistemology drives research practice, which in turn delivers knowledge outcomes that fit with and reinforce that delineation".

The location of the researcher and reflexivity. We have already noted that the functionalist orthodoxy in IBMS entails a realist ontology, positivistic epistemology, separations of subject and object, and of theory from observation, mainly quantitative methods, and value neutrality. It has not felt obligated to respond to the crisis of legitimation so pervasive a concern in the social sciences, a crisis that has lead to greater levels of reflexivity, a surfacing of the researcher's ethical and political commitments, and a radical re-evaluation of the researcher-researched relationship. Postcolonial theory has helped precipitate these changes, provided a profound questioning of the politics and ethics of research, and been part of the challenge to realist ontologies and objectivist epistemologies. Perhaps more than anything it has worried over and compelled a radical scrutiny of the relationships and politics of alterity (Bhabha, 1994; Spivak, 1987, 1990; Taussig, 1993). What does it mean to be in an encounter with others embedded in the specifics of their own location, a location radically different from that of the interlocutor? What can one know of the other and

what right does one have to presume to represent the other, especially when those representations are translated via the interests, motives, meaning frames and theories of the researcher and the Western location from which they emanate?

Postcolonial theory demands researchers consider their own location and the resources they draw upon in relationship to any research object. It also demands that the nature of the relationship between the researcher's location (in the fullest possible sense – geographical, ideological, cultural, historical, material, theoretical, ethical) to that of the researched location is examined and implications for the research process and its outcomes considered. In other words, it insists, as increasingly is the case in the social sciences, on a fulsome reflexive practice (Hardy *et al.*, 2001; Johnson and Duberley, 2003; Steier, 1991). This contrasts with most current IBMS research, which operating under functionalist paradigmatic assumptions presumes that if objective measures can deliver an untrammelled representation of a pre-existing reality by a detached an objective observer through valid measures, then there is nothing to be reflexive about. Representation is viewed as a technical problem of locating methods and a neutral language that provide a direct correspondence to an objective reality.

Postcolonialism works to reveal the politics of representation and how all acts seeking to interpret others are acts of translation between the domain (broadly construed) of the researcher and that of the researched co-constructing a subjective reality (Bhabha, 1994). Furthermore, as Said clearly showed, the "object" of study is fabricated through the specific and located epistemological and theoretical practices the Western researcher deploys. This is an exercise of power in a Foucauldian sense in that a discourse is constructed that presumes to the status of knowledge and which works an inclusion-exclusion practice. The Western researcher needs to be alert to these processes and to reflexively analyse their location with respect to them. Part of this is to acknowledge the privileged position they occupy and to examine the nature of their relationship to the research, think through the likely outcomes and effect of their research on the researched, and take responsibility for those consequences. This is akin to what Johnson and Duberley (2003) refer to as *epistemic reflexivity* which insists that the researcher attend to the impact of their "habitus" on their theorising and research practice; to be reflexive about *praxis*. Such insistence requires the Western-centred researcher to think through and be clear about the ethical and political commitments they bring to their practice and to be scrupulous in both declaring and remaining faithful to them.

Business, imperialism and globalisation. Postcolonialism has provided a trenchant critique of colonialism, neo-colonialism and imperialism and its critical practice is now being applied to globalisation and its effects, interpreted by some as a contemporary manifestation of the imperialist impulse. Indeed, for Said colonialism was just one manifestation of the West's imperialist project (Parry, 1997). Parry, (1997, p. 227), whilst recognising different manifestations of imperialism, notes the contemporary form of "industrial-military interventions and aggressive investment programmes implemented by the expansionist social orders of western nation-states". However, she also recognises that imperialism no longer requires military intervention or form of occupation, but is constituted by the construction of dependencies of the sort the US has most prodigiously pursued. Imperialism is "the radically altered forms of capitalism's accelerated penetration into the noncapitalist world" (Parry, 1997, p. 228) creating an unbalanced and asymmetrical new world order under western hegemony.

Other commentators also see modern capitalism and globalisation as a form of imperialism imposing a new spatial and temporal order on the world, but masking the imperialist impulse with rhetoric of rationality and modernisation (Harvey, 1989; Soja, 1989). Clearly, international business is central to the globalisation process and its effects. Thus postcolonialism offers a critique of globalisation that abuts directly with the concerns of the IBMS discourse. It is a critical practice that orthodox IBMS with its functionalist and managerialist inclinations has not engaged with as yet to any marked degree (exceptions include Banerjee and Linstead, 2001; Chakravartty, 2004; Mirchandani, 2004; Prasad, 1997).

Critiques of globalisation have typically taken one of two forms, those informed by Marxist/neo-Marxist analyses of the operations of international capital and its exploitative, material effects on the world's disadvantaged, and those informed by a postcolonial, critical cultural discourse perspective (Krisnaswarmy, 2002). Those of the former, such as Ahmad (1992) and Parry (1987), criticise the latter for instantiating a distractive discourse diverting attention from the material conditions of exploitation and suppression and from effective material resistance, instead favouring forms of cultural resistance[9]. Gikandi (2000) also suggests that those providing a positive account of globalisation, such as Robertson (1992) and Huntington (1996) have appropriated postcolonialism to support their arguments. In doing this they are also engaging in a broader strategy, which is to focus on the cultural effects of globalisation and thus avoid a focus on the economic and material. This becomes possible because some postcolonial positions can be read as offering a counter to the homogenisation and convergence arguments expressed by some opponents of globalisation. Some postcolonial theorists, then, deny the homogenising effects of globalisation and maintain that Western cultural hegemony, especially as manifest in consumerism, is repeatedly undercut by local resistances based on mimicry, hybridity, appropriation, and other strategies (Appadurai, 1996; Bhabha, 1994; Hall, 2000). For some there is even a kind of celebration of the carnivalesque spaces, which they see as opened up by the de-territorialisation and collapse of boundaries as an effect of globalisation (e.g. Garcia Canclini, 1995). Hall (2000, p. 215), for example, argues that although globalisation has homogenising tendencies, it fails to achieve this, instead releasing a "subaltern proliferation of difference". Bhabha took Said to task for depicting colonialism monolithically and as an indubitably one-sided process and argues both that colonialism has been diverse in the forms it has taken and that there has always been an active engagement and resistance to it by the colonised particularly through process of hybridisation. He is in the camp of the critical cultural discursive critics of colonialism and globalisation for example stating that "it is the realm of representation and the process of signification that constitute the space of the political" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 190). He also argues therefore, that there is always an interaction, indeed, a negotiation in relations of alterity and that positions of Self-other are performed in those (localised) negotiations. In a similar manner, Appadurai (1993, 1996) has also pointed that under globalisation there is not a uni-directional flow of capital – financial and cultural – but that there is a return and a flow in the other direction.

Spivak seems to pursue a typically nuanced (some might say conflicted) position, acknowledging both the material and the cultural discursive misrepresentations and deprivations which imperialism have wrought. Indeed, in some respects she seems to see the discursive subject positioning and othering processes as complementary to

material exploitation within the pantheon of Western imperialist practice. However, at other times she appears to emphasise one over the other. For example, she states that "Globality is invoked in the interest of the finacialization of the globe, or globalisation" (Spivak, 1998, p. 330). At other times her analysis is profoundly textual and focused on the discursive production of disenfranchised subjectivities and subject positions with resistance imagined at the level of the sign. Nonetheless, she has sought to provide a critique of imperialistic globalisation, particularly with regard to the continued effects of the international divisions of labour. The analysis includes showing the intensified marginalisation and increased invisibility of the "subaltern" within the machinations of the globalisation of capital and particularly the displacements of the international division of labour.

Postcolonial theory offers a number of points of analysis and critique of globalisation. IBMS has mostly not engaged with that debate and in not doing so is legitimately located as simply serving the interests of the large corporations so implicate in the globalisation processes and its effects. IBMS primarily provides information and knowledge of interest and value to Western organisations and particularly transnational ones and those that transact internationally. That was the remit for IBMS in the USA at the outset under the influence of Harbison and colleagues and remains so today. In terms of postcolonial analysis, it would seem that neither a focus on the positive cultural heterogeneities and carnivalesque possibilities of globalisation, nor a single-minded focus on the sheer materiality and financialisation effects will provide an adequate analysis and some form of rapprochement would be valuable.

Towards a reconfigured research practice in IBMS

The critique of IBMS offered by postcolonialism is only just beginning to be explored and remains to be fully applied to OS more generally. It offers the ground for a trenchant and far-reaching interrogation of IBMS that, if taken seriously, could lead to a radical reconfiguration of the field. There is not the space here to fully explore such a reconfiguration. It is hoped that the outline of the critique provided above is sufficiently suggestive of the trajectory such a reconfiguration might take. We will have to be content with some indicative pointers.

The postcolonial critique is not merely a critique of the content of IBMS research, nor of the uses to which it is put, it is more profound than that. It impels a radical reconfiguration of all of the key commitments of research in IBMS – ontological, epistemological, methodological, ethical and political. It is a critique that includes a radical questioning of grand theories and narratives, particularly challenging the functionalism dominant in IBMS and its presumptions of universalism. It adopts an epistemology that accepts the specific, local, historical, cultural and ideological location of any knowledge practice and theorising. The privileged status and superior claims of Western-dominated research and conceptualisation practices are challenged and simultaneously the legitimacy and value of other local, indigenous accounts of their own business and management practice are acknowledged. It calls for a research practice that is deeply reflexive about the location[10] of the researcher, the location of the researched and the relationship between them. It therefore calls not just for a reflexive practice, but also one that is deeply contextualised. It also requires that the researcher be clear about his/her research commitments, particularly epistemological,

ethical and political thereby, for example, requiring the researcher to think through the possible effects and consequences of their research practice, particular in terms of emancipation or the obverse, increased exploitation or reproduction of power asymmetries. Additionally, the researcher must remain attuned to their representational practices and work to eradicate appropriating, essentialising or exoticising representations.

The critique also suggests that Western researchers can, alternatively, make use of the knowledge and self-representations of local people within the culture, but care must be taken that this does not result in yet another form of translation and misrepresentation. There are a number of options. The simplest is the classic method of using local informants. The practice, much employed by anthropology, has been severely criticised (Marcus and Fischer, 1986; Prasad, 2003; Spivak, 1999)[11]. One issue is that an informant is still involved in a translation process – both literally and in the sense of cultural translation. Firstly, they are often required to research and write in a language other than their own, but more importantly they will be translating their knowledge and cultural content into forms comprehensible to western audiences. Another option is to use local partners in Western-centred research, but this is also fraught with difficulties (e.g. Peterson, 2001). A different option is for local, non-Western researchers to speak for themselves, but problems remain. Given the politics of research and publishing, indigenous researchers still have to engage in translation – again in both senses. Such research is still refracted through the discourse of Western-dominated IBMS and locatable in that discourse. This means positioning the research and thinking within western-derived epistemologies, theories and methodologies. Indigenous self-representations needs to be seen as a longer-term goal since it would require openness within Western knowledge systems and shifts in the politics of knowledge (for example, radical changes in publishing policies in academic journals).

In embracing a postcolonial critical position care needs to be exercised that the imperialistic tendencies of international capital and business are not simplified and homogenised, nor that their effects are seen as uni-directional and imposed upon a passive non-Western subjects. The interpenetrations, the "third spaces" (Bhabha, 1994), the negotiations, the resistances, the indiginisations, the hybridisations are all processes for which postcolonialism provides some analytic tools, and they all need to be addressed. This calls for a nuanced and sophisticated critical practice. As Kanneth (1997, p. 272) says "Gaining knowledge of other cultures is not a simple, uncomplicated matter of neutral translation from one social order to the direct relativity of another". One needs to examine what takes place in that translation processes and be reflexive about the role played by the researcher. Kanneth goes further and argues that translation does not provide a comfortable meeting ground or easy accommodation of one culture to another, rather it should bring about a transformation in the language – in the meaning system – that is the destination for the translation. In other words, the translation wrings changes in the researcher's domain as well. This is part of the effort to avoid the production of sameness by assimilating the difference of the other. A translation that does not alter the meaning frames of the researcher's location will simply be reproducing what it already knows, will be reducing difference to sameness. Developing research practices that preserve difference and otherness, which preserve

"foreignness" and resist representations that simply mirror or circle back into the known and familiar is perhaps the biggest challenge IBMS faces.

Notes

1. It must be acknowledged that not all forms of postcolonialism are so informed and in some areas there is antipathy towards postmodernism (see, for example, Moore-Gilbert, 1997).

2. The labels to apply to these geo-political and cultural locations are always fraught with difficulties and indeed are a reflection of the problems that postcolonialism deals with. By North Atlantic is meant the USA and those Northern European nations that were economically developed and that had research universities networked into a growing international academy. Similarly problematic of course is the label "the West" which we shall use as a heuristic device in this paper. The West stands for those countries again characterised by economic development and that share some common cultural heritage, principally through the enlightenment and the conception of a Self contrasted to the East and the Orient that developed under an enlightenment-fuelled colonial and imperial expansion. The term continues to have currency today through the alignment of those embedded in international capitalism and the globalisation process. Specifically the term refers to the metropolitan centre (a term we also use occasionally) dominated by the countries of the North American continent, Western Europe (although this is an increasingly blurred boundary) with the UK and other former colonial powers of most significant, plus some former European colonies that have sustained a European connection and identity such as Australia and New Zealand.

3. Principally Harvard University, Princeton, University of California, MIT, and the University of Chicago.

4. We do so whilst acknowledging, with Sardar (1999), that *Orientalism* (Said's text) is but one example of "orientalism" considered as a series of discourses articulating and constructing the relationship between the West and its Others.

5. Orientalism, at least in Said's account was mainly concerned with the West's confrontation with the Other in the Middle East, and particularly with Islam, but the notion has subsequently been extended to include the whole of Asia and as signifying "all that the West was not and some of what the West actually desired" (Sardar, 1999, p. 3).

6. Even more radically, Djait (1985) sees orientalism as not merely at the service of colonialism but as the handmaiden to modernity, especially as modernity is a thoroughly Western construal.

7. As noted some elaboration can be found in Westwood (2001).

8. The term "subaltern" was original coined by Gramsci and refers to the lower castes of society, unorganized peasants, communities of zero workers outside of the main regimes – economic and political – in society and thus are marginalized and unable to find a location in societies' core discourses. Spivak is particularly keen to note the location of women in the subaltern class, and to assert the continued relevance of the notion in the face of the marginalizing effects of the international division of labour under globalisation.

9. Indeed, Ahmad (1992) sees postcolonial theory as being co-opted by the centre and thus unable to pursue the struggle of the dispossessed.

10. Intended again in the fullest sense – so not just geographic location, but also historical, cultural, ideological, economic and political.

11. The value of informants in the sense of accuracy and providing a truthful account of their culture was, of course, delivered a blow by Freeman's (1999) exposure of Margaret Mead's work in Samoa.

References

Abdel-Malek, A. (1981), *Civilisation and Social Theory*, Macmillan, London.

Ahmad, A. (1992), *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures*, Verso, London.

Appadurai, A. (1993), "Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy", in Robbins, B. (Ed.), *The Phantom Public Sphere*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN, pp. 269-95.

Appadurai, A. (1996), *Modernity at Large*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. and Tiffin, H. (1998), *Key Concepts in Post-colonial Studies*, Routledge, London.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. and Tiffin, H. (2000), *Post-colonial Studies: The Key Concepts*, Routledge, London.

Banerjee, S.B. and Linstead, S. (2001), "Globalization, multiculturalism and other fictions: colonialism for the new millennium?", *Organization*, Vol. 8, pp. 683-722.

Bendix, R. (1964), *Nation Building and Citizenship*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Bhabha, H.K. (1994), *The Location of Culture*, Routledge, London.

Boyacigiller, N.A. and Adler, N.J. (1991), "The parochial dinosaur: organisational science in a global context", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 262-90.

Brockway, L. (1979), *Science and Colonial Expansion: The Role of the British Royal Botanical Gardens*, Academic, New York, NY.

Calas, M.B. and Smircich, L. (1999), "Past postmodernism? Reflections and tenative directions", *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 24 No. 4, pp. 649-71.

Chakravartty, P. (2004), "Telecom, national development and the Indian state: a postcolonial critique", *Media, Culture & Society*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 227-42.

Clegg, S.R., Hardy, C. and Nord, W.R. (1996), *Handbook of Organization Studies*, Sage, London.

Clifford, J. and Marcus, G.E. (Eds) (1986), *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

Cooper, F. (2002), *Africa since 1940. The Past of the Present*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Djait, H. (1985), *Europe and Islam*, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

Farmer, R.N. and Richman, B.M. (1965), *Comparative Management and Economic Progress*, Irwin, Homewood, IL.

Foucault, M. (1979), *Discipline and Punish*, Viking, New York, NY.

Freeman, D. (1999), *The Fateful Hoaxing of Margaret Mead: A Historical Analysis of her Samoan Research*, Westview Press, Boulder, CO.

Galison, P. and Stump, D.J. (1996), *The Disunity of Science*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.

Garcia Canclini, N. (1995), in Chiappari, C.L. and Lopez, S.L. (Transl.) (Eds), *Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN.

Gikandi, S. (2000), "Globalization and the claims of postcoloniality", *South Atlantic Quarterly*, Vol. 100 No. 3, pp. 627-58.

Granick, D. (1954), *Management of the Industrial Firm in the USSR: A Study in Soviet Economic Planning*, Columbia University Press, New York, NY.

Hall, S. (2000), "Conclusion: the multi-cultural question", in Hesse, B. (Ed.), *Unsettled Multiculturalisms: Diasporas, Entanglements, Transruptions*, Zed, London, pp. 209-41.

Harbison, F. and Myers, C.A. (1959), *Management in the Industrial World: An International Analysis*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.

Harding, S. (1996), "European expansion and the organisation of modern science: isolated or linked historical processes?", *Organisation*, Vol. 3 No. 4, pp. 497-509.

Harding, S. (1998), *Is Science Multicultural? Postcolonialisms, Feminisms and Epistemologies*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis, IN.

Hardy, C., Philips, N. and Clegg, S. (2001), "Reflexivity in organisation and management theory: a study of the production of the research subject", *Human Relations*, Vol. 5 No. 5, pp. 531-60.

Harris, P.R. and Moran, R.T. (1979), *Managing Cultural Differences*, Gulf, Houston, TX.

Harvey, D. (1989), *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Hodgetts, R.M. and Luthans, F. (2000), *International Management: Culture, Strategy and Behavior*, 4th ed., Irwin/McGraw-Hill, Boston, MA/NewYork, NY.

Hofstede, G. (1980), *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*, Sage, London.

Hofstede, G. (1991), *Cultures and Organisations: Intercultural Cooperation and its Importance for Survival*, McGraw-Hill, London.

Huntington, S.P. (1996), *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, Simon & Schuster, New York, NY.

Johnson, P. and Duberley, J. (2003), "Reflexivity in management research", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 40 No. 5, pp. 1279-303.

Kanneth, K. (1997), "Africa' and cultural translation: reading difference", in Pearson, K.A., Parry, B. and Squires, J. (Eds), *Cultural Readings of Imperialism: Edward Said and the Gravity of History*, Lawrence & Wishart, London, pp. 267-89.

Kerr, C., Dunlop, J.T., Harbison, F.H. and Myers, C.A. (1960), *Industrialism and Industrial Man: The Problems of Labor and Management in Economic Growth*, Heinemann, London.

Krishnaswarmy, R. (2002), "The criticism of culture and the culture of criticism at the intersection of postcolonialism and globalisation theory", *Diacritics*, Vol. 32 No. 2, pp. 106-26.

Kumar, D. (1991), *Science and Empire: Essays in the Indian Context 1700-1947*, Anamika Prakashan and National Institute of Science and Technology, Delhi.

Kwek, D. (2003), "Decolonizing and re-presenting culture's consequences: a postcolonial critique of cross-cultural studies in management", in Prasad, A. (Ed.), *Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis: A Critical Engagement*, Palgrave, New York, NY.

Lane, H.W., DiStefano, J.J. and Maznevski, M. (1997), *International Management Behavior*, 3rd ed., Blackwell, Cambridge, MA.

Leung, K., Bhagat, R.S., Buchan, N.R., Erez, M. and Gibson, C.B. (2005), "Culture and international business: recent advances and their implications for future research", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 36 No. 4, pp. 357-79.

Levy, M. (1966), *Modernisation and the Structure of Societies*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Lewis, W.A. (1955), *Theory of Economic Growth*, Allen & Unwin, London.

Loomba, A. (1998), *Colonialisin/Postcolonialism*, Routledge, London.

Mackerras, C. (1989), *Western Images of China*, Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

Marcus, G.E. and Fischer, M.M.J. (1986), *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Mead, R. (1994), *International Management: Cross-Cultural Dimensions*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Mirchandani, K. (2004), "Practices of global capital: gaps, cracks and ironies in transnational call centres in India", *Global Networks*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 355-73.

Moore-Gilbert, B. (1997), *Postcolonial Theory: Contexts, Practices, Politics*, Verso, London.

Nath, R. (1988), *Comparative Management: A Regional View*, Ballinger, Cambridge, MA.

Nkomo, S.M. (1992), "The emperor has clothes: rewriting 'race' in organisations", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 487-513.

Osigweh, C.A.B. (1989), "The myth of universality", in Osigweh, C.A.B. (Ed.), *Organisational Science Abroad*, Plenum Press, New York, NY.

Parekh, B. (1997), "The West and its Others", in Pearson, K.A., Parry, B. and Squires, J. (Eds), *Cultural Readings of Imperialism: Edward Said and the Gravity of History*, Wishart, London, pp. 173-93.

Parry, B. (1987), "Problems in current theories of colonial discourse", *Oxford Literary Review*, Vol. 13, pp. 25-58.

Parry, B. (1997), "Narrating imperialism: Nostromo's dystopia", in Pearson, K.A., Parry, B. and Squires, J. (Eds), *Cultural Readings of Imperialism: Edward Said and the Gravity of History*, Lawrence & Wishart, London, pp. 227-46.

Peterson, M.F. (2001), "International collaboration in organisational behaviour research", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 22, pp. 59-81.

Phatak, A.V. (1983), *International Dimensions of Management*, Kent Publishing Company, Boston, MA.

Prasad, A. (1997), "The colonising consciousness and representations of the Other: a postcolonial critique of the discourse of oil", in Prasad, P., Mills, A.J., Elmes, M. and Prasad, A. (Eds), *Managing the Organisational Melting Pot: Dilemmas of Workplace Diversity*, Sage, London, pp. 285-311.

Prasad, A. (Ed.) (2003), *Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis: A Critical Engagement*, Palgrave, New York, NY.

Punnett, B.J. and Shenkar, O. (Eds) (1996), *Handbook for International Management Research*, Blackwell, Cambridge, MA.

Redding, G. (2005), "The thick description and comparison of societal systems of capitalism", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 36 No. 2, pp. 123-55.

Robertson, R. (1992), *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*, Sage, London.

Sachs, W. (Ed.) (1992), *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*, Zed, Atlantic Highlands, NJ.

Said, E.W. (1978), *Orientalism*, Pantheon, New York, NY.

Said, E.W. (1993), *Culture and Imperialism*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, NY.

Sardar, Z. (1988), *The Revenge of Athena: Science, Exploitation and the Third World*, Mansell, London.

Sardar, Z. (1999), *Orientalism*, Open University Press, Buckingham.

Slemon, S. (1994), "The scramble for post-colonialism", in Tiffin, C. and Lawson, A. (Eds), *De-scribing Empire: Postcolonialism and Textuality*, Routledge, London.

Soja, E. (1989), *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*, Verso, London.

Spivak, G. (1987), *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*, Methuen, New York, NY.

Spivak, G. (1990), *The Post-colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogue*, Routledge, New York, NY.

Spivak, G. (1994), "Can the subaltern speak?", in Williams, P. and Chrisman, L. (Eds), *Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*, Columbia University Press, New York, NY, pp. 66-111.

Spivak, G.C. (1998), "Culture talks in the hot peace: revisiting the 'Global Village'", in Cheah, P. and Robbins, B. (Eds), *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling beyond the Nation*, University of Minnesota Press, MN, pp. 329-50.

Spivak, G.C. (1999), *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

Steier, F. (1991), *Research and Reflexivity*, Sage, London.

Taussig, M. (1993), *Mimesis and Alterity*, Routledge, New York, NY.

Thomas, N. (1994), *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government*, Polity, Cambridge.

Westwood, R. (2001), "Appropriating the other in the discourses of comparative management", in Westwood, R. and Linstead, S. (Eds), *The Language of Organization*, Sage, London, pp. 241-82.

Westwood, R.I. (2004), "Towards a post-colonial research paradigm in international business and comparative management", in Marschan-Piekkari, R. and Welch, C. (Eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods for International Business*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp. 56-83.

Wilkinson, E. (1990), *Japan versus the West: Image and Reality*, Penguin, London.

Wong-Mingji, D. and Mir, A.H. (1997), "How international is international management? Provincialism, parochialism, and the problematic of global diversity", in Prasad, P., Mills, A.J., Elmes, M. and Prasad, A. (Eds), *Managing the Organisational Melting Pot: Dilemmas of Workplace Diversity*, Sage, London, pp. 340-64.

Young, R.J.C. (1997), "Hybridism and the ethnicity of the English", in Pearson, K.A., Parry, B. and Squires, J. (Eds), *Cultural Readings of Imperialism: Edward Said and the Gravity of History*, Lawrence and Wishart, London, pp. 127-50.

Young, R. (2001), *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Further reading

Cohn, B.S. (1996), *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

McClelland, D.C. (1961), *The Achieving Society*, Van Nostrand Reinhold, Princeton, NJ.

Prasad, P. (2003), "The return of the native: organizational discourses and the legacy of the ethnographic imagination", in Prasad, A. (Ed.), *Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis: A Critical Engagement*, Palgrave, New York, NY, pp. 149-70.

Trompenaars, F. (1993), *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business*, Nicholas Brealey, London.

About the author
Robert Westwood is a Reader at the University of Queensland Business School. His current interests are in postcolonial theory, the intersection of popular culture and organisation studies, and humour in organisations, as well as long standing interests in critical organisation studies, culture and management, the meaning of work and the language/power nexus. He has researched and published widely in these areas with contracted book projects underway in each of the first three topics. His most recent books include *Language and Organisation*, published by Sage in 2001 and co-edited with Professor Steve Linstead and *Debating Organisation: Point/Counterpoint in Organisation Studies* published by Blackwell in 2003 and co-edited with Professor Stewart Clegg. He is Co-Editor of the journal *Culture and Organisation* and on the Editorial Board of *Organisation Studies* and other journals. Robert Westwood can be contacted at: b.westwood@business.uq.edu.au