



Open Research Online

Citation

Kothiyal, Nivedita; Bell, Emma and Clarke, Caroline (2018). Moving Beyond Mimicry: Developing Hybrid Spaces in Indian Business Schools. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 17(2) pp. 137–154.

URL

<https://oro.open.ac.uk/52683/>

License

(CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0) Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Policy

This document has been downloaded from Open Research Online, The Open University's repository of research publications. This version is being made available in accordance with Open Research Online policies available from [Open Research Online \(ORO\) Policies](#)

Versions

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding

**MOVING BEYOND MIMICRY: DEVELOPING HYBRID SPACES IN INDIAN
BUSINESS SCHOOLS**

Nivedita Kothiyal
York Management School
University of York, UK

Emma Bell
Open University Business School
The Open University, UK

Caroline Clarke
Open University Business School
The Open University, UK

Abstract

This article analyses the identity work of Indian management educators and scholars as they seek to establish, maintain and revise a sense of self in the context of business school globalization. We show how globalization, combined with the historical legacy of colonialism, renders Indian scholars precarious in their interactions with Western business schools. Based on a qualitative interview study, we explore how Indian business school scholars perform their identities in the context of neo-colonial relations, which are characterised by the dominance of English language and a pressure to conform to research norms set by globally-ranked journals. Drawing on postcolonial theory, our argument focuses on mimicry as a distinctive form of identity work that involves maintaining difference between Western and non-Western identities by ‘Othering’ Indian scholars, while simultaneously seeking to transform them. We draw attention to ambivalence within participants’ accounts, which we suggest arises because the authority of Western scholarship relies on maintaining non-Western scholars in a position of alterity or ‘not quite-ness’. We suggest that hybridity offers an opportunity to disrupt and question current practices of business school globalization and facilitate scholarly engagement that reflects more diverse philosophical positions and worldviews.

Business school globalization, its antecedents, processes and consequences, is of enduring interest to management educators and scholars (Doh, 2010). Across North America, Western Europe, Australia and Japan, globalization of business schools is being driven by increased geographical mobility of academics and students and the rising number of institutions seeking international certification from professional bodies (Hardy & Tolhurst, 2014). As well as presenting management educators with cultural challenges related to programs and pedagogical practice (Hardy & Tolhurst, 2014), globalization influences management scholarship. The challenges that arise from globalization are related to the increased significance of international certification assessments (Romero, 2008), and business school rankings (Gioia & Corley, 2002; Collet & Vives, 2013) which incorporate assessments of faculty research quality based on the status of journals they publish in (Adler & Harzing, 2009; Mingers & Willmott, 2013). Rankings and accreditation systems generate isomorphic pressure, in the form of coercive, mimetic and normative processes that shape global business schools in ways which limit the diversity of scholarship (Alvesson & Gabriel, 2013). Understood in these terms, business school globalization is a potentially universalising force that encourages cultural convergence and increasing sameness by introducing de-territorialized market logics (Ritzer, 2007).

Business school globalization is also constituted through asymmetric, neo-colonial relations between countries in the Western core and peripheral, non-Western nations (Mir et al., 2004; Srinivas, 2012; Cooke and Alcadipani, 2015). In addition to understanding the effects of colonial and imperial history on business schools today, the concept of *neo-colonialism* enables understanding of ongoing processes of political, economic and cultural domination through which scholars in business schools in the rest of the world continue to be dominated and

subordinated by those in the West. Understanding business school globalisation involves taking into account the effects of these power relations on management scholarship and education. To achieve this, we draw here on postcolonial theory. The importance of postcolonialism stems from its role in accounting for the historical, cultural and geographical origins of management thought as rooted in Western domination over non-Western voices (Frenkel & Shenhav, 2006; Prasad, 2012; Seremani & Clegg, 2015; Westwood, Jack, Khan, & Frenkel, 2014). This provides the basis for understanding the impact of core-periphery interactions in maintaining relationships of dependency between scholars in the West and those situated in countries on the periphery (Alatas, 2003; Varman & Saha, 2009).

Our research question focuses on understanding how neo-colonial relations shape the identities of scholars in Indian business schools. Based on a qualitative interview study of Indian management scholars, we explore how they perform their professional identities in ways which reflect these unequal power relations. We draw on the concept of mimicry (Bhabha, 1994) to understand the effects of neo-colonial relations on scholarly identity. The notion of hybridity, or a 'third space' (Bhabha, 1994), is suggested as a means of resisting current norms and practices of business school globalization that reinforce and propagate neo-colonial relations, enabling alternative forms of agency. Hybridization relies on mutual transformation of the identities of the colonizer and colonized in ways that connect them (Gandhi, 1998). Hence, we suggest the development of hybridity creates the possibilities within which the logic of business school globalization may be questioned.

We begin by introducing the notion of identity work used to frame our analysis and providing a

historical summary of the development of management education in India. Next, we explain the postcolonial concepts of mimicry and hybridity which are central to understanding how the identities of Indian management scholars are shaped as a consequence of the legacy of colonial history and business school globalization (Rizvi, Lingard & Lavia, 2006). After introducing our methods, we present our findings which focus on the trend towards mimicry in Indian business schools in response to English language dominance and pressure to conform to research norms set by globally-ranked journals. Our contribution highlights the interdependent nature of identity work in the core and on the periphery and the possibilities for disruption and challenge that this presents. We conclude by suggesting how management scholars in peripheral locations could develop hybridized spaces of in-betweenness, transforming their subjectivities in ways which enable more diverse epistemological worldviews to be acknowledged.

POSTCOLONIALISM AND IDENTITY IN INDIAN BUSINESS SCHOOLS

The study of identity is concerned with understanding ‘people’s subjectively construed understandings of who they were, are and desire to become’ (Brown, 2015: 20). This concept is crucial to understanding the meanings that individuals reflexively attach to themselves, and are attributed to them by others, including through social interactions and prevalent discourses. The processes and practices through which identities are constructed can be understood as identity *work*. This label draws attention to the agency of social actors in identity formation, as they form, maintain and revise a coherent sense of self within particular contexts (Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003). Constraints on identity arise as a consequence of power relations which frame the extent to which certain identities may be accommodated or resisted. Identity theorists draw attention to

the temporary nature of identities, which rely on ‘momentary achievements’ (Ybema Keenoy, Oswick, Beverungen, Ellis & Sabelis, 2009: 301), and are stitched together at a point of intersection in order to create the impression of a coherent self. This literature points to the partial and provisional nature of identity work. It also highlights the importance of perceptions of others on whom individuals rely for confirmation, including of imagined others (Mead, 1934).

Contemporary organizations are an important arena where ‘identities are mediated, formed and transformed’ (Muzio & Kirkpatrick, 2011: 397) through a mutually constitutive process that intersects with power and discourse to ‘create other-selves’ (Kosmala & Herrbach, 2006: 1398). The importance of organizational identity formation arises because work offers significant opportunities for ‘recognition of the self as continuously improving’ (Roberts, 2005: 629), through seductive discourses of career-building, as well as concrete rewards which are appealing only because ‘we have naturalized the idea that identity is and *should* be of central concern’ (Knights and Clarke, 2017: 346). Much organizational and professional identity work takes place in demanding situations or moments of transition. Identity work ‘is more necessary, frequent and intense in [such] situations where strains, tensions and surprises are prevalent, as these prompt feelings of confusion, contradiction and self-doubt, which in turn lead to examination of the self’ (Brown, 2015: 25).

Identity work has been shown to be pervasive and problematic for management scholars as a consequence of the ‘real or imagined demands of others’ (Knights & Willmott, 2004: 72) which make it impossible to meet expectations. Intensified work regimes and pressures to publish in a narrowly prescribed set of journals (Macdonald and Kam, 2007; Adler & Harzing, 2009) are tied

to a 'ranking process [that] by definition, excludes the majority of subjects' (Clarke & Knights, 2015: 1879). This encourages organizational colonization of identity (Knights & Clarke, 2017) and renders academic selves fragile, insecure and vulnerable (Collinson, 2003; Knights & Clarke, 2014). As these authors argue, the failure of academic identity work is related to the tendency to be preoccupied with self. This can lead to 'compulsive behaviour that encourages us to find meaning in our own subjection' (Knights & Clarke, 2017: 351), suggesting that academics are, to an extent, 'complicit in their own subjection' (Boussebaa & Brown, 2017: 22).

As a consequence of business school globalization there are likely to be some similarities between the identity work of scholars in the West and India, related to the spread of tensions between teaching and publishing (Adler, 2016), the dominance of particular epistemological and ontological perspectives (Grey, 2010) and notions of what constitutes academic excellence (Butler & Spoelstra, 2012). However, in relation to academic identity, the question of 'who we are... may be answered quite differently by groups with distinct histories and professional identities' (Brown & Humphreys, 2006: 252). Consequently, we suggest there are likely to be significant differences between the identity work carried out by business school scholars in the West and scholars in peripheral locations such as India. In the section that follows, we provide an historical overview of business school education in India before going deeper into the postcolonial concepts that inform our analysis of the identity work of management scholars in India.

Management Education in India

The identities of scholars in Indian business schools are performed on a global stage that is

shaped by a colonial history which continues to cast its 'shadow in the postcolonial era' (Banerjee & Linstead, 2004: 224) and contributes to the (re)production of West/Rest relations (Boussebaa, Sinha & Gabriel, 2014). Business schools in India were significantly shaped by US values and practices in the post-independence period following the end of British colonial rule (1858-1947) (Srinivas, 2002). The first Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs) were established by the government of India with support from the Ford Foundation - Kolkata in 1959 in partnership with Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Ahmedabad in 1960 in collaboration with Harvard University (Srinivas, 2008). These collaborations were based on a logic of transferring management knowledge and pedagogy from the technologically advanced, affluent core to the economically poor, underdeveloped periphery (Srinivas, 2012). This logic enabled the transfer of academic curricula and teaching, hiring and tenure methods from US business schools to India (Mohan, 2011).

The first generation of faculty at IIM Ahmedabad (IIMA) either had a PhD, were engaged in obtaining one from a US business school, or were sponsored to attend the International Teachers Program (IITP) at Harvard Business School. This created a 'community' of Indian management academics socialised into US business school cultures (Srinivas, 2002). IIMA launched a doctoral program in 1972 to train the next generation of management scholars and introduced a Faculty Development Program in 1979 for existing faculty. While this enabled more local faculty development, it entrenched a hierarchy that positioned IIMs as elite institutions in comparison to other business schools in India. The language of instruction in IIMs was English, a legacy of colonial educational policy (Mir et al., 2004). While the context of India is unique and specific, similar patterns of neo-colonial dominance and US-led business school expansionism have been

observed in the development of management education in Brazil, where teaching in English is common and faculty are trained according to US norms (Alcadipani & Caldas, 2012; Cooke & Alcadipani, 2015).

The effects of business school globalization can be seen in India where institutions are under increasing pressure to become 'world class educational institutions' (Murthy et al., 2007) and produce 'global managers' (Sheth, 1991; Khatri et al., 2012). There has also been significant growth in the number of new business schools (FICC, 2011; Mahajan, Agrawal, Sharma & Nanjia, 2014): in 2005/6 there were 1,888 management institutes, by 2010/11 this had risen to 3,858 (Vakkayil & Chatterjee, 2017). This has generated concerns about the quality of management education in India related to shortages of faculty and the adequacy of educational systems and processes of regulation (Panda & Gupta, 2014; Sheel & Vohra, 2014; Mahajan et al., 2014). In elite institutions there has been an emphasis on producing global research, as schools have sought to enhance their position in international rankings (Banerjee, 2013) by encouraging faculty to publish in journals listed in the Financial Times 'Top 40' (Khatri, Ojha, Budhwar, Srinivasan & Varma, 2012). This has led to greater diversification between institutions, as some schools pursue distinctive accommodation of local orientations while others prioritize conformity to global institutional norms (Vakkayil & Chatterjee, 2017). This context provides the conditions within which Indian management scholars perform their identities, in ways which are, as we argue below, shaped by neo-colonial relations including 'Western othering... and attempts to universalize Western approaches' (Ulus, 2005: 891).

Mimicry and Hybridity in Business School Globalization

Any constitution of identity is 'always an act of power' (Laclau, 1990: 33) that relies on processes of differentiation, achieved through the maintenance of domination and privilege. We suggest that, due to the neo-colonial relations which shape business school globalization, representations of scholars in peripheral locations like India tend to be constructed as suffering from a 'lack' (Hall, 2000), in comparison to scholars in the West who are represented as dominant. Indian scholars can thus become - consciously or unconsciously - engaged in a form of identity work that seeks to compensate for this 'perceived definition of cultural identity or estrangement' (Pickering, 2001: 49). Like most attempts to secure the self, these strategies are problematic because identities positioned as 'Other' will, by definition, 'never be adequate-identical' to the subject positions assigned to them (Hall, 2000: 6).

Postcolonial scholars argue that the spread of business school education from the core to the periphery relies on maintenance of discursive conditions through which dominance is achieved and maintained (Jack & Westwood, 2006; Westwood & Jack, 2007). Ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies and methods that privilege the positivist paradigm are key to this process (Jack, Westwood, Srinivas & Sadar, 2011) and encourage 'hegemonic, competitive and mimetic processes' of knowledge production (Üsdiken, 2014: 783). This is a form of what Ibarra Colado, 2006) calls 'epistemic coloniality' or 'violence' (see also Spivak, 1988; 2012) and involves taking methodologies and methods developed by scholars in the West and seeking to apply them universally (Gobo, 2011). Such colonizing approaches to research involve Western researchers 'collecting' knowledge about 'foreign' cultures and using this to construct an essentialized Other (Prasad, 2003). By limiting what is taught as 'global' knowledge, the Western origins that constitute management thought are both opaque and insufficiently acknowledged (Banerjee and

Linstead, 2004). Recently, some management scholars have called for greater appreciation of postcolonial theory as a way of encouraging critical self-reflection among educators and developing cross-cultural approaches to learning (Joy & Poonamallee, 2013). Others have drawn on postcolonial thought to argue for recognition of the diverse challenges faced by business schools in peripheral locations and the need for more diverse responses to globalization (Nkomo, 2015).

This study responds to calls for more fine-grained empirical analyses of neo-colonial identity regulation as a process that involves organizational power regimes and discourses being used to shape identities (Boussebaa & Brown, 2017; Das and Dharwadhar, 2009). It therefore focuses on how the dynamics of business school globalization are enforced and enacted locally, and the ways in which Indian scholars respond to attempted identity regulation. A key issue that we consider concerns inequalities that arise from the dominance of the English language in business school globalization. ‘Global’ English is recognized as the ‘default’ language in university research and education (Phillipson, 2008) and is seen as a way for universities to internationalize and become ‘world class’ (Altbach, 2007). Focusing on the shift towards teaching and publishing in English in French business schools, Boussebaa & Brown (2017: 8) argue that ‘Englishization’ is associated with US-domination within business school globalization, which is helping to remake non-Anglophone identities through ‘a quasi-voluntary process of imperialism’.

Englishization in management education is supported by the use of Anglo-American textbooks which facilitate the spread of Western management ideas from the core to the periphery (Nkomo, 2011; Fougère & Moulettes, 2012). Anglophone dominance creates pressure to publish in English language journals (Meriläinen, Tienari, Thomas & Davies, 2008) where peer review

processes privilege native English speakers, generating insecurities among non-native English speakers about their competence in such settings (Horn, forthcoming). Granting legitimacy to certain scholars on the basis of English-language usage (Phillipson, 2008) adversely affects multilingual scholars across disciplinary communities and contributes to the exclusion of non-Western researchers from academic publication networks (Uzuner, 2007).

We draw here on the foundational work of Bhabha (1994) to analyse how business school globalization is shaped by neo-colonial relations. Bhabha suggests mimicry arises from narcissistic demands imposed on the colonized to emulate the habits, culture, speech, values and institutions of the colonizer. As the adoption of the colonizers' cultural values, norms and institutions is never a straightforward reproduction, mimicry always involves failure (Jefferess, 2008). This gives rise to a dialectical relationship between colonizers and colonized which continually produces its slippage, fixing the colonial subject as a "partial" presence' (Bhabha, 1984: 86). Consequently, the 'reforming, civilizing mission' of the colonizer 'is threatened by the displacing gaze of its disciplinary double' who is '*almost the same, but not quite*' (Bhabha, 1994: 84, emphasis in original). This gives rise to a fluctuating relationship between 'colonizers' and 'colonized' where accommodation and resistance coexist, generating profound *ambivalence* for them both (Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin, 1998). Bhabha's perspective on mimicry enables appreciation of the fundamental ambivalence of the West/Rest encounter as mutually constitutive, interested in transforming, yet also reliant on maintaining difference between Western and non-Western identities through 'Othering' (Boussebaa et al., 2014). The Other is thus a symbol of cultural diversity that can never fully be assimilated. This gives rise to *hybridity*, rather than sameness, not 'as some kind of "blending" of previously distinct

subjectivities and categories, but... a form of resistance... [that] threatens the “purity” of imperial identity and continually frustrates the colonizer’s ability to fully reform and control the “Other”” (Boussebaa et al., 2014: 1155).

To summarize our argument so far, we suggest the concepts of postcolonialism and identity can be used to generate insight into the effects of globalization on Indian business schools. We have introduced the notion of ‘Othering’, combined with Bhabba’s concepts of mimicry and hybridity, which enable understanding of how neo-colonial relations are maintained through identity regulation. We now present the methodology on which our study is based, before going on to address our research question, through which we seek to generate fine-grained understanding of the power regimes and discourses that shape the identities of scholars in Indian business schools.

APPROACH TO STUDY

This analysis is based on a qualitative semi-structured interview study involving 32 researchers and educators in business schools in India. Sampling of participants was purposive, guided by relevance to our research question. Our research design used stratified sampling to represent hierarchical level (professor, associate and assistant professor), degree of experience (established and early career), and type of institution (Indian Institutes of Management - hereafter IIMs, universities and private business schools). Purposive sampling formed the basis for selection of participants who represented a range of management subject areas and methodological approaches: 13 self-identified in their interview accounts as positivist/quantitative, 10 as qualitative or mixed methods with a positivist orientation, and 13 as interpretive, qualitative

and/or critical. Overall gender distribution of the sample was 25 men/11 women. Author 1 drew on her cultural insider status (Brannick & Coghlan, 2007) to negotiate access and establish trust with participants, many of whom were already known to her. Approximately half the interviews were conducted face-to-face by one or both researchers, the remainder via Skype which provided a convenient and naturalistic mode of qualitative inquiryⁱ (Hanna, 2012). Interviews were between 30-70 minutes in duration and were professionally transcribed verbatimⁱⁱ. Our approach to sampling was contingent (Hood, 2007), hence the criteria used to sample participants evolved as understanding of the phenomenon developed. The decision to cease data collection was made when a satisfactory level of saturation was achieved, i.e. when data collected from participants generated relatively fewer new insights.

Consistent with our contingent sampling approach which allows for a degree of flexibility in the iterative process of data collection and analysis, the decision was taken to interview a smaller number of Indian 'diaspora' (Hall, 1990) scholars (n = 5) who had moved to work in US or UK business schools. These 'key informants' (Eisenhardt, 1989) were selected on the basis of their specialist knowledge of the Indian management research and education community. Their accounts were used to supplement the main sample and develop in depth understanding of patterns of behaviour.

Reflexivity, understood as a process of exploring the situated nature of knowledge and the institutional, social and political processes that go into its production, is significant in understanding our situated identities in this project. Author 1 is an Indian scholar and Authors 2 and 3 originate from, and work in, the UK. As interpretive researchers who share a critical

orientation, our work is characterised by a commitment to understanding and challenging power relations, including those related to the production of knowledge. Consequently, we are skeptical of quantitative methods that rely on the construction of asymmetrical relationships between researchers and subjects as a basis for extracting information. Instead we favor methods such as qualitative interviewing that seek to establish a less-hierarchical relationship between interviewer and interviewee. We therefore used reflexivity as a ‘multi-voicing practice’ which involves asking questions about the ability of the author(s) to speak authentically about the experience of the Other, interrogating the relationship between them. Reflexivity is thus a ‘positioning practice’ (Alvesson, Hardy & Harley, 2008) through which we explored how networks of practices and institutionalized norms legitimize certain forms of knowledge.

In confronting the complex positionalities entailed in this research collaboration, we also drew on the concept of ‘bicultural research’ (Smith, 1999) which encourages non-Western and Western researchers to work together in conducting decolonizing research. This approach values, reclaims and foregrounds non-Western voices and methodologies, while resisting the positioning of ‘certain players within postcoloniality as more “valid” postcolonial researchers/scholars’ (Swadener & Mutua, 2008: 31). The first two authors independently kept a reflective diary of the research process which they subsequently shared as the basis for joint discussions about the power relations embedded in the research. As the project developed, we became increasingly aware of differences between us as scholars, in addition to similarities. In writing up our analysis, presenting papers and responding to reviewer feedback, we reflected on the tensions associated with the collaboration. While these tensions cannot be eliminated, by continuing to reflect on them critically we endeavor to maintain awareness of how the desire to work

collaboratively is both enabled and constrained by conventions associated with the global production and dissemination of management knowledge, including by seeking to publish our findings in international journals such as this one.

Interview questions focused on a range of issues of identity work related primarily to participants' academic careers, including their research, teaching and experiences of publishing. Because this was an interpretive study, analysis relied on abduction and was characterised by dialogical, iterative movement between theory and empirical phenomenon to produce a reflective narrative rather than an explanatory model or theoretical propositions (Mantere & Ketokivi, 2013). We took an emergent approach in engaging with our empirical data using NVivo to break down the interview transcripts and assign codes to individual segments of text. Next, we searched for recurrences of specific segments of coded text within and across transcripts, and links between coded categories. This process formed the basis for grouping related data excerpts together and refining them analytically into first-order categories while continuing to make connections to the literature and our research questions. This was not just a matter of fitting data to theory, but also challenging and developing theory through the generation of creative, empirical insights. Together we constructed narrative explanations of patterns observed in the data before selecting what we considered were the best explanation from these competing alternatives (Mantere & Ketokivi, 2013). This enabled identification of three themes which featured prominently in participants' accounts: 'linguistic domination', 'research mimicry' and 'experiencing ambivalence'.

Linguistic Domination

Our first theme relates to the use of English as the language of the colonial encounter. This theme is related to the rise of global journal publishing which is driven by editorial ‘networks of academics primarily located in the West’ (Murphy & Zhu, 2012: 923). Indian scholars reported a need to perform persuasively in an arena where the English language is both dominant and ‘unmarked’ (Laclau, 1990) as a consequence of *‘being pressurised by this English-speaking world which wants to be closer and closer to the US...’* (Suresh, professor). Entry into global networks was suggested to be hindered by the use of *‘Indian English’*.

Participants suggested that English language dominance encourages an increased focus on small and atypical English-speaking sample populations. In multilingual India, business school globalization and the pressure to publish in English has encouraged the study of those groups where English is spoken, despite representing a very small proportion of Indian society.

[Indian management researchers] have basically studied easily studyable populations... I think we definitely have left out a large part of the population in the country... in the process [of using English as the language of research]. (Anindita, professor)

English language dominance is further associated with an increased inclination towards quantitative research, as a means of mediating the demands of writing in English as a non-native speaker. Anindita suggested that qualitative research required greater *‘language proficiency [in English]’*. Suresh described this, *‘being articulate, having ability to make nuanced argument by play[ing] with the [English] language’*. Anindita explained that in seeking to write up research in a way that was acceptable to international journals, some scholars were attracted to *‘the positivist*

paradigm [and] using... quantitative methodology' because they think 'even if my [English] language is not great, I can still research [and write]'.

English language dominance can also lead to the loss of nuanced, pluralistic meanings as a consequence of translation. Multilingualism led some scholars to confine their data collection to Hindi speaking communities, one of the official, and more widely spoken languages of India. They subsequently translated data into English to enable publication in international journals. Some participants sought to demonstrate '*validity*' and eliminate '*bias*' by obtaining co-researcher agreement on translations and doing back-translation using bilingual experts to ensure consistency (Temple & Young, 2004). Such practices are embedded in Western notions of science that encourage 'objective' characterization and classification using what are assumed to be value neutral, 'scientific' categories (Bell, Kothiyal & Willmott, 2017). The impossibility of achieving 'neutrality' and 'objectivity' in translation was highlighted by a number of participants, including Padmaja (associate professor) who gave the example of the word '*izzat*', commonly translated as 'respect' but which has diverse connotations in different Indian regions. As Durga (professor) noted, in her cross-cultural comparative study of Indian and European managers, what constitutes knowledge is compromised, as meanings that cannot be translated into English may be lost (Seremani & Clegg, 2015):

If we are asking the questions in English and people who are responding are not native speakers of English, then there is a gap... The method demands that when you are trying to tap the thought processes of people, you should ask the questions in the... language which they are most comfortable with... When we did the... interviews for this project in India [they were] in English, but in Sweden it was in Swedish... they speak Swedish whereas in India we speak English but

not all of us are equally comfortable with that language.

English language dominance was regarded by Dipanker (professor), as a constraint on possibilities for achieving more pluralistic ways of understanding and being.

We see only what our language allows us to see... Our thinking is... limited by our exposure and socialisation into English... If language tends to restrict exploration of that diversity, then I think we are losing out a lot in understanding...

The identity consequences associated with English language dominance are multiple and complex, not least because this can lead to feelings of inadequacy and insecurity (Knights & Clarke, 2014). Participants emphasised the '*scathing comments*' received from journal editors and reviewers about their use of Indian English, which they perceived as '*jerky*', '*absurd*', '*weird*' and '*improper*'.

I write Indian Englishⁱⁱⁱ, and often times that's very jarring for either the American or the British reviewer...things which are taken as very acceptable in Indian English... we get comments [like] the idea might be good, [but] it would have to be rewritten... [with] the language errors, the grammar errors. (Suresh)

The stigmatization (Horn, forthcoming) that arises from writing in Indian English, which is deemed less 'pure' in the transnational intralinguistic hierarchy of power (Bousseba et al., 2014), led some to reflect on comments of editors and reviewers which could '*once in a while*' become '*really hurting*'.

The response would be ‘oh, good research, but it seems like the researcher is a non-native English speaker... [and even after] the third time [of professional proof-reading]... the comments are [that] there are still massive errors in the writing. (Manoj, UK-based professor)

This leaves Indian management scholars, including those working in Anglophone contexts, in a situation where they are constructed as the ‘native’ who is trying to be white - ‘almost the same, but not quite’. Manoj’s quote suggests language use is related to the academic ‘habitus’, a distinctive system of thought, feeling, language and behaviour (Bourdieu, 1988) which management scholars inhabit (Śliwa and Johansson, 2015). This includes style, accent and pronunciation, in addition to vocabulary and grammar, which is used to demonstrate one’s ability to conform to English-speaking academic rules (Tietze & Dick, 2013). Assistant professor Swapnil suggested editorial judgements were informed by author location as well as language, suggesting ‘*even editors should not be able to see the [name and affiliation of the] author of the paper, until [the review process is] finished*’. This confirms the painful and stressful nature of these relationships, as a consequence of pressure to conform to Anglophone standards (Horn, forthcoming).

One consequence of English language dominance in business school globalization is to act as a constraint on the type and form of knowledge that is produced. The pressure to publish in global English that arises from business school globalization requires knowledge to be created in the language of the colonial encounter and worldviews (Phillipson, 2008), to the detriment of contextually embedded, local knowledge. As participants indicate, a mental and epistemological colonization is involved when using English to understand people whose first language is not

English (Bhattacharya, 2007).

Research Mimicry

Our second theme concerns the collection and analysis of empirical evidence using theoretical approaches and methods used in the West which sustain ‘the insidious imposition of European worldviews’ (Liu, 2016: 782). We approach this theme through the concept of mimicry. Mimicry arises from narcissistic demands imposed by the colonizer, as the following quotes highlight.

We do whatever the West is doing ... our whole nature of questioning, and issues of methodology are being framed elsewhere, that is how I look at it... we have been trained to ‘toe the line’.

(Amrit, professor)

My reading of social sciences... in India is that it is done very, very thoughtlessly, imitatively, and with just an eye on getting the PhD certificate, getting something published’ ... It happens... [with] replication studies, which take the research design... from American research... [and] replicate that study in India... that is one kind of imitation. The second kind of imitation is that they look for the current, the most popular statistical methods, and then they try to fit their research design so that it suits that particular statistical method...The third kind of imitation is at the conceptual level... Indian social [scientists]... tend to imitate... concepts and frameworks which have been proposed in the West, especially in the USA... There are a number of levels at which we seem to be doing imitative research. (Dipanker)

Yet the conformity of Indian management scholars to these expectations is never quite enough because the value of Indian research is subordinated to Western studies.

In spite of the fact [that]... more than 95% of the samples in American research studies are American... they claim generalisation and universality, while they point out that, since your data is only from India, how we can make any generalisation from it? (Dipanker)

Here the dominance of Western scholarship is maintained by rendering invisible the ‘problematic nature of the knowledge production process’ (Banerjee and Linstead, 2004: 223), so that Western knowledge always occupies a space that is both particular and universal, such that it comes to defy and form part of what is understood to be ‘global’. Such mimicry is related to the institutional history of management education in India, which has encouraged a focus on the US as a source of expertise, knowledge and talent (Varman and Saha, 2009). Key to this has been the education of Indian management scholars in North America and Europe.

[Faculty] were all trained abroad, and abroad in the sense of from the US... [When they came] back to India after doing their PhD [and] working there for some time... they created... [a] culture of an American graduate program. (Gyan, professor)

This encourages the belief that management knowledge is confined to a ‘set of logical concepts discovered through a process of deduction and variously tested through positivistic methods’ (Srinivas, 2008: 47), while simultaneously constituting alternative paradigms based on interpretive, qualitative methods as supplementary and inferior (Bell et al., 2017).

Several interviewees spoke of the epistemic violence (Ibarra Colado, 2006) associated with the preference for positivist, quantitative methods in their doctoral training and the tendency to replicate this in their own teaching.

[Academic training supported by international] scholarships... which I went on, all end up teaching us a certain kind of research... when I come back, I bring the whole legacy back with me. So each one of us [who returns]... doesn't only bring the method, I also bring the kind of questions I ask with it. (Anindita)

Most of the [Indian] B schools that I have come across do not have... qualified teachers who can teach qualitative research or qualitative data analysis. (Shubra, assistant professor)

Academics who did undertake qualitative research described themselves as largely self-taught and relatively isolated within their business schools. Participants also spoke of the introduction of career entry, probation and promotion norms that mimic academic performance management regimes in the West, ranking and rewarding individuals and institutions for publishing in globally-ranked journals.

Unless you [as an early career researcher] have a publication [in an international journal], it will be difficult to get [a job]... If you are about to graduate... you should have at least a revise-and-resubmit...[at an] advanced stage... in the publication process. (Srinivas, professor)

Unfortunately, our own institute has formed a policy which [makes it] a mandatory requirement to publish in journals which have impact factor on Thomson Reuters... My career progression was in happier times. I did not have... these requirements of... ABC-ranked journals... I always looked for which audience I wanted to reach out to, and generally my audience was India, because I wanted to provoke Indian scholars. I wanted to help Indian managers, so I never was keen to publish in journals abroad... I did most of my publishing in India. (Dipanker)

Like scholars in the West, including in Europe (Grey, 2010), Indian scholars are constrained by the publication 'game' (Butler & Spoelstra, 2012) and the career limiting consequences of failure to perform. Dipanker mourns the loss of engagement with Indian audiences, suggesting that globalisation had become the new global colonialism (Banerjee and Linstead, 2004). Such neo-colonial encounters place particular pressure on early career researchers. This sometimes leads to the forging of instrumental co-authoring relationships with native English-speaking scholars in the West, potentially diluting the distinctiveness of their research.

If... [an Indian doctoral student has] a good paper, but it is raw in the sense that it is not immediately publishable in its current form, [US] faculty will probably spend a day or two and fix it to be what is required to get it published. So from their side, the effort is very minimal, but it becomes something that... can get into the publication process. (Srinivas)

This account suggests peripheral scholars are viewed as 'data-collectors' and 'theory-testers', while scholars in the West are positioned as 'theory-generators' (Westwood & Jack, 2007: 249). Such a perspective reinforces a notion of global knowledge as the result of Western scholars' intervention to redress 'a lack' in Indian scholarship, attempting to appropriate and reconfigure it in their own image. These unequal relations provide the conditions of possibility for 'honorary authorship' (Greenland & Fontanarosa, 2012), where an individual is named as an author on a paper irrespective of whether or not they have made a substantive contribution. This finding is consistent with Horn (forthcoming) who found some native English-speaking respondents expected co-authorship in exchange for helping non-native speakers to 'polish' their manuscript to a publishable standard. Academic dependency on the Western academy is further fostered

through narcissistic demands that Indian scholars must follow in order to be recognized, as Suresh noted:

[T]he editor of... [name of a top international journal came] to my last conference... He said, if you want to submit to my journal, you look at the last three, four issues, see the [Western] theory that they're covering, see the objectives... and if you are not covering those issues, don't submit to us ... [So] now we... will pick up some stupid problem so that we can submit to the [name of the journal], rather than respond to our local context.

Some interviewees responded emotionally to the effects of mimicry, which they saw as limiting research creativity and pluralism.

It's sad... if you have an environment that doesn't enable... [the choice of methodology to be left to the researcher] That... limit[s] the researcher. So then what kind of results are you going to end up with?... (Neha, professor)

American journals only look for concepts familiar to them. Creative conceptual contribution from India is hardly welcome... That is where I think it's very, very sad. (Dipanker)

Individuals caught up in the exercise of colonial power suffer from 'double consciousness' 'a peculiar sensation of ...always looking at one's self through the eyes of others' (DuBois, 2005: 9, cited in Liu, 2017). Yet the effects always fail to be total, because adoption of the colonizers' cultural values, norms and institutions is never a straightforward process of reproduction (Bhabha, 1994). Mimicry therefore contains the seeds of its own destruction; the copy draws attention to colonial authority in a way that has the potential to disrupt and de-authorize it

through imitation (Jefferess, 2008). Hence, in our study, while Indian scholars' confirmation of their identity comes to depend on the Other, the effectiveness of mimicry as a strategy is undercut because it simultaneously maintains and eliminates the alterity of the Other, leading to a fundamental ambivalence surrounding business school globalization in India.

Experiencing Ambivalence

Indian management scholars are caught in a double bind: they are encouraged to mimic Western business school practices, but their scholarship is nonetheless often regarded as inferior, derivative, imitative, replicative and irrelevant. Their accounts suggest that, like the situation of the 'native' who is trying to be white, Indian management scholars may come to be positioned as 'almost the same, but not quite'.

Even 20 years ago when I submitted things ...people were able to come back and they said, 'the quality, we don't rely [on it if] it's from India' ... (Manoj)

As Bhabha argues, ambivalence arises because it is impossible for the colonial subject to become a disciplinary double. This gives rise to the possibility of resistance, including by questioning universalistic conceptions of knowledge in management education.

When we then we talk about...[published research that focuses on Western contexts with] students...[in] our executive education programs or whatever... we don't have so much credibility in our own classrooms, because the Indian context is different... At times, we... start wondering, 'does this hold water in this condition?', which impacts on our ability to deliver in the

classroom. I have seen this not just with me, but with many of my colleagues. (Rajani, associate professor)

This can give rise to resistant educational practices which challenge universalistic conceptions of management knowledge.

I keep talking about these things [academic dependency]... At the last Indian Academy [of Management Conference]... It was just a debate, a panel discussion... I had one of my faculty colleagues crying in that... She felt... 'there is somebody who is articulating what I wanted to articulate!' (Suresh)

Writing is not part of our [*Smriti*^{iv} culture]. I have done so many interesting things [research]... but I don't necessarily write all of it... [There is an] interesting story of a sage... [who was] a teacher... One of his students read a book and he thought 'well, my master says many more interesting things...why can't he write them?' So, he would bug his master [by asking] 'why don't you write?' ... After many years... the master one day turned and told him 'but you are my book' ... [This] whole tradition ... inform[s] us to some extent, even today. (Anindita)

Other participants cited Hindu philosophical traditions and notions of selfhood based on Indian religious thought as the basis for alternative forms of knowledge.

In Europe and [the] USA... René Descartes developed this mind-body separation, but in India we never... defined that separation, and I think what is becoming very popular in the West, what Indians call embodied knowing, was really always a tradition of India and the first-person knowing was always more valued in India than the third-person knowing. Indian philosophy has

been inner-directed, what has been called in the West ‘first-person methodology’. (Dipanker)

Indian literature talks about the *atma* [soul]... and I think Western literature is missing out... they have come to a space where it is so difficult for people to accept things that cannot be directly or indirectly observed, so you call that thing ‘spirituality’ and it will do fine, but when you call it ‘*atma*’ ... [a term which comes] from some religious text... [then Western scholars] say, ‘no, this is not religion, this is OB... so you shouldn’t bring in religion’. (Suresh)

Participants were also wary of reactions against colonialism and globalization that promote Orientalist stereotypes of Indian culture in an attempted return to an ‘authentic’, ‘pre-colonial past’ (Srinivas, 2012). One warned against conflating ‘*multiple “Indian” cultural traditions. One should ask whose traditions are being made to stand in for “Indian” traditions*’ (Haider, US-based professor). Here we see precisely the critique that Banerjee and Linstead (2004) level against neo-colonial practices of management, where non-Western knowledge is taken and distorted to reflect the sovereign and hegemonic image, a process that ‘appropriates their message, inevitably betraying them’ and creates ‘partial truths and forms of fiction’ (p. 223).

DISCUSSION: DEVELOPING HYBRIDITY IN MANAGEMENT EDUCATION

This article has addressed the question of how different groups with different histories respond to identity regulation practices associated with business school globalization. Specifically, it has developed insight into the identity work involved in management scholarship in India and the fundamental ambivalence that results from seeking to establish and maintain a sense of self in this context. We have suggested that the transfer of business school norms and practices from the

West, which is one feature of business school globalization, is oriented towards the production of a reformed, recognizable Other who does not threaten the legitimacy or superiority of the centre (Frenkel, 2008). This maintains management researchers in India in a peripheral relationship of academic dependency (Alatas, 2003). By bringing together identity theory with the postcolonial concepts of mimicry, ambivalence and hybridity, we have argued that academic identity work tends to replicate and reinforce neo-colonial relations. Using Bhabha's theorization of mimicry, we have argued that Indian management scholars are placed in the situation of the 'native' who is trying to be white, where they are 'almost the same, but not quite'. This is quite a different identity position from early career researchers in the West who, while they face similar institutional pressures, are not automatically 'Othered' in the same way. For Indian management scholars, ambivalence persists throughout their careers, even among senior scholars. Our analysis thereby exposes the alterity of Indian scholarly identities as distinct and different, rather than adequate-identical (Hall, 2000) to those of scholars in the West, as a consequence of these asymmetrical power relations.

Business school globalization potentially intensifies identity regulation practices associated with academic work, resulting in their gradual remaking through a combination of self-disciplinary practices and neo-colonizing forces (Boussebaa & Brown, 2017). Our analysis suggests neo-colonial relations which surround business school globalization in India have muted Indian scholars' subjectivities through the colonization of language as well as modes of self-expression and educational practices. Yet the extent to which Indian scholars respond to attempted identity regulation in the context of globalization depends on the local cultural context that provides meaning to their actions (Yousfi, 2014). Relations between colonizer and colonized are not

binary and antagonistic, based on the oppression of one and the subjugation of the Other who is incapable of resisting dominant discourses (Rizvi et al., 2006). Instead they are characterised by varying experiences of empowerment and disempowerment, dominance and exploitation (Jefferess, 2008; Boussebaa & Brown, 2017). In expressing their subjectivity, Indian business school scholars may appear to consent to globalized norms while casting doubt and subtly defying them (Prasad & Prasad, 2003; Ravishankar, Cohen and El-Sawad, 2010). In so doing, the concept of mimicry exposes the inherent fragility of neo-colonial relations that surround business school globalization.

We therefore suggest the concept of hybridity enables logics of business school globalization to be reformulated in a way which goes beyond confrontation based on binary distinctions between global and local, Western and non-Western, while still acknowledging the asymmetrical relationship between them (Frenkel & Shenhav, 2006; Seremani & Clegg, 2015). Hybridity creates spaces where ‘diverse epistemological positions and worldviews may be allowed to coexist and engage in dialogue’ (Seremani & Clegg, 2015: 5). This approach to business school globalization acknowledges the inherently dialectical relationship between scholars in the West and the Rest by showing how the former rely on the latter for their recognition and authority. The concept of hybridity acknowledges the instability of academic identity and enables ‘other *denied* knowledge’ to ‘enter upon the dominant discourse and estrange the basis of its authority’ (Bhabha, 1994: 114, emphasis in original). Hence, we suggest that the uncertainty and ambivalence which arises from mimicry enables discourses of global management research to be problematized.

We conclude by offering suggestions for how hybridity may be cultivated within the business school, focusing on: i) doctoral education, ii) conferences as sites of decolonized learning, and iii) linguistic diversity. While these proposals do not resolve the tensions and problems caused by neo-colonial relations, our purpose here is to disrupt and question current practices of business school globalization in a way which encourages exploration of alternatives.

Doctoral Education

PhD programs in Indian business schools tend to mimic US doctoral training and socialise students into positivistic, quantitative research. They also influence research training in ‘second tier’ Indian business schools (Sheel & Vohra, 2014). Developing hybridity in doctoral management education would enable this neo-colonial logic to be challenged by encouraging dialog about multiple ways of knowing and fostering collaborative learning across paradigms. Hybridity also challenges the logic of research where ‘focus on method as technique [is] divorced from its ontological and epistemological location’ (Jack & Westwood, 2006: 485). In so doing it entails moving away from colonizing ways of knowing that rely primarily on methods of quantitative, statistical measurement and ontological absolutism (Connell, 2007). This requires education in interpretive research and qualitative methods including participatory action research (Burns, Hyde, Killet, Poland & Grey, 2014) and methods that rely on close engagement with issues and people who have historically been marginalized and silenced (Smith, 1999; Swadener & Mutua, 2008).

Developing hybridity in management education necessitates development of doctoral programs that draw on local knowledge, philosophical traditions or belief systems and focus on place,

ecology and values. Such 'indigenous' approaches to management research seek to empower people who have survived imperialism and colonialism, and recognises their right to take control of their own forms of knowledge, languages and cultures (Jackson, 2014; Smith, 1999). Rather than making minor adjustments to theoretical questions that take account of endogenous or local cultural circumstances, hybridity places issues of social and environmental sustainability at the heart of management education, by encouraging researchers to move beyond exclusively human-centric concerns (Smith, 1999). Where research collaborations are formed between non-Western and Western scholars, hybridity implies reflexivity based on critical appraisal of academic identities and taken-for-granted assumptions. However, there is a need for caution in using terms like 'indigenous' because of the tendency for this term to be used to construct romanticised representations that remain embedded in neo-colonial logics (Bannerjee & Linstead, 2004). Hybrid approaches to doctoral management education must instead move beyond binary distinctions between colonizer/colonized, indigenous/non-indigenous and 'reveal and critique particular ways of knowing in the cultural construction of the Other' (Bannerjee & Linstead, 2006: 431).

Conferences as Sites of Decolonized Learning

Business school globalization has traditionally involved scholars in India seeking approval from the centre through affiliations between professional bodies in peripheral locations, like the Indian Academy of Management and US-based Academy of Management (AOM). Typical of the type of activity that this generates are workshops led by Western scholars and journal editors on topics such as 'international publishing'^v. Hybridity instead involves scholars in India working with professional associations to organize events that question academic neo-colonialism

(Alatas, 2003). The use of Open Space (Owen, 1997) or World Café (Brown, 2010) principles could encourage more dialogical equitable exchanges and help to avoid privileging particular viewpoints. Virtual meetings using Internet technologies such as wikis, blogs, Twitter, Skype and discussion forums could complement or provide an alternative to expensive international travel to meetings (Parker & Weik, 2014).

Hybridity relies on questioning Western norms of management scholarship as the ‘one best way’ of doing research and acknowledging that they are partial and subject to colonizing biases. This requires interrogation of the assumption that Anglo-American dominated journals and business schools are ‘international’ (Murphy & Zhu, 2012). It is also important to avoid casting knowledge production as an extractive project of appropriating data from peripheral locations and turning it into articles as artefacts for Western consumption (Jackson, 2014). Rather, hybridity involves questioning the logic of research that is skewed towards Western concepts and theoretical frameworks favoured by US and European journal editors and scholars (Murphy & Zhu, 2012). At the same time, hybridity implies rejection of essentialist, nativist notions of authentic Indian knowledge based on particular histories, traditions and cultures which are not representative of the sub-continent as a whole (Srinivas, 2011).

Linguistic Diversity

Dar argues there is ‘an urgent need to protect and expand spaces in the postcolonial/neo-colonial world where hybridized and multilingual selfhoods’ can flourish (2017: 17). As our analysis highlights, English language dominance in Indian business school globalization limits the relevance of management education and constrains the ability of faculty to conduct pluralistic

research. Greater hybridity would require business school policy initiatives and career incentives that reward scholars' engagement with local managerial issues and challenge embedded inequalities. This entails questioning the logic of global rankings and international accreditation bodies (Panda & Gupta, 2014; Nkomo, 2015) and recognizing the value of locally embedded publications that, while not be globally-ranked, are potentially more locally relevant (Murphy & Zhu, 2012).

Hybridity implies that language translation is a political and cultural, as well linguistic process which relies on deep understanding of context and involves meanings that are not necessarily parallel across cultures and contexts (Steyaert & Janssens, 2013). It encourages the multiplicity of languages through which knowledge is created and making spaces for multilingual scholarship (González & Lincoln, 2006), in the form of dialectical, conversational research publications and educational programs that use two or more languages simultaneously. Hybridity also recognizes the heterogeneous nature of the English language and denaturalizes narrowly defined writing conventions (Dane, 2011). Linguistic diversity has implications for the development of postcolonial management education (Joy & Poonamallee, 2013) through publication of articles and books and case studies of Indian businesses, organizations and communities in local languages (Varman, 2014). Hybridity encompasses the use of alternatives to linguistic communication to reach multilingual communities, including via the use of multimedia, e.g. collective documentary filmmaking (Slutskaya, Game & Simpson, 2016) and video diaries (Zundel, MacIntosh & Mackay, 2016), as well as photographs (Ray & Smith, 2011), music (Sutherland, 2012), artistic images and artefacts (Mack, 2012).

CONCLUSION

This article has focused on understanding how neo-colonial power relations construct the identities of Indian management scholars as ‘Other’ in comparison to scholars in the West. This identity work creates the conditions for mimicry, whereby Indian management scholars are regarded as ‘almost the same, but not quite’. Further research is needed in order to understand the effects of neo-colonial relations on academic identity in other business schools affected by the legacies of colonialism and globalization, such as South Africa (Darley & Luethge, 2015; Nkomo, 2015), and Brazil (Alcadipani, & Caldas, 2012). While Indian management scholars are subject to the imposition of global norms which regulate their identity, our analysis suggests they are reflexive individuals who seek to resist these practices. This takes the form of ambivalence as a source of uncertainty that enables the homogenizing effects associated with business school globalization to be questioned and challenged.

As a response, we have explored an alternative form of business school globalization that seeks to exploit the hybridity that arises through mimicry. Local hybridization practices, of the kinds we have described above, encourage naturalised boundaries between Western and non-Western management thinking to be problematized and universal notions of management knowledge to be destabilized. The development of hybridity in management education involves challenging the control of a privileged group over knowledge production and questioning whether all societies are knowable in the same way and from the same point of view (Connell, 2007). This encourages problematization of the superiority of Western management knowledge and recognition of pluralistic cultural knowledge that exists in societies such as India, while challenging any notion

of inferiority. Hybridity involves resisting discourses of globalization which assume homogenization and integration is desirable and possible. In so doing, hybridity helps to disrupt the perceived universality of business school globalization based on a logic of dissemination from the core to the periphery, simultaneously highlighting the effects of domination while at the same time enabling them to be resisted (Yousfi, 2014).

By setting out potential ways of developing hybrid spaces in Indian business schools, we have sought to open up discussion of how to enhance pluralism and creativity through globalization. Rather than simply translating local, Western knowledge into a form suitable for global consumption, hybridity involves provincializing Western canons of management knowledge, which in turn generates the potential for more diverse forms of knowing. In engaging with the notion of hybridity, it is also important to avoid essentialism, through depicting Indian cultures as ‘coherent and stable and fundamentally distinct from the West’ (Ravishankar et al., 2010: 156). Instead it is essential to acknowledge the hybrid nature of *all* knowledge, identities and practices, not only those which emerge from the colonial encounter (Srinivas, 2012; Yousfi, 2014).

Hence the importance of hybridity stems not only from its value in changing practice in Indian business schools but also as a resource that could be used to transform management education and research in the West (see also Joy & Poonamallee, 2013). Hybridity involves questioning universalist understandings of management thought and embracing greater epistemological, theoretical and methodological diversity. This relies neither on the inappropriate export of Western models, concepts, theories and methodologies, nor on the promotion of regional relativism by creating knowledge which is unable to be communicated to other parts of the

world. Instead it entails questioning the boundaries between Western and non-Western knowledge, demonstrating the value of pluralistic ways of knowing, and developing reciprocal practices that rely on meaningful collaboration between them.

REFERENCES

- Altbach, P.G. 2007. The imperial tongue: English as the dominating academic language. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 42: 3608-3611.
- Adler, P. 2016. Our teaching mission. *Academy of Management Review*, 41: 185-195.
- Adler, N., & Harzing, A.W. 2009. When knowledge wins: Transcending the sense and nonsense of academic rankings. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8: 72-95.
- Alatas, S. F. 2003. Academic dependency and the global division of labour in the social sciences. *Current Sociology*, 51: 599-633.
- Alcadipani, R., & Caldas, M.P. 2012. Americanizing Brazilian Management. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, 8: 37-55.
- Alvesson, M. & Gabriel, Y. 2013. Beyond formulaic research: In praise of greater diversity in organizational research and publications. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 12: 245-263.
- Alvesson, M., Hardy, C. & and Harley, B. 2008. Reflecting on reflexivity: Reflective textual practices in organization and management theory. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45: 480-501.
- Annamalai, E., 2004. Nativization of English in India and its effect on multilingualism. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 3:151-162.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. 1998. *Key concepts in post-colonial studies*. Psychology Press.
- Banerjee, A. 2013. Academic research productivity: What may be 'reining' in the Indian B-School? *IIM Working Paper Series*, No. 2013-06-06.

- Banerjee, S.B., & Linstead, S. 2006. Make that sixty-seven: A rejoinder to Whiteman and Cooper's Sixty-six ways to get it wrong. *Human Relations*, 59: 429-442.
- Banerjee, S.B., & Linstead, S. 2004. Masking subversion: Neocolonial embeddedness in anthropological accounts of indigenous management. *Human Relations*, 57: 221-247.
- Bell, E., Kothiyal, N., & Willmott, H. 2017. Methodology-as-technique and the meaning of rigor in globalized management research. *British Journal of Management*, 28: 534-550.
- Bhabha, H. 1994. *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bhattacharya, K. 2007. Consenting to the consent form: What are the fixed and fluid understandings between the researcher and the researched? *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13: 1095-1115.
- Bourdieu, P. 1988. *Homo academicus*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Boussebaa, M. & Brown, A. 2017. Englishization, identity regulation and imperialism. *Organization Studies*, 38: 7-29.
- Boussebaa, M., Sinha, S. & Gabriel, Y. 2014. Englishization in offshore call centres: A postcolonial perspective. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 45: 1152-1169.
- Brannick, T., & Coghlan, D. 2007. In defense of being "native": The case for insider academic research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 10: 59-74.
- Brown, A.D. 2015. Identities and identity work in organizations. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 17(1), 20-40.
- Brown, A.D., & Humphreys, M. 2006. Organizational identity and place: A discursive exploration of hegemony and resistance. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43: 231-257.
- Brown J. 2010. *The world café: Shaping our futures through conversations that matter*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Burns, D., Hyde, P., Killet, A., Poland, F. & Grey, R. 2014. Participatory organizational research:

Examining voice in the co-production of knowledge, *British Journal of Management*, 25: 133-144.

Butler, N., & Spoelstra, S. 2014. The regime of excellence and the erosion of ethos in Critical Management Studies. *British Journal of Management*, 25: 538-550.

Clarke, C.A. & Knights, D., 2015. Careering through academia: Securing identities or engaging ethical subjectivities? *Human Relations*, 68: 1865-1888.

Collet, F. & Vives, L. 2013. From pre-eminence to prominence: the fall of US business schools and the rise of European and Asian business schools in the *Financial Times* global MBA rankings. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 12: 540-563.

Collinson, D.L. 2003. Identities and insecurities: Selves at work. *Organization*, 10: 527-547.

Connell, R. 2007. *Southern theory: Social science and the global dynamics of knowledge*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Cooke, B. & Alcadipani, R. 2015. Towards a global history of management education: The case of the Ford Foundation and the São Paulo School of Business Administration, Brazil. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 14: 482-499.

Dane, E. 2011. Changing the tune of academic writing: Muting cognitive entrenchment. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 20: 332-336.

Dar, S. 2017. De-colonizing the boundary object. *Organization Studies*, accessed online: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0170840617708003?journalCode=ossa>

Darley, W.K., & Luethge, D.J. 2015. The role of faculty research in the development of a management research and knowledge culture in African educational institutions. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 15: 325-344.

Das, D. & Dharwadkar, R. 2009. Cultural mimicry and hybridity: On the work of identity in

international call centers in India. In B. Bannerjee, V. Chio & R. Mir (Eds.). *Organizations, markets and imperial formations: Towards an anthropology of globalization*: 181-197. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. 2005. The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*, 1-32. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

Doh, J. P. 2010. Why aren't business schools more global and what can management educators do about it? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 9: 165–168.

DuBois, WEB 2005. *The souls of black folk*. New York: Pocket Books.

FICCI, 2011. *Private sector participation in Indian higher education*. FICCI Higher Education Summit. Kolkata: Ernst & Young.

Eisenhardt, K. M. 1989. Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 532–50.

Fougère, M. & Moulettes, A. 2012. Disclaimers, dichotomies and disappearances in international business textbooks: A postcolonial deconstruction. *Management Learning*, 43: 5-24.

Frenkel, M. 2008. The multinational corporation as a third space: Rethinking international management discourse on knowledge transfer through Homi Bhabha. *Academy of Management Review*, 33: 924-942.

Frenkel, M. & Shenhav, Y. 2006. From binarism back to hybridity: A postcolonial reading of management and organization studies. *Organization Studies*, 27: 855-876.

Frenkel, M., Jack, G., Westwood, R., & Khan, F.R., 2014. Carrying across the line. In M. Frenkel, G. Jack, R. Westwood & F.R. Khan (Eds.), *Core-periphery relations and organization studies*: 223-247. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Gandhi, L. 1998. *Postcolonial theory: A critical introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Gioia, D.A. & Corley, K.G. 2002. Being good versus looking good: Business school rankings and the Circean transformation from substance to image. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 1: 107-120.
- Gobo, G. 2011. Glocalizing methodology? The encounter between local methodologies. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 14: 417-437.
- González, E.M.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. 2006. Decolonizing qualitative research: Non-traditional reporting forms in the academy. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 7: accessed: <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs060418>
- Greenland, P., & Fontanarosa, P.B. 2012. Ending honorary authorship. *Science Magazine*, 337: 1019.
- Grey, C. 2010. Organizing studies: Publications, politics and polemic. *Organization Studies*, 31: 677-694.
- Hall, S. 2000. Who needs identity? In S. Hall & P. Du Gay (Eds.). *Questions of cultural identity*: 1-17. London: Sage.
- Hall, S. 1990. Cultural identity and diaspora. In J. Rutherford, J. (Ed.). *Identity, community, culture, difference*: 222-237. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Hanna, P. 2012. Using internet technologies (such as Skype) as a research medium: A research note. *Qualitative Research*, 12: 239-242.
- Hardy, C., & Tolhurst, D. 2014. Epistemological beliefs and cultural diversity matters in management education and learning: A critical review and future directions. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 13: 265-289.

- Hood, J.C. 2007. Orthodoxy vs. power: The defining traits of grounded theory. In Bryant, A. and Charmaz, K. (Eds.). *The SAGE handbook of grounded theory*:151-164. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Horn, S.A. (forthcoming) Non-English Nativeness as Stigma in Academic Settings. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*. DOI: 10.5465/amle.2015.0194
- Ibarra Colado, E. 2006. Organization studies and epistemic coloniality in Latin America: Thinking Otherness from the margins. *Organization*, 13: 463-488.
- Jack, G., Westwood, R., Srinivas, N. & Sadar, Z. 2011. Deepening, broadening and re-asserting a postcolonial interrogative space in organization studies. *Organization*, 18: 275-302.
- Jack, G., & Westwood, R., 2006. Postcolonialism and the politics of qualitative research in international business. *Management International Review*, 46: 481-501.
- Jackson, T. 2014. How can we encourage indigenous research? *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 14:135-137.
- Jefferess, D. 2008. *Postcolonial resistance: Culture, liberation and transformation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Joy, S., & Poonamallee, L. 2013. Cross-cultural teaching in globalized management classrooms: Time to move from functionalist to postcolonial approaches? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 12: 396-413.
- Khatri, N., Ojha, A.K., Budhwar, P., Srinivasan, V. & Varma, A. 2012. Management research in India: Current state and future directions. *IIMB Management Review*, 24: 104-115.
- Knights, D & Clarke, C.A. 2014. It's a bittersweet symphony, this life: Fragile academic selves and insecure identities at work. *Organization Studies*, 35: 335-357.

- Knights, D. & Clarke, C. 2017. Pushing the boundaries of amnesia and myopia: a critical review of the literature on identity in management and organization studies. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 19: 337-356.
- Knights, D. & Willmott, H. 2004. *Management lives: Power and identity in work organizations*. London: Sage.
- Kosmala, K. & Herrbach, O. 2006. The ambivalence of professional identity: On cynicism and jouissance in audit firms. *Human Relations*, 59: 1393-1428.
- Macdonald, S., & Kam, J. 2007. Ring a ring o' roses: Quality journals and gamesmanship in management studies. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44: 640-655.
- Mack, K. 2012. Taking an aesthetic risk in management education: Reflections on an artistic-aesthetic approach. *Management Learning*, 44: 286-304.
- Mahajan, R. Agrawal, R., Sharma, V. & Nanjia, V. 2014. Factors affecting quality of management education in India: An interpretive structural modelling approach. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 28: 379-399.
- Laclau, E. 1990. *New reflections on the revolution of our time*. London: Verso.
- Liu, H. 2017. Beneath the white gaze: Strategic self-orientalism among Chinese Australians. *Human Relations*, 70: 781-804.
- Mantere, S. & Ketokivi, M. 2013. Reasoning in organizational science. *Academy of Management Review*, 38: 70-89.
- Mead, G.H. 1934. *Mind, self, and society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Meriläinen, S., Tienari, J., Thomas, R., & Davies, A. 2008. Hegemonic academic practices: Experiences of publishing from the periphery. *Organization*, 15: 584-597.

- Mingers, J., & Willmott, H. 2013. Taylorizing business school research: On the ‘one best way’ performative effects of journal ranking lists. *Human Relations*, 66: 1051-1073.
- Mir, R., Mir, A. & Srinivas, N. 2004. Managerial knowledge as property: the role of universities. *Organization Management Journal*, 1: 126-137.
- Mohan, T.T.R., 2011. *Brick by red brick*. New Delhi: Rupa Publications.
- Murphy, J., & Zhu, J. 2012. Neo-colonialism in the academy? Anglo-American domination in management journals. *Organization*, 19: 915-927.
- Murthy, N.N., Mote, V.L., Indiresan, P.V., Jayagovind, A., Balaram, P., Pental, D., Rao, M.R., Ballal, H.S., Bisoi, A.K., Narang, P. & Ravichandran, N. 2007. Building world class educational institutions in India: Challenges and prospects. *Vikalpa*, 32: 89-103.
- Muzio, D. & Kirkpatrick, I. 2011. Introduction: Professions and organizations-a conceptual framework. *Current Sociology*, 59: 389-405.
- Nkomo, S.M. 2011. A postcolonial and anti-colonial reading of ‘African’ leadership and management in organization studies: Tensions, contradictions and possibilities. *Organization*, 18: 365-386.
- Nkomo, S.M. 2015. Challenges for management and business education in a “developmental state”: The case of South Africa. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 14: 242-258.
- Owen H. 1997. *Open space technology: A user's guide*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Panda, A., & Gupta, R.K. 2014. Making academic research more relevant: A few suggestions. *IIMB Management Review*, 26: 156-169.
- Parker M. & Weik, E. 2014. Free spirits? The academic on the aeroplane. *Management*

Learning, 45: 167-181.

Phillipson, R. 2008. The linguistic imperialism of neoliberal empire. *Critical Enquiry in Language Studies*, 5: 1-43.

Pickering, M. 2001. *Stereotyping: The politics of representation*. London: Palgrave.

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*: 95-120. Basingstoke: Prentice Hall.

Prasad, A. 2012. *Against the grain: Advances in postcolonial organization studies*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press DK.

Prasad, P. 2003. The return of the native: Organizational discourses and the legacy of the ethnographic imagination. In A. Prasad (Ed.), *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis: A critical engagement*: 149-170. Basingstoke: Prentice Hall.

Ravishankar, M.N., Cohen, L. & El-Sawad, A. 2010. Examining resistance, accommodation and the pursuit of aspiration in the Indian IT-BPO space: reflections on two case studies. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 41: 154-167.

Ray, J.L., & Smith, A.D. 2011. Using photographs to research organizations: Evidence, considerations and application in a field study. *Organizational Research Methods*, 15(2): 288-315.

Ritzer, G. 2007. *The globalization of nothing 2*. Thousand Oaks CA: Pine Forge Press.

Rizvi, F., Lingard, B. & Lavia, J. 2006. Postcolonialism and education: Negotiating a contested terrain. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 14: 249-262.

Roberts, J., 2005. The power of the 'imaginary' in disciplinary processes. *Organization*, 12: 619-642.

- Romero, E.J. 2008. AACSB Accreditation: Addressing faculty concerns. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 7: 245-255.
- Ryen, A., & Gobo, G. 2011. Managing the decline of globalized methodology. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 14: 411-415.
- Seremani, T.W. & Clegg, S. 2015. Management theory: The role of epistemological ‘third spaces’. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 25: 171-183.
- Sheel, R. & Vohra, N. 2014. Fostering academic research among management scholars in India: An introduction to the special issue. *VIKALPA*, 39: v-xi.
- Sheth, N.R. 1991. What is wrong with management education, *Economic and Political Weekly*, M123-M128.
- Śliwa, M., & Johansson, M. 2015. Playing in the academic field: Non-native English-speaking academics in UK Business Schools. *Culture and Organization*, 21: 78-95.
- Slutskaya, N., Game, A.M. & Simpson, R. 2016. Examining the role of collective ethnographic documentary in organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, accessed online: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428116676343>
- Smith, L.T. 1999. *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- 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.
- Srinivas, N. 2002. Cultivating Indian management. In A. van Iterson, W. Mastebroek, T. Newton & D. Smith (Eds), *The Civilized Organization: Norbert Elias and the Future of Organization Studies*: 151-169: Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Srinivas, N. 2008. Mimicry and revival: the transfer and transformation of management knowledge to India, 1959-1990. *International Studies of Management and Organization* 38: 38-57.
- Srinivas, N. 2012. Epistemic and performative quests for authentic management in India. *Organization*, 19: 145-158.
- Steyaert, C., & Janssens, M. 2013. Multilingual scholarship and the paradox of translation and language in management and organization studies. *Organization*, 20: 131-142.
- Sutherland, I. 2012. Arts-based methods in leadership development: Affording aesthetic workspaces, reflexivity and memories with momentum. *Management Learning*, 44: 25-43.
- Swadener, B.B., & Mutua, K., 2008. Decolonizing performances: Deconstructing the global postcolonial. In N. Denzin, Y. Lincoln & L.T. Smith (Eds), *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies*: 31-43. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Sveningsson, S. & Alvesson, M. 2003. Managing managerial identities: Organizational fragmentation, discourse and identity struggle. *Human Relations*, 56: 1163-1193.
- Temple, B., & Young, A. 2004. Qualitative research and translation dilemmas. *Qualitative Research*, 4:161-178.
- Thornborrow, T. & Brown, A.D. 2009. 'Being regimented': Aspiration, discipline and identity work in the British parachute regiment. *Organization Studies*, 30: 355-376.
- Tietze, S., & Dick, P. 2013. The victorious English language: Hegemonic practices in the management academy. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 22: 122-134.
- Ulus, E. 2015. Workplace emotions in postcolonial spaces: Enduring legacies, ambivalence, and subversion. *Organization*, 22: 890-908.

- Üsdiken, B. 2014. Centres and peripheries: Research styles and publication patterns in 'top' US journals and their European alternatives, 1960–2010. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51: 764-789.
- Uzuner, S. 2008. Multilingual scholars' participation in core/global academic communities: A literature review. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7: 250-263.
- Varman, R. 2014. Marketing thought in India: Challenges of hegemony and inclusivity. *VIKALPA*, 39: 1-6.
- Varman, R. & Saha, B. 2009. Disciplining the discipline: Understanding postcolonial epistemic ideology in marketing. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 25: 811-824.
- Vakkayil, J. & Chatterjee, D. 2017. Globalization routes: The pursuit of conformity and distinctiveness by top business schools in India. *Management Learning*, 48: 328-344.
- Westwood, R.I., Jack, G., Khan, F.R., & Frenkel, M. 2014. Situating core-peripheral knowledge in management and organisation studies. In M. Frenkel, G. Jack, R. Westwood, & F.R. Khan (Eds.), *Core-periphery relations and organization studies*: 1-32. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Westwood, R.I., & Jack, G. 2007. Manifesto for a post-colonial international business and management studies: A provocation. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, 3: 246-265.
- Ybema, S., Keenoy, T., Oswick, C., Beverungen, A., Ellis, N., & Sabelis, I. 2009. Articulating identities. *Human Relations*, 62: 299-322.
- Yousfi, H. 2014. Rethinking hybridity in postcolonial contexts: What changes and what persists? The Tunisian case of Poulina's managers. *Organization Studies*, 35: 393-421.

Zundel, M., MacIntosh, R., & Mackay, D. 2016. The utility of video diaries for organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*. Accessed online:

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1094428116665463>

Acknowledgement

We would like to express our appreciation to the scholars who participated in this study (funded under the British Academy of Management Researcher Development Scheme 2013 BAMRDGS2013_14833). In addition to the constructive comments offered by the Associate Editor and three AMLE reviewers, this paper benefited from the support of Raza Mir, for which we are extremely thankful.

ⁱ What is naturalistic depends on the cultural norms and practices adopted by a particular group. In this study, Indian management scholars were comfortable with the use of Skype as a mode of conversation with others; this is consistent with our own experience.

ⁱⁱ With the exception of one individual who declined to be interviewed but agreed to respond to questions via email.

ⁱⁱⁱ Indian English is a global form spoken by non-native speakers in India. It has rules that are shaped by the mother tongue combined with a multilingual vibrant creativity that reflects a distinct cultural identity.

^{iv} The literal meaning of *Smriti* is 'memory', or as this participant says 'from memory', to indicate reliance on remembered knowledge that is conveyed orally rather than primarily through written texts.

^v For example, see program for 4th Biennial Conference of the Indian Academy of Management and IIM Lucknow, December 2015, <http://www.iiml.ac.in/4thiamconference/conference-schedule/> [accessed 28.06.16]