University of Massachusetts - Amherst
ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst

Dissertations | Dissertations and Theses

2-1-2009

Globalization and identity formation: A postcolonial analysis of the international entrepreneur

Banu Ozkazanc-Pan
University of Massachusetts Amherst, banuopan@yahoo.com

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.umass.edu/open_access_dissertations

Recommended Citation
Ozkazanc-Pan, Banu, "Globalization and identity formation: A postcolonial analysis of the international entrepreneur" (2009). *Dissertations.* Paper 48.

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Dissertations and Theses at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

GLOBALIZATION AND IDENTITY FORMATION:
A POSTCOLONIAL ANALYSIS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ENTREPRENEUR

A Dissertation Presented

By

BANU ÖZKAZANÇ-PAN

Submitted to the Graduate School of the University Of Massachusetts Amherst in Fulfillment of the Requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

February 2009

Isenberg School of Management

© Copyright by Banu Özkazanç-Pan 2009

All Rights Reserved

GLOBALIZATION AND IDENTITY FORMATION:
A POSTCOLONIAL ANALYSIS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ENTREPRENEUR

A Dissertation Presented

By

BANU ÖZKAZANÇ-PAN

Approved as to style and content by:

_____
Marta B. Calás, Chair

_____
Linda Smircich, Member

_____
Dilek Çetindamar Kozanoğlu, Member

_____
Henry Geddes, Member

_____
D. Anthony Butterfield, Dean
Isenberg School of Management

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation is dedicated to many people. It may ultimately be my writing and work, but many people supported me in achieving it and I would like to thank each and every one of them in making this international project possible. First, I would like to thank the TABC organization and its members in Northern California for allowing me access to their lives and their conferences. To the Turkish (and Turkish-American) entrepreneurs in Northern California and those in Turkey who were kind enough to let me interview them; I thank you very much as you've taught me many things about the high-tech sector and about being a researcher. To the Sinerjiturk organization for putting together such a great conference and allowing me to participate and ask many, many questions; I am truly grateful. To my friends and colleagues at or previously at the Isenberg School doctoral program at UMASS Amherst; without you, this dissertation would not be possible. Thank you for your encouragement, friendship, and support: Kristina Bourne, Michael Braun, Paul Donnelly, Carlos Gonzalez, Scott Latham, Arturo Osorio, and Sinead Ruane. To my friends Barbara, Bindu, Tam and Kimberly; your support and home are truly appreciated, thank you. To my family, mom, dad, and pezi; I thank you for believing in me and flying me to where I needed to go! To my husband, Jeff; without you, this nucleus would not exist. To my committee members, Dilek Çetindamar and Henry Geddes; thank you for your patience and guidance, as this dissertation would not be possible without you. Finally, I would like to thank two amazing women, Marta B. Calás and Linda Smircich, whose achievements in the organization studies field have been a source of inspiration, awe, and humility, and whose guidance, encouragement, and friendship have been with me since the beginning.

ABSTRACT

GLOBALIZATION AND IDENTITY FORMATION:
A POSTCOLONIAL ANALYSIS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ENTREPRENEUR

FEBRUARY 2009

BANU ÖZKAZANÇ-PAN, B.A., JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

M.B.A., LOYOLA COLLEGE IN MARYLAND

Ph.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

DIRECTED BY: PROFESSOR MARTA B. CALÁS

In the United States, the past twenty years has witnessed a growing academic interest in understanding 'globalization,' i.e., a series of interconnected social, cultural, and political processes occurring under integrated economies. Management scholars have tried to understand globalization in terms of its potential consequences for companies conducting business in various countries and regions. However, globalization involves more than this, for as new relationships between people and places occur, new ideas about who they/ us are in those relationships also emerge. How can international management scholars thus understand these complex relationships occurring under globalization? How can they theorize and study such relationships?

Although there are multiple ways to address these questions, the approach to globalization within U.S.-based international business and management research has been insufficient. First, meta-theoretical assumptions supporting U.S.-based management theories and practices have seldom been questioned in regards to their deployment in non-Western contexts. Second, the emphasis of this research on "cultural differences" implies "separation" and may conceal social and cultural formations established through

global relationships. Thus, alternative approaches to understanding business practices in the context of globalization are needed.

To this effect, I first develop the notion of *identity formation*, based on poststructuralist and postcolonial theories, as a conceptual framework, in contrast with the modernist views of identity informing the extant international management literature. I suggest this notion as an appropriate focus of analysis for understanding contemporary relationships between people in the world. To demonstrate these arguments, I conduct fieldwork focused on the international entrepreneur, specifically the Turkish entrepreneur. Relying on an extended case study design and a multi-method approach, I examine how Turkish entrepreneurs in high-technology sectors in the U.S. and in Turkey engage in identity formation processes.

The identity formation framework allows me to demonstrate how globalization processes occur relationally through embedded discourses of hybridity, gender, subalternity, and nation articulated by international entrepreneurs. I further address how postcolonial lenses allow for conceptualizing encounters between West and non-West occurring under globalization as a series of interdependent events at the locus of identity formation. As such, my dissertation offers a theoretically distinct conceptualization for globalization research in international management.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv

ABSTRACT v

LIST OF TABLES x

CHAPTERS

1. INTRODUCTION 1

State of the IM Field: Studying People and Globalization 5
What is Missing from International Management Research 7
Analytical Framework: From Essential to Hybrid Selves 10
The Self 11
Knowledge 13
Relationship between My Research Question and Postmodern/ Poststructuralist Assumptions 14

Identity Understood as a Process 14
Identities are Relational 15

Conceptualizing Identity from the 'Non-West' 16

Identities are Hybrid 18

Dissertation Outline 20

2. THEORIZING IDENTITY AND CULTURE: FROM INTERNATIONAL MANAGEMENT TO POSTCOLONIAL ANALYSES 24

The Self in IM Scholarship 24
The Problem of Knowledge in IM 26
IM Theoretical Interventions to the Problem of Representation 27
IM Methodological Interventions to the Problem of Representation 31
Why These Interventions and Critiques Are Not Enough 34

3. REFRAMING INTERNATIONAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP THROUGH POSTCOLONIAL FRAMEWORKS 37

The Analytic Perspective of Homi K. Bhabha: The Hybrid Subject.....40
The Analytic Perspective of Edward W. Said: Overturning Orientalized Cultural Representations and Giving Voice.....43
The Analytic Perspective of Gayatri C. Spivak: Gendered Subaltern Subjects.....46
Summary of Theoretical Perspectives.....51
Examining Postcolonial Concerns in Context: The 'Non-West' and 'Non-Westerner'.....52

The International Entrepreneur: A Case in Point.....53

Three Approaches to the Study of International Entrepreneurship.....56
What is Problematic in Existing Approaches to International Entrepreneurship.....57
Recognizing Movement, Mobility and Colonial History.....58

Postcolonial Interrogation of International Entrepreneurship.....60
Summary of IM and Entrepreneurship Critique from the 'Outside': What Now?.....66

4. METHODOLOGY.....70

Study Design.....70
Gaining Access: Entering the Field.....72
Data Collection Method and Sites.....76
Data.....77
Research Participants: Interviewees and Conference and Meeting Attendees.....78
Data Analysis.....79

5. EMERGING HYBRID SELVES OF TURKISH HIGH-TECH ENTREPRENEURS: THE STRUGGLE FOR SELF AND TECHNOLOGY.....81

Location, Location, Location: Being Turkish-American, Sometimes.....83

And.....83
Shifting Selves.....87
No Return.....88

Sites as Intersections of Voice and Place: Emergent Hybridities.....91
Resistance and Refusal: The Fight over High-Technology.....97

Symbolic Acts.....100
Business-Speak.....102

6. FORMING TURKISH ENTREPRENEURIAL IDENTITIES: HIGH-TECHNOLOGY, GLOBALIZATION, AND ORIENTALISM 107

Forming Relational Selves in the U.S. 108

Becoming Bey 112
History, Nations, Politics and Culture 114

Relational Identities in Turkey 119
U.S. Management Discourses: Circulating Globally, Orientalizing Locally 122
Resistance: The Oriental Speaks Back 126

7. GENDER, SUBALTERNITY, AND REFLEXIVITY: FEMINIZATION AND MASCULINIZATION OF HIGH-TECHNOLOGY ENTREPRENEURSHIP 131

Enter the Researcher: Reflexivity and Subaltern Agency to 'See' the Fieldwork 132
Emergent Masculinities: "Young Turks" in Silicon Valley 136

Gendering and Gender Contestations 143

"The Difference Difference Makes": Turkish and Turkish-American Women Speak about High-Technology Entrepreneurship 146
Nations and High-Technology Labor: The Global Production Cycle 152

Turkey: Feminization and Subalternity 155

8. IDENTITIES IN A POSTCOLONIAL GLOBALIZED WORLD 158

Complexity and Contradictions: Postcolonial Contributions to International Management 165

APPENDIX: THE TABLES 168

REFERENCES 178

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Comparison of Modern and Postmodern Conceptualizations of Self, Knowledge, and Identity 169

2. Conceptualization of Identity Formation under Postmodern and Postcolonial Frameworks 170

3. Summary of the Analytic Frameworks of Bhabha, Said, and Spivak: Identity, Epistemology, and Resistance 171

4. Comparison of the Conceptualization of the Research Subject (Identity/ Representation) and Methodologies under International Entrepreneurship and Postcolonial Frameworks 174

5. Study Sites and Data Collection Venues 175

6. Data Collected During Fieldwork 176

7. Summary of Fieldwork Participants and Types of Data Gathered 177

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

I have taken these trips since I was a little girl: traveling back and forth between multiple homes, multiple nations; a constant back and forth between Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland and the United States. Each of them my home, each of them changing, each of them changing me. So, what could be more natural and easy than going to a couple of these homes and doing research? What complicated matters more than I was willing to admit at the beginning of this project was my naïve idea that I was supposed to go "back" as a researcher, as a scientist, as an observer. This was, after all, my interpretation of what a dissertation project should look like.

Yet, along the way, this idea changed drastically. I realized there was a rupture between my imagined self as researcher/ observer and the space I occupied in the research itself. Despite all my claims to be doing postcolonial reflexive work, at times I struggled with what this meant and how to write it. Consequently, what unfolded during my research project was anything but a linear narrative of the way things are in the world. Rather, I was telling a story about globalization, about belonging and disavowing, and about being in-between. It is a project that spanned two nations (Turkey and the US), many imaginations and identities, and included the participation of one humbled researcher.

The project began when I saw on television a short business piece about Turkey. In early 2005, an episode of CNN's "Global Office," a show depicting businesses and business practices around the world, focused on an entrepreneurial Turkish firm that manufactures goods for the European market. Of specific interest about the show is the

way in which Turkey was talked about. Turkey was presented through images of the Grand Bazaar and women wearing headscarves and veils, while described as "a historic crossroads between European and Asian cultures, … better known for the exotic bazaars and ancient monuments of old Istanbul than for its factories" (CNN Global Office, 2005). The show then discussed how the Turkish manufacturer Beko bought out Germany's Grundig brand and moved the production to Istanbul, while keeping the German name on all manufactured televisions in order to "downplay" the Turkishness of Grundig. In effect, the show presented Turkey and Turkish businesses as having an "image problem" and having to hide their national origin in the goods manufactured for Western markets. The tone of the piece was of incredulity and surprise over the possibility of business innovation in Turkey. This show was an absolute statement about Turkey, about being Turkish, and about being a Turkish businessperson. It claimed to know me as a Turk, no matter where I was in the world.

Turkey is a porous region whose borders and names have changed many times throughout history. It is a place of encounters amongst different empires, peoples, technologies, and cultures. It is a place of contradictions as described by foreigners—yet, as someone who calls it a "home," I don't see it that way. For me, Turkey is made up of people who over time, and continuing to today, absorb, adapt, twist, and mold different cultures and produce ideas and practices that are unrecognizable to the West as anything other than contradictory. So, how do I tell the story of a past that never was, a present that keeps changing, and a future that doesn't exist? How do you speak back to an "all-knowing" Western representation of yourself? How do you change the conversation in the business world to reflect something other than a discourse of Turkey as in the past,

where women are oppressed and business is done in bazaars? How do you understand the experiences of Turkish business people under globalization?

Going to one of my interviews in Istanbul, I got into a taxi and read the driver directions to the Istanbul Technical University Technopark from a small piece of paper. I tell him to take the highway rather than the local road, which my brother assures me is what the locals do, and that I need to get there as soon as possible. Despite my attempt to speak local knowledge and impart a sense of urgency true to the pace of Istanbul, he smiles at me as he asks, or rather states, "Abla, sen yurtdisinda oturuyorsun herhalde?," which quite literally means, "Older sister, you live outside the country, don't you?" Of course the "older sister" is a word of respect, rather than a true family relation. Was it my business casual clothes, my unkempt hair, or my luggage that I had shoved in the backseat of the car?

For the cab driver, my interaction with him, the way I described my destination, my clothes, hair, and luggage, were markers of someone who wasn't quite the-secular (i.e., not wearing a scarf)-Turkish-woman-riding- in-a taxi-in-Istanbul, but someone closely resembling her. I wasn't offended, but I still felt a sense of loss and sadness—all of a sudden, I didn't belong as much I thought I did; I'd been pushed outside. My experience of being an insider and/ or outsider, depending on the encounter, exemplifies the moving complexity that is globalization. As we head down the busy roadways near Maslak, I'm reminded of why I'm here—to write back, to excavate ways of seeing oneself and others who have been marginalized in a world in the making.

And who am I in the research process? Well, I am not a native: I am mobile. But I still claim Turkey and the US as my homes because I feel a sense of belonging—what

does this belonging mean? What does it look like? Are there others who feel something similar? If I belong, then why do I feel so lost when I go "back home" to Turkey? **……..**

Narratives, such as mine, are lived-experiences of globalization, as people out of choice, force, or necessity cross borders and boundaries of all kinds, producing new cultural practices and ideas about the social world. Over the past three decades, such experiences have been an important topic of discussion and research across the social sciences, as anthropology, political science, history and economics scholars examine the complex geopolitical, social, and cultural activities taking place across integrated national economies –i.e., globalization (Adler, 2002; Castells, 1996; Hardt and Negri, 2000, 2004; Massey et al., 1999; Schiller, Basch and Blanc 1995).

Within the business and management academic community, there has also been a growing interest in understanding globalization. These interests expand from Adler and Graham's earlier concerns that, "as the proportion of foreign to domestic trade increases, so does the frequency of business negotiations between people from different countries and cultures" (1989: 515) to recent arguments about business functions now taking place over geographical and temporal distances in a 'virtual' world as global production chains span the globe. Through the circulation of technologies, ideas, and people, global business activities are thus made possible.

Such dynamic concepts of globalization have been around for the last two decades. For instance, Appadurai (1990) puts forth his notion of "scapes" to view globalization as flows of people, technology, finance, media, as well as political ideas. In this sense, doing business under globalization relies on a set of interconnections and

exchanges between people and places, where, as suggested by Pieterse, "a process of hybridization…gives rise to a global mélange" (1994: 161). Thus migration, immigration, and hybridization become important and relevant ideas in thinking about globalization, for as "transnational connections" (Hannerz, 1996) and new relationships between people and places occur, new ideas about who they/ us are in those relationships also emerge.

How do international management (IM) scholars thus understand these complex relationships that have been occurring under globalization? How do they theorize and study such relationships? What do these relationships mean for the people engaged in these kinds of transnational business activities? Do business scholars understand such encounters amongst people as key to further conceptualize the complexities of globalization?

State of the IM Field: Studying People and Globalization

Although there are various ways these questions have been addressed, the approach to the study of people and globalization within U.S.-based international business and management research seems to lack dynamic conceptualizations of globalization and the people involved in these processes. Traditionally, the literature has emphasized cross-cultural and comparative approaches, as scholars try to differentiate business people and business practices around the world (see Tsui, Nifadkar and Ou, 2007, for an overview). More importantly, cross-cultural and comparative IM work that attempts to differentiate among people and their business practices generally does so based on psychological concepts and cultural notions (i.e., national culture) as if both were static entities rather than dynamic processes. Specifically, this has meant that the

conceptualization of people within the IM literature has been based on Western concepts of self, while globalization has been studied as separation of stable cultures. Below, I expand upon these problematics by focusing on how the current approach to cross-cultural and comparative IM compartmentalizes self/ identity and culture as they relate to individuals and globalization.

To be clear, it is not that scholars ignore that their traditional theoretical constructs are problematic for representing the different people under study in a globalized world. For instance, as Boyacıgiller and Adler note in their well recognized paper:

> Americans have developed theories without being sufficiently aware of non-U.S. contexts, models, research, and values. Our goal, however, is not to extend made-in-America organizational science beyond its current geographical boundaries, but rather to strengthen it by suggesting fundamental changes in how scholars can think about and create theories. (1991: 263)

Unfortunately, while some scholars have recognized that a problem exists, most solutions have been focused on finding appropriate theories and methods that fit the 'culture' or people under study, rather than on underscoring the possibility that all people in the world may not conceptualize themselves in the same way (e.g., Geertz, 1983). In other words, philosophical and meta-theoretical questions over the constitution of self/ identity in the management literature have not been addressed, while the study of the self continues in a culturally relative, but essentialist fashion (e.g., Americans are individualistic, Asians are collectivistic, see Hofstede, 1980).

Meanwhile, globalization has been studied through decontextualized and comparative cultural approaches that privilege management ideas and practices from the

West, while silencing those associated with the non-West. For instance, in the IM field globalization has been studied as a movement of management theories and practices from "industrialized nations" to the "rest of the world" (i.e., best practices) or as a 'global/ local' dichotomy. Often these ideas have been presented as 'convergence' and 'divergence' with US management ideas and practices (cf., Adler, Doktor and Redding, 1986; Blyton, 2001; Khanna and Palepu, 2004; Leung et al., 2005; Ralston, Holt, Terpstra and Kai-Cheng, 1997; Shenkar, 2004). That is, business ideas and practices have often been thought of as moving from the 'West' to the 'Rest' or as having identifiable aspects, which can be called either distinctly 'global' or 'local.' The global often implies universal applicability, while the local is frequently considered as idiosyncratic or lesser practices or ideas. In this same vein, the global/ universal is more likely to be thought of as coming from dominant "industrialized nations," while the local/ idiosyncratic is more likely to be associated with specific "cultural practices" functioning as referent of non-dominant societies.

In these arguments, *the complex and necessary interconnections between all people and nations,* which make 'doing business' under globalization possible, have not been sufficiently recognized. Under the current approaches, the study of these business activities has been based on cultural comparisons between people (i.e., cultural differences) that assume a static, Western-centric world of peoples and cultures, without consideration for the historic and ongoing relations among nations.

What is Missing from International Management Research?

To clarify, there is no dearth of concerns over these issues. Recently, one important focus of U.S.-based and Western international management scholarship, cross-

cultural and comparative IM in particular, has been to outline how to think about people *from* and *in* different parts of the world engaged in international business transactions. A pressing issue, at present, is how to conceptualize such 'global business people' within international management theory and research: How can cross-cultural and comparative international management scholars represent the people they want to study? What must they consider in order to conceptualize and understand different people in international management? (Boyacıgiller, Kleinberg, Phillips and Sackmann, 2004; Earley and Singh, 2000). However, as I will soon argue, these questions are not innocent, but, rather, are implicitly sustained by strong a priori assumptions about the subjects scholars intend to study.

That is, despite concerns, the solutions proposed from within the IM field still follow the meta-theoretical assumptions that gave rise to the problems in the first place. Meta-theoretical assumptions supporting U.S.-based management theories and practices have not been articulated or questioned, particularly in terms of their deployment in non-Western contexts. More importantly, little has been done to offer alternative views to these theories and practices.

First, there is no debate over the theoretical frameworks guiding international management research and their epistemological assumptions. What are the implications of this lack when articulating certain representations of non-Western business practices, cultures, and people in general, i.e., how are a priori meta-theoretical assumptions implicated in the problems of parochialism that have been identified? (Jack, Calás, Nkomo and Peltonen, 2008).

Second, emphasis on "cultural differences," no matter how "culturally sensitive"

imply "separation," which would also conceal other social and cultural formations established through global relationships. Finally, with some notable exceptions (see Jack and Westwood, 2006), there is no debate over the role of the researcher in the very production of IM knowledge or a reflexive stance on what constitutes IM knowledge.

Bringing these critical lenses to the Turkish example on CNN, I ask the question: how come a U.S.-based, popular business show discusses Turkey and Turkish businesses as less likely to be innovative and more likely to be traditional? Can't this *one way* of 'knowing' Turkey and Turks be another way of 'not knowing' them? (Mueller, 1987: 8). In this sense, CNN's "Global Office" exports management practices that make sense *for* and *in* the West and perpetuates images of Turkey that have often originated in and been maintained through the norms of international management scholarly literature, even when authored by Turkish scholars (i.e., Bayazit, 2003; Bilgic, 1998; Erdem, Ozen, and Atsan, 2003; Karabati and Say, 2005; Kozan and Ergin, 1999; Kusku and Zarkada-Fraser, 2004; Robert and Wasti, 2002). Through this process, Turkey is represented through discourses of technology as "lesser than," "in the past," and exotic and remote, while much of contemporary Turkey and its many relationships with the rest of the world disappear. However, as Calás and Smircich note,

> if Western knowledge has been constituted in difference from 'others,' by rendering them invisible, what would happen if those 'others' were to speak back? What if they were to show how they are constituted as others? What if these others were to reclaim their own specificities, away from the dualisms [e.g. West/ Rest] embedded in Western discourses of knowledge? (1996: 238)

Guided by these latter remarks, I observe that meta-theoretical considerations are needed before international management theory and research can articulate alternative

approaches to understanding business people and practices in the context of globalization. I further argue that an appropriate focus of analysis to address these encounters is through the notion of *identity formation* in relationships between people in the world. I, therefore, consider a relevant research question to be: How do business people in the context of globalization *form* their identities?

Specifically, since globalization involves the movement of people and ideas, these flows result in encounters and exchanges all over the world and give way to a series of *relational processes* as people engage in economic, cultural, and political activities more generally. As people interact with each other through these activities, new *identities* are produced, which perhaps better represent "international business people" in the world today. To study identity formation in ways that recognize the voices of the various participants in "the encounter," including the researcher, it is necessary to go beyond theoretical and research approaches currently available in the IM literature. To this effect, in this dissertation, I develop an analytical framework to redirect IM theory and research, demonstrating, through critique and fieldwork, a more complicated account of globalization processes through people engaged in them.

Analytical Framework: From Essential to Hybrid Selves

Modernist philosophical traditions implicitly support conceptualizations and representations of the self in much of the international management literature. By making explicit these traditions, I underscore the ontological and epistemological basis of such conceptualizations and open space, at the same time, for articulating different meta-theoretical premises about self/ identity and knowledge in the context of globalization, which frame my research question. For this purpose, I draw from postmodern and

poststructuralist theorizing offering systematic critiques of modernist assumptions regarding 'self' and 'knowledge' as outlined in Western philosophical traditions. These critical analyses, starting in the 1970's and usually identified with the works of French theorists, in particular Lyotard, Derrida, and Foucault, have already influenced scholars across the social sciences to (re)consider their practices of theorizing about the social world, as well as the assumptions underlying particular theories used to explain that world. In organization and management studies, considerable work has also been done in this regard (see Calás and Smircich, 1999), but, as I will argue later, international and management theory and research has hardly been touched by it.

In the following section, I expand on key modernist assumptions about "the self" and "knowledge," discussing how these assumptions have been problematized by postmodernist and poststructuralist analyses. This is the first step to develop my analytical framework for the rest of the dissertation. The second step, discussed in the final section of this chapter, incorporates still another argument, that of postcolonial theories, which further complicates modernist assumptions about "the self" and "knowledge" by considering voices and places that, in appearance, were left out of them.

The Self

One of the main ideas to emerge from modernist intellectual traditions is that 'Man' has a 'universal human nature,' which can be understood through the language of rationality (Gandhi, 1998). Based mostly on the philosophy of Descartes, the assumption is that the 'self' is located in the individual cognitive ability for rational thought. Modern philosophy's assumptions on subjectivity or conceptualization of human beings, is that of self-evident individualism, whereby a person exists based on her/ his ability to think and

reason: *cogito, ergo sum* (Descartes' famous "I think, therefore I am"). If all human beings understand themselves in such a manner, then they have nothing other than a 'universal human nature.' Furthermore, based on these philosophical assumptions, one's identity is a reflection of one's conscious self. This modernist understanding of an essential 'self' is a starting point of critique from postmodern and poststructuralist frameworks.

From a postmodern framework, scholars do not assume that the self exists as a cognitive and self-sufficient whole that can be reflected as one's essential 'identity.' Rather, for the postmodern scholar, 'the self' exists in relation to the 'Other,' i.e., in a relationship of identity and difference, which is shifting and hierarchically constituted: subjectivity. There is no end to this process, for one is constantly *becoming* in relationship to others.

Similarly, the poststructuralist scholar also shares this understanding of self/ identity, but focuses on how identity forms in discursive, text based renderings, and in other representations. For example, a general question from this perspective might be: how do dominant representations create particular sets of identities for certain groups of people by ascribing them certain qualities —i.e., how come U.S.-based management texts, or the media, represent and identify Turks as traditional people? The focus on representations of identity emphasizes the central role of language and signification in poststructuralist analyses. Identity exists not as an ontological reality, but as a linguistic practice where some dominant articulations normalize "ways of being."

Thus, for both the postmodern and poststructuralist frameworks, who I say I am and who others say I am, my "self," depends on the real or imagined 'Other.' Based on

these perspectives, identity is a way to differentiate one's self *in relation* to the 'Other'—without the 'Other,' there can be no self. For example, the dominant representation of Turks as "traditional people" is only possible because those engaged in this representation are, in principle, contrasting it to their own self-representation as "modern people." The latter representation, however, is not made explicit, for modern philosophy considers that identity reflects an autonomous subject, a cognitive and reasoning essential self: "the modern self" does not need the 'Other' to exist.

Knowledge

Western humanism and the Enlightenment were about exploring the essence and possibilities of 'Man,' and thus, one of the main concerns of philosophy emerging during these periods was about the constitution of knowledge (i.e., Descartes, Kant, Locke, and Hume). In general, the rational and thinking self is the center of all knowledge claims: 'Man' is able to produce the familiar from the unfamiliar and, hence, have knowledge. The object of knowledge is therefore external to 'self' and thus can be discovered through 'Man's' reasoning and logical thinking. For the modern philosophical framework, the concern is over what we know and the way we know it: an interest in the *content* and *validity* of knowledge (Gandhi, 1998).

However, for the postmodern and poststructuralist scholar, *how* we know what we know, instead of *what* we know and the *way* we know it, is the most important consideration. That is, knowledge does not exist out there to be gathered and processed by the researcher; rather, the researcher needs to be mindful of how his/ her theories constitute the very world under study. This position on what constitutes reality, or the question over ontology, stands in contrast to the modern philosophical assumptions of an

external reality (ontology) that can be reflected or described through language (knowledge or epistemology). From the postmodern and poststructuralist perspective, language constitutes reality: *how* we say *about* the world enables the world we thus see. In this sense, ontology cannot be understood as separate or separately from epistemology.

Further, if modern philosophy is about defining and representing the world we live in, then *reflexivity* is the postmodern and poststructuralist attempt to situate such knowledge production as an activity itself and be able to ask questions, such as, *how* do we theorize about the world? And *how* does 'knowledge' happen? The conceptualization of knowledge from these perspectives is also related to the idea of power relations—how certain ways of thinking about the world became the norm or common sense—in the production of knowledge. Reflexivity allows the scholar to consider whose interests are served through the production of a particular kind of knowledge and to consider/ trace, historically, such claims to knowledge.

Relationship between My Research Question and Postmodern/ Poststructuralist Assumptions

Above, I outlined and differentiated the assumptions of the modern and postmodern/ poststructuralist frameworks through the concepts of "self" and "knowledge" to further discuss, in this section, how these assumptions allow me to conceptualize my research question: How do business people in the context of globalization *form* their identities? Below, I discuss specifically how identity can be understood.

Identity Understood as a Process

One of the ways in which I address 'identity' in my research question, and

dissertation in general, is to conceptualize it as a *process* rather than an essence. I call this process *identity formation* in order to address the ways in which people develop, evolve, and change their sense of self or who they say they are. Put another way, I'm interested in understanding how "language gets recruited 'on site' to enact specific social activities and social identities" (Gee, 1999: 1). In this sense, identity is not a fixed reflection of the modern self, but, rather, a *formative practice* whereby individuals tell stories of who they are. In the dissertation, I want to consider *how business identities are formed in international contexts.*

Identities are Relational

In a similar fashion, the conceptualization of identities as relational follows the postmodern and poststructuralist position on subjectivity in that the 'self' does not exist as an autonomous, cognitive self but rather exists *in relation* to the 'Other.' I address the process by which differentiating identities from each other occurs: the understanding of 'self' versus someone/ something else. On this very point, Felski suggests "difference is not a foundation but a relation, not an inherent property, but a distinction engendered within a given semiotic framework" (1997: 17). In the case of my dissertation, I am interested in understanding the various *ways in which business people form their identities relationally in their international business practices.*

The conceptualization of identity as relational is also associated to the postmodern and poststructuralist positions on *reflexivity*. For instance, in studying Turkish entrepreneurs, I address how they form their business identity in relationship to how they conceptualize me and my positions: as researcher, as woman, as doctoral student, as Turkish and so forth. I am the shifting 'Other' to their shifting 'self.' Furthermore, there

is the issue of my conceptualization of their identities, the stories I write, and the writing that writes me are a part of the dissertation in terms of the knowledge claims I make: which stories do I write, which ones don't I write, which ones can't I write? The writing of the dissertation from my position as a 'Third World,' woman scholar, working from a U.S. business school background, is part of the story of business identity formation in the context of globalization I tell in these pages. For a comparison of theoretical differences among modern and postmodern positions, see Table 1.

Conceptualizing Identity from the 'Non-West'

However, the arguments I raise above are mostly critiques of modernist assumptions about identity in Western philosophical traditions, but they are not able to articulate "voices" that may arrive from other traditions. For that purpose, I need to enroll the aid of postcolonial studies. The position of postcolonial studies as *non-Western* critiques of Western epistemological claims sets them apart from postmodern and poststructuralist critiques which are "critiques of modernity *in* the West *by* the West and, of necessity, themselves exclusionary of other forms of knowledge" (Calás and Smircich, 1999: 661). Postcolonial studies can be defined generally as a theoretical field that questions Western epistemological and ideological claims about/ over non-Western cultures (place) and people (voices).

While postcolonial theorists have shared concerns with postmodern and poststructuralist scholars regarding critiques of the Enlightenment and modernist notions of knowledge and subjectivity, they further critique how these notions, such as modernist versions of progress and rationality, have served as justifications for Western colonial and imperial rule. Further, postcolonial studies go beyond the anti-humanist stance of

postmodern and poststructuralist approaches. These scholars argue against meta-narratives that forward universalist versions of "humanity" and "progress" as representative of the interests of all peoples and cultures. Such meta-narratives render different populations in an essentialist fashion and can deprive people of their own historical and temporal location. In effect, Western notions of "modernity" become the norm against which the 'Other' is judged as "traditional" or "less developed" (Gandhi 1998; Loomba 1998).

These postcolonial concerns over the representation of the 'Third World' are further complicated by postcolonial feminist scholars, who argue that Western writing, as well as Western feminist work, still tends to portray the 'Third World woman' as a homogenous category needing economic development (Barker, 2000). The 'Third World woman' is oppressed and needs the West to emancipate her (Mohanty, 2003). In such representations, the 'Third World' is conceptualized as a singular place, while the 'Third World woman' often enters the conversation as a preexisting sexual-political object, whose subject-place within the text is already determined. There is little consideration over the social and textual production of different gender roles, gender relations, and gendered discourses occurring in the context of multiple 'Third Worlds.' Rather, there are cross-cultural comparisons devoid of relational analysis and contextual meaning that offer absolutes about the condition of the 'Third World woman' (Narayan, 1997, 2000). Importantly, such representations afford no agency to the 'Third World woman' and often speak on her behalf.

Thus, as part of their theoretical frameworks, postcolonial studies, and particularly postcolonial feminist work, highlight historical power relations between

peoples and nations and call attention to the institutional and geographical position of the researcher in relation to his/ her epistemological claims over and about non-Western cultures and people. These include calling attention to the position occupied by the researchers, no matter where they come from, who would only ask questions influenced by modernist Western epistemologies. From a postcolonial perspective, understanding 'global business people' would thus imply reconceptualizing the notion of "people" by attending to their formation within contemporary West/ Rest relationships, while also attending to their historical relations. As Mohanty suggests, such projects are "trying to uncover how ethnocentric universalism is produced in certain analyses…[through] discourse that sets up its own authorial subjects as the implicit referent, that is, the yardstick by which to encode and represent cultural others. It is in this move that power is exercised in discourse" (2003: 21). And it is through resistance and recovery that such authoritative representation of the Third World is challenged and dismantled.

Following these arguments, in this dissertation project, I begin reformulating how people understand themselves under globalization by challenging existing notions of the self in the IM field. While postmodern and poststructuralist analyses allow for addressing the production of selves/ identities as relational processes, postcolonial works offer the notion of hybrid selves that can speak back to the West and challenge these existing notions.

Identities are Hybrid

Postcolonial perspectives on identity emphasize multiplicity of and exchange between different people in the world based on the idea of the hybrid subject, which can be summarized with the following:

> Metaphors of hybridity and the like not only recognize differences within the subject, fracturing and complicating holistic notions of identity, but also address connections between subjects by recognizing affiliations, cross-pollinations, echoes, and repetitions, thereby unseating difference from a position of absolute privilege (Felski, 1997: 12).

Thus, I conceptualize identity in this dissertation based on the idea of *hybridity*. Hybridity calls into question modern Western philosophy's assumptions of purity regarding essential subjectivities. Hybrid understanding of subjects stands in contrast to the idea of a pure culture that can be identified, for instance, as essentially 'Turkish' or 'American.' Yet, it also calls into question the celebratory postmodern "multiple selves," which leave unattended how subjectivities are indeed *formed through power relations*.

That is, conceptualizing different people in the world based on assumptions emanating from the philosophy of Western thinkers can lead to representations of the 'Other' as pure, homogenous, and fixed (i.e., through "cultural differences"). At the same time, these conceptualizations can end up reproducing the values of the West by reflecting the 'Other' in the theorizer's notion of the (modern, Western) self. The postcolonial self, constituted through historical and contemporary power relations, counters and resists such hegemonic representations of identity by interjecting the pure with the hybrid. Through this disruptive act, the postcolonial voices itself in the space occupied by the colonizing notion of the (Western) self. However, it is important to note that the hybrid self is not necessarily a self produced as the sum total of cultural encounters between different people, but, rather, it is a polyvocal relational process embedded in historic power relations.

Following this logic, producing the postcolonial hybrid self is a philosophical *and* political project, both for the subject and the researcher. It is a project that aims to resist dominant forms of knowledge, while simultaneously (re)articulating the terms of

knowledge production and, thus, necessitates a reflexive approach to research. As already noted by feminist philosophers, power relations between researchers and those they study necessitate an ethico-political commitment to "self-interrogation and a political practice of rejecting and reconstituting our given social identities in the context of the production of new knowledges" (Ferguson, 2000: 190). Guided by this, to examine the hybrid self within the context of globalization through such a reflexive approach requires researchers to recognize their own (privileged) position in 'scientific inquiry' and become cognizant of whose interests may be served through their research (Ferguson, 2000). In addition, the very idea of the hybrid self is further complicated by the fact that differences among postcolonial theorizing allows for diverse ideas of what constitutes resistance and (re)articulation within the context of reflexive research. For a comparison of postmodern and postcolonial concepts of identity formation, see Table 2.

In the following chapters, the analytical value of the poststructuralist and postcolonial ideas just discussed serve, first, as background for a critical review of extant international management literature. Later on, they contribute to further developing the theoretical and methodological framework for the rest of the dissertation.

Dissertation Outline

In Chapter 2, by focusing on the cross-cultural and comparative IM literature, I discuss how the 'self' and knowledge have been theorized in the extant literature, focusing specifically on issues of representation. I go on to discuss how the IM field has addressed concerns around representation through theoretical and methodological interventions. To outline the value of postcolonial frameworks briefly outlined in Chapter 1 for the IM field and to frame the rest of my dissertation, I discuss why these

interventions and critiques existing within the field are not enough to move IM theory and research beyond the current state of affairs.

To fully illustrate the value of postcolonial lenses and discuss further the theoretical basis for my approach and research question, I expand upon, in Chapter 3, postcolonial frameworks. Specifically, I discuss the theoretical lenses of Homi Bhabha, Gayatri Spivak, and Edward Said in terms of their contributions to the postcolonial field and the implications of their work for the IM field. In this section, I also discuss how postcolonial lenses can allow for rethinking of the story I told in the beginning of the dissertation to demonstrate their differences. Following this, I focus on the international entrepreneur as a case in point to suggest how, as the subject of the dissertation, this group of people can be studied to demonstrate the value of postcolonial approaches for the IM field and illustrate the complexities of globalization. To do so, I first outline existing approaches to the study of international entrepreneurship and critique an exemplar of this work by way of each postcolonial position to underscore underlying assumptions in the literature. To demonstrate these arguments, I rely on the international entrepreneur, specifically the Turkish entrepreneur, as the empirical focus of the dissertation.

In Chapter 4, I discuss the methodological concerns related to carrying out fieldwork on identity formation informed by poststructuralist and postcolonial frameworks by focusing on issues of representation and researcher reflexivity. I also discuss why my chosen methodology, namely a combination of auto-ethnography and ethnography, is appropriate for the research questions I am addressing. I then go on to discuss my study design, how I gained access to the field, data collection method and

sites, data, research participants, and data analysis.

In Chapters 5 through 7, I highlight and analyze identity formation processes as viewed through each postcolonial lens. Specifically, in Chapter 5, I outline identity formation processes guided by the work of Homi Bhabha by discussing how hybrid identities form as the West and non-West encounter each other, both epistemologically and materially (through behaviors and practices). I focus specifically on the emergence of hybrid selves in different contexts within the U.S. and Turkey and discuss acts of resistance to Western ideas about high-technology use and production.

In Chapter 6, I highlight and analyze identity formation processes guided by the theoretical lens of Edward Said by examining Turkish high-tech entrepreneurial identities in the context of historic power relations between the United States and Turkey. I discuss the production of relational selves in the U.S. and Turkey and outline how U.S. management discourse Orientalizes local understandings and knowledge. Finally, I outline resistance to Orientalist representations and ideas imposed on Turkey and Turks by highlighting how the Oriental speaks back.

In Chapter 7, I discuss my own role within the research process as an exercise in reflexivity, guided by Gayatri Spivak's concerns around reflexivity and subaltern agency. Guided by Spivak's analytics, I then discuss how identity formation processes take shape through gendered subalternizing discourses of high-technology entrepreneurship. In the context of the United States and Turkey, subalternity of gender allows a particular kind of masculinity to be associated with high-technology entrepreneurship in the U.S. by silencing Others through feminization. I then outline differences in the experiences of Turkish and Turkish-American women entrepreneurs in high-technology and, finally,

focus on how high-technology entrepreneurship is possible through global production cycles.

In Chapter 8, I reexamine the story I discussed in the introduction of the dissertation through postcolonial frameworks in order to outline how each of the lenses would allow for a different analysis. By doing so, I outline how postcolonial frameworks offer the IM field redirection in representing people, studying identity formation and theorizing globalization. I suggest that postcolonial positions offer a glimpse into the complexities and contradictions of globalization rather than a neatly stacked series of lenses through which to view the world. I conclude by suggesting that the terms under which representation and knowledge take place in IM need to be challenged and postcolonial approaches offer one way to question these terms.

CHAPTER 2

THEORIZING IDENTITY AND CULTURE:

FROM INTERNATIONAL MANAGEMENT TO POSTCOLONIAL ANALYSES

Starting about three decades ago, there has been a growing interest in the U.S. towards theorizing and researching 'culture' and cultural dimensions of international management. Generally considered as cross-cultural and comparative international management, scholars within this area have conceptualized and researched management ideas and behaviors in various parts of the world. I focus, specifically, on research that shows how management theories and practices from "the West," particularly as they relate to individuals and groups, are applied across various geographic, cultural, social, economic, and political boundaries in order to generate *international management knowledge/ research*.

The Self in IM Scholarship

Within the cross-cultural and comparative international management field, there has been a plethora of research addressing micro level similarities and differences in/ among individuals and groups 'across cultures.' In such work, 'culture' is generally defined as collective mental programming (Hofstede, 1980, 1998; Hofstede and Bond, 1988) or underlying norms and values individuals share with members of their own nations, regions, and groups (Triandis, 1983; Triandis and Suh, 2002; Trompenaars, 1996). A good amount of this research focuses on similarities and differences in managerial behaviors/ practices (Adler and Graham, 1989; Al-Jafary and Hollingsworth, 1983; Bourantas and Papadakis, 1996; Hofstede et al., 2002; Huo, Huang and Napier, 2002; Kovach, 1994; Lee, 1999; Lowe, Milliman, De Cieri and Dowling, 2002; Naulleau

and Harper, 1993; Wiley, 1994). Others have been concerned with personal traits (Black, 1999; Glunk, Wilderom and Ogilvie, 1996; Ivancevich and Baker, 1970; Lindell and Arvonen, 1996; Oliver and Cravens, 1999; Soedarsono, Murray and Omurtag, 1998; Yousef, 1998), and attitudes (Boone and Van den Bosch, 1996; Globokar, 1996; Hofstede, 1998; Kanungo and Wright, 1983; Kuehn and Al-Busaidi, 2000; Ramamoorthy and Carroll, 1998; Sparrow and Wu, 1997; Sullivan and Peterson, 1991).

The cross-cultural and comparative international management literature also includes a subset of work focusing on gender differences in management values and practices across different cultural contexts. Scholars in this area examine sex differences (i.e., men and women) regarding individualism/ collectivism (Kashima et al., 1995), self-regulation (Kurman, 2001), organizational justice (Lee, Pillutla and Law, 2000), and leadership activities (Bartol, Martin and Kromkowski, 2003; Gibson, 1995; Zander and Romani, 2004) across cultures. These scholars are, in effect, attempting to delineate how gender *and* culture make a difference in work related values and management practices in diverse people around the world.

Thus, in general, questions around values in different countries have been of great interest (Connor, Becker, Kakuyama and Moore, 1993; d'Iribarne, 2002; Eyjolfsdottir and Smith, 1996; Gamble and Gibson, 1999; Kirkman and Shapiro, 2001; Singh, 1990). Notable among these is, no doubt, the enormous amount of publications generated by and through Geert Hofstede's frameworks and, more recently, through the GLOBE project (cf. JIBS, 2006) in an attempt to delineate what difference culture makes for leadership, among many other constructs (e.g., House, Javidan and Dorman, 2001).

Yet, all these research efforts have also generated levels of dissatisfaction, in particular regarding concerns with the way representations of individuals and groups in "other cultures" may have left out important aspects of their identities, which are deemed to be relevant for relationships *between* cultures. This lack of theoretical constructs also extends to notions of globalization, where scholars recognize globalization as "economic interdependence among countries that develops through cross-national flows of goods and services, capital, know-how, and people" (Gelfand, Erez and Aycan, 2007: 481), but still study it through *stable cultural categories that differentiate and separate between people in the world*. Nonetheless, concerns over how to represent people in an interdependent world and how to study globalization have resulted in various internal critiques within this scholarly field. Below, I expand upon these critiques and discuss why solutions proposed cannot move the field beyond the frustrations and concerns voiced over existing theories of international management.

The Problem of Knowledge in IM

For more than forty years, one major criticism of existing international management research is its use of U.S.-based management theories to investigate business practices and experiences of non-U.S. and non-Western people (Gonzalez and McMillan, 1961). On this point, Boyacıgiller and Adler suggest that "parochialism" has been one of the main problems of international organizational science where "Americans have developed theories without being sufficiently aware of non-U.S. contexts, models, research, and values" (1991: 263). Or as Hofstede suggests, "both management practitioners and management theorists…have been blind to the extent to which activities like 'management' and 'organizing' are culturally dependent…most present-day

management theories are 'ethnocentric,' that is, they take the cultural environment of the theorist for granted" (1983: 88-89). Speaking on the very notion of representation and self, scholars have already recognized that "people in different cultures have strikingly different construals of the self, of others, and of the interdependence of the 2 [sic]. These construals can influence, and in many cases determine, the very nature of individual experience, including cognition, emotion, and motivation" (Marcus and Kitayama, 1991: 224).

The attempt to find solutions to these ongoing concerns has resulted in multiple theory development forums over the past twenty five years: *Journal of International Business Studies* (1983), the *Academy of Management Review* (1991), and *Academy of Management Journal* (1995). For instance, as guest editors for the AMR theory development forum, Doktor, Tung, and Von Glinow suggest:

> the world has become more interconnected, and…people of different nations…are being drawn close together as they influence each other…This special theory forum on international topics was designed to…expand our current "Western" thinking, which has been the lens through which most of our contemporary management theories have been formulated (1991a: 259).

These concerns over how to conceptualize and represent the cultural 'Other' as research subject within the context of globalization have produced two general categories of solutions, namely, theoretical and methodological interventions to address the problem of representation in a global world.

IM Theoretical Interventions to the Problem of Representation

Theoretical interventions to address these concerns generally can be understood as one of three kinds: attempts to find culturally-specific, or a 'cultural-fit' in, management

practices; attempts to find 'indigenous' models; and use of research teams that include 'native' members. Altogether, the theoretical interventions are in some ways addressing the etic/ emic debate that has been ongoing in the cross-cultural and comparative management field (see Gelfand, Erez and Aycan, 2007). In the emic approach, researchers extol using culturally-specific approaches to study management in different contexts, while the etic approach is understood as a universal approach that can be used to study management regardless of context. Below, I describe how this debate unfolds into its component theoretical parts and discuss how scholars' suggestions in recent years use both approaches in order to produce a more 'comprehensive' understanding of management activities.

The first theoretical approach, finding business and management models and theories that 'fit' the context under study (d'Iribarne, 2002; Punnett and Shenkar, 1994), includes investigating the culturally-specific business practices of managers and entrepreneurs as a way to differentiate between various ethnic and cultural groups and their business practices (Clark, Grant and Hejltjes, 2000; George and Zahra, 2002; Morris, 2000; Oberg, 1963; Ram, 1997; Richman, 1965). As editors of the *Academy of Management Review* theory development forum suggest, "the key to cross-culturally applicable management theory appears to lie in cultural contingency" (Doktor, Tung and Von Glinow, 1991b: 363). Consequently, this type of intervention extols a culturally-sensitive or culturally-aware approach to international management research.

The second theoretical approach calls for finding management and business models that are 'indigenous.' On this topic, Adler, Doktor and Redding state:

> Part of our ability to understand or predict the future behavior of our peers, colleagues, and competitors may be

> caused by our inability to understand how they are modeling the world and what kind of causal dimensions they use to see the world…our ability to present our view of the world so that it can be understood and appreciated within the cognitive paradigms held by significant foreign colleagues determines, in large measure, our own acceptance by and relevance in an increasingly multicultural managerial environment (1986: 313)

Boyacıgiller and Adler expand upon this position by suggesting researchers "study non-U.S. management systems on their own terms" (idiographic research) (1991: 279). As a group, these scholars suggest that cross-cultural and comparative international management research should pay attention to non-U.S. based or local models of business and management. By doing so, they can produce management knowledge that can represent and describe 'accurately' the cultural context they want to study.

The third suggested theoretical intervention is the use of multicultural teams, to include 'native' members of the culture under study (Boyacıgiller and Adler, 1991). On this idea, Doktor, Tung and Von Glinow suggest:

> In order to improve the validity of the theory within the new or enhanced domain, it may be necessary to include an indigenous member of the new domain in the theory-construction activities. This suggestion implies that management theory construction in domains beyond North America ought to be undertaken by research teams, the members of which are representative of the new domain to be included as applicable to the theory so constructed (1991b: 364)

Thus, this theoretical intervention to the problem of representation, or how to make management theory representative of the various cultures under study, assumes that including "a native" would produce a more culturally sensitive and inclusive theoretical framework, despite the fact that the suggestion is more a methodological point about the research design than a well thought out theory development argument.

As a group, these theoretical interventions are an attempt to 'internationalize' international management research by making such research culturally-appropriate and inclusive of other peoples and societies using both an etic (cultural-general/ universal) and an emic (culture-specific) approach to study management issues (see Gelfand, Erez and Aycan, 2007) in order to produce a more "complete" understanding of the phenomena under study. These combined theoretical approaches are considered both culturally-specific *and* universally applicable as they incorporate different levels of analysis (Kirkman and Shapiro, 1997). In a similar fashion, more recent work calling for a multi-contextual approach to study management and work suggests the following:

> The major contexts that may separate one nation from another include the physical, historical, political, economic, social, and cultural. These contexts pave the foundation for different ways of knowing by people in that nation. The ways of knowing include physical (e.g., the meaning of time or space), communication (reliance on verbal or nonverbal means), sensory (attention to visual, auditory, or kinetic cues), psychological (decision-making style, information processing, or display of emotion), or philosophical (moral or spiritual bases of decision making). These ways of knowing in turn determine the meaning of work or organizations (Tsui, Nifadkar and Ou, 2007: 38)

In fact, these latter arguments still show little awareness that the problem lies first and foremost on the researchers' way of understanding, –i.e., the basic assumptions supporting theories– as already articulated by Adler in the early 1980s through a meta-theoretical framework (Adler, 1983b, 1983c). These theoretical interventions are important insofar as highlighting differences among peoples in the world is the aim; however, as I will show, they are still problematic.

At the most immediate, under the label of culturally-appropriate, these interventions presuppose that "cultures" and peoples within them have stable identities,

ahistorical, and pure, and that these identities can be studied by researchers using the 'right' cultural dimensions. Yet, creating the 'right' cultural dimensions poses the additional problem of needing to reflect on the cultural provenance of these theory-making ideas (i.e., Adler and Graham, 1989; Boyacıgiller and Adler, 1991; Hofstede, 1980; 1983). Further, these ideas are unlikely to be questioned by "the indigenous member" who has been invited to participate in research teams. As such, these individuals would still be guided by Western epistemological assumptions about what is "knowledge."

Altogether, these theoretical approaches show that the IM field is (still) trying to find "better" ways of differentiating among people and nations (i.e., multiple contexts, different levels of analysis) as a means of studying globalization. By contrast, and as this dissertation underscores, insofar as the problems are viewed in this light, there is no way out of them. Rather, I contend, it is necessary to find ways of understanding new relationships and identities formed through *encounters between people* in the world; encounters that are in fact *creating* the conditions *we call globalization*.

IM Methodological Interventions to the Problem of Representation

Unwillingness or inability to reflect on meta-theoretical issues in IM, has transformed most theory development concerns into methodological deliberations on how to capture and compare stable cultures and cultural identities. In general, methodological approaches to the study of international management are as well guided by modernist epistemologies. As I explained in the introduction to this dissertation, modernist epistemologies, in particular positivism, study the social world as a set of "concrete empirical artifacts and relationships which can be identified" (Burrell and Morgan, 1979:

26). Epistemologically, positivism, and its associated nomothetic methodologies, attempts to reflect the social world as if it were similar to the natural world, i.e., emanating from laws and regularities that would then allow to positing generalizations from research findings (Morgan and Smircich, 1980).

Within the context of cross-cultural and comparative international management research, positivism dominates identity research. The majority of studies are an examination of subjects through a priori categories (i.e., race, gender, ethnicity, nationality) and variables (i.e., generated from answers to surveys, tests, and questionnaires) established through the research design. In effect, the assumption is that identities and psychological traits exist a priori in the social world and their appropriate representation is a *methodological* rather than a theoretical or epistemological problem. The emphasis on methods rather than on epistemological assumptions guiding international management research can be seen even in the early days of the field as "a good paradigm will either specify a definition of culture or replace it with a set of measurable variables that might together reflect potentially important setting impacts" (Roberts and Boyacıgiller, 1984: 428).

The primacy of methodology continues on in more recent times. As Earley and Singh, editors of the special international management research forum of the *Academy of Management Journal* (1995), suggest, "Our focus in this forum is to advance international and intercultural research through the presentation of outstanding work using sophisticated new methodologies and research styles to address questions of global business" (1995: 327). While more recently these same scholars recognize that "conceptualizations of self…in management research suffer from the myopia of a

Western lens" (Earley and Singh, 2000: 2-3), they still suggest that *methodological* extensions of "domestic" management research frameworks into international contexts can overcome this myopia.

The suggestions offered by these scholars are emblematic of the continued dominance of positivism guiding international management identity research. As such, their aim is to strengthen study designs and to find 'appropriate' and 'better' variables to incorporate into models for increased explanatory power. At the end, most concerns are over the instrumental production of 'practical' management knowledge rather than a reflexive stance over the assumptions and modes of theorizing guiding research. Thus, capturing identities and representing the self end up as concerns best addressed through methodological interventions.

Expanding further on these ideas, the first type of methodological intervention develop study designs focusing on ways to improve sampling, survey instruments, data collection, and statistical analyses (Adler, 1983a, 1984; Adler, Doktor, and Redding, 1986; England and Harpaz, 1983; Hofstede, Bond, and Luk, 1993; Negandhi and Estefan, 1965; Sekaran, 1983; Verbeke, 2000). As such, the guiding assumption is that representing international business people, practices, and ideas 'accurately' would depend on choosing correct study designs.

The second methodological intervention is based on choosing and defining appropriate variables, which can produce accurate accounts of cross-cultural and comparative international management practices (Adler, Campbell, and Laurent, 1989; Sekaran and Snodgrass, 1986; Teagarden et al., 1995). Variables, particularly those that are thought to explain culture and cultural differences, are considered 'units of analysis'

which need to be included (Lenartowicz and Roth, 1999). Thus, the concern is how to 'localize' the 'universal' (i.e., human nature and identity) methodologically through cultural variables: "We suggest that variables should first be developed in as universal terms as possible. Having done so, the next step would be to 'localize' the variables to suit a certain culture" (Lim and Firkola, 2000: 142). In effect, representation becomes a methodological matter of fitting universal concepts to the context and people under study.

Why these Interventions and Critiques are not Enough

Even when they may appropriately identify the problem (i.e., need to examine multiple contexts and move beyond U.S.-based management theories), as a group international management scholars do not seem to be able to break loose from formulating 'appropriate' theories and methodology to solve their predicaments. This is seen in calls to "determine which management theories de facto embrace the North American cultural context" (Doktor, Tung, and Von Glinow, 1991a: 260) and "develop management theories that are effective and functional when applied in culture settings" (Doktor, Tung, and Von Glinow, 1991b: 363). This emphasis on culturally-specific theories and new methodologies does not allow for a reconsideration of the Western philosophical assumptions guiding a more general assumption: that it is altogether possible to do cross-cultural and comparative international management theories and research. Paradoxically, even the articulation of *international* is done *in relation* to the U.S. and North America more generally, as suggested recently by the editors of AMJ:

> this journal has made a successful transition from being primarily North American in focus to being a truly international journal—one with (1) many authors who are international scholars, (2) many samples collected outside North America, and/ or (3) many topics related to

> international or cross-cultural management (Kirkman and Law, 2005: 7)

Evidently, scholars do not reflect upon the fact that their problem is that assumptions embedded within these very "international" management theories end up reflecting back their own creators. Representations put forth in the cross-cultural and comparative international management fields already create a research subject/ identity based on assumptions regarding the 'self' from Western modernist philosophy, no matter how "culturally sensitive" (another modernist assumption) the specification. While this has not gone unrecognized, such recognition does not change the modernist assumptions that imagine "culture" pure, fixed, and identifiable. Thus, "the problem" is articulated more as a matter of the quantity of "variables" that must be accounted for rather than a matter of re-thinking meta-theoretical assumptions in conceptualizing the situation. As Roberts and Boyacıgiller, perhaps ironically, suggest: "Imagine the vast heterogeneity of philosophies and approaches [to management] one would have to consider if the nature of modern scientific research were not determined by Western tradition" (1984: 430).

My dissertation addresses this very suggestion as I highlight the possibilities of doing international management theory and research differently. How can the epistemological assumptions of 'Western' and U.S.-based international management research be highlighted as a *local* understanding such that they are no longer the norm? What other kind of research would then be possible? In what follows, I further argue that a two-step approach is necessary in order to move towards a truly *international* management theory and research when addressing globalization. The first step, which I have just articulated in the prior pages**,** is an examination of assumptions embedded in the textual representations of IM research showing how they reproduce the very Western

assumptions and traditions the research might be decrying. The comparative and cross-cultural international management literatures conceptualize their subjects through psychological concepts, and differentiate between them based on cultural differences. Through essentialist representations of identities using *metaphors of psychology and culture*, the shifting and relational aspects of identity formation are effaced while other possible management ideas and practices are silenced. By attempting to differentiate between peoples in terms of their psychological and cultural characteristics, researchers assume that identities are static, pure, given, and knowable. Cultural differences become a reified way of conceptualizing identities and experiences of international business people. Fundamentally, these literatures are a summary of the experiences of Western 'selves' as the center of the cognitive universe without needing to address their relationships to others despite contextual claims to globalization. All that is accomplished is to control different "voices" and to keep everyone in its "place," and thus, in their representations, there is no other "self" in these literatures but the Western self.

Thus, the second step of my approach is needed as a possible way out of this impasse. By further expanding on the postcolonial theories informing the analytical framework of this dissertation, I propose a set of theoretical alternatives that may help bring to visibility that which have been silenced in the extant IM literature. I develop these alternatives in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 3

REFRAMING INTERNATIONAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP THROUGH POSTCOLONIAL FRAMEWORKS

As discussed earlier, postcolonial theories are related to postmodern and poststructuralist theoretical positions by a shared critique of modernist philosophical assumptions regarding the self and knowledge. What sets postcolonial scholars apart from their postmodern and poststructuralist colleagues is their position as non-Western critics of Western philosophical assumptions specifically in relation to the non-West. As such, postcolonial scholars highlight the importance of historical experiences among nations and peoples in critiques and analyses of Western philosophy. In contrast, postmodern and poststructuralist analyses of modernist philosophy are still Western critiques of Western philosophical assumptions. Thus, the postcolonial framework incorporates the relevance of the 'non-West' both to the theoretical arguments based on Western philosophy and to the critiques of these arguments offered by postmodern and poststructuralist positions.

By highlighting the relevance of the 'non-West' to any theoretical argument guided by Western philosophical assumptions, postcolonial studies can offer another way to conceptualize the formation of international business identities under conditions of globalization based on historic colonial relations between nations. Only a few scholars in international management have paid attention to the implications of considering relations of postcoloniality in their research (Banerjee and Linstead, 2001; Calás, 1992; Chio, 2005; Frenkel and Shenhav, 2003, 2006; Jack and Westwood, 2006; Kwek, 2003; Mir, Mir and Upadhyaya, 2003; Moulettes, 2007; Prasad, 2003a).

More recently, there has been a growing interest in considering postcolonial concerns within the international management field as evidenced by the special issues of *Critical Perspectives on International Business* (2008) on postcolonial perspectives, and *AMR* (2008). However, these interventions are small in comparison to the volumes of existing IM research produced through Western institutions and theoretical frameworks (Jaya, 2001; A. Prasad, 2003b; Wong-MingJi and Mir, 1997).

Both international management and postcolonial approaches can be understood as contemporary scholarly conversations on globalization developed over the past thirty years. They both consider 'the rest of the world' but differ significantly in their theoretical approaches to the topic. Postcolonial studies as a field of inquiry is made up of diverse theorists engaged in critiquing Eurocentric and Western representations of non-Western worlds. As a group, these theorists want to call attention to privileged canonical knowledge that makes claims about non-Western peoples and to articulate instead, knowledge that has been marginalized by Western epistemological interventions. In order to accomplish these objectives, postcolonial scholars rely on several theoretical approaches having their roots within Marxist, postmodern, and poststructuralist frameworks.

Theoretical links to Marxist traditions range from calls to action on behalf of subjugated populations to text-based analyses of the material effects of the base (economic conditions) on the superstructure (social, political, and cultural systems). In addition, and as previously stated, postcolonial theorists share concerns with postmodern and poststructuralist scholars based on critiques of Enlightenment-based justifications for colonial and imperial rule, such as notions of "progress through scientific pursuits,"

“rationality” and “modernity.” Furthermore, postcolonial studies also share the anti-humanist stance of postmodern and poststructuralist approaches where scholars argue against meta-narratives that claim to represent universal goals for all peoples and cultures, rendering different populations in an essentialist fashion, and thus depriving them of their own historical and temporal location (Gandhi 1998; Loomba 1998). Yet, despite their calls to make non-Western knowledge available, postcolonial theorists also warn of replacing the margin with another one or celebrating the native (Bhabha, 1990a).

Although the postcolonial studies field may seem united by shared concerns of Western epistemological hegemony and knowing differently, as well as their emphasis on the formation of “others” identities as a relational practice between colonizers and colonized, the analytic strength of postcolonial studies lies in the distinct theoretical approaches of various scholars to these very concerns. To illustrate the importance of these differences, I will rely on three key theorists who have made significant contributions to the postcolonial field: Homi K. Bhabha, Edward W. Said, and Gayatri C. Spivak.

In the following paragraphs, I outline significant points from each of these scholar’s theoretical contributions, highlighting their analytical common ground as well as points of divergence. Taking in turn the theoretical lens of each postcolonial thinker, I outline their conceptualization of subject formation within Western literatures including representations of non-Western populations, and their strategies for recovery and resistance. By using each of their lenses in turn as part of my fieldwork, I demonstrate how when used independently, each lens allows for consideration of a different set of contexts when understanding self under globalization. More importantly, when brought

together, these different postcolonial lenses offer a relational framework for the analysis of identity formation and globalization.

The Analytic Perspective of Homi K. Bhabha: The Hybrid Subject

Homi K. Bhabha's contributions to postcolonial studies stem from expansion of Franz Fanon's (1965, 1967) psychoanalytic lens examining the aftermath of French colonization in Algeria and the Caribbean. Bhabha expands upon this work and considers the consequences of British colonization of India through his engagement with concepts such as the creation of cultural differences, hybridity, mimicry, and nation (1990a,b, 1994a,b,c,d). I discuss Bhabha's theoretical position on each of these ideas and what they mean for identity formation.

One of the mainstays of colonial thought is the notion that particular non-Western populations were in need of Western intervention (i.e., colonization) as they were, by virtue of their religion and culture, less developed. Bhabha sees such colonizer/ colonized binaries as attempts by the colonizer to create cultural differences based on territorial ambitions of the colonizers rather than any 'scientific' differences. This is relevant in that often anthropologists and anthropological lenses were used at the behest of colonial regimes in order to determine the 'culture' of populations and prepare them for colonization (P. Prasad, 2003). By claiming a concrete and real difference between two cultures, and the superiority of "the one" over "the other," the colonizer attempts to make known his/ her authority and power. In effect, "cultural differences" is subtext for domination of all kinds (i.e., territorial, religious, social, cultural, political, and economic) rather than a reflection of any 'real' differences between people.

However, Bhabha considers the possibility of speaking back to such

epistemological domination through his concept of hybridity. Hybridity intervenes in any attempt to create such a difference through a binary opposition, as it creates ambivalence over the purity of identities and knowledge for either the colonized or the colonizer by remarking the co-implication of all colonizer-colonized relationships. Thus, hybridity denies the colonizer's superiority and, therefore, his/ her anticipated recognition by his/ her subject. As Bhabha states:

> Hybridity has no such perspective of depth or truth to provide: it is not a third term that resolves the tension between two cultures…Hybridity is a problematic of colonial representation and individuation that reverses the effects of colonialist disavowal, so that other 'denied' knowledges enter upon the dominant discourse and estrange the basis of its authority—its rules of recognition (1994c: 113-114)

Through this concept, Bhabha challenges stereotypes of the colonized perpetuated by the colonizer in attempts to rule over populations, lands, and cultures. Similar to poststructuralist rejection of essentialist notions of race and gender, Bhabha suggests that colonizer and colonized alike cannot claim to have an essential identity giving them particular characteristics. Rather, identities exist in a state of ambivalence and cannot be determined or categorized despite the efforts of the colonizer. Instead, Bhabha focuses on the hybrid nature of *subjects existing within the postcolonial condition*.

Bhabha also considers the psychoanalytic dimensions of domination and its effects on postcolonial subjects through his concept of mimicry. Mimicry emerges as the attempt of the colonizer to transform the colonized into a copy the colonizer's culture. It is a form of discipline and surveillance that works at the level of the unconscious, for mimetic regimes imposed on the colonized work to define the colonized in the image of the colonizer. However, the colonized can attempt to subvert such mimetic attempts by

(re)interpreting and giving culturally-based meaning to practices (i.e., religious, economic) imposed on them by the colonizer (Bhabha, 1994c). In effect, the colonized can conceptualize the world on his/ her own terms rather than those dictated by the colonizer while, concurrently, the colonizer representations become imbued with their own colonial experiences.

Yet, despite the possible agency of the colonized in such situations, mimetic colonial endeavors aimed to dominate a land and its people are inextricably linked to colonial narratives that attempt to tell the story of the colonized, and Bhabha's theoretical emphasis on the role of the nation aims to demonstrate this. He begins with an assertion that a nation exists through narration. In other words, he conceptualizes the idea of a nation through the act of writing, which allows for the creation of a national identity, sovereignty, and people. Narratives that allow a nation to come into existence reflect the political rationality and cultural authority of its authors and often depict the nation as an entity populated by homogenous people. By presenting the nation as a homogenous geographic space, the colonizer attempts to erase the historical presence of people who were already there. Bhabha's highlights how such narratives purposefully include certain populations as part of the nation while excluding others.

Moreover, Bhabha's framework affords the possibility of recovery and resistance by allowing subjects to speak in-between through hybridity, Bhabha's framework allows for an epistemological intervention that opens up space for recovering a self that was (almost) colonized by dominant forms of Western knowledge (i.e., cultural differences). Under his framework, resistance takes the form of refusing the identity imposed on a person by the West's homogenizing and hegemonic knowledge forms. More than this,

resistance also means refusing the meanings assigned to particular ideas and practices as put forth by the West. In effect, resistance means fighting for symbolic meaning.

In summary, Bhabha's work explores the connections among writing, identities, and nation building. His framework for analysis considers psychoanalytic dimensions and repercussions of colonial rule while simultaneously focusing on textual/ theoretical maneuvers, such as binary oppositions and mimicry as attempts to legitimize differences between Western and non-Western people. Bhabha's work challenges the rules by which Western texts create essential characteristics for people and focuses instead on the indeterminacy of identities. More importantly, his framework highlights how people produce culturally-based meanings around various practices and thus problematizes the notion that ideas can be imposed or transferred mimetically between cultures.

The Analytic Perspective of Edward W. Said: Overturning Orientalized Cultural Representations and Giving Voice

Said's contributions to the postcolonial field emanate from his systematic engagement with colonial British/ Middle East relations as he outlines how colonial representational forms and material structures are connected. Based on his seminal work**,** *Orientalism* (1978)**,** and other work**s** following this, he examines Western representations of the Middle East and highlights the ways in which such textual representations are connected to Western economic, political, and military institutions (1985, 1988, 1991, 1993a,b,c 2000). As an analytic lens, Orientalism is generally understood as the representation of non-Western subjects within Western writing, or more specifically:

> Orientalism can be discussed and analyzed as the corporate institution for dealing with the Orient—dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it: in

> short, Orientalism as a Western-style for dominating, restructuring and having authority over the Orient (2001: 169)

Said suggests that the modern definition of Orientalism would address its ties to imperialism as "it [Orientalism] is a style of knowledge that goes hand in hand with, or is manufactured or produced out of, the actual control or domination of real geographical territory and people" (2001: 169). Through his analytic framework, Said connects Western representation and epistemological claims about the East with Western material and political power, showing the links between epistemology and material power through textual analyses.

He suggests that the use of binary oppositions to represent the non-West ('them') are endemic Western ('us') attempts to homogenize the world within Western texts. By creating binary oppositions between people of the 'West' and the 'Rest,' Western writing attempts to classify non-Western populations into homogenized and rigid categories. For Said, such categorizations represent the East and Eastern people as backwards, inferior, and feminized and the West as progressive, advanced, and masculine (1985). Through the use of binary opposites, the non-West becomes portrayed as fixed in time and unable to change. Relying on Foucault's notion of discourse (1980, 1982) and Gramsci's (1971) notion of hegemony, he demonstrates how the 'real' East becomes the discursive Orient, as particular representations of the East become normalized through academic writings claiming epistemological support to legitimize notions of a "real" difference between West and East.

Said attempts to reverse such binary notions and suggests that the Western pursuit of knowledge is not disinterested. Paying attention to the ways in which Western

academic writing represents its subjects of inquiry, he shows how Western material domination of the non-Western world is conscious and intentional, and that cultural products (i.e., academic writing) cannot be separated from political activities. In essence, Said's framework depicts how culture is political and thus never a neutral concept or activity. Related to these ideas, he further argues that an unequal relationship between knower and known exists whereby academic writers claim epistemological authority over non-Western peoples by suggesting they must be represented for they cannot represent themselves. Thus, part of the postcolonial project for Said is to challenge "the muteness imposed upon the Orient as subject" (1985: 202).

In addition, Said proposes that Western scholarship and textual representations of the non-West have political and material effects, for material structures and processes help keep the West dominant over the East through the indivisible relationship between claimed "knowledge" and deployed power. For Said, material structures take the form of military, political, and economic institutions while material processes exist as cultural representations of Eastern subjects, based on Western academic and fiction writing, which circulate in Western minds and societies. By suggesting the West as backwards and in need of development, Western academic writing gives legitimacy to Western material interventions into the non-West.

Despite the effects of Orientalism, Said's lens also allows for agency and resistance to Western *misrepresentations* of the non-West. Resistance under Orientalism can be described as overturning binary oppositions that ascribe absolute qualities, such as backward and unchanging, to non-Western people and cultures. By representing the non-West (i.e., people and cultures) in historic context to the West and giving examples of

how they are progressive and able to change, Said's lens allows for the non-West to speak back to Western interested representations that Orientalize and silence.

In summary, Said's framework helps uncover the connections between Orientalism, as a discourse based on modes of representation, vocabulary and imagery, and Western material structures. His analytics also highlight the ways in which Orientalist discourses emanating from Western academic knowledge rhetorically feminize the non-West (i.e., as weak, in need of help) and, based on this, influence macro decisions such as foreign or business policies embarked upon by Western nations and institutions.

The Analytic Perspective of Gayatri C. Spivak: Gendered Subaltern Subjects

In general, Spivak is considered a postcolonial feminist scholar whose contribution to postcolonial studies stems from her use of Marxist deconstructionist approaches to examine gender textually and materially (1985a,b,c, 1987, 1988, 1990, 1996, 1999). Focusing specifically on the female postcolonial subject in British-ruled India, she contends that these women are doubly subjugated by colonial rulers and indigenous patriarchy. In line with other postcolonial feminist concerns I mentioned earlier, she also problematizes Western attempts to represent Third World women, for Western feminist theories often speak of women as a universal category without reference to the specific historical, socio-economic, and geo-political realities faced by postcolonial subjects. Thus, Spivak attempts to show the limits and specificity of universal categories, such as "Woman," that Western feminist writing often employs to speak about *the Third World woman.* For Spivak, the female postcolonial occupies a space that is not readily accessible by Western feminist theories as these theories are

themselves cultural productions. Thus, she endeavors to highlight how the gendered postcolonial subject exists at the margins of Western feminist theories as well as Western forms of representation that attempt to represent all women.

Spivak makes other important contributions to postcolonial studies through her use of deconstructive techniques to dismantle binary oppositions, demonstrating the ways in which such binary categories are *created* and *sustained*. In a similar fashion to Bhabha, she suggests that there no ontological reality such as cultural differences or a pure cultural self. However, she differs in that she does not focus on the psychological effects of domination but more so, on the textual production of domination. To this end, she questions taken-for-granted categories such as "East" and "West" and suggests neither category exists as an ontological reality independent of attempts to represent them in relational terms. Rather than showing how Western writing *misrepresents* non-Western populations, she deconstructs the very notions that allow Western writing to construct the non-West, suggesting that each half needs the other in order to exist. She accomplishes this by highlighting the ways in which binaries create difference between ideas, cultures, or populations based on often marginalized themes that go unvoiced within texts and narratives.

Specifically, Spivak critiques Western texts based on their use of narratives to attribute certain qualities to non-Western populations. These narratives function by allocating non-Western populations into categories based on the assumption of natural differences and assigning populations or cultures within such categories fundamental characteristics. Following from these categorizations, populations of the non-West or the "Third World" become represented in a normalized fashion. Spivak then works to point

out the role of narration in creating a particular view or category and suggests that recounting reality is itself a process through which different narratives can produce different realities. Thus, she attempts to portray the multiplicity and heterogeneity of populations by deconstructing universal narratives of gender and race, no matter how "well intended," that claim to represent all.

To this effect, her theoretical focus also highlights the connections between epistemological interventions of Western academia into global economic realities, arguing, for instance, that academic writing that intervenes on behalf of the "Third World" subject still follows imperialist tendencies. She states:

> It seems particularly unfortunate when the emergent perspective of feminist criticism reproduces axioms of imperialism. An isolationist admiration for the literature of the female subject in Europe and Anglo-America established the high feminist norm. It is supported and operated by an information-retrieval approach to "Third World" (the term is increasingly, and insultingly, "emergent") literature, which often employs a deliberately "non-theoretical" methodology with self-conscious rectitude (1999: 114)

In particular, academic writing that offers finality based on such interventions needs to be addressed. For Spivak, the act of concluding interrupts the multiple processes of narration and can lead to categorization of cultures and populations into stagnant and fixed groups. On this point, she states "when a narrative is constructed, something is left out. When an end is defined, other ends are rejected, and one might not know what those ends are….What is it that is left out? Can we know what is left out? We must know the limits of the narratives" (1990: 19). To this end, she highlights the limitations of academic writing through catachresis, or by intentionally misappropriating ideas and images so as to reveal new meanings of space within narratives (Spivak, 1999).

Finally, one of Spivak's most important material contributions to the postcolonial field is shown in her concerns with the gendered international division of labor. These concerns add to her critiques of the epistemic violence that Western academic feminist writings impart on the female postcolonial subject. Spivak further develops Gramsci's (1971) notion of *the subaltern*, (already addressed by a group of scholars known as the Subaltern Studies group in India), as people beyond the representational reach of both Western and Third World academics. For Spivak, the subaltern exist outside global capitalist processes and do not have the agency to speak for themselves; but she then reclaims this same notion of "the subaltern" as a space to interrupt and question dominant subject positions and, through it, problematizes several attempts to represent the gendered division of global labor under conditions of globalization. More importantly, her framework incorporates reflexivity into postcolonial studies in order to interrupt attempts to represent the 'Third World' as a unitary place and, concurrently, to recover knowledge that may have been effaced under colonization.

Yet recovery is not simply an information retrieval process. Under Spivak's postcolonial theoretical lens, resisting hegemonic forms of representation and recovering what may have been marginalized are precarious acts that may end up reproducing the very hegemonic forms of knowing they aim to dismantle. Specifically, by speaking back from a position deemed 'silent' or 'oppressed,' an individual may come to represent all 'those' people and thus be put 'back' in their place, textually and materially. Thus, Spivak's framework highlights that recovery and resistance are not innocent acts of retrieving 'lost knowledge' but necessarily ethico-political interventions that call attention to mechanisms of marginalization (i.e., how is the gendered postcolonial subject

produced and subalternized?) and their material consequences (i.e., how do different gendered postcolonial subjects experience globalization differently?). These interventions implicate the researcher, who is in effect, writing back with and for the postcolonial subject. Subaltern agency then is a problematic of partial resistance and situated recovery rather than a complete and finalized version of it.

In summary, Spivak's theoretical work focuses on the textual production of the gendered postcolonial subject as she outlines how this subject exists at the margin of Western feminist and academic writing. Rather than focusing exclusively Western on narratives and their consequences for postcolonial subjects, Spivak is equally determined to address the material. Her framework links texts to the material world as she examines the living and working conditions of female postcolonial subjects with respect to the international division of labor and the interventions that are made on their behalf. To these effects, however, rather than becoming the "native informant" within a Western academic institution, Spivak questions her own privileged position in studying the 'Third World.' In her arguments she highlights the "Third World" as existing only in relationship to a "First World" of Western invention, produced by a Western imagination that also produces "native" populations and "knowledge" about them. Consequently, one of the main contributions of Spivak's framework is the reflexive position and questioning that she requires of researchers who want to study postcolonial subjects. In effect, Spivak's work speaks directly to the problematic of representation: giving voice is neither an academic methodological issue nor necessarily possible to do. It is a practice that attempts to address the gendered power relations among different people and nations embedded in the global economy.

Summary of Theoretical Perspectives

In summary, Bhabha, Said, and Spivak each make distinct theoretical contributions to postcolonial studies and these contributions have different implications for international management theory and research (Frenkel, 2008; Özkazanç-Pan, 2008). Specifically in terms of identity formation, each scholar allows for a different examination of identity/ representation and resistances to dominant Western forms of knowledge based on their distinct frameworks. Despite these differences, postcolonial scholars share theoretical assumptions regarding representational strategies and historic power relations.

Firstly, postcolonial theories pay close attention to the language of representation in texts/ writing and in particular to the theories, concepts, and words used to represent non-Western people textually including how "the research subject" is formed through specific signifiers. This focus allows theorists to consider who may benefit from a particular representation of the non-West/ non-Westerner in Western academic writing and to highlight connections among academic theory, epistemology/ research, and education regarding the 'Third World.'

Secondly, postcolonial theories focus on particular historical, economic, and political relations among nations in order to provide a context for relational differences. In other words, 'cultural differences' can only be understood by acknowledging the relevance of encounters between peoples under colonial/ postcolonial and imperialist conditions. How are such "differences" formed? In relationship to what? Who articulates them? In which ways, and for what purposes? Postcolonial theories thus highlight power relations that are embedded in these relationships.

Altogether, I argue that postcolonial theory is immediately relevant to understanding "international management." That is, from these perspectives, international management discourse of "cultural differences" is another Western linguistic practice whereby certain conceptualizations of self/ difference are considered management 'knowledge' while other ways of understanding relationships among people in the world are marginalized. Table 3 summarizes the focal points of each theorist's analytical framework on identity/ representation, 'Western' research, and resistance to Western epistemological interventions.

Examining Postcolonial Concerns in Context: The 'Non-West' and 'Non-Westerner'

Taken together, postcolonial frameworks emphasize how power relations and historic political and economic relationships among nations are relevant to present-day representations of the 'non-West' and contribute to study contemporary encounters between West and non-West under globalization. For instance, they make possible to examine my original CNN story as one example of this, where conceptualizing Turkey as not having business innovation can be understood as a 'Western' management knowledge assertion that excludes other conceptualizations of what innovation might look like in Turkey. Furthermore, postcolonial concerns raised in regards to the female postcolonial subject now make possible seeing the CNN as an example of gendered business and technology discourses gaining authority by feminizing and marginalizing Turkish businesses (i.e., don't expect to see much business innovation) and simultanously silencing the Turkish woman by only allowing her to occupy the position of oppressed (i.e., veiled woman)

Studying the United States and Turkey through postcolonial lenses would allow

for an examination of postcolonial meta-theoretical concerns around West/ non-West relationships and an articulation of identity formation narratives in the context of such encounters. While the United States and Turkey do not have historical colonial relationship per se, postcolonial frameworks nonetheless help to acknowledge further power relations –i.e., neocolonial relations which included political, military and economic issues- as important and relevant to academic writing, research, and education about Turkey in U.S. representations. In effect, postcolonial concerns over epistemology underscore how such representations (i.e., gendered, traditional) marginalize Turkey and Turkish business people while simultaneously emphasizing the continued relationships between the United States and Turkey as the broader context for understanding cultural differences in business people and practices within each country.

I further illustrate the analytical value of postcolonial approaches in the following section by focusing on a subset of the IM literature addressing the international entrepreneur. "The international entrepreneur" is perhaps the paradigmatic case for underscoring the problems about the IM literature reviewed in chapter 2, but it is also an important example to highlight possible solutions to them. These solutions are further illustrated through my field research and analyses as discussed in the rest of the dissertation.

The International Entrepreneur: A Case in Point

I continue to emphasize, and hopefully amply illustrated, that the problems of representation in IM academic literatures as well as other representations, such as media images, is located in theoretical lenses created in the West. Further, these theoretical models, no matter their "self-critique," continue to be used for studying business people

and business practices under conditions of globalization while producing, instead, what they claim to be studying based on Western modernist philosophical assumptions. As I have further addressed, today different theoretical lenses are possible and they can be found in postcolonial theoretical frameworks. As an illustration of possibilities opened by these frameworks, I examine below a subset of the IM literature comprising the study of the international/ ethnic entrepreneur, by contrasting the understanding of this topic in the extant literature with other understandings emerging from postcolonial analysis.

Within the context of globalization, entrepreneurs often reflect the movement of people and the interconnection of places. Such international entrepreneurs characterize simultaneous lives/ identities: they know the 'native' business practices of their societies while traveling globally. The flexibility of identity formation can be represented by this group of people, who are doing business on "their own" and are less constrained to identify themselves by the structural limitations of multinational organizations. Thus, international entrepreneurs are a good way to examine globalization processes related to identity formation.

In recent years, there has been a growing academic interest in international entrepreneurship as evidenced by management journals producing special issues on this very topic including the *Academy of Management Journal* (2000) and *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice* (forthcoming). More importantly, the growth of the field has been marked by scholars attempting to define international entrepreneurship conceptually as the field continues to emerge mainly by borrowing concepts from strategy, entrepreneurship, and international management/ business fields (McDougall and Oviatt, 2000; Zahra and George, 2002). Thus, one of the pressing concerns in the field is how to

conceptualize and study international entrepreneurship in light of globalization. Despite these concerns, most work within this nascent field does not focus specifically on the mobility of business people and ideas through migration and movement but rather on the static aspects of entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship even if they acknowledge the existence of ethnic or immigrant aspects of entrepreneurial activities. As I will discuss, this subset of the literature brings to visibility, at its most immediate, the problems created by fixing "identity" and "culture" in the extant IM literature when addressing globalization.

To accomplish this, I discuss existing approaches to the study of international entrepreneurship by way of representative articles rather than conduct an exhaustive literature review. I then go on to critique these approaches based on existing concerns emanating from postcolonial frameworks already outlined and focus specifically on one article as an exemplar to demonstrate how each postcolonial lens allows for interrogation of the assumptions underlying this set of literature. To clarify, I suggest that theories of and approaches to the study of international entrepreneurship do not address mobility in people and ideas or consider the new ontology (i.e., complex, contradictory processes) of globalization. To this end, I outline an alternative theoretical approach to the study of international entrepreneurship based transnational concerns existing under postcolonial frameworks. As I will demonstrate through my fieldwork, postcolonial positions allow me to reconsider the conceptualization of self under globalization particularly in terms of encounters among people and question the micro/ macro divide (i.e., individual level versus organizational level focus) existing in the international entrepreneurship approaches.

Three Approaches to the Study of International Entrepreneurship

One of the approaches to the study of international entrepreneurship can be called the 'macro' approach as scholars focus on firms and firm level attributes (see Zahra and George, 2002) to outline the processes by which entrepreneurial business ventures internationalize (Autio, Sapienza and Almeida, 2000; Fletcher, 2004; Lu and Beamish, 2001; Madsen and Servais, 1997). The main concern of this approach is to understand how entrepreneurial firms do business by going from one location to another or how they 'go global' in their operations. Borrowing heavily from the strategy and international business fields, the focus of this literature is to examine which organizational variables, such as top management teams, firm age, market strategy, etc., influence how and why entrepreneurial firms decide to sell their services and products internationally and globally.

The second approach to the study of international entrepreneurship focuses on various individuals and groups moving between different nations and cultures and engaging in entrepreneurial business activities. This approach to studying international entrepreneurship has a micro focus (i.e., individuals and groups) and attempts to determine and examine cross-cultural differences among entrepreneurs. In a similar epistemological fashion to the international management literature, the assumption is that 'culture' makes a difference in the business experiences and practices of entrepreneurs (Baker, Gedajlovic and Lubatkin, 2005; Thomas and Mueller, 2000). Scholars adopting this cross-cultural comparative approach examine differences in entrepreneurial intentions (Van Auken, Stephens, Fry and Silva, 2006), orientations (Kreiser, Marino and Weaver, 2002), perceptions (Chrisman, Chua and Steier, 2002), decision making

(Mitchell, Smith, Sewright and Morse, 2000; Mitchell et al., 2002), and values (Begley and Tan, 2001) across different people and nations.

Finally, the third approach to the study of international entrepreneurship identifies and compares ethnic and immigrant entrepreneurs across different nations. Scholars working with this framework ask questions such as, *who* are ethnic/ immigrant entrepreneurs? And *what* kinds of entrepreneurial business activities and practices do they engage in? (see Light and Rosenstein, 1995)? Research within the ethnic/ immigrant entrepreneurship field focuses on identifying their characteristics (Chaganti and Greene, 2002; Collins, 2002; Evans, 1989; Heibert, 2002; Hollingsworth and Hand, 1976; Peterson, 1995; Peterson and Meckler, 2001; Phizacklea and Ram, 1995; Raijman, 2001) and highlights different entrepreneurial practices, experiences, and activities across different immigrant and ethnic groups (Barrett, Jones, McEvoy and McGoldrick, 2002; Itzigsohn and Dore-Cabral, 2000; Johnson, Munoz and Alon, 2007; Jung and Katsioloudes, 2001; Menzies, Filion, Brenner and Elgie, 2007; Min and Bozorgmehr, 2000; Peterson and Roquebert, 1993; van Tubergen, 2005; Vincent, 1996).

What is Problematic in Existing Approaches to International Entrepreneurship

Although these three different approaches to the study of international entrepreneurship may on the surface look different, they share fundamental epistemological assumptions about globalization and the conceptualization of self more generally. In other words, while each of these three approaches may seem distinct and cognizant of mobility, they in fact reflect some of the previous problems I already pointed out in the international literature. Specifically, although the macro approach focusing on why and how entrepreneurial firms go global partially recognizes the

movement of people and firms across nations, the study of such movement is nonetheless still based on preconceived notions related to what internationalization looks like and 'doing business globally.' In other words, the processes of entrepreneurship under globalization are still theorized based on ideas of going from "here" to "there" and thereby ignore historic and ongoing relations among nations necessary for international entrepreneurship to occur. Ultimately, globalization and going global are seen through traditional international business lenses that cannot see the complexity of the processes and contexts they aim to study.

Second, while both the micro approaches, specifically the cross-cultural/ comparative and the ethnic/ immigrant entrepreneurship lenses, aim to study entrepreneurs in the context of globalization, they still rely on the problematic assumptions about the self typical of the international management field. That is, despite recognition of some aspects of globalization including people moving from one nation to another (i.e., immigrants) and those moving across many nations as "'born global'" entrepreneurs (Oviatt and McDougall, 1994) carrying out traditional entrepreneurial activities across national borders (Oviatt and McDougall, 2005b), individuals are still conceptualized as static carriers of culture similar to the IM field. Thus, although movement has been recognized to some extent in the international entrepreneurship field, the recognition still lacks the necessary acknowledgement of historic relations among people and among nations that make 'doing international entrepreneurship' possible under globalization.

Recognizing Movement, Mobility and Colonial History

Although the international entrepreneurship field may not have fully recognized

the relevance of movement, mobility and history in addressing entrepreneurial activities , there is a growing number of scholars outside the management and entrepreneurship disciplines who have begun to recognize transnationality when examining entrepreneurial activities in the context of migration and ethnic communities (Castles, 2002; Conway and Cohen, 1998; Guarnizo and Diaz, 1999; Guarnizo, Sanchez and Roach, 1999; Landolt, Autler and Baires, 1999; Portes, 1999; Portes, Guarnizo and Landolt, 1999; Schiller and Fouron, 1999; Vertovec, 1999). Along with these important developments, non-business scholars have also raised concerns about the isolationist approach to the study of immigrant enterprises in societies as such an approach does not allow consideration of the relationships occurring *among* different immigrant enterprises as people cross cultural boundaries in societies (Pieterse, 2003). Thus, while most of these scholars and their research on entrepreneurial activities exist outside of management disciplines, there have been notable exceptions (see Light 2007) within the management and entrepreneurships fields.

Consequently, there are now scholars within these fields who focus on the transnational entrepreneur as they try to understand how immigrants develop enterprise relationships in multiple countries (Portes, Guarnizo and Haller, 2002) as well as scholars who have begun to recognize the relevance of colonial relations to management and business transactions. For example, "a number of features have contributed to the increased salience and visibility of ethnic minority businesses…large-scale immigration from former colonies has led to the growth of sizeable ethnic minority communities" (Phizacklea and Ram, 1995: 595; see also, Essers and Benschop, 2007). With these developments in mind, postcolonial concerns over voice (identity) and place (culture)

become immediately relevant to research on international entrepreneurship.

In the next section, I consider further these general concerns by interrogating the international entrepreneurship assumptions through postcolonial and poststructuralist positions outlined earlier. With this in mind, my research question: How do business people in the context of globalization form their identities? may now be reformulated as: How do international entrepreneurs in the context of globalization form their identities? One way to answer this question is to reconsider notions of identity in this literature: How is this literature implicated in reproducing the modern Western self in representations of international entrepreneurs?

Postcolonial Interrogation of International Entrepreneurship

One of the guiding assumptions of the management literature can be seen also in the entrepreneurship literatures. These literatures approach the study of entrepreneurs based on the "universal" cognitive "self" and rely on psychological characteristics and dimensions to identify and study them (Brockhaus and Horwitz, 1986). These studies try to identify their personality, values, attitudes, motivation, and needs achievement (Begley and Boyd, 1987; Brockhaus, 1982; Choo and Wong, 2006; Gillin and Moignard, 2006; Hellstrom, Hellstrom and Berglund, 2001; Kets de Vries, 1977; Malach-Pines, Levy, Utasi and Hill, 2005; Morris and Schindehutte, 2005; Sagie and Elizur, 2001; Sexton and Bowman, 1985; Sexton and Bowman-Upton, 1990; Tang, Tang and Lohrke, 2008). The underlying individual of this set of literature is then used cross-culturally and comparatively to produce the ethnic/ immigrant entrepreneurship I discussed previously.

My main concern is the lack of debate over the fact that the very idea of "the individual" in psychology and the concept of culture are based on Western modern

philosophy and thus used to conceptualize the ethnic/ immigrant entrepreneur. Yet the concern here is not the truthfulness of such representative regimes (as this is already a problematic assumption) but a concern over voice: how do particular ways of conceptualizing the self become the norm through "conventions of warrant?" (Gergen, 1989: 74). Thus, the concern I want to raise here is how are the discourses of self from Western psychology utilized by international management and entrepreneurship texts to create the concept of 'the entrepreneur'? Questions over voice and place become particularly relevant in this sense in that the ethnic/ immigrant entrepreneur is given voice in the voice of the dominant by being embedded in a particular place: once such people are 'here' (place), how are they still different than 'us' and how should we speak about 'them' (voice)?

In light of this, the displacement associated with becoming an 'ethnic' person or an 'immigrant' is not considered in the international entrepreneurship literature. Yet, the processes of displacement, which enable a person to move from one country to another and thus become relationally something/ someone else in another context are an integral part of identity formation. The literature behind the 'immigrant' entrepreneur assumes that the individual is still the same individual he/ she was back 'home' and still an 'outsider' to the society in which s/ he currently lives. In other words, the immigrant is equated with an invasion where one nation and culture come into another without regard to reciprocity or exchange. Based on this, the immigrant is a suffocating concept of personhood as it affords no agency for identity formation since identity is already understood through reference to nationality and the culture that is assigned to that nation(ality). As a consequence, the immigrant entrepreneur is conceptualized as an

individual without history who represents his/ her entire culture and nation at all times and whose management practices are based on cultural traditions of his/ her nation.

Specifically, the existing approaches to the study of international entrepreneurs do not allow the voice of the entrepreneur to speak for him/ herself or allow consideration for the processes of displacement to be seen. While these critiques are generally concerns associated with postcolonial and poststructuralist positions, each of the postcolonial lenses outlined earlier provide a distinct critique of international entrepreneurship and its extant assumptions. To demonstrate these, next I provide a rereading of an exemplar of international entrepreneurship literature from each of the lenses of Bhabha, Said, and Spivak.

In their article, Ahmed, Mahajar and Alon (2005) examine the historical development of Malay entrepreneurship by considering various cultural, societal, governmental and economic factors at play. They conceptualize Malay entrepreneurs through cultural characteristics and value systems developed in the West such that they can make claims such as, “entrepreneurship in Malaysia essentially refers to the gathering of productive resources in an effort to start a business venture on a small scale with the hope of providing a reasonable income to the entrepreneurs” (2005: 170). Beyond this definition, they go on to state the following about Malay culture and values, “the Malay is generally aggressive, selfish” (2005: 180) based on a survey given in 1988. Thus, these examples give voice to the ‘Malay’ entrepreneur based on Western epistemological terms of the self: through the lenses of culture and cognition (values). In effect, the entrepreneurial self emanating from the West as previously outlined is used internationally to produce a Malay entrepreneur.

In particular, the Malay entrepreneur has characteristics that make his/ her entrepreneurial behavior 'Malay' as represented through 'cultural factors'. Over time, there is some given or 'real' characteristic/ trait/ behavior that can be *identified as* and *differentiated from* other cultures as 'Malay.' 'Malay' then represents a set of fixed signifiers that can be used to differentiate 'Malay' from that which is 'non-Malay.' Furthermore, identity is assumed to be knowable such that knowing 'Malay' culture can allow the researcher to know the 'Malay' entrepreneurial identity and 'Malay' managerial practices. In effect, this conceptualization of the ethnic entrepreneur based on 'culture' reflects a fixed and pure entrepreneurial business identity that does not offer the possibility of knowing differently: the Malay self does not speak for him/ herself but rather speaks in the voice of the West.

Examined from Bhabha's hybridity lens, the pure cultural notion of a Malay individual is immediately called into question as diverse people were colonized ultimately by the British and subsumed under the label Malaysian. Although the article mentions the colonial past of Malaysia (including Portuguese and Dutch colonial regimes prior to British rule), there is no reference or acknowledgment of how particular original populations were differentiated from each other into ethnic categories such as Malay, Chinese or Indian. In order to rule Malaysia, both as a people and as a nation, the British colonial regime categorized people and separated them into different labor functions. However, hybridity challenges the cultural authority of the British in knowing people as "Malay" (or Chinese or Indian) both epistemologically and materially in order to rule them.

To clarify, by claiming people are Malay and then deciding their role in society

(i.e., Malays were put in charge of agriculture), the British ultimately were attempting to voice who people are (epistemology) and what they can/ should do (materiality or practice). By continuing to rely on such cultural differences in the article, the authors perpetuate the effects of British rule in mimetically imposing ideas, such as Malays should become entrepreneurs, onto already colonized people. The idea that Malays should become entrepreneurs is colonizing in that Malay is already a subject position created through colonial encounter while entrepreneur implies that development is only possible through business behavior that makes sense for the West. Consequently, hybridity brings to light questions over whether entrepreneurship and the underlying assumptions about self it entails can translate into the Malaysian context.

From the lens of Said, the examination of Malay entrepreneurship takes place in an ahistoric context that does not consider the ongoing repercussions of the historic colonial encounters influencing contemporary Malaysia. While the articles suggests that the Malays under colonization were "forced to…practise traditional agriculture and fisheries" while the "Indian community worked in rubber plantations, whereas the Chinese were given a high status and placed in urban areas" (2005: 170), the authors do not consider how these historic practices may be continuing today or influencing the development of Malay entrepreneurship. In this sense, there is no acknowledgement of ongoing power relations among different ethnic groups within Malaysia or a consideration of how such relations may influence entrepreneurial identity formation.

Furthermore, the article assumes that Malay identity is paradoxically distinct and generalizable in a stable world such that "understanding…Malay entrepreneurship can help researchers form a generalised theory of entrepreneurship in developing countries,

with particular emphasis on Asia" (2005: 168). In other words, the world is conceptualized as standing still such that understanding one set of people in a multiethnic, multicultural nation can be used conceptually to understand the entrepreneurial selves and practices of millions of people in Asia. As previously discussed in the dissertation, globalization is seen as static rather than an ongoing process enabling encounters and exchanges.

Finally, from the lens of Spivak, the article focuses on the development of Malaysia through Malays in relation to the Chinese and Indian communities. That is, by developing the Malays, Malaysia itself can become developed economically. This can be seen in the following statement that describes attempts to develop Malaysia by "mov[ing] the Malays out of the rural sector into modern business activities" (2005: 172). Malaysian development in this sense is linked to Malay entrepreneurship, which has to follow Western modes of entrepreneurship activities (i.e., borrow capital from financial institutions rather than family) in order to become modern.

The Malays in the context of other ethnic identities (i.e., Chinese, Indian) become feminized as needing help in order to become entrepreneurs while Malaysia also becomes feminized in the global context as it tries to present itself as developed and a safe financial location for Western businesses. This double feminization is possible through the masculinization of entrepreneurship as the savior of Malays and Malaysia. Rather than a neutral economic activity, entrepreneurship in the Malaysian context is an attempt to reorganize the existing power relations and social stratifications that cluster particular ethnic groups in particular industries. While the authors recognize the "social restructuring objectives" (2005: 173) of the economic development policy, they do not

consider the repercussions of the policy in terms of ongoing gendered subalternizing relations among the "community of nations" or the feminization of Malays within the context of other ethnic communities.

With these postcolonial critiques, I have attempted to demonstrate how postcolonial lenses interrogate and can redirect international entrepreneurship by considering issues of voice and place. As such, postcolonial interventions into the international entrepreneurship field necessitate a fundamental shift in the meta-theoretical foundations of the field in terms of the concept of self and globalization such that the movement of people and ideas is recognized in the very notions of international entrepreneurship. Next, I discuss what can be done differently in the field now that postcolonial frameworks have been discussed.

Summary of IM and Entrepreneurship Critique from the 'Outside': What Now?

I started this review of the international entrepreneur by asking: How is this literature implicated in reproducing the modern Western self in representations of international entrepreneurs? Yet, this question generates other questions that also open space for my field research: Do these representations further reproduce the notions of the self and identities that are available to actual international business people? Are there other possible identities? And if so, how are these formed and represented? In other words, "representations" are more than just textual (i.e., Rabinow, 1986), since the literature is also implicated in the *production* of identities in relationships between text and practices.

To this end, each postcolonial scholar promotes a different theoretical lens to study how identity/ representation is formed within the context of this relationship.

Bhabha's framework offers the possibility of understanding people through hybridity rather than pure, cultural selves (i.e., Turkish versus American identities). Hybridity is not only a self-construct but a strategy for resisting colonizing representations that offer no voice or agency and questioning mimetically imposed cultural ideas and practices. By studying international entrepreneurs in the U.S. and Turkey, I can uncover (or recover) other ways of understanding self and business practices as they occur in the West/ non-West encounter.

Said's theoretical focus on historic power relations highlights how globalization is a set of dependencies and relationships such that people, nations, and cultural differences needs to be understood within this particular context. Furthermore, his articulation of the terms of knowledge production (i.e., science is not neutral) highlights how cultural differences as they exist in the IM literature may perpetuate Orientalism and silence non-Western voices particularly as Western management ideas and practices circulate hegemonically in the global economy through media and business school knowledge. Based on Said's work, studying the international entrepreneur in the U.S. and Turkey allows for consideration of how such individuals exist in relational aspects in the context of historic geopolitical and economic interdependencies among nations.

Spivak's lens adds another layer of complexity to understanding the self and the West/ non-West encounter in the context of globalization. Her theoretical focus on the gendered postcolonial subject and the subaltern highlights how gendered discourses (i.e., epistemological violence) and material practices (i.e., division of global labor) enable particular identities and practices to become the norm by marginalizing others. More importantly, Western representational strategies of the 'Third World' produce a subaltern

subject that occupies a gendered place in the text and in the world. By examining how discourses of international entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship take place in the U.S. and Turkey, Spivak's lens uncovers a self embedded within gender(ed) relations among people and nations. Moreover, she calls attention to the role of the researcher in producing such academic knowledge about the Third World and thus highlights power relations between an institutionally located and privileged researcher and a research subject located institutionally in the gendered division of global labor.

In summary, although each postcolonial scholar offers a distinct theoretical approach to the examination of identity, as a group they find some common ground in their epistemology of conceptualizing relational aspects of identities. This stands in contrast to the conceptualization of research subjects under international management research. These theoretical and epistemological differences between international management and postcolonial frameworks have implications for how research subjects and hence identity can be examined methodologically (see Table 4).

In light of these differences, what can the postcolonial argument contribute to the international management field? As previously stated, the international management field itself has already expressed concern over its ability to represent 'international' management subjects particularly in a globalized world, and the contribution of the postcolonial framework goes towards addressing this very concern. Thus, to demonstrate the value of postcolonial analyses for international management theorizing and research, the dissertation attempts to answer the following questions: How do international entrepreneurs in the context of globalization form their identities? How are these possible identities formed and represented? Through these questions I examine Turkish

entrepreneurs as an exemplar of international business people in the context of globalization, and contrast the representations of their identities made in the IM literature with other possibilities allowed by my research questions. Notice that these are specifications of my more general research questions as stated on Chapter 1. In the next chapter, I describe the methodological approach that I followed.

CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

My research question: "How do international entrepreneurs in the context of globalization form their identities?", as discussed in the previous chapter, is guided by postcolonial theoretical frameworks, and methodologically answering this question must attend to constructivist critical epistemology. To this effect, I examine narratives of identity formation occurring under globalization. How are people telling stories about themselves in the context of globalization? What stories do they tell? To whom do they tell them? Where do they tell them? For what purposes? To attend to these concerns, however, is more than a matter of choosing methods that can address the research question –e.g., ethnography- for postcolonial frameworks also highlight that issues such as the seemingly simple act of retrieving information from research participants –i.e., "informing"- is also in question. For instance, how do researchers speak for others and how do they speak of particular places? (Appadurai, 1988). That is, postcolonial positions (Spivak specifically) problematize how 'the researcher', the actual writing of the research, and the audience for whom it is written, are implicated in the very research that is conducted and are, therefore, part of the process of identity formation (Khan, 2005; Lal, 1996). Below, I discuss how the study design I employed addresses the research question *and* these other concerns.

Study Design

The postcolonial frameworks I rely on share a common interest in the primacy of texts and language and thus allow me to make the argument that language constructs reality and is implicated in representing "knowledge". Yet, each of these postcolonial

theoretical positions engages with texts written by the West about the Rest through distinct analyses. These philosophical arguments translated into the material reality of data collection mean that I needed a study design allowing me to pay attention to language and text to examine how identity formation happens through hybridity/ mimicry, gender and subalternity, and historic power relations. Further, this meant that to study identity formation I had to pay attention not only to its textual construction in the participant's narratives but also my very implication in these processes. The design that enabled me to fulfill these aims was a combination of ethnography and auto-ethnography. I use ethnography loosely as a borrowed methodological tool from anthropology to engage in-depth fieldwork through participant observations, interviews, and collection of artifacts (i.e., physical objects from sites). Although postcolonial positions have a problematic relationship with ethnography as it was often the handmaiden of colonial rule (see P. Prasad, 2003) and assumed a universal notion of culture (see Sokefeld, 1999), I rely on methods available from more recent reflexive and critical ethnographic approaches, such as Clifford's (1992) in "Traveling Cultures", to examine identity formation as it occurs among encounters of different mobile people.

Yet ethnographic approaches focusing on mobility rather than fixed place are not sufficient in this case for, as my personal story that marks the beginning of this dissertation outlines, I am very much an interested participant in the research project. Thus guided by Spivak's theoretical concerns around this very issue, I take a reflexive stance that complicates the information retrieval function of ethnography; no longer could I simply report identity formation as the other's voice (identity) even if in mobile places (cultures) for, as researcher, I occupy a subject position parallel to and in

interaction with that of the other participants in this project. For this reason I took further recourse on auto-ethnography, "the study, representation, or knowledge of a culture by one or more of its members" (Buzard, 2003: 61), or ethnonarrative (Hansen, 2006). Both of these approaches refer to a reflexive practice of considering the researcher as part of the context both materially and textually. Auto-ethnography materializes as the intersections of researcher's voice, place, and privilege that need to be considered in contacts with participants (i.e., observations, interviews) and in the writing of the research (i.e., informing, reporting).

Based on this position, gaining access to the research sites and participants is part of the question of researcher involvement and needs to be addressed. It is the story of the researcher's identity formation as well as an entrance into the story of possible selves under globalization. To this effect, in the next section I discuss how I gained access to the various individuals, groups, organizations, and sites in the study. Following this, I then discuss the subjects, data collection methods, and data analysis techniques employed. Although these methodological discussions are part of the narratives I tell, I focus much more on my role as researcher-informant in chapter 7 as this is the chapter guided by Spivak's concerns over gender and reflexivity.

Gaining Access: Entering the Field

I limited the dissertation to an examination of high-tech entrepreneurs in the United States and Turkey. Since the high-tech sector is associated with modernization, innovation, and Western-ness, high-tech entrepreneurs were a good test case to examine relational identity formation from postcolonial perspectives: were these entrepreneurs totally Westernized? Given the expected role of high-tech entrepreneurs in "developing

and commercializing technologies worldwide" (Kropp and Zolin, 2005: 1), was there convergence towards US modeling of their international high-tech entrepreneurial business activities? In other words, was there mimicry? What else could have been going when Turkish entrepreneurs became involved in a field what was considered the domain of the West and the Westerner? Furthermore, by keeping the study focused on the high-tech sector, I can claim to have examined the same segment of entrepreneurs within each country.

To accomplish these various inquiries into identity formation, from 2005 to 2008, I attended annual high-tech business conferences in the Silicon Valley area and a similar conference in Antalya, Turkey. I learned about the conference that ultimately became the first data collection sites for my dissertation upon receiving an email from a Turkish community listserv in 2005 discussing an upcoming high-tech conference in Silicon Valley. The fieldwork for the dissertation began in the following conference, "Bridging Silicon Valley and Turkey," that took place at the Stanford University Schwab Residential Center in Palo Alto, California on May 21, 2005. The conference was organized by the Turkish American Business Connection (TABC) Association in Santa Clara, CA, Stanford Turkish Student Association, and the Stanford Graduate School of Business High Tech Club. I attended the conference as a participant after contacting members of TABC about my dissertation interests. They forwarded me the names and emails of three entrepreneurs who wanted to speak to me during the conference. The conference aimed to bring together high-tech Turkish entrepreneurs to network and discuss investment opportunities in Turkey.

My initial contact was with Baris[i] an entrepreneur with whom I had exchanged emails regarding his participation in my study prior to arriving in California. He told me to call him once I arrived in Palo Alto, CA on May 20, 2005. Upon doing so, he invited me to a pre-conference gathering held at the hotel I was staying at for the duration of the conference. I found out that this gathering was for TABC members and conference speakers and organizers only. He introduced me to members of TABC including the president of the organization. Once I told the president of TABC that I had emailed them in the previous months about my dissertation project, he welcomed me to the gathering and started to introduce me to all the Turkish entrepreneurs as well as other TABC members who had come to this pre-conference social. The president of TABC at the time, Kemal, was also one of the three entrepreneurs who agreed to be interviewed at the time. The third entrepreneur, Hakan, said he had a business meeting and would be out of town during the conference. However, he agreed to be interviewed later on if I came back to the area to carry out the rest of my project.

The next day, I attended the conference from 8 AM to 9 PM, including welcome speeches by the Los Angeles Consulate General of Turkey, the president of TABC, and the chairman of the board of Cisco systems. The conference ran two parallel tracks of panel discussions including "Turkish technology sector and opportunities" and "Entrepreneurship and high-tech ventures." I attended all the discussions and presentations in the second track, "Entrepreneurship and high-tech ventures." I chose this track based on my dissertation focus on high-tech and the related discourse around modernization and Western-ness. All the presentations and discussions were carried out in English although there were some Turkish phrases/ sayings that were used

intermittently to make certain points. During the conference there were several breaks which gave me the opportunity to have conversations with other conference attendees and to expand my contacts.

During the cocktail hour and networking session at the end of the conference, I was invited to a post-conference barbeque to be held the next day (Sunday, May 22nd, 2005) at the house of one of the TABC members, Cem (also an entrepreneur). During this time, I met members of TABC that I didn't have the opportunity to meet at the conference. In addition, I was able to schedule an interview with Cem upon my return to the area and to obtain the names of other Turkish high-tech entrepreneurs who would be in the area at that point. During and after the conference, I made additional contacts with several other members of this entrepreneurial community for possible participation in my fieldwork.

I came back to the Silicon Valley area from July to October 2005 to carry out further preliminary interviews, and through these I gained access to still other Turkish high-tech entrepreneurs in that area. I also attended First Thursdays, which were free, informal meetings where individuals got together to discuss social and cultural events affecting the Turkish and Turkish-American community. The conferences, in contrast, were formal gatherings (i.e., had to pay to attend) with sponsors, high-profile Turkish entrepreneurs, and Turkish politicians. Further, I went to Turkey from November 2005 to January 2006, and established links with high-tech entrepreneurs there based on contacts provided by my interviewees in Silicon Valley as well as other links obtained through a member of my dissertation committee at the School of Management at Sabanci University in Istanbul, Turkey.

This initial access and consequent returns to conferences put together by the TABC in 2006 (Turkey's Role in the Global High Technology Market) and 2007 (Financing our High-Tech Future: Investments in Turkey) as well as email communications throughout the course of the dissertation allowed me to become part of the conference over the several years of data collection. I became a participant observer, for instance, as members asked my advice about what they should present for topics rather than treating me a guest as I was initially seen in 2005 (I discuss these events further in chapter 7). In addition to attending the conferences in the Silicon Valley area put together annually by TABC, I attended the Turkish high-tech sector conference in January 2008 in Antalya, Turkey put together by Sinerjiturk. I learned about this conference through the TABC website.

Data Collection Method and Sites

During the fieldwork, I carried out participant observations, self-observations, and interviews and collected various material artifacts (i.e., books, pamphlets, videos, Powerpoint presentations) at various empirical sites in the United States and Turkey. Since each of the postcolonial frameworks values language and text, I focused on discourse (language in use and in texts) during the data collection in order to understand how identity formation takes place through different narratives. Specifically, in order to study identity formation at the level of hybridity and mimicry (culturally-based meanings), I focused on the empirical sites themselves as allowing particular narratives of identity formation to take place. Next, to study identity formation at the level of historic power relations between nations, I examined economic and political historic events/ relations between the United States and Turkey. I observed participant behaviors

and material practices during the interviews, conferences, and get-togethers- e.g., the First Thursdays. (See Table 5 for summary of data collection sites).

Data

As part of the fieldwork, I collected data in the following empirical sites depending on which postcolonial lens I was utilizing: interviews, conversations, participant observations, websites, and conference materials (artifacts) including presentations, handouts, and any other text materials. The interviews took place one-on-one while conversations took place either one-on-one or with me participating in small group (three to four people) discussions. Participant observations took place at the pre and post conference social gatherings, during the conferences, and at First Thursdays. Text data was obtained during the conferences through field notes, presentations, handouts, and by examining the TABC, Sinerjiturk and entrepreneurs own corporate websites (if available).

During the interviews I carried out, I chose to use open ended questions such as "Can you tell me about yourself?" in order to focus on how entrepreneurs decided to go into the business they did and become entrepreneurs. Follow up questions focused on how entrepreneurs came to identify themselves as entrepreneurs and as business people, how they thought of themselves as 'Turkish' entrepreneurs in light of the context of the U.S. and Turkey. I chose to focus on such open ended questions followed by more specific ones based on each of the distinct postcolonial lenses and the different contribution each made to understanding identity formation in the context of the U.S. and Turkey. By utilizing different methods depending on the postcolonial position, the act of producing data becomes inextricably linked to the theoretical assumptions guiding my

fieldwork. Thus, what I pay attention to and how I pay attention to it in terms of what becomes called data can be properly called the "politics of evidence" (Denzin and Giardina, 2008). It's questions such as "for whom do 'we' produce knowledge?" and "what are the consequences of such claims of knowledge?" arriving out of postcolonial concerns that sets apart postcolonial fieldwork as a political project from being simply a *qualitative* approach to fieldwork. With these concerns in mind and as part of the research process, a summary of data collected during the fieldwork is presented in Table 6.

Research Participants: Interviewees and Conference and Meeting Attendees

Research participants in this study can be separated into two kinds: those that participated in one-on-one interview and those that I observed during ethnographic fieldwork at conferences and meetings. For the one-on-one interviews, I interviewed a total of fifteen individuals that I had contacted either directly during the conferences or through contacts I established at the conferences and meetings. All fifteen participants interviewed during the study identified themselves as entrepreneurs in the high-tech sector and as Turkish or Turkish-American when I initially asked them (either in person or via email) whether they would participate in my study. During my fieldwork in the U.S. from July 2005 to October 2005, I carried out interviews with eight male Turkish high-tech entrepreneurs. The one-on-one interviews allowed me to collect textual data and make ethnographic observations during moments of encounters while participants that attended the conferences and meetings could be observed using ethnographic field methods. Such observations allowed me to examine encounters among different people as I became embedded in the research process. See Table 7 for a summary of participants

and types of data gathered through each participant encounters.

Data Analysis

In order to address the shared textual concerns of the postcolonial positions and to pay attention to their distinct approaches framing my argument, I utilize narrative analysis, as this type of analysis allows me to speak to the theoretical arguments I raise in regards to subjectivity/ identity formation. If identity formation is positioned as a discursive process whereby identities are formed through language and the stories people tell about themselves, then narrative analysis would allow me to analyze this process. As such, narratives do not await discovery by researchers but are co-created among participants and researchers out of oral renditions when people tell stories about their experiences (i.e., through interviews, conversations, speeches) and tell stories about events (see Riessman, 2007 for overview of narrative approaches).

I took the following steps in order to uncover identity formation processes. First, all audio recordings were transcribed into text format in the original language of the interview. In addition, field notes based on conversations and behaviors and practices that I observed during participant observation, as well as materials from websites and conference proceedings (such as Powerpoints and handouts) were all recorded down on paper and thus turned into written texts that could be read and analyzed.

One important issue here is whether selves, ideas, concepts, and practices articulated through one language can be translated or made sense in another as postcolonial frameworks foreground the limits and at times impossibility of cultural translations and epistemological impositions. Nonetheless, translations were still necessary when using direct quotes given that not all the dissertation committee members

speak Turkish. Despite the fact that when I used them they were verified by the dissertation committee member who is a native Turkish speaker, part of the methodological concern in this study is *how* to translate and whether such translations (i.e., conceptual equivalence) are possible despite the researcher's claims to be able to translate. Based on postcolonial frameworks, translation is not merely a methodological issue but a concern over researcher reflexivity and subaltern agency. Whose interpretation is valid? Whose voices have a say when "the native speaker" can no longer speak as a native?

With these concerns in mind, in the following chapters, I discuss how of the postcolonial lenses allowed me to see particular aspects of identity formation processes through narratives. The chapters are organized in the following way. In chapter 5, I present data analysis based on Bhabha's lens and discuss the emergence of hybrid selves. In chapter 6, I move onto Said's framework to outline how historic power relations are relevant to understanding the context of identity formation and globalization. Finally, in chapter 7, I rely on Spivak's lens and discuss how identity formation takes place through gendering and subalternizing discourses while discussing my role as 'native' informant. In the final chapter, I bring together each of these distinct contributions to articulate an approach to the study of identities and globalization made possible by postcolonial frameworks. I contrast this approach with existing assumptions and approaches to theory and research in the extant IM literature and discuss how postcolonial insights can offer movement beyond the current impasse of producing management knowledge for the Rest of world without hearing what the Rest of world has to say.

CHAPTER 5

EMERGING HYBRID SELVES OF TURKISH HIGH-TECH ENTREPRENEURS: THE STRUGGLE FOR SELF AND TECHNOLOGY

In this chapter, I engage with the general research question, "How do international entrepreneurs in the context of globalization form their identities?" by relying on Homi Bhabha's theoretical concerns on the formation of the self and hybridity. I discuss how various hybrid selves emerged during the course of the interviews and at the distinct sites of fieldwork. I describe three different hybrid selves that emerged in the Silicon Valley context and discuss the emergence of these hybrids in relation to those that formed in the context of Turkey. Next, I discuss how the sites of ethnographic fieldwork, such as the interviews and conferences, themselves enabled distinct hybrid understandings of the self, of technology, and of entrepreneurship to emerge. Finally, I discuss how resistance to mimicry of Western hegemonic concepts of technology and of the high-tech entrepreneur appeared in the contexts of hybrid identity formation.

One of the guiding arguments I've been making in this dissertation is that the fully formed psychological self is the foundation of the international management literature focusing on individuals and groups, including the international entrepreneur field. In contrast to the fully formed psychological self that inhabits the IM field, the postcolonial lens of Bhabha offers hybridity as a means of interrupting these conceptualizations voicing the Other as an immobility fixed in a particular culture/ place. That is, when the 'entrepreneur' concept is used to examine and compare 'entrepreneurs' particularly in terms of nationality as a proxy for culture, an 'immigrant' or 'ethnic' entrepreneur materializes in the text. Effectively, this conventional approach to the study

of people under globalization does not afford them agency or allow for an examination of relational connections to multiple places individuals may have, for people are thought to speak for and from only a particular place/ culture. For instance, in the IM literature, the assumption is that a person identified as a Turk speaks from/ of Turkey. Instead, I point out that identity and culture (voice and place) are not necessarily unitary but rather intersectional and relational concepts, which are never settled. To this end, I demonstrate how people speak about themselves and narrate their experiences of being Turkish or Turkish-American entrepreneurs through notions of place and dis-place, allowing for distinct hybrid selves to come into formation. Specifically, the production of mobile hybrid selves occurs as people tell stories based on their physical movements across nations, places, and contexts.

In the sections below, I discuss how narratives of identity formation take place differently in different contexts and are not place or culture-bound. Through Bhabha's work, I illustrate the possibility of understanding one "self" in terms that are not based on pure cultural notions of identity (e.g., as Turkish or as American) or that link identity (voice) to a particular culture (place) as is the case in the dominant international management and entrepreneurship fields. For this purpose, I rely on Bhabha's notion of the hybrid as a doubly-significant act of recovering a self that is colonized by a homogenizing lens *and* as a way of resisting mimetic impositions of ideas (including those about self) upon the colonized.

I accomplish this through a close reading of texts that were produced during my fieldwork. The focus of my analysis are the one-on-one interviews I conducted with high-tech entrepreneurs in the U.S. and Turkey as well as the observations from the high-tech

conferences I attended from 2005 to 2008 in Northern California (TABCON) and Turkey (Sinerjiturk) as described in the previous chapter.

Location, Location, Location: Being Turkish-American, Sometimes

During the ethnographic fieldwork in the U.S., all the interviews, conferences, and First Thursdays took place across several cities, such as Palo Alto, San Jose, Santa Clara, Milpitas, and San Francisco, which are better known collectively as Silicon Valley. Thus, the location or context for the fieldwork is significant in that the stories articulated were done so in a context that occupied a privileged place in the global economy as a '*the* place for high-tech and innovation.' The participants I spoke with during the fieldwork as well as conference attendees who identified themselves as Turkish or Turkish-American had entered this place through immigration. The stories of 'coming over' and 'making it in the Valley' as told during the conferences and interviews narrated a self that at times struggled with the label 'immigrant' or 'Turk' affixed to them. Thus, individuals' narratives were contextually sensitive and made sense based on localized experiences. In effect, there were several different ways in which the formation of different hybrid selves based on narratives of being Turkish-American occurred. I identified them as narratives of "and", narratives of "shifting selves" and narratives of "no return."

And

A group of entrepreneurs narrated themselves as Turkish-American by describing themselves as Turkish *and* American in Silicon Valley. This was expressed in the following ways:

> **Kemal:** So I'm the head of this organization, it means I'm trying to gather Turkish…American professionals which are still not connected and try to connect them in a common

> platform where they can exchange information or support each other and become better at the things they are doing
> **BOP:** why Turkish-American?
> **Kemal:** why Turkish-American? Coz that's just the segment? And I'm a Turkish-American, I'm not an American, I'm not, I don't have citizenship in the country but I've been here long enough to consider myself Turkish-American, and plus the name sounds misleading too, it's Turkish *and* American so there's dash in between

For this entrepreneur, *and* meant knowing the business practices and concepts in Silicon Valley and in Turkey, such as knowing to talk over tea or coffee prior to a business meeting. For instance, when I asked about business values in Silicon Valley and in Turkey:

> **Kemal:** yani is degerleri olarak bakmiyim simdi, is degil kulterel degerlere bakiyorum cunku su insanlar en ufagindan 'ooooh' Turkiyede cay icme konusu ise gittigim zaman bir yerde abi cay ikram edelim kahve ikram edelim Amerikada oluyorda boyle bir geleneksel degil Turkiyedeki gibi bir routine halinde bir process halinde degil mesala hayir kardesim ben cay icmeyecegim bana gore is konusalim benim vaktimi alma dedigin zaman cok buyuk bir kabalik (well, I don't want to consider business values but let me consider cultural values because people, when you go to Turkey for business, people say 'ooooh' the tea time issue, when you go somewhere for business, someone will say, sir, can we offer you some tea, some coffee? This happens in America as well but it's not tradition, it isn't a routine, or a process like it is in Turkey. If you say, no thanks, I don't want any tea, I think we should talk business, don't take up my time, if you say this, it's very shameful, it's very rude)

For this entrepreneur, being Turkish and American was not necessarily a matter of citizenship but entering a space that was denied to him politically as a result of being on a sponsored visa and denied to him culturally as a result of being labeled a Turk. Thus, he was entering this space through the discourse of business values or knowing how to do business in the Valley as a way to claim an identity that was not legally his—an identity

that was reserved for those who belong to the U.S. as a citizen and for those who are legitimate owners of the space 'immigrant' (to the U.S.). Rather than being the 'Turk', an identity that was ascribed to him in the Valley and a position he felt immobilized him, he created a hybrid way of being necessitated by the context he was in. Consequently, the hybrid self which emerged through 'knowing the business practices' allowed him to participate in Silicon Valley culturally and legally as an entrepreneur.

In a similar fashion to the above example, hybrid selves that utilized the metaphor of *and* emerged in the Silicon Valley location in relation to being 'foreign born.' In the following passage, this entrepreneur describes who he hired in Silicon Valley in order to produce products for the U.S. market:

> **Selim:** And these guys were just like myself, you know. They're tuned into culture here, what's going on. When I say culture, it's, you know, lifestyle, music, art, movies, everything, you know. They're aware of all of these things and not as a witness or, you know, they're not keeping statistic about what's happening around their life. They're living it, also. They're a part of it. So that's what I mean, you know, culturally adaptive, you know. They're like a Turkish American, you know. They're very much adapted here because our job, what we produce, we have to impress masses and you couldn't come here with a subculture and try to, you know, fulfill their needs, so you have to be—active part. Yeah, active part. You have to be active part but the subculture, I don't think you can do that.
> **BOP:** And what would be the subculture then?
> **Selim:** Not really being part of it, you know, know about it but, you know, kinda you don't feel it internally and when you don't feel it, you couldn't produce something for – you know, suitable for the bigger mass. You always fulfill what has been expected from you. Physical labor better for those kinds of people.

Thus, the hybrid self emerging as a Turkish *and* American identity was based on trying to interrupt the stabilizing effect of being labeled as foreign. For Selim, being

foreign was equated with being on the outside as he suggests, “I even didn’t have any desire to be part of Turkish or minority community, just wanted to do what I wanted to do.” The story is complicated and thus reveals the complexity of identity formation under globalization: Selim is actively trying to narrate himself as someone who does not speak for being Turkish. He’s actively participating in the production of goods for the larger U.S. market as an entrepreneur. A position he accomplished through ‘knowing’ the U.S. market and a position which is so precarious that he feels it would be compromised if he were identified with a subculture: a Turkish immigrant who cannot ‘know’ based on the very fact of being an immigrant. The hybrid self in this case emerged out of a need to position oneself as both a Turk/ foreigner and as an American/ part of U.S. masses in order to call oneself a successful entrepreneur in Silicon Valley.

Yet, there is more to this story. This entrepreneur also positioned himself as a Turk in the TABCON conference despite the fact that his family had immigrated to Turkey from Bosnia—in effect, he claimed to be Turk based on an understanding of people and of family that stood in direct opposition to what he considered an American notion of people and family. Simultaneously, he claimed to be a foreigner, a Turk in the U.S. while also being an active part of the U.S. “masses” rather than part of any minority community.

In fact, Selim is a good example of the intersections of identity and culture that occur by denying the label of immigrant. This label would only allow Selim to occupy an identity who is by definition not related to or part of the broader U.S. society but considered apart from it. In effect, by being labeled an immigrant, Selim would occupy a particular place/ culture (i.e., Turkey) in the U.S. while simultaneously being denied the

epistemological authority to be an American. Thus, what Selim accomplishes is to narrate a self that was Turkish for the purpose of participating in the study and not Turkish for the purpose of being an entrepreneur in Silicon Valley. He created a cleaner hybrid identity through *and* by bridging all the other ambiguities of his complicated story. His example demonstrates how individuals can actively resist occupying a specific identity in order to have a legitimate voice in the particular relational context in which they are embedded.

These examples highlight different ways in which Turkish *and* American identities form, showing that Turkish-American identities are neither unitary hybrids nor do they always emerge under the same presuppositions. Yet, these examples are not sufficient to fully demonstrate the complexity, instability, and unpredictability of hybrid identity formation, as shown in the next stories.

Shifting selves

What I label "shifting selves" are oscillations between Turkishness and Americanness as defined by shifting notions of place and context. This can be seen through the following example,

> **Ismail:** there was so much that both countries have given you that at some point, maybe I would identify myself as Turkish-American with the emphasis on the Turkish side. But depends on where I am. Here in the U.S., I'm Turkish-American and overseas, everybody knows that I'm from Turkey. But they look at me as American, not as Turkish.
> **BOP:** How about in Turkey would you say you're Amerikali Turk (the American Turk)? Or how would you?
> **Ismail:** Except when I'm with my mother. People also look at me, too, except few friends that still have that they may still see me as I was rather than Amerikali Turk (the American Turk).
> **BOP:** But not your mother?
> **Ismail:** Yeah, she doesn't want to see it any other way.

BOP: Just the Turk?
Ismail: Yeah.

Thus, a hybrid self comes into formation through the specificities of place and context. By place, I'm referring to the position from which Ismail speaks: he speaks about himself as a Turk, as a Turkish-American, or as an Amerikali Turk (the American Turk) in light of the position he's occupying as entrepreneur in Silicon Valley, as son in Turkey, as friend in Turkey, and as a global business traveler (Ismail had been going to Taiwan to source semiconductors since becoming senior VP of manufacturing and business operations in 2003). This gets further complicated in the following examples from Turkey, where hybrid identity formation demonstrate the instability of narratives about culture and nation.

No return

In Turkey, I interviewed seven entrepreneurs and two of these entrepreneurs had dual citizenship: U.S. and Turkey. These two entrepreneurs, one male and one female, had spent a number of years working and living in the U.S. and identified themselves as Turkish-American. Then, for different reasons, they had each moved to Turkey to work in start-ups or start their own company. Their examples demonstrate the complex processes of identity formation as individuals speak from position of mobility in the context of globalization. This complexity and movement came into play as I interviewed these entrepreneurs in Turkey as part of the 'Turkish' group of entrepreneurs expecting to hear their stories of 'return'. However, their narratives told the story of a much different self, a self that emerged as an American expat living overseas. Both these entrepreneurs were resisting the label of Turks who had 'gone back' to Turkey and who were now 'speaking back' from Turkey. Rather, their experiences demonstrate the problematic

notion of 'going back' as this concept assumes an ahistorical and static approach to the study of identity formation.

If people are conceptualized as coming from and going back to a particular culture, then one assumes that people and cultures are stable over time. This is one of guiding assumptions of the existing IM literature when psychological and cultural dimensions are seen as stable over time and thus allowing for comparing and differentiating people across these dimensions. Yet, the notion of hybridity complicates these very ideas. Hybridity interrupts the link between time and place and allows for a complicated notion of self to emerge that is not the history of a self existing across different points in time. The interruption of this link can be seen in the following examples:

> **Murat:** I went to the U.S. when I was a child with my parents. So I got educated there, UC Berkeley to get an engineering degree. And I've been in the States since 1970. And worked at a bunch of chip companies in Silicon Valley ranging from Philips to National Semiconductor and then Analog Devices; and then finally a startup over there…And then we had always been thinking about doing something in Turkey. My wife really likes Istanbul; which is when we first got married, but we lived in Hong Kong for three years. So we've really enjoyed that so we wanted to relive that experience again.

And similarly:

> **BOP:** how would you identify yourself?
> **Semra:** Well, that's a tough question. If I wanted that – because I lived 25 years in the U.S. – when I went to U.S., I was 24, 25 years old, and then I lived 25 years there, so my life is almost – well, now considering I'm two more years, maybe I'm more Turkish now. It's sort of my adulthood, raising my child, enjoying income, having a career, building a career. Everything happened there, so the real enjoyment of life and learning to be a citizen, voting, understanding politics, and everything else as an adult

> happened there, so the aspect of – and I'm an American citizen, that is very American, and that will stay as it is, but there's also the cultural aspect. Being born here, raised by a Turkish family, learning my first language in Turkish, the culture, the religion, all the aspects of my upbringing, that brings that Turkish in me, so I have both identities, and can identify with both of them. I go to the U.S., I am the perfect U.S. citizen. I come here, and I'm almost perfect Turkish citizen…the company I'm in actually is very different than the rest of Turkey. We're like a little America here. It's an adventure.

As Bhabha's framework points out, the hybrid self forms out of different conditions and in the examples provided here, the discourses available for understanding oneself change when moving from the U.S. to Turkey. Despite their claims to be Turkish-Americans, these individuals narrate a self that does not quite fit in when in Turkey, nor can they narrate themselves as being Americans-abroad. Hybridity thus highlights the impossiblity of a pure cultural identity and the limits of theorizing such a self. The hybrid self cannot claim a cultural home or a secure epistemological place to speak from; it is fragmented and stands in stark contrast to the stable notions of self and identity present in the IM literature. The hybrid self offers no truth but rather makes conceptualizing individuals as products of a specific cultural community impossible, if such cultural communities are assumed to have no or little contact with others and are seen as stable repositories of identity and culture over time.

Altogether, the examples in this section demonstrate Bhabha's argument that the hybrid is not simply a sum of different parts but a political project working to interrupt hegemonic notions of unitary culture that are assigned to people. In these cases, various hybrid selves emerged out of different necessitating circumstances and contexts, and worked to speak back to those labels imposed on each individual as they entered and

exited the United States. In contrast to the fully formed selves from the extant IM literatures, where these individuals would have been assigned an identity of Turkish or American based on nationality, the hybridity lens allows individuals to narrate much more complex intersections of voice and place under conditions of globalization.

Sites as Intersections of Voice and Place: Emergent Hybridities

In this section, I focus specifically on two main research sites to demonstrate how the intersections of voice and place also occur in a broader context of interactions and encounters among different people: the TABCON conferences and the Sinerjiturk conference. I read these sites as narratives in which hybridity happens. In other words, sites of encounter are by themselves already bringing a different kind of context related to identity formation. Thus, the guiding question here is, How do a whole set of people, who are in theory all Turkish, occupy an assumed common space? How does identity formation happen here? Rather than being inert contexts for identity formation, I conceptualize the sites as producing particular ways in which individuals narrate themselves. Specifically, by focusing on the sites, I can examine that group of individuals who are occupying a space reserved for "the wonders of the colonizer": the high-technology sector.

Both the TABCON and Sinerjiturk conferences (2005-2008), were attended mostly by Turks. To reiterate, high-technology sector is associated with the West, with creativity, with innovation, and with wealth. Thus, here were a number of Turks gathering in that space in an attempt to be considered successful globally in the high-technology sector. The privileged space occupied by the West can be seen in the various conference themes that were put together: TABCON 2005—Bridging Silicon Valley and

Turkey, TABCON 2006—Financing Our High-technology Future: Investments in Turkey, TABCON 2007—Turkey's Role in the Global High Technology Market, and Sinerjiturk 2008—Turkey in the Global Communication Sector.

The expectation at these conferences was for attendees to become high-technology entrepreneurs in the model of "the colonizer", yet that's not exactly what was happening. Rather, a whole host of other things were happening, not just in terms of personhood but in terms of ideas and activities. In effect, hybridization was occurring not only at the level of identity formation (as I previously described) but also in the very concepts and material practices undertaken to mimic the West.

For example, the TABCON conferences from 2005 to 2007 took place in Palo Alto, Berkeley, and San Jose respectively, and were repeatedly referred to as happening in the heart of Silicon Valley. Silicon Valley in this case was a space reserved for being the global center of innovation and high-technology creativity and production (Hakan: all the innovation comes from here). Yet despite being in Silicon Valley, the Turkish entrepreneurs were still considered outside of it as evidenced by speakers that were brought in to uncover and educate the audience about the possibilities of Turkish-American success in Silicon Valley. Just by living and working in Silicon Valley, one does not become part of it, and thus it was necessary to invite speakers who spoke about achieving success or entering a space that was not available to them. These speakers were brought in each year and the stories were similar in terms of making it in Silicon Valley despite being a foreigner and having very little money.

"Making it" meant that they had been involved in multiple-start ups, some of which had failed, but nonetheless they continued being part of start ups. Thus these

success stories were in effect stories of having 'arrived' in Silicon Valley, of having arrived at that space, and the conferences themselves symbolized their arrival at high-technology. In effect, the conferences were a declaration of 'we are here and we are staying' which was made possible through discursive practices such as announcing the conference in Turkish media outlets, having Turkish sponsors for the event, and extending invitations to CEOs of high-technology firms to come speak at these 'annual' conferences. As such, the conference symbolized a success in Silicon Valley *and* in Turkey through knowing how to tell the story of success in each space.

In a similar fashion, at the Sinerjiturk conference in Turkey success stories were articulated by Turks having start-up companies in the high-technology sector in China, South Korea, Canada, and the U.S. Thus, this conference as a site of encounter intended to show how 'like the West' Turks were but the success stories that were necessary in this context were much more international: they were not only about succeeding in the U.S. but about succeeding in China and South Korea. In effect, this was a much more global conference about the high-technology sector and provincialized the conferences taking place in Silicon Valley. If the conferences in Silicon Valley were symbolic of having arrived at high-technology just in the U.S., the Sinerjiturk conference symbolized an arrival at high-technology globally. Thus, despite similarities in terms of success stories in each site, there was a distinction in why such stories were necessary and how they emerged.

An example of this distinction can be seen in the case of Murat, one of the entrepreneurs I interviewed in Turkey. As already described, Murat identified himself as more on the American side of Turkish-American and had come to Turkey from Silicon

Valley to start a company. He was brought in as a success story speaker both at the TABCON 2006 conference and at the Sinerjiturk 2008 conference. In Silicon Valley, he spoke about his company in Turkey and thus represented the possibility that high-technology entrepreneurship could be done successfully in Turkey. In effect, his story was unique in signifying the possibility of doing high-technology in Turkey. Meanwhile, during the Sinerjiturk conference in Turkey, he was part of a panel entitled Ufuk Cizgileri—Vizyonerler (The Horizon—Visionaries), which was populated by heads of start ups in Turkey. In effect, he was part of the crowd and his story was one of many. Thus, Murat was brought to both conferences but each site allowed for a distinct hybrid to emerge in terms of identities and ideas legitimizing the Turkish high-technology sector. At the conference in Silicon Valley he was the Turk who succeeded in Turkey and this gave him legitimacy to speak in Silicon Valley about high-technology in Turkey; at the conference in Turkey he was the Turk who succeeded overseas and thus this gave him legitimacy to speak in Turkey about high-technology in Turkey. Depending on which place he occupied, Murat had a different kind of legitimate identity to talk about high-technology in Turkey because he was seen as a different Turk in each place.

Hybridity enabled individuals to enter spaces that were denied them by the colonizing discourse of the Western high-technology sector and, further, each conference produced particular entrepreneurship narratives for nations that were also trying to enter this denied space. However, these were contradictory narratives in that in Silicon Valley, despite the intentions of the TABCON conferences to produce entrepreneurs through inspiration, learning and networking, the easiness of Turkish presence may have served as obstacles for Turkish “know-how” to enter this space. In contrast, the Turkish

conference produced narratives of Turkey as a knowledgeable entrepreneurial nation such that Turks were able to enter a global space bringing other nations along with them..

To clarify, the narrative of high-technology entrepreneurship in Silicon Valley is that of an ordinary occurrence and practice as everyone can access it and afford to participate in it, as exemplified by the relative low cost of sponsorship options, which ranged from $1,000 to $10,000. The conferences were attempting to portray Turks and Turkey as capable of participating in the high-technology sector in a place where conferences, and high-technology entrepreneurs were seen as ordinary (Selim: here, I'm one of the crowds!). Being a Turkish high-technology entrepreneur here signified success by the very use of the word Turkish, as these individuals had overcome obstacles related to being foreign (Ismail: I had hundred dollar in my pocket; Cem: A beard makes you look suspicious and affects how people trust you…being a foreigner, having an accent was tough).

Yet rather than produce space for practicing high-technology entrepreneurship based on Turkish knowledge, the conferences were essentially (re)establishing the cultural authority of Silicon Valley through mimetic imposition of ideas on attendees. The 'ordinariness of innovation' was possible based on the extraordinary venture capital resources, highly-trained labor infrastructure, and 24/ 7 outsourced global production cycle of Silicon Valley. Yet these very notions are the colonizing ideas and practices of Silicon Valley that do not allow space for alternative ways to participate in the knowledge and innovation creation processes. Moreover, they do not allow room for other nations, such as Turkey, to enter the conversation as knowledgeable about high-technology since these very local/ Silicon Valley practices are thought to be *the* global

way to produce innovation.

In Turkey, a very different series of ideas emerged as Turkey became narrated as an entrepreneurial nation. To be specific, the Sinerjiturk conference lasted three days and the attendance fee included hotel accommodations. The least expensive sponsorship option was 6,000 Euro or $9,420 while the most expensive sponsorship package was 35,000 Euro, or about $55,000 (based on Euro/ dollar exchange rates at the time). In contrast to the Silicon Valley conferences, where high-technology was narrated as an everyday occurrence, high-technology in Turkey was seen as an elite sector in that the conference had prohibitive attendance fees and was attended mostly by government representatives and NGO officials, CEOs, boards of directors, and upper level managers. Within this context, Turkish high-technology entrepreneurs were seen as part of the elite global high-technology space. Along with this, Turkey was seen as playing a role in the global high-technology sector (Levent: gun gectikce daha da agirlasan kuresel rekabet ortaminda ulkemizi gelismis ulkeler arasinda saygin bir konuma ulastirmak ici elbirligi, guc birligi yapmamiz gerekmektedir—in the context of increasing global competition, we have to work together in order to bring our country to a respectable level matching that of other developed countries).

In the Sinerjiturk conference, entrepreneurship signified a way to join this elite sector and be like the West although the kinds of people and ideas being produced at the Turkish site was anything like the West. The site itself was part of the exchange of ideas and practices from different part of the world, resulting in hybrid identities of who can be a high-technology entrepreneur. The acknowledgement of hybridity in this sense allowed the Turkish site to produce narratives of high-technology entrepreneurship by giving

voice to those whose experiences in high-technology in the Rest of the world were seen as valuable. Meanwhile, the TABCON conferences reproduced local (U.S.) narratives in an attempt to impose "global" cultural authority about high-technology entrepreneurship by virtue of their location: Silicon Valley. In other words, Silicon Valley (as a place) is a way to speak for high-technology entrepreneurship which prohibits the linking of voice (speaking for high-technology) with another place (for example, Turkey). Yet, these epistemological impositions do not go unchallenged. Bhabha's framework allows my analyses to show agency to refuse the Westerner's gaze and resist mimetic impositions about the meaning of high-technology in the relational formation of "high-tech" identities throughout both sites.

Resistance and Refusal: The Fight over High-Technology

Over the course of the fieldwork, I witnessed the emergence of hybridities through symbolic fights over who creates technology and who uses it. The very production of hybrid identities were political recovery projects as individuals were trying to voice themselves as knowledgeable. I already discussed how individuals resisted particular identities assigned to them through epistemological labels, such as immigrant, and rearticulated themselves in terms reserved for the West (i.e., innovative, high-technology producers). In effect, I outlined how Turkish entrepreneurs voiced a high-technology self as a way to interrupt the cultural authority of the West as the only voice and place of high-technology.

In the U.S., Turkish entrepreneurs felt they could occupy this space, a space they felt had been denied to them based on being immigrants, through a combination of acts: by getting the right education, holding the right to patents, and starting one's own

technology company. Once these acts came together, then as an individual, you were considered a high-technology entrepreneur. Yet, why was being a high-technology entrepreneur so coveted? Why was it so important? And what did being a high-technology entrepreneur mean? The meaning of high-technology entrepreneurship took multiple forms and clearly meant different things to different entrepreneurs.

For some Turkish-American entrepreneurs, it meant not being part of subculture (Selim: subculture fulfills what's been expected of you as a minority), a subculture that was identified with physical labor rather than entrepreneurial creativity. Being a high-technology entrepreneur was a way to resist the label of minority and thus be able to speak about coming to the U.S. on one's own terms: coming to America as an entrepreneur rather than a Turkish immigrant. For others, it meant occupying the space of the colonizer on one's own terms.

For example, for Tamer, Silicon Valley was a place he imagined based on what he heard on the Voice of America radio in Turkey. For him, Silicon Valley was a place for inventions, dreams, sciences, and education. By coming to Silicon Valley, getting his PhD, starting his own company and having patents, he was occupying space that only existed in his imagination. Yet, interestingly after becoming a U.S. citizen, he decided to identify himself as an immigrant.

> **Tamer:** I was…a student chasing, you know, an exciting field, but now eventually, I see myself as an immigrant, although I'm a U.S. citizen…I think immigrant means that the only reason why we stay in this country is because of our skills, I mean all the wealth we build is solely due to us. I mean we never brought any penny with us from friends and family. So those are excellent characteristics [like] the pioneers who came to America and started a company.

In effect, he equates being an immigrant with being a pioneer: a discourse that is

the foundation of American notions of nationhood. The immigrant self then emerges as a way to join this nationhood on one's own terms as opposed to being told as immigrant you're an outsider. In this case immigrant means insider, it means pioneer, and it means entering a space that was imagined many years ago in another country.

For others, being a high-technology entrepreneur meant that you were differentiated from other businessmen. For instance:

> **Cem:** Well, I'm a hard-working, honest businessman right now but it changed, really [I'm] a technologist. I think that's a new breed of businessman. Just to explain what I mean by that, it changed from 20 years ago from businessman being a club, mostly coming out of Harvard Business School or other business schools. It changed from that to really technologists, people who have been engineers or built technologies in the past became businessman. So I'm part of that. I fit that description. I think there's been significant cross change in that respect. When you go look at some of the brick and mortar businesses in U.S., you still see that club. But that mentality, you have someone who is the GM of Nabisco or the CEO of Nabisco becomes CEO of GE, for example, that mentality has changed significantly recently. I do have an MBA as well but really I'm an engineer but I'm a businessman.

For Cem, high-technology entrepreneur means you're unique and not interchangeable. Thus being a technologist, as he calls it, is a way to accomplish distinction between businessmen and technologists and allows him to be a foreigner in Silicon Valley in a form that is acceptable.

In Turkey, by contrast, individuals engaged in resistance differently as they entered a space that was denied to them while simultaneously refusing the Western gaze about what could and could not be 'made in Turkey'. In this case, the Turkish entrepreneurs were fighting to occupy the space of technology creators and users rather

than manufacturers of electronics (such as TVs). These acts of resistance took place either through symbols and "symbolic acts" or through "business-speak".

Symbolic acts

The importance of symbolic acts can be seen in this example of naming a company. Osman named his company Biometri-CS because:

> **Osman:** eh, simdi aslinda iste, biliyorsunuz, biometric bir sektor, yani, onun bizim isimde, seyde, nasil soyleyim, sirket ismimizde kullanmak istedim ben (as you know, biometric is a sector, and in our field of work, how should I say this, I wanted to use it in naming our firm)
> **BOP:** anliyorum (I understand)
> **Osman:** hem yurtdisi birimleriyle vesaire um, ama iste basvurdugumuzda Turk hukumeti bu Ingilizce isim deyip olmaz dedi, ondan sonar bizde bir kucuk bir 'ti-rik' yaptik, Biometric tire c s dedik, eh, [benim ve] esimin adi[nin bas harfleri] (this way, it could make sense for foreign organizations but when we applied to the Turkish government to get this name, they say no, you can't have an English name so we did a small 'trick', we said Biometri hyphen c and s, the first initials of mine and my wife's names)
> **BOP:** evet (yes)
> **Osman:** iste, son harfini buyuttuk, son ikisini, bir kartimi veriyim, ondan sonra iste, iste biometric teknolojileri vurgulamak icin bir parmak izi koyduk, biz bulduk yani, biz kendimiz yaptik (and then we enlarged the last two letters [c and s], let me give you my card, and then to emphasize the use of biometric technology use, we put a fingerprint on the card, so we found it, we did it ourselves)

Here the trick has a double meaning: getting over a Turkish government hurdle but also the Turkish ability to produce technology. That is, the second part of the trick means occupying the space of high-technology not available to Turkish companies by 'tricking' foreigners to see the company as 'not Turkish' but Western. In a similar fashion, Bora recounts the naming of his organization as Intra. For Bora, this naming convention is based on his desire to keep the company name 'safe' so that he can do business with

Europe and the U.S. By using letters that are not Turkish, he avoids the ‘problem’ of pronunciation and establishes a name that is half of a word that has already entered the Turkish language: intranet.

These symbolic acts signify that in order to enter the global high-technology sector, there needs to be a refusal of the identity assigned to Turks and Turkey as manufacturers rather than creators. Yet accomplishing this act of defiance requires hybrid naming practices that make sense in Turkish and English. In effect, one cannot get completely away from the Western gaze or colonizing conceptions of how a high-technology company should be if one wants to do business with the West.

These symbolic acts of resistance however are only one way in which such refusals of the identity assigned to Turks took place. The second symbolic way in which Turkish entrepreneurs were occupying a space that had left them out was by rearticulating the meaning of relationships with Western high-technology firms as sources of prestige and quality rather than simply economic transactions.

For instance, Bora indicated “we (his firm) are solution providers for HP, Microsoft, and Siemens”, while Turgut read me out loud the letter he received from Microsoft expressing interest in his software product and suggested that he would consult with Microsoft about which firms he should be in direct contact with in Europe and in the U.S. These examples highlight that the West and Western high-technology firms have a symbolic meaning beyond economics, reiterating an appreciation of Turkish high-tech “know-how”. Yet again, the dependence of the Turkish entrepreneurs is highlighted in that their “know-how” is predicated on their recognition by the Western gaze.

Business-speak

In contrast to symbolic acts of refusal and resistance, there were entrepreneurs who engaged in business-speak and actions as a means to enter the space of high-technology. Up to a point, business-speak served as code for attaining hybrid identities such that Turks could talk as Americans. In this instance hybrid selves form through narratives linking voice in one nation with place in another nation. In other words, one's identity is not the reflection or product of a national culture (or culturally and psychologically whole) but rather a process whereby people can narrate a self based on cultural exports from another nation. In turn, such hybrid identities interrupt the cultural imposition of a homogeneous nation idea demanding that Turks speak as Turks; by delinking voice and place: Turks can speak as Americans.

The first example highlights how a Harvard business education enables Alp to live "like an American in Turkey" as he speaks about his experiences separating his social life from his work:

> **Alp:** bunu ayırmamız gerektiğini öğrendim, sonra iş arkadaşımızın arkadaşımız olamayacağını öğrendim, çok acı çektim bundan, Harvard'da bir gittik, …vakalarda onu o kadar çok anlattılar ki, hatta orada böyle T gruplar yapıyorlar, adam hüngür hüngür ağlıyor, aile şirketi var mesela adam ortak abisi mesela, annenin iki kişiye karşı pozisyonları, bir baktık ki....dertleri aynı, aynı çok benzeşiyoruz. Orada onu söylediler bize. İş yaşamınızdaki şeylerinizle, power dostluğu engeller, powerlı olan adamı kimse sevmez yani...bu lafını orada öğrendim, çok bayılıyorum, Türkçe'si yok çünkü, herkes hüngür hüngür ağlıyordu, ben buna layık mıyım diye, insanlara orada bayağı terapi yapıyorlar, çok da güzel fiyatlara (I found out that we had to separate the two, I later learned that my work friends really couldn't be my friends, this hurt me a lot, we went to Harvard, and the cases there really exemplified this, they were doing T groups there, there was

> a man crying, he had a family business for example his brother was his partner and the mother had taken sides against them, we saw that the problems were the same. They taught us this there. In your work life, power prevents friendships, nobody likes the man with the power, I love that saying, it doesn't exist in Turkish, everybody was crying, I said, do I deserve this? They really give you good therapy there, for good prices!)

Alp narrated himself as an American Turk based on his experience at Harvard in acquiring U.S. business school discourse and his subsequent actions based on this discourse as he separated out his social and business lives.

The importance of education as a link to the U.S. was exemplified by another Turkish high-tech entrepreneur who throughout the interview used English words and phrases based on his business undergrad education in Turkey. Bora suggested that the "barriers to entry were too low" in his sector and that the "barriers to entry are quite high in the technology sector" allowing the products to be of higher quality in Europe and the U.S.. He stated that people in the Turkish government didn't have the education or "vision" to "make technology a priority" particularly as they were busy building fountains in various cities and interested in soccer rather than 'important' matters.

Both of these examples highlight the intersections of voice and place that allow for decoupling identity from national culture. Each entrepreneur resists the homogenizing label of Turkish as a way to gain entrance to a place (the U.S.) that 'knows' business and high-technology. In effect, these entrepreneurs narrate a "Western" self as understood through what they consider Western business ideas and practices despite their location in Turkey. Through their narrations, the Turkish entrepreneurs (attempt to) enter a space

denied to them by the cultural authority of Western business and high-technology knowledge.

This was further accomplished through the organization of companies. On this point, Bora discussed his organization as being a “flat hierarchy” and not a “patron”. The patron (or the boss mentality) was in reference to how Turkish companies are usually described as being run by one man who tells the others what to do. Similarly, Alp discussed his organization as being “flat” and having an open door policy while Osman also described his organization as “flat” and “run democratically and not like a despot”. In effect, these entrepreneurs were defying the patron mentality that was assumed to be the norm in how Turkish run organizations.

However, these notions of how Turkish organizations are run came not necessarily from the West but from a proxy of the West: the Turkish-American entrepreneurs in Turkey. In talking about themselves, both Semra and Murat, discussed the number of technology patents they have from the U.S. and their work culture as being different from the Turkish work culture. For Semra, the Turkish work culture was based on the patron and the legal framework such that you could go to jail based on something you signed without realizing it. Similarly, Murat spoke about how the Turkish work culture is based on the patron. He suggested that the only people who helped him start up in Turkey were honest people who also had U.S. influence like him.

Thus, the ability of the Turkish entrepreneurs to refuse the gaze of the West and enter a space that was denied to them was under attack from those very people who claimed to be both Turkish and American and know how to be in both cultures. Western ideas of what constitutes honest business practices and good organizational structure had

colonized the Turkish organization by way of business education and business practices that were assumed to be global. This was quite interesting in that the Turkish-American entrepreneurs in the U.S. had described themselves as Turkish based on being honest businessmen (Hakan, Cem, Ismail, and Tamer). This was also the case with Turkish entrepreneurs in Turkey who described themselves as being honest (Bora, Alp, and Osman).

Yet, when the Turkish-American entrepreneurs who identified themselves as more American than Turkish arrived in Turkey, they brought a colonizing notion of how to do business and denied business knowledge to Turkish firms. On this very point, Murat states:

> **Murat:** …the way I conduct business is much more of an American style.
> **BOP:** Can you tell me what you mean by that?
> **Murat:** High ethical standards and the way we're running business processes, a respect for individuals, delegation, developing people—yeah, the Turkish systems are in sharp contrast to that. They're basically what's called patron.
> **BOP:** Right. I guess my question is how would you differentiate the two?
> **Murat:** One is totally hierarchical family run businesses, over here. I mean the people are not brought into to being part of the company and actually helping decisions in the company and things like that, things are always driven by a single individual or their family members. And this is not a – there's no process, there's no procedure, there's no strategy…

In effect, the Western gaze was not necessarily the domain of the Westerner per se but could be entered upon by an Other who occupied that space through the language of domination and colonization. The Western gaze became embodied in the person of the Turkish-American who was more American now that he was in Turkey. Can refusing

such a gaze bring about any material change in their organizations? Can the Western gaze be dismantled as the norm in business practice? Is it even possible?

By relying on Bhabha's analytical lens I can answer these questions in the affirmative, but not how the extant IM discourse might have expected. I discussed how hybrid selves in the context of the U.S. and Turkey were forming. At each location, different hybrid selves emerged out of the political necessities and discourses available to individuals—moreover, the production of hybrid identities was often purposeful in accomplishing a sense of self that afforded entrance to the global high-technology sector. Various hybrid selves were formed and hybridities accomplished through discourses of what being Turkish meant, what being in Silicon Valley meant and what education meant. Importantly, each site of encounter in the U.S. and Turkey enabled a distinct set of hybridities to emerge related to entrepreneurial business ideas and practices and a distinct set of resistances to the Western gaze.

Altogether, hybridity and mimicry do not dismantle outright the Western gaze over the colonized. Rather, they create an ambivalent third space where neither the colonized nor the colonizer can exist beyond colonization. However, it is in these relational spaces that it might be possible to find some novelty.

CHAPTER 6

FORMING TURKISH ENTREPRENEURIAL IDENTITIES: HIGH-TECHNOLOGY, GLOBALIZATION, AND ORIENTALISM

In this chapter, I engage with the research question "how do international entrepreneurs form their identities in the context of globalization?" guided by Said's Orientalism lens. Through it, I discuss identity formation in the context of historic power relations among different peoples and nations. Specifically, I consider the historic relationships between Turkey and the United States as the context to examine entrepreneurial identity formations and high-technology activities taking place within each country. I then consider how Western management discourse in the form of high-technology knowledge and practices circulates in the global political economy. This circulation allows particular people and nations, voices, and places, to have legitimacy in speaking about high-technology and others to be silenced on the subject. In the final section of the chapter, I discuss how the individuals 'speak back' to those very Orientalist representations and practices that render them silent in high-technology entrepreneurship.

By relying on Said's analytic focus on the "interdependence of various histories *on* one another and the necessary interaction of contemporary societies *with* one another" (1993: 38), identity formation processes became inextricably linked to the particular historic relationship of Turkey and the United States, as well as that of Turkey and other nations. These historic relations can be described, for instance, as a series of military, economic, and political interdependences with Turkey's entry into NATO. This context is relevant for understanding how Turkish-American and Turkish entrepreneurial identities emerge as people become embedded in such power relations among nations.

Consequently, culture and cultural differences between the U.S. and Turkey in terms of entrepreneurial identity formation and high-technology activities are seen as processes that form and reform through encounters between the U.S. and Turkey at the level of the nation.

In this sense, I discuss how voice/ identity emerge based on narratives of relational place. To clarify, under Said's lens, place is not a static signifier of culture but a complex set of ongoing dynamic relationships among people and among nations that have consequences for understanding contemporary experiences/ stories of globalization. Thus, by using the Orientalist lens, I focus on the "map of interactions" among states, groups, and identities that can be identified by "examining cultural documents" (Said, 1993: 20) rather than comparing the U.S. and Turkey through the lenses available in international entrepreneurship (e.g., how do U.S. and Turkish entrepreneurs differ in opportunity recognition?)

Forming Relational Selves in the U.S.

One of the most significant ways individuals narrated themselves to me was by comparing themselves to other immigrants in the context of Silicon Valley. The importance of immigrants to Silicon Valley particularly in terms of labor (i.e., Indian software programmers) was well articulated throughout the course of the fieldwork by numerous participants in conferences as well as participants in the research study. Yet it was important to keep in mind how immigrants tell the story of their experiences in coming to Silicon Valley and working there. Based on Said's analytic focus, I considered the formation of selves in relation to others which took place through several different narratives strategies where a particular voice (identity) or place (culture) was Orientalized

in order for a Turkish identity to emerge. In this case individuals narrated themselves as immigrants with reference to cultural Others, with reference to other entrepreneurs in Silicon Valley and with reference to Turkey.

For instance, one of the Orientalizing discourses that enabled the Turkish identity to form was accomplished in reference to a Mexican identity. Individuals described themselves as a Turk by saying that they were not undocumented, which in the context of California meant not Mexican. One example of this is Kemal, who was having difficulty obtaining a green card but had nonetheless formed his own start up while working for a major technology corporation in Silicon Valley. When I asked what being a Turkish entrepreneur meant, he stated,

> What does it mean? Well it means, do you mean my visa status? [laughs] It annoys the hell out of me, 'coz I can't do much. I have a company which I can't work for in reality, I can own the company, I can be a stakeholder but I can't work for the company, I have to hire people…Right now, I'm here with an H1-B, so it's sponsored so that means I'm a slave of some corporation. I find the green card process humiliating, I don't know, I resisted it, I don't know, I've been offered it two times.

This situation of being unable to get a green card when he wants to be documented as a legal immigrant who could work for his own corporation was complicated by the fact that he saw himself as different from the Others, the 'undocumented' people in California. In effect, he was trying to get out of an Orientalized position by Orientalizing another group of people: the Mexicans as 'undocumented' workers.

He related himself to Mexicans saying that I'm not like them because they are illegal and being a Turk is not the same Other as being a Mexican in the U.S. Specifically, the historic relationship of military, economic, and political cooperation

between Turkey and the U.S. contrasts to the relationship between Mexico and the U.S., which is often discussed through the discourse of illegal immigration. In effect, Kemal was differentiating himself from the Mexicans even though he was 'illegal' but not illegal in the same way. He was illegal for working at his own start up but legal in the sense that he could work for another corporation through a sponsored visa, while the 'undocumented' workers were assumed to be illegal for all types of work. In so doing, he was also positioning Turkey as superior to Mexico in the hierarchy of the "community of nations."

Another example of how a relational self forms in reference to cultural Others was expressed by Ismail, who described what being a Turk in the Valley meant in relation to being Greek or Armenian. In order to understand why he would chose to describe himself as a Turk in relation to these other nationalities, the historic relationship between Turkey, Greece, and Armenia has to be clarified. This complicated political relationship emanates from the minority status of Greeks and Armenians under the Ottoman Empire and the present-day reality of land and atrocity claims made by Greece and Armenia against Turkey. Further complicating the relationship is the Turkish desire to join the E.U. and the Greek ability to block such accession. Although I've only briefly described the political and economic history of these three nations, the historic animosities were playing out in Silicon Valley through the Turkish entrepreneur. These relationships were at the locus of Ismail's identity formation who was born into a Turkish family in Greece and had to be smuggled out of Greece at night in order to be allowed to come back to Turkey. Out of this, Ismail tried to, on one front, address misconceptions about Turkey and, on the other front, address the fact that there are times

when ‘the Turk’ must defend Turkey against others. He says:

> **Ismail:** the awareness of Turkey, if there is one, in general in a negative way, it doesn’t really um, not only in a negative way it doesn’t even, there’s no admission of what Turkey is**,** now it doesn’t, when I say negative, it puts Turkey as if, fifty years ago or a century ago uh, it doesn’t say Turkey is this but it’s negative, it says Turkey is negative AND you know fifty years ago, old situation than describing, even in the uh, shall we say in the enlightened Silicon Valley
> **BOP:** uh huh
> **Ismail:** the entrepreneurs’ knowledge of Turkey is extremely limited at best and uh the unfortunate effect of that is that there’s an impression already, everybody has some earful or somehow they know something about Turkey and quite often what they know is, is not good
> **BOP:** Midnight Express!! Yeah that’s what everyone says to me, well I’ve seen the movie Midnight Express, which is terrible because it’s just a movie, but when you start the conversation there, it doesn’t go far
> **Ismail:** right, that’s right, it’s just the, but even with the Midnight Express whatever twenty years ago movie, even people that doesn’t know Midnight Express their impression of Turkey, they don’t know, so they are just, the limited knowledge they have is driven by this hearsay or impressions or either you can blame the press or the non-friendly ethnic groups

Further, the U.S. was quite relevant in this sense as the formation of the Turkish identity took place not only through reference to historic cultural Others, but also through the relational understanding of what being an American means. In effect, a Turkish identity can only form in relation to being not Turkish and what ‘not Turkish’ looks like is voiced through nation-based political and cultural discourses. As an example of the production of this dichotomy, several entrepreneurs narrated themselves as Turkish and not American while simultaneously narrating Turkey versus the United States. This can be seen in the following conversation:

> **Cem:** Just one of the stories, one day in dorms that I stayed at for the first time, these kids were discussing the Eastern Block, the West versus East, and so on. But more specifically like the Russian or Soviet border. They were vehemently putting forward the view that there should be a limited nuclear war which essentially completely contaminated that area so that it would create a buffer zone between Europe and Soviet Union. They were actually seriously –
> **BOP:** This is was
> **Cem:** at MIT.
> **BOP:** I see.
> **Cem:** That was one of the biggest shocks for me, the fact that people can think – they were so detached emotionally from the rest of the world that they even conceive of, they would accept millions upon millions of people dying and losing their homes in that area just to create a buffer zone. That was a shock…how we would look at the world compared to these bunch of kids who are saying, "Go have a nuclear contamination zone." No one will hopefully ever think of something like that in Turkey. At least you see the whole world as a whole world. We don't think Turkey is the center of the world and everything that happens is revolved around inside Turkey.

Thus, in order for the Turkish identity to take form in Silicon Valley and get out of the Orientalized position it's occupying, individuals feel they have to differentiate themselves from other nationalities based on the relationship among Turkey, the U.S., and other nation(s). The fear and suspicion they've experienced as a Turk in the Valley (Kemal, Ismail) relates to how they want to vacate the Orientalized position imposed on them by these cultural Others (i.e., Mexicans, Greeks, Armenians). Moreover, identity formation producing a notion of the self as Turk also happened through differentiation from an American point of view of the world (Cem). In effect, being a Turk meant not being American by virtue of a worldview that placed the U.S. in the center.

Becoming bey

Moreover, the production of Turkish *high-technology entrepreneurial* identities

followed a similar pattern of self differentiation but this time through narratives distinguishing oneself from Other Turks. One of the ways in such a differentiation occurred, allowing a high-technology entrepreneurial identity to form, was based on discourses of education. Several of the entrepreneurs I spoke with in Silicon Valley spoke about having technical degrees in engineering and computer science fields (Tamer) including having PhDs (Cem, Hakan) as a way to differentiate themselves from "handcraft sellers," "restaurateurs," "construction workers" and "alin yazmali Turkler" (Turks from the villages).

By Orientalizing other Turks through the discourse of education, these entrepreneurs created an identity for themselves as high-technology entrepreneurs. One of the reasons for this distinction was the assumption of who and what the Other represented: the Turks who did not have the education were the Turks from Eastern Turkey or the villagers. These Turks were the only other identifiable immigrant group that was associated with Turkey. In Turkey, the Eastern villages were known for the immigrant labor they had sent to Germany in the late 1960s. The Turkish immigrant community in Germany has grown in size since then but is still considered lower or working class even upon returning to Turkey. Thus, by differentiating oneself through education in a field considered elite, Turkish high-technology entrepreneurial identity came into formation. But education was more than an innocent discourse differentiation oneself from Other Turks—it's a way to change status or move up in social standing in Turkey, it's a way to change one's voice.

Said's lens allows me to see how the relational self emerges out of the context of historic national interdependences. In this context, leaving and returning Turkey are

relevant events that allow particular narratives of self to emerge. With each leaving and return, individuals change not only who they are in Turkey but also who they are in Silicon Valley. This mobility in the context of the changing dynamic between Turkey and the United States allows for certain possibilities for voice: people are no longer bound to a place as they can enter and leave this place (as they become displaced). They become high-technology entrepreneurs in Silicon Valley *and* someone else in Turkey as well. The following examples demonstrate this point.

For Ismail, becoming a high-technology entrepreneur in Silicon Valley also meant becoming a "bey" in Turkey (I wanted to be Ismail bey), where bey, the equivalent of 'gentleman', is traditionally used to signify respect to a man of higher social standing and would not necessarily be used for a man who's from the lower working class. Ismail was by his own description a child from a poor working family in Turkey and would not have been called 'bey' socially. For others, becoming a high-technology entrepreneur meant that they had achieved a level of education and success that was not available to them in Turkey based on their socioeconomic status. As one example, Cem expressed not being able to afford to go home for several years when he first came to the U.S. and about the virtues of being a technologist. For him, a technologist meant that he was unique and not interchangeable like the Harvard-educated CEOs of brick and mortar companies. These CEOs represented an indistinguishable face as Cem suggested that the CEO of one major corporation was often hired to lead another—this was not the case with high-technology firms. Consequently, he could now go back to Turkey as someone who was unique and successful in Silicon Valley.

History, Nations, Politics and Culture

These examples of individual relational identity formation emerge as people voice themselves in relation to cultural Others, other entrepreneurs and their lives 'back in' Turkey. Although these individual encounters and narratives can be interpreted as instances of class formation, they also need to be understood within the broader concepts Said's framework addresses particularly in terms of history, nations, politics, and culture. To examine these concepts and what they mean for identity formation, I outline a series of encounters between Turkey and the U.S. as I observed them during the TABCON conferences put together by TABC. My first step is to discuss the significance of TABC in understanding the broader context of the Turkish/ U.S. relationship.

Based on the TABC website (www.tabc-us.org), the TABC mission is summarized as the following:

> TABC advances the interests of Turkish-American businessmen and businesswomen, entrepreneurs and professionals from all industries through personal networking and professionally organized informative events. With relationships in Turkey with academic institutions and businesses, and with focus on local interests, the missions of TABC could be summarized as: to enhance the business careers of its members, to promote professional networking opportunities for and among its members and Turkish Americans, and to foster professional relationships between businesses and professionals in Turkey and the U.S.

In relation to the annual TABCON conferences, the TABC website states:

> Our goal is to further improve the interaction of engineering and business communities between Turkey and the Bay Area, discuss the current and future high-technology business opportunities, remind ourselves of outstanding technological success stories, help define the current trends in business development in general and try to answer important questions we all have regarding the future of Turkish economy and its technology sector. We truly believe that this conference will provide an invaluable

> opportunity for all of us to come together and learn from highly talented pool of panelists and speakers who will be joining us from different parts of Turkey and the United States.

This is relevant in that the TABC attempts to provide a bridge between the U.S. and Turkey in terms of business opportunities and networking. In other words, as an organization, its members see themselves as bridging the U.S. and Turkey through business, economic, and political ties. As an organization, the president of TABC claims they are not a cultural or political group but a not-for-profit association promoting the interests of Turkish and Turkish-American businesspeople in the Bay Area. However, as evidenced by the conferences, by the events they host, and by the events posted on their website, the cultural is business is political. For instance, TABC hosted a dinner for the Turkish prime minister, and the website announces events such as "'Khojaly: A town no more' featuring Thomas Goltz. Mr. Thomas Goltz is an expert in Azerbaijan and will be presenting in UC Berkeley about the Khojaly Massacre of 1992 committed by the Armenian troops", and TABC's sponsorship of the 11th annual California Turkish Arts and Culture Festival.

As Said himself points out, the cultural is always political and thus, there is no way to separate out cultural interests from business and political ones. As such, identity formation needs to be understood also as a cultural *and* political process. The links between the cultural and political can be seen by examining the reoccurring theme at annual TABCON conferences of inviting Turkish government officials to speak about the relationship between the U.S. and Turkey. It is this historic and ongoing relationship that provides the context for understanding Turkish entrepreneurship as a cultural and political process in Silicon Valley. To elucidate this process, I share part of the speech

given by Engin Ansay, the consul general of Los Angeles at TABCON 2005:

> As Turkey advances in its accession progress, the contributions it can make to the E.U. in the area of foreign policy are also becoming clearer. Turkey's accession will greatly enhance the E.U.'s global reach influence, be it strategic or economic. A powerful message will be sent to the whole world that Europe is not defined by a narrow understanding [of] geography or religion, but by common values…As Turkey is diversifying its relations with the E.U., she continues to strengthen and broaden the existing relations with the United States as one of her most important foreign policy objectives. Emergence of new clashes and ethnic wars after the collapse of the Soviet Union has brought these two NATO allies even closer during the past decade. Turkey and the United States closely cooperated in major challenges against world peace and security, like they did in the Korean war, the Gulf war, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Kosovo, Somalia, Afghanistan and in northern Iraq after the Gulf war

At TABCON 2006, he was invited to speak again and discussed how the conference had brought "Turkish American businessmen, the representatives of business associations, the members of parliament, local officials and diplomats together." In 2007, the consul general was again invited (albeit the post had changed and a new consul had arrived) and his speech included the following quote, "diplomacy notion changing [is] in the contemporary world, now enhancing business interests of their nations is becoming an essential tasks of [a] diplomat" (Hakan Riza Tekin).

Thus, what emerges out of the TABCON conferences is the notion that business and diplomacy are linked such as the political connections between nations are what dictate the economic relationships. In the case of the U.S. and Turkey, the consul general's speech attempted to get Turkey out of the Orientalized non-European position by presenting it as equal to Europe and then discuss the U.S. need for Turkey for world peace. In effect, Turkish entrepreneurship was seen as part of this diplomatic effort, an

effort that is inextricably linked to business interested both in the U.S. and in Turkey such peace is no longer a political issue but a business issue.

This is evidenced further by the fact that in 2008, the TABCON annual conference, usually held in Northern California, took place in Washington, DC as a panel entitled "U.S.-Turkey Relations: Regional Allies, Global Partners" at the 27th annual conference put together by ATC (American Turkish Council), AFOT (American Friends of Turkey), TAIK (Turk American Is Konseyi—Turkish American Business Council), and DEIK (Dis Ekonomi Iliskiler Kurulu—Foreign Economic Relations Board).

The TABC's website announced its connection to this conference as follows: "This year's TABCON will consist of two panels at the ATC-AFOT/ TAIK-DEIK 27th Annual Conference. The conference theme is U.S. Turkish Relations and TABC is heading the Information Communication Technology Committee, bringing our experience in entrepreneurship [sic] and information technology…The 2008 Annual Conference will celebrate the continued vitality of one of the most important bilateral relationships in the world: the US-Turkey relationship."

The relationship between the U.S. and Turkey then serves as the broader context for understanding how Turkish high-technology entrepreneurial identity formation is not only putting forth a cultural self but a political and business one as well. The Turkish entrepreneurial self does not come into existence simply by starting a high-technology company but rather, it comes into existence mindful of what being Turkish means in the U.S.-Turkish relationship. Further, this relationship already places Turkey in a position of economic and political dependence on the U.S.

In light of the broader military, economic, and cultural/ political processes linking

Turkey and the United States, Turkish high-technology entrepreneurial identity formation allows me to speak about how the intersections of voice and place are not necessarily transparent but already embedded in power relations. Thus, Turkish high-technology entrepreneurs speak from an Orientalized position that becomes Orientalized through historic relationships that continue in the present. These relationships require going beyond differentiating Turkish high-technology entrepreneurs from others (e.g., Mexicans, other Turks). In order to emerge as powerful individuals they have to produce narratives that link them into the broader discourses of international economic and political relationships.

Relational Identities in Turkey

Within this context, the formation of relational identities in Turkey share some similarities with the processes by which identity formation was possible in Silicon Valley but also differ significantly in terms of how Orientalist discourses function in the Turkish context. During the course of my interviews and observations in Turkey, the historic context for relational identity formation was the relationship between Turkey, the U.S., and the E.U. (although this third part of the relationship became much more relevant as I describe in the final section). These relationships were important as they contextualized how individuals narrated their experiences as Turks (rather than entrepreneurs) encountering the U.S. through ideas and practices. In other words, individuals had to dismantle the position in which they were placed in order to speak with the voice they wanted to speak with: to speak as an entrepreneur rather than a Turk. Thus, one way to conceptualize entrepreneurial identity formation in Turkey is that it is a two-step process. First, the entrepreneur had to get out of the Orientalized position he was placed in: Turk.

Second, he had to enter the space denied to him: entrepreneur. As an example of this, Alp discussed how in order to do business with Americans, he had to first explain to them that the next Islamic revolution was not going to happen and that in order to do business with the English, he had to explain that there is indeed electricity in Turkey. The following demonstrates this double move as Alp discusses going to the U.S. and Europe to find capital investors for his firm:

> **Alp:** Belki bir venture apital buluruz diye gittik, adam koyuyor masasının üzerine, kardeşim, sen neredesin diyor, sen dünyanın obur tarafındasın diyor, çok küstah, Londra'dakilerle konuştuk, onlar Türkiye'yi daha iyi biliyorlardı, fakat sonuçta herkesin söylediği şey, bana şunu söylüyor tell me what business are you going do? Dedim ki benim business planlarım var, onlara baksanıza, Türkiye dünyada bu becerileriyle yapabilecekleri ile değil de, ancak politikayla ilgi çekebiliyor, insanlar bana hep onu soruyorlar, bu Islamistler ne zaman iktidara gelecek, darbe ne zaman olacak, ya 98, 99 yılı bu, anlat anlat, ben burada bir şirketim bana ne politikadan, ben size business'larımı anlatacağım (We went [to the US] thinking we could find some venture capital, but the man said where are you from? You're from the other side of the world! So arrogant, we went to speak with people in London, and they knew Turkey better but in the end, they said to me, "tell me what business are you doing?" I said I have business plans, why don't you take a look at them. Turkey seems to always attract attention based on politics and not what we can achieve through business. Everybody kept asking me, when are the Islamists going to come to power, when will the revolution be? This is 1998, 1999. Still, they said tell us tell us, well, I'm here to tell you about my business, I don't care about politics, I'm here to tell you about my business.)

The conceptualization of Turkey as a place of political upheaval and economic uncertainty prohibits Alp from having a voice as an entrepreneur and when he speaks, he speaks for an entire nation and culture. In effect, the Turk can only voice oneself on cultural/ political terms rather than have legitimacy to speak for or about

entrepreneurship.

As the following examples demonstrate, Orientalizing representations work by denying the Other a voice while at the same time speaking for the Other. Subsequently, identity formation takes place within this context of denials and attributions. For example, an encounter between a Turkish-American entrepreneur (Murat) and what he considered Turkish business practices became narrated as the cultural business practices of Turkey. As you would recall from the previous chapter, for Murat American business practices were seen as the norm as he said companies in Turkey hide everything to escape from paying taxes. In effect, he narrated a relational identity of being American given his business practices (professionally run, high ethical standards) in relation to what he considered was the Turkish way of doing business (family based or hierarchical). The particular business practices he had encountered in Turkey were described on Orientalized terms and expressed as cultural differences between American business practices and Turkish business practices. Thus, the very process of Orientalizing a particular business practice and attributing it to a national culture was an attempt to create a binary opposition and cultural differences. The dichotomy worked based on the assumption that what was considered American business practices were progressive and democratic while those associated with Turkish business practices were backwards and undemocratic. Yet, this dichotomy, professional versus family business, was not seen in an Orientalized way by Turks who also made this distinction. In effect, Turkish entrepreneurs were able to overturn such binaries.

For example, Osman made the comment that his son was getting an MBA and that eventually, the family business would be run more professionally by his son. He also

commented on running his business like a family where all the decisions are made together as a family. This notion of what constitutes a family-business practice stands in stark contrast to an American understanding of family-business practices in Turkey: those that are unprofessional, unethical, and based on a patron hierarchy (Murat, Semra). Thus, the Turkish entrepreneur was forming a relational identity through business practices to show he was running a flat, democratic organization as embodied in the concept of family. Meanwhile the West looked at his organization as a family run Turkish firm and by virtue of that label, Turkish family, he was seen as an undemocratic 'patron'.

As these examples highlight, identity formation in Turkey takes place through Orientalizing discourses of U.S.-based ideas about entrepreneurship that deny alternative ideas about carrying out business to be voiced as anything other than cultural differences. Cultural differences effaces historic power relations between the U.S. and Turkey as this concept does not allow consideration for how U.S.-based business ideas entered Turkey as part of the Marshall Plan (see Üsdiken, 1996, 2004), how such business ideas are the products of U.S. corporate hegemony in the global economy, or why such business ideas should be considered the 'norm' under conditions of globalization. In the next section, I try to address some of these concerns particularly as they relate to my research question on identity formation by focusing specifically on hegemonic U.S.-based management ideas, in the form of Western management education, circulating under conditions of globalization. By doing so, I demonstrate how relational identities emerge through the hegemonic global circulation of U.S. management knowledge.

U.S. Management Discourses: Circulating Globally, Orientalizing Locally

As I've previously discussed, Said's framework highlights how Orientalist

discourses circulate in the minds of Western societies through various publications and media outlets. In the contemporary business world, this can be seen in the hegemonic circulation of U.S. management knowledge. As a body of work, the ideas and practices emanating from the U.S. in terms of how to do business become the norm against which the Orientalized other is compared. The hegemony of such U.S.-based business knowledge, inclusive of ideas and practices, becomes established through management discourses of how to do business in Other parts of the world and how those Other parts of the world look like. In effect, this body of work establishes rules of recognition and portrays non-Western people and countries as in need of Western business intervention in the form of knowledge and capital. Non-Western business people and their practices are not considered legitimate voices that can contribute to a conversation on international management and globalization but become discussed in terms of their cultural differences and 'risk' for investments (i.e., FDI).

Narratives of identity formation highlight how U.S.-business ideas and practices become hegemonic as these narratives speak of the cultural and political conditions facing non-Westerners in high-technology entrepreneurship. Specifically, such narratives highlight how discourses of nation building, development economics, and structural adjustment produce a particular kind of Turkish high-technology entrepreneur and entrepreneurship to emerge in the global high-technology sector as already behind in time. In such narratives, U.S.-based management knowledge plays a crucial referent as Turkish high-technology entrepreneurs and Turkey as a nation look for a way to get out of the Orientalized position assigned to them symbolically (Turkey is known for political upheaval) and materially (Turkey manufactures rather than creates technology) through

Western management discourses. But the mere act of looking for "the way out" reiterates the Orientalized position of Turkey by conceding to the superiority of the referent.

As the following demonstrates, Turkey and Turkish entrepreneurship assign themselves a position of inferiority: they had to catch-up to the 'information age' that the West was producing and experiencing particularly if they wanted to enter the E.U. Thus, Turkey was neither a voice of the information age nor a place for it. This was expressed in the following way by one Sinerjiturk conference participant:

> **AN:** bilgi toplumuna nasil gecilecek bu cok acik degil, bu bir hedef olabilir, yani aciklamak gerekirse ikinci konuda, birinci konu hedef saplamak, bu 2013'de bilgi toplumu olmamizin icin sade vatandasin evine elli megabyte'nin gitmesi gerekiyor, buda icinde Erzincan'daki koylumuzde dahil, bu bir hedef olabilir, kendi pazarimiz icimiz diye dusunuyorum, aslinda dusunmemek lazim, ic pazar degil cunku global ama elimizde ic pazarimiz var, fakat somut bir hedefimizin olmasi gerektigini inaniyorum, buda Ercinzandaki dedemize elli megabyte ne zaman gidecegidi hedefidir, bes yil icinde gitmesi gerekiyor diyorum (It's not clear how we're going to become an information society, this could be a goal, if you need clarification, the first topic should be setting a goal, this could be that if by 2013 we want to be considered an information society, there has to be a 50 megabyte connection going to even our villagers, even those in Erzincan (city has most snow, some of the worst infrastructure in Turkey), this could be a goal, I think our own domestic market is there but perhaps we shouldn't think that way because it's global but we have a domestic market and we should have a clear goal and this goal could be establishing when that grandfather in Erzincan will have a 50 megabyte connection, I think it needs to reach him in five years)

In the Sinerjiturk conference high-technology entrepreneurship activities were seen as one way that Turkey could get out of this Orientalized position and join that elite group of nations both in terms of being considered developed and being considered European rather than Middle Eastern (i.e., by joining the E.U.). In other words, to produce

“Turkiye’nin yurtdisindaki teknoloji ureten bir ulke oldugu imaji” (“Turkey’s global image as a technology producing nation”, participant, Sinerjiturk conference). To this end, high-technology entrepreneur and entrepreneurship occupied a privileged position for materially and symbolically vacating the Orientalized position imposed on Turkey.

Yet entering the global high-technology sector materially is different than entering it symbolically: even if Turkey was to become a technology producing nation, it would still have to overcome the Orientalized U.S.-management discourse depicting Turkey as a manufacturing (i.e., textiles and durable goods) Middle Eastern nation. One example of such discourse was seen during TABCON 2005 when John Morgridge, former CEO of Cisco systems delivered the keynote speech. During the speech, he suggested that the internet plus education was the global equalizer and went on to describe what Cisco could do for Turkey given that Cisco had been working in Israel, training Arabs and Jews to coexist peacefully through the Cisco academy program. He then went on to discuss how Cisco helps prepare least developed countries for the Internet economy through partnerships with the UN, UNDP, and UN Volunteers in training students. During this presentation, he discussed Turkey as he moved from slides of Arab countries to slides of Afghanistan. He concluded by stating that in 2008, Cisco would be opening up an entrepreneurship institute in Ankara, Turkey and starting up in Turkey, an entrepreneurship fund which could be used (by Cisco) to buy out Turkish technology companies.

Thus, by making Orientalist claims about Turkey (in need of economic and political development) Western firms, such as Cisco, were able to position themselves as necessary to the very survival and development of Turkey. Moreover, by presenting

Turkey in the context of Arab countries and Afghanistan, Morgridge was claiming that Turkey was no different than 'those' countries in which Cisco had already developed training programs. In effect, the historic relationship between Turkey and the rest of the world was erased through this one speech that spoke about Turkey as if it was frozen until the West arrived. Perhaps more disturbingly was the entrepreneurship fund that would be set up in which Cisco could buy out Turkish technology companies: an act from which there is no recovery as an acquisition denies the Turkish firm ability of entering the high-technology sector without Western intervention. This notion was repeated again and again as Turkey's perception to foreign investors was accomplished through Orientalist discourses of "lack of good governance", "continuous political and economic instability" (MY, TABCON 2006) and research by McKinsey and other consulting groups that portrayed Turkey as "high risk."

The circulation of such Orientalist representations of Turkey reflect Western attempts to understand Turkey in a way that makes sense for the West rather than understanding Turkey in a historically contextual fashion that would have to recognize the ongoing relationship between Turkey and the U.S. as well as Turkey and other nations. By denying such relationships, Turkey is categorized as no different from any other "Middle Eastern" country. Yet such Orientalist representations did not go unchallenged as resistance to Orientalism was occurring, albeit in different forms, in the U.S. and Turkey.

Resistance: The Oriental Speaks Back

One of the ways in which Orientalist notions about being Turk and about Turkey were resisted was by overturning what being an immigrant entrepreneur meant in the

context of Silicon Valley. In effect, the Turkish entrepreneurs I interviewed in Silicon Valley did not want to be known as immigrants through notions of ethnicity. They were engaging in different acts to interrupt the discourse of the immigrant entrepreneur culturally and politically and thus challenging the muteness assigned to them. Moreover, they dismantled the cultural authority of the U.S. in high-technology by demonstrating how high-technology was not a value free scientific practice but a cultural and political one. In the U.S., these resistant acts and processes were made possible by actively resisting and overturning categories that denied voice to people who wanted to understand themselves differently.

One example of such resistance can be seen in Kemal, who constantly hid the fact that he was Turkish for fear of racism and said he was trying to "change concept the of Barbaric Turk through business activity." He said the following:

> **Kemal:** istesende istemesende o Turk kimligi sana yapistiriliyor bu ulkede ben nederim, ben nederim bilmiyorum acikcasi, yani Turk girisimcimiyim cunku takildigim cevremden dolayi buyuk bir ihtimalde Turk girisimciyim hep Turk girisimcileri afise edip zaten ornekler yaratmaya calisiyoruz organizasyon icersinde yani Murat'ye bu odulu vermeminiz sebebide buydu mesala o toplantida oyle derim ama ben istersemde ben sade, girisim, girisimciyim desem Amerikalilar zaten burda irkci insanlar olduklari icin niye girisimcisin sen Amerika degilsin (Whether you want it or not, that Turkish label is stuck on you in this country, I don't know what I would say, I would say I'm a Turkish entrepreneur, as an organization [TABC],we're always trying to portray Turkish entrepreneurs and that's the reason why we gave Murat that award, that's the reason, that's what I would say, but if I wanted to say, I'm just an entrepreneur, the Americans would say, because there is some racism here, they would say you're not an American)

Thus, there is resistance over the very notion of who can be an entrepreneur and who has to be qualified, such as a *Turkish* entrepreneur. In other words, the labeling of ethnicity before American in the context of entrepreneurship means that this person is not really the same as the American entrepreneurs, who don't need to be qualified—they are just entrepreneurs. Ethnicity in this sense plays an Orientalizing role as it marks the entrepreneur as less than or not equal to. By dropping the ethnic label, Kemal resists an Orientalizing discourse of immigrant as Other and lesser-than kind of entrepreneur. Yet the immigrant was not always seen as a negative label. For Tamer, calling himself an immigrant was a way to differentiate himself as that resistant body who made it despite the odds of being poor, vulnerable, and being a foreigner. Immigrant for him signified an accomplishment, a drive and it was an identity he chose to call himself *after* receiving his U.S. citizenship. In other words, he rearticulated what being an immigrant means as a positive and proactive act rather than a label attached to you from which you cannot escape.

In a similar vein, other Turkish entrepreneurs discussed stories of resistance identity and rearticulating what being Turkish meant in the high-technology sector. For Selim, Orientalism meant that if he had stayed in Turkey and become a subsidiary or franchise of a Western firm in Turkey, then he would have essentially become a "tool to the West, pouring Turkish wealth into West, get poorer and poorer." His way of resisting this was to become an entrepreneur in the U.S., an idea he associated with being "creative" and "innovative." Yet he also said that he did not want to be labeled as part of any minority community or subculture—in effect, he was producing a Turkish entrepreneurial identity on his own individual terms rather than accepting the label of

Turkish if it was going to be ascribed to him based on ethnic and cultural affiliation. Thus, he immigrated on his own terms rather than under an ethnic label.

The ability of individuals to resist Orientalizing discourses is again evidenced by Turkish-American entrepreneurs who held dual citizenships and decide when they want to be Turks (e.g., Semra as well as Selim). To clarify, several of these dual citizens decided to use their U.S. passports when traveling to Europe. It was a way to get respect and avoid visas but is indicative of the historic economic and politic relationship between Turkey and Europe: by being an American, they get out of that Orientalized position the Turkish passport places them in. In effect, they can claim to be Turkish when they want rather than when they encounter Europe.

Similarly, resistance to Orientalist discourse about Turkey was taking place through the Sinerjiturk conference. For example, the Sinerjiturk conference highlighted how there was infrastructure and entrepreneurial spirit in Turkey but the problem was of creating awareness and recognition abroad in Turkey's ability to produce technology. Thus, the focus was on how to create a "farkindalik," a recognition or awareness abroad—this act of resistance would be complete only when technology products could say made in Turkey and be considered high quality.

Yet despite the fact that resistance was going on, distinctions must be made between the resistances taking place in the U.S. versus those taking place in Turkey. One of the main differences in the conferences is the audience even though both audiences were made up of mostly Turks. In the U.S., the conference was seen as an "institutionalization" of Turkish technology networking in Silicon Valley and thus a much more localized resistance to Orientalist notions (EA, TABCON 2006) whereas the

Sinerjiturk conference took place at an economic and political level (both in terms of cost and level of Turkish government involvement). This was necessary for what it was trying to achieve. In other words, the Sinerjiturk conference was a show of resistance and entering the space denied to the Oriental through official national ceremony—the conference started by members singing the Turkish national anthem as images of Ataturk, the founder of 'modern' Turkey were flashed on the screen. This was followed by a one minute of silence for those who lost their lives in terror attacks. Thus, this conference was a national undertaking meant to launch Turkey into global high-technology competition with other nations. In contrast, the conferences in the U.S. were trying to create a business bridge to Turkey and thus trying to connect to Turkey rather than to the Rest of the world.

In summary, Said's framework allowed me to see how relational identities take place in the context of national relationships and how these identities are used to lay claim to and produce knowledge that is denied to the Orientalized Turk. Such relational identity formations highlight the interconnection and interdependence of national economies and politics and, within this context, necessitate an understanding of cultural differences and self as political activities. Consequently, identity formation is not an innocent process of cultural differentiation of self from Others: it is an interested act. In light of this, identity formation can be used as an act of resistance, to achieve recognition by the West and "reinscribe" (Said 1993, 210) what being Turkish means in the context of Silicon Valley and the world. Examining Turkish entrepreneurial identity formation then allows one to see how "incursions by the periphery to domains of experience...hitherto commanded by metropolitan center" (Said 1993, 244) take place.

CHAPTER 7

GENDER, SUBALTERNITY, AND REFLEXIVITY: FEMINIZATION AND MASCULINAZATION OF HIGH-TECHNOLOGY ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The theoretical framework provided by Spivak's complicated postcolonial positions allows for an examination of entrepreneurial identity formation at the level of gender and subalternity. Moreover, her lens takes into consideration that any knowledge produced by the researcher as 'native informant' or as 'expert' needs to be articulated through reflexive writing and research. Thus, rather than a traditional chapter reporting 'back' analyses, this chapter incorporates reflexivity into the very analytic account that is supposed to take place in this space. To accomplish this chapter, I first discuss how my position in the field changed throughout the course of the encounters I entered, such as the one-on-one interviews and conferences, over the course of four years (2005-2008) and how these encounters were related to subaltern agency. I then discuss how a particular masculinity became attributed to high-technology in Silicon Valley and contrast it with subaltern resistance against such masculinization of high-technology in Turkey. Following this, I address how gendered business practices allowed for two distinct experiences of high-technology to emerge from the narratives of two Turkish high-technology women entrepreneurs in Turkey. Finally, I outline how the global division of labor and nations make high-technology entrepreneurial identity formation possible in Silicon Valley.

In this sense, this chapter is an autoethnographic narrative that tells my story as a participant within the research process. With reflexivity in mind or rather in practice, I rely on Spivak's postcolonial insights to analyze narratives from the fieldwork focusing

specifically on the feminization and masculinization of high-technology entrepreneurship. I do this not as an omniscient researcher but as someone whose involvement in the research process cannot be extricated from what I saw and how I saw it. In a sense, notions of gender, subalternity, and reflexivity, further complicate the multiple narratives of entrepreneurial identity formation occurring under globalization I addressed in the previous chapters.

Enter the Researcher: Reflexivity and Subaltern Agency to 'See' the Fieldwork

One of the guiding assumptions of Spivak's theoretical lens is that the researcher is not an information retriever for the Western academic institution that she may be linked to, nor necessarily a 'native' who 'goes back home' to where she came from, expecting to fit 'back in.' Thus, Spivak's work raises specific concerns over voice (identity) and place (culture) and speaks directly to their problematic intersections in fieldwork settings, where participants are embedded in power relations. In light of these concerns, notions of "native", "home", "going back", and "reporting back" are all contested terms in this chapter. For instance, as researcher I held Turkish citizenship but did this mean I was a "native," fluent in the "cultural" knowledge of Turkey? I was not 'going home' since I was not raised in Turkey but in Saudi Arabia and Switzerland. In this sense, there was no 'sense of return' since I had never lived in Turkey to be able to leave Turkey in the first place. Equally relevant is how I entered the research project based on an affiliation with a Western academic institution that needed a 'report back' from the field. Yet, this 'reporting back' function is by definition a problematic practice in that it does not recognize what "reporting back" actually does and how it comes about.

.

For instance, there were no “natives” waiting for me to be interviewed when I arrived in Silicon Valley or in Turkey. Rather, both I and the other participants were mobile: we produced multiple identities during the course of the fieldwork that crossed geographic, national, and imaginary boundaries to account for our experiences of globalization. These multiple narratives of self changed dependent on place: in Turkey, my family affiliations, dress, and socioeconomic status marked me as part of the secular elite class. This is noteworthy in that who I was perceived to be in Turkey affected my encounters with entrepreneurs in Silicon Valley as well as in Turkey. Moreover, being a woman, a gendered body, at times affected how I entered and exited the interview and conference spaces and how I was narrated into the research.

I experienced the research as a gendered body and, as such, various boundaries emerged around me and about me, inscribing me into particular discourses of self. That is, depending on the interview, I was seen through multiple lenses and thus could say I had multiple selves throughout the course of the fieldwork. For instance, I was seen as woman/sexed object by one Turkish entrepreneur in Silicon Valley who wanted to take me out to dinner. I was confronted by an identity that I rejected, I wanted to be seen as a ‘professional’ or gender-neutral in the face of someone who inscribed me as something else. As a result of this experience, I did not contact this entrepreneur for an interview again. Yet, this gendered self/identity was not the only one that emerged out of my interactions. I also became you’re-like-my-spouse which was expressed as “my wife has a bag just like that” in reference to my Longchamp handbag (Hakan, Silicon Valley). Thus, I was inscribed into a gendered role (i.e., wife) rather than researcher role.

The gendered position that I occupied emerged not only during this interaction but

through others as male entrepreneurs asked, “How can I help you?” (Hakan, Silicon Valley) and “teknik bilginiz olsa bu konulari tartisabiliriz… Cok teknik seyler bunlar, hem islemler teknik, hem program isleyis acisindan iki turlu teknik ozetleyen seyler” (If you had technical knowledge, we could debate these topics…these things are very technical, technical operationally and technical in how the program operates so technical in both aspects, Turgut, Turkey). In effect, I ‘needed help’ and ‘did not how’ when entering the space of high-technology. High-technology was the domain of expert knowledge and it was assumed I did not have this expert knowledge. Thus, expert knowledge became gendered as a particular kind of masculinity that ‘helps’ the woman who in turn became feminized as ‘needing help.’

Yet, this gendered position was not the only identity that emerged during the course of storytelling about entrepreneurship. A class identity also emerged during the interviews in Silicon Valley, as class was one way for entrepreneurs to claim to be ‘equal’ to me in Turkey. This was expressed in the following ways:

> **Kemal:** I had an interesting conversation with our ambassador in, in Washington, D.C. the other day, he said—
> **BOP:** what’s his name?
> **Kemal:** Faruk Lohoglu, he has an interesting last name, anyway, he said you’ve figured out everything but you’ve failed to figure out the green card issue [laughs] get your green card
> **BOP:** [laughs]
> **Kemal:** it was interesting
> **BOP:** well my grandfather knows the consul general
> **Kemal:** everybody knows him
> **BOP:** we also know the fahri konsolos [honorary consul general] in Baltimore, he’s a family friend, he’s really good at stamping things when you need stamps [laughs]
> **Kemal:** good

Thus, Kemal dismantled each attempt I made to forge a class identity equal to his during

this first interview. Throughout the course of the fieldwork as I continued my interviews with him and attended conferences that he helped put together, my encounters with Kemal were what I call positional achievements. At each encounter, he was in a position to grant or deny me access to the conferences that were vital to the study and thus, I had to constantly accomplish a position with him in order to continue with the fieldwork. In light of this, I'm not sure that had I any choice or agency in this relationship in terms of the position I occupied insofar as "I needed to get access". As a reflexive researcher, I was constantly trying to 'give voice' (albeit problematically) to the Turkish high-technology entrepreneur but during encounters such as these, I was the one who needed a voice.

Moreover, out of the fieldwork encounters in Turkey my professional and researcher identities were also recrafted. In Turkey, I was referred to as a "researcher" (Osman), who understood the technology business by virtue of her being an "isletmeci" (business person, Alp), and who knew how to speak English, which was the language of business (Bora). These identities emerging in the Turkish context stood in stark contrast to the gendered feminized identities that were forming in Silicon Valley during my interviews and exchanges. I should note that the one person who said I lacked technical knowledge in Turkey was a man who had 'returned' to Turkey after living in Germany for 25 years. Thus, I became feminized as an outsider to high-technology through my encounters with entrepreneurs in Silicon Valley as well as the one Western 'returnee' in Turkey. In contrast, my encounters in Turkey produced an experience of globalization that recognized me as a knowledgeable person about business as professional and as researcher.

By recounting how multiple identities formed during the course of my fieldwork, I want to reiterate that these various encounters created certain border around me related to who I was in the research process, what I could do, what I could say or not, and what I couldn't do. Taken together, these different ways of being in the field contributed to how I determined what was worth seeing, what was significant, and which stories would be narrated as the story of the dissertation. What was subaltern agency in this context? Perhaps subaltern agency was the ability of the entrepreneurs to negotiate a position with me but this occurred through gendered discourses and practices. I discuss this in-depth next and then further my analyses by discussing subalternization processes related to the international division of the global high-technology sector.

Emergent Masculinities: "Young Turks" in Silicon Valley

Over the course of the three TABCON conferences I attended from 2005 to 2007 one important process I experienced and observed taking place was the emergence of a particular masculinity associated with Silicon Valley entrepreneurship. To clarify how such masculinity emerged, it is important to focus on the role of women (myself included, as previously narrated), and older men at the conference as groups of people who were marginalized through a feminization process. I begin by outlining the role of different women at the conferences and then discuss how older men became embedded in the feminization process.

At each TABCON conference, average attendance was about two hundred people with the number of women attending usually around twenty to twenty-five. According to the data I was able to gather during the events, in the 2005 conference there were no women panelists and the women who attended the conference did so mostly in the

capacity of wives and daughters of attendees (family), volunteers, or master or doctoral students interested in business and/or technology. In 2006, there were again no women panelists and the number of women attending was again about ten percent of the total number of attendees. Women who attended this conference were wives of attendees, volunteers, students, and some mid-level managers from Silicon Valley corporations.

In 2007, the number of women attending was again about twenty and these women were wives, volunteers, mid-level managers, and independent workers (such as real estate agents). However, the honorary consul for the Republic of Turkey, BJK, also attended this conference. BJK was an American woman who had married a Turkish man and was the first non-Turkish person to receive the honorary title. Since the late 1970s, she had been involved in various Turkish organizations and interests across the Bay Area and was regarded as a leader and influential voice in addressing Turkish issues. Moreover, the 2007 conference also included two different panels where one of the four panel members was a woman. At these panels, one of them spoke about venture capital funding in Turkey, while the other discussed working for a U.S.-based non-profit that identifies 'high-impact' entrepreneurs in developing nations. Both these women were from Turkey. Within this context, I witnessed the emergence of a particular gendered identity that was associated with Silicon Valley.

One of the observations I made during the TABCON conferences was that although the attendance of women was consistently low during the three years, at the 2007 conference women had higher visibility both in terms of the honorary consul attending and in terms of women taking part in the panels. However, during the lunch break in 2007 and immediately afterwards, I also witnessed the emergence of a particular

kind of masculinity that was becoming associated with the Turkish presence in Silicon Valley. As a narrative, my experience tells the story of how this particular kind of masculinity was emerging as *the* voice for high-technology entrepreneurship in Silicon Valley while silencing other voices that could have also spoken for high-technology. To this effect, the 2007 lunch break proved to be a turning point in the experiences of women and older men attending the conference over the course of three years. Below, I discuss these events as processes of voicing and silencing.

At the previous TABCON conferences, lunch was usually sandwiches and sodas so people often sat in small groups around the conference area as the lunch arrangements were not as formalized, but during the 2007 lunch break, a self-serve buffet was set up with about twenty large round tables seating ten each, were arranged throughout the room. As the attendees went through the buffet line, they were looking at which tables to sit at and soon each table began filling up rather quickly with a number of male attendees. There were a few women scattered throughout the mostly men tables but what was worth noting is that a table of only women emerged. I entered the buffet line late and at this point very few tables had seating available so I decided to sit at a table that was in the far corner and had BJK and another woman sitting at it. Soon, three other women joined us and a number of men came to say hello but did not sit with us even though we were one of the few tables that had seats available. During this conference, men were actually pulling seats from unused tables and using them to sit with other men at tables that were intended for ten people.

As the number of men coming to say hello but not sitting down became a pattern, a couple of the women in the lunch group decided to ask some of the men to join us but

they each declined. This became a game in that we were each trying to get a man to sit with us and the only ones who ended up sitting down with us were an old friend of BJK, an American man in his late seventies working for Turkish Airlines, and the husband of the pregnant woman sitting with us. We actually cheered when the husband decided to sit down but he actually left before lunch was over to join another table.

During lunch, the main topic of conversation was why men did not want to join our table. One of the suggestions by BJK was that men talk about what they know. Such a claim is possible based on a silenced assumption: women do not know. We do not know and we do not understand what men talk about in the context of high-technology. In effect, we were left outside the technology networking happening during lunch. Another woman, SB, suggested that we should become part of the women's leadership network taking place at Santa Clara University (SCU) and that this way we (women) would also have a network. During this conversation, another woman came to join our table and she suggested that the leadership network would be a good idea. Despite the intentions of these women, having a women's technology leadership network would only work to signal a separation: a women-in-technology network versus a technology network.

Yet, the notion of technology and the practices surrounding technology networking that emerged at the 2007 TABCON conference was already gendered and this was evidenced in the following ways. The end of lunch was signaled with a bell, and as the attendees scattered to join one of the two parallel sessions going on I continued speaking with BJK and a couple of the women as we walked to the panel we were all planning to attend. During this panel, I sat between BJK and SB, who had commented

about the women's leadership network at SCU. BJK suggested that at next year's TABCON conference (i.e., 2008), she wanted to have a panel on women, entrepreneurship, and leadership. Meanwhile, SB commented that her husband, BB, had stopped coming to the TABCON conferences since he felt old, didn't think he could contribute anything to the events, and thought that the conferences were now the domain of 'young Turkish guys.' This was quite significant in that BB was one of the best known and well regarded Turkish entrepreneurs in Silicon Valley and his name had come up numerous times over the course of the fieldwork when I explained my dissertation topic to the different people I had met.

These comments by BJK and SB were a reflection on the change in the attendees since the 2005 conference. Since then, the conference had attracted more and more of these young Turkish males (under the age of 35) and I had already experienced this change when I first came into the 2007 conference space. During the breakfast hour before the conference, I was drinking coffee while standing up at a cocktail table and noticed that each cocktail table had about three or four young Turkish males speaking Turkish, exchanging cards, and discussing their businesses. Groups such as these were also taking place in the space of the conference room and not necessarily at tables, as groups of men dressed in suits were huddled together talking and exchanging business cards. I noticed that the men would stay in the small group until one or two decided it was time to move onto another group such that the small groups were continuously changing in make up, even though what was occurring in each group was the same: talk about business, exchange cards, then move onto next person or group of people. During this parade, several young men approached me, "What do you do?" they would ask.

When I told them I was a doctoral student and doing research for my thesis, they would say, “So you don’t have a business” or “You don’t work in high-technology.” They never asked for my card and I had to ask for theirs, meanwhile noticing that they were willing to give their cards without asking if they met someone who had the right answers to their questions. In effect, they spent minimal time interacting with me.

What I witnessed was subalternity happening over a three year period. I witnessed the formation of an identity in which the form of masculinity that’s associated with Silicon Valley takes place by marginalizing the ‘Other’ as feminized. This marginalization took place through the exclusionary practices (i.e., networking) that eventually produced a table of women and one older man and deterred older male entrepreneurs from attending the 2007 conference. These ‘Other’, the women and older men who felt marginalized and placed in a feminized position, were produced through gendering in which a more macho culture (young Turkish males) created subalternity of gender, which was then silenced.

In this sense, gender was doubly silenced as women and older males were not given voice in two different ways. First, there was no participation available to those feminized Others existing in the margins of the macho culture that became associated with high-technology entrepreneurship. In effect, they were subalternized as unable to speak for high-technology since they were not equal participants in the networking and relationship-forming that was occurring among the younger Turkish males. These networks and relationships were keys to knowing what kinds of high-technology opportunities were available in the Silicon Valley area. Ironically, networking among Turkish and Turkish-American professionals was the very practice that the TABC

organization promoted through the First Thursday meetings and the TABCON conferences. However, as I experienced them, the First Thursdays were informal and more private events focusing mostly on individuals getting together to discuss social and cultural events affecting the Turkish and Turkish-American community. The conferences, in contrast, were formal high-profile public gatherings such that when the exclusion of women and older males took place it did so in a highly-visible context. Consequently, the form of masculinity associated with high-technology entrepreneurship gained legitimacy in that there was no challenge to it in a high-visible context. This lack of challenging voices takes me to my second point on the institutionalization of silencing gender.

As indicated in the previous chapter, in 2008, there was no annual TABCON conference but a number of TABC members presented a small panel during the 27th annual conference on U.S.-Turkey relations in Washington, D.C. The description from the TABC website of this event is "TABC is heading the Information Communication Technology Committee, bringing our experience in entreprenuership [sic] and information technology." Now, there was no space for resisting the masculinity of Silicon Valley as it was now presented as *the* source for expert knowledge on entrepreneurship and technology. Consequently, the women, entrepreneurship, and leadership panel, as suggested by BJK in 2007, could not take place in the traditional required space (TABCON conference) to speak back to the very practices and people that had silenced gender in the first place. More striking was the fact that the emergent masculinities were appearing in what is assumed to be the most technologically sophisticated, progressive and open minded place in the world: Silicon Valley. When seen through the lens of gender, this place was not progressive for women and feminized Others (e.g., older men).

Gendering and Gender Contestations in Turkey

In contrast to the masculinity associated with entrepreneurship in Silicon Valley, in Turkey the issue of gender was immediately voiced and contested. In order to understand why this issue would be raised as such in Turkey, it is important to place this act of contestation within historical context. The Young Turks movement during Ottoman rule at the beginning of the 20th century attempted to reform the existing religion-based monarchy through progressive intellectual and artistic endeavors. A number of these Young Turks gave inspiration to the founder of the Turkish republic, Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, in establishing a secular republic in 1923 and giving Turkish women many rights not enjoyed by European women at the time. However, the establishment of the republic was not through democratic means but by the heavy military and political hand of the state under Ataturk. This paradox will become relevant later on in this chapter as I discuss the role of the subaltern in Turkey versus Silicon Valley. Nonetheless, there is a tradition of speaking back and contesting political matters in contemporary Turkey and gender, since the founding of the republic, has been a political issue producing many contestations.

At the Sinerjiturk conference in 2008, the panelists over the three days of the conference were all men with the exception of one woman, MB, who was invited to speak on the panel entitled, "Turk diasporasi ile iliskilerimizi gelistirmek" (Improving our relationship with the Turkish diaspora). The purpose of the panel was to raise awareness in Turks living outside of Turkey about technology challenges facing Turkey. When it was her turn to address the topic, MB said the following:

> **MB:** 35 yil kadar once Ankara'da Ericsson Turk sirketinde ticaret mudurlugu yaparken o endestrudeki tek bayan

> bendim, Sinerjiturkun toplatilarindada ilk, yani bayan konusmaci ben oldum, merak ediyorum, telekomunikasyonda bayanlara pek yer yokmu, nedir? Ilgimi cekti bu! (35 years ago when I was the sales manager at Ericsson's Turkish company in Ankara, I was the first woman in that industry. At the Sinerjiturk conference, it seems that I'm the first woman panelist/speaker, I'm wondering if there's no room for women in telecommunication. This has really intrigued me!)

Her speech was interrupted with claps of support, once right after she said, "I'm wondering…" and again right after she said, "This has really…" I observed that those who were clapping were not just women but men as well. This was in addition to the fact that in terms of percentages, the number of women attending the TABCON conference was about ten percent (about twenty women in a conference of two hundred), while at the Sinerjiturk conference, women made up about fifteen percent of the total attendance (about twenty women in a conference of one hundred and fifty). Although these may not be significant differences, the scarcity of women in the technology sector was only addressed during the conference in Turkey.

This was a noteworthy moment in my research experience and can be used to demonstrate how gendering functions in a different subalternizing way in a 'traditional' Muslim culture (as represented in the West). The question of gender came up immediately during the Sinerjiturk conference and was recognized as an issue that needed to be addressed. Moreover, the conference itself was a gathering of government and union officials, high-technology firm CEOs, and upper level management teams who were there to network, develop technology awareness, and discuss what kinds of activities Turkey needed to in order to become part of global high-technology sector. One woman supported by other women and men denied subalternity to gender, and in this

highly-visible context, the subaltern could speak.

Yet this act of resistance is not necessarily complete in that the women attending the conference were all secular women or women not wearing any headscarves. The conference itself began by a singing of the Turkish national anthem as images of Ataturk, the founder of 'modern' Turkey were displayed on the screens. Whether a nonsecular woman would have been allowed to attend the conference or make such an observation is debatable and thus in this case, gendering functions in another subalternizing way. Going back to my previous point in the above section about the functioning of the Turkish 'modern' republic, how subalternization occurs becomes relevant. In this context, the Turkish republic exists as secular and modern by subalternizing the headscarfed or veiled woman. The modern secular Turkish woman exists in relation to the absent other: the traditional woman wearing the headscarf or veil. As such, the traditional woman is doubly-subjugated by indigenous patriarchy, in the form of men, secular women and the Turkish state, *and* by colonizing 'expert' discourses of high-technology entrepreneurship from Silicon Valley that are already based on a particular kind of Young Turk masculinity. In effect, the secularist political ideology of the Turkish state subalternizes through different means in Turkey and in Silicon Valley.

My study is limited to secular women, and thus the issue of the headscarf gets back to my own position in the field as secular woman. I didn't interview any women wearing the headscarf, or know where to go to contact them, as the headscarf is a political issue,. Nonetheless I interviewed two secular women high-technology entrepreneurs, one Turkish and one Turkish-American, and each of their stories highlight distinct discourses about women, work, life, and entrepreneurship in Turkey.. Each narrative speaks to

different gender and gendering processes in high-technology entrepreneurship and highlights diverse conditions facing the female postcolonial subject, regardless of self-identification.

"The Difference Difference Makes": Turkish and Turkish-American Women Speak about High-Technology Entrepreneurship

My interviews with these two women demonstrate how gendering processes work to subalternize people and practices related to high-technology differently even if they take place within the same place/culture (i.e., Turkey). The distinctions I highlight here show how intersections of voice and place are not necessarily straightforward. Issues of speaking for (women high-technology entrepreneurs) and speaking from (Turkey) become more complicated than simply representing *the* voice of the Turkish high-technology woman entrepreneurs, for voices and places continue to shift during encounters among people, highlighting the complexities of identity formation in the context of globalization.

To clarify, each woman spoke about her experiences but did so in a way that either spoke directly about the gendered processes that allowed high-technology entrepreneurship to be possible (i.e., Turkish woman) or spoke about high-technology entrepreneurship based on a discourse about gender not making a difference (i.e., Turkish-American woman). Thus, despite their (assumed) shared place (i.e., Turkey), each woman voiced her experience through distinct discourses such that dismantling and challenging the masculinity associated with high-technology would look very differently under each story. To this effect, the difference that difference makes in understanding women's experiences is that identities are not formed based on a stagnant voices and

places. Rather identities form as voices shift in the encounters people have with each other. Being a Turkish woman entrepreneur in this sense was not a preformed subaltern identity that could be easily captured but a shifting set of narratives about experiences of gendered work norms and hours, family, and high-technology knowledge.

For instance, in my interview with Zeynep, she explains what she means by the prevalence of a male culture at work:

> **Zeynep:** şunu kastediyorum, mesela akşam yemeğinde iş konuşmak, Cumartesi, Pazar çalışmak, şimdi bunlar çok yaygın, hadi gidip bir iki bir şeyler içelim biraz da işimizi konuşalım, ben bunu yapamıyorum, çünkü benim evde bekleyen çocuklarım var. Ben akşam yemeği denildiğinde tüyleri diken diken olan biriyim. Hafta sonlarımı çocuklarımla geçirmek istiyorum. Ben sonuçta sabah 8:30 aksam 7:30 arası işimi bitiririm, ondan sonraki zamanımı da vaktimi de çocuklarımla geçirmek istiyorum. Bir bu anlamda kısıtlıyım zaman olarak, ve bunu istemiyorum gerçekten, dolayısıyla erkeklerin alışık olduğu düzende çalışamıyorsunuz. Yani o düzenin parçası olamıyorsunuz, ikincisi erkekler kendi aralarında çok rahat iletişim kurabiliyorlar, kavgaları da gürültüleri de dostlukları da olabiliyor, birlikte iş yapmaya erkekler çok alışkın. Kadınlarla iş yapmaya alışık değil, yani daha çok yeni oldu, birkaç gün önce. Yanımdaki satıştaki arkadaşım erkek ben de bayanım. Şimdi ben Genel Müdür ünvanı ile gidiyorum ama sadece erkek olduğu için patron onunla konuşuyor, sizinle konuşmuyor, aradan bunca yıl geçmiş, bunca şey elde etmişsiniz fakat hala cinsiyet nedeni ile sizin bir elemanınız size tercih edilebiliyor. Bu da bir gerçek. Sonuçta ben bunu inkar edemem, ben gittiğimde satışta erkek olmasını önemsiyorum, çünkü kendi aralarında daha iyi anlaşıyorlar, benden daha iyi anlaştıkları kesin. Böyle bir durum var, bir de Türkiye'de maalesef şöyle bir durum var, kadının yeri evdir. Yani dünyada da bu çok yaygın. (What I mean is, for exaple speaking about work at dinner, working on Saturday, Sunday, these things are very prevalent now, let's go get a couple of drinks and let's talk a little business, I can't do this because I have children waiting for me at home. When someone says dinner, I get goosebumps. I want to spend my weekend with my children. I end up working from 8:30 in the morning to

> 7:30 at night and then I want to spend the rest of my time with my children. In one sense, I'm limited by time and I really don't want that, but because of that you end up not being able to work in a style men are accustomed to. What I mean is, you are not able to become part of that style. And second, men communicate better among themselves, be it their arguments, their noise, their friendships. They're not used to doing business with women, something happened very recently, just a few days ago. My salesperson and I went to a sale, and he's a man and I'm a woman. I'm going to the sale with the title of General Manager but because the salesperson is a man, the boss only speaks to him and doesn't speak to you, it's been so many years and you've accomplished so much in that time but because of your gender, it's possible that they prefer your employee over you. This is reality. I can't deny this at the end, I think it's important to have a man when you go on a sale because they communicate much better among themselves, they communicate much better than me for sure! So that's the situation, that's unfortunately the situation in Turkey, a woman's place is at home. I mean it's like that everywhere in the world)

Yet again, in Turkey gender is voiced immediately in the context of doing business in high-technology. This is not the same as narrating the experiences of a woman entrepreneur but the issue of how a particular masculinity becomes associated with the high-technology sector. In this case, Zeynep discusses how norms associated with doing business in high-technology emerge as norms based on the schedules of men, who are not the caregivers. Her cognizance of gender as a lens to explain her experiences and entrepreneurship stood in stark contrast to the gender-neutral explanations of the Turkish-American woman entrepreneur I interviewed in Turkey. Below, I share what she said when I asked her about her experiences as a woman entrepreneur:

> **Semra:** So it has not been an issue where it was an obstacle in raising money, or managing my company, or finding people to work for me, people trusting that I would be able to close a second round. There has not been an issue of that such, and I believe women who are risk takers can be

entrepreneurs, and the U.S. capital market are accepting it if you have the right credibility, if you have the patents, titles, experience, references. I was not treated differently because I was a woman. I must say, at the time when my company was going to C round, my board decided that I should be replaced, that a professional CEO – but not because I was a woman, because I was a technologist always associated with research and development. I didn't have an MBA. I never managed a big company. I never managed P&L for more than a couple million dollars.

BOP: What's P&L?

Semra: Profit and loss, managing money basically, and making sales, although I must say, at the A round, the very initial rounds of my company, I made the first couple of sales personally, so I was actually very good in sales. I just didn't have enough tax leverage to be able to show – to prove myself, so when they make a decision as such, I went along with it because I owned a bulk of that company, and I wanted it to succeed, and the VCs [venture capitalists] that I had at that round were from very credible companies… and they were very experienced VCs, and they said, "You're good. You should stay with the company as the founder, and we'll entice you to stay on board and own more of the company, but for the sake of the future of your company, we have to bring somebody experienced whose background is sales, not research," so at that time I interviewed with men and women, more men than – much more men. There were just a few women. You should see, there was an executive search firm. What was the name of it?...There was a few of them in our field, but you should see the common list. It's all male, male, male, male, male, male just maybe one female, and so we ended up finding a guy CEO for the company, and unfortunately he didn't do very well. He worked at – I gave him my office, my chair, my pay, my everything and I stepped aside a little bit, but at the end of the day, he didn't do too well either. I thought, "Well, maybe if they kept me on board, maybe I could have done a better job," but I accepted it, so there's nobody to finger point at. Now my company's name has changed after I left…Because I departed, I maintained some ownership of the company, but they have a new team, new product ideas, completely refreshed, and apparently doing very well.

This example highlights how Semra's narrative positions herself and her business practices as the masculine West while feminizing Turkish business practices. She accomplishes by first making the point that being a woman was not an issue or an obstacle, echoing U.S.-based management ideas of "what difference does gender make?" In effect, she articulates gender as sex difference and goes to suggest there was no difference. Yet her narrative works to dismantle this very notion as she recounts the story of being asked to move aside as CEO, a story that demonstrates how research and development occupies a feminized place in relation to the superiority of an MBA. The feminized position of research and development in the U.S. however is not the same position it occupies when Semra encounters Turkish businesses and business practices. The emergent masculinity of research and development in the Turkish context occurs in the following way:

> **Semra:** Our funder, it's ironic, is from a very reputable textile firm in Turkey that provided initial funding for this company. They said, "Don't you guys punch cards?" I said, "Excuse me, this is not a factory, it's a research and development firm where people work sometimes very long hours. Sometimes they come in on weekends. Sometimes they come in late because they worked the day before for ten extra hours," but there is a little bit of that mentality that still permeates, but it's changing. Let me tell you why it's changing, because many of the big corporations in Turkey made the right move of bringing to their executive team people with foreign industry backgrounds, some from France, from England, from U.S., and that changes the culture. I think the leaders always are the ones who – what do you call it – teach the ways to do business to their folks, so with those people in some key positions in Turkey, I think there is a tremendous change in the way they do business.

To understand how U.S. management practices emerge as the norm while an emergent masculinity is associated with high-technology, it's important to note that Semra

identifies herself as “an American executive who’s being an executive abroad” and says, “we’re like a little America here.” Thus, her move to Turkey signals the mobility of assumptions and ideas she has about how to do business in a high-technology firm. But upon encountering the Turkish context, the feminized position of research and development in the U.S. becomes superior to factory work in Turkey. In effect, high-technology work genders factory work as feminine while simultaneously subalternizing Turkish business practices as in need of Western intervention. Semra embodies the masculine West as she narrates Turkish businesses as “the head guy actually has the budget, never delegates to anyone, monitors and manages everything” and distinguishes this from her “little America” where she “delegates”, is “proactive”, and doesn’t’ “have to breathe behind somebody’s back to make him work.” In effect, Turkish business practices are spoken about as inferior to *and* in need of Western (benevolent) business practices. Yet these practices are not necessarily benevolent but rather colonizing notions of what business should look like in Turkey.

Further, Semra’s experience with dinner highlights the processes by which Turkish social practices become colonized by American high-technology business ideas as can be seen in the following excerpt:

> **Semra:** rarely I had seen throughout my experience in the U.S. where your friends are your colleagues, very rarely, although I had a few of them, naturally, but in here, it’s more like I came here the first week – actually our other VP said, “Oh, you should come visit with me,” and my first reaction was, “Oh, no. This is not necessary.” “Oh,” she says, “what do you mean? You have to come to dinner. Bring your kids,” and that more intimate, more friendlier environment, that’s very conducive of doing business.

In her narrative, Semra only accepts the dinner invitation as an opportunity to continue doing business-at-home rather than a social occasion and thus is willing to dismantle her assumed boundary of work/life for the sake of business. In contrast, Zeynep resists bringing home work or working during the weekend as these are gendered practices produced by men: she does not feel that she has a choice and thus attempts to create and maintain a boundary between work and life. In the Turkish context, Zeynep voices how gendered conditions allow a particular kind of high-technology entrepreneurship to emerge while Semra, as the voice of the masculine West, sees high-technology as a gender-neutral activity that can take place at work or at home.

Nations and High-Technology Labor: The Global Production Cycle

In this section, I discuss further how local gendered business practices as discussed in the last two sections (i.e., in Silicon Valley and in Turkey) are linked to broader feminization process occurring globally. For instance, gendered ideological practices from Silicon Valley produce a feminized global division of high-technology labor and affect entrepreneurship ideas and activities in different nations, such as Turkey. To examine this dynamic process, I first consider how the emergence of the masculinities of high-technology entrepreneurial self in Silicon Valley takes place based on silent assumptions about the Other: family. This is expressed in the following ways, “in this type of environment, first of all, you can’t go home at five, second thing is doesn't matter what hour you go, the job is still not done” (Ismail), “I don’t leave before eleven pm and I’m back at eight, nine am” (Hakan), and “you should forget your family and your friends…I sleep four hours a day, everyday” (Kemal). This is expressed even more concretely as:

> **Ismail:** when I said more commitment, when an entrepreneur really identifies with his venture, [it] becomes a very personal thing, you can't separate yourself, sleepless night, long hours and frankly, it takes an awful lot away from your family…To give you an example, when I started Company A in 1971, there were four of us, our three partners in the first two years went through a divorce and their families broke up. I was the only that came out unscathed out of the whole venture. Second time around in 1980, Company B era, our third partner, our chief technical guy, he came, he started, his family broke up our first year of our formation. When I started the third one, Company C, my partner had a divorce within the first two months of our operation [laughs]. Secondly, you really have to have your spouse for a partner…it's going to take a team and support for years to come…we speak all the greater glory of starting a company, we forget about the sweat and tears that go in there. This commitment from your family to help you out is key to it.

Such narratives highlight that in order to become high-technology entrepreneurs, men have to work long hours. These long hours are only possible if the spouse is assumed to be responsible for the family. Yet how these high-technology selves emerge is not only based on the gendered assumptions about how to or who can become an entrepreneur—high-technology entrepreneurship already assumes a particular global division of labor that places Silicon Valley as the center of technology innovation and the rest of the world as potential places for low cost outsourcing. This global division of labor allows for U.S. firms to stay competitive, as high-technology workers outside the U.S. complete the job. Thus, the global division of high-technology is based on those nations that produce the innovation versus those that manufacture it.

These activities are documented in the following ways:

> **Hakan:** most of the work is done outside the country, we have, we outsource to two, three different teams in Russia, in three different cities actually, three in India, two in Pakistan, about two in Ukraine and one is about to go to

> China oh, one is in Romania, so this, but getting the work done there is the cheapest thing you can imagine…as a start up you have to watch out for resources and the money, how you spend, so they do good work, they do much better work than people here, they work hard, those people, and they are, actually managing them is easier, they're scattered and they don't have actual offices here, they finish their work…so most of the work here is integration and testing, things related to customer side here, other than that, the work is distributed.

Similarly, Selim discusses his company's operations:

> **Selim:** I do have, bunch of you know, helping me with this thing, I have company in Canada, I have three programmer in India, and I have two artists here. They help me, back me up you know, whenever I need their help and I also have our product manager here, an Indian guy, so nobody checks out in the work, nobody punches the time card and I find bigger efficiency letting people to do what they have to do and they create their own work time and work hours and I come to realize that when we used to run eight to five, things wasn't going as fast but now things going dramatically fast, for example we do all the strategy art works and everything here daytime from eight to five and at the end of the day, what I do is I send the files to India okay, we retire for the day, but morning when we start again, everything's already done, they came back, so the program is done, so we're taking, we're utilizing our night hours in the production, meaning one side of the world and the other side of, we have global…
> **BOP:** so it's twenty-four hour production
> **Selim:** exactly, twenty-four hour production never stops so in that way we can develop, you know, games lot faster than anyone else or our local competition who does everything locally, it was this gain, this gain in time…

These stories portray how U.S. high-technology entrepreneurship is only possible based on dependence on the 'Third World,' or put crassly, "one kick ass person in Silicon Valley is equal to fifteen engineers in Pakistan" (KB, TABCON 2007). It's the silent local spouse and low-cost subaltern global laborer in the feminized manufacturing nation that allow for Silicon Valley entrepreneurs to be "successful" in high-technology. In turn,

these processes are embedded in global competition to become a nation that receives such outsourced jobs and FDI in order to become a "world class player" in high-technology. Put another way, nations compete and become feminized to be seen as attractive for FDI such that they become dependent on technology producing nations for money and jobs. Feminization then is not only the gendering of nations as producing versus manufacturing but also the production of a nation that is economically dependent on Western FDI and firms for its internal development.

Turkey: Feminization and Subalternity

During the TABCON and Sinerjiturk conferences, I witnessed the subalternization and feminization of Turkey to global capital and labor competition as speaker upon speaker discussed Turkey as an "attractive" place to do business. This was evidenced in the following ways, "Our structural reform efforts are guided by international best practices. The main pieces of the agenda are public sector reforms, financial sector reforms and privatization…we see private sector as the driving force in the economy. In this respect, we have liberalized key sectors in the economy…Turkey is one of the few emerging markets which one can bring capital with an ease of mind, establish a company within a day, with no discrimination on whatsoever, make a good profit and leave as one wishes or continue enjoying life and making money" (Engin Ansay, Consul General of Turkey, TABCON 2005). Moreover, other speakers repeated the macroeconomic changes in Turkey that had taken place and thus made it an attractive place to bring "your" (Western) business (CE, SO, MS, CT, TABCON 2006; BK TABCON 2007). One of the problems as articulated by speakers at TABCON conferences was that certain nations were "behind" (India is like U.S. in the 50's, China

is Taiwan fifteen years, SA, TABCON 2006) and needed drastic steps to "catch up" including government incentives in the technology sector, "home country champions" from the U.S., and transparency in the financial sector. Moreover, Turkey, like other developing nations, would get FDI when macroeconomic stability was achieved (AA, TABCON 2006).

In contrast to the TABCON conferences, the Sinerjiturk presenters focused on what other countries were doing and what could be done in Turkey to promote high-technology rather than discuss Turkey as in need of "catching up." Within this context, Turkey could only compete in one of two ways: low-cost labor or niche technology products. Turkey's attempts to enter the global high-technology sector were further complicated by E.U. accession talks, a part of which involved labor negotiations and pay. As such, Turkey could not enter the global high-technology sector as a low-cost labor country nor did any of the presenters at the Sinerjiturk believed this was beneficial for the country. Yet E.U. accession was not guaranteed and it was possible that Turkey enact all the necessary reforms and still be denied entrance. In effect, the Sinerjiturk conference highlighted how Turkey could end up outside of global capital flows (FDI), low-cost labor flows, not have any niche technology products to be able to enter the global high-technology sector and left to live under the newly liberalized economy. Technology entrepreneurship in this context was a matter of national necessity: it was a way to become somewhat self-sufficient in an interdependent world where the terms of economic dependency among nations were not necessarily negotiable.

In summary, I saw gendering processes related to identity formation in distinct ways in Silicon Valley and Turkey. Moreover I tried to portray how emergent forms of

masculinity are not necessary based on sex but that gendering and can take place by women as well as men (Calás and Smircich, 2006; Calás, Smircich and Bourne, 2009 forthcoming). As such, I outlined how local gendered practices in Silicon Valley and Turkey enabled different concepts of entrepreneurial self and entrepreneurship to emerge in the context of the global feminized division of high-technology nations and labor. Throughout the chapter, I've tried to portray how the researcher, and how she sees what she sees, makes a difference in what's written down in the analysis. Reflexivity in this sense existed as the complicated intersections of subaltern agency and constructivist epistemology while I tried to produce local rather than global knowledge.

CHAPTER 8

IDENTITIES IN A POSTCOLONIAL GLOBALIZED WORLD

Having gone through the various analyses in the previous chapters, how can the story at the beginning of the dissertation be understood in light of postcolonial frameworks and the complexities they bring to light? What can the story highlight about identity formation and globalization? Moreover, what can be said about the ways in which people and globalization are theorized and researched in the international management and entrepreneurship fields?

As I watched the CNN Office program portray Turkey and depict images, what I had seen was the complexity and contradictions of globalization and the ongoing encounters it produced particularly among people, ideas, and practices. It was postcolonial frameworks that allowed me to see such complexity, contradiction, and encounters rather than tell the simplistic story of Turkey is becoming like the West (convergence) or like the Rest (divergence) arguments. The dissertation had been messy because the world was not simple and trying to study people in the middle of globalization meant acknowledging the vastly moving bodies of knowledge, people and practices rather than fixing people to locations: particular voices come from particular places.

The Grundig example, the representations of Turkey and my experiences as something other than native can now be seen as examples of globalization through postcolonial lenses. Moreover, these examples also highlight how each of the postcolonial lenses would change the conversation about representation, identity formation and globalization in ways that are sometimes at odds with each other. Thus,

postcolonial theoretical positions do not offer a ‘way out’ but rather complicate how we see the world and how we are in the world.

With these ideas in mind, going back to the CNN story about Beko taking over Grundig, what the story missed was hybridity, history and processes of subalternization—but who could blame CNN when the overriding international business discourse of the West could not see or tell the story in any other way either. Based on Western international business discourse, the story of the takeover was told in business terms (i.e., financially good decision) and details that didn’t fit into this conversation (i.e., keeping the Grundig name) were translated into business terms and ultimately talked about as an “image problem.” However, the image problem was not simply an issue of representation or better marketing as it also entailed an assumption about ability and quality: Western consumers would probably assume technological and electronic goods coming from Turkey would be of lower quality and thus, that’s why the Grundig name was kept. As my intention in this dissertation was to ‘speak back’ to these very ideas and representations, how could I discuss the act of keeping one name in lieu of another and the idea of the image problem differently through postcolonial lenses?

If I were to re-examine the story through the lens of hybridity, what allowed Grundig to emerge as a Turkish-owned company with a German name was in part due to Beko wanting to enter the European market on equal terms with other ‘European’ manufacturers. Seen through hybridity, keeping the name Grundig was an act of resistance on the part of Beko necessitated by marketplace (i.e., European market and CNN in this case) assumptions about Turkish technological know-how (or lack thereof) and electronic manufacturing. The very act of emerging as a Turkish company capable of

selling in the European market is only possible through hybridity. Rather than a simple naming convention, hybridity in this case is the act of keeping the Grundig name and thus owning technology knowledge, ideas and practices that are denied to one based on his/her voice and place (i.e., being a Turkish business). The name Grundig allows Beko to represent Turkey and Turkish entrepreneurship on their own terms and interrupt the assumptions in Europe about Turkish manufacturing.

Yet the story can also be seen another way through an Orientalist lens by acknowledging the historic movement of labor from Turkey to Germany beginning in the 1960's. Turks who immigrated to Germany during this time were uneducated, poor and were placed in manufacturing and service industries as cheap labor. Over the decades, Turks born in Germany were often denied citizenship as they were still seen as children of immigrants rather than having 'German blood.' To this day, the image of Turkey and of Turks still remains stereotyped as the uneducated, blue collar worker despite mobility of ethnic Turks into jobs traditionally held by Germans. Thus, a Turkish company taking over a German manufacturer is significant in terms of historic power relations between two people and nations: rather than German integrating Turks into German society, Turkish companies were now taking over well-known German brands and companies. In this sense, whose Germany was it anyway? And could the immigrant claim it as his or her own place particularly in light of such business deals?

But the story can be seen a third way through the lens of subalternization and gendering. The very assumptions about Turkey and Turkish businesses that are outlined in the CNN example (and again highlighted throughout the dissertation by participants at various conferences) are possible through a process of subalternization: Turkey becomes

feminized based on lack of knowledge and representation in the technology sector in contrast to countries that are ‘experts’ in technology production. Thus the very act of continuing to use a German name such as Grundig aids in the subalternization process of Turkey as Turkish technology know-how is subsumed under a European label. Moreover, gendered images used to depict Turkey (i.e., veiled women) further subalternize Turkey through the use of women’s bodies as symbols of Turkey. Like Turkey, the veiled woman is traditional and not modern, and thus cannot be knowledgeable about technology. Thus, the feminization and subalternization of Turkey depends on both representational strategies (i.e., epistemology) and physical bodies and practices (i.e., voice and place).

Having thus (re)told the CNN Global Office story through each of the lenses, what about my own experiences in this project? I began the dissertation by telling a story, a complicated story about self and identity as I moved from one nation to another, from one experience to another. Yet along the way, what seemed self-evident in terms of who I was and what my role would be in the dissertation was challenged in different ways particularly as I came to understand better what postcolonial analyses could illuminate about my own experiences. The notion of the native-self returning to her home nation to collect data on people-like-her never existed—instead, what I experienced and wrote about was the emergence of a hybrid gendered self that denied such an innocent return. The place I came to understand as home was not a stagnant and static nation but rather, my ‘return’ was much more akin to a dislocated state of being.

These attempts to “get out” or “become someone/ something else” bring me back to my original concern over whether I was a tourist, a native, a traveler…or someone else in the research process. I never figured this one out but understood that who I became

during the different encounters were not necessarily out of choice as I had imagined—at times I did not have choice about which position I occupied, about which voice had to speak from, and about which place I represented. Reflexivity in practice was much more difficult than I had imagined—there was no gauge to tell me that I had been reflexive or a moment where I felt comfortable doing the research reflexively. Moving back and forth among nations is an exhaustive process, physically, emotionally and epistemologically. Attempting to study this process as it relates to identity formation and exemplifies complex and contradictory processes of globalization through the lens of the international entrepreneur is a much more difficult task than leaving one location and showing up in another—it necessitates examining displacement and placement that cannot be done with the existing approach in the international entrepreneurship literature. This being said, to actually drop my theoretical tools and pick up another set was perhaps the most difficult challenge I faced in this dissertation.

The theoretical positions of Bhabha, Spivak, and Said each allowed for a distinct view of how identity formation processes take place in the context of globalization. To clarify, Bhabha's postcolonial concerns establish that different hybrid selves take form in different sites of encounters between the West and the Rest. Moreover, his lens depicts how hybridity allows for a particular kind of resistance against mimectic impositions of ideas that dictate how individuals should understand themselves and particular practices—in the case of Turkish high-technology entrepreneurs, there were different hybrid evolved that were inevitably called the same name: Turkish-American. Yet becoming Turkish-American looked different in Silicon Valley than it did in Turkey depending on the site of encounter (i.e., Silicon Valley, TABCON conference, Turkey,

Sinerjiturk conference) and the relational role of the individual in that encounter. The hybrid self emerged as a way to refuse the gaze of the West that had immobilized Turkey and Turkish entrepreneurs in a position they did not want to occupy: not known for their innovation and technology. Yet being Turkish was a slippery slope as how individuals understood what being Turkish meant as the particular context they were in constantly changed. Equally important was the fact that what or who was considered the embodiment of that immobilizing Western gaze changed.

In contrast, Said's focus on historic power relations among nations allowed for consideration of how relational identities form differently in Silicon Valley and Turkey. In Silicon Valley, Turkish high-technology entrepreneurs attempted to get out of the Orientalized position they were put in through visa status and the ethnic immigrant label associated with them by Orientalizing others. This was accomplished by differentiating themselves from other Turks, other ethnicities in Silicon Valley, and through a cultural/ political identification of self as 'technologically capable' in the context of ongoing U.S./ Turkish geopolitical and economic relations. In Turkey, entrepreneurial identity formation occurred in relation to the West as Turkish entrepreneurs tried to overcome hegemonic Western high-technology business knowledge that Orientalized business practices in Turkey. As such, through Said's lens, entrepreneurial identity formation processes were seen as cultural/ political acts of agency, and at times acts of resistance to Orientalism, that highlighted how and why it was necessary to position oneself as Turkish or Turkish-American depending on the context of national relations between the U.S., Turkey, and other nations (i.e., EU, Turkey-Greece-Armenia, U.S.-Mexico). In this sense, globalization did not mark the separation of nations as implied by the "cultural

differences" approach to identity formation. Rather, entrepreneurial identity formation processes highlighted that context is relevant for understanding how and why different identities emerged in Silicon Valley and in Turkey (e.g., Tsui, 2007). Further, it also highlighted that "context" is an ongoing process as well, in this case as the interdependence of nations.

In contrast, Spivak's concerns over gender, subalternity and the postcolonial subject allowed for an examination of how gendering and subalternity functioned differently in different sites of encounters. As a site, Silicon Valley enabled the formation of a macho male culture which became associated with high-technology entrepreneurship. This took place by silencing the Other of young, male high-technology entrepreneurs: women and older men. In contrast, the issue of women and gender was immediately articulated in the Turkish context where the subaltern spoke back to the masculinity associated with the high-technology sector. Moreover, gendered practices of high-technology work came to light in distinct ways in Silicon Valley and Turkey but were both nonetheless inscribed, albeit differently, in a broader context of global competition, division of labor, and twenty-four hour production cycles for high-technology goods and services. These global flows of capital (FDI) and labor (outsourcing) enabled Silicon Valley to become *the* place of technology and innovation and for Turkey to be left out. Within this context, the gendered high-technology entrepreneurial self in Silicon Valley emerged by disavowing spouse and family while simultaneously subalternizing high-technology entrepreneurship in Turkey as "behind."

Thus, each of the lenses highlights a distinct way of understanding identity formation processes and globalization as processes taking place through encounters of

people and ideas. Yet using each of these postcolonial frameworks separately does not imply that these processes are taking place separately at one point or another depending on which lens one uses. Rather, these lenses also highlight that globalization is a contradictory process such that there is no neat set of ideas one can use to study it. In effect, it is impossible to use each lens one after another as if they were nested—the assumptions about self, translation, and resistance under each of the lenses are at times at odds with one another. Thus, what can be learned from these lenses that could be useful for international management?

Complexity and Contradictions: Postcolonial Contributions to International Management

One of the underlying assumptions in international management I have attempted to challenge and interrupt is the notion of a static self that is defined without reference to an 'Other.' This redefinition is only possible by simultaneously viewing globalization as an ontological reality that is different than convergence/ divergence or global/ local dichotomies. That is, in order to study the self as relational, processual, and hybrid, one must also contend with the complexities and contradictions of globalization. This means that the contextual movement (i.e., with reference to hybridity, history, and subalternity) of people, ideas, knowledge, and practices are acknowledged as a new ontological reality that should guide theory and research in international management and entrepreneurship fields.

Thus, postcolonial contributions to international management emanate from the complexity and contradictions they highlight rather than from providing neat, stacked lenses. That is, postcolonial frameworks not only challenge assumptions about international management theory and research but the very notion of what kind of

organizational science can be produced. As I've highlighted through my critique and demonstrated through empirical work, context is not about including more variables or more levels of analysis (see Oviatt and McDougall, 2005a). It is not, as Rousseau and Fried suggest, possible to contextualize international research based on three tiers including rich description of the setting, followed by analysis of contextual effects, and finally, through comparative studies in order to highlight "powerful institutional and cultural differences" (2001: 11). In other words, postcolonial frameworks makes impossible the micro, macro, and meso approaches or the level of analysis argument, as these arguments more generally prevent understanding the full complexity of business phenomena particularly in the context of globalization (see Kyriakidou and Ozbilgin, 2006).

Postcolonial frameworks highlight that "the production of theory is in fact a very important practice that is worlding the world in a certain way" (Spivak 1990: 7). They also make relevant that ethico-political considerations are part of producing theory particularly in international management, as the imposition of Western management concepts and the circulation of Western business ideas can end up colonizing and thus silencing those very ideas and practices non-West scholars claim to value. Postcolonial work then attempts to dismantle this "desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, *as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite*" (Bhabha, 1994b: 86). In this sense, postcolonial research projects are always political and attempt to "make concurrent those views and experiences that are ideologically and culturally closed to each other and that attempt to distance/ suppress other views and experiences" (Said, 1993: 33). Altogether, thus, this dissertation was a political project that attempted to speak back and

recover (however problematically) the right to speak about “the self” by rearticulating it such that it fully questions the terms under which representation and knowledge has taken shape in the international management field as we know it. How “the other selves” would reclaim the field is another project waiting to be written.

APPENDIX

THE TABLES

TABLE 1:

Comparison of Modern and Postmodern Conceptualizations of Self, Knowledge, and Identity

	Modern	**Postmodern**
Self	• Based on universal human nature • Located in individual cognitive ability for thought • Self-evident universalism	• Exists in relation to Other • Continuously becoming: not fixed or stable
Knowledge	• Based on rational and logic thought • External to self: language reflects reality • Concern over what we know: progress through accumulation of it	• How we know relevant • Language constitutes reality • Knowing is a situated activity embedded in power relations
Identity	• Reflection of one's conscious self • Exists a priori: ontological reality	• Forms discursively • Exists in relationship of difference

TABLE 2:

Conceptualization of Identity Formation under Postmodern and Postcolonial Frameworks

Postmodern	Postcolonial
• Identity formation conceptualized through self/ Other consideration	• Identity formation conceptualized through West/ Rest consideration
• Identity formation is a process through which selves form and reform: sense of self continuously developing, evolving, and changing (multiple selves)	• Identity formation is a process through which selves form and reform: sense of self continuously developing, evolving, and changing
• Identity formation is relational: understand self in relation to Other	• Identity formation is relational: understand self in relation to Other
	• Identity formation is hybrid process engaged through encounters: voices of identity formation arriving from non-Western traditions acknowledged, no postmodern multiple selves but selves formed through historic power relations among people/ nations, Third World complex rather than singular space

TABLE 3:

Summary of the Analytic Frameworks of Bhabha, Said, and Spivak: Identity, Epistemology, and Resistance

	Identity/ representation	**Epistemology and Western writing/ research**	**Resistance**
Bhabha	• Cultural differences invention of colonizer to make his/ her authority known • Hybridity: questions taken for granted authority of colonizer, challenges stereotypes of colonized perpetrated by colonizer • Hybridity of subject challenges pure cultural self: hybrid self is in-between, indeterminate, ambivalent, linked to nation • Mimicry: attempt by colonizer to make colonized copy colonizer's culture, linked to culturally-based meaning	• Examines formation of nation through literary traditions and language of culture that produce particular political boundaries of nationhood: who is left out of these narratives? • Looks at negotiations between political and cultural authority deployed in writing the nation • Questions whether epistemological translation of Western ideas/ practices in and onto non-Western context possible	• Refuse identity assigned by colonizer or refuse the colonizers gaze textually • Struggle for symbolic meaning: dismantle mimetic impositions of ideas and practices and the very meanings assigned to them by West • Give localized meanings to ideas and practices, working textually against those 'global' meanings imposed upon by the West

continued, next page

	Identity/ representation	Epistemology and Western writing/ research	Resistance
Said	• People of the East constructed in binary opposition to Western subject: them (Other) versus us (West) • The Eastern subject Orientalized through cultural representations and discourse: - A discursive Orient versus the 'real East' - East categorized as unable to change and fixed in time - East is backward, inferior, and feminine in comparison to West • Totalizing understanding of subject (such as 'the East' or 'Eastern people')	• Western pursuit of knowledge not disinterested • Modes of representation within academia are in alliance with material structures which aid in keeping Western dominance over the East: global circulation of knowledge that legitimizes and perpetuates Orientalism • Questions whether 'innocent' representation possible given people exist in historic colonial and power relationships	• Overturn binary oppositions that misrepresent the East as backward and inferior: give voice to silenced people • Produce counter-hegemonic representations of the East that acknowledge historic contexts and power relations between East and West

continued, next page

	Identity/ representation	Epistemology and Western writing/ research	Resistance
Spivak	• Gendered postcolonial subject produced textually and materially through gendered division of global labor • Subaltern includes social groups not readily visible to colonial and privileged Third World historiographers • Binary oppositions only exist in relation to each other: subvert and dismantle them • Multiplicity and heterogeneity of postcolonial cultures and peoples: variations in historical experiences • Decentered selves rather than essentialized identities (race and gender) based on origins and roots	• Highlights researcher reflexivity as part of knowing • Scrutinizes Western benevolent intervention on behalf of postcolonial subject: such efforts are still within imperialist tendencies • Calls into question academic writing that purports finality/ closure • Pays attention to silencing of subaltern: how narratives gain authority by marginalizing certain experiences and knowledge • Through deconstruction, attempts to reveal assumptions and strategies on which narratives grounded • Intentionally misappropriates ideas to open up new spaces of meanings	• Voicing effaced knowledge and speaking back related to each other: they are problematic of subaltern agency and researcher reflexivity • Recovery and resistance are ethico-political interventions rather than information retrieval acts • Resistance is speaking back from position deemed silent and highlighting processes of subalternization/ marginalization

TABLE 4:

Comparison of the Conceptualization of the Research Subject (Identity/ Representation) and Methodologies under International Entrepreneurship and Postcolonial Frameworks

Theoretical approaches	Self/ research subject	More common methodologies employed
International Entrepreneurship Frameworks	• Entrepreneur concept based on Western psychology's "individual" • Implies that subject is "pure" and "whole" • Universal subject (all people understand themselves in the same way) • Approach to identity/ representation is comparative and relativistic: identity is preformed based on culture and values and can be compared	• Use of demographic information (i.e., race, ethnicity, gender) to categorize and compare subjects • Use of questionnaires, survey instruments, tests, and scales to generate variables • Analyses and comparisons through statistical methods
Postcolonial Frameworks	• Consider identity formation: Shifting, relational process • Historically formed • Relational at the moment of encounter • Allows for ways to articulate and inhabit multiple identities embedded in power relations: hybrid rather than celebratory multiple selves	• Use of textual data, writing, and language in use to outline discursive practices • Rely on interviews, conversations, presentations, speeches, and written documents • Analysis based on theoretical focus • Methods, data, and data analysis not separate from theories guiding research question • Question of native informant: how to write and represent research subjects in light of researcher reflexivity

TABLE 5:

Study Sites and Data Collection Venues

Year	Conferences	One-on-one interviews	First Thursdays meetings
2005	• May 20-22, Palo Alto: 2nd TABC conference, pre/ post conference events (Bridging Silicon Valley and Turkey)	• July-October, Silicon Valley • November-December, Istanbul and Ankara	• July-October, Silicon Valley
2006	• May 27, Berkeley: 3rd TABC conference, pre/ post conference events (Financing our High-technology Future: Investments in Turkey)	• January, Istanbul and Ankara	
2007	• April 26, San Jose: 4th TABC conference (Turkey's Role in the Global High-technology Market)	• January, Istanbul and Ankara	
2008	• January 18-19, Antalya: 1st Sinerjiturk conference (Turkey in the Global Communication Sector)		

TABLE 6:

Data Collected During Fieldwork

Summary of data
• 400 pages of interview transcripts • 45 hours of video recording from conferences (only available for TABCON 2007 and Sinerjiturk 2008)\ • 40 Powerpoint presentations from all conferences (2005 to 2008) • 250 pages from the websites of the organizations involved in putting together the conferences (TABC and Sinerjiturk) and from the corporate websites of the high-tech entrepreneurs (if available) • 180 pages of field notes from all conferences in the U.S. and Turkey including pre and post conference events (such as cocktails and dinners), First Thursdays informal gatherings in Silicon Valley • Multiple conference handouts (such as pamphlets, reports, and advertisements from sponsors)

TABLE 7:

Summary of Fieldwork Participants and Types of Data Gathered

Location	One-on-one interviews: Text data and ethnographic observations	Conference and meeting attendees: Ethnographic observations
California	• Ismail, male, 55 years old, bachelors degree, U.S. and Turkish citizenship • Fatih, male, 50 years old, Ph.D., U.S. and Turkish citizenship • Baris, male, 34 years old, MBA, Turkish citizenship • Cem, male, 45 years old, Ph.D., U.S. and Turkish citizenship • Kemal, male, 31 years old, bachelors, Turkish citizenship • Hakan, male, 36 years old, Ph.D., U.S. and Turkish citizenship • Tamer, male, 42 years old, Ph.D., U.S. and Turkish citizenship • Selim, male, 54 years old, Ph.D., U.S. and Turkish citizenship	• About 200 attendees at each of the TABC conferences from 2005 to 2007 • About 20-25 individuals at First Thursday meetings in 2005
Istanbul and Ankara, Turkey	• Bora, male, 40 years old, bachelors degree, Turkish citizenship • Murat, male, 48 years old, bachelors., U.S. and Turkish citizenship • Osman, male, 46 years old, Ph.D., Turkish citizenship • Zeynep, female, 45 years old, bachelors, Turkish citizenship • Turgut, male, 59 years old, Ph.D., Turkish and German citizenship • Alp, male, 47 years old, MBA, Turkish citizenship • Semra, female, 50 years old, Ph.D., U.S. and Turkish citizenship	• About 150 attendees during the Sinerjiturk conference

REFERENCES

Academy of Management Journal. 2000. Special research forum: International entrepreneurship: The intersection of two research paths. 43(5): 902-1003.

Academy of Management Review. 2008. Special topic forum: Critique and international management: An uneasy relationship? 33(4): 870-1006.

Adler, N. J. 1983a. Cross-cultural management research: The ostrich and the trend. *Academy of Management Review,* 8(2): 226-232.

Adler, N. J. 1983b. A typology of management studies involving culture. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 14(2): 29-47.

Adler, N.J. 1983c. Understanding the ways of understanding: Cross-cultural management methodology reviewed. In Richard N. Farmer (Ed.), *Advances in International Comparative Management,* 1: 31-67. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Adler, N. J., Brody, L. W., & Osland, J. S. 2000. The women's global leadership forum: Enhancing one company's global leadership capability. *Human Resource Management,* 39(2/ 3): 209-225.

Adler, N. J., Campbell, N., & Laurent, A. 1989. In search of appropriate methodology: From outside the People's Republic of China looking in. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 20(1): 61-74.

Adler, N. J., Doktor, R., & Redding, S. G. 1986. From the Atlantic to the Pacific century: Cross-cultural management reviewed. In J.G. Hunt & J.D. Blair (Eds.), 1986 *Yearly Review of Management* of the *Journal of Management,* 12(2): 295-318.

Adler, N. J., & Graham, J. L. 1989. Cross-cultural interaction: The international comparison fallacy? *Journal of International Business Studies,* 20(3): 515-537.

Adler, R. H. 2002. Patron-client ties, ethnic entrepreneurship and transnational migration: the case of Yucatecans in Dallas, Texas. *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development,* 31(2): 129-161.

Ahmed, Z. U., Mahajar, A. J., & Alon, I. 2005. Malay entrepreneurship: historical, governmental, and cultural antecedents. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management,* 5(3/ 4): 168-186.

Al-Jafary, A., & Hollingsworth, A. T. 1983. An exploratory study of managerial practices in the Arabian Gulf region. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 14 (2): 143-152.

Appadurai, A. 1988. Introduction: Place and voice in anthropological authority. *Cultural anthropology,* 3(1): 16-20.

Appadurai, A. 1990. Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Public Culture,* 2: 1-24. Reprint in revised form 1996, *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization,* 27-47. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Autio, E., Sapienza, H. J., & Almeida, J. G. 2000. Effects of age at entry, knowledge intensity, and imitability of international growth. *Academy of Management Journal,* 43(5): 909-924.

Banerjee, S. B., & Linstead, S. 2001. Globalization, multiculturalism and other fictions: Colonialism for the new millennium? *Organization,* 8(4): 683-722.

Baker, T., Gedajlovic, E., & Lubatkin, M. 2005. A framework for comparing entrepreneurship processes across nations. *36: 492-504.*

Barker, D. K. 2000. Dualisms, discourse and development. In U. Narayan & S. Harding (Eds.), *Decentering the center: Philosophy for a multicultural, postcolonial, and feminist world:* 177-188. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Bayazit, O. 2003. Total quality management (TQM) practices in Turkish manufacturing organizations. *The TQM magazine.* 15(5): 345-350.

Begley, T. M., & Tan, W. 2001. The socio-cultural environment for entrepreneurship: A comparison between East Asian and Anglo-Saxon countries. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 32(3): 537-553.

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. 1966. *The social construction of reality.* New York: Doubleday.

Bhabha, H. K. 1990a. Introduction. In Homi K. Bhabha (Ed.), *Nation and narration*: 1-7. New York: Routledge.

Bhabha, H. K. 1990b. DissemiNation: Time, narrative, and the margins of the modern nation. In Homi K. Bhabha (Ed.), *Nation and narration*: 291-322. New York: Routledge.

Bhabha, H. K. 1994a. Interrogating identity: Frantz Fanon and the postcolonial prerogative. In *The location of culture*: 40-65. New York: Routledge.

Bhabha, H. K. 1994b. Of mimicry and man. In *The location of culture:* 85-92. New York Routledge.

Bhabha, H. K. 1994c. Signs taken for wonders. In *The location of culture*: 112-122. New York: Routledge.

Bhabha, H. K. 1994d. Conclusion: 'Race', time and the revision of modernity. In *The location of culture*: 236-256. New York: Routledge.

Barrett, G., Jones, T., McEvoy, D., & McGoldrick, C. 2002. The economic embeddedness of immigrant enterprise in Britain. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research,* 8(1/ 2): 11-31.

Bartol, K. M., Martin, D. C., & Kromkowski, J. A. 2003. Leadership and the glass ceiling: Gender and ethnic group influences on leader behaviors at middle and executive managerial levels. *Journal of Leadership & Organization Studies,* 9(3): 8-19.

Begley, T. M., & Boyd, D. P. 1987. Psychological characteristics associated with performance in entrepreneurial firms and smaller businesses. *Journal of Business Venturing,* 2: 79-93.

Bilgic, R. 1998. The relationship between job satisfaction and personal characteristics of Turkish workers. *The Journal of Psychology,* 132(5): 549-557.

Bjornskov, C., & Foss, N. J. 2008. Economic freedom and entrepreneurial activity: Some cross-country evidence. *Public Choice,*134: 307-328.

Black, B. 1999. National culture and high commitment management. *Employee Relations,* 21(4): 389-404.

Blyton, P. 2001. The general and the particular in cross-national comparative research. *Applied Psychology: An International Review,* 50(4): 590-595.

Boone, P. F., & Van Den Bosch, F. A. J. 1996. Discerning a key characteristic of a European style of management. *International Studies of Management & Organization,* 26(3): 109-127.

Bourantas, D., & Papadakis, V. 1996. Greek management. *International Studies of Management & Organization,* 26(3): 13-32.

Boyacıgiller, N. A., & Adler, N. J. 1991. The parochial dinosaur: Organizational science in a global context. *Academy of Management Review,* 16(2): 262-290.

Boyacıgiller, N. A., Kleinberg, J., Phillips, M. E., & Sackmann, S. A. 2004. Conceptualizing culture: Elucidating the streams of research in international cross-cultural management. In B.J. Punnett & O. Shenkar (Eds.), *Handbook for international management research,* 2d ed.: 99-167. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Braithwaite, J., Westbrook, M. T., & Mallock, N. A. 2007. How subordinates exert pressure on their managers: Anglo and Confucian-Asian comparisons. *Journal of Managerial Psychology,* 23(1): 40-53.

Brockhaus, Sr., R. H. 1982. The psychology of an entrepreneur. In C.A. Kent, D.L. Sexton, & K.H. Vesper (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of entrepreneurship*: 31-56. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Brockhaus, Sr., R. H., & Horwitz, P. S. 1986. The psychology of an entrepreneur. In D. L. Sexton & R. W. Smilor (Eds.), *The art and science of entrepreneurship*: 25-48. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger

Burrell, G. & Morgan, G. 1979. *Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis: Elements of the sociology of corporate life*. (reprint, 2000 Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing) London: Heinamann.

Buzard, J. 2003. On auto-ethnographic authority. *The Yale Journal of Criticism,* 16(1): 61-91.

Calás, M.B. 1992. 'An/ other silent voice? Representing 'Hispanic woman' in organizational texts', in A.J. Mills and P. Tancred (Eds.), *Gendering Organizational Analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. pp. 201–21.

Calás, M. B., & Smircich, L. 1999. Past postmodernism? Reflections and tentative directions. *Academy of Management Review,* 24(4): 649-671.

Calás, M. B. & Smircich, L. 2006. From the 'woman's point of view' ten years later: Towards a feminist organizational studies. In S. Clegg, C. Hardy, T. Lawrence, & W. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies:* 284-346. London: Sage Publications.

Calás, M. B., Smircich, L. & Bourne, K. A. 2009. Extending the boundaries: Reframing "entrepreneurship as social change" through feminist perspectives. *Academy of Management Review*, forthcoming.

Castells, M. 1996. *The Rise of the Network Society.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Castles, S. 2002. Migration and community formation under conditions of globalization. *International Migration Review,* 36(4): 1143-1168.

Chaganti, R., & Greene, P. G. 2002. Who are ethnic entrepreneurs? A study of entrepreneurs' ethnic involvement and business characteristics. *Journal of Small Business Management,* 40(2): 126-143.

Chio, V. C. M. 2005. *Malaysia and the development process: Globalization, knowledge transfers and postcolonial dilemmas.* London: Routledge.

Choo, S., & Wong, M. 2006. Entrepreneurial intention: Triggers and barriers to new venture creations in Singapore. *Singapore Management Review,* 28(2): 47-64.

Chrisman, J. J., Chua, J. H., & Steier, L. P. 2002. The influence of national culture and family involvement on entrepreneurial perceptions and performance at the state level. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice,* 26(4): 113-130.

Clark, T., Grant, D., & Heijltjes, M. 2000. Researching comparative and international human resource management. *International Studies of Management & Organization,* 29(4): 6-23.

Clifford, J. 1992. Traveling cultures. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, & P. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural studies*: 96-116. New York: Routledge.

CNN Global Office. 2005. *Turkey switches on to TV market.* http:/ / edition.cnn.com/ 2005/ BUSINESS/ 01/ 17/ turkey.beko/ index.html. January 17.

Collins, J. 2002. Chinese entrepreneurs: The Chinese diaspora in Australia. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research,* 8(1/ 2): 113-133.

Connor, P. E., Becker, B. W., Kakuyama, T., & Moore, L. F. 1993. A cross-national comparative study of managerial values: United States, Canada, and Japan. In S. B. Prasad & R. B. Peterson (Eds.), *Advances in International Comparative Management***,** 8: 3-29. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Conway, D. & Cohen, J. 1998. Consequences of migration and remittances for Mexican transnational communities. *Economic Geography,* 74(1): 26-44.

Critical Perspectives in International Business. 2008. Critical reflections on management and organizations: a postcolonial perspective, 4(2/ 3): 90-333.

Denzin, N. K. & Giardina, M. D. 2008. *Qualitative inquiry and the politics of evidence.* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

d'Iribarne, P. 2002. Motivating workers in emerging countries: universal tools and local adaptations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 23(3): 243-256.

Doktor, R., Tung, R. L., & Von Glinow, M. A. 1991a. Incorporating international dimensions in management theory building. *Academy of Management Review,* 16(2): 259-261.

Doktor, R., Tung, R. L., & Von Glinow, M. A. 1991b. Future directions for management theory development. *Academy of Management Review,* 16(2): 362-365.

Earley, P. C., & Singh, H. 1995. International and intercultural research: What's next? *Academy of Management Journal,* 327-340.

Earley, P. C., & Singh, H. (Eds.). 2000. *Innovations in international and cross-cultural management.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

England, G. W., & Harpaz, I. 1983. Some methodological and analytic considerations in cross-national comparative research. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 14(2): 49-59.

Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice (forthcoming). International entrepreneurship: Do institutions matter?

Erdem, F., Ozen, J., & Atsan, N. 2003. The relationship between trust and team performance. *Work Study,* 52(6/ 7): 337-340.

Essers, C. & Benschop, Y. 2007. Enterprising identities: Female entrepreneurs of Moroccan or Turkish origin in the Netherlands. *Organization Studies,* 28(1): 49-69.

Evans, M. D. R. 1989. Immigrant entrepreneurship: Effects of ethnic market size and isolated labor pool. *American Sociological Review,* 54(6): 950-962.

Eyjolfsdottir, H. M., & Smith, P. B. 1996. Icelandic business and management culture. *International Studies of Management & Organization,* 26(3): 61-72.

Fanon, F. 1965. *The wretched of the earth.* New York: Grove Press.

Fanon, F. 1967. *Black skin, white masks.* New York: Grove Press.

Felski, R. 1997. The doxa of difference. *Signs: Journal of women in culture and society,* 23(1): 1-21.

Ferguson, A. 2000. Resisting the veil of privilege: Building bridge identities as an ethico-politics of global feminisms. In U. Narayan & S. Harding (Eds.), *Decentering the center: Philosophy for a multicultural, postcolonial, and feminist world:* 189-207. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Fletcher, D. 2004. International entrepreneurship and the small business. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development,* 16: 289-305.

Foucault, M. 1980. *Power/ knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. 1982. The subject and power. In H. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*: 208-226. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Frenkel, M. 2008. The multinational corporation as a third space: Rethinking international management discourse on knowledge transfer through Homi Bhabha. *Academy of Management Review,* 33(4): 924-942.

Frenkel, M., & Shenhav, Y. 2003. From Americanization to colonization: The diffusion of productivity models revisited. *Organization Studies***,** 24(9): 1537-1561.

Frenkel, M., & Shenhav, Y. 2006. From binarism back to hybridity: A postcolonial reading of management and organization studies. *Organization Studies,* 27(6): 855-876.

Gamble, P. R., & Gibson, D. A. 1999. Executive values and decision making: The relationship of culture and information flows. *Journal of Management Studies,* 36(2): 217-240.

Gandhi, L. 1998. *Postcolonial theory.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Gee, J. P. 1999. *An introduction to discourse analysis.* New York: Routledge.

Geertz, C. 1983. *Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Gelfand, M. J., Erez, M., & Aycan, Z. 2007. Cross-cultural organizational behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology,* 58: 479-514.

George, G., & Zahra, S. A. 2002. Culture and its consequences for entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice,* 26(4): 5-8.

Gergen, K. J. 1989. Warranting voice and the elaboration of the self. In J. Shotter and K. J. Gergen (Eds.), *Texts of identity*: 70-81. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gibson, C. B. 1995. An investigation of gender differences in leadership across four countries. *Journal of International Business,* 26(2): 255-279.

Gillin, L. M., & Moignard, B. L. 2006. Serial entrepreneurs and focused human intentionality in the development of the Cambridge technopole. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business,* 3(1): 36-55.

Globokar, T. 1996. Intercultural management in Eastern Europe: An empirical study of a French-Slovenian plant. *International Studies of Management & Organization,* 26(3): 47-59.

Glunk, U., Wilderom, C., & Ogilvie, R. 1996. Finding the key to Germany-style management. *International Studies of Management & Organization,* 26(3): 93-108.

Gonzalez, R. F., & McMillan, Jr., C. 1961. The universality of American management philosophy. *Academy of Management Journal,* 4(1): 33-41.

Gramsci, A. 1971. In Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith (Eds.), *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*: 257- 276. New York: International Publishers.

Guarnizo, L. E. & Diaz, L. M. 1999. Transnational migration: a view of Colombia. *International Migration Review,* 22(2): 397-421.

Guarnizo, L. E., Sanchez, A. I. & Roach, E. M. 1999. Mistrust, fragmented solidarity, and transnational migration: Colombians in New York city and Los Angeles. *International Migration Review,* 22(2): 367-399.

Hamada, T. 1995. Inventing cultural others in organizations: A case of anthropological reflexivity in a multinational firm. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 31(1): 162-185.

Hannerz, U. 1996. *Transnational connections: Culture, people, places.* NY: Routledge.

Hansen, H. 2006. The ethnonarrative approach. *Human Relations,* 59: 1049-1075.

Hardt, M., & Negri, A. 2000. *Empire.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hardt, M., & Negri, A. 2004. *Multitude: War and democracy in the age of empire.* NY: Penguin Press.

Hayton, J. C., George, G., & Zahra, S. A. 2002. National culture and entrepreneurship: A review of behavioral research. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice,* 26(4): 33-52.

Heibert, D. 2002. Economic associations of immigrant self-employment in Canada. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research,* 8(1/ 2): 93-112.

Hellstrom, T., Hellstrom, C., & Berglund, H. 2001. The innovating self: Exploring self among a group of technological innovators. *Journal of Managerial Psychology,* 17(4): 267-286.

Hofstede, G. 1980. Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hofstede, G. 1983. The cultural relativity of organizational practices and theories. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 14(2): 75-89.

Hofstede, G. 1996. An American in Paris: The influence of national on organizational theories. *Organization Studies,* 17(3): 525-537.

Hofstede, G. 1998. Attitudes, values, and organizational culture: Disentangling the concepts. *Organization Studies,* 19(3): 477-492.

Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. H. 1988. The Confucius connection: From cultural roots to economic growth. *Organizational Dynamics,* 16(4): 5-21.

Hofstede, G., Bond, M. H., & Luk, C. 1993. Individual perceptions of organizational cultures: A methodological treatise on levels of analysis. *Organization Studies,* 14(4): 483-503.

Hofstede, G., Van Deusen, C. A., Mueller, C. B., Charles, T. A., & The Business Goals Network. 2002. What goals do business leaders pursue? A study in fifteen countries. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 33(4): 785-803.

Hollingsworth, A. T., & Hand, H. H. 1976. Educational guidelines for successful Black, White, and Cuban entrepreneurs. *Journal of Small Business Management,* 14(2): 31-38.

House, R., Javidan, M., & Dorman, P. 2001. Project GLOBE: An introduction. *Applied Psychology: An International Review,* 50(4): 489-505.

Huo, Y. P., Huang, H. J., & Napier, N. K. 2002. Divergence or convergence: A cross-national comparison of personnel selection practices. *Human Resource Management,* 41(1): 31-44.

Itzigsohn, J. & Dore-Cabral, C. 2000. Competing identities? Race, ethnicity and panethnicity among Dominicans in the United States. *Sociological Forum,* 15(2): 225-247.

Ivancevich, J. M., & Baker, J. C. 1970. A comparative study of the satisfaction of domestic United States managers and overseas United States managers. *Academy of Management Journal,* 13(1): 69-77.

Jack, G., Calás, M.B., Nkomo, S.M, & Peltonen, T. 2008. Critique and international management: An uneasy relationship? *Academy of Management Review*, 33(4): 870-884.

Jack, G., & Westwood, R. 2006. Postcolonialism and the politics of qualitative research in international business. *Management International Review,* 46(4): 481-501.

Jaya, P. S. 2001. Do we really 'know' and profess'? Decolonizing management knowledge. *Organization,* 8(2): 227-23

JIBS 2006. An exchange between Hofstede and GLOBE. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 37 (6): 931-881.

Johnson, J. P., Munoz, J. M., & Alon, I. 2007. Filipino ethnic entrepreneurship: An integrated review and propositions. *International Entrepreneurship Management Journal,* 3: 69-85.

Jung, C. M., & Katsioloudes, M. I. 2001. Cultural context and the Vietnamese-American entrepreneurial experience. *Journal of Transnational Management Development,* 7(2): 37-46.

Kanungo, R. N., & Wright, R. W. 1983. A cross-cultural comparative study of managerial job attitudes. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 14(2): 115-129.

Karabati, S., & Say, A., I. 2005. Relating work values to societal values: Evidence from the Turkish business context. *Cross-Cultural Management,* 12(2): 85-107.

Kashima, Y., Yamaguchi, S., Kim, U., Choi, S., Gelfand, M. J., & Masaki. Y. 1995. Culture, gender, and self: A perspective from individualism-collectivism research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 69(5): 925-937.

Kets de Vries, M. F. R. 1977. The entrepreneurial personality: A person at the crossroads. *Journal of Management Studies,* 14: 34-57.

Khan, S. 2005. Reconfiguring the native informant: Positionality in the global age. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society,* 30(4): 2017-2035.

Khanna, T., & Palepu, K. G. 2004. Globalization and convergence in corporate governance: Evidence from Infosys and the Indian software industry. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 35: 484-507.

Kirkman, B. L., & Law, K. 2005. From the editors: International management research in the AMJ: Our past, present and future. *Academy of Management Journal,* 48(3): 377-386.

Kirkman, B. L., & Shapiro, D. L. 1997. The impact of cultural values on employee resistance to teams: Toward a model of globalized self-managing work team effectiveness. *Academy of Management Review,* 22(3): 730-757.

Kirkman, B. L., & Shapiro, D. L. 2001. The impact of cultural values on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in self-managing work teams: The mediating role of employee resistance. *Academy of Management Journal,* 44(3): 557-569.

Klein, K. J., Dansereau, F., & Hall, R. J. 1994. Levels issues in theory development, data collection, and analysis. *Academy of Management Review,* 19(2): 195-229.

Kovach Jr., R. C. 1994. Matching assumptions to environment in the transfer of management practices. *International Studies of Management & Organization,* 24(4): 83-99.

Kozan, M. K., & Ergin, C. 1999. The influence of intra-cultural value differences on conflict management practices. *The International Journal of Conflict Management,* 10(3): 249-267.

Kreiser, P. M., Marino, L. D., & Weaver, K. M. 2002. Assessing the psychometric properties of the entrepreneurial orientation scale: A multi-country analysis. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice.* 26(4): 71-94.

Kropp, F., & Zolin, R. 2005. Technological entrepreneurship and small business innovation research programs. *Academy of Marketing Science Review,* 7: 1-14.

Kuehn, K. W., & Al-Busaidi, Y. 2000. A difference of perspective: An exploratory study of Omani and expatriate values and attitudes. *International Journal of Commerce and Management,* 10(1): 74-90.

Kurman, J. 2001. Self-regulation strategies in achievement strategies: Culture and gender differences. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology,* 32(4): 491-503.

Kusku, F., & Zarkada-Fraser, A. 2004. An empirical investigation of corporate citizenship in Australia and Turkey. *British Journal of Management,* 15: 57-72.

Kwek, D. 2003. Decolonizing and *re*-presenting culture's consequences: a postcolonial critique of cross-cultural studies in management. In A. Prasad (Ed.), *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis*: 121-146. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kyriakidou, O. & Ozbilgin, M. F. (Eds.) 2006. *Relational perspectives in organization studies.* Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Lal, J. 1996. Situating locations: The politics of self, identity, and 'Other' in living and writing the text. In D. L. Wolf (Ed.), *Feminist dilemmas in fieldwork*: 185-214. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Landolt, P., Autler, L, & Baires, S. 1999. From Hermano Lejano to Hermano Mayor: the dialectics of Salvadoran transnationalism. *International Migration Review,* 22(2): 290-315.

Lee, C., Pillutla, M., & Law, K. S. 2000. Power-distance, gender and organizational justice. *Journal of Management,* 26(4): 685-704.

Lee, H. 1999. Transformation of employment practices in Korean business. *International Studies of Management & Organization,* 28(4): 26-39.

Lenartowicz, T., & Roth, K. 1999. A framework for cultural assessment. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 30(4): 781-798.

Leung, K., Bhagat, R. S., Buchan, N. R., Erez, M., & Gibson, C. B. 2005. Culture and international business: Recent advances and their implications for future research. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 36: 357-378.

Light, I. 2007. Global entrepreneurship and transnationalism. In L. Dana (Ed.), *Handbook of research on ethnic minority entrepreneurship*: 3-15. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Light, I., & Rosenstein, C. 1995. *Race, Ethnicity, and Entrepreneurship in Urban America.* New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Lim, L., & Firkola, P. 2000. Methodological issues in cross-cultural management research: Problems, solutions, and proposals. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management,* 17(1): 133-154.

Lindell, M., & Arvonen, J. 1996. The Nordic management style in a European context. *International Studies of Management & Organization,* 26(3): 73-91.

Loomba, A. 1998. *Colonialism/ Postcolonialism*. New York: Routledge.

Lowe, K. B., Milliman, J., De Cieri, H., & Dowling, P. D. 2002. International compensation practices: A ten-country comparative analysis. *Human Resource Management,* 41(1): 45-66.

Lu, J. W., & Beamish, P. W. 2001. The internationalization and performance of SMEs. *Strategic Management Journal,* 22: 565-586.

Madsen, T. K., & Servais, P. 1997. The internationalization of born globals: an evolutionary process? *International Business Review,* 6(6): 561-583.

Malach-Pines, A., Levy, H., Utasi, A., & Hill, T. L. 2005. Entrepreneurs as cultural heroes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology,* 20(6): 541-555.

Marcus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. 1991. Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review,* 98(2): 224-253.

Massey, D. S., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A., & Taylor, J. E. 1999. *Worlds in Motion: Understanding International Migration at the End of the Millennium.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

McClintock, A. 1995. *Imperial leather: Race, gender, and sexuality in the colonial context*. NY: Routledge.

McDougall, P. P., & Oviatt, B. M. International entrepreneurship: The intersection of two research paths. *Academy of Management Journal,* 43(5): 902-906.

Menzies, T. V., Filion, L. J., Brenner, G. A., & Elgie, S. 2007. Measuring ethnic community involvement: Development and initial testing of an index. *Journal of Small Business Management,* 45(2): 267-282.

Min, P. G. & Bozorgmehr, M. 2000. Immigrant entrepreneurship and business patterns: A comparison of Koreans and Iranians in Los Angeles. *International Migration Review,* 34(3): 707-738.

Mir, R., Mir, A., & Upadhyaya, P. 2003. Toward a postcolonial reading of organizational control in A. Prasad (Ed), *Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis: A Critical Engagement:* 47-74. New York: Palgrave.

Mitchell, R. K., Smith, J. B., Morse, E. A., Seawright, K. W., Peredo, A. M., & McKenzie, B. 2002. Are entrepreneurial cognitions universal? Assessing entrepreneurial cognitions across cultures. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice,* 26(4): 9-32.

Mitchell, R. K., Smith, J. B., Seawright, K. W. & Morse, E. A. 2000. Cross-cultural cognitions and the venture creation decision. *Academy of Management Journal,* 43(5): 974-993.

Mohanty, C. T. 2003. *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Morgan, G., & Smircich, L. 1980. The case for qualitative research. *Academy of Management Review,* 5(4): 491-500.

Mohr, G., & Wolfram, H. 2008. Leadership and effectiveness in the context of gender: The role of leaders' verbal behaviour. *British Journal of Management,* 19: 4-16.

Morris, M. H. 2000. The power of ethnic entrepreneurship. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship,* 5(2): 5-7.

Morris, M., & Schindehutte, M. 2005. Entrepreneurial values and the ethnic enterprise: An examination of six subcultures. *Journal of Small Business Management,* 43(4): 453-479.

Moulettes, A. 2007. The absence of women's voices in Hofstede's *Cultural Consequences*: A postcolonial reading. *Women in Management Review,* 22(6): 443-455.

Mueller, A. 1987. Power and naming in the development institution: The 'discovery' of 'women in Peru'. Presented at the fourteenth annual Third World Conference, Chicago.

Narayan, U. 1997. *Dislocating cultures: Identities, traditions, and Third World feminisms.* NY: Routledge.

Narayan, U. 2000. Essence of culture and a sense of history: A feminist critique of cultural essentialisms. In U. Narayan & S. Harding (Eds.), *Decentering the center: Philosophy for a multicultural, postcolonial, and feminist world*: 7-16. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Naulleau, G., & Harper, J. 1993. A comparison of British and French management cultures: Some implications for management development practices in each country. *Management Education and Development,* 24(1): 14-25.

Negandhi, A. R., & Estafen, B. D. 1965. A research model to determine the applicability of American management know-how in differing cultures and/ or environments. *Academy of Management Journal,* 8(4): 309-318.

Oberg, W. 1963. Cross-cultural perspective on management principles. *Academy of Management Journal,* 6(2): 129-143.

Oliver, E. G., & Cravens, K. S. 1999. Cultural influences on managerial choice: An empirical study of employee benefit plans in the United States. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 30(4): 745-762.

Oviatt, B. M. & McDougall, P. P. 1994. Toward a theory of international new ventures. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 25(1): 45-64.

Oviatt, B. M., & McDougall, P. P. 2005a. Defining international entrepreneurship and modeling the speed of internalization. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice,* 29: 537-553.

Oviatt, B. M., & McDougall, P. P. 2005b. The internationalization of entrepreneurship. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 36: 2-8.

Özkazanç-Pan, B. 2008. International management meets 'the rest of the world.' *Academy of Management Review,* 33(4): 964-974.

Peterson, M. F. 1995. Leading Cuban-American entrepreneurs: The process of developing motives, abilities, and resources. *Human Relations,* 48(10): 1193-1215.

Peterson, M. F., & Meckler, M. R. 2001. Cuban-American entrepreneurs: chance, complexity and chaos. *Organization Studies,* 22(1): 31-57.

Peterson, M. F., & Roquebert, J. 1993. Success patterns of Cuban-American enterprises: Implications for entrepreneurial communities. *Human Relations,* 46(8): 921-937.

Phizacklea, A., & Ram, M. 1995. Ethnic entrepreneurship in comparative perspective. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research,* 1(1): 48-58.

Pieterse, J. N. 1994. Globalisation as hybridisation. *International Sociology,* 9(2): 161-184.

Pieterse, J. N. 2003. Social capital and migration. *Ethnicities,* 3(1): 5-34.

Portes, A. 1999. Conclusion: towards a new world—the origins and effects of transnational activities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 22(2): 463-477.

Portes, A., Guarnizo, L. E., & Haller, W. J. 2002. Transnational entrepreneurs: An alternative form of immigrant economic adaptation. *American Sociological Review,* 67(2): 278-298.

Portes, A., Guarnizo, L. E., & Landolt, P. 1999. The study of transnationalisn: pitfalls and promise of an emergent research field. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2): 217-237.

Prasad, A. (Ed.). 2003a. *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Prasad, A. 2003b. The gaze of the other: Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis. In A. Prasad (Ed.), *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis:* 3-43. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Prasad, P. 2003. The return of the native: Organizational discourse and the legacy of the ethnographic imagination. In A. Prasad (Ed.), *Postcolonial theory and organizational analysis*: 149-170. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Punnett, B. J., & Shenkar, O. 1994. International management research: Toward a contingency approach. *Advances in International Comparative Management,* 9: 39-55.

Rabinow, P. 1986. Representations are social facts: modernity and post-modernity in anthropology. In J. Clifford and G.E.Marcus (Eds.), *Writing Culture: The Politics and Poetics of Ethnography*: 234-261. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Raijman, R. 2001. Mexican immigrants and informed self-employment in Chicago. *Human Organization,* 60(1): 47-55.

Ralston, D. A., Holt, D. H., Terpstra, R. H., & Kai-Cheng, Y. 1997. The impact of national culture and economic ideology on managerial work values: A study of the United States, Russia, Japan, and China. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 28(1): 177-207.

Ram, M. 1997. Ethnic minority enterprise: an overview and research agenda. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research,* 3(4): 149-156.

Ramamoorthy, N., & Carroll, S. J. 1998. Individualist/ collectivism orientations and reactions towards alternative human resource management practices. *Human Relations,* 51(5): 571-588.

Richman, B. M. 1965. Significance of cultural variables. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 8(4): 292-308.

Riessman, C. K. 2007. *Narrative methods for the human sciences.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Robert, C., & Wasti, S. A. 2002. Organizational individualism and collectivism: Theoretical development and an empirical test of a measure. *Journal of Management,* 28(4): 544-566.

Roberts, K. H. & Boyacıgiller, N. A. 1984. Cross-national organizational research: The grasp of the blind men. In Barry M. Staw & L.L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior,* 6: 423-475. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Rousseau, D. M., & Fried, Y. 2001. Location, location, location: Contextualizing organizational research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 22(1): 1-13.

Sagie, A., & Elizur, D. 2001. Entrepreneurship and culture as correlates of achievement motive: A multifaceted approach. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management,* 1(1): 34-52.

Said, E. W. 1978. *Orientalism.* New York: Random House.

Said, E. W. 1985. Orientalism reconsidered, *Race and Class,* 27(2), Institute of race relations. Reprint in 2000, *Reflections on exile and other essays*: 198-215. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Said, E. W. 1988. Representing the colonized: Anthropology's interlocutors, *Critical Inquiry,* 15, copyright 1989 The University of Chicago Press. Reprint in 2000, *Reflections on exile and other essays*: 293-316. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Said, E. W. 1991. The politics of knowledge, *Raritan: A Quarterly Review,* 2(1). Reprint in 2000, *Reflections on exile and other essays*: 372-385. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Said, E. W. 1993a. Nationalism, human rights, and interpretation. In R.M. Polhemus & R.B. Henkle (Eds.), *Critical reconstructions: The relationship of fiction and life.* Stanford University Press. Copyright 1994 Board of Trustees Leland Stanford Junior University. Reprint in 2000, *Reflections on exile and other essays*: 411-435. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Said, E. W. 1993b. Wild orchids and Trotsky: Messages from American universities. Interview with Mark Edmundson in G. Viswanathan (Ed.). 2001. *Power, politics, and culture. Interviews with Edward W. Said*: 164-182. New York: Pantheon Books.

Said, E. W. 1993c. *Culture and Imperialism.* NY: Routledge.

Said, E. W. 2000. The clash of definitions: On Samuel Huntington. In *Reflections on exile and other essays*: 569-590. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Schiller, N. G., Basch, L., & Blanc, C. S. 1995. From immigrant to transmigrant: Theorizing transnational migration. *Anthropological Quarterly,* 68(1): 48-63.

Schiller, N. G. & Fouron, G. E. 1999. Terrains of blood and nation: Haitian transnational social fields. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 22(2): 340-366.

Sedgwick, P. 2001. *Descartes to Derrida: An introduction to European philosophy.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Sekaran, U. 1983. Methodological and theoretical issues and advancements in cross-cultural research. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 14(2): 61-73.

Sekaran, U., & Snodgrass, C. R. 1986. A model for examining organizational effectiveness cross-culturally. *Advances in International Comparative Management,* 2: 211-232.

Sexton, D. L., & Bowman, N. 1985. The entrepreneur: A capable executive and more. *Journal of Business Venturing,* 1: 129-140.

Sexton, D. L., & Bowman-Upton, N. 1990. Female and male entrepreneurs: Psychological characteristics and their role in gender-related discrimination. *Journal of Business Venturing,* 5: 29-36.

Shenkar, O. 2004. One more time: international business in a global economy. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 35: 161-171.

Singh, J. P. 1990. Managerial culture and work-related values in India. *Organization Studies,* 11(1): 75-101.

Soedarsono, A. A., Murray, S. L., & Omurtag, Y. 1998. Productivity improvement at a high-technology state-owned industry—an Indonesian case study of employee motivation. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management,* 45(4): 388-395.

Sokefeld, M. 1999. Debating self, identity, and culture in anthropology. *Current Anthropology,* 40(4): 417-431.

Sparrow, P., & Wu, P. 1998. Does national culture really matter? Predicting HRM preferences of Taiwanese employees. *Employee Relations,* 20(1): 26-56.

Spivak, G. C. 1985a. Feminism and critical theory. In P.A. Treichler, C. Kramarae, & B. Stafford (Eds.), *For alma mater: Theory and practice in feminist scholarship:* 119-152. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. Reprint 1987 in *In other worlds:* 77-92. New York: Routledge.

Spivak, G. C. 1985b. Scattered speculations on the question of value. *Diacritics,* 15(4): 73-93. Reprint 1987 in *In other worlds:* 154-175. New York: Routledge.

Spivak, G. C. 1985c. Subaltern studies: Deconstructing historiography. In R. Guha (Ed.), *Subaltern studies IV:* 330-363. New Delhi: Oxford University Press. Reprint 1987 in *In other worlds:* 197-221. New York: Routledge.

Spivak, G. C. 1987. *In other worlds: Essays in cultural politics.* New York: Routledge.

Spivak, G. C. 1988. Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture:* 271-313. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Spivak, G. C. 1990. In S. Harasym (Ed.). *The post-colonial critic: Interviews, strategies, dialogues with Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak.* New York: Routledge.

Spivak, G. C. 1996. In D. Landry & G. Maclean (Eds.). *The Spivak reader*. New York: Routledge.

Spivak, G. C. 1999. *A critique of postcolonial reason: Toward a history of the vanishing present*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Sullivan, J. J., & Peterson, R. B. 1991. A test of theories underlying the Japanese lifetime employment system. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 22(1): 79-97.

Tang, J., Tang, Z., & Lohrke, F. T. 2008. Developing an entrepreneurial typology: the roles of entrepreneurial alertness and attributional styles. *International Entrepreneurship Management Journal,* 4: 273-294.

Teagarden, M .B., Von Glinow, M. A., Bowen, D. E., Frayne, C. A., Nason, S., Huo, Y. P., Milliman, J., Arias, M. E., Butler, M. C., Geringer, J. M., Kim, N., Scullion, H.,

Lowe, K. B., & Drost, E. A. 1995. Toward a theory of comparative management research: An idiographic case study of the best international human resources management research. *Academy of Management Journal,* 38(5): 1261-1287.

Taylor, S. 2001a. Locating and conducting discourse analytic research. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, and S.J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis,* 5-48. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Taylor, S. 2001b. Evaluating and applying discourse analytic research. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, and S.J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis,* 311-330. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Thomas, A. S., & Mueller, S. L. 2002. A case for comparative entrepreneurship: Assessing the relevance of culture. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 31(2): 287-301.

Triandis, H.C. 1983. Dimensions of cultural variation as parameters of organizational theories. *International Studies of Management & Organization,* 12(4): 139-169.

Triandis, H. C., & Suh, E. M. 2002. Cultural influences on personality. *Annual Review of Psychology,* 53: 133-160.

Trompenaars, F. 1996. Resolving international conflict: Culture and business strategy. *Business Strategy Review,* 7(3): 51-68.

Tsui, A.S. 2007. From homogenization to pluralism: international management research in the academy and beyond. *Academy of Management Journal,* 50 (6): 1353-1364.

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

Üsdiken, B. 1996. Importing theories of management. *International Studies of Management & Organization,* 26(3): 33-46.

Üsdiken, B. 2004. Exporting managerial knowledge to the outpost. *Management Learning,* 35(3): 255-270.

Van Auken, H., Stephens, P., Fry, F. L., & Silva, J. 2006. Role model influence on entrepreneurial intentions: A comparison between USA and Mexico. *Entrepreneurship Management,* 2: 325-336.

Verbeke, W. 2000. A revision of Hofstede et al.'s (1990) organizational practices scale. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 21: 587-602.

Vertovec, S. 1999. Conceiving and researching transnationalism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 22(2): 447-462.

von Tubergen F. 2005. Self-employment of immigrants: A cross-national study of 17 Western societies. *Social Forces,* 84(2): 709-732.

Wiley, D. L. 1994. Developing managers in the former Soviet Union. *International Studies of Management & Organization,* 24(4): 64-82.

Wolf, J. 1997. Introduction. *Management International Review,* 37(1): 3-6.

Wong-MingJi, D., & Mir, A. H. 1997. How international is international management? Provincialism, parochialism, and the problematic of global diversity. In P. Prasad, A.J. Mills, M. Elmes, & A. Prasad (Eds.), *Managing the Organizational Melting Pot: Dilemmas of workplace diversity:* 340-364. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yousef, D. A. 1998. Predictors of decision-making styles in a non-western country. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 19(7): 366-373.

Zahra, S. A. & George, G. 202. International entrepreneurship: The current status of the field and future research agenda. In M. A. Hitt, R. D. Ireland, S. M. Camp & D. L. Sexton (Eds.), *Strategic entrepreneurship: Creating a new mindset:* 255-282. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Zander, L., & Romani, L. 2004. When nationality matters: A study of departmental, hierarchical, gender, and age-based employee groupings' leadership preferences across 15 countries. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 4(3): 291-315.

[i] To keep the anonymity of interviewees, I changed their names. To differentiate one-on-one interviewees from the other participants in the study (i.e., conferences and First Thursdays) I used initials when referring to these participants. Finally, I kept the actual names of the two official representatives of the Turkish republic (Consul Generals Engin Ansay and Hakan Riza Tekin) and the CEO of Cisco systems (John Morgridge) who attended TABCON conferences as these men were all public figures who gave speeches.