Yin Yang and Philosophical Destruction: Transcending cross-cultural management research in the field of International Business

By
Grace Hao Wang
Master of Management Macquarie University
Master of Business Administration Macquarie University

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Research

Certification

This thesis is submitted in fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Research, in the Graduate School of Management, Macquarie University. This represents the original work and contribution of the author.

I hereby certify that this has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other university or institution.

Signed:

Grace Hao Wang
December 2014

Abstract

Cross-cultural management research in the field of International Business (hereafter IB) is in a state of paradigm crisis. The dominant methodological positivist paradigm is facing an "internal contradiction" where it can no longer take for granted its own operating assumptions of being objective, context-free and universal—the very activity required for conducting research.

In order to go beyond the limitations of the methodological positivist paradigm, and thereby transcend the paradigm crisis, management academics around the world made passionate pleas for strides toward embracing multiparadigm research that utilises insights and strengths from different paradigms. However, present multiparadigm strategies and suggestions are often considered conceptually vague, and of limited use due to their incomplete understanding of the key terms "paradigm" and "paradigm incommensurability". In fact, the notion of paradigm has frequently been objectified, seen as a "thing" to be manipulated, juxtaposed on a board of paradigms or equated to research methodology. Subsequently, the importance of paradigm incommensurability in transforming paradigm limitations and uncovering implicit and tacit assumptions is not realised or utilised in enabling multiparadigm research. As a result, iterative pleas have been made for more than two decades, studies that have successfully adopted multiple paradigms are in fact rare and few. The methodological positivist paradigm continues to dominate cross-cultural management research within the field of IB.

This study aims to enable effective multiparadigm study. Thus going beyond paradigm crisis in cross-cultural management research. In so doing, it first provides a clear examination of the terms paradigm and paradigm incommensurability as reflected in the writings of Thomas Kuhn; it then outlines the importance of paradigm incommensurability from a hermeneutic perspective in facilitating paradigm transformation that leads to innovative theory development; and lastly it demonstrates that only through the acknowledgement of paradigm incommensurability, the possibility of seeing from other's perspective and conducting multiparadigm research is opened up.

Second, this study introduces the indigenous Chinese philosophy of Yin Yang as an alternative philosophical framework for cross-cultural management research. The Yin Yang perspective in been dynamic, holistic and paradoxical embraces but goes beyond the framework of methodological positivism. Therefore, it has the ability to encompass and embrace the existence of the incommensurable research perspectives, and hence surpass the limitations of methodological positivism.

Third, this study presents the concept of Philosophical Destruction as an essential activity for cross-cultural management research. Philosophical destruction uncovers and examines the underlying assumptions in which the methodologies, epistemologies, ontologies and ethics of a subject area are themselves situated. Thus, enabling researchers to include but also move beyond methodological positivist research assumptions and methodologies. By doing so, the research subject matter will be part of the rationale for choosing a particular methodology rather than assuming a priori that the dominant methodological positivism is the sufficient form of research for all areas of inquiry.

The main limitation of this study is its sole focus on theory and conceptualisation. This is largely due to the requirement of this dissertation, which is not to pursue empirical evidence at this initial stage but to concentrate on the broad literature review in developing in-depth understanding of the challenges on hand, and the potential solutions for cross-cultural management research in the field of IB, all with the aim to prepare for the doctoral program in the following year.

Overall, the study achieved its main objective in enabling multiparadigm research. It contributed theoretically to cross-cultural management by providing conceptual clarification of the important terms paradigm and paradigm incommensurability; introducing the Yin Yang perspective as an alternative philosophical framework for cross-cultural research; and presenting the concept of philosophical destruction as an essential activity in uncovering implicit paradigm, cultural and research assumptions for cross-cultural management research. Together these clarifications and conceptualisations serve the purpose of challenging and encouraging researchers to fully utilise incommensurability in transforming paradigm limitations, and conducting multiparadigm research that enriches cross-cultural management knowledge generation and theoretical development.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Cross-cultural management research within the field of International Business (hereafter IB) is in a state of paradigm crisis. The dominant methodological positivist paradigm is facing an "internal contradiction" where it can no longer take for granted its own operating assumptions of being objective, context-free and universal —the very activity required for conducting research. For globalisation challenges the fundamental epistemological and ontological assumptions in which cross-cultural management research in IB is conducted and it is increasingly recognised there is no basis upon which to assume a universal standard in researching different cultures.

Consequently, management academics around the world made passionate pleas for strides toward embracing multiparadigm research (Chen & Miller, 2010; Okhuysen & Bonardi, 2011; Primecz, Romani, & Sackmann, 2009; Sullivan & Daniels, 2008). Similarly, review articles in IB and cross-cultural management research have all pointed to the belief that further theoretical development and knowledge generation necessitates more than one paradigm—namely the positivist paradigm (e.g., Boyacigiller, Kleinberg, Phillips, & Sackmann, 2004; Lewis & Grimes, 1999; Sullivan & Daniels, 2008), because the alternative, the status quo of one dominate paradigm, turned out to be "sterile" and "mostly irrelevant" for operating business in times of globalised opportunities and crises (Lowe, Magala, & Hwang, 2012: 763).

Though multiparadigm studies are frequently suggested and requested those suggestions are often considered to be methodologically vague (Romani, Primecz, & Topçu, 2011) due to their limited understanding of the central concepts—paradigm and paradigm incommensurability. In fact the notion of paradigm has frequently been objectified, seen as a "thing" to be manipulated or juxtaposed on a board of

paradigms and equated to research methodology (i.e., Lewis & Grimes, 1999; Romani et al., 2011). Subsequently, the importance of paradigm incommensurability in transforming paradigm limitations and uncovering implicit and tacit assumptions is not realised or utilised in enabling multiparadigm research. As a result, iterative pleas have been made for more than two decades (i.e., Gioia & Pitre, 1990; Schultz & Hatch, 1996; Romani et al., 2011); studies that have successfully adopted multiple paradigms are in fact rare and few. The methodological positivist paradigm continues to dominate cross-cultural management research within the field of IB.

Thus, the overall objective of the study is to enable effective multiparadigm study thereby going beyond the paradigm crisis in cross-cultural management research within the field of IB. This study has chosen two meta-perspectives through which to overcome the "paradigm crisis" that has dominated cross-cultural studies in management. Both the indigenous Chinese philosophy of Yin Yang and the Heideggerian concept of philosophical destruction provide a framework for going beyond the "paradigm wars" that have beset cross-cultural management research.

The reasons for choosing Yin Yang and philosophical destruction are because they both encourage researchers to embrace and welcome the incommensurable cross-cultural research paradigms; they both allow for a dialogue between different perspectives and they both inspire researchers to grasp but also move beyond the positivist research framework in transcending future cross-cultural management research. Of course this does not mean that other forms of non-reductive philosophical frameworks and assumptions uncovering activities would not have the same effect, but for the purpose of this study the scope is limited to only the indigenous Chinese philosophy of Yin Yang and philosophical destruction. For this

reason, the present research proposition is defined as the following: How Yin Yang and philosophical destruction can aid in multiparadigm research and transcend the paradigm crisis in cross-cultural management research.

Aim of the study

The overall objective of the study is to enable effective multiparadigm research, thereby going beyond the paradigm crisis in cross-cultural management research within the field of IB. More specifically, the aims of the dissertation are threefold. The first aim is to fill the conceptual gap and provide a detailed examination of the notions of paradigm and paradigm incommensurability. As following the writing of Thomas Kuhn, in order to utilise insights from different paradigms to enrich cross-cultural management research, we need to paradoxically first, recognise and acknowledge paradigm incommensurability, in order to be able to play in the space of difference.

For "if we presume that a foreign culture is incommensurable with ours, we might be able to better understand it, while if we assume that we can just translate it into ours, the internal logic and richness of the culture stays hidden." (Cortois, 2000:2). In other words, In other words, the expansion of horizons for new way of being is opened up, only when we can humbly letting go of our own prejudices, acknowledge and embrace each other's differences (Gadamer, 1975). It is important to point out that the goal is not to eliminate difference but to be able to play with difference; to see the same in the other and the other in the same—a perspective central to Yin Yang attunement.

Second, this study is intended to introduce the indigenous Chinese philosophy of Yin Yang as an alternative philosophical framework for cross-cultural management research, which embraces and welcomes the incommensurable research

perspectives. From the Yin Yang point of view, instead of defending whether the analytical or the holistic research framework is best suited for today's multi-dimensional cross-cultural research environment, it argues for the understanding of the complementariness and mutual dependency of both; how the tensions between the two frameworks operate in each culture and across cultures; as well as the paradox of universality and culture-specificity of assumptions, values and behaviors through the encountering, acceptance and exploration of different cultural perspectives. Thus, the indigenous Chinese Yin Yang philosophy, which stresses balance and harmony, encompasses both analytical and holistic research frameworks and more. This may prove to be a rich source of strategic ideas and inspiration for transcending the methodological positivism's limitations, resolving the current paradigm crisis and advancing cross-cultural management research within the field of IB.

Third, this study is intended to introduce the concept of Philosophical Destruction and demonstrate how it can be an essential instrument to work with our own and others' incommensurable cross-cultural research assumptions. For rather than conducting cross-cultural management research with presupposed/taken for granted research assumptions, a philosophical destruction uncovers and examines the underlying assumptions in which the methodologies, epistemologies, ontologies and ethics of a subject area are themselves situated. Such a philosophical destruction is of crucial importance because cross-cultural management research methods are neither simply universal nor situated in what Philosopher Thomas Nagal (1989) calls the "view from nowhere" but are inherently culturally specific. They are a product of the way in which we have been acculturated. Thus to work through, or possibly transcend the cultural biases, we need to be able to explore the fundamental

epistemological and ontological assumptions underpinning these methods. The more we can destruct our own and other's assumptions, the more we are aware of and can go beyond them; not being limited by one epistemology, ontology or a set of ethics of cross-cultural management research but being able to open up what Spinosa, Dreyfus and Flores call "new worlds"—part of the aim of cross-cultural living. The cost of not conducting such a philosophical destruction is that we risk getting caught in a vicious circle: the way in which conclusions are constructed reflects the very cultural biases of their research methodologies.

Organisation of the study

In this study, Chapter 1 intends to raise awareness of the current paradigm crisis state within cross-cultural management research in the field of IB. It demonstrates that the methodological positivist paradigm, as the dominate research paradigm, can no longer take for granted its operating assumptions of being universal, objective and context-free—the very activity required for conducting research. Furthermore, its inherited limitations of being context-free, unable to examine its own ontological and epistemological assumptions, and being reductive, are increasingly recognised as incapable of dealing with today's multi-dimensional cross-cultural research environment.

Chapter 2 aims to explore the wider management literature for insights into the possible solutions that can resolve the current paradigm crisis. The analysis shows that only through multiparadigm research, which utilises insights and strengths from different perspectives, the possibility of resolving the paradigm crisis is opened up. However, the existing multiparadigm strategies and suggestions are considered to be methodologically vague (Romani et al., 2011), and of limited use due to their

incomplete understanding of the central concepts—paradigm and paradigm incommensurability. Therefore, it is conjectured that only by truly understanding the terms paradigm and paradigm incommensurability is the acknowledgement and appreciation of different paradigms made possible.

Chapter 3 presents a detailed hermeneutic analysis over the terms paradigm and paradigm incommensurability. It explicitly demonstrates how the current understanding of the terms paradigm and paradigm incommensurability has in fact oversimplified and objectified the notion of paradigm, therefore completely dismissed the significance of paradigm incommensurability in revealing implicit cultural and paradigm assumptions, and its ability in transforming paradigm limitation and enabling multiparadigm studies. In contrast to the previous multiparadigm suggestions that downplay the importance of paradigm incommensurability, this chapter shows that it is only through the unprejudiced acceptance and acknowledgement of paradigm incommensurability that the possibility for a new way of seeing and being from a different perspective is opened up.

Chapter 4 introduces the Chinese indigenous philosophy of Yin Yang and its three principles of holism, paradox, and change. In explicating the distinctions between the Yin Yang perspective and the Western worldview, it has shown that the Yin Yang perspective, in been holistic, dynamic and paradoxical, embraces but goes beyond the framework of positivism. Therefore, it has the ability to welcome and embrace the incommensurable perspectives, transcend the limitations of methodological positivism, and thereby resolving the paradigm crisis in cross-cultural management research.

Chapter 5 introduces the concept of philosophical destruction and demonstrates how

it can be a useful instrument to work with our own and other's incommensurable cross-cultural research assumptions. The main objective of Chapter 5 is to enable researchers to include but also move beyond methodological positivist research assumptions and methodologies through the activity of philosophical destruction. In so doing, the research subject matter will be part of the rationale for choosing a particular methodology rather than assuming a priori that the dominant methodological positivism is the sufficient form of research for all areas of inquiry.

Limitations of the study

The overall limitation of the study is its sole focus on theory and conceptualisation. This is largely due to the nature of this research project; that is, to gain in-depth undertaking of a particular research field and to build relevant research skills to enter into the PhD program in the following year. From this standpoint, the main objective of this dissertation is not to pursue empirical evidence at this initial stage but to concentrate on a broad literature review in developing in-depth understanding of the challenges on hand and the potential solutions for cross-cultural management research in the field of IB.

Expected contributions

This dissertation is intended primarily as a theoretical contribution in enabling multiparadigm research in cross-cultural management within the field of IB, thereby resolving the current paradigm crisis. The dissertation first, explicitly examines the key terms of paradigm and paradigm incommensurability to provide clarification and to prevent further objectification and simplification. By doing so, it shows that instead of perceiving paradigm incommensurability as formidable differences between paradigms, it is indeed the key to paradigm transformation through enabling

multiparadigm research.

Second, the dissertation introduces the indigenous Chinese philosophy of Yin Yang as an alternative philosophical framework to research across cultures. In contrast to the Western analytical framework, Yin Yang, in been holistic, paradoxical and dynamic, welcomes and embraces the incommensurable research perspectives. Thus, Yin Yang provides a different cross-cultural research perspective that allows the playful dance of the "opposing voices" in cross-cultural management research in resolution and harmony, and encourages researchers to embrace but go beyond the dominant research paradigm for knowledge generation and theoretical development.

Lastly, the dissertation presents the concept of philosophical destruction. The significance of destruction from a philosophical perspective is that it allows a person to catch sight of their own taken-for-granted conventions and assumptions by allowing them to be thrown into question through disruptions in experience. In cross-cultural management research, philosophical destruction is of crucial importance because cross-cultural management research paradigms are neither simply universal nor situated in what philosopher Thomas Nagal (1989) calls the "view from nowhere". They are inherently culturally specific, they are a product of the way in which we have been acculturated. Thus, in order to transcend paradigm limitations and uncover implicit cultural research assumptions the activity of philosophical destruction must be conducted, failing to do so will result in misleading or biased research outcomes.

Although it is not within the scope of this study to offer a detailed Yin Yang and philosophical destruction methodology for conducting multiparadigm research, the conceptual clarification of the important terms paradigm and paradigm incommensurability, the introduction of the alternative Yin Yang perspective together

with the activity of philosophical destruction, serve the purpose of encouraging future researchers to fully utilise incommensurability in transforming paradigm limitations and conducting multiparadigm research that enriches cross-cultural management knowledge generation and theoretical development.

Chapter 1. Paradigm Crisis within the field of IB

This chapter reviews the relevant literature streams to demonstrate the current state of "paradigm crisis" within cross-cultural management research in the field of IB. The chapter begins by first making clear distinctions between positivist, methodological positivist and ontological positivist paradigms, because the indiscriminate use of the overall term "positivism" disregards the important contribution made possible by such an important methodology. It then identifies the methodological positivist paradigm as the dominant paradigm in cross-cultural management research and reveals why it is currently in a "paradigm crisis" state. Second, it explicates the limitations of the dominant methodological positivist paradigm and their implications for cross-cultural management research.

1.1 Methodological positivism versus Existential-ontological positivism

In this section, we need to first make clear that positivism is methodological positivism, but more. In fact, it comprises both methodological positivism and what, following the work of Martin Eger (2006) the philosopher of science and education, will be called an existential-ontological positivism. It is crucial to distinguish between positivism, methodological positivism and existential-ontological positivism because the indiscriminate use of the overall term "positivism" not only disregards the important contribution made possible by such a methodology, but also commits the act of stereotyping and generalization -- the very activity we wish to get beyond in the study of culture.

Methodological positivism, according to Martin Eger (2006), is expressed as an unquestioning commitment and allegiance to method above all else, whereas

existential-ontological positivism is always not only willing to situate itself in the cultural and historical perspective, but sees the latter as essential to the development of the scientific imagination. For Martin Eger (2006), without imagination, research is not possible. Indeed, methodological positivism gives rise to what he sees as a routinisation of research (Eger, 2006) rather than an on-going practice of re-searching. Einstein once said, "It would not be called 're-search', if we did not constantly need to re-search." And for him, this meant being willing to question the assumptions in terms of which research is conducted.

This is also why Martin Eger (2006) calls a non-methodological positivism an existential ontological positivism, because it is always willing to have its assumptions questioned in the light and context of what it is studying. Instead of conducting research with a pre-conceived and fixed method, it allows its method to enter into a dialogue with the subject matter of the research. In direct contrast, methodological positivism begins research with predetermined research methods, thus the outcome it receives is defined in advance of the actual research. In other words, its outcomes are pre-determined by its unquestioning belief in objectivity, neutrality, value freedom and universality.

1.2 Paradigm crisis within the dominant methodological positivist paradigm

In closely observing cross-cultural management research within the field of IB, it is not difficult to see that the methodological positivist research paradigm has dominated the field for decades (Jackson & Aycan, 2006; Jack, Calás, Nkomo, & Peltonen, 2008; Primecz, Romani, & Sackmann, 2009), in which the "cross-national comparison perspective" (Sackmann & Phillips, 2004) or the national culture model is its chief representation (e.g., Hofstede, 1980 & 2001; House et al., 2004; Schwartz,

1992: Trompenaars, 1993). The dominant methodological positivist research paradigm with its taken-for-granted research assumptions of being universal, objective and context-free is increasingly scrutinised as incapable of dealing with today's complex cultural realities (Tung, 2008; Tung & Verbeke, 2010). Such a realisation resulted in a paradigm crisis for methodological positivism, for it can no longer take its own operating assumptions for granted—the very activity that is required for conducting research.

In cross-cultural management research, the dominant methodological paradigm implicitly assumes all culture-related phenomena can be examined in a reduced and rationalised manner by "cutting . . . the culture concept down to size . . . [into] a narrowed, specialized, and . . . theoretically more powerful concept" (Geertz, 1973:4) in order to establish universal cultural theory through the legitimised "rigors" of positivism (Boyacigiller & Adler, 1991).

Nevertheless, in a multicultural global society, where pluralism has increasingly become the norm (Tung, 2008) and the acceptance that so much of culture is non-conscious, implicit and context-specific (Triandis, 2001), the goal to establish a universal and "nomothetic" cultural view is not only unnecessary but also "delusional" (Lowe, Moore, & Carr, 2007). The heavy reliance on the positivist research paradigm without critically examine its implicit research assumptions often creates "clearly inaccurate cross cultural context" (Tung & Verbeke, 2010: 1265) that objectifies the ethic of others (Roy & Starosta, 2001), and generates results that "mask or confound the phenomena under investigation" (Tung, 2008).

Globalisation not only challenges the fundamental epistemological and ontological assumptions in which cross-cultural research in management and IB is conducted, it

also makes clear that there is no basis upon which to assume a universal standard in researching different cultures. With methodological positivism no longer able to dismiss its limitations, and the possibility that there are other ways to research across cultures, it has gone into a state of "internal contradiction".

The methodological positivist research methodology is dependent on the epistemological and ontological assumptions of objectivity and universality. To accept that there are limits to its own operating assumptions, and the fact that there is no universal way of studying culture, is to agree that the very idea of "universality", "objectivity" and "context–free" is only a culturally-bound notion which originated from the Cartesian ontological distinction between subject and object (Heidegger, 1985). Hence, paradoxically, the methodological positivist methodology that values context-free, universality and objectivity is indeed culture-laden and based on its own limited epistemology and ontology. Such a state of internal contradiction within methodological positivism threatens its theoretical foundation and results in a paradigm crisis, for it can no longer take its own operating assumptions for granted— the very element that is required for conducting research.

1.3 Limitations and implications of the methodological positivist paradigm on cross-cultural management research

There are three well-recognised methodological positivist paradigm limitations. The first limitation is its tendency to establish "context-free prediction" that is unable to capture the complexity and the intricacy of today's actual cross-cultural encounters (Jackson & Acyan, 2006: 6). For to acknowledge cultural relativity or context specificity, one is obligated to function from premises that are contrary to positivist epistemology of being context-free and objective; thus, to achieve paradigmatic rigor,

"much comparative research proceeds *as if* the theoretical frameworks for comparisons are culture free", even when only lip service is sometimes paid to the prospect that they are not (Jack, Calás, Nkomo, & Peltonen, 2008: 873). The consequence of this is that while context is acknowledged as an important dimension of culture, methodological positivist research assumptions about the nature of reality make it unable to work with this dimension (Birkinshaw, Brannen, & Tung, 2011).

The unexamined and taken-for-granted ontological and epistemological assumptions with regards to empirical data present another paradigmatic limitation. For example, in IB research, the most widely used measures of cultural differences, such as Hofstede, Schwarts and GLOBE, are all value based (Birkinshaw et al., 2011). In these researches abstract values are seen as objective variables to be numbered and measured. However, treating abstract value as objective empirical data to measure and represent culture, only reveals the taken-for-granted ontological and epistemological assumptions of methodological positivism rather than the very concept of culture it is trying to understand.

For It is increasingly realised that values, and this way of studying values, are only one aspect, not the sum total of a country's culture; they are incapable of fully representing the value-behaviour link (Birkinshaw et al., 2011. Therefore, results generated in this context often lack managerial relevance. For practitioners, managers and scholars alike, who have experienced the lived cross-cultural encounters by studying culture in an abstract and decontextualised way has indeed disconnected values from their social and cultural life.

Similarly, the most popular national cultural dimensions used in IB research to date, such as Hofstede's (1980), Schwartz' (1994) values survey, Trompenaars (1993),

Inglehart and associates' World Values Survey (Inglehart, 1997), and GLOBE's (House et al., 2004), are all based on the predetermined "fallacious assumption" of cultural homogeneity within a given country (Tung & Verbeke, 2010: 1266). In practice, it is increasingly shown that cultural diversity within a nation can be as significant, and sometimes more so, than differences cross-nationally (McSweeny, 2009). Though the assumption of national cultural uniformity can lead to statistically significant results, their implications for actual managerial decisions, lived experience and economic performance are anything but clear (Tung & Verbeke, 2010).

The deficiency of only using dimensions of perceived values in representing national culture together with the ungrounded assumption of national cultural uniformity explain, in part, why there are many conflicting findings on the impact of selected cultural dimensions on managerial behaviour and firm strategy (Birkinshaw et al., 2011). In many ways, to understand cultural diversity within a given nation is more challenging than representing cultural diversity by using a predetermined set of cultural distance scores, as there is a whole range of nuances such as age, gender, ethnicity, religion, generational differences that cannot be reduced to one score, and together they all play a part in influencing people's behaviours, values and interactions.

The third well-recognised limitation of the methodological positivist paradigm is its "impoverished reductionism"' in conceptualising and operationalising culture (Jack et al., 2008: 875). Such a reductionism often means the lived experience of "culture" is marginalised (Tayeb, 1994) through objectification and generalisation because such an approach often introduces bipolarised dichotomies, supports hierarchies, objectifies phenomena, and stimulates abstractification and absolutism (Ani, 1994).

For example, in commenting on scholars that have adopted a predetermined

methodological positivist approach in researching Chinese culture, Stening and Zhang (2007: 126) maintained that "As persons who have themselves been culturally conditioned, researchers may unwittingly, then, overlook the quite different cognitive frameworks of the people they are studying, and address questions about their behavior through lenses that are inappropriate; for example, adopting a cause–effect, reductionist, positivistic perspective when a more holistic, integrative, relational perspective might make more sense in examining and interpreting what is really going on." Unfortunately, by doing so, no matter how elegant the methodological positivist essentialist regularities appear to be, they manage to sweep their own prejudice, context, history and culture under the rug.

Similarly, unquestioningly adopting the methodological positivist research assumptions as a priori in examining different cultures also results in what Abdul JanMohamed (1985) calls a "strategy of generalization". According to JanMohamed, this generalisation consequently leads to the "commodifi[cation]" of the native "so that he [or she] is now perceived as a generic being that can be exchanged for any other native" (1985: 64).

In this scene, what methodological positivism fails to grasp is the "otherness of the other", the very distinct quality that makes us all different. Instead, it tries to reduce the otherness of the other, to its own language (Levinas, 1985) that is self-justified by the ideals of universality, objectivity and value free, that supposedly allow methodological positivism to stand above all cultures. Consequently, not only can it not see itself from others' perspectives, it also does not have the capacity to realise that its own perspective is nothing but culturally defined and determined. Ironically, the "blind spot" of the methodological positivism is that it does not see that it has a blind spot.

The dominance of the methodological positivist research practice that unconsciously objectifies the "ethnic other" is further perpetuated and institutionalised in universities, governments and business organisations through the circulation of research findings. For what is not realised is that objectification and stereotyping are regrettably and unavoidably accompanied by elitism and ethnocentrism. Contradictorily, rather than enhancing our mutual cross-cultural understanding it significantly hinders our awareness, sensitivity and appreciation of each others' cultural difference and the synergy created through cross-cultural encounters. Hence, Roy and Starosta's (2010:14) in addressing the same concern in cross-cultural research, asserted that: "One should not objectify other cultures and their people, nor take national cultures as an a priori, given quantity."

In actual encounters with other human beings, the Jewish existential philosopher-Martin Buber has shed some light on this matter in his famous writing, *Ich und Du*. In *Ich und Du*, Buber has expressed with great poetic power and philosophical wisdom that "dialogue is at the heart of every human existence" (Roy and Starosta: 10). According to Buber (1970), there are two primary types of relations: "I-Thou" and "I-It". Buber (1970) describes the "I-Thou" relationship between two human beings as filled with qualities such as "mutuality, openheartedness, directness, honesty, spontaneity, frankness, lack of pretence, non-manipulative intent, communion, intensity, and love in the sense of responsibility of one human for another" (Johannesen, 1971: 375). While in an "I-It" relationship, a person sees and uses the other person as an object for his/her self-interest. For Buber (1970), only in the "I-Thou" relationship we can fully appreciate each other's uniqueness and "it is the dialogic relationship of 'I-Thou' that helps humans attain their completeness by understanding one another in a spirit of authenticity" (Roy & Starosta, 2001: 10).

Unfortunately, the methodological positivist approach in researching about different cultures falls within Buber's I-It relationship rather than I-Thou relationship—the very thing we wish to get beyond, for the methodological positivist approach always reduces and constructs the other as an object to be studied rather than as a human being to be encountered. Furthermore, because methodological positivism assumes the objectification of the other is a "natural" rather than a culturally constructed way of conducting research, it is blind to the fact that it is objectifying others though its own research methodology.

Of course we need to highlight the reflexive irony of this: cross-cultural research conducted in reductive methodological positivist frameworks promotes respect for and understanding of different cultures, but the very research methodology it uses in fact has not only reduced the profound complexity of culture but also promoted and stimulated objectification and stereotyping of human beings. Hence, it is not surprising when Jack et al., (2008) in commenting on the state of international management has asserted that: "[T]he continued dominance of functionalist and positivist thinking in this field is perhaps its most fundamental *and* unrecognized problem."

In summary, this chapter explored the various streams of literature to explicate the current state of "paradigm crisis" within cross-cultural management research in the field of IB. The chapter first, made a clear distinction between positivism, methodological positivism and ontological positivism to show that methodological positivist paradigm is the dominant research paradigm in cross-cultural management research. The need for such a clear distinction between positivism, methodological positivism and ontological positivism is because indiscriminate use of the overall term

"positivism" disregards the important contribution made possible by such a methodology and commits the act of stereotyping and generalisation—the very thing that we wish to get beyond in studying culture. Second, the literature review shown that it is increasingly recognised, the methodological positivist paradigm can no longer capture today's complex cross-cultural reality due to its paradigmatic assumptions and limitations. Such realisation has resulted the methodological paradigm into a "crisis" state where it can no longer take for granted its operating assumptions of being context-free, universal and objective. Lastly, the chapter discussed in detail the limitations of the dominant methodological positivist paradigm and their implications on cross-cultural management research. In order to resolve the "paradigm crisis" and to move the field of cross-cultural management research forward, various efforts and suggestions have been made and these will be explored in the following chapter.

Chapter 2. Attempts to go beyond methodological positivism

This chapter explores the wider management literature for insights into the possible solutions that can resolve the current paradigm crisis. The chapter begins by first, offers a detailed account of efforts that have already been made within and outside the methodological positivist paradigm with the aim of transcending the paradigm crisis. These efforts have all pointed to the urgent need for multiparadigm research that utilises insights and strengths from different perspectives. This chapter then critically analyses the usefulness and practicality of existing multiparadigm strategies and suggestions. The analyses have shown that these suggestions and solutions are considered to be methodologically vague, hence of limited use due to their limited understanding of the central concepts—paradigm and paradigm incommensurability. Lastly, it concludes with the conjecture that only by truly understand the terms paradigm and paradigm incommensurability, are we able to acknowledge and appreciate the differences between different paradigms, and fully utilise their strength and insight to move cross-cultural management research forward and resolve the current paradigm crisis.

2.1 Attempts from within and outside the methodological positivist paradigm to resolve the paradigm crisis

Appeals for solutions in the domain of cross-cultural management, to escape from this lamentable paradigm crisis, emanate from both within and outside the dominant methodological positivist paradigm. Continuous efforts were made over the past three decades, for example, in challenging the domination, the weaknesses and the

inherited assumptions of the positivist research paradigm (Adler, 1983; Boyacigiller & Adler, 1991; Lowe, 2001) many have argued for the need for a more nuanced epistemological, methodological and ontological approach in understanding culture (Redding, 1994); advocated the use of the qualitative research method as an alternative to derive deep insights (Morgan & Smircich, 1980); called for conducting "context-embedded", "context-specific" or "context-bounded" research (Tsui, 2004); pleaded for paradigmatic diversity in fostering greater creativity and insight (Gioia & Pitre, 1990), forefronted the importance of "epistemic consciousness" and the need to avoid "single paradigm myopia" (Lowe et al., 2007). Additionally, Morris, Leung, Ames and Lickel (1999) have proposed to avoid theoretical simplicity through the improvement of "thick" description and the use of interplay and integration between etic and emic techniques that promises synergistic benefits in the dual understanding of the unique and specific, along with generalisable aspects of cultural phenomena.

Even within the dominant methodological positivist research paradigm there were various attempts made to improve methodological weaknesses of the chief Hofstedean national culture model, through more scientifically designed research framework (Schwartz, 1992); counter Western research bias by adding on additional culture dimension of Confucian dynamism (Hofstede, 1991), later changed to long-term/short-term orientation (Hofstede, 2001); adopt more practically orientated research design (Trompenaars, 1994); and investigate more societies (House et al., 2004). However, by using different cultural dimensions these studies have essentially adopted the same ontological and epistemological research assumptions in viewing culture (Fang, 2012), and are therefore unable to move beyond the limitations of the methodological positivist paradigm.

In bringing the indigenous cultural perspective to the table, many have called for

high-quality Chinese management research (Tsui, 2004) that "may contribute to global management knowledge" (Tsui, 2009:1). Some have suggested Asian scholars should participate in "global scholarly discourse" and "make major contributions . . . by drawing on traditional Asian thought in developing new theories" (Meyer, 2006: 119), others have pleaded for an "ambicultural" approach that gives the indigenous Eastern perspective a more equal validity (Chen & Miller, 2010). Fang (2012) has shown how the indigenous Chinese philosophy of Yin Yang can be adopted as an alternative perspective in understanding today's complex multicultural environment, moreover ÖZkazanÇ-Pan, (2008) demonstrated the use of postcolonial study in understanding the non-Western "other", and in disrupting the hegemony of the Western epistmology in international management research.

2.2 The need for multiparadigm research and various suggested strategies

As a result, awareness of multiple perspectives and multiparadigm research seem to be enjoying a resurgence (Okhuysen & Bonardi, 2011; Sullivan & Daniels, 2008; Primecz et al., 2009). Similarly, various articles commenting on cross-cultural management have all pointed out that the transcendence of the methodological positivist paradigm necessitates more than one paradigm in IB and cross-cultural management research (e.g., Boyacigiller et al., 2004; Lewis & Grimes,1999; Sullivan & Daniels, 2008), because the alternative, the status quo of the methodological positivist paradigm, turned out to be "sterile" and "mostly irrelevant" for operating business in times of globalised opportunities and crises (Lowe, Magala, & Hwang, 2012: 763). Strategies for avoiding "paradigm parochialism" (Lowe, 2001), such as adopting multiple perspectives and multiparadigm research approaches in cross-cultural management are evidenced by, for example, the strategies of "combining lenses", "paradigm interplay", "paradigm crossing", all with the aim to transcend paradigm limitations and enrich theoretical development.

Combining lenses, in Okhuysen and Bonardi's (2011) term, implies combination of theoretical lenses in terms of similarity of the phenomena they address and the compatibility of their underlying assumptions. Combining lenses that share compatible underlying assumptions in addressing similar or different phenomena represents the easier research to craft as it is aimed at articulating existing theory rather than new theory development. Whereas, in contrast, combining lenses that have incompatible underlying assumptions and addressing similar or different phenomena represents the most challenging research to craft, due to the difficulty in presenting a coherent explanation that is based on incompatible ontological and epistemological worldviews. It demands the researchers not only clearly understand their own explicit and implicit assumptions, but also have intimate knowledge and understanding of others' potentially incompatible ontological and epistemological worldviews.

Such a combination, with its focus on involving disparate areas of research and vastly different underlying assumptions, has the most potential to explain management phenomena that have not been explored previously. The benefits and the logic of using multiple lenses in examining organisational issues are clearly evident: it allows scholars to sustain a healthy assessment of the world (Currie, Knights, & Starkey, 2010) and avoid the tendency to generate "isolated silos" of knowledge (Okhuysen & Bonardi, 2011:6).

However, merely understanding or acknowledging its benefits does not promise successful adaptation of such an approach because combining lenses is not only methodologically vague but also practically challenging. What has not been realised is that to understand a different worldview is to be able to live in a different world. With its rules and assumptions, often confronting our existence by calling our

inherited beliefs and assumptions into question. Such confrontation brings with it great anxiety and ambiguity (Segal, 1998). Therefore, though the idea of combining lenses is easy to rationalise and comprehend, but without adequate methodology that allows the researchers to work with anxiety and ambiguity, it is exceedingly difficult to achieve.

Similarly, Romani et al., (2011) suggested a multiparadigm strategy of interplay between the positivist and the interpretive paradigms or as the authors state "the interpretive and positivist methodologies" (2011:433) to make a theoretical contribution. In their suggestion, paradigm interplay refers to a paradigmatic dialogue that respects and builds on the connections and distinctions between different paradigms' components used by Kuhn to emphasise continuity and change during scientific revolution. Romani et al., (2011) claim that paradigm interplay can be achieved in three steps that consist of: first, conducting separate analysis within both the interpretive and positivist paradigms; second, the outcomes of the analyses are compared and contrasted in light of each other to reveal connections and differentiations; and lastly, the highlighted connections and distinctions open up ground for new contributions.

The success of achieving paradigm interplay appears to depend on researchers' ability to master different research methodologies and to stand in between a paradigm neutral space. But how do we stand in a paradigm natural space if, indeed, paradigm consists of our own ontological and epistemological worldviews? Paradigm comprises of different research methodologies, but more; it includes not only various implicit and explicit assumptions that guide our daily research activities, but also how we perceive the world.

Therefore, it would be naive to equate the ability to master various research methodologies to the capacities of holding onto different worldviews. Paradigm includes methodology, but more, and the ability to master different worldviews requires the capacity to hold on to a diverse range of cognitive heuristics that allow researchers to accept and work with the coexistence of multiple truths (Lowe et al., 2007) that create a constant state of contradictories and instability. With the formal logic of either/or currently dominating Western academic thought (Fang, 2012), it makes such a state extremely undesirable.

Furthermore, using the interpretive and positivist methodologies in representing their respective paradigms has, in fact, objectified the notion of paradigm. Such an overly-simplified and objectified conception of paradigm begs the question of authors' understanding of the term paradigm, and consequently their suggestion of standing in a paradigm neutral space to conduct paradigm interplay in theory building.

Another multiparadigm strategy, according to Shultz and Hatch (1996), is called "paradigm crossing". It encompasses simultaneously recognising and engaging apparently opposite paradigms in theory building. Such strategy assumes permeability between the opposing paradigms. It emphases that paradigmatic insights and biases are most recognisable from a third view. And by preserving the creative tension through movements between the paradigms, it allows the researchers to hold multiple views at the same time and produce a new state of awareness. The authors claim that paradigm crossing is similar to paradox but differs in its insistence on preserving tension instead of trying to resolve it. Paradigm crossing does not fix itself in one or the other paradigm, but rather allows the argument to flow between them.

Using functionalist and interpretive paradigms from the organisational culture study as an example, Shultz and Hatch (1996) illustrated by adopting the postmodern perspective in viewing functionalist and interpretive paradigms, it is possible to map out their similarities in perceiving culture as "pattern", "essence" and "static". The discussion of these similarities explores paradigm permeability. The discussion of their distinctions reminds researchers that paradigm differences are important too. To recognise such similarities and distinctions at the same time requires the researcher to engage, shift between, then withdraw from both paradigms and stand at a paradigm neutral space that is achieved by adopting the postmodernism perspective view of culture.

Paradigm cross strategy is convincing with its contributions in that it stimulates researchers' awareness by holding multiple views at the same time. However, their standpoint does not explicate how to paradigm cross in practice—it is conceptual. It leaves researchers helpless regarding the practical possibility of simultaneously performing an analysis in several paradigms without the intimate knowledge of those paradigms. And more importantly what perspective to choose that may enable the researcher to stand in a paradigm natural space.

Shultz and Hatch (1996) argued paradigm crossing could be adopted between any opposing paradigms. However, by only focusing on the most recognisable and frequently used interpretive and functionalist paradigms within organisational cultural research, appears to perpetuate the hegemony of the Western bond interpretive and functionalist paradigms, rather than stimulated paradigmatic diversity. Especially when the rising importance of the East in general and its thriving business enterprises in the time of globalised crisis forces us to reflect on the existing limited understanding of the term paradigm; and to develop more inclusive and holistic notion of paradigm that are compatible with today's cross-cultural management

complexity.

2.3 The need to understand paradigm and paradigm incommensurability

In summary, iterative pleas to resolve the methodological paradigm crisis have all pointed to the need for multiparadigm studies. However, suggestions for conducting multiparadigm studies are often considered to be methodologically vague (Romani et al', 2011) due to their limited understanding of the central concepts—paradigm and paradigm incommensurability. In fact, the notion of paradigm has frequently been objectified, seen as a "thing" to be manipulated or juxtaposed on a board of paradigms and equated to research methodology (e.g., Lewis & Grimes, 1999; Romani et al, 2011). Subsequently, the importance of paradigm incommensurability in transforming paradigm limitations and uncovering implicit and tacit assumptions is not realised or utilised in enabling multiparadigm research. As a result, iterative pleas have been made for more than two decades (i.e., Gioia & Pitre, 1990; Schultz & Hatch, 1996; Romani et al., 2011), studies that have successfully adopted multiple paradigms are in fact rare and few.

This scarcity has only led to the conjecture that: the fundamental issues are not about realising and acknowledging the logical importance of having multiple perspectives and adopting multiparadigm strategies, but rather, following the writing of Thomas Kuhn, that in order to utilise insights from different paradigms to enrich cross-cultural management research we need to paradoxically first recognise and acknowledge paradigm incommensurability in order to be able to play in the space of difference, which we see as at the heart of the Chinese indigenous philosophy of Yin Yang. For "if we presume that a foreign culture is incommensurable with ours, we might be able to better understand it, while if we assume that we can just translate it

into ours, the internal logic and richness of the culture stays hidden." (Cortois, 2000:2) In other words, it is only through the unprejudiced acceptance and acknowledgement of others' differences that the possibility for what Hans George Gadamer calls "the expansion of horizons" for new way of seeing and being from a different perspective is opened up.

In conclusion, this chapter reviews a wide range of management literature in searching for the possible solutions that can resolve the current paradigm crisis. Through the analysis of the efforts that have already been made from within and outside the methodological positivist paradigm, it is shown that multiparadigm research, which utilises insights and strengths from different perspectives has the potential to transcend methodological positivist paradigm limitations and move cross-cultural research forward. However, in critically reviewing the current multiparadigm suggestions and strategies, it has been found that these suggestions lack fundamental understanding of the important terms "paradigm" and "paradigm incommensurability", thus are considered to be methodologically vague (Romani et al., 2011), hence of limited use. It is therefore conjectured that only through in-depth understanding of the terms paradigm and paradigm incommensurability, are we able to fully acknowledge and appreciate the difference between different paradigms and utilise their strengths and insights to move cross-cultural management research forward and resolve the current paradigm crisis.

Chapter 3. Paradigm and paradigm incommensurability

This chapter provides a detailed examination of the notions "paradigm" and "paradigm incommensurability". It serves to explicate the terms paradigm and paradigm incommensurability, and to demonstrate why only through the acknowledgement of paradigm incommensurability is a new way of seeing through others' perspectives made possible. It begins by clearly identifying three IB meta-paradigm perspectives and their interpretations of paradigm incommensurability that constitute the current paradigm debates in addressing the multiplicity of paradigmatic references. It then offers a hermeneutic view of the terms paradigm and paradigm incommensurability, as contrasted with the current limited understanding of those terms, and outlines their implications. Lastly, it demonstrates why only through the acknowledgement of paradigm incommensurability are both paradigm transcendence and multiparadigm study made possible.

3.1 The paradigms debates and incommensurability

The paradigms debate (see Fabian, 2000; Greene, 2008; Hassard & Kelemen, 2002; Scherer, 1998; Scherer & Steinmann, 1999) addresses the plurality of paradigms in which there are three main meta-paradigm perspectives that illustrate this plurality: the segregation perspective, the integration perspective, and the multiparadigm perspective (Romani et al., 2011). The concept of paradigm incommensurability has frequently been a point of departure for most paradigm debates as it is either used to support or to oppose the three meta-paradigm perspectives. Briefly stated, paradigm incommensurability in general has frequently been referred to as scientific paradigms

that are qualitatively different or in some cases contradictory; they can neither be merged nor interact with each other in a meaningful way (Kuhn, 1962).

What is called the segregation perspective maintains that different paradigms represent distinctive research approaches because researchers in addressing their subject are always influenced by "explicit or implicit assumptions about the nature of the social world and the way in which it may be investigated." (Burrell & Morgan, 1979: 1-4). Burrell and Morgan (1979) claim that differences in ontology, epistemology, methodology, as well as assumptions about human nature, create insurmountable barriers between different paradigmatic perspectives, therefore they can not be related to each other in a meaningful way. The segregation perspective is often labeled protectionist or isolationist (e.g., Scherer, 1998) and it tends to perceive the functions of paradigms as being to preserve and to maintain their own specific research practices (Romani et al., 2011).

From the segregation perspective, Burrell and Morgan's (1979) claim of paradigm incommensurability serves two purposes: first, it advocates the legitimacy of different research paradigms within cross-cultural organisational science, and second, the incommensurability thesis prevents paradigm domination and paradigm synthesis by stating that each paradigm must be separately developed and applied (e.g., Jackson & Carter, 1993). However, many have strongly criticised Burrell and Morgan's (1979) paradigm categorisation as "a structure of simplistic and ambiguous dimensionality where complex and diverse notions are forced into artificial and ill-fitting unity" (Greenfield, 1991/1993: 178) and their proclaimed use of Kuhn's (1962) incommensurability thesis is in fact a form of denial of the very transcendental dynamic of paradigms put forward by Kuhn (Lowe et al., 2007). It holds on to an implicit belief in a monolithic universality.

The second perspective is known as paradigm integration. Proponents (e.g., Pfeffer, 1993 and Donaldson, 1998) of this perspective argue in favor of abandoning all but one paradigm to unify a scientific field of research to increase its influence. For example, in organisational research, Pfeffer (1993: 611) has made a strong hegemonic argument that "without some minimal level of consensus about research questions and methods, fields can scarcely expect to produce knowledge in a cumulative, developmental process." This argument essentially promotes paradigm hegemony and views the existing plurality of research paradigms as a sign of lacking paradigmatic maturity in organisational science.

The incommensurability argument in this case opposes the integrationist perspective. In response, some reject the notion of paradigm incommensurability altogether (e.g., Donaldson, 1998) while others use Kuhn's view of incommensurability that revolved around relationships between paradigms to support their argument. Kuhn (1962) states that there is no common ground for different paradigms to compare and relate to each other therefore paradigms are incommensurable. The integrationist argues that there is no existing common ground for comparisons, but in developing mutual understanding between paradigms new rules and grounds can be developed and built for paradigmatic integration, thus moving toward establishing a common agreement (Scherer & Steinmann, 1999).

Nevertheless, in reality when one paradigm dominates a research field, what has been seen is the marginalisation of other perspectives rather than the integrationist ideal of paradigm mutual understating. As an example, in cross-cultural management research the positivist paradigm has dominated the field for decades (Jackson & Aycan, 2006; Jack et al., 2008; Primecz et al., 2009); with its immense influence in dictating how cross-cultural research should be done it has not only restricted the

development of the field but also marginalised other research perspectives. Furthermore, according to Schultz and Hatch (1996) the research framework developed based on an integrationist perspective frequently includes terms and arguments, abstracted from other paradigmatic context without considering and understanding their paradigmatic ontologies and epistemologies, thereby producing misleading and less relevant research outcomes.

The third perspective is known as multiparadigm. It grants that paradigms are distinctive academic worldviews legitimate in their own terms. It differs from the previous two perspectives by advocating the possible associations and interactions between paradigms without integration (e.g., Lewis & Grimes, 1999; Romani et al., 2011; Schultz & Hatch, 1996). From this perspective, researchers are encouraged to recognise and engage with multiple paradigms rather than disregarding them as the integrationist perspective, or refusing to confront them as the segregation perspective. It urges the use of multiple paradigms in enabling researchers to produce novel and relevant insight through sustaining a healthy assessment of the world (Currie, Knights, & Starkey, 2010) and avoiding generation of "isolated silos" of knowledge (Okhuysen & Bonardi, 2011: 6).

The multiparadigm perspective appears to deny the fact that researchers are condemned to paradigm incommensurability. Instead, it calls for a kind of playfulness or border crossing between paradigms. For example, Schultz and Hatch (1996: 530) claim:

> Our denial of incommensurability does not mean that we accept an integrationist view…we explore the possibilities of paradigm crossing as a third metatheoretical position that resists both incommensurability and integration. We contribute a new

paradigm-crossing strategy that we label interplay, defined as the simultaneous recognition of both contrasts and connections between paradigms.

Nevertheless, the refutation of incommensurability is not enough to deny incommensurability. Indeed, if paradigms are incommensurable then there exists no common measure to compare and contrast different paradigms. Schultz and Hatch (1996) have not shown this to be the case. Furthermore, it raises the fundamental question of, from where do we compare and contrast them? A neutral space outside of paradigms? Or, as we will show, it is in the space of being caught between paradigms.

Various perspectives of the paradigm debate disclose beliefs of the perceived appropriate way to conduct research. The protectionists use incommensurability as an emancipatory tool to promote knowledge generations from separate and diverse paradigms. The integrationists use it to argue for a unified paradigm in theory development through accumulation. The proponents of the multiparadigm perspective assert that they reject both isolation and integration in favour of paradigm interactions through language learning.

3.2 Hermeneutic dimension of paradigm and paradigm incommensurability

Seen from a hermeneutic (Heidegger, 1985) point of view regarding paradigm and paradigm incommensurability is that there is more to paradigm incommensurability that meets the "eyes" of the latter three perspectives. While this study has no sympathy with the first two perspectives discussed above, it adopts the same view as the multiparadigm perspective in terms of working though paradigm difference.

Similarly, this study agrees that knowledge generation and theoretical development can be enriched from insights drawn from a dialogue across different paradigms.

However, it is concerning that the multiparadigm perspective has by-passed the significance and fruitfulness of working through paradigm incommensurability. This research aims to explore paradigm incommensurability instead of seeing it as a limitation or obstacle for working in the space between paradigms. In fact, paradigm incommensurability in this study is seen as the basis for helping us become new kinds of researchers. Such a perspective is clearly expressed by the hermeneutic philosopher Richard Rorty, who maintains that genuine rather than defensive meetings between researchers of different paradigms offers us the opportunity:

> To reinterpret our familiar surroundings in the unfamiliar terms of [the other]. … Discourse [with the other] is supposed to be abnormal, to take us out of our old selves by the power of strangeness, to aid us in becoming new beings. . . The attempt to edify [ourselves or others] may consist in . . . the attempt to reinterpret our familiar surroundings in the unfamiliar terms of" our encounter with other "culture[s] or historical period[s] . . . (Rorty, 1979:360)

Rorty enables us to see that working between paradigms is one such opportunity, which cuts to the bone of our identity as researchers. It is not an emotionally easy task and can produce much defensiveness on the part of researchers. He also fore fronted that working through objective paradigm interaction via paradigm language learning is in fact a paradigmatic ideal and cannot be achieved. Moreover, by equating the objective research methodology with paradigm has in fact oversimplified the notion of a paradigm and therefore downplayed the importance of paradigm incommensurability in enabling paradigm transformation. Hence, this study argues that only though encountering and acknowledging paradigm incommensurability do

we have the opportunity to uncover our own and others' tacit and implicit assumptions, thereby opening up the possibility for a new way of being that is inclusive of different paradigmatic assumptions and insights.

In order to discuss the possibility of multiparadigm research, Kuhn's terms paradigm and paradigm incommensurability need to be clearly elucidated. This thesis's understanding of the terms paradigm and paradigm incommensurability differs from the three meta-paradigm perspectives in a qualitative way that is focused on the hermeneutic phenomenological dimension of the terms paradigm and incommensurability.

It argues that paradigm includes not only research methodology but shapes our way of what Martin Heidegger calls (1985: 233) "being-in-the-world". This means that it operates on both explicit and implicit levels. We conduct research through the taken-for-granted ontological and epistemological assumptions of a paradigm without even being aware that we are doing so. In other words, we do not simply have our ontological and epistemological assumptions before us as objects or principles to be manipulated. We need, as Heidegger (1985) calls it, to "destroy" our paradigms in order to make them explicit. One strategy of destruction is the willingness to see our own perspective through the perspective of another. Acknowledging and embracing incommensurability is the first fundamental step for transcending paradigm limitation, not only embracing multiparadigm perspectives but in becoming new beings.

The original term paradigm is derived from the Greek word "paradigm", meaning distinct shared pattern or common measure. Thomas Kuhn (1962), the philosopher of science gave it its contemporary meaning in his discussion regarding the phenomenology of scientific progress. Kuhn defines paradigm as a set of received

ontological, epistemological and scientific assumptions, which form a theoretical framework. In this theoretical framework theories can be tested, evaluated and, if necessary, improved.

Additionally, a paradigm is also a cognitive framework with "an entire constellation of beliefs, values, techniques and so on, shared by a given [scientific] community", in which "universally recognised scientific achievements . . . for a time provide model problems and solutions to a community of practitioners" (Kuhn, 1962: 175). In other words, paradigm is seen as a temporary theoretical framework and a structure of thought that provides a particular vision of reality, which guides the way we perceive, think and act during out daily researching activities.

What we observe is conditioned and mediated by our paradigm. Paradigm dictates what is considered to be rational and relevant, and it manages expectations by telling us what we are expected to see. In our normal day-to-day activities our paradigmatic assumptions are exceedingly difficult to notice. It is only in the scenario of "break down", or the encounter with the incommensurable other who adopts a different set of assumptions, that our own implicit assumptions become explicit.

In this context, theories developed by a community of scientists only make sense in their own paradigm and are incommensurable with theory developed in other paradigms. Whether scientists want to admit it or not, they are always knowingly or unknowingly under the influence of a paradigm. One that discloses the world in certain ways and closes down the world or blinds the scientist in other ways. Even the most rational and objective of scientists is operating in terms of a particular paradigm. Indeed, for Kuhn, "rationality" and "objectivity" are part of the principles of a particular paradigm. There is no view from "no-where", only views from "some-

where." Therefore, the essence of Kuhn's incommensurability thesis is that there is no common measure in terms of which all paradigms can be situated in relationship to each other, and there is no universal or meta-paradigm language in terms of which all paradigms can communicate with each other.

From this standpoint, the multiparadigm perspective's suggestion of objective paradigm interaction through language learning, which respects the difference of each paradigm is simply a liberal paradigmatic ideal and cannot be achieved. This is so because it completely dismisses Kuhn's incommensurability thesis. For whose language and assumptions should we adopt when conducting such an objective interaction between two different paradigms when there isn't a paradigm-neutral language, and where do we find such a paradigmatic neutral space when we are always under the influence of a paradigm? Indeed, as an example, the indigenous Chinese philosophy of Yin Yang has always stated that we are always situated in a phenomenon, never outside of it. Similarly, Heidegger also claims we are beings within a world. This has clearly shown that the ideal of a paradigm neutral place is in fact an implicit assumption of a paradigm rather than a point that has been demonstrated.

Furthermore, the indiscriminate interchange of the term paradigm and research methodology (for example, see Romani et al., 2011) has in fact objectified and oversimplified the term paradigm and downplayed its significance in dictating our actions through its range of tacit assumptions. For the subjective paradigm comprises of objective research methodology, but more. In other words, paradigm is both a cognitive and a theoretical framework in which we may develop various objective research methodologies that guide our research activities.

The ability to master different research methodologies cannot be compared or equated to the ability of mastering different paradigms. For example, there are positivist or interpretive researchers in both formal logical-dominated cognitive framework of "either or" society, and paradox-oriented cognitive framework of "both and" society. Equating the research methodologies they use to their implicit overall paradigm is indeed oversimplified the range of assumptions that provide meaning for their actions. Thus restricted our understanding of the other human being and instigated generalisation and prejudice. The oversimplification of the term paradigm and the limited understanding of paradigm incommensurability has explained in large part, why there are plethora of suggestions and requests for multiparadigm research, but in reality the existence of such studies are rare and few.

The nuanced paradox that is not always visible in Kuhn's (1996) writing is that although he believed in paradigm incommensurability, he also believed movement between paradigms is possible. Paradigms are not immutable or ahistorical. On the contrary, they are dynamically socially constructed conventions. They come into being and they pass away. Paradigm moves are possible but they are achieved through the transformative movement of a paradigm shift rather than objective paradigm interactions as suggested by the multiparadigm perspective. Such shifts have a particular logic or phenomenology of their own. They are qualitative rather than quantitative.

Paradigm shift requires a leap into the incommensurable that provides a new and emerging way of seeing things. This faith in leaping into the incommensurable is central to paradigm transformation. It is only later, once the rules and conventions of the new paradigm begin to be defined, that not only will it be demonstrated, but that the very criteria of proof will be established. In this sense, the movement between

different paradigms is not itself rational, for what counts as rationality is determined from within a paradigm. Hence to move between different paradigms is to move between different assumptions about the nature of rationality.

In reflection on his own encounter with paradigm incommensurability and paradigm transition, Bohr once said: "Every great and deep difficulty bears in itself its own solution. It forces us to change our thinking in order to find it."(Palermo, 2013) Echoing this point Einstein also made clear that a paradigm problem is not solved in the same terms or with the same set of assumptions, which led to the identifying of the problem in the first place. Heidegger (2010:358) takes this a step further by asserting that "there where the danger is, so the saving power grows."

In summary, to be able to utilise insights form different paradigms requires a fundamental rethinking of conducting IB research in the space between paradigms. Such a paradigm shift expands the limit of the old paradigm to include new assumptions and insights from other paradigms. Paradigms are much more than a set of logical propositions to be put in a four-by-four table. They are tacit or implicit ways of seeing and being in the world, which shape the way we do research. The proposed objective paradigm interaction and paradigm learning might seem conceptually logical, but are unattainable in reality because such suggestion simplifies and objectifies the notion of paradigm and dismisses the essence of Kuhn's incommensurability thesis that there exist no paradigm neutral place and paradigm neutral mindset to conduct such an interaction.

3.3 Paradigm transcendence through the acknowledgement of paradigm incommensurability

As fore fronted by Bohr, Einstein and Heidegger, paradigm incommensurability plays a key role in making paradigm shift possible. Paradigm incommensurability applies not only to paradigms but to "cultures" as well. It reveals our implicit and taken-for-granted paradigm and culture assumptions, therefore opening up new possibilities for seeing the world from others' perspectives. For it is only when we can let go of the need to reduce the others to our own perspective that we can see the world from others' perspectives, thereby our own limited paradigm has been transformed and expanded.

As Bernd Jager (1994) puts it, paradigm incommensurability is a space of "self-showing". It is entered only when our habitual everyday world is ruptured such that we can no longer be fully absorbed or engaged in this everyday world of activities, we begin to see ourselves in our everyday world of activities. The incommensurable other allows us to see our culture heritage in a way that we cannot do while absorbed in the everyday world of our own scripts for doing things. For when we dialogue with those who share our culture or paradigm, we take the paradigm for granted. In the face of the stranger, the incommensurable, however, it is our very paradigm or culture that become explicit themes of concern, that we come to see the very language and logic of our own paradigm (Segal,1999).

In this context, the rupturing of our everyday by the incommensurable other is the condition through which we have been given access to our own historicity. The experience of the incommensurable other is in fact the basis where we can rediscover our own culture, history, and our taken-for-granted beliefs that regulate our way of doing

things in a vastly different way. In other words, it is only through the experience of paradigm incommensurability we are engaged in the activity of revealing and exploring the implicit paradigm and culture assumptions (Heidegger, 1985). Lyotard (1990: 3) claims that the activity of exploring tacit and hidden assumptions "refines our sensitivity to differences and reinforces our ability to tolerate the incommensurable", and this is indeed the space that cross-cultural management research in IB also needs to enter to go beyond.

However, it must be emphasised that the activity of exploring implicit assumptions can only begin where culture or paradigm incommensurability is acknowledged. Thus admitting paradigms and cultural matters can no longer be verified empirically through scientific and social scientific research but only through uncovering and exploring of assumptions without prejudice. Emmanuel Levinas (1985) would call such an acknowledgement of incommensurability the ethical encounter with the Otherness of the other. Prejudice stops where there is an appreciation of the fact that the other cannot be contained in, but always exceeds my research perspective on the other. The other always exceeds "the idea of the other in me." (Levinas, 1985:51). It is the acceptance of the incommensurable and this irreducibility of the other to my perspective that our own culture and prejudice is prevented, and the exploring of the implicit assumptions begins.

Furthermore, working with incommensurable paradigms allows us not only to see our own habitual and taken-for-granted ways of seeing the world but also opens up new possibilities for seeing the world from others' perspectives. For example, sociologist Zigmund Bauman (1990) states that it is only through working with the incommensurable others that both the "self" and the "other" can be understood. Similarly, American philosopher Richard Rorty (1979:360) states that working with

the unfamiliar other in expanding our own paradigm limitation "is supposed to be abnormal, to take us out of our old selves by the power of strangeness, to aid us in becoming new beings."

Thus, it is only through the encounter of the incommensurable our own implicit paradigm and cultural assumptions become explicit themes of concern. In order to transcend our own paradigm limitations we need to acknowledge paradigm incommensurability so that the ethical exploring of our own and other assumptions can begin and the paradigm shift is a work in progress. It is in this context that Fang's (2012) research into cross-cultural management becomes important, for he has shown us that through Yin Yang we are not reduced to an either/or logic but that we can always find the Yin in the Yang and the Yang in the Yin. The psychological flexibility contained in such an approach to IB is central for research today. The need to have one dominant paradigm is a dangerous anachronism for working in the sphere of difference. We need to work with our differences to be edified by them.

In summary, this chapter provides a detailed hermeneutic analysis of the terms paradigm and paradigm incommensurability. It explicitly demonstrates how the current understanding of these terms has in fact oversimplified and objectified the notion of paradigm. Therefore completely dismissed the significance of paradigm incommensurability in revealing implicit assumptions, transforming paradigm limitations, and enabling multiparadigm studies. In contrast to the previous multiparadigm suggestions that downplay the importance of paradigm incommensurability, this chapter shows that it is only through the unprejudiced acceptance and acknowledgement of paradigm incommensurability that the possibility for a new way of seeing and being from a different perspective is opened up.

Chapter 4. Yin Yang perspective of cross-cultural management research

In choral music, opposing voices combined create beauty and harmony; and the interplay between discord and coherence inspired the timeless classics of Beethoven and Mozart (Lewis, 2000). In a similar fashion, the indigenous Chinese philosophy of Yin Yang provides a perspective that allows for the playful dance of the "opposing voices" in cross-cultural management research—in resolution and harmony. In contrast to the Western analytical mindset that breaks the whole into parts, the Yin Yang perspective takes an holistic and expansive point of view, one that is based on the principles of holism, paradox and change. Yin Yang considers all parts in terms of their connections and associations within their specific context in a totality (Chen, 2002). The both/and logic is most frequently used to illustrate the Yin Yang perspective of balance and harmony (Chen & Miller, 2010; Fang, 2012; Li, 2014).

From the Yin Yang point of view for cross-cultural management research, instead of defending whether the analytical or the holistic research framework is best suited for today's multi-dimensional cross-cultural research environment, it argues for: the understanding of the complementariness and mutual dependency of both; how the tensions between the two frameworks operate in each culture and across cultures; and the paradox of universality and culture-specificity of assumptions, values and behaviors through the encounter, acceptance and exploration of different cultural perspectives.

In this chapter it is suggested that the Chinese Yin Yang philosophy, which stresses balance and harmony, embraces both analytical and holistic research frameworks.

Therefore it may prove to be a rich source of strategic ideas and inspiration for transcending the methodological positivism limitations, resolving the current paradigm crisis and advancing cross-cultural management research within the field of IB.

Thus, the purpose of this chapter is threefold. First, to briefly introduce the Chinese indigenous philosophy of Yin Yang and its three principles of holism, paradox, and change; second, to explicate the distinctions between the Yin Yang perspective and the Western worldview to show that the Yin Yang perspective, in been holistic, embraces but goes beyond the framework of positivism; third, to demonstrate how the indigenous philosophy of Yin Yang can transcend the limitations of methodological positivism and resolve the paradigm crisis in the current cross-cultural research practice.

4.1 Yin Yang

The Chinese worldview is holistic, dynamic and dialectical (Chen, 2002; Li, 1998, 2008; Peng & Nisbett, 1999). This worldview is best represented by Yin Yang, an indigenous Chinese philosophical perspective (Fang, 2012). Yin Yang embodies three basic principles of holism, paradox, and change.

According to the Yin Yang philosophy, all phenomena are influenced and shaped by the continuous interaction and integration of two opposite cosmic energies, namely Yin and Yang. Yin is the passive, negative, and feminine energy, such as the moon, darkness, softness, and femininity; whereas yang is the active, positive, and masculine energy such as the sun, brightness, hardness, and masculinity.

The symbol of Yin Yang exemplifies harmony between two extremes in which yin and

yang epitomise the opposing qualities of humanity and nature; the curve in the middle signifies perpetual movement, which is the essence of the principle of change; the principle of paradox is represented by the fact that there is a black dot in the white area and a white dot in the black area that are united and coexist to form the greater whole; the principle of holism is apparent, for the beauty of the Yin Yang symbol can only be appreciated holistically, as the whole generates the cycle of changes between parts of yin and yang (Peng, Spencer-Rodgers, & Nian, 2006).

The indigenous Yin Yang perspective "is so powerful and pervasive that it has influenced Chinese philosophies, martial arts, medicine, science, literature, politics, daily behaviour, beliefs, thinking, and other arenas for thousands of years" and "greatly influenced almost all ancient Chinese scholars, like Lao Tsu (571–447 B.C.), Sun Tsu (c. 550 B.C.), Confucius (557–479 B.C.), Hsun Tsu (298–238 B.C.), Hanfei Tsu (c. 285–233 B.C.), Gongsun Long (284–259 B.C.), and Mo Tsu (327–238 B.C.)" (Lee, 2000: 1066).

4.1.1 Principle of holism

The Yin Yang principle of holism stresses that all things are inseparable from their opposites. Thus, parts are seen as integrated pieces that exist only in a larger whole. The foundation of this principle is the interdependency of associations and connections, therefore individuals, social connections, and cultural matters are not considered to be separate elements but rather, every aspect of life is interconnected (Chu, 1999).

Through the influence of the principle of holism, Chinese thinking has traditionally embraced a holistic and integrative view of the world (Peng et al., 2006). As applied to people, Chinese thinking emphases that self and other are not diametrically

opposed or independent, but rather they are interdependent opposites that combine to form a greater whole (Chen, 2001).

Consequently, such a perspective rejects an independent, context-less and situation-free explanation over individuals' behaviors; instead, it presupposes a part-whole approach that examines individuals' relationship to the greater whole in a specific context (Hansen, 1983; Munro, 1985). For the same reason, the "Chinese explanations of cultural differences would not be based on dichotomies, but rather rely on a holistic model in which each culture has a relatively differentiated affinity to or distance from the whole." (Peng et al., 2006:257).

4.1.2 Principle of paradox

The term paradox denotes "contradictory yet interrelated elements – elements that seem logical in isolation but absurd and irrational when appearing simultaneously" (Lewis, 2000: 760). The concept of paradox usually carries some negative connotation in the Western mind due to the prevailing influence of linear logic in the Western world (Fang, 2012)

However, the Yin Yang principle of paradox sees paradoxes as interdependent opposites or dualities that together form the totality. Influenced by the principle of paradox, the Chinese view opposites as containing within themselves the seed of the other, and together these opposites produce a dynamic unity. The cornerstone of this perspective is the premise that opposites in a paradox are not merely elements intertwined in a state of tension, but parts interacting to form a state of wholeness.

For example, the Taoist cosmology states that opposites cannot exist without the other. Similarly, according to Confucius "the extreme of yin is yang, the extreme of

yang is yin", and "The combination of one yin and one yang is the way of nature and the seed of change" (Confucius, *The I Ching*, adapted from Chen, 2001: 97). As Hampden-Turner (1981) notes, Yin Yang, through its representation of a cohesive whole that is constructed of contradictions, also explicitly characterises the distinction from the Western view of paradox as exclusive opposites. Moreover, viewing paradox as interdependent opposites also signifies how the Yin Yang perspective purposefully avoids simple polarisation of contradictions (Chen, 2002).

Arguably, the most well-known Chinese paradox is represented by the Mandarin word *wei-ji,* which loosely translates as "crisis" in English. The word *wei-ji* contains both the Chinese characters of "danger" and "opportunity". The concept of *wei-ji* conveys the Chinese view that danger and opportunity are intricately connected in a dynamic relationship. Crisis is not seen as an insurmountable problem but as an opportunity for transformation and transcendence, a process in which adversity can lead to opportune action. The word *wei-ji* gained prominence in the late 1990s when Western media and economists identified it as the strategic standpoint that allowed many Chinese organisations to transform themselves in the wake of the Asian financial crisis through identifying emerging new opportunities (Chen, 2001).

Similarly, from the Yin Yang point of view the current paradigm crisis within cross-cultural management research also presents a transformative opportunity for IB research to transcend the methodological positivism paradigm limitations through embracing different cross-cultural research perspectives. For instead of getting caught in the dominant methodological paradigm that is reductive and excludes other forms cross-cultural research, the Yin Yang perspective allows for different cross-cultural research perspectives to thrive by standing in tension and relationship to each other.

The significance of paradox in dealing with multidimensional and ambiguous phenomena has already been forefronted by Cameron and Quinn (1988) over two decades ago. Cameron and Quinn (1988) argue that only through exploring paradox, researchers in IB might avoid polarising and oversimplifying matters, hence fully recognising the diversity, ambiguity and complexity of phenomena. The ability to work with paradox and reconciliation of opposing or conflicting ideas grows even more urgent today because globalisation has not only further intensified the rising plurality, diversity and change, but it has also increased the complexities of managing multicultural businesses and conducting research globally. As Lewis (2000: 774) asserts: "the rising intricacy, ambiguity, and diversity of organisations place a premium on researchers' abilities to think paradoxically." Similarly Wels (1996: 34), in discussing managing across culture, also states "strategy as paradox and paradox as strategy".

Notwithstanding the importance of paradox, in the management field in general, paradox is still treated mainly within an either/or framework that views the opposites as independent and nonrelated elements (Chen, 2002). Such a reductive conception of paradox has significantly limited our understanding of today's intricate cross-cultural issues around the world. In fully recognising this constraint, Lewis (2000: 761-762) states that:

> [Trying to] make sense of an increasingly intricate, ambiguous, and ever-changing world [often leads to] polarized either/or distinctions that mask complex interrelationships . . . Grounded in the philosophies of Aristotle, Descartes, and Newton, formal logic requires parsing phenomena into ever smaller and more disparate pieces. Yet, formal logic is based on either/or thinking, incapable of comprehending the intricacies of paradox.

Indeed, in a global context, when multifaceted and paradoxical relationships between individuals and companies are increasingly become the norm, to make significant advances in cross-cultural management theory will require researchers to address paradoxes inherent in human beings and their social organisations in a holistic and non-reductive way (Lewis, 2000). Thus, Poole and Van de Ven (1989:563) urged us to "look for theoretical tensions or oppositions and use them to stimulate the development of more encompassing theories." From this point of view the Chinese Yin Yang perspective, which stresses a both/and logic embraces both analytical and holistic research frameworks; paradox and exclusive opposites may prove to be a fruitful source of ideas for advancing the extant cross-cultural literature.

4.1.3 Principle of change

The Yin Yang principle of change states that all things and phenomena are in a constant state of flux; they do not stand still but are always in a dynamic changing process (Peng et al., 2006). Like the succession of day and night, the coming and going of the four seasons, and the forever moving cycle of birth, aging and death.

As an example, the principle of change can easily be seen in the Taoist attitude towards words and notions that signify existence and knowledge. For knowledge and existence is ever changing, therefore concepts that signify knowledge and existence are also dynamic and changeable. For instance, Zhuang-zi explicitly claimed that no concept should be taken literally because they are not static. Zhuang-zi stated, "The Tao has never known boundaries; words have no constancy" (Zhuang-zi, 370-301 BC/1968: 43). That is, "boundaries and distinct categories are associated with the impairment of the Tao and are foreign to the Tao" (Peng et al., 2007). Accordingly, Zhuang-zi held that the sage does not discriminate among ideas and that "those who discriminate fail to see (the Tao)" (Zhuang-zi, 370-301 BCE/1968: 44).

The principle of change is of fundamental importance in that it sets the logical foundation for the Chinese Yin Yang philosophy. For the concept of change leads to the belief in paradox and contradiction, and paradox and contradiction come as a result of the belief in change. For if all phenomena in the universe are changing perpetually, then what is true today might not be true tomorrow. Holism, in turn, is the outcome of a belief in change, paradox and contradiction.

Thus, the principles of change, paradox and holism can be characterised as circular logic rather than linear logic. The Chinese saying that: "change is the only irreversible static phenomenon of the universe" best illustrate such a circular logic. For from Yin Yang point of view, the opposite phenomena of change and stasis contain within themselves the seed of the other; they are not merely elements intertwined in a state of tension, but rather phenomena that interact to form a state of wholeness.

4.2 The Yin Yang perspective and the Western worldview

In many respects, these three principles of the Yin Yang perspective appear to be logically opposed to and incommensurable with the Western reasoning and philosophical worldviews due to its holistic nature and its fundamental both/and logic. However, it is important to point out that the Yin Yang both/and logic and its holistic nature also means the Yin Yang perspective in studying culture embraces, but goes beyond the dominant methodological positivist paradigm. Instead of arguing for one dominant way of studying culture such as the methodological positivism, it emphasis the importance and necessity of studying culture from a more inclusive way that allows the coexistence of different research perspectives without dichotomy and separation, but demonstrates a holistic synthesis of differences that transcends our own cultural and paradigm limitations.

For example, the incommensurability can be easily observed between the Western and Yin Yang ways of reasoning. For it is argued that the Western reasoning is grounded in the basic laws of Aristotelian logic: the law of identity, the law of non-contradiction, and the law of the excluded middle (Peng, 1997). These laws imply that, truth can be deduced by discarding and introducing individual propositions until contradictions are eliminated (Chen, 2002). Where in contrast, the Yin Yang perspective states identity only exist in the coexistence of opposites and duality; there is no true contradiction; and there exists no absolute truth, truth is associated with and embedded in context and situation (Fang, 2012).

Similarly, differences in philosophical worldviews can also be seen from the Yin Yang perspective and the Western worldview. For instance, since the pre-Socratic philosophy of Democritus (460–360 B.C.), Western thinking has already been characterised by its analytical view that deconstructs phenomena into unique constitutive elements of study (Peng et al., 2006). Indeed, the Greek roots of "analysis" suggest "breaking apart" or "loosening", whereas the Chinese Yin Yang epistemology emphasises the importance of appreciating the complexity and totality of a phenomenon, the "big picture", without undermining the uniqueness of parts.

Such fundamental distinctions in thinking and logic, without the acceptance and understanding of other's differences, often lead to disagreement and argument on how culture should be studied and what methodology should be employed in cross-cultural management research. For example, in commenting on the methodological positivist Western scholars in researching Chinese culture, Stening and Zhang (2007:126) maintained that:

As persons who have themselves been culturally conditioned, researchers may unwittingly, then, overlook the quite different cognitive frameworks of the people they are studying, and address questions about their behavior through lenses that are inappropriate; for example, adopting a cause–effect, reductionist, positivistic perspective when a more holistic, integrative, relational perspective might make more sense in examining and interpreting what is really going on.

Similarly, Fang (2012), in discussing the future of cross-cultural management research asserts that each culture is itself made up of the dynamic tension of opposites that is full of paradox, contradictions and implicit assumptions. Therefore, to work with, or to possibly transcend our own cultural assumptions and paradigm limitations, we need to be able to explore and embrace different epistemological and ontological cultural and paradigm assumptions. The more we understand our own and others' cultural and paradigm assumptions, the more we are aware of and can go beyond them. Thus, to move cross-cultural research forward we need an holistic and inclusive both/and framework that allows the coexistence of not only the Western analytical perspectives and the Yin Yang holistic view, but also many other possible ways of studying culture without dichotomy and separation but as a holistic synthesis of differences that transcend our own cultural and paradigm limitations.

4.3 Yin Yang in trancending the limitaions of the methdological posotivisim

As discussed in Chapter 1 of this thesis, the dominant methodological positivist paradigm is increasingly being recognised as incapable of dealing with today's complex cultural realities (Tung, 2008; Tung & Verbeke, 2010) for its inherited limitations of being reductive, context-free and unable to explore its own assumptions. It also suffers from a form of internal contradiction, which is generally silenced in the study of culture. This contradiction involves the recognition that if

cultures are different and the methodologies for studying culture emerge out of the cultures of which they are part, then the methodologies for studying culture are themselves culturally relative and shaped. While prominent positivist researchers such as Hofstede appear to have recognised the prejudices within their thought, they have not developed the methodologies or a different framework to incorporate their own biases into their studies. Thus, they have simultaneously recognised and suppressed them.

In contrast, the Yin Yang perspective, in been holistic, dynamic, harmonious (Zhang, 1996) and paradoxical (Li, 1998), has the potential to trancend methdological positivisim's limitations of being reductive, context-free and unable to explore its own assumptions. In eing holistic, one can see reasons on opposite sides, without excluding bias; being dynamic, one is aware of the situation, context and change, without being static; being harmonious or paradoxical, one can avoid thinking naively that any cultural paradox and contradiction should and can be reduced to an either/or problem. (Li, 2014).

In aiming to resolve the methodological paradigm crisis and to transcend the methodological positivist paradigm limitations, Tony Fang (2012) has initiated the reconceptualisation culture from a more holistic and expansive Yin Yang point of view. Fang (2012: 25) redefines culture as:

> Possessing inherently paradoxical value orientations, thereby enabling it to embrace opposite traits of any given cultural dimension . . . (and) potential paradoxical values coexist in any culture and they give rise to, exist within, reinforce, and complement each other to shape the holistic, dynamic, and dialectical nature of culture.

In contrast to the dominant methodological positivist paradigm that assumes national

cultural homogeneity (Tung & Verbeke, 2010), the Yin Yang principle of paradox that emphasises the coexistence of opposites and duality adopts a different perspective about nation cultural differences that is focused on the need to understand the intrinsic paradoxical nature of culture.

As Fang (2012) argues from the Yin Yang point of view, the coexistence of paradoxical values and behaviors in a culture only reflects the paradoxical nature of that culture, and no matter how different cultures may seem to be, they can share essentially the same value orientations. From this standpoint, national culture is not just determined by a selected few cultural dimensions, but rather, people in any culture are surrounded by many potentially conflicting value orientations from which they select the ones that are most appropriate to the situation at hand, i.e., primed (Hong et al., 2000; Mok & Morris, 2010). Depending on the context, situation and time, some values ultimately "trump" others in guiding action (Osland & Bird, 2000:70).

Moreover, instead of assuming culture as a situation and context-free phenomenon like the methodological positivist paradigm, the Yin Yang perspective of culture is firmed rooted in the importance of context and situationality. As Lowe, Magala and Hwang (2012) state, the pursuit of a concept of culture that is situation and context-free is consistent with the belief in absolute truth popular in the classical Western logical positivism, where in comparison, from the Yin Yang point of view, there exists no absolute truth; truth is associated with and embedded in context and situation (Fang, 2012).

In addition, in the age of globalisation and the Internet, cultures are increasingly permeating through national borders, mingling, hybridising and transforming through

migrations, international trades and technological advances (Nakata, 2009). Today's extraordinary global interpenetration, interdependence and interconnection also means people—the ultimate possessors and carriers of culture—are interacting, exchanging and confronting each other's diverse ways of life across greater geographical regions at an unprecedented rate. The indigenous Yin Yang philosophy that emphasis the coexistences of opposites, balance and harmony accommodates this drastic changing culture reality by suggesting that each culture is a unique portfolio of self-selected globally available values as a consequence of the culture's all-dimensional learning over time (Fang, 2012).

Overall, the Yin Yang perspective of culture emphasises the necessity to redefine culture in today's increasingly globalised society by integrating various "cultural perspectives". The virtue of the Yin Yang perspective is that it does not redispose the researcher to thinking in an "either/or" term but in a "both/and" framework that does not exclude but welcomes differences; it allows cross-cultural research methodologies to be situated and studied in their historical context; it fosters insight into conflicting and interdependent opposites, and urges researchers to explore in depth the various forms of paradox and contradictions in our cross-cultural encounters. For Yin Yang allows us to make the implicit explicit, the unsaid, said; the unstated, stated; and the black in every white. It therefore encourages us to integrate the strengths of the various schools of thought to redefine the study of culture that is appropriate to today's context and situation.

So which perspective is better? The Western analytical view? Or the Chinese Yin Yang perspective? If the Yin Yang perspective of cross-cultural research seeks to accomplish anything, it is a new more embracive way of studying cultural differences. Instead of making normative claims about which culture-specific frameworks of

cross-culture research are better or worse, the Yin Yang approach argues for the understanding of how the tensions between the two frameworks operate in each culture and across cultures; the complementariness and mutual dependency of both. The focus is on understanding the paradox of universality and culture-specificity of assumptions, values and behaviors through the encounter, acceptance and exploration of different cultural perspectives.

The social and cultural implications of the Yin Yang perspective may reach beyond purely intellectual exploration. This form of research encourages researchers and practitioners to play in the dance of difference within and between cultures. The Western analytical approach may be excellent for many purposes, such as scientific explorations; the Chinese holistic approach maybe excellent for many other purposes, such as dealing with ambiguous and multidimensional issues. Just like the way sound and silence dance together—they are inseparable and make no sense without each other. "Balance is essentially about the wholeness in which all dualities, polarities, and complementary forces find their resolution" (Chen, 2002:189). Thus, the ideal state or ultimate strength of cross-cultural research should be a combination of both Western analytical and Chinese holistic approaches, a synthesis of many different ways of research. Perhaps this is the real meaning of multiculturalism.

Chapter 5. Philosophical Destruction of Cultural Management Research

"Philosophical destruction" is a phrase that emerged at the dawn of philosophy. It emerges in the philosophy of Plato and culminates in the philosophy of Heidegger. The significance of destruction from a philosophical perspective is that it allows a person to catch sight of their taken-for-granted conventions and assumptions by allowing them to be thrown into question through disruptions in experience.

In cross-cultural management research, the activity of philosophical destruction uncovers and examines the underlying assumptions in which cross-cultural research methodologies, epistemologies, ontologies and ethics of a subject area are themselves situated. Such a philosophical destruction is of crucial importance because cross-cultural management research paradigms are neither simply universal nor situated in what philosopher Thomas Nagal calls the "view from nowhere" (Nagal, 1989), but are inherently culturally specific; they are a product of the way in which we have been acculturated. Even science, as Rorty (1991:13) notes, is a product of acculturation:

> Recognition that no description of how things are from a God's-eye point of view, no skyhook provided by some contemporary or yet-to-be-developed science, is going to free us from the contingency of having been acculturated as we were. Our acculturation is what makes certain options live, or momentous, or forced, while leaving others dead, or trivial, or optional.

Thus, to work through or even to possibly transcend our own cultural biases and paradigm limitations, we need to be able to explore the fundamental epistemological and ontological cultural assumptions underpinning these paradigms through the activity of philosophical destruction. The more we can destruct our own cultural and paradigmatic assumptions, the more we are aware of and can go beyond them; not been limited by one epistemology, ontology or a set of ethics of cross-cultural management research, but been able to open up what Spinosa, Dreyfus and Flores call "new worlds"—part of the aim of cross-cultural living.

However, it is important to point out that philosophical destruction can only begin where cultural or paradigm incommensurability is acknowledged. This is because such an acknowledgment signifies the fundamental realisation that the incommensurable paradigms and cultures can no longer be verified empirically through scientific and social scientific research but only through the unprejudiced exploring of assumptions. The cost of not conducting such a philosophical destruction is that we risk getting caught in a vicious circle, the way in which conclusions are constructed reflects the very cultural biases of their research methodologies.

Thus, the purpose of this chapter is to enable researchers to include but also move beyond methodological positivist research assumptions and methodologies. In so doing, the research subject matter will be part of the rationale for choosing a particular methodology rather than assuming a priori that the dominant methodological positivism is a sufficient form of research for all areas of inquiry. The chapter begins by introducs the concept of philosophical destruction, it then demonstrates why the current paradigm crisis within the cross-cultural management research is an essential condition for conducting philosophical destruction. The chapter concludes by discussing the necessity and importance of philosophical

destruction in cross-cultural management and the unfortunate consequences of failing to do so.

5.1 Philosophical Destruction

Philosophy is an activity of making the implicit, hidden or taken-for-granted assumptions of a paradigm explicit (Heidegger, 1985). Philosophy, as Lyotard (1990:3) claims, "it refines our sensitivity to differences and reinforces our ability to tolerate the incommensurable". The notion of "destruction" describes the basis of much philosophical methodology, both ancient and modern. Indeed, Greek philosopher Plato (1968) was the first to use the term destruction to distinguish philosophy. He claims that whereas scientists examine the world in terms of conventions and assumptions, philosophers examine the conventions and assumptions, in terms of which scientists and others constructed conventions and assumptions. For Plato, the aim of philosophy was to "destroy" all conventions and assumptions so as to arrive at the universal and first principles of things. Thus, it could be said that philosophy proceeded through a process of destroying assumptions.

In the twentieth century, Martin Heidegger has explicitly used the term "destruction" in his major work, *Being and Time,* to characterise his methodology of philosophy. Like Plato, Heidegger (1985) believed that destruction was distinctly a philosophical activity in that it questions the assumptions behind conventions. However, rather than arriving at first principles, the process of destruction aimed at the disclosure of the fundamental terms of different worlds. It allows us to see how the assumptions of different traditions and heritage give rise to different ways of seeing and being within the world:

> [D]estruction is just as far from having the negative sense of shaking off the
> ontological tradition. We must, on the contrary, stake out the positive possibilities of
> that tradition, and this means ... arriving at those primordial experiences in which we
> achieved our first ways of determining the nature of Being—the ways which have
> guided us ever since. (Heidegger, 1985: 44)

Destruction is thus a process of enabling us to see our own and others' ontological and epistemological assumptions of seeing the world.

Such destruction is necessary because not only the fundamental assumptions of our tradition are hidden and implicit, they get taken for granted in ways that we don't even know we are seeing things through the terms of a tradition for seeing things:

> When tradition thus becomes master, it does so in such a way that what it 'transmits'
> is made so inaccessible, proximally and for the most part, that it rather becomes
> concealed. Tradition takes what has come down to us and delivers it over to self-
> evidence; it blocks our access to those primordial 'sources' from which the categories
> and concepts handed down to us have been in part quite genuinely drawn. Indeed it
> makes us forget that they have had such an origin, and makes us suppose that the
> necessity of going back to these sources is something, which we need not even
> understand. (Heidegger, 1985: 43)

Hence, it is only through the process of philosophical destruction that implicit and taken-for-granted assumptions are made explicit. Furthermore, philosophy, unlike positivist science, is not reductive. The destruction of assumptions is not aimed at proving one set of assumptions or one paradigm to be superior to another paradigm. Rather, through working with the incommensurable it allows us not only to see our own habitual and taken-for-granted ways of seeing the world, it also opens up new possibilities for seeing the world from others' perspectives.

5.2 Paradigm crisis as an essential condition for philosophical destruction in cross-cultural management research

Among many others, Ernest Gellner (1964) and Thomas Kuhn (1996) have argued that science and the social sciences usually have no use for philosophy. It is, however, in moments of scientific crisis that scientists and social scientists need to become philosophical. Because it is only in moments of crisis that scientists and social scientists cannot take the assumptions of what Kuhn (1996) calls their "paradigm" for granted, and need to engage in a rethinking of their fundamental assumptions. Thus, he says:

> Scientists have not generally needed or wanted to be philosophers. Indeed, normal science usually holds creative philosophy at arm's length, and probably for good reason. To the extent that normal research work can be conducted by using the paradigm as a model, rules and assumptions need not be made explicit. It is, I think, particularly in periods of crisis that scientists have turned to philosophical analysis as a device to unlock the riddles of their field. (Kuhn, 1996: 88)

Indeed, this is particularly the case in cross-cultural management research where the dominant methodological paradigm is in a crisis state, for it can no longer take for granted its operating assumptions of been context-free, universal and objective. Furthermore, with the increasing acknowledgement that much of culture is non-conscious, implicit and context specific (Triandis, 2001), methodological positivism's goal to establish a universal and "nomothetic" cultural view is not only unnecessary but also "delusional" (Lowe, Moore, & Carr, 2007).

Methodological positivism is no longer able to dismiss its limitations and is forced to reconcile with the fact that there are possibly other incommensurable ways of

researching about cultures, such as the Yin Yang perspective of culture, which emphasis the importance of context, situation, paradox and change. Such acknowledgement marks the beginning of the philosophical destruction of taken-for-granted assumptions of methodological positivism. For philosophical destruction can only begin where culture or paradigm incommensurability is acknowledged.

Incommensurability occurs, as Kuhn (1996) makes clear, where different paradigms cannot agree on the basic conventions, rules, beliefs and regulations through which to see, measure, examine and analyse the world. Stening and Zhang (2007:125) make this point quite explicitly in the context of cross-cultural management research in IB:

> At a fundamental level, some would argue (e.g. the famous anthropologist Malinowski, as discussed in Berry, 1969), that the whole notion of cross cultural comparisons is invalid in that we are seeking to compare phenomena that are incomparable, that have meaning and relevance only within their own cultural context.

Adding to this point is the position put forward by Lowe (2001), and Fang (2005-2006), in which Western conceptualisations and measurements of Chinese culture are incommensurable insofar as they take, among other things, a rational structural perspective rather than one based on contradictions and process. Furthermore, for the rise of China and the East in general, their impact on the world may lead to a greater questioning of the universal, one-best-way, view of cross-cultural research (Birkinshaw, Brannen, & Tung, 2011). We certainly cannot afford to assume that the language of the dominant Western methodological positivism is the language in which to study culture universally. The methodological positivist paradigm itself needs to be subjected to debate, and to debate which welcomes difference, the other or the stranger.

In fact, for there are no basic conventions, rules and beliefs between the incommensurable paradigms in cross-cultural management research, scientists are called upon to be philosophical. They can no longer take their assumptions for granted and need to enter a period of philosophical destruction. Destruction through the gaze of the other, that is, through the way in which the paradigm of the other sees their own paradigm. This applies both within and between cultures. When social scientists of different traditions within a culture do not agree on fundamentals, philosophical destruction is a process of exploring new worlds. When researchers from different cultural traditions engage with each other, philosophical destruction allows each to see the other through the perspectives of each other's worldviews.

5.3 The necessity of philosophical destruction in cross-cultural management research

Philosophical destruction is essential in the context of cross-cultural studies as the more "globalised" the world becomes, the more skilled social scientists and practitioners are required to be in the practice of destruction. For we cannot enter the culture of another while taking our own assumptions for granted. We need to be able to "destroy" our own assumptions in the light of the other in order to cope with strange and unfamiliar situations.

In the context of methodologies for studying cross-cultural management in IB, destruction is pertinent for the same reason, but more. It ensures that methodologists do not take for granted the assumptions of their own conventions as the "universal" or "objective" way of seeing the world, but understand that the conclusions they draw are relative to the conventions and assumptions in which they see the world. It thus allows humility to be included in the conclusions drawn by researchers, a humility in

which researchers not only reflect on the subject matter of different cultures but also allows them to appreciate how their methodologies are themselves a product of specific cultural conventions.

Furthermore, destruction also aids in new theory creation. For scientists and social scientists are unconsciously influenced by the paradigm they adopt when conducting research. Therefore when they are "striving to solve a problem defined by existing knowledge and technique is not, however, just looking around. He knows what he wants to achieve, and he designs his instruments and directs his thoughts accordingly" (Kuhn, 1996:96). It takes an act of philosophical destruction of his or her taken-for-granted conventions to see that he or she is driven to see the world in a particular way: "It is hard to see how new theories could arise without these destructive changes in beliefs about nature." (Kuhn, 1996:98)

Without acknowledging the incommensurable, and conducting philosophical destruction in cross-cultural management research, what we have witnessed is that academics, in defending their own culturally biased position, often reduce others to their own set of assumptions and rules rather than exploring and embracing different research perspectives to enrich the extant cross-cultural understanding (i.e., Hofstede, 1996, 1998, 2002, 2006). The unfortunate consequences of refusing to acknowledge the incommensurable and not destroying our own assumptions is that the way in which conclusions are constructed reflect the very cultural biases of their research methodologies and assumptions-- they are incomplete at best and misleading at worst.

For example, it is well known that Hofstede's (1980) original cross-cultural work has identified four major cultural dimensions: power distance, uncertainty avoidance,

individualism and masculinity, in which he believed those dimensions have successfully "uncover[ed] the secrets of entire national cultures" (Hofstede, 1980: 44). However, subsequent research conducted by Bond and colleagues (Chinese Culture Connection, 1987) with a focus on the Chinese cultural perspective suggested that there were other important dimensions of culture, which were not identified by Hofstede's study. In order to counter Western bias, the result was the addition of a fifth dimension, later labeled Confucian dynamism (Hofstede & Bond, 1988) or long-term versus short-term orientation (Hofstede, 2001).

The fifth dimension was not well received by the Western research community for it was confusing and puzzling. Hofstede and Bond (1988:17-18) explain: "[t]his dimension is somewhat puzzling to the Western readers . . . (it) is composed precisely of those elements that . . . Western instruments had not registered; a Westerner would not normally find them important". However, it was also not well received by the Chinese research community for it has completely missed the essence of the Chinese "philosophical principle of dualism and paradox" (Fang, 2003:355).

The interesting fact is that the fifth dimension is supposedly an Oriental addition to the dimensional theory of culture that counters Western bias, but instead of taking Chinese researchers' perspectives into consideration, and use them to destruct his own culturally-biased assumptions, Hofstede has completely disregarded Fang's (2003) critique and criticised his suggestion as being "pretentious" and "reads like a dictionary of Chinese philosophical terms", despite agreeing that "the author demonstrated his knowledge of Chinese" (Hofstede, 1998:1).

By been unwilling to acknowledge the incommensurable culture, and to destruct his own implicit fundamental assumptions, what Hofstede has missed is the important point made by Fang (2003) that while Western thought operates in terms of binary opposites such as "individualism versus collectivism" or "long-term versus short-term orientation", Chinese thought operates in terms of a dynamic sense of paradoxes of opposites. Hofstede does not seem to hear this point and assumes that binary opposites will make sense for all cultures without understanding that it does not make sense for the paradox and dualism-oriented Chinese culture.

It is ironic in this case that cross-cultural researchers who display a great sensitivity and empathy for issues concerning managing across cultures, do not necessarily show the same understanding for incommensurable paradigms in researching across cultures. What needs to be developed is the skills to destruct one's own and others' fundamental assumptions. Thus, a sensitivity and empathy for the relationship between different research paradigms can flourish in researching across cultures. Sensitivity in choosing a research methodology that is appropriate for the phenomenon being researched is part of understanding and being a wise research practitioner (Sartre, 1968).

In conclusion, in the era of "globalisation" we can no longer remain locked within our own culturally conditioned research and management mindset, but rather accept that a philosophical destruction which uncovers and examines the underlying assumptions is essential. The danger of conducting research without understanding our own and others' taken-for-granted assumptions and methodologies is that we are essentially trying to compare, contrast and comprehend one culture from another culture's point of view. These different perspectives are often competing accounts of reality which cannot be assumed to be reconciled. Hence we risk getting caught in a

vicious circle; the way in which conclusions are constructed reflects the very cultural biases of their research methodologies.

It is suggested that only through the acknowledgment of the incommensurables can the activity of philosophical destruction that uncovers and examines the underlying assumptions begin. The more we can destruct our own cultural and paradigmatic assumptions, the more we are aware of and can go beyond them. Therefore identifying novel cross-cultural research perspectives that open up new possibilities to understand cross-cultural matters that we could never have understood before.

Conclusion and Discussion

Globalisation not only challenges the fundamental epistemological and ontological assumptions in which cross-cultural research in management and IB is conducted. It also makes clear that there is no basis upon which to assume a universal standard in researching different cultures. In closely observing cross-cultural management research within the field of IB, it is not difficult to see that the methodological positivist research paradigm has dominated the field for decades (Jackson & Aycan, 2006; Jack, Calás, Nkomo, & Peltonen, 2008; Primecz, Romani, & Sackmann, 2009) with its implicit and taken-for-granted research assumptions of being universal, objective and context-free.

Increasingly, many have recognised the dominant methodological positivist paradigm is not only incapable of dealing with today's complex cultural realities (Tung, 2008; Tung & Verbeke, 2010), but it also frequently creates "clearly inaccurate cross-cultural context" (Tung & Verbeke, 2010: 1265) that objectifies the ethic others (Roy & Starosta, 2001), and generates results that "mask or confound the phenomena under investigation" (Tung, 2008). Thus, Jack et al., (2008) in commenting on the state of international management asserted that: "[T]he continued dominance of functionalist and positivist thinking in this field is perhaps its most fundamental *and* unrecognised problem." Furthermore, the dominant methodological positivist paradigm in facing an "internal contradiction" where it can no longer take for granted its own operating assumptions of being objective, context-free and universal—the very activity required for conducting research—has driven the field of cross-cultural management research to a state of paradigm crisis that hinders further theoretical development and knowledge generation.

Thus, the overall objective of the present study is to enable researchers to go beyond the paradigm crisis through effective multiparadigm study that utilises insights and strengths of different paradigms and perspectives. This study has achieved this objective by bringing awareness to the current paradigm crisis within the field of IB (Chapter 1); demonstrated that only through multiparadigm research that can we move beyond the methodological positivism (Chapter 2); offered a non-reductive understanding of the terms "paradigm" and "paradigm incommensurability" to show that only through the acknowledgement of paradigm incommensurability a new way of being and research is opened up (Chapter 3); introduced Yin Yang as an alternative philosophical framework that embraces and encourages diverse research perspectives to contribute to cross-cultural management research (Chapter 4); and lastly presented philosophical destruction as an essential part of conducting cross-cultural management research that uncovers implicit and tacit culture and research assumptions (Chapter 5).

Summary and contribution of each chapter

Chapter 1 presents a broad literature review that is intended to sketch the landscape of cross-cultural management research in the field of IB and raise awareness of its paradigm crisis state. The review illustrates that the methodological positivist paradigm, being the dominant research paradigm, can no longer take for granted its operating assumptions of being universal, objective and context-free, and its inherited limitations of being context-free, unable to examine its own research assumptions and being reductive, are increasingly recognised as incapable of dealing with today's multi-dimensional cross-cultural research environment.

Chapter 2 explores the wider management literature in searching for insights into the

possible solutions that can resolve the current paradigm crisis. The analysis has shown that only through multiparadigm research, which utilises insights and strength from different perspectives, the possibility of resolving the paradigm crisis is opened up. However, the existing methodologically vague (Romani et al., 2011) multiparadigm strategies and suggestions are of limited use because of their incomplete understanding of the central concepts—paradigm and paradigm incommensurability. Therefore, it is proposed that only through in-depth understanding of the terms paradigm and paradigm incommensurability, the acknowledgement and appreciation of different paradigms is made possible.

Chapter 3 provides a clear examination of the terms paradigm and paradigm incommensurability as reflected in the writing of Thomas Kuhn. The examination outlines the importance of paradigm incommensurability from a hermeneutic perspective in facilitating paradigm transformation that leads to innovative theory development. And it demonstrates that only through the acknowledgement of paradigm incommensurability, the possibility of seeing from others' perspectives and conducting multiparadigm research is opened up.

Chapter 4 introduces the indigenous Chinese philosophy of Yin Yang as an alternative philosophical framework for cross-cultural management research. The Yin Yang perspective, in been dynamic, holistic and paradoxical embraces, but goes beyond the framework of positivism. Therefore, it has the ability to embrace and encourage the incommensurables research perspectives and transcend the limitations of methodological positivism.

Chapter 5 presents the concept of Philosophical Destruction as an essential activity for cross-cultural management research. Philosophical destruction uncovers and

examines the underlying assumptions in which the methodologies, epistemologies, ontologies and ethics of a subject area are themselves situated. Thus enabling researchers to include but also move beyond methodological positivist research assumptions and methodologies. In so doing, the research subject matter will be part of the rationale for choosing a particular methodology rather than assuming a priori that the dominant methodological positivism is the sufficient form of research for all areas of inquiry.

The main limitation of this study is its sole focus on theory and conceptualisation. This is largely due to the requirement of this dissertation is not to pursue empirical evidence at this initial stage, but to concentrate on broad literature review in developing in-depth understanding of the challenges on hand, and the potential solutions for cross-cultural management research in the field of IB, in preparation for entering the PhD program in the following year.

Overall, the study has achieved its main objective in enabling multiparadigm research. It has contributed theoretically in cross-cultural management by providing conceptual clarification of the important terms "paradigm" and "paradigm incommensurability"; introducing the Yin Yang perspective as an alternative philosophical framework for cross-cultural research; and presenting the concept of philosophical destruction as an essential activity in uncovering implicit paradigm, cultural and research assumptions for cross-cultural management research. Together, these clarifications and conceptualisations serve the purpose of challenging and encouraging researchers to fully utilise incommensurability in transforming paradigm limitations and conducting multiparadigm research, which ultimately enriches cross-cultural management knowledge generation and theoretical development.

Transcending cross-cultural management research

In the environment of today's globalised risks and opportunities it is increasingly recognised that the ability to master different perspectives and generate new ideas is essential (Chen & Miller, 2010). Especially with the rising importance and influence of different norms and traditions coming from outside the North America-Western Europe bloc, that has characterised and dominated knowledge generation for the past century and a half (Birkinshaw et al., 2011), many started to look for inspirations and sources of ideas from the Asian cultures that espouse the Yin Yang principles (Fang, 2012).

Similarly, as scholars in the field of IB, we all come from diverse multicultural heritages with our own unique ontological worldviews. We should leverage and capitalise on such unique cross-cultural research perspectives, "rather than merely comply with discipline-based methodological approaches that render us subordinate to other scholarly fields of inquiry" (Birkinshaw et al., 2011: 575); we need to become "sources of ideas" not merely "storers" (Sullivan, Nerur, & Balijepally, 2011) in transcending future cross-cultural knowledge generation and theory development.

Thus, for today's multidimensional cross-cultural environment I believe a dialogue between the indigenous philosophy of Yin Yang and hermeneutic phenomenology will be fruitful in revealing the East in the West, and the West in the East. In moving cross-cultural management research forward such a dialogue is necessary for the reasons provided in this study, and more, and this will be the theme for my future PhD research project.

References:

Adler, N.J. (1983). 'A Typology of Management Studies Involving Culture', *Journal of International Business Studies* Fall: 29–47.

Ani, M. (1994). Y*urugu: An African-centered Critique of European Cultural Thought and Behavior*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

Bauman, Z. (1990). Modernity and Ambivalence. In M. Featherstone. (Eds.), *Global Culture: Nationalism, globalization and Modernity,* London: Sage Publications.

Berry, J.W. (1969). 'On Cross-cultural Comparability', *International Journal of Psychology*, 4: 119–28.

Birkinshaw, J., Brannen, M. Y., & Tung, R. L. (2011). From a distance and generalizable to up close and grounded: Reclaiming a place for qualitative methods in international business research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 42(5), 573-581.

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

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

Buber, M. (1970). *I and Thou* (W.Kauffman, trans.). New York: Charles Scribner's

Sons.

Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis*. London: Heinemann.

Cameron, K.S. & R.E. Quinn. (1988). "Organizational Paradox and Transformation." In R.E. Quinn and K.S. Cameron (eds.), *Paradox and Transformation: Toward a Theory of Change in Organization and Management*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Chen, M-.J. (2001). *Inside Chinese Business: A Guide for Managers Worldwide*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Chen, M.-J. (2002). Transcending paradox: The Chinese 'middle way' perspective. *Asian Pacific Journal of Management,* 19(2/3): 179–199.

Chen, G.-M. (2008). Bian (Change): A perpetual discourse of I Ching. *Intercultural Communication Studies,* 17(4): 7–16.

Chen, M-J. & Miller, M. (2010). West meets East: towards an ambicultural approach to management. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, November,17-24

Chu, C-.N. (1999). "Warriors guru." *Asia Inc*.

Cortois, L. (2000). Incommensurability in the comparative study of cultures. From Kuhn to Benedict, back & forth. In S. Milz (Eds.), *Comparative Cultural Studies and Ethnic Minority Writing Today: The Hybridities of Marlene Nourbese Philip and Emine Sevgi Özdamar*. *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture*, 2(2), 4.

Currie, G., Knights, D., & Starkey, K. (2010). Introduction: A post-crisis critical reflection on business schools. *British Journal of Management,* 21(Supplement), S1–S5.

Donaldson, L. (1998). The myth of paradigm incommensurability in management studies: Comments by an integrationist. *Organization*, 5, 267-72.

Greenfield, T. (1991/1993). Re-forming and Re-valuing Educational Administration: Whence and When Cometh the Phoenix?. In T. Greenfield & P. Ribbins (Eds.), *Greenfield on Educational Administration*, 169–98. London: Routledge.

Fabian, F. H. (2000). Keeping the tension: Pressures to keep the controversy in the management discipline. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 350-71.

Fang, T. (2003). A critique of Hofstede's fifth national culture dimension. International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 3(3): 347–368.

Fang, T. (2005–2006). From 'onion' to 'ocean': Paradox and change in national cultures. *International Studies of Management & Organization,* 35(4): 71–90.

Fang, T. (2012). Yin Yang: A new perspective on culture. *Management and organization Review,* 8(1), 25-50.

Gioia, D. A., & Pitre, E. (1990). Multi-paradigm perspectives on theory building. *Academy of Management Review*, 15, 584-602.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays* (Vol. 5019). Basic books.

Gellner, E. (1964). *Thought and change*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Hampden-Turner, C. (1981). *Maps of the Mind*. New York: Macmillan.

Hassard, J., & Kelemen, M. (2002). Production and consumption in organizational knowledge: The case of the'paradigms debate.' *Organization*, 9, 331-55.

Heidegger, M. (1985). *Being and Time*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell

Heidegger, M. 2010. *Basic Writings.* Routledge

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind.* London: McGraw- Hill.

Hofstede, G. (1996). 'Riding the waves of commerce: A test of trompenaars'"model" of national culture differences', *International Journal of Intercultural Relations,* 20(2), 189-198.

Hofstede,G.(2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). London, England: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (2006). What did GLOBE really measure? Researchers' minds versus respondents' minds. J*ournal of International Business Studies*, 37(6), 882-896.

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

Hong, Y., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist,* 55(7), 709–20.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (eds) (2004). *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The Globe Study of 62 Societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and postmodernization: Cultural, economic, and political change in 43 societies.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Jack, G. A., Calás, M. B., Nkomo, S. M., & Peltonen, T. (2008). Critique and international management: an uneasy relationship?. *Academy of Management Review,* 33(4), 870-84.

Jackson, T., & Aycan, Z. (2006). Editorial: From cultural values to cross cultural interfaces. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 6, 5-13.

Jackson, N., & Carter, P. (1993). Paradigm wars: A response to Hugh Willmott. *Organization Studies*, 14, 721-25.

Jager, B. (1994). Theorising and an elaboration of place: inquiry into Galileo and Freud. In R. Masek (Eds.), *Hermeneutic and Phenomenological Psychology.* Princeton University Press

JanMohamed, A. (1985). The economy of manichean allegory: The function of racial difference in colonialist literature. *CriticalInquiry,* 12,59–87.

Johannesen, R.L. (1971). The emerging concept of communication as dialogue. *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 5, 373–382.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. University of Chicago Press.

Kuhn, T. S. (1990). Dubbing and redubbing: the vulnerability of rigid designation. In C. W. Savage (Eds.), *Minnesota studies in the philosophy of science, XIV: Scientific theories* (298-318). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lee, Y.-T. (2000). What is missing in Chinese-Western dialectical reasoning? *American Psychologist,* 55(9): 1065–1067.

Levinas, E. (1985). *Totality and Infinity*. Pittsburgh, Penn.: Duquesne University.

Lewis, M. W. (2000). Exploring paradox: Toward a more comprehensive guide. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*(4), 760-776.

Lewis, M. W., & Grimes, A. J. (1999). Metatriangulation: Building theory from multiple paradigms. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 672-90.

Li, P. P. (1998). Towards a geocentric framework of organizational form: A holistic, dynamic and paradoxical approach. *Organization Studies,* 19(5): 829–861.

Li, P. P. (2008). Toward a geocentric framework of trust: An application to organizational trust. *Management and Organization Review,* 4(3): 413–439.

Li, X. (2014). Can Yin-Yang Guide Chinese Indigenous Management Research?. *Management and Organization Review*, 10(1), 7-27.

Lowe, S. (2001), "In the kingdom of the blind, the one-eyed man is king", *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management,* 1(3), 313-32.

Lowe, S., Carr, A. & Moore, F. (2007). Paradigmapping studies of culture and organization. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 7(2), 237-50.

Lowe, S., Magala, S., & Hwang, K. (2012). All we are saying, is give theoretical pluralism a chance. *Journal of Organizational Change Management,* 25(5), 752-774.

Lyotard, J. F. (1990). *The Postmodern Condition*. Manchester University Press.

McSweeney, B. (2009). Dynamic diversity: Variety and variation within countries. *Organization Studies*, 30 (9): 933–957.

Meyer, K. E. (2006). Asian management research needs more self-confidence. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management,* 23(2), 119–137.

Eger, M. (2006). *Science, Justice, and understanding: The Philosophical Essays of Martin Eger,* (ed.) Shimony. A. Chicago: Open Court

Mok, A., & Morris, M. W. (2010). Asian-Americans' creative styles in Asian and American situations: Assimilative and contrastive responses as a function of bicultural identity integration. *Management and Organization Review,* 6(3): 371–390.

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

Morris, M.W., Leung, K., Ames, D. and Lickel, B. (1999), "Views from inside and outside: integrating emic and etic insights about culture and justice judgment", *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 781-96.

Nagel, T. (1989). *The view from nowhere.* Oxford University Press.

Nakata, C. (2009). 'Going beyond Hofstede: Why we need to and how', in Nakata, C (ed.) *Beyond Hofstede: Culture frameworks for global marketing and management*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Okhuysen, G. and Bonardi, J-P. (2011). Editor's comments: the challenges of building theory by combining lenses. *Academy of Management Review*, 36 (1), 6-11.

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

Osland, J. S., & Bird, A. (2000). Beyond sophisticated stereotyping: Cultural sensemaking in context. *Academy of Management Executive,* 14(1): 65–79.

Palermo, E. (2013). Niels Bohr: Biography & Atomic Theory Retrieved from http://www.livescience.com/32016-niels-bohr-atomic-theory.html

Peng, K., (1997). *Naïve dialecticism and its effects on reasoning and judgment about contradiction.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Peng, K., & Nisbett, R. E. (1999). Culture, dialectics, and reasoning about contradiction. *American Psychologist*, *54*(9), 741.

Peng, K., Spencer-Rodgers, J., & Nian, Z. (2006). Naïve dialecticism and the Tao of Chinese thought. In *Indigenous and Cultural Psychology* (pp. 247-262). US: Springer.

Pfeffer, J. (1993). Barriers to the advance of organizational science: Paradigm development as a dependent variable. *Academy of Management Review,* 18, 599-621.

Plato. (1968). *Republic*, translated by Lee D. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Poole, M.S. & A.H. Van de Ven. (1989). "Using Paradox to Build Management and Organization Theories." *Academy of Management Review,* 14, 562–578.

Primecz, H., Romani, L., & Sackmann, S. (2009). Multiple perspectives in cross-cultural management. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 9 (3), 267-74.

Redding, S.G. (1994). 'Comparative Management Theory: Jungle, Zoo or Fossil Bed?', *Organization Studies*, 15(3), 323–59.

Romani, L., Primecz, H., & Topçu, K. (2011). Paradigm interplay for theory development: A methodological example with the Kulturstandard method. *Organizational Research Methods*, *14*(3), 432-455.

Roy, A., & Starosta, W. J. (2001). Hans-Georg Gadamer, language, and intercultural communication. *Language and intercultural communication,* 1(1), 6-20.

Rorty, R. (1979). *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. Princeton: Princeton UP.

Rorty, R. (1991). *Objectivity, relativism, and truth: philosophical papers* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.

Sackmann, S. A., & Phillips, M. E. (2004). Contextual Influences on Culture Research Shifting Assumptions for New Workplace Realities. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, *4*(3), 370-390.

Sartre, J.P. (1968). *Search For A Method.* New York: Vintage Books

Scherer, A. G. (1998). Pluralism and incommensurability in strategic management and organization theory: A problem in search of a solution. *Organization*, 5, 147-69.

Scherer, A. G., & Steinmann, H. (1999). Some remarks on the problem of incommensurability in organization studies. *Organization Studies*, 20, 519-44.

Schultz, M., & Hatch, M. J. (1996). Living With Multiple Paradigms the Case of Paradigm Interplay in Organizational Culture Studies. *Academy of Management Review*, *21*(2), 529-557.

Schwartz, S. J. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology,* 25: 1–65.

Schwartz, S. H. (1994). "Beyond Individualism/Collectivism: New Cultural Dimensions of Values," in U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. C. Choi & G. Yoon (eds), *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Methods and Applications.* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Segal, S. (1999). The Anxiety of Strangers and the Fear of Enemies. *Studies in Philosophy and Education,* 17(4), 271-82.

Schultz, M., & Hatch, M. J. (1996). Living with multiple paradigms: The case of paradigm interplay in organizational culture studies. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 529-557.

Stening, B. W., & Zhang, M. Y. (2007). Methodological challenges confronted when conducting management research in China. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management,* 7(1), 121-142.

Sullivan, D.P. and Daniels, J.D. (2008). Innovation in international business research: a call for multiple paradigms. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 39, 1081-90.

Sullivan, D., Nerur, S. P., & Balijepally, V. (2011). Source or storer & quest; IB's performance in a knowledge network. *Journal of International Business Studies,*

42(3), 446-457.

Tayeb, M. (1994). Organizations and national culture: Methodology considered. *Organization Studies*, *15*(3), 429-445.

Tsui, A. S. (2004). Contributing to global management knowledge: A case for high quality indigenous research. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management,* 21(4), 491–513.

Tsui, A. (2009). Editor's introduction – Autonomy of inquiry: Shaping the future of emerging scientific communities. *Management and Organization Review,* 5(1), 1–14.

Tung, R. L. (2008). The cross-cultural research imperative: The need to balance cross- national and intra-national diversity. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 39(1): 41–46.

Tung, R. L., & Verbeke, A. (2010). Beyond Hofstede and GLOBE: Improving the quality of cross-cultural research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41(8): 1259-1274.

Trompenaars, F. (1994). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in global business.* Chicago, IL: Irwin.

Weaver, G. R., & Gioia, D. A. (1994). Paradigms lost: Incommensurability versus structurationist inquiry. *Organization Studies*, 15, 565-90.

Wels, H. (1996). "Strategy as Paradox and Paradox as Strategy, Images of and Paradoxes in Chinese Culture: Expatriate Managers in Sino-Western Joint Ventures." In W. Koot, I. Sabelis, and S. Ybema (eds.), *Contra- dictions in Context: Puzzling over Paradoxes in Contemporary Organizations*. Amsterdam: VU University Press.

Zhang, Q. 1996. The Xiangshu thinking of I-Ching and the direction of Chinese culture. *Philosophical Research,* 3: 65–73. (In Chinese.)

Zhuang-zi. (370-301/1968). *The complete works of Chuang Tzu* (Translated by Watson, B.). New York: Columbia University Press.