

# Charting Contested Territory: Paradigmatic Conflicts in Critical Management and Organization Studies Discourse

Severin Hornung<sup>1</sup>, Thomas Höge<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*University of Innsbruck, Department of Psychology, Innsbruck, Austria, severin.hornung@uibk.ac.at*

<sup>2</sup>*University of Innsbruck, Department of Psychology, Innsbruck, Austria, thomas.hoege@uibk.ac.at*

**ABSTRACT:** Drawing on the philosophy of science, this essay addresses ideological and epistemological heterogeneity in management and organization studies scholarship. The presented review and application of the meta-theory of scientific paradigms establish connections with prior controversies to delineate, deconstruct, and reappraise the current discourse in the pluralistic field of management and organization studies. Representing theories of society focusing on regulation (order) vs. radical change (conflict), and conceiving social science as concerned with objective vs. subjective realities, a classic taxonomy differentiates functionalist, radical structuralist, interpretive, and radical humanist paradigms. Scientific progress has transformed these into ontological, epistemological, and axiological configurations of post-positivist (normative, mainstream), interpretative (constructivist, hermeneutic), postmodern (dialogic, poststructuralist), and critical (dialectic, antagonistic) approaches. Associated meta-theorizing is applied to academic disputes involving critical management studies. Distinguishing degree and location, four fundamental and foundational inter- and intra-paradigmatic conflicts are analyzed: a) the evidence-debate between critical scholars and mainstream (post-)positivist functionalists; b) the performativity-debate within the field of critical management studies; c) the managerialism-debate between radical critical structuralists and poststructuralists; and d) the ideology-debate representing influences on adjacent fields, exemplified by an emerging critical paradigm in work and organizational psychology. Underlying dynamics are framed as fermenting and fragmenting forces, driving paradigm delineation, differentiation, disintegration, and dissemination. The developed meta-theoretical perspective facilitates self-reflexive scholarship, meaning-making, and knowledge-creation, promoting a deeper understanding and better navigation of the organizational literature as an ideologically contested terrain of social science.

**KEYWORDS:** Philosophy of science, research paradigms, academic discourse, critical management studies, critical work and organizational psychology, dialectic analysis, epistemological critique

## Introduction

The core objective of this essay is to outline, structure, and interpret current academic discourses in management and organization studies (MOS), explore their foundations, interconnections, and dynamics, and suggest new patterns of meaning from a more integrated perspective, based on a developed conceptual framework (Hornung and Höge 2021). Analyzed are debates surrounding the increasingly established, yet controversial stream of Critical Management Studies (CMS), promoting alternative interpretations of the functions, means, and meanings of management research, education, and practice (Adler, Forbes, and Willmott 2007; Alvesson, Bridgman, and Willmott 2009). A pluralist umbrella-paradigm and self-described “big tent” approach, CMS is a heterogeneous movement seeking to question, expose, and challenge prevailing understandings of management and organization, advocating non-mainstream positions, alternative approaches, and unorthodox methodologies, rooted in critical thinking and emphasizing attention to power relationships and concern for social justice. This includes various critical perspectives, such as Marxist Labor Process Theory (LPT), the Freudo-Marxist Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School, but increasingly also

other psychoanalytic, neo- and post-Marxist streams, notably, poststructuralist and postmodern theorizing, such as Foucault studies, phenomenology, discourse analysis, feminism, postcolonial and queer studies, critical race theory, post- and transhumanism, among others. Paraphrasing an influential definition, CMS seeks critical questioning of dominant, harmful or limiting, under-challenged ideologies, institutions, interests, and identities, by means of negation, deconstruction, re-voicing or de-familiarization, aimed at inspiring social reform in the interest of the majority, and/or those non-privileged, and resistance to and/or emancipation from those limiting influences, while maintaining some level of empathy and understanding for the effects of constraining conditions on people's experiences and actions (Alvesson, Bridgman, and Willmott 2009). Contentious elements in this definition have culminated in the "performativity debate", discussed below.

In a foundational contribution, Fournier and Grey (2000) have established *denaturalization*, *reflexivity*, and *anti- or non-performativity* as core paradigmatic principles of CMS. Echoing the classic social critique of ideology, denaturalization means not taking social phenomena for granted (at face value), but rejecting, deconstructing, and transcending dominant (interest-guided and biased) interpretations of hegemonial "common wisdom", by exposing their hidden agenda as projects of power (Seeck, Sturdy, Boncori, and Fougère 2020). Denaturalization requires reflexivity, i.e., critical interrogation of the historical and socio-cultural contexts of observed phenomena as well as the interests served by prevailing interpretations, including the positioning and paradigmatic assumptions, biases, and intellectual preformation of the researchers themselves (McDonald and Bubna-Litic 2012). Anti- or non-performativity (as used here) refers to a stance that rejects any "functional" role or in collusion with the "management of human resources", i.e., the economic imperative of "valorizing" human activities via instrumental means-ends calculations to generate profit, classically considered exploitation (Klikauer 2015). According to this postulate, CMS is antagonistically opposed to goals of management, related to increasing efficiency and effectiveness, a matter of controversy, discussed below with regard to alternative objectives of "critical performativity" (Fleming and Banerjee 2016). In the self-narrative of CMS, emergence of the paradigm in the 1990s involved peculiar circumstances.

As an academic movement, CMS was the result of sociologists and other critical social scientists in the UK (and Australia) seeking employment at business schools, following the neoliberal restructuring of universities, spelling austerity and cutbacks to less directly "value adding" departments and disciplines in the humanities and social sciences (Hassard, Hogan, and Rowlinson 2001). This account illustrates the tensions and dialectics of political forces as drivers in the establishment, maintenance, and disintegration of paradigms—a dynamic interpretation adopted in this essay. Unsurprisingly, CMS was never embraced by "functionalist" business-school disciplines, such as economics, mainstream management, or marketing, but, within the last decades, still has established itself as a significant stream with own networks, journals, handbooks and textbooks, conferences, representation in professional associations, editorial boards, and commissions (Adler, Forbes, and Willmott 2007; Klikauer 2015). Further, CMS has had considerable interdisciplinary outreach and impact on adjacent fields, contributing to the development of critical paradigms in other areas of management, such as accounting, organization history, and human resource management (Delbridge and Keenoy 2010), but also applied social and community psychology (Davidson et al. 2006; McDonald and Bubna-Litic 2012). Thus, CMS has become increasingly institutionalized as a pluralistic meta-paradigm. Recently, however, not only frictions, but fissures and divisions have appeared along familiar boundaries of included sub-paradigms, pitting different degrees of "criticality" against each other. Underlying latent disagreements have, in varying degrees, become manifest in academic disputes and controversies, such as the "performativity debate", which involves questions of seeking

cooperation or conflict with managerial interests, and the suggested secession of Critical Theory-based and Marxist streams from CMS (Klikauer 2018). Reviewing, structuring, and discussing these debates is the core intention of the present essay, thus, it tries to provide an overview of current issues in critical management discourse. Moreover, a central proposition of this contribution is that these disputes need to be seen as a continuation of the so-called paradigm wars in MOS and others fields, respectively, that theorizing on research paradigms is invaluable for analyzing and making sense of the underlying issues, arguments, and disagreements in current academic discourse.

### **Paradigms in Management and Organization Studies**

Scientific paradigms were introduced by Kuhn (1962) as overarching and largely unquestioned frameworks, shared by groups of scholars, organizing accepted values, assumptions, theories, models, concepts, methods, conventions, and cumulative results, that is, the “intellectual universe”, that the respective research stream, field, or tradition operates in and out of. According to such a fundamental and categorical conceptualization, researchers in competing, alternative or succeeding paradigms inhabit entirely “different worlds”, each characterized by specific ontological (theories about reality), epistemological (methods for knowledge-creation), and axiological (values and objectives) bases, beliefs or conventions (Freshwater and Cahill 2013). These axiomatic building blocks are assumed to be only limitedly compatible, valid, or transferable across paradigmatic boundaries, giving rise to notions of *incommensurability* (Kuhn 1962; Shepherd and Challenger 2013). The intensely and controversially discussed issue of incommensurability deals with questions regarding if, how, when, and to what extent paradigms are mutually exclusive, self-contained, and isolated—or, alternatively, whether and how knowledge can be transferred, combined, or integrated across paradigm boundaries, resulting in multi-paradigmatic, inter-paradigmatic, meta-paradigmatic or paradigmatically pluralistic types of research (Gioia and Pitre 1990; Schultz and Hatch 1996).

Alternative concepts challenging incommensurability are paradigm *integration*, typically viewed in a hierarchical sense, such that a “deviating” or fringe paradigm is assimilated into the mainstream, and paradigm *dissolution*, as a dialectical process, where both paradigmatic frames of reference (thesis and antithesis) are simultaneously negated, preserved, and transformed (synthesis) to form a new higher-order paradigm (Shepherd and Challenger 2013). Alternatively, assuming paradigmatic *pluralism*, scholars have speculated about the different ways in which paradigms interact with each other (interplay) to produce new paradigmatic configurations and research approaches (Schultz and Hatch 1996). Answers to the above questions, heavily independent on how comprehensive, rigorous, and fundamental research paradigms are defined in the respective context, thus leading to claims regarding the elusiveness of the paradigm-terminology. Hence, paradigms are most adequately represented as multi-level concepts. For instance, scholars have argued that distinct meanings of paradigm involve at least four different levels, summarized as (1) worldview, (2) theory of knowledge, (3) research tradition, and (4) example or model (Freshwater and Cahill 2013). On the hierarchically highest level, research paradigms represent a comprehensive worldview, an integrated way of relating to and thinking about the world, including deep-seated attitudes, beliefs, and socio-moral values. On the next lower level, paradigms can refer to an epistemological position, i.e., a theory of knowledge and its creation, including shared belief systems, shaping the ways in which research questions are derived, posed, and investigated. Further, paradigms can also refer to different research traditions, schools of thought, or communities of practice within an academic discipline, which are partly defined by shared beliefs and models regarding which and how methods of inquiry should be

employed in the respective field. Lastly, paradigms can refer to influential examples, conventions, heuristics, or models, i.e., more or less tried and tested approaches to identify and investigate research problems, for instance, statistical methods. Less frequently pointed out or discussed is the strong theoretical convergence between paradigms and ideologies. The latter also refers to frames of reference with orienting, descriptive, normative, and legitimating functions—but are also assumed to contain elements that are biasing, manipulating, and instrumentalizing their adherents at the behest of undisclosed particular interests that play a role in the creation and proliferation of the respective ideologies (Seeck, Sturdy, Boncori, and Fougère 2020). Emphasizing similarities between “research paradigms” and “research ideology” is useful to make salient and better understand that research is not beyond interest-guided influences, but is easily and frequently biased or turned into an instrument of deception, repression or propaganda (e.g., industry-funded research as lobbying of vested interest; government intervention against politically inconvenient research). Illustrating this point, recently an intensive debate has ignited within work and organizational psychology regarding the socially, morally, and intellectually corrosive effects of neoliberal ideology in the design of and academic research on workplace practices (Bal and Dóci 2018). This critique of research ideology became a constitutive element of a new critical paradigm (Islam and Sanderson 2022; Weber, Höge, and Hornung 2020), as outlined below and integrated into a meta-theory of paradigmatic conflict in MOS.

Based on the seminal work of Kuhn (1962) on the philosophy of science, theorizing on research paradigms has made important contributions to developing MOS as an interdisciplinary and pluralistic field. An important milestone in this line of self-reflexive research is Burrell and Morgan’s (1979) taxonomy of sociological paradigms underlying different approaches to organizational analysis, as well as its reconceptualization by Deetz (1996) and later extension by Hassard and Wolfram Cox (2013). An insightful review and rhetoric analysis of the ensuing “paradigm wars”, i.e., controversial discussions and contentious exchanges by proponents of conflicting research traditions and philosophies, is provided by Shepherd and Challenger (2013), compiling arguments for and against paradigm incommensurability, integration, pluralism, and dissolution.

The present study follows different aims, focusing on more recent debates involving or surrounding the self-proclaimed pluralistic paradigm of CMS. Partly, these debates resemble continuations or new editions of previous controversies. Similar to the concept of paradigm itself, the term “paradigm wars” is not clearly defined. Frequently, refers to the divide between quantitative and qualitative methods, typically associated with positivist and interpretive traditions in the social sciences (Freshwater and Cahill 2013). However, while this rift surely serves as a “battleground” or zone of engagement, it does not reflect the whole “theatre of war”. Paradigmatic disputes go beyond methodological or even epistemological differences, but include different basic assumptions about the nature of social realities, the foundations of human societies, and the psychology of the human species. Specifically, intersecting the rift between quantitative-positivistic and qualitative-interpretive methods is another paradigmatic divide with regard to critical-emancipatory orientation. Identified by Burrell and Morgan (1979) as the sociology of radical change is the Marxist tradition of social critique of the political economy and revolutionary transformation of society. Often marginalized or downplayed by the mainstream, this critical paradigm is especially relevant for the present analysis as a constitutive force “reincarnated” in CMS, but also as a source of paradigmatic dynamism and fragmentation.

Laying the foundation of the meta-theory of social science approaches to MOS research, Burrell and Morgan (1979) distinguish *functionalist* and *interpretive* from *radical structuralist* and *radical humanist paradigms*. These four paradigms are differentiated based on converging

and diverging assumptions in two dimensions: a) regarding the objective vs. subjective nature of social realities; and b) orientation towards regulation vs. radical change, emphasizing social order vs. conflict as the basis of society and organization. Each stream is discussed with regard to philosophical background, intellectual foundations, and influence on organizational analysis. In simplified terms, the four paradigms are rooted in sociological positivism (functionalist), German Idealism (interpretive), Marxism (critical structuralist) and Freudo-Marxist Critical Theory (radical humanist). This initial taxonomy was revised by Deetz (1996), who relabeled the regulation/order vs. change/conflict distinction into embeddedness in social discourses of consensus vs. dissensus. The objective-subjective (ontological) dimension was replaced with an alternative (epistemological) distinction regarding origin of concepts and problems, contrasting an elite or a priori with a local or emergent approach to social science. In this postmodern reinterpretation, the concept of paradigms was substituted with “softer” alternatives, such as “discourses”, “studies”, or “approaches”. Accordingly, Deetz (1996) distinguishes normative (functionalist mainstream), interpretive (hermeneutic, constructivist), critical (radical emancipatory), and dialogic (deconstructionist) studies. These are designated by historical “time identity” as modern or progressive, premodern or traditional, late modern or reformist, and postmodern or deconstructionist. Dimensions along which these approaches are contrasted include basic goals, methods, hopes, metaphors of relationships and organization, addressed problems, concern with communication, promised organizational benefits, narrative style, mood, and social fears. Taken together, the contributions of Burrell and Morgan (1979) and Deetz (1996) were extremely influential and numerous authors have adopted, modified or extended their taxonomies (Gioia and Pitre 1990; Schultz and Hatch 1996; Hassard and Wolfram Cox 2013; Wrench and Punyanunt-Carter 2012).

Both the classic model and the revised version are integrated in Table 1. The alternative taxonomy displayed in Table 2 illustrates adjustments or modifications suggested by subsequent authors. Accordingly, different approaches to MOS can be differentiated by the extent to which they frame organization as conflict vs. order (pluralism, diverging interests vs. unitarism, converging interests) and/or structures as determined vs. created (power and interests vs. agency and free will). The former applies critical (structuralist) and, to a lesser extent, to postmodern (poststructuralist), the latter to interpretive (hermeneutic) and postpositive (functionalist) research. Interpretive and postmodern approaches share relativist ontology and inductive epistemology, emphasizing subjective perceptions and generation of knowledge from real-world organizations. Postpositive and critical approaches build on realist assumptions regarding the objective existence of social phenomena, and prioritize deductive epistemology in form of the application and testing of theory in organizations. Overall, some variation notwithstanding, the most frequently distinguished paradigms converge with what has been broadly identified as postpositive, interpretive, postmodern, and critical approaches to social research.

Main ontological (theories), epistemological (methods), and axiological (objectives) characteristics of these four paradigms are summarized in Table 3, drawing on Wrench and Punyanunt-Carter (2012). Accordingly, in addition to the ontological relativism-realism distinction outlined above, epistemological differences regarding prioritized modes of knowledge-creation range from postpositive empirical-technical observation and manipulation, hermeneutic interpretation, and postmodern deconstruction of discourses, to radical theory-based critique. The latter is combined in the critical paradigm with an emancipatory axiology, aimed towards instigating radical change and social reform. In contrast, postpositive research is geared toward devising interventions to increase control and performance, whereas interpretive approaches are concerned with description, meaning, and understanding. Most proximal to the

critical paradigm, postmodern or dialogic discourses pursue objectives of denaturalization, that is, disclosing and unmasking power relations, rather than attempts to upend or overturn structures of domination. Notably, however, in a tripartite revision, Hassard and Wolfram Cox (2013) differentiate structural, anti-structural, and post-structural paradigms, suggesting that each contains more status-quo-oriented normative and critical streams or sub-paradigms. For the present analysis, more general differences between critical (radical structuralist) and dialogical or postmodern (post-structuralist) approaches, as outlined above, are elemental to understanding paradigmatic conflicts in current discourses in MOS that will be outlined below in greater detail.

Table 1. Taxonomies of Paradigms in Organizational Research

	<b>Social Reality as Subjective</b> Local / Emergent Origin of Concepts and Problems:	<b>Social Reality as Objective</b> Elite / A Priori Origin of Concepts and Problems:
<b>The Sociology of Radical Change</b> Social Discourse of Dissensus	<b>Radical Humanist Paradigm</b> Dialogic Studies Postmodern, Deconstructionist (Postmodern / Poststructuralist)	<b>Radical Structuralist Paradigm</b> Critical Studies Late Modern, Reformist (Critical / Antagonistic)
<b>The Sociology of Regulation</b> Social Discourse of Consensus	<b>Interpretive Paradigm</b> Interpretive Studies Premodern, Traditional (Constructivist / Hermeneutic)	<b>Functionalist Paradigm</b> Normative Studies Modern, Progressive (Postpositivist / Mainstream)

Source: Based on Burrell and Morgan (1979; in bold) and Deetz (1996)

Table 2. Alternative Taxonomy of Paradigms in Organisational Research

	<b>Relativist Ontology:</b> Subjective Perception <b>Inductive</b> <b>Epistemology:</b> Deriving Knowledge from Organizations	<b>Realist Ontology:</b> Objective Existence <b>Deductive</b> <b>Epistemology:</b> Applying Knowledge to Organizations
<b>Organization as Conflict:</b> Pluralist view emphasizing diverging interests <b>Structures as Determined:</b> Emphasis on socio-historical factors, structures reflect power and interests	<b>Postmodern</b> (poststructuralist, deconstructionist)	<b>Critical</b> (radical structuralist, dialectic, antagonistic)
<b>Organization as Order:</b> Unitarist view emphasizing converging interests <b>Structures as Created:</b> Emphasis on human agency; structures reflect the free will of individuals	<b>Interpretive</b> (hermeneutic, phenomenological)	<b>Postpositive</b> (functionalist, mainstream)

Source: Own elaboration based on Wrench and Punyanunt-Carter (2012)

Table 3. Ontological, Epistemological, and Axiological Dimensions of Paradigms

	<b>Ontology:</b> Existence of Social Reality (Theories)	<b>Epistemology:</b> Modes of Knowledge-Creation (Methods)	<b>Axiology:</b> Values or Goals of Research (Objectives)
<b>Postpositive Paradigm</b>	<b>Realism</b> (objective / legitimate)	<b>Observation</b> (empirical-technical)	<b>Intervention</b> (regulation / control)
<b>Interpretive Paradigm</b>	<b>Relativism</b> (subjective / constructed)	<b>Interpretation</b> (hermeneutic / inductive)	<b>Description</b> (understanding)
<b>Postmodern Paradigm</b>	<b>Relativism</b> (subjective / enacted)	<b>Deconstruction</b> (decoding discourses)	<b>Denaturalization</b> (disclosure)
<b>Critical Paradigm</b>	<b>Realism</b> (objective / exploitative)	<b>Critique</b> (theory-based / dialectic)	<b>Emancipation</b> (transformation)

*Source: Own elaboration based on Wrench and Punyanunt-Carter (2012)*

### **Method: Hermeneutic Exploration and Structuring of Discourses**

The presented review aims to offer a stimulating exploration, structured compilation, and integrative discussion of academic discourses, based on the application and extension of meta-theorizing on research paradigms. Warranted is the disclaimer that the presented narrative is subjective, interpretive, selective, and illustrative, offering an opinionated and provocative perspective. The adopted epistemological stance reflects a critical position, unapologetic about not aspiring to post-positive standards for objectivity, replicability, and comprehensiveness, underlying the restrictive and technocratic approach of systematic literature reviews (Hornung and Höge 2021; Hornung and Rousseau 2018). Following traditional approaches to scientific commentaries and narrative reviews, key publications were identified, structured in a theory-informed iterative process, and interpreted within the context of the authors' prior knowledge and nomological arguments. Calling attention to identified patterns and speculating about their possible interconnected meanings, attempts at theory-building are offered.

Methodologically, this hermeneutic approach aspires to the epistemological model of a "problematizing review" (Alvesson and Sandberg 2020), as a legitimate form of scientific advocacy and knowledge-creation (Hornung, Unterrainer, and Höge 2022). Literature searches covered major data bases for social science. Separate searches informed different sections, including publications on paradigms in MOS; review articles and chapters on CMS and the critique of Evidence-based Management (EBM); contributions discussing critical performativity; articles on managerialism and the labor process debate; and critical approaches in industrial, organizational, and work psychology. Listings of relevant articles were compiled, sighted, and sorted, based on abstracts and cursory readings. Key articles were identified via cross-referencing and citation tracking. In the present condensed write-up, only a selection of exemplary key publications can be included.

### **Framework: Paradigmatic Conflicts in Critical Management Discourse**

Drawing on concepts from the philosophy of science and their uptake in the MOS literature, selected discourses are integrated into a model of paradigmatic conflict, differentiating inter- and

intra-paradigmatic conflicts, affirming or challenging paradigm boundaries. Distinguishing between location and degree, four types of paradigmatic conflicts are included, labelled external and internal frictions and fractures. *Frictions* describe *fundamental* conflicts (first degree). *Fractures* (second degree) are *foundational*, i.e., constitutive for emerging new paradigms. The former conflicts do not challenge existing paradigm boundaries, the latter introduce new (previously latent, hidden or downplayed) paradigmatic demarcations. This distinction bears similarities with the dialectics of “agonisms” versus “antagonisms” (Parker and Parker 2017), where the former conflicts are productive, permitting some form of compromise or solution, and the latter involve mutually exclusive or irreconcilable positions (Shepherd and Challenger 2013; Schultz and Hatch 1996).

The second distinction of conflict location, differentiates *external* and *internal* (inter- and intra-) paradigmatic disputes. The former *reach across* paradigm boundaries, the latter are *contained within* a shared paradigm. Populating this matrix of domains (or types) of paradigmatic conflict are four discourses involving current CMS scholarship related to confronting EBM; debating performativity; breakaway of radical fractions; and the emergence of Critical Work and Organizational Psychology (CWOP). This framework is presented in Table 4. Outlined next are core tenets of the respective four conflictual discourses, including some aspects of their intellectual roots, historical background, and interconnections.

Table 4. Four Domains of Paradigmatic Conflict Involving CMS

	<b>Frictions: Fundamental Conflicts</b> (First degree) Paradigmatic disagreements without challenging paradigm boundaries	<b>Fractures: Foundational Conflicts</b> (Second degree) Paradigmatic disagreements introducing new paradigm boundaries
<b>External:</b> Inter-paradigmatic disputes reaching across paradigm boundaries	<b>(1) Evidence-Debate</b> Proponents of CMS confronting Evidence-based Management (→ Paradigm delineation)	<b>(3) Ideology-Debate</b> Role of CMS in emergence of critical work and organizational psychology (→ Paradigm dissemination)
<b>Internal:</b> Intra-paradigmatic disputes arising within paradigm boundaries	<b>(2) Performativity-Debate</b> Dispute on collaboration vs. conflict (non-/anti- or critical performativity) (→ Paradigm differentiation)	<b>(4) Managerialism-Debate</b> Breakaway of more radical Marxist and critical management theory (→ Paradigm disintegration)

Source: Own elaboration based on Hornung and Höge (2021)

### ***External Frictions: The Evidence-Debate***

External frictions across paradigm boundaries are exemplified by hostile exchanges between proponents of CMS and EBM. Seeking to “improve” management decisions and organizational practices, EBM is relatively recent, yet highly influential (post-)positivist movement, advocating scientific methodology for the aggregation, synthesis, and transfer of research into practice (Rynes and Bartunek 2017). Prioritized are methods emulating natural science—quantification,

experiments, statistics, meta-analysis, systematic reviews, and decision support systems. Rooted in scientific positivism, EBM opposes the pluralist principles of CMS, fueling a heated controversy, described in detail elsewhere (Morrell, Learmonth, and Heracleous 2015). CMS scholars, notably Learmonth (2008) and Morrell and Learmonth (2015), have deconstructed EBM as an ideologically-driven political project, advancing managerialism through an agenda of positivistic “scientism”, reinforcing paradigmatic hegemony, while marginalizing non-mainstream positions and alternative methodologies. EBM would, if not intentionally divisive then effectively, exclude and degrade qualitative research, specifically interpretive and critical approaches not fitting the constrained, ideologically preformed canon of acceptable (evidence-based) methods (Learmonth 2008; Morrell and Learmonth 2015).

Striking a reconciliatory note, Hornung and Rousseau (2018) have suggested theorizing on research paradigms to analyze the controversy, exploring ways to dialectically overcome seemingly incompatible assumptions of EBM and CMS. However, this search for common ground has been limitedly successful at best (Morrell, Learmonth, and Heracleous 2015). Subsequently, a comparative overview of opposing or antagonistic paradigmatic features of the two streams, their criticism of each other, and mutual learning opportunities, was presented as a basis for further debate (Hornung 2018). This included contrasting the scientific paradigms of EBM and CMS along the dimensions of self-image, objectives, conceptions of evidence, processes, theories, methods, and image of the respective other, and is summarized in Table 5 below. This comparative analysis illustrates lacking communalities and provides arguments for paradigm incommensurability between the fundamentally critical and the functionalist postpositive mainstream MOS research. CMS is critical about management, aimed at inspiring social reform, resistance to, and emancipation from domination, whereas EBM aspires to be useful to management and benefitting employees by “improving” managerial decision-making. Whereas proponents of CMS have deconstructed EBM as political agenda naturalizing managerial interests, marginalizing critical thinking and methods, and co-opting or eradicating plurality, “evidence-based” scholars have branded CMS as obstructionist, unconstructive, unscientific, unrealistic, and self-serving, employing criticism for its own sake without offering “viable” alternatives. Paradoxically, an important meta-theoretical contribution of EBM lies in its divisiveness, activating, intensifying, and reinforcing ideological conflicts that otherwise might have remained latent, dormant or contained.

Paradigmatic plurality appears to emerge partly in response to being challenged by hegemonic homogenizing tendencies, which are inherent in the technocratic and prototypically “fascist” tendencies of the evidence-based practice discourse. Specifically, this refers to the exclusion, marginalization, and degradation of ontologically (theories), epistemologically (methods), and axiologically (values) “deviating” research paradigms. Exposing and “denaturalizing” EBM as a hegemonial project of managerialism and scientific positivism has strengthened the paradigm of CMS. Indeed, branding EBM as a “backlash” against ideological and methodological pluralism (Learmonth 2008) has struck a nerve. Resembling a truly dialectic dynamic, i.e., likely not realized by the protagonists, EBM appears as a reactionary response to the emergence of CMS about a decade earlier. Since then, EBM has been increasingly absorbed into the scientific model of mainstream research, teaching, and interventions, legitimizing and reinforcing it, while simultaneously advancing the academic political-economic interests of associated networks of scholars. Under the surface, however, “ripple effects” of the evidence-dispute may connect to the emergence of a new critical stream in work and organizational psychology, discussed below.

Table 5. The EBM–CMS Dispute: Contrasting Competing Research Paradigms

Aspects / Dimensions	Evidence-Based Management (EBM)	Critical Management Studies (CMS)
<b>Self-image</b>	Useful for management, instrumental for improving organizational decision-making	Critical about management, aimed at inspiring social reform, resistance, and emancipation
<b>Objective</b>	Conscientious, explicit, judicious use of best available evidence from multiple sources	Challenging accepted, dominant, and harmful ideologies, institutions, interests, and identities
<b>Evidence</b>	Formalized, based on scientific research, organizational data, practitioner experience, and stakeholder perspectives	Diverse methods, including negation, de-familiarization, deconstruction, reframing, imagination, narratives, theorizing, introspection
<b>Processes</b>	Systematically asking for, acquiring, appraising, aggregating, and applying the best available evidence, and assessing outcomes	Using principles of denaturalization (ideology critique), reflexivity (context, history), and non- or critical performativity (emancipation)
<b>Theories</b>	Mainstream theories from psychology, sociology, business administration, and economics	Fringe theories, Marxism, Critical Theory, psychoanalysis, discourse theory, and deconstructivism
<b>Methods</b>	Oriented towards natural science, cause and effect, experiments, quantification, statistics	Oriented towards social science, qualitative, interpretative, deconstruction, narratives, linguistics
<b>Other-image</b>	Obstructionist, self-serving, criticism for its own sake, unconstructive, unscientific, unrealistic, offering no viable alternative	Political agenda naturalizing managerial interests, marginalizing critical thinking, alternative methods, and ideological plurality

*Source: Own elaboration based on Hornung (2018)*

### ***Internal Frictions: The Performativity-Debate***

Internal paradigmatic frictions characterize the “performativity debate” within CMS, pitting calls for concessions, compromise, and collaboration with management against positions emphasizing conflict, confrontation, and counteractions. Denaturalization, reflexivity, and anti-performativity were originally established as constitutive features of CMS (Fournier and Grey 2000). The notion of strict anti- or non-performativity, as principled refusal to participate in the managerial “valorization agenda”, was challenged by Spicer, Alvesson, and Kärreman (2009, 538), advocating for a more “constructive” approach of critical performativity, as “active and subversive intervention into managerial discourses and practices [...] through affirmation, care, pragmatism, engagement with potentialities, and a normative orientation.” Suggested was a transition from antagonistic opposition against management with the goal of societal change or “macro-emancipation”, to a relationship of agonistic tensions, including targeted collaboration on specific issues and enactment of limited, so-called “micro-emancipatory” improvements for workers, in despite of the potentially system-justifying functions of such interventions. Exactly how much positive regard, empathy, and compromise in engaging with management on “potentialities” is warranted and viable, versus the need for confrontation, subversion, and principled refusal, has become a matter of heated contention (Fleming and Banerjee 2016). The literature on the intra-paradigmatic performativity-debate is extensive and beyond the scope of

this review. Exemplary contributions are Edwards (2017) and Koss Hartmann (2014), who call for a less categorical and canonical critique in CMS, advocating for notions of “subversive functionalism” and strengthening the linkages between mainstream and critical studies. Less prominently featured are voices of concern and counter-movements to the “performative turn” in CMS (Hassard, Hogan, and Rowlinson 2001). After years of controversy, Spicer, Alvesson, and Kärreman (2016), elaborated their proposal, suggesting to reorient critical performativity to focus on issues of public importance, engaging with non-academic groups, deliberation, and building social movements. Indeed, this extension reads somewhat less (co-)managerialist and geared towards establishing CMS as a force for social transformation. Nonetheless, the confrontational rhetoric reveals substantial internal frictions and infighting within the CMS paradigm. Apparently, what has been called the “performative turn” or “third wave” of CMS has not only increased its momentum and impact, but has also resulted in some level of internal dissent and division within the pluralistic CMS paradigm. The more severe and “fractioning” varieties of the performativity-question can be seen as culminating in the managerialism-debate discussed below, which can be identified as an outgrowth or extension of the intensive labor process debate from the 1980s to 2000s led between radical structuralists and poststructuralists.

### ***Internal Fractures: The Managerialism-Debate***

Fractures within the paradigm surface in critique of CMS as a manifestation and instrument of managerialism, colluding with and providing legitimacy to the domination and exploitation of workers at the hand of management for interests of capital (Braverman 1974). Klikauer (2015; 2018), in particular, deconstructs CMS as a domesticated “tamed” criticism, differentiating not only between CMS and Traditional Management Theory (TMT), but also introducing Critical Management Theory (CMT) and Marxist (Labor Process) Management Theory (MMT) as paradigms with constitutive theoretical foundations and epistemological interests, mapping out central themes, key publications, authors, institutions, and journals.

The proposed classification of approaches is displayed in Table 6. In addition to the four versions distinguished by Klikauer (2018), Humanistic Management Theory (HMT) is included as a fifth stream. Whereas TMT employs mainstream functionalist social science in service of an empirical-technical interest in organizational efficiency and effectiveness, HMT enriches the mainstream by including and advocating for normative ethical and moral considerations (Pirson 2019). Characteristic for humanistic management approaches are attempts to demonstrate or argue for the instrumentality of moral conduct and worker wellbeing for (longer-term) profitability goals (Weber, Höge, and Hornung 2020). Underlying institutional logics of unitarism (convergence of interest; e.g., wellbeing, health as preconditions for performance) and paternalism (employer responsibility for employee welfare) can be distinguished from more direct forms of economism and instrumentality (e.g., performance management; testing and assessment). Eventually, however, both paradigms serve a functionalist “regulation” or “domination” agenda, rather than one of conflict, radical change, or emancipation. Klikauer’s (2015; 2018) analysis comes to similar conclusions with regard to the current state of CMS. Accordingly, CMS combines a variety of more or less critical positions (e.g., poststructuralism, social constructivism, phenomenology), but, despite frequent claims to the contrary, its grounding in Critical Theory (Frankfurt School of Freudo-Marxism) would be spurious or superficial. Going beyond empirical-analytical TMT, which is oriented towards maintaining or increasing organisational control and domination, he attests CMS merely hermeneutic interest with regard to understanding subjectivity and power relationships in historical contexts, but not a genuinely critical-emancipatory intent, aimed at promoting active resistance and ending domination, which

he sees exclusively addressed in the radical streams of CMT and MMT. CMS is portrayed as complicit in dominating workers by educating management how to better “handle” the human factor, fulfilling “palliative” and system-justifying functions in buffering (adding a “human touch” to) the hardships, suffering, and injustices produced by managerial regimes of system-inherent austerity, rationalization, and work intensification (cost cutting, layoffs, performance requirements). This scathing assessment echoes the critique of Braverman (1974), the “founding father” of Marxist LPT, directed at the early human relations movement, branded as the “maintenance crew” or “handmaidens” of capitalism. Similar arguments apply to HMT and business ethics. Indeed, proponents of critical performativity have described the intent of engaging with and “improving” management in oddly similar terms as proponents of EBM have outlined their functionalist vision of “better” management (Hornung and Rousseau 2018). Pointing out these parallels, Klikauer (2018) argues that radical emancipatory intent, along with a critical theoretical foundation, determine paradigmatic boundaries. CMS would neither subsume the Marxist LPT tradition nor represent the Freudo-Marxist Frankfurt School, which is probably best known for its credo of categorical refusal of compromise: “There is no right life in the wrong one”. Klikauer (2015) exposes and denounces the so-called “performative turn” in CMS, not as “subversion”, but as a “sell-out”, a self-sacrifice on the “altar of capital” in exchange for the “cheap pearls” of being accepted as “constructive” and “relevant”. His polemic rhetoric makes clear that he wants no part in what he considers a (not so) covertly managerialist project, stabilizing and colluding with, rather than challenging and opposing structures of domination and exploitation. Moreover, he leaves no doubt as to which side of the domination–emancipation divide he allocates the majority of CMS scholars on. Notable is the correspondence of Klikauer’s (2018) taxonomy with Burrell and Morgan’s (1979) four paradigms with CMT as radical humanist, MMT as radical structuralist, CMS as interpretive, and TMT as functionalist. Importantly, the radically critical paradigms of CMT and MMT require further elaboration and differentiation, which cannot be provided here.

Table 6. Five Sub-Paradigms in Management Research

	<b>Theoretical Basis</b>	<b>Knowledge-Creating Interest</b>
<b>Traditional Management Theory (TMT)</b>	Mainstream functionalist, performance-oriented organization science	Empirical-technical interest in increasing organizational control, efficiency and effectiveness
<b>Humanistic Management Theory (HMT)</b>	Mainstream enriched with normative ethical and moral considerations	Empirical-technical interest in demonstrating instrumentality of worker wellbeing for organizations
<b>Critical Management Studies (CMS)</b>	Various more or less critical, postmodern, and alternative approaches	Hermeneutic interest in understanding meaning and subjectivity in historical contexts
<b>Critical Management Theory (CMT)</b>	Frankfurt School of Critical Theory	Critical-emancipatory interest in freedom and autonomy, supporting resistance and ending domination
<b>Marxist Management Theory (MMT)</b>	Labor Power and Labor Process Theory	

*Source: Own elaboration based on Klikauer (2018)*

### ***External Fractures: The Ideology-Debate***

Discussed under the heading of “external fractures” are impacts of CMS on the emergence of new paradigm boundaries in adjacent fields of social science, such as psychology, pedagogy, and

history (Davidson et al. 2006). The focus is on the emerging movement of CWOP, based on the authors' background and involvement with associated professional initiatives and activities. The impact of CMS is documented in the pioneering works of Islam and Zyphur (2009), who compare mainstream and critical perspectives on organizational topics, such as job analysis, employee selection, training, and careers; McDonald and Bubna-Litic (2012), who draw on CMS to denounce scientism, individualism, managerialism, and lacking ethical grounding in psychology applied to work and organizations; and Gerard (2016), introducing the epistemology of the critical paradigm to Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Foundational publications further include Bal and Dóci (2018), Mumby (2019), and Weber, Höge, and Hornung (2020). Each of these contributions has sparked or is connected to broader scientific discourses and controversial debates in Europe, the United States, and Germany, respectively.

The most recent and comprehensive review of the emergence and positioning of CWOP was provided by Islam and Sanderson (2022), who elaborate how mainstream work and organizational psychology is shaped by a self-reinforcing matrix of scientism, individualism, managerialism, neoliberalism, and hegemony. Further, these authors position the paradigm of CWOP between mainstream work and organizational psychology and CMS, contrasting core themes, disciplinary roots, socio-political context of emergence, dominant conceptions of the person, epistemological or methodological orientations, and relations to practice. Attesting to the emergence of CWOP is a growing international network, research groups, journal special issues, workshops, meetings, and conferences dedicated to developing this new paradigm. Providing momentum for the CWOP movement, an achievement has been to initiate debate within the European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology (EAWOP) regarding pervasive and unchallenged influences of neoliberal ideology on contemporary workplace practices and psychological research (Bal and Dóci 2018). In a discipline historically plagued by double-binds between humanistic ideals of employee wellbeing and personality development and the normative power of economic imperatives perpetually demanding increases in performance and profits, calling out socially, morally, and intellectually corrosive consequences of subservience to particular political-economic interests, has struck a nerve (Weber, Höge, and Hornung 2020). This showed in the galvanizing role of the formulated criticisms for a growing group of critically-oriented researchers and also in defensive responses of leading scholars in the field. Research has since progressed, including conceptual, empirical, and practical applications of the critique of neoliberal ideology as matrix of political, social, and fantasmatic logics, systemically biasing workplace practices and their scientific evaluation through a dogmatic trinity of individualism, competition, and instrumentality. Displayed in Table 7 is an attempt to map out the positioning of CWOP. Distinguished are influences from within psychology versus other fields of social science (intra- vs. interdisciplinary) and with a domain-specific focus on work and organizations versus broader socio-cultural applicability to life and societies (organization vs. social science). This includes various critical psychologies (Parker 2009; Teo 2015), Marxist social critique and Critical Theory (Frankfurt School), as well as critical poststructuralist studies, e.g., those on governmentality and subjectification (Mumby 2019). Interdisciplinary influences focusing on the work context have come, aside from sociology, mostly from CMS, as an important role-model.

From a dialectic and dynamic perspective, the constitution of CWOP is not independent from, but a consequence of the ideological victory of CMS in exposing managerialism, positivism, and politics in EBM. Main proponents of EBM are scholars in occupational psychology and organizational behavior, where a spin-off of the evidence-discourse is highly influential. Fractures in psychology, from this perspective, are connected to the "blowback" caused by EBM's assault on ideological and methodological pluralism in management research.

Table 7. Disciplinary Positioning of Critical Work and Organizational Psychology

	Organization Science: Domain-specific focus on work and organizations	Social Science: Broader socio-cultural focus on life and societies
<b>Intra-disciplinary:</b> Critical streams within the discipline of psychology	The Emerging Field of Critical Work and Organizational Psychology	Marxist Psychology, Psychology of the Subject, Analytical Social and Radical Humanist Psychology, Indigenous Psychologies, Critical Social and Applied Psychology
<b>Inter-disciplinary:</b> Critical streams from other social science disciplines	Critical Management Studies; Industrial, Organizational, and Work Sociology; Critical Human Resource Management	Social Critique, (Neo-)Marxism, Critical Theory / Frankfurt School, Poststructuralism, Feminism, Post- Colonial Theory, Critical Race Theory

*Source: Own elaboration*

### Conclusion: Fermenting and Fragmenting Forces in CMS

Four domains of paradigmatic conflict involving CMS were outlined and their interconnections and intellectual backdrops discussed. Analyzed intra- and inter-disciplinary dynamics of paradigm delineation, differentiation, dissemination, and disintegration can be framed as driven by dialectic tensions between “*fermenting*” and “*fragmenting*” forces of and within CMS. Fermenting (inciting or stimulating) critique, CMS has been able to strengthen and consolidate own boundaries against EBM (delineation) and redraw paradigmatic boundaries in other fields, as discussed with respect to CWOP (dissemination). The ensuing boost in influence may have led to “overextending” the boundaries of CMS, losing shared understanding of core objectives and legitimate levels of cooperation (or collusion) versus conflict with management as a real-world force, resulting in fragmenting tendencies of paradigm differentiation and disintegration.

Based on the above theorizing on contemporary paradigms in MOS, the framework of external vs. internal and fundamental vs. foundational conflicts should be further differentiated and extended, accounting for the plurality of approaches. Inter-paradigmatic conflicts between the postpositive and critical paradigm manifest similarly in different disciplines, such as sociology, management, and psychology. Intra-paradigmatic conflicts within CMS are led with different levels of severity between core critical and moderately critical deconstructionist and postmodern streams, in the form of disputes on issues of ontology, epistemology, and axiology, constituting, delineating, and differentiating the broader umbrella-paradigm. In the critical tradition, the function of management is an antagonistic force, representing, imposing, and enforcing particular political-economic interests, defying, degrading, and distorting humanistic ideals of emancipation (at or from work). Appeal, integrity, and legitimacy of CMS depend on its ability to instigate, distil, and channel discontent, outrage, and convulsion about social injustice, exploitation, and environmental destruction—not to participate in it. Thus, laudable aspirations to have a positive impact on people’s working life and demonstrating that alternative forms of organizing are possible, risk diluting, distracting from, or even corrupting the core emancipatory project of CMS. Fragmenting forces, however, are not limited to radical voices, demanding secession of genuinely critical approaches, but also includes those advocating for a “third way” by making CMS attractive and “palatable” for managerialism, reframing it as some variety of “business ethics” or “new human relations movement”, emphatic, subservient and “useful to”, instead of challenging, resisting and counteracting, managerial interests, ideology, and modes of

power. Representatives of such conciliatory approaches of paradigm “integration” are, for instance, Visser (2010; 2019) and Prasad and Mills (2010), who argue for strengthening the common ground and interconnections between ethical-humanistic aspirations in the mainstream and critical-emancipatory approaches in CMS. More radical fractions have argued that attempts at paradigm integration mean subsumption under and assimilation into the (openly or implicitly) managerialist mainstream agenda (Klikauer 2015; 2018). Despite likely well-intentioned calls for rapprochement, the common denominator between the functionalist mainstream and radical critical approaches is marginal. Former are based on an understanding of society emphasizing order, consensus, and regulation, the latter focus on structural conflict, domination, and the need for radical change. Domestic conflicts within the pluralistic CMS paradigm mirror these inter-paradigmatic tensions, respectively resemble self-similar “fractals” of those on a different level of analysis. Existence of fragmenting forces does not necessitate that CMS will disintegrate. Dialectics of *reform or revolution* notoriously perturb and agitate social movements, appearing in different manifestations of contradictory tensions between opposing principles of incremental vs. radical change, compromise vs. conflict, pragmatism vs. purity, collusion vs. irrelevance or assimilation vs. marginalization. As argued by Rowe and Carroll (2014), momentum and strength can arise from such energizing dynamism between radical and reform-oriented forces within critical social movements. Whether CWOP will change paradigmatic structures and dynamics in psychological research on work and organizations, as CMS had done earlier, remains to be seen. Current fractures within CMS send a message to critical movements in other fields, cautioning them that too much compromise and collaboration with prevailing interests and those in power positions may end up compromising and corrupting the very goals of fundamental critique—not only on a personal and pragmatic, but also on a paradigmatic and meta-theoretical level. Recognition, usefulness, relevance, and positive impact extract a high price of justifying and supporting an exploitative, destructive, and ideologically antagonistic system. Raising the stakes for all to take personal responsibility and principled action, both from an objective dialectic and a psychodynamic subjective perspective, there is no question, whether the metaphorical “dark side of the force” will strike back—but rather, when and how. Critical researchers are reminded that denaturalization and emancipation are two sides of the same coin of exposing ideology and upending domination. This is a qualitatively different perspective than functionalist observation and regulation or deconstructionist interpretation and understanding. Pragmatic arguments for nuanced understandings of critical performativity and examples of alternative organizations notwithstanding, the emancipatory interest at the core of critical research should be non-negotiable. Meta-theorizing on scientific paradigms offers a framework to chart the intellectual territory of shared, related or linked versus indifferent, incompatible or antagonistically opposed ontological, epistemological and axiological assumptions, beliefs, and convictions concerning appropriate theories, methods, and values in research. The deep-seated unconscious and ideological components of associated worldviews necessitate applications of psychodynamic theorizing and psychoanalysis for future paradigmatic explorations of the MOS field as a domain of ideologically contested and potentially self-reflexive research.

## References

- Adler, P. S., Forbes, L. C., and Willmott, H. 2007. “Critical Management Studies.” *Academy of Management Annals* 1 (1): 119-179.
- Alvesson, M., Bridgman, T., and Willmott, H. eds. 2009. *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Alvesson, M., and Sandberg, J. 2020. “The Problematizing Review: A Counterpoint to Elsbach and Van Knippenberg’s Argument for Integrative Reviews.” *Journal of Management Studies* 57 (6): 1290-1304.

- Bal, P. M., and Dóci, E. 2018. "Neoliberal Ideology in Work and Organizational Psychology." *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 27 (5): 536-548.
- Braverman, H. 1974. *Labor and Monopoly Capital*. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.
- Burrell, G., and Morgan, G. 1979. *Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis*. London, UK: Heineman.
- Davidson, H., Evans, S., Ganote, C., Henrickson, J., Jacobs-Priebe, L., Jones, D. L., Prilleltensky, I., and Riemer, M. 2006. "Power and Action in Critical Theory Across Disciplines: Implications for Critical Community Psychology." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 38 (1-2): 35-49.
- Deetz, S. 1996. "Crossroads—Describing Differences in Approaches to Organization Science: Rethinking Burrell and Morgan and their Legacy". *Organization Science* 7 (2): 191-207.
- Delbridge, R., and Keenoy, T. 2010. "Beyond Managerialism?" *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 21 (6): 799-817.
- Edwards, P. K. 2017. "Making 'Critical Performativity' Concrete: Sumantra Ghoshal and Linkages Between the Mainstream and the Critical." *British Journal of Management* 28 (4): 731-741.
- Fleming, P., and Banerjee, S. B. 2016. "When Performativity Fails: Implications for Critical Management Studies." *Human Relations* 69 (2): 257-276.
- Fournier, V., and Grey, C. 2000. "At the Critical Moment: Conditions and Prospects for Critical Management Studies." *Human Relations* 53 (1): 7-32.
- Freshwater, D., and Cahill, J. 2013. "Paradigms Lost and Paradigms Regained." *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 7 (1): 3-5.
- Gerard, N. 2016. "Toward a Critical I-O Psychology". *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist* 54 (2).
- Gioia, D. A., and Pitre, E. 1990. "Multiparadigm Perspectives on Theory Building." *Academy of Management Review* 15 (4): 584-602.
- Hassard, J., Hogan, J., and Rowlinson, M. 2001. "From Labor Process Theory to Critical Management Studies." *Administrative Theory & Praxis* 23 (3): 339-362.
- Hassard, J., and Wolfram Cox, J. 2013. "Can Sociological Paradigms Still Inform Organizational Analysis? A Paradigm Model for Post-Paradigm Times." *Organization Studies* 34 (11): 1701-1728.
- Hornung, S. 2018. "Anathema or Alter Ego? The Radical Critique of Evidence-based Management as a Learning Opportunity." Poster presented at the *Annual Meeting of the Center for Evidence-Based Management (CEBMA)*, Chicago, USA, August 9, 2018.
- Hornung, S., and Höge, T. 2021. "Paradigm Wars in Management and Organization Science: A Metatheoretical Metaphorical Narrative." *Proceedings of the 4<sup>th</sup> EBOR Conference*, 1-20. Konya, Turkey: EBOR.
- Hornung, S., and Rousseau, D. M. 2018. "Revisioning Evidence-based Management: Developing Propositions Towards Rapprochement of Concept and Criticism." In *Research and Development on Social Sciences*, edited by R. Yilmaz, M. A. Icbay, and H. Arslan, 201-209. Bialystok, Poland: E-Bwn.
- Hornung, S., Unterrainer, C. and Höge, T. 2022. "Dialectics of Sustainability: Contrasting Mainstream Neoliberal and Critical Ecosocialist Perspectives on Sustainable Development." *European Journal of Sustainable Development Research* 6 (1): 1-9.
- Islam, G., and Sanderson, Z. 2022. "Critical Positions: Situating Critical Perspectives in Work and Organizational Psychology." *Organizational Psychology Review* 12 (1): 3-34.
- Islam, G., and Zyphur, M. 2009. "Concepts and Directions in Critical Industrial/Organizational Psychology". In *Critical Psychology*, edited by D. Fox, I. Prilleltensky, and S. Austin, 110-125. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Klikauer, T. 2015. "Critical Management Studies and Critical Theory: A Review." *Capital & Class* 39: 197-220.
- Klikauer, T. 2018. "Critical Management as Critique of Management." *Critical Sociology* 44 (4-5): 753-762.
- Koss Hartmann, R. 2014. "Subversive Functionalism: For a Less Canonical Critique in Critical Management Studies." *Human Relations* 67 (5): 611-632.
- Kuhn, T. S. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Learmonth, M. 2008. "Evidence-based Management: A Backlash Against Pluralism in Organizational Studies?" *Organization* 15 (2): 283-291.
- McDonald, M., and Bubna-Litic, D. 2012. "Applied Social Psychology: A Critical Theoretical Perspective." *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 6 (12): 853-864.
- Morrell, K., and Learmonth, M. 2015. "Against Evidence-based Management, for Management Learning." *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 14 (4): 520-533.
- Morrell, K., Learmonth, M., and Heracleous, L. 2015. "An Archaeological Critique of 'Evidence-based Management': One Digression After Another." *British Journal of Management* 26 (3): 529-543.
- Mumby, D. K. 2019. "Work: What is it Good for? (Absolutely Nothing)—A Critical Theorist's Perspective." *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice* 12 (4): 429-443.
- Parker, I. 2009. "Critical Psychology and Revolutionary Marxism." *Theory & Psychology* 19 (1): 71-92.

- Parker, S., and Parker, M. 2017. "Antagonism, Accommodation and Agonism in Critical Management Studies: Alternative Organizations as Allies." *Human Relations* 70 (11): 1366-1387.
- Pirson, M. 2019. "A Humanistic Perspective for Management Theory: Protecting Dignity and Promoting Well-Being." *Journal of Business Ethics* 159 (1): 39-57.
- Prasad, A., and Mills, A. J. 2010. "Critical Management Studies and Business Ethics: A Synthesis and Three Research Trajectories for the Coming Decade." *Journal of Business Ethics* 94: 227-237.
- Rowe, J. K., and Carroll, M. 2014. "Reform or Radicalism: Left Social Movements from the Battle of Seattle to Occupy Wall Street." *New Political Science* 36 (2): 149-171.
- Rynes, S. L., and Bartunek, J. M. 2017. "Evidence-based Management: Foundations, Development, Controversies and Future." *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior* 4 (1): 235-261.
- Schultz, M., and 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.
- Seeck, H., Sturdy, A., Boncori, A. L., and Fougère, M. 2020. "Ideology in Management Studies." *International Journal of Management Reviews* 22 (1), 53-74.
- Shepherd, C., and Challenger, R. 2013. "Revisiting Paradigm(s) in Management Research: A Rhetorical Analysis of the Paradigm Wars." *International Journal of Management Reviews* 15 (2): 225-244.
- Spicer, A., Alvesson, M., and Kärreman, D. 2009. "Critical Performativity: The Unfinished Business of Critical Management Studies." *Human Relations* 62 (4): 537-560.
- Spicer, A., Alvesson, M., and Kärreman, D. 2016. "Extending Critical Performativity." *Human Relations* 69 (2): 225-249.
- Teo, T. 2015. "Critical Psychology: A Geography of Intellectual Engagement and Resistance." *American Psychologist* 70 (3): 243-254.
- Visser, M. 2010. "Critical Management Studies and 'Mainstream' Organization Science. A Proposal for a Rapprochement." *International Journal of Organizational Analysis* 18 (4): 466-478.
- Visser, M. 2019. "Pragmatism, Critical Theory and Business Ethics." *Journal of Business Ethics* 156: 5-57.
- Weber, W. G., Höge, T., and Hornung, S. 2020. "Past, Present, and Future of Critical perspectives in Work and Organizational Psychology—A Commentary on Bal (2020)." *Zeitschrift für Arbeits- und Organisationspsychologie / German Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 64 (3): 196-200.
- Wrench, J., and Punyanunt-Carter, N. 2012. *An Introduction to Organizational Communication*. Online: 2012 Book Archive (<https://2012books.lardbucket.org/>).