Analyzing Current Debates in Management and Organization Studies: A Meta-theoretical Review and Dialectic Interpretation

Severin Hornung[1], Thomas Höge[2]
[1]University of Innsbruck, Department of Psychology, Innsbruck, Austria,
severin.hornung@uibk.ac.at

[2]University of Innsbruck, Department of Psychology, Innsbruck, Austria,
thomas.hoege@uibk.ac.at

ABSTRACT: Drawing on concepts from the philosophy of science, dialectically synthesized are academic conflicts grounded in ideological and epistemological heterogeneity in management and organizational scholarship. The presented review and application of the meta-theory of scientific paradigms highlights connections and continuities with prior controversies to delineate, deconstruct, and reappraise current discourses in the pluralistic field of management and organization studies. Differentiating between theories of society emphasizing regulation vs. radical change, and scientific assumptions regarding objective vs. subjective realities, delineates *functionalist, interpretive, radical structuralist,* and *radical humanist* paradigms. Subsequent developments have transformed these ontological, epistemological, and axiological configurations into *post-positivist* (normative, mainstream), *interpretive* (constructivist, hermeneutic), *postmodern* (dialogic, poststructuralist), and *critical* (dialectic, antagonistic) research approaches. Associated meta-theorizing is applied to academic disputes involving critical management studies. Distinguishing degree and location yields four fundamental and foundational inter- and intra-paradigmatic conflicts: 1) the *evidence-debate* between critical scholars and mainstream functionalists; 2) the *performativity-debate* within critical management studies; 3) the *managerialism-debate* between radical structuralists and poststructuralists; and 4) the *ideology-debate* representing influences on adjacent fields, exemplified by an emerging critical paradigm in work and organizational psychology. Interdependent dynamics underlying these conflicts are framed as fermenting and fragmenting forces, driving paradigm delineation, differentiation, disintegration, and dissemination. The developed meta-theoretical perspective aims to facilitate more self-reflexive scholarship, meaning-making, and knowledge-creation by promoting deeper understanding and more proficient navigation of the organizational literature as an ideologically contested terrain of social science. Theorizing on research paradigms is helpful to make sense of underlying ontological, epistemological, and axiological fault lines. Trajectories of future developments are speculated about with a focus on dialectics between critical management studies and the emerging paradigm of critical work and organizational psychology.

Introduction

Situated at the nexus of powerful, inherent societal conflicts of interest, the interdisciplinary and heterogeneous field of management and organizational studies (MOS) has previously served as an academic battleground for heated ideological, methodological, and value-based disputes. Paralleling similar intellectual clashes in other fields, notably sociology (Strubenhoff 2018) and education (Ylimaki and Brunner 2011), these debates were fittingly termed the "paradigm wars" in MOS (Shepherd and Challenger 2013). Although contributions that explicitly problematize these fundamental paradigmatic conflicts seem to have subsided, the underlying tensions and contradictions may have camouflaged, diversified, and metastasized, but have not vanished (Learmonth and Harding 2006; McDonald and Bubna‑Litic 2012). Against this background, the core objective of this critical review and essay is to outline, structure, and interpret current academic discourses in MOS, explore their foundations, interconnections, and dynamics, and suggest new patterns of meaning from a more integrated perspective, based on a previously developed meta-theoretical framework (Hornung and Höge 2021). Specifically, analyzed are debates surrounding the increasingly established, yet still controversial stream of Critical Management Studies (CMS), which broadly aims at promoting alternative interpretations of the functions, means, and meanings of management research, education, and practice (Adler, Forbes, and Willmott 2007). A pluralist umbrella-paradigm and self-described "big tent" approach, CMS is a heterogeneous movement that has set out to question, expose, and challenge prevailing understandings of management and organization, advocating for non-mainstream positions, alternative approaches, and unorthodox methodologies, rooted in critical thinking and emphasizing attention to power relationships and concern for social justice (Alvesson, Bridgman, and Willmott 2009). The big tent approach of CMS includes various (more or less) critical research streams and traditions, notably, Marxist Labor Process Theory (LPT), the Freudo-Marxist Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School, but also other psychoanalytic, neo- and post-Marxist streams, including poststructuralist and postmodern theorizing, such as Foucault studies, phenomenology, discourse analysis, feminism, postcolonial and queer studies, critical race theory, post- and transhumanism, among others (Alvesson and Willmott 1992; Adler, Forbes, and Willmott 2007; Mumby and Ashcraft 2017). Paraphrasing an influential definition, CMS is an academic social movement that 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. The practical aim is to instigate social reforms in the interest of

the majority, and/or those non-privileged, and to inspire 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, specifically the implied reference to a pragmatic stance and acceptance of real-world conditions, point towards and have culminated in the "performativity debate" within CMS, discussed below.

Critically questioning the taken for granted, challenging structures of domination, problematizing the non-neutrality of knowledge, and one's own positioning as a researcher, are considered common themes in CMS (Adler, Forbes, and Willmott 2007). In what has become a foundational contribution, Fournier and Grey (2000) have specified and condensed these issues, establishing *denaturalization*, *reflexivity*, and *anti- or non-performativity* as core paradigmatic principles or pillars of CMS. Echoing the classic critique of ideology, denaturalization means not taking social phenomena for granted (at face value), but rejecting, deconstructing, and transcending dominant (interest-guided, biased) interpretations of "common wisdom", by exposing their hidden agenda as projects of power (Seeck, Sturdy, Boncori, and Fougère 2020). Denaturalization requires reflexivity, as the critical interrogation of 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 of the researcher in colluding with the "management of human resources", i.e., the economic imperative of "valorizing" human activities via instrumental means-ends calculations to generate profit, considered exploitation in the classic critique of the political economy (Klikauer 2015a, 2015b). According to this postulate, CMS is antagonistically opposed to the goals of management, typically related to increasing efficiency and effectiveness or other economic objectives. However, this anti- or non-performative stance has become 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 early 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 in business schools, following the neoliberal restructuring of universities, spelling austerity and cutbacks to less economically "value adding" departments and disciplines in the humanities and social sciences (Rowlinson and Hassard 2011). Academic success notwithstanding, the intellectual development of CMS has been influenced by the ideological defeat of the Left and the rise of the "New Right" in the form of Thatcherism and Reaganism, which would soon evolve into the hegemony of hyper-capitalist neoliberalism (Hassard, Hogan, and Rowlinson 2001). This account illustrates the tensions and dialectics of political

forces and socio-historical developments as drivers in the establishment, maintenance, and disintegration of research paradigms—a dialectic and dynamic interpretation, which is adopted in this essay. Unsurprisingly, CMS was never fully 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 2015a; Parker 2023). Further, CMS has had considerable interdisciplinary outreach and impact on adjacent fields, contributing to the development of critical paradigms in other areas of MOS, such as accounting (Baker 2011), marketing (Tadajewski, 2010), organization history (Durepos, Shaffner, and Taylor 2021), organizational communication (Mumby and Ashcraft 2017), and human resource management (Bratton and Gold 2015; Delbridge and Keenoy 2010), but also applied social psychology (McDonald and Bubna – Litic 2012) and community psychology (Davidson et al. 2006). Thus, CMS has become increasingly institutionalized and influential as a pluralistic meta-paradigm.

More recently, however, not only the usual theoretical frictions and discussions, but more serious fissures and divisions have appeared along familiar fault lines of the included sub-paradigms, pitting different degrees of "criticality" and concerns with economic structures 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, trying 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 interpreted as a continuation or (re-)manifestation 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 first introduced by Kuhn (1962) as overarching and largely unquestioned frameworks, shared by groups of scholars, organizing commonly accepted 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 most 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 (Ardalan 2019; 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) into 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. 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 (Ardalan 2019). 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 (Bonache and Festing 2020). 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 or discursive methods. Less frequently pointed out or discussed is the strong theoretical (and practical) convergence between paradigms and ideologies (Hornung, Höge, and Unterrainer

2021). Similar to paradigms, ideologies provide frames of reference with orienting and descriptive as well as normative and legitimating functions. Moreover, critical conceptions of ideologies emphasize that these frameworks contain elements aimed at biasing, manipulating, and instrumentalizing their adherents at the behest of undisclosed powerful particular interests that are central for the creation and dissemination 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 (Hornung 2012). On the contrary, critical socio-historical analyses show that science can be easily biased and 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, which can be seen as a manifestation of reflexivity, has become a constitutive element of a new critical paradigm (Islam and Sanderson 2022; Weber, Höge, and Hornung 2020), as outlined further below and integrated into a suggested meta-theory of paradigm 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 its reconceptualization by Deetz (1996), and the subsequent 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), who are compiling arguments brought forward by scholars 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 inherent 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 immanent social critique of the political economy with the stated objective of the revolutionary transformation of stratified class-based societies. Often marginalized or downplayed by the mainstream, this critical paradigm is especially relevant for the present analysis as a constitutive force, to some extent "reincarnated" in CMS, but also as a source of ongoing controversy and paradigmatic dynamism as well as potential fragmentation.

Laying the foundation of the meta-theory of social science approaches in MOS, 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 science and investigated realities; and b) orientation towards *regulation vs. radical change*, emphasizing social order vs. conflict as 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), Historical Materialism or Marxism (radical structuralist), and Freudo-Marxist Critical Theory (radical humanist). The functionalist paradigm is also influenced by systems theory and critical rationalism, while influences on the interpretive paradigm include phenomenology, hermeneutics, symbolic interactionism, and ethnomethodology (Ylimaki and Brunner 2011). Differentiating these paradigms, the objective–subjective dimension involves assumptions concerning ontology (realism vs. nominalism), epistemology (positivism vs. anti-positivism), methodology (nomothetic vs. ideographic), and human nature (determinism vs. voluntarism). In the objectivist approach to social science, reality is a "given", existing external and independent from the individual; focusing on empirical evidence and hypothesis testing, research seeks to discover generalizable fundamental laws and causal relationships that govern reality through the operationalization and measurement of constructs and quantitative analysis; rather than emphasizing free will and agency, humans are considered to be more strongly influenced by their environments (Goles and Hirschheim 2000). In contrast, in the subjectivist approach, reality is viewed as socially constructed and interpreted by the individual; similarly, knowledge is seen as relative and research focuses on understanding meanings of phenomena within the entirety of situations by analyzing subjective accounts.

Radical structuralist and radical humanist paradigms reflect these contrasts at least to some extent. While both share a Marxist conflict conception of society as class struggle, in the latter, the material conception of economic realities is complemented by influences of psychoanalytic theory, emphasizing subjective consciousness. Underlying the regulation–radical change dimension are

incompatible theories of society. The "order" or "integrationist" view in the functionalist and interpretive paradigm emphasizes stability, integration, functional coordination, and consensus. Accordingly, society tends toward unity, cohesion and shared interests with societal forces continuously improving the status quo. In contrast, the "conflict" or "coercion" perspective informing radical structuralist and radical humanist paradigm focuses on change, conflict, disintegration, and coercion (Burrell and Morgan 1979). Accordingly, society contains deep-seated structural conflicts, as ruling political economic elites oppress, constrain, and exploit the majority. Based on the former, the sociology of regulation is concerned with the status quo, social order, consensus, social integration and cohesion, solidarity, need satisfaction, and actuality, whereas sociology of radical change emphasizes social transformation, structural conflict, modes of domination, contradiction, emancipation, deprivation, and potentiality.

The initial taxonomy of Burrell and Morgan (1979) was later revised by Deetz (1996), who relabeled the regulation/order vs. change/conflict distinction into one of embeddedness in social discourses of consensus vs. dissensus. The objective–subjective (ontological) dimension was replaced with an alternative (epistemological) distinction regarding the origin of concepts and problems, contrasting an elite or a priori with a local or emergent approach. In this post-structuralist reinterpretation, the concept of paradigms was substituted with "softer", more ambiguous alternatives of "discourses", "studies", or "approaches". Deetz (1996) distinguishes *normative* (functionalist mainstream), *interpretive* (hermeneutic, constructivist), *critical* (radical emancipatory), and *dialogic* (deconstructionist) studies. These discourses are characterized by their historical "time identity" as modern or progressive, premodern or traditional, late modern or reformist, and postmodern or deconstructionist. Further 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 (for details see Deetz 1996). This influential revision both illustrates and represents the linguistic turn in MOS, reflecting increased concern with discourses, subjectivities, language, and communication, instead of material structures, economic interests, ideology, and theoretical meta-narratives (Mumby and Ashcraft 2017).

Taken together, the contributions of Burrell and Morgan (1979) and Deetz (1996) were extremely influential in MOS and numerous authors have adopted, modified or extended their meta-theoretical taxonomies (Ardalan 2019; Gioia and Pitre 1990; Goles and Hirschheim 2000; Schultz and Hatch 1996; Hassard and Wolfram Cox 2013; Kornau, Frerichs, and Sieben 2020). Both the classic model and the revised version are integrated in Table 1. The alternative taxonomies displayed in Table 2 incorporate various adjustments or modifications suggested by subsequent authors (Wrench and Punyanunt-Carter 2012). Accordingly, different approaches to MOS can be differentiated by the degree to which they frame

organization as conflict vs. order (pluralism or diverging interests vs. unitarism or converging interests) and/or structures as determined vs. created (based on power and interests vs. agency and free will). The former applies critical (structuralist) and, to a somewhat lesser extent, to postmodern (poststructuralist) approaches, the latter to interpretive (hermeneutic) and postpositive (functionalist) research. Further, interpretive and postmodern approaches share a relativist ontology and inductive epistemology, that is, they emphasize 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. 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.

Although the dimensions of Burrell and Morgan (1979) still hold some validity, they do not fully reflect the complexity and nuances of the differentiated approaches anymore. Drawing on Wrench and Punyanunt-Carter (2012), main ontological (theories), epistemological (methods), and axiological (objectives) characteristics of the four paradigms are summarized in Table 3. In addition to the ontological relativism-realism distinction, 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 (Kornau, Frerichs, and Sieben 2020). The latter is combined in the critical paradigm with an emancipatory axiology, aimed at instigating radical change and social transformation. In contrast, postpositive research is geared toward devising interventions to increase control and performance, whereas interpretive approaches are mainly concerned with description, meaning, and understanding. Most proximal to the critical paradigm, postmodern or dialogic approaches pursue objectives of denaturalization, that is, disclosing, unmasking, and debunking hidden power relations, opening them up to discursive deliberation, rather than striving to upend or overturn structures of domination and exploitation.

Notably, in a tripartite revision, Hassard and Wolfram Cox (2013) differentiate between a structural, anti-structural, and post-structural paradigm. The latter is characterized as ontological relativist, epistemological relationist, methodologically reflexive and deconstructionist with regard to human nature. Moreover, these authors suggest that each paradigm contains more status-quo-oriented or normative and critical streams or sub-paradigms. Critical post-structural theories of autonomism, post-structural feminism and post-colonialism are contrasted with normative or uncritical post-structuralist approaches of actor-network theory, archeo-genealogy, and process theory. While relevant to demonstrate ambiguity in the delineation of paradigms, for the

present analysis, more general differences between critical (radical structuralist) and dialogical or postmodern (poststructuralist) approaches are more elemental to understanding paradigm conflicts in current discourses in MOS, which are outlined in greater detail below.

Table 1. Classic and Revised Taxonomy of Paradigms in Organizational Research

	Social Reality as Subjective Local / Emergent Origin of Concepts and Problems:	Social Reality as Objective Elite / A Priori Origin of Concepts and Problems:
The Sociology of Radical Change Social Discourse of Dissensus	**Radical Humanist Paradigm** Dialogic Studies Postmodern, Deconstructionist (postmodern / poststructuralist)	**Radical Structuralist Paradigm** Critical Studies Late Modern, Reformist (critical / antagonistic)
The Sociology of Regulation Social Discourse of Consensus	**Interpretive Paradigm** Interpretive Studies Premodern, Traditional (constructivist / hermeneutic)	**Functionalist Paradigm** Normative Studies Modern, Progressive (postpositivist / mainstream)

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

Table 2. Alternative Taxonomies of Paradigms in Organisational Research

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

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

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

	Ontology: Existence of Social Reality (Theories)	**Epistemology:** Modes of Knowledge-Creation (Methods)	**Axiology:** Values or Goals of Research (Objectives)
Post-positive Paradigm	**Realism** *Objective / Legitimate* Organizations serve a legitimate societal function and have an objective existence, independent of their members. Organizations as social systems are enduring entities	**Observation** *Empirical / Technical* As people must choose actions that get the best organizational results, individual mindsets matter little. To learn about an organization, it is sufficient to observe aggregate behaviors	**Intervention** *Regulate / Control* Research produces objective, generalizable knowledge on cause and effects, which can be used to explain reality, generate predictive theories, and to improve management practices
Inter-pretive Paradigm	**Relativism** *Subjective / Constructed* Organizations come into existence and are maintained through communication. They are socially constructed, existing only in relation to their members' subjectivities	**Interpretation** *Hermeneutic / Inductive* To learn about an organization, observation of aggregate behaviors is insufficient. The subjective mindsets of members must be examined and interpreted in context	**Description** *Understand / Elaborate* Research aims to describe the organization on its members' own terms. This knowledge can be used to inform general theories and applied to management practices
Post-modern Paradigm	**Relativism** *Subjective / Enacted* Organizations come into existence as temporary combinations of interests against the fluidity of larger historical and cultural discourses; they exist only in relation to these forces	**Deconstruction** *Decoding Discourses* Organizations as "texts" that can be "read" to deconstruct, decode, or trace back historical and cultural discourses underlying the formation of an organization's power relations	**Denaturalization** *Disclose / Debunk* Dominant interests maintain power by ensuring organizational discourses are rendered on their terms and seem natural; research seeks to "denaturalize" and reopen power relations
Critical Paradigm	**Realism** *Objective / Exploitative* Reflecting dominant societal interests, organizational power structures, exploitation have objective existence, formed by historical and cultural forces independent of people	**Critique** *Theory-based / Dialectic* Exposing hidden power structures in organizations by using general theories on oppression and exploitation as frameworks to analyze a particular organization	**Emancipation** *Transform / Liberate* Research exposes and changes structures of power and exploitation so that marginalized interests can resist and foreclosed opportunities for human development become possible

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

Method: Hermeneutic Exploration and Dialectic Analysis of Discourses

The presented hermeneutic and narrative review aims to provide a stimulating exploration, structured compilation, and integrative discussion of current academic discourses in MOS, based on the application and extension of meta-theorizing on research paradigms. Warranted in this context is the disclaimer that the presented scientific narrative is subjective, interpretive, eclectic, and illustrative—intended to offer an informative as well as opinionated and provocative perspective. The hereby adopted epistemological stance reflects a critical position, unapologetic about not aspiring to post-positive standards for objectivity, replicability, and comprehensiveness, underlying the restrictive, technocratic approach of systematic literature reviews (Hornung 2012; Hornung and Höge 2021; Hornung and Rousseau 2018). Following more traditional approaches to scientific commentaries and narrative reviews, key publications were identified and collected; their contents structured in a theory-informed iterative process, and interpreted within the context of the authors' prior knowledge and nomological network, personal observations, and developed arguments. Calling attention to identified patterns and speculating about their possible interconnected meanings, some attempts at theory-building are offered, drawing on dialectic analysis and reasoning (Gioia and Pitre 1990). Methodologically, this hermeneutic approach aspires to the epistemological model of the problematizing review (Alvesson and Sandberg 2020), as a legitimate form of scientific advocacy and knowledge-creation (Hornung, Unterrainer, and Höge 2022). Following the hermeneutic processes outlined by Boell and Cecez-Kecmanovic (2014), literature searches covered major databases in business and social science. Separate searches with various combinations of relevant terms were conducted to inform the different sections of the article, 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. Additional articles were identified via cross-referencing and citation tracking. Key publications and exemplary contributions on specific topics are included in the presented integrative review without claims of comprehensiveness. A core theoretical contribution is the structuring of current debates within the framework of paradigmatic conflicts introduced next.

Framework: Paradigmatic Conflicts in Critical Management Discourse

Drawing on concepts from 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 controversial discourses involving current CMS scholarship. These are: (1) the *evidence-debate*, delineating paradigm boundaries between CMS and the hyper-functionalist EBM movement; (2) the *performativity-debate*, differentiating positions regarding collaboration vs. conflict within CMS; (3) the potentially disintegrating *managerialism-debate* between moderate CMS pragmatists and radical fractions of Critical Theory and Marxist LPT; (4) the *ideology-debate*, which reflects inter-paradigmatic influences of CMS in fermenting and disseminating critique in adjacent fields, exemplified by the recently emerging new paradigm of Critical Work and Organizational Psychology (CWOP). This framework is presented in Table 4. Outlined in the following sections are core tenets of each the four conflictual discourses, including aspects of their intellectual roots, historical background, and interconnections.

Table 4. Four Domains of Current Paradigmatic Conflicts Involving CMS

	Frictions: Fundamental Conflicts (First degree) Paradigmatic disagreements without challenging paradigm boundaries	Fractures: Foundational Conflicts (Second degree) Paradigmatic disagreements introducing new paradigm boundaries
External: Inter-paradigmatic disputes reaching across paradigm boundaries	**(1) Evidence-Debate** Proponents of CMS confronting Evidence-based Management (→ Paradigm delineation)	**(4) Ideology-Debate** Role of CMS in emergence of Critical Work and Organizational Psychology (→ Paradigm dissemination)
Internal: Intra-paradigmatic disputes arising within paradigm boundaries	**(2) Performativity-Debate** Dispute on collaboration vs. conflict (non-/anti- or critical performativity) (→ Paradigm differentiation)	**(3) Managerialism-Debate** 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 hyper-functionalist movement, advocating systematic use of scientific methodology for the aggregation, synthesis, and transfer of organizational research into practice (Briner, Denyer, and Rousseau 2009; Rynes and Bartunek 2017). Prioritized are methods emulating natural science and medicine, i.e., quantification and statistical hypothesis testing, experiments and randomized trial-control studies, meta-analysis, systematic reviews, and decision support systems. Rooted in scientific positivism, EBM opposes the pluralist principles of CMS, fueling a heated controversy between the two movements, described in more detail elsewhere (Hornung 2012; Hornung and Rousseau 2018; Morrell, Learmonth, and Heracleous 2015). CMS scholars, notably Learmonth (2008) and Morrell (2008), have deconstructed EBM as an ideologically-driven political project, advancing managerialism through an agenda of positivistic *scientism*, reinforcing paradigmatic hegemony, while marginalizing alternative methodologies and non-mainstream positions. EBM would, even 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 and Harding 2006; Morrell and Learmonth 2015). Further, the politics of the EBM approach would delegitimize and suppress any research topics that do not fit the functionalist (exploitative) performativity of the managerial agenda. Striking a more reconciliatory note, Hornung and Rousseau (2018) have suggested theorizing on research paradigms to analyze the controversy, exploring ways to dialectically dissolve seemingly incommensurate assumptions of EBM and CMS. However, this search for common ground has been limitedly successful (Morrell, Learmonth, and Heracleous 2015). Subsequently, a comparative overview of the opposing, 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 attempt to foster dialogue 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. It is summarized in Table 5. This comparative analysis illustrates lacking communalities and provides arguments for paradigm incommensurability between fundamentally critical approaches and the functionalist postpositive mainstream in MOS research. At least in its inaugural version and in theory, CMS is critical about or even opposed to management, aimed at inspiring social reform, resistance, and emancipation of employees from managerial domination and exploitation. In contrast, EBM is explicitly managerialist, aspiring to be useful to management and, spreading a prototypically

unitarist ideology, claims to also benefit employees by "improving" managerial decision-making (Briner, Denyer, and Rousseau 2009). 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. In many ways, the evidence-based debate represents an exemplary manifestation of clashing paradigms of order and regulation versus conflict and radical change, the archetype of which is the positivism dispute in German sociology (Strubenhoff 2018) between the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory and proponents of so-called "critical" (i.e., scientific) rationalism.

Paradoxically, an important meta-theoretical contribution of EBM lies precisely in its divisiveness, thus activating, intensifying, and reinforcing ideological conflicts that otherwise might have remained latent, dormant or contained (Learmonth and Harding 2006). Similar to forms of resistance being activated by the exercise of power, paradigmatic plurality appears to emerge partly in response to being challenged by hegemonic and homogenizing forces. These are inherent in the technocratic and prototypically *fascist* tendencies of the evidence-based practice discourse, as analyzed by Holmes, Murray, Perron, and Rail (2006). Specifically, this critique refers to the exclusion, marginalization, and degradation of ontologically (theories), epistemologically (methods), and axiologically (values) deviating or non-conforming research paradigms. Exposing and denaturalizing EBM as a hegemonial political project of neoliberal managerialism and scientific positivism, has strengthened the paradigm of CMS. Branding EBM as a "backlash" against ideological and methodological pluralism (Learmonth 2008) has struck a nerve. Resembling a truly dialectic dynamic, likely not fully realized by its protagonists, EBM appears as the reactionary response to the emergence of CMS about a decade earlier (Hornung 2012). Hence, emergence, initial success, and establishment of CMS has evidently challenged the (post-)positivist and managerialists hegemony of mainstream research in MOS, including its humanistically disguised variations. EBM thus can be seen as the antagonistic counterforce or antithesis to CMS, seeking to reassert the normative dominance of the functionalist paradigm.

Since its inception about two decades ago, EBM has been increasingly established and progressively absorbed into the scientific model of mainstream research, teaching, and interventions, legitimizing and reinforcing those, while simultaneously advancing the academic political-economic interests of associated networks of scholars and practitioners. Similar to other types of political and social ideologies, an inherent feature of the scientistic and managerialist model of EBM is that it strives for unquestioned dominance or hegemony, i.e., that its principles are fully and widely internalized and thus turn into normatively accepted scientific practices or "common sense" (Alvesson and Spicer 2016). Resulting in paradigm

delineation, the evidence-debate sparked by CMS has, at least temporarily, disrupted this homogenizing tendency by opening up critical discourse. Further, under the surface, the "ripple effects" of this inter-paradigmatic dispute appear to be connected to the emergence of a new critical stream in work and organizational psychology, a countermovement at least partly inspired by CMS and its resistance against EBM, as elaborated below (Parker 2023). Moreover, the stated goal of EBM to make an impact on organizational and management practices, coupled with the (partly correct) accusation that critical approaches are often rather theoretical and lack such an orientation towards the real world, may have, in turn, also contributed to the intra-paradigmatic performativity-debate within CMS, which is discussed in the following section.

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

Aspects / Dimensions	Evidence-Based Management (EBM)	Critical Management Studies (CMS)
Self-image	Useful for management, instrumental for improving organizational decision-making	Critical about management, aimed at inspiring social reform, resistance, and emancipation
Objective	Conscientious, explicit, judicious use of best available evidence from multiple sources	Challenging accepted, dominant, and harmful ideologies, institutions, interests, and identities
Evidence	Formalized, based on scientific research, organizational data, practitioner experience, and stakeholder perspectives	Diverse methods, including negation, de-familiarization, deconstruction, reframing, imagination, narratives, theorizing, introspection
Processes	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)
Theories	Mainstream theories from psychology, sociology, business administration, and economics	Fringe theories, Marxism, Critical Theory, psychoanalysis, discourse theory, and deconstructivism
Methods	Oriented towards natural science, cause and effect, experiments, quantification, statistics	Oriented towards social science, qualitative, interpretative, deconstruction, narratives, linguistics
Other-image	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 more practical relevance and impact, along with concessions, compromise, and collaboration with management, against more radical and

principled positions emphasizing conflict, confrontation, and counteractions (Fleming and Banerjee 2016). Denaturalization, reflexivity, and anti-performativity were initially established as constitutive paradigmatic 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", however, was soon challenged by Spicer, Alvesson, and Kärreman (2009). Building on the truism, that CMS is also "performative" insofar as it seeks to attain alternative and emancipatory goals, these authors advocate for the more "constructive" approach of *critical performativity*, which they defined as "active and subversive intervention into managerial discourses and practices […] through affirmation, care, pragmatism, engagement with potentialities, and a normative orientation" (Spicer, Alvesson, and Kärreman 2009, 538). These five elements of their original definition are further elaborated in Table 6. Although suggested strategies may not sound overly sensational, they do contain a fundamental redefinition of CMS. Effectively suggested here is a transition from an antagonistic opposition against management with the goal of radical societal change or "macro-emancipation", to a relationship of agonistic tensions, including a more empathetic stance towards the managerial perspective, pragmatic acceptance of real-world conditions, targeted collaboration with management on specific issues, and engaging in more limited, so-called "micro-emancipatory" improvements for workers (Parker and Parker 2017; Huault, Perret and Spicer 2014). 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). Exemplary contributions to this discussion include Edwards (2017), Koss Hartmann (2014) and Wickert and Schaefer (2015). Taken together, these authors call for a less radical, categorical or canonical critique, advocating for moderate notions of "subversive functionalism", strengthening the linkages between mainstream and critical perspectives, and developing incremental and progressive understandings of critical performativity, which includes mobilizing and pragmatically involving management to achieve meaningful change.

Considerably fewer in number and less prominently featured are voices of dissent and advocates for counter-movements to the "performative turn" in CMS, calling attention to the "collaborationist" character and high risk of failure of the suggested collusion with management (Fleming and Banerjee 2016), the defeatists, apologetic, and system-justifying functions of a shift towards micro-emancipatory interventions (Hassard, Hogan, and Rowlinson 2001), and insisting that CMS should first and foremost be concerned with the *critique of management* (Klikauer 2018). In a more moderate version of this criticism, Cabantous, Gond, Harding, and Learmonth (2016) point out that critical performativity is overly preoccupied with language and discourses, instead of material conditions of work, and neglects or downplays issues of power and politics in organizations. Further contributions have

criticized the misrepresentation of the theoretical basis of the concept of critical performativity (Gond, Cabantous, Harding, and Learmonth 2016), as well as its lacking or problematic practical feasibility within the broader anti-emancipatory context of employed labor in a capitalist economy (Butler, Delaney and Spoelstra 2018; King and Land 2018; King and Learmonth 2015). Accordingly, some authors have sought to demonstrate the concept of critical performativity and scholar-practitioner collaboration in the domain of non-capitalist, worker-recuperated, and democratic or otherwise "alternative" organizations (Esper, Cabantous, Barin-Cruz, and Gond 2017; Kociatkiewicz, Kostera and Parker 2021). Others have developed the connection between critical performativity and academic activism for socio-ecological justice (Contu 2020; Reedy and King 2019). An arguable more managerialist stream has applied the concept to critical leadership studies (Alvesson and Spicer 2012). Indeed, it should have become clear that the literature on the intra-paradigmatic performativity-debate in CMS is extensive and beyond the scope of this review.

Notably, after several years of controversy, Spicer, Alvesson, and Kärreman (2016), have expanded their proposal, suggesting to reorient critical performativity to focus on issues of public importance, engaging with non-academic groups, building social movements, and propagating deliberation. Branding their critics as being overly concerned with intra-academic debates, engaging in "author-itarian" (*sic*) theoretical policing, faking relevance through symbolic radicalism, and repackage common sense, these authors have presented a revised conceptualization, which is detailed in Table 6. This extended notion of critical performativity can be read as a process model, covering the phases of issue selection (public interest, reflexive framing), underlying reasoning or logic (care and circumspection, pragmatism and progressivism), actual forms of social engagement (involving disgruntled elites, mobilizing resources, micro-mobilizations, resonant framing) and desired outcomes (bullshit reduction, articulating alternatives, deliberation). Indeed, this extension reads somewhat less (co-)managerialist and better geared towards establishing CMS as a force for social transformation. Nonetheless, the confrontational rhetoric of Spicer, Alvesson, and Kärreman (2016) reveals substantial internal frictions and infighting within the CMS paradigm. Apparently, what has been the called the "performative turn" or "third wave" of CMS has not only increased its momentum and practical impact, but has also resulted in a heightened level of internal dissent and division within the pluralistic meta-paradigm. The more severe and "fractioning" varieties of the performativity-question can be seen as culminating in the managerialism-debate, discussed below as an outgrowth or extension of the labor process debate led between radical structuralists and poststructuralists during the 1980s and 90s and characterizing the "second wave" of CMS (Thompson and Smith 2000; Tinker 2002). As such, the performativity-debate in several respects can be interpreted as a continuity of classic themes of conflict in MOS.

Table 6. Proposed Models of Critical Performativity

Original Elements of Critical Performativity (Spicer, Alvesson, and Kärreman 2009)	Extended Model of Critical Performativity (Spicer, Alvesson, and Kärreman 2016)
Affirmative Stance Location at close proximity to object of critique to identify points revision; empathetic instead of antagonistic stance towards management	**Issue Selection** Extent of public interest: Addressing issues of broader importance to non-academics Reflexive framing: Challenging widely held assumptions in a meaningful way
Ethic of Care Providing space for respondents' views, but also seeking to subtly challenge them; accepting and understanding subjectivities	**Forms of Reasoning** Care and circumspection: Taking opposing views seriously and fostering critical debate Pragmatism and progressivism: Developing counter-concepts from existing discourses Potentials and the present: Looking for alternatives that already exist in practice
Pragmatism Working with particular aspects of an organization; accepting real-world conditions and promoting communicative action among different stakeholders	**Forms of Engagement** Engaging disgruntled elites: Getting high status actors to support critical causes Mobilizing resources: Expanding means and opportunities for critical researchers Micro-mobilization: Forums engaging different non-academic groups Resonant framing: Connecting with the experiences of a wider audience
Potentialities Creating a sense of what could be by engaging latent possibilities in an organization; exploring "heterotopias" instead of unrealistic (utopian) aspirations	**Desired Outcomes** Bullshit reduction: Exposing ideology and deconstructing harmful ideas Articulating alternatives: Oriented towards potentialities of real-world heterotopias Deliberation creation: Forums were people with different position engage in debate
Normative Systematic assertion of criteria used to judge good forms of organization; focusing on positive aspects; finding opportunities for micro-emancipation	

Source: Own elaboration based on Spicer, Alvesson, and Kärreman (2009, 2016)

Internal Fractures: The Managerialism-Debate

Fractures within the pluralistic paradigm of CMS surface in the critique of its pragmatic approach as a manifestation and instrument of managerialism, implicitly colluding with and providing legitimacy to the domination and exploitation of workers for the interests of capital (Hassard, Hogan, and Rowlinson 2001; Parker and Parker 2017). In particular, Klikauer (2015a, 2018) deconstructs CMS as a domesticated form of tamed criticism and incremental reformism, striving for "better" management, instead of trying to overcome, sabotage or subvert managerial hegemony. Accordingly, he differentiates not only between CMS and Traditional Management Theory (TMT), but also introduces additional streams of Critical Management Theory (CMT) and Marxist (Labor Process) Management Theory

(MMT) as distinctive 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 7. In addition to the four versions of MOS distinguished by Klikauer (2018), Humanistic Management Theory (HMT) is included as an important fifth stream. Whereas TMT employs mainstream functionalist social science in service of an empirical-technical managerial interest in organizational efficiency and effectiveness, HMT enriches the mainstream by including and advocating for normative ethical and moral considerations (Laszlo 2019; 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). Indeed, underlying fantasmatic logics of harmonious employment relationships, based on convergence of interest or unitarism (e.g., wellbeing, health as preconditions for performance) and industrial paternalism (employer responsibility for employee welfare) can be distinguished from more direct or aggressive forms of economism and instrumentality (e.g., performance management; testing and assessment). Eventually, however, both paradigms serve and legitimize the managerial functionalist regulation or domination agenda, rather than one of conflict, radical change, or emancipation.

Remarkably, Klikauer's (2015a, 2018) analysis comes to very similar conclusions with regard to the current state of CMS. Accordingly, CMS combines a variety of more or less critical positions, such as poststructuralism, social constructivism, and phenomenology, but, despite frequent claims to the contrary, its grounding in Critical Theory (the Frankfurt School of Freudo-Marxism) would be spurious or superficial at best (Alvesson and Willmott 1992). Going beyond empirical-analytical TMT, which is oriented towards maintaining or increasing organisational control and domination, he attests CMS merely a hermeneutic interest with regard to understanding subjectivity and power relationships in historical contexts, but no genuinely critical-emancipatory intent, aimed at promoting active resistance and ending domination. Such a critical-emancipatory interest in freedom and autonomy, he sees exclusively addressed in the radical streams of CMT and MMT. In contrast, CMS is portrayed as complicit in dominating workers by educating management on 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 (e.g., cost cutting, layoffs, performance requirements). This scathing assessment echoes the critique of Braverman (1974), the "founding father" of Marxist LPT, directed at the social scientists of the early human relations movement, who were branded as the "maintenance crew" of management or the "handmaidens" to capitalism (Gerard

2023). Similar arguments can be made for HMT and business ethics, both of which rarely problematize fundamental structural conflicts of interest in employment.

Indeed, aside from a different (subjectivist) conception of social science, 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 (2015a, 2015b) 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 practically 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. Not a coincidence is the correspondence of Klikauer's (2018) taxonomy with Burrell and Morgan's (1979) four paradigms. Specifically, CMT corresponds with the radical humanist, MMT with the radical structuralist, and TMT with the functionalist position, while CMS is "downgraded" to the interpretive paradigm concerned with understanding and description, subscribing to a regulation agenda, rather than one of conflict or radical change. The radically critical and genuinely emancipatory paradigms of CMT and MMT differ slightly, with the former being more concerned with psychological aspects of the revision of false consciousness, and the latter more focused on economic and material conditions of workers and instigating structural social change. Notably, these envisioned streams are not fully developed, let alone established in MOS. However, the paradigm of MMT implies a "resurrection" of LPT, while CMT reflects the unfulfilled promise of CMS as a paradigm in MOS based on Freudo-Marxist Critical Theory. Another chance for realizing such a genuinely critical project might be the emerging paradigm of CWOP, which is outlined next.

Table 7. Five Sub-Paradigms in Management Research

	Theoretical Basis	Knowledge-Creating Interest
Traditional Management Theory (TMT)	Mainstream functionalist, performance-oriented organization science	Empirical-technical interest in increasing organizational control, efficiency and effectiveness
Humanistic Management Theory (HMT)	Mainstream enriched with normative ethical and moral considerations	Empirical-technical interest in demonstrating instrumentality of worker wellbeing for organizations

Critical Management Studies (CMS)	Various more or less critical, postmodern, and alternative approaches	Hermeneutic interest in understanding meaning and subjectivity in historical contexts
Critical Management Theory (CMT)	Frankfurt School of Critical Theory	Critical-emancipatory interest in freedom and autonomy, supporting resistance and ending domination through revision of consciousness
Marxist Management Theory (MMT)	Labor Power and Labor Process Theory	Critical-emancipatory interest emphasizing economic and material conditions and structural change

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; Durepos, Shaffner, and Taylor 2021). The focus here is on the emerging movement of CWOP, based on the authors' background and involvement with associated professional initiatives and activities. The impact of CMS on the emergence of CWOP is documented, for instance, 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 point out problematic issues in social psychology applied to work and organizations, with regard to a biasing preference for positivist (quantitative) methods, an imbalanced focus on the individual, unreflected identification with the perspective of managers or owners, and lacking moral-ethical grounding; and Gerard (2016), who introduced the epistemology of the critical (radical structuralist) paradigm into industrial and organizational psychology. Foundational publications of CWOP further include the articles of 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 industrial/work and organizational psychology in Europe, the United States, and Germany. Providing momentum for the CWOP movement, a notable achievement has been to initiate debate within the European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology (EAWOP), regarding the pervasive and unchallenged influences of neoliberal ideology on contemporary workplace practices as well as on psychological theorizing and research on work and organizations (Bal and Dóci 2018). Specifically, neoliberal ideology is analyzed as a cascading system of political, social, and fantasmatic logics, systemically biasing societal institutions of work, organizational practices, and the mentalities of individuals as well as the scientific representation and evaluation of these domains. Conceptualized in terms of a dogmatic trinity of individualism, competition, and instrumentality, the political logic of neoliberalism manifest in social and fantasmatic logics associated with

quantitative assessment and selection, performance focus and monitoring, growth and progress, harmonious employment relationships, and social engineering (Bal and Dóci 2018). In a discipline historically plagued by suppressed (i.e., typically not problematized) double-binds between humanistic ideals of employee wellbeing and personality development and the normative power of economic imperatives demanding perpetual increases in performance and profits, calling out the socially, morally, and intellectually corrosive consequences of subservience to particular political-economic interests has struck a nerve.

The cathartic momentum of the critique of neoliberal ideology in work and organizational psychology was demonstrated not only in the galvanizing role the formulated criticism has played for a growing group of critically-oriented researchers, but also by the defensive and passive-aggressive responses of leading scholars in the field (Dóci and Bal 2018; Weber, Höge, and Hornung 2020). Research has since progressed, including conceptual and empirical applications of the critique of neoliberal ideology as a matrix of political, social, and fantasmatic logics of individualism, competition, and instrumentality. Among others, a countermodel of radical humanist ideas of individuation, solidarity, and emancipation has been suggested (Hornung, Höge, and Unterrainer 2021). 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 explicitly position 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 between these two paradigms. Attesting to the emergence of CWOP is a growing international network of scholars and their academic activities, such as journal special issues (Abrams et al. 2023), workshops, meetings, and conferences (Hornung, Unterrainer, and Höge 2022), explicitly dedicated to developing and establishing this new paradigm.

Summarized in Table 8 are different versions of the critique of mainstream work and organizational psychology underlying this alternative paradigm. Common denominators are the restricted positivist methodology, individualization of systemic issues, prioritization of a managerial interests, and instrumentalization of employees. Further aspects relate to the naturalization of competition and market mechanism, lacking moral-ethical foundation, and hegemonial aspirations, i.e., claiming exclusive validity of its theories, models, and methods (Hornung 2012). To some extent these criticisms reflect the considerations underlying CMS as the need for an alternative paradigm that transcends scientific positivism, is not geared towards increasing performance and profits, and does not naturalize managerial power and exploitative

structures. Moreover, displayed in Table 9 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). The latter include various streams of critical psychology and psychoanalysis (Parker 2009; Teo 2015; Tolman 2009), Marxist social critique and Critical Theory (Frankfurt School) as well as critical poststructuralist studies, in particular those focusing on neoliberal governmentality and subjectification (Fleming 2014; Munro 2012), but also feminism, postcolonial theory, and critical race studies as well as critical theories on sustainability, degrowth, and ecosocialism (Rose and Cachelin 2018). Interdisciplinary influences focusing on the work context have come, aside from sociology, mostly from CMS, as an important role-model for CWOP (Parker 2023; Islam and Sanderson 2022), but also from the broader field of organization studies and the mostly CMS-inspired stream of critical human resource management (Delbridge and Keenoy 2010). A more detailed account of the scientific ancestry of CWOP is provided by Weber (2023). As mentioned earlier, 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. After all, main proponents of EBM are scholars in occupational psychology and organizational behavior, where a spin-off of the evidence-discourse is highly influential (Briner, Denyer, and Rousseau 2009). Fractures in psychology, from this perspective, are connected to the "blowback" caused by EBM's assault on ideological and methodological pluralism in management research. The emergence of CWOP thus can be interpreted as the synthesis of the dialectic antagonism between CMS and EBM.

Table 8. Criticisms of Mainstream Work and Organizational Psychology

McDonald and Bubna-Litic (2012)	Bal and Dóci (2018)	Islam and Sanderson (2022)
Positivism		Scientism
Individualism	Individualism	Individualism
Managerialism	Instrumentality	Managerialism
Amorality	Competition	Neoliberalism
		Hegemony

Source: Own elaboration

Table 9. 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
Intra-disciplinary: Critical streams within the discipline of psychology	The Emerging Field of Critical Work and Organizational Psychology	Marxist Psychology, Psychoanalysis, Psychology of the Subject, Analytical Social and Radical Humanist Psychology, Indigenous Psychologies, Critical Social and Applied Psychology
Inter-disciplinary: Critical streams from other social science disciplines	Industrial, Organizational, and Work Sociology, Critical Management Studies Organization Studies, Critical Human Resource Management	Social Critique, (Neo-)Marxism, Critical Theory / Frankfurt School, Poststructuralism, Feminism, Post-Colonial Theory, Critical Race Theory, Critical Sustainability. Degrowth, Ecosocialism

Source: Own elaboration

Discussion: Dialectics between Fermenting and Fragmenting Forces

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 hardline critical theorists 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 pragmatically 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 2015a, 2015b, 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.

The mere existence of fragmenting forces does not mean that CMS will necessarily 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 (Röllmann et al. 2023). 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 (Parker 2023). Recognition, usefulness, relevance, and positive impact extract a high price of justifying and supporting an exploitative, destructive, and ideologically antagonistic system (Klikauer 2018). 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 can be seen as two sides of the same coin of exposing ideology and upending domination (Mumby 2019). This is a qualitatively different perspective than functionalist observation and regulation or deconstructionist interpretation and understanding. Pragmatic arguments for nuanced understandings of critical performativity as well as sporadic promising examples of alternative organizations notwithstanding, the emancipatory interest at the core of critical research should be non-negotiable (Gerard 2023). The performativity-debate in CMS can be interpreted as an attempt to "walk the line" between the paradigmatic positions of radical critique, fundamental opposition, and theoretical aspirations of macro-emancipation versus more subtle attempts at subversion, pragmatism, and micro-emancipatory interventions. If and how the underlying dialectic between principled paralysis and corrupting collaboration can be resolved, is still an open question that requires situational solutions.

Conclusion: What Next?

Meta-theorizing on scientific paradigms offers an insightful framework to chart the intellectual territory of the interdisciplinary and paradigmatically diverse field of MOS. This concerns shared, related, and linked versus indifferent, incompatible, and antagonistically opposed ontological, epistemological, and axiological assumptions, principles, and convictions concerning appropriate theories, methods, and values in management and organisational research. The deep-seated unconscious and ideological components of associated worldviews call for further applications of psychodynamic theorizing and dialectic analysis for future paradigmatic explorations of the MOS field as a domain of politically contested, but also potentially self-reflexive research. While each of the four analyzed debates warrant ongoing observation and attention, the most recent development of the emergence of a critical paradigm in the field of work and organizational psychology, inspired by the critical tradition in management studies, exhibits probably the most open and dynamic trajectory. The coming decades will show whether this emerging paradigm will become largely independent from and incommensurate with the normative functionalist psychological mainstream, dissolve and transform mainstream research from within, collapse and be (re-)integrated into the functionalist mainstream paradigm, or will fragment into a number of more or less marginalized critical sub-paradigms or research traditions precariously existing at the fringe of the mainstream. The first trajectory (incommensurability) would follow the developmental pathway of CMS, the second (dissolution) seems to be the pathway of the EBM movement, the third (integration) would mean outright

failure, and the fourth (fragmentation) would basically mean a return to the previous status quo. From the current vantage, all four trajectories as well as mixed or hybrid versions seem plausible. Although, according to the present analysis, there is a dialectic dynamic at work here, which scenario will eventually manifest, is not predetermined, but remains to be seen—and told.

Acknowledgment

References

Abrams, R., Bal, P. M., D'Cruz, P., Hornung, S., Islam, G., McDonald, M., Sanderson, Z., and Tonelli, M. J. 2023. "The Story of this Special Issue on Critical Perspectives in Work and Organizational Psychology." *Applied Psychology* 72 (1): 3-12.

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.

Alvesson, M., and Spicer, A. 2012. "Critical Leadership Studies: The Case for Critical Performativity." *Human Relations* 65 (3): 367-390.

Alvesson, M., and Spicer, A. 2016. "(Un) Conditional Surrender? Why do Professionals Willingly Comply with Managerialism." *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 29 (1): 29-45.

Alvesson, M., and Willmott, H. 1992. "On the Idea of Emancipation in Management and Organization Studies." *Academy of Management Review* 17 (3): 432-464.

Ardalan, K. 2019. "Ideology: A Multi-Paradigmatic Approach." *Journal of Interdisciplinary Economics* 31 (2): 124-142.

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.

Baker, C. R. 2011. "A Genealogical History of Positivist and Critical Accounting Research." *Accounting History* 16 (2): 207-221.

Boell, S. K., and Cecez-Kecmanovic, D. 2014. "A Hermeneutic Approach for Conducting Literature Reviews and Literature Searches." *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* 34 (1): Article 12.

Bonache, J., and Festing, M. 2020. "Research Paradigms in International Human Resource Management: An Epistemological Systematisation of the Field." *German Journal of Human Resource* Management 34 (2): 99-123.

Bratton, J., and Gold, J. 2015. "Towards Critical Human Resource Management Education (CHRME): A Sociological Imagination Approach." *Work, Employment and Society* 29 (3): 496-507.

Briner, R. B., Denyer, D., and Rousseau, D. M. 2009. "Evidence-based Management: Concept Cleanup Time?" *Academy of Management Perspectives* 23 (4): 19-32.

Butler, N., Delaney, H., and Spoelstra, S. 2018. "Risky Business: Reflections on Critical Performativity in Practice." *Organization* 25 (3): 428-445.

Cabantous, L., Gond, J. P., Harding, N., and Learmonth, M. 2016. "Critical Essay: Reconsidering Critical Performativity." *Human Relations* 69 (2): 197-213.

Contu, A. 2020. "Answering the Crisis with Intellectual Activism: Making a Difference as Business Schools Scholars." *Human Relations* 73 (5): 737-757.

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.

Dóci, E., and Bal, P. M. 2018. "Ideology in Work and Organizational Psychology: The Responsibility of the Researcher." *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 27 (5): 558-560.

Durepos, G., Shaffner, E. C., and Taylor, S. 2021. "Developing Critical Organizational History: Context, Practice and Implications." *Organization* 28 (3): 449-467.

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.

Esper, S. C., Cabantous, L., Barin-Cruz, L., and Gond, J. P. 2017. "Supporting Alternative Organizations? Exploring Scholars' Involvement in the Performativity of Worker-recuperated Enterprises." *Organization* 24 (5): 671-699.

Fleming, P. 2014. "When 'Life Itself' Goes to Work: Reviewing Shifts in Organizational Life Through the Lens of Biopower." *Human Relations* 67 (7): 875-901.

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).

Gerard, N. 2023. "Still Servants of Work? Exploring the Role of the Critic in Work and Organizational Psychology." *Applied Psychology* 72 (1): 13-25.

Gioia, D. A., and Pitre, E. 1990. "Multiparadigm Perspectives on Theory Building." *Academy of Management Review* 15 (4): 584-602.

Goles, T., and Hirschheim, R. 2000. "The Paradigm is Dead, the Paradigm is Dead… Long Live the Paradigm: The Legacy of Burrell and Morgan." *Omega* 28 (3): 249-268.

Gond, J. P., Cabantous, L., Harding, N., and Learmonth, M. 2016. "What Do We Mean by Performativity in Organizational and Management Theory? The Uses and Abuses of Performativity." *International Journal of Management Reviews* 18 (4): 440-463.

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.

Huault, I., Perret, V., and Spicer, A. 2014. "Beyond Macro-and Micro-Emancipation: Rethinking Emancipation in Organization Studies." *Organization* 21 (1): 22-49.

Holmes, D., Murray, S. J., Perron, A., and Rail, G. 2006. "Deconstructing the Evidence‐based Discourse in Health Sciences: Truth, Power and Fascism." *International Journal of Evidence‐Based Healthcare* 4 (3): 180-186.

Hornung, S. 2012. "Beyond New Scientific Management? Critical Reflections on the Epistemology of Evidence-based Management." In *The Oxford Handbook of Evidence-based Management*, edited by D. M. Rousseau, 389-403. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

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 4ᵗʰ EBOR Conference*, 1-20. Konya, Turkey: EBOR.

Hornung, S., Höge, T., and Unterrainer, C. 2021. „Ideologies at Work in Organizations: An Emerging Critical Perspective and Reflexive Research Agenda." In *Eurasian Business Perspectives. Proceedings of the 29th Eurasia Business and Economics Society Conference*, edited by M. H. Bilgin, H. Danis, E. Demir, and S. Vale, 165-182. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

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.

Hornung, S., Unterrainer, C., and Höge, T. 2023. "Conference Report: Highlights and Impressions from the First International Conference on Critical and Radical Humanist Work and Organizational Psychology." *Journal Psychologie des Alltagshandelns / Psychology of Everyday Activity* 16 (1): 13-20.

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.

King, D., and Land, C. 2018. "The Democratic Rejection of Democracy: Performative Failure and the Limits of Critical Performativity in an Organizational Change Project." *Human Relations* 71 (11): 1535-1557.

King, D., and Learmonth, M. 2015. "Can Critical Management Studies Ever be 'Practical'? A Case Study in Engaged Scholarship." *Human Relations* 68 (3): 353-375.

Klikauer, T. 2015a. "Critical Management Studies and Critical Theory: A Review." *Capital & Class* 39 (2): 197-220.

Klikauer, T. 2015b. "What is Managerialism?" *Critical Sociology* 41 (7-8): 103-1119.

Klikauer, T. 2018. "Critical Management as Critique of Management." *Critical Sociology* 44 (4-5): 753-762.

Kociatkiewicz, J., Kostera, M., and Parker, M. 2021. "The Possibility of Disalienated Work: Being at Home in Alternative Organizations." *Human Relations* 74 (7): 933-957.

Kornau, A., Frerichs, I. M., and Sieben, B. 2020. "An Empirical Analysis of Research Paradigms within International Human Resource Management: The Need for More Diversity." *German Journal of Human Resource Management* 34 (2): 148-177.

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.

Laszlo, C. 2019. "Strengthening Humanistic Management." *Humanistic Management Journal* 4 (1): 85-94.

Learmonth, M. 2008. "Evidence-based Management: A Backlash Against Pluralism in Organizational Studies?" *Organization* 15 (2): 283-291.

Learmonth, M., and Harding, N. 2006. "Evidence-based Management: The Very Idea." *Public Administration* 84 (2): 245-266.

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. 2008. "The Narrative of 'Evidence-based' Management: A Polemic." *Journal of Management Studies* 45 (3): 613-645.

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.

Munro, I. 2012. "The Management of Circulations: Biopolitical Variations after Foucault." *International Journal of Management Reviews* 14 (3): 345-362.

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.

Mumby, D. K., and Ashcraft, K. L. 2017. "Critical Approaches." In *The International Encyclopedia of Organizational Communication*, Vol. I, edited by C. R. Scott and L. Lewis, 1-23. Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Parker, I. 2009. "Critical Psychology and Revolutionary Marxism." Theory & Psychology 19 (1): 71-92.

Parker, M. 2023. "Hard Lessons: (Critical) Management Studies and (Critical) Work and Organizational Psychology." *Journal Psychologie des Alltagshandelns / Psychology of Everyday Activity* 16 (1): 54-59.

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.

Rose, J., and Cachelin, A. 2018. "Critical Sustainability: Incorporating Critical Theories into Contested Sustainabilities." *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences* 8: 518-525.

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.

Röllmann, L. F., Degen, J. L., Dóci, E., Bal, P. M., Hornung, S., Islam, G., Kühn, T., and Sanderson, Z. 2023. "Bricolage of Positions and Perspectives from the Panel Discussion on Prospects and Contestations of Critical and Radical Humanist Work and Organizational Psychology: Are We Ready to Take Over?" *Journal Psychologie des Alltagshandelns / Psychology of Everyday Activity* 16 (1): 61-70.

Reedy, P. C., and King, D. R. 2019. "Critical Performativity in the Field: Methodological Principles for Activist Ethnographers." *Organizational Research Methods* 22 (2): 564-589.

Rowlinson, M., and Hassard, J. 2011. "How Come the Critters came to be Teaching in Business Schools? Contradictions in the Institutionalization of Critical Management Studies." *Organization* 18 (5): 673-689.

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.

Strubenhoff, M. 2018. "The Positivism Dispute in German Sociology, 1954–1970." *History of European Ideas* 44 (2): 260-276.

Tadajewski, M. 2010. "Critical Marketing Studies: Logical Empiricism, 'Critical Performativity' and Marketing Practice." *Marketing Theory* 10 (2): 210-222.

Teo, T. 2015. "Critical Psychology: A Geography of Intellectual Engagement and Resistance." *American Psychologist* 70 (3): 243-254.

Thompson, P., and Smith, C. 2000. "Follow the Redbrick Road: Reflections on Pathways In and Out of the Labor Process Debate." *International Studies of Management & Organization* 30 (4): 40-67.

Tinker, T. 2002. "Spectres of Marx and Braverman in the Twilight of Postmodernist Labour Process Research." *Work, Employment and Society* 16 (2): 251-281.

Tolman, C. W. 2009. "Holzkamp's Critical Psychology as a Science from the Standpoint of the Human Subject." *Theory & Psychology* 19 (2): 149-160.

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. 2023. "Some Lineages and Resources of Critical and Radical Humanist Work and Organizational Psychology." *Journal Psychologie des Alltagshandelns / Psychology of Everyday Activity* 16 (1): 21-30.

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.

Wickert, C., and Schaefer, S. M. 2015. "Towards a Progressive Understanding of Performativity in Critical Management Studies." *Human Relations* 68 (1): 107-130.

Wrench, J., and Punyanunt-Carter, N. 2012. *An Introduction to Organizational Communication.* Online: 2012 Book Archive (https://2012books.lardbucket.org/).

Ylimaki, R. M., and Brunner, C. C. 2011. "Power and Collaboration-Consensus/Conflict in Curriculum Leadership: Status Quo or Change?" *American Educational Research Journal* 48 (6): 1258-1285.