



Perspectives

MAKING OUR WORK MATTER: FROM SPECTATOR TO ENGAGEMENT

Journal:	<i>Academy of Management Perspectives</i>
Manuscript ID	AMP-2020-0051.R1
Document Type:	Article
Research Methods:	Cross-sectional < Research Design, Systematic review < Qualitative Methods
Theoretical Perspectives:	Epistemology, Ethics, Philosophy of science
Disciplinary Domains:	Climate change < Business, Society and Ethics, Corporate social responsibility < Business, Society and Ethics, Crisis and issue management < Business, Society and Ethics, Sustainability < Organizational Development and Change, Societal impact < Business, Society and Ethics

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **MAKING OUR WORK MATTER: FROM SPECTATOR TO ENGAGEMENT**
4
5 **THROUGH A PUBLIC ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT STUDIES**
6
7

8
9
10 **ANN L CUNLIFFE**
11 *Fundação Getúlio Vargas-EAESP, Brazil*
12

13 **KATHRYN PAVLOVICH**
14 *University of Waikato Management School, New Zealand*
15
16

17
18
19
20 **ABSTRACT**
21
22

23 There are growing concerns about making our work matter in society and organizations,
24 narrowing the theory-practice gap by doing research that has impact. In this paper, we suggest
25 that there is more at stake than the issue of relating theory to practice, that we need to consider
26 how we generate knowledge and think about its relevance. We argue that at the heart of such an
27 endeavor lie critical ontological and epistemological considerations: first, the need to *rethink our*
28 *self-Other relationships* – the nature of the relationship between ourselves as scholars and
29 community members; and second, the need to generate more situated and relational forms of
30 knowing-from-within that address social and environmental issues. Drawing on the work of
31 critical sociologist Michael Burawoy, we elaborate four approaches to generating knowledge
32 within Organization and Management Studies, arguing that a *Public Organization and*
33 *Management Studies* offers one way of making our work matter, requiring us to move from being
34 spectators of the world to becoming actively engaged with multiple Others in generating
35 knowledge and action. We discuss both the challenges and opportunities of a Public OMS,
36 offering examples of how we can become more actively engaged.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **KEYWORDS:** Impact, self/other, socially-relevant knowing-from-within, public organization
4
5 and management studies, epistemological issues, active engagement
6
7
8
9

10
11 **Acknowledgement:** We would like to thank our Associate Editor, Margarethe Wiersema
12
13 and two anonymous reviews for their helpful comments on earlier versions of this article.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INTRODUCTION

The original passion for social justice, economic equality, human rights, sustainable environment, political freedom or simply a better world, that drew so many of us to sociology, is channeled into the pursuit of academic credentials (Burawoy, 2005a, p.5).

The debate about the relevance of Organization and Management Studies (OMS) is ongoing, often framed around a ‘gap’ between rigor and relevance, theory and practice, and academics and practitioners (e.g., Bartunek, 2020; Hodgkinson & Starkey, 2011; Kieser, Nicolai, & Seidl, 2015; Phillips et al, 2013; Starkey, Hatchuel & Tempest, 2009). Much of this debate stems around not only what knowledge is produced, but also *how* it is produced (Gibbons et al., 1994). Business schools in particular have come under criticism for their focus on scientific and managerialist approaches that separate business from society – reinforcing the view that the impact of our scholarship at a collective/societal level has been largely missing (Tourish, 2019).

There have been calls for business schools to address the grand challenges in society, which has become more acute given the pandemic (Beech & Anseel, 2020), and to adopt more problem-centered approaches to knowledge production through, for example: Mode 2 approaches (Gibbons et al., 1994; Starkey & Madan, 2001); design science (Hodgkinson & Starkey, 2011; 2012; van Aken & Romme, 2009); engaged scholarship (Van de Ven, 2007), insider/outsider research teams (Bartunek & Louis, 1996; Yeo & Dopson, 2018), and change laboratories (Sannino & Engeström, 2017). While these are laudable shifts, the focus of this research often remains functionalist, objectivist, and organizationally-oriented and rarely embodies a critical social conscience (Rubião-Resende & Zilberberg-Oviedo, 2020). Our purpose is not to rehash this debate, but to propose that we need to embrace a critical social conscience in our research, and to do so we need to return to

1
2
3 the fundamental ontological issue of rethinking our self-Other (academic-world) relationships. We
4 suggest this requires a shift in our research practice, one that eliminates and interweaves
5 boundaries between theory-practice, academic-practitioner, rigor-relevance, neutrality-bias,
6 generalizability-contextualization, etc., in an intersubjective space where they emerge and shift in
7 a dialectic interplay between ourselves, others and our surroundings (Cunliffe, 2011).
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 As Burawoy (2005a) states in the epigraph quote above, we need to return to addressing
16 the fundamental question of how we may engage with multiple communities to address social and
17 environmental problems. Bapuji et al. (2020) claim that in times of troubles, organizations have
18 traditionally *responded*; now they need to step up, redesign and help lead the reshaping of society.
19 Such approaches are emerging in top academic journals, possibly as a consequence of deepening
20 concerns regarding the grand societal challenges. This has resulted in a sudden rise in more
21 collective forms of knowledge production and action that extend beyond the firm's boundaries to
22 positively impact society. For example, the *Academy of Management Discoveries* hosted a special
23 issue on the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, examining the shared blueprint that
24 focuses on planetary peace and prosperity (e.g., Williams, Whiteman & Parker, 2019). The
25 *Academy of Management Perspectives* compiled a special issue on collective entrepreneurship for
26 social impact (Markman et al., 2019). In this issue, Doh, Tashman and Benischke (2019) argued
27 the need for collective environmental entrepreneurship (CEE) where different knowledge from
28 business, government and NGOs work as partners to leverage and combine their competencies in
29 addressing grand environmental challenges. In the *Journal of Management Studies*, King and
30 Carberry (2020) explore the impacts of social movements, societal crisis and organizational theory.
31 These are just a few examples of organizational research that now places society at the center of
32 organizational inquiry, suggesting the emergence of a 'new science' that includes acting *in the*
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 world through engaging with Others (Nicolescu, 2008). The purpose of this expository paper, then,
4
5 is to address how Organization and Management Studies (OMS) research might begin to engage
6
7 with the world's social, economic and human inequalities, and environmental problems by
8
9 embracing multiple forms of knowledge creation. To do so, we extend sociologist Michael
10
11 Burawoy's (2005a) four types of knowledge – professional, critical, policy, and public - to our
12
13 OMSⁱ context.
14
15

16
17 Our contribution therefore lies in exploring how a *Public Organization and Management*
18
19 *Studies*, situated within an intersubjective ontology, can bring a critical social conscience to our
20
21 research, one that has possibilities for transformative outcomes. Public Organization and
22
23 Management Studies (Public OMS) critiques the notion that we are 'in here' and everything else
24
25 is 'out there', acknowledging that we exist in entangled, interdependent and indeterminate webs
26
27 of relationships (Pavlovich, 2020). This calls upon us to think and act in more reflexive ways by
28
29 questioning our role in society, the nature of 'good' knowledge, and how we should engage with
30
31 'Others' in addressing publicly-relevant issues – in other words, a fundamental re-thinking of the
32
33 nature of our place as academics in the world. We begin this conversation by discussing the
34
35 epistemological considerations through an examination of our current OMS perspectives
36
37 (Professional, Critical and Policy), before elaborating the need for a fourth form, Public
38
39 Organization and Management Studies. We address challenges and opportunities, before offering
40
41 illustrations of how a Public OMS can help us become more engaged.
42
43
44
45
46

47 **Epistemological considerations: How can OMS create knowledge that is socially useful?**

48
49

50 As OMS scholars, we study human behavior, economic performance, social organization,
51
52 and forms of corporate governance, topics that lend themselves to influencing practice. We have
53
54 the knowledge and expertise to make our work matter by creating social (as well as economic)
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 value; facilitating the design and management of socially-responsible organizations; participating
4
5 in the creation of sustainable environments and community well-being; and influencing human
6
7 rights and social justice. Despite this, until recently, we have still been (ironically for an applied
8
9 social sciences discipline) a minor player in the arena of global responsibility. If we are to make
10
11 our work matter, we need to blur the self-Other boundary and “transform social science to an
12
13 activity done in public, for the public, sometimes to clarify, sometimes to intervene, sometimes to
14
15 generate new perspectives, and always to serve as eyes and ears in ongoing efforts at understanding
16
17 the present and deliberating about the future” (Flyvbjerg, 2001, p.166). What, then, might we do?
18
19
20
21

22 In addressing the issue of whether OMS should engage with society’s grand challenges,
23
24 we ask two initial reflexive questions (to paraphrase Burawoy, 2005a, 2007):
25
26

- 27 1. Organization and management studies for whom? *Ourselves* as academics (knowledge for
28
29 knowledge’s sake) and/or *others* (knowledge for a purpose)? This question is underscored
30
31 by the nature of the self-Other relationship, and in particular our role as spectators or
32
33 engaged participants.
34
35
- 36 2. Organization and management studies for what? For *means* (e.g., techniques, principles
37
38 and models of effectiveness and efficiency) and/or *ends* (the impact of business and
39
40 business schools on society at large)?
41
42
43
44

45 These questions are important because if we buy into the idea that OMS is concerned with both
46
47 means and ends, business and society, then we need to consider how we can engage the
48
49 transformative potential of knowledge generation.
50
51

52 Engaging with Others therefore begins at home with a reflexive self-examination of the
53
54 differences and complexities within our profession. OMS is multifaceted: an interweaving of
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 various functional disciplines and forms of knowledge, each with its own logic and role to play in
4 terms of legitimizing, relevancing and destabilizing the discipline. These logics result in multiple
5 ideological tensions, which influence the perceived legitimacy of particular types of knowledge
6 and research, and appropriate the meaning of ‘relevance’ and ‘impact’.
7
8
9
10
11

12
13 In Table 1 (below), we translate and extend Burawoy’s (2005a) three types of sociology to
14 OMS. Each form is ideological, based around deep commitments to a particular perspective
15 (Deetz, 1996), which holds an implicit and/or explicit moral stance and assumptions about
16 preferred means and ends. Perspectives are reinforced because academics are often trained in a
17 specific tradition, have individual expertise in a specialized field, and work within institutional
18 cultures and knowledge communities that support a particular form of knowledge. Each knowledge
19 community endeavors to establish and retain legitimacy by developing an internal logic or ‘system
20 of intelligibility’ – a coherent form of knowledge – around the established norms and standards of
21 that community. We highlight these commitments by identifying the ontology, self-Other
22 relationship and the implicit or explicit moral stance that generally underpins each form, followed
23 by its purpose, associated epistemology and way of theorizing, and finally what is seen to be
24 relevant within each form.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 INSERT TABLE 1 HERE
42

43 *Professional OMS*

44
45
46 *Professional OMS*, mainly based on an often axiomatic objectivist ontology of a real reality
47 out there (Cunliffe, 2011), embraces the logic of science and positivism to formulate models,
48 theories and frameworks to explain the empirical world. The self-Other relationship is bounded:
49 expert academics who endeavor to separate themselves from the Others as spectators because of
50 concerns that involvement could lead to bias. The epistemological strategy of Professional OMS
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 is functionalist and performative, generating knowledge that will improve managerial and
4 organizational efficiency and effectiveness – through the possession and application of knowledge
5 and expertise based on ‘scientific’ theories and ‘facts’. Good knowledge is therefore judged by the
6 scientific constructs of validity, reliability and generalizability that focus on research protocols and
7 technique (Burawoy, 2005a). An underlying purpose of Professional OMS is to legitimize the
8 discipline by creating specialist expertise knowledge, predictive theories and models that help
9 systematize organizations and management.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19
20 Theorizing is often ‘top down’ and deductive with the aim of advancing and building theory
21 (Suddaby, Hardy & Huy, 2011). Fisher and Aguinis (2017) define theory elaboration as a process
22 in which pre-existing concepts or models are used to explain empirical observations, which
23 “requires specifying constructs, relations, and processes at the conceptual level and assessing the
24 fit of those relations empirically” (p.441). Similarly, Corley and Gioia (2011) argue that a
25 significant theoretical contribution can be located along two dimensions – *originality* (further split
26 into revelatory and incremental) and *utility* (scientifically and practically useful). Scientific utility
27 improves conceptual rigor, while practical utility (based on a knowledge transfer model) relates to
28 developing theory that “can be directly applied to the problems practicing managers and other
29 organizational practitioners face” (p.18). This approach is typical of Professional OMS because it
30 is based upon developing theory that has an impact *on* practice rather than impact *in* practice. In
31 other words – to return to the two reflexive questions on page 6 – Professional OMS is responsible
32 for developing knowledge to improve organizational design, technology, product development,
33 strategy, marketing, etc., and is often based on a spectator role with the academic as a detached
34 and neutral observer of society.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 *Critical OMS*
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Critical OMS utilizes an objectivist and sometimes a subjectivist (socially-constructed and individually experienced) discursive ontology, to destabilize the discipline and its normative interests by engaging with the aim of emancipation from what is viewed as the ideologically-informed theory and practice of Professional OMS. By employing the logic of anti-performativity through reflexive critique, Critical OMS aims to radicalize mainstream theories by examining “how prevailing structures of domination produce a systemic corrosion of moral responsibility when any concern for people or for the environment requires justification in terms of its contribution to profitable growth” (Adler, Forbes & Wilmott, 2007, p.121). As such, it is the reflexive conscience (Burawoy, 2004) of Professional OMS, challenging its foundations and values by questioning the ideologically-infused nature of knowledge and practice: interrogating and destabilizing fixed representations, sedimented meanings, and oppressive practices. Because Critical OMS is mainly anti-normative, concerned with critiquing the politicized relationships, regimes and discourses of domination in organizations and society, the moral stance of Critical OMS is often relativism – that no one moral position should be privileged because that replaces one system of domination with another. While some Critical OMS scholars are concerned with emancipation from these unequal power relations, they still tend to view the self-Other relationship from a spectator, detached intellectual stance, studying and advocating change for others without necessarily considering their own role (self) in the process. It remains a world ‘out there’. And paradoxically, while developing their own critical theories, critical scholars can be anti-theory in the sense of challenging the fixed and causal nature of mainstream theories.

The issue of relevance in Critical OMS is a contested one, with two main conflicting positions (Fournier & Grey, 2000). The first – anti-performativity – implicitly challenges the very notion of relevance and any forms of intervention by seeking to disengage from practice, preferring

1
2
3 to undermine and overthrow mainstream OMS and management practice through intellectual or
4 canonical critique (Hartman, 2014). Impact as an end result is questionable, unless it is about
5 provoking others to think differently and more critically. The second position is one of critical
6 performativity, which is about moving beyond agonistic criticism to promoting social change
7 (Edwards, 2017) and to eliminate oppressive practices through *transformative redefinition* or a
8 progressive performativity (Wickert & Schaefer, 2015). Thus, one can be a Critical OMS scholar
9 and educator *and* engage with practice by encouraging managers and students to reflexively
10 question relationships of power and control, engage in ‘critical’ action, and develop more
11 responsible and equitable organizations and managers. This critically-reflexive engagement with
12 managers or as managers (King & Learmonth, 2015) can help address the moral ambiguities and
13 contradictions within our own and their work. Hartman (2014) adds a third possibility, subversive
14 functionalism, in which relevance could be framed as a critique used to complement and enlighten
15 mainstream theories and practice and offer alternative forms of organizing and managing.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 To summarize, much of Critical OMS seeks to question mainstream forms of knowledge
34 and organizing from a spectator perspective by focusing on a critique of the Other – of managers,
35 business and society, i.e., knowledge for ourselves and questioning means and ends. However, a
36 small minority of critical management scholars do reflexively examine self-Other relationships
37 between themselves, the Academy, business and society (e.g., Prasad, 2015) and engage in
38 intellectual or academic activism by addressing social justice issues (e.g., Contu, 2018). Reedy
39 and King (2019) for example, engage in critical performativity through the practice of activist
40 ethnography, participating in and researching alternative organizations who are working for
41 change.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 *Policy OMS*
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The goal of Policy OMS is to solve problems or conduct research for specific clients such
4 as business organizations or government, or find solutions to specific problems identified by
5 funding bodies. Its internal logic is often based on pragmatic forms of ‘useful’ and expert
6 knowledge, disseminated through an objective transactional exchange and knowledge transfer
7 where the academic tends to be the expert researcher. Thus, Policy OMS generates knowledge for
8 a purpose (the client’s) and potentially for both means and ends. In this sense, it is associated with
9 relevancing the discipline because it is about developing or applying models, principles,
10 techniques and processes associated with Professional OMS, to inform, question, evaluate, or
11 facilitate practice, e.g., business problems, technology transfer, global challenges, or policy issues.
12 Policy OMS can be influenced by funding needs for research, a drive for innovation, or
13 organizational, regional, or national development initiatives (Sá, Dias, & Sá, 2018). The moral
14 stance is one of pragmatism or instrumentalism because value is determined by the requirements
15 of the situation at hand and the practical social or organizational consequences (Dewey,
16 1908/1996), i.e., knowledge and theory are justified by application to practice in particular
17 circumstances that have predetermined ends.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 The self-Other relationship can often be seen in terms of academics (self) as expert
39 consultants and advisers to organizations and policy makers (Others), but in which the needs of
40 the Other play a major role. While acknowledging the risk involved in the current academic
41 climate, Prahalad (2011) commented that he made a decision early in his career that his research
42 would “always start(s) with the preoccupation of managers” (p.139) – a strategy consistent with
43 Policy OMS. There are examples of institutional support for this form of knowledge, the Stanford
44 Center on Poverty and Inequalityⁱⁱ supports research, disseminates information and aims to train
45 policy makers and politicians. The Center for Strategic Communication at Arizona State
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Universityⁱⁱⁱ draws on faculty from various disciplines to research and offer guidance to policy
4 makers and spokespersons on various topics, for example, narratives used by Islamist extremists'
5 to influence contested populations. National initiatives in Europe seek to encourage Policy OMS
6 through an impact and engagement agenda, which includes the UK Research Excellence
7 Framework's impact case studies, and the Economic and Social Research Council's (ESRC)
8 priority in terms of funding research "mobilising social science evidence to address significant
9 social and economic challenges" including: mental health, housing, productivity, the
10 macroeconomy, climate change, and trust and global governance in a turbulent age^{iv}. Yet funded
11 Policy OMS (and Professional OMS) research is often based on academic standards relating to big
12 survey data oriented around instrumental goals and thin description. Further, business and
13 management is often less forthcoming than other disciplines (e.g., education, sociology, health)
14 and interdisciplinary fields in promoting such work.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Finally, Policy OMS comprises consulting activities by both academics and management
32 consultants, sometimes in partnership, who apply theory and generate knowledge of practical use,
33 often through organizational development activities or action research. Consultants and academic
34 entrepreneurs are not just concerned with business efficiency and policy advice, but also corporate
35 social responsibility and markets for virtue. In their study of CSR consultants in Québec, Brès and
36 Gond (2014) found consultants were translators not only in terms of applying knowledge to
37 practice, but also in spreading responsible practices across organizations, acting as intermediaries
38 between social movements and business, and enacting and influencing CSR regulations and
39 standards.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Each form of OMS operates independently with its own purpose, values, legitimating
53 strategy, and way of determining and evaluating relevance. But they also, to a degree, work
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 interdependently as Policy OMS draws on and applies knowledge and expertise generated by
4 Professional OMS, and Critical OMS can be the conscience of each by asking what might be taken
5 for granted or unspoken in policies, practices and social and moral values. Each also has its own
6 pathology (Burawoy, 2004). Professional OMS can be overly focused on method and is in danger
7 of being irrelevant because of spectatorship or “a certain excess of distance” from the world
8 (Faubion, 2009, p.149). While reflexivity is seen as a cornerstone of Critical OMS, it is often
9 translated as an abstract philosophical and inward-looking methodological reflexivity examining
10 the assumptions underpinning the nature of knowledge and research, rather than a reflexivity
11 embedded in practice. It can be seen to be dogmatic, esoteric and portentous (e.g., Rowlinson &
12 Hassard, 2011) with no clear outcomes. Policy OMS can become “a servant of power” of
13 government and funding bodies (Burawoy, 2004, p.1611) and produce knowledge that is too
14 narrowly and instrumentally focused, resulting in criticisms of a lack of rigor. To summarize,
15 Professional and Critical OMS can become too self-referential, while Policy OMS can limit the
16 range of knowledge produced and each can impede alternative ways of theorizing. As Tsui (2013,
17 p.167) notes:

18
19 “These criticisms suggest a lack of concern by management scholars for the relevance of
20 our work for the larger society and may even imply that academia has been no better than
21 Wall Street in terms of caring for the world beyond our own interests.”

22
23 In our endeavor to make our work matter, we draw on the work of Burawoy to propose the need
24 to consider a fourth form that is relatively unknown in Organization and Management Studies
25 compared to the other three – a *Public Organization and Management Studies*.

26
27 Within the literature, current solutions to narrowing the gap between theory and practice
28 include: developing theories that help managers better solve problems, using more appropriate

1
2
3 theoretical frameworks in our research, creating better (more predictive) models, and educating
4 managers more effectively (e.g., Aguinis et al, 2020; Corley & Gioia, 2011). These focus on
5
6 “closing the research-practice gap in [...] ways practitioners can better know what the science says
7
8 and engage more readily in its application” (Hodgkinson & Rousseau, 2009, p.542). But as Van
9
10 de Ven and Johnson (2006) note, these solutions focus on increasing relevance by improving
11
12 *knowledge transfer*, i.e., making academic theory relevant to practice and communicating that
13
14 theory more effectively, rather than stepping back and addressing the gap in terms of *knowledge*
15
16 *production* as a collective achievement. There have been moves to view knowledge as such, for
17
18 example: engaged scholarship (Van de Ven, 2007), insider/outsider research teams (Bartunek &
19
20 Louis, 1996; Yeo & Dopson, 2018), co-generated and transformative research (Marcos & Denyer,
21
22 2012; Scaratti et al, 2017), Mode 2 research (Gibbons et al., 1994; Starkey & Madan, 2001) and
23
24 trading zones (Romme et al, 2015; Sealy et al., 2017). We suggest these forms of research are
25
26 implicitly or explicitly based on narrowing the self-Other gap to varying degrees, and while they
27
28 have been significant in stimulating thinking around relevance and impact of such research, they
29
30 have not bridged academia and practice as much as hoped (Bartunek, 2011). Indeed, as Bartunek
31
32 (2020) notes more recently in her assessment of the impact on practice of key theories such as
33
34 Porter’s Five Forces Model, that “what was theorized about fit the times and addressed issues of
35
36 concern” (p.25), and often through consulting activities (Policy OMS).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 It is our intention to build on this work by suggesting that there is more at stake than the
46
47 issue of relating theory to practice, it is also important to reflect on how we generate knowledge
48
49 and the nature of our relationship with others and the world around us. We argue that at the heart
50
51 of such an endeavor lie critical ontological considerations: the need to *rethink our self-Other*
52
53 *(academic-practitioner/community/society) relationships*, because understanding the various ways
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in which this relationship is understood impacts how it is enacted and the type of knowledge
4
5 generated.
6
7

8
9 **MAKING OUR WORK MATTER THROUGH A PUBLIC ORGANIZATION AND**
10
11 **MANAGEMENT STUDIES**
12
13

14
15 The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world, in various ways; the point is to
16
17 *change* it. (Marx, 1845–1846, in Harkavy, 2006, p.7)
18
19

20
21 We now argue that there is a fourth form of OMS – *A Public OMS* – that offers a way of
22
23 making our work matter by blurring the boundaries between self-Other. Knowledge generation
24
25 through an intersubjective ontology requires an engagement of our sociological imagination
26
27 (Mills, 1959) which eschews abstracted empiricism in favor of addressing the “problems of
28
29 history, the problems of biography, and the problems of social structure in which biography and
30
31 history intersect” (p.225). We begin by defining Public OMS (see Table 2) before going on to
32
33 examine its implications.
34
35

36
37 INSERT TABLE 2 HERE
38

39
40 Burawoy (2005a,b) and others (Nichols, 2007) have been vocal in calling for a Public Sociology
41
42 to complement traditional sociology by drawing attention to the need for public debate on the
43
44 nature of society: the values, problems and challenges experienced by people across the world. We
45
46 argue that a Public OMS differs from the other three types because its ‘deep commitments’ (Deetz,
47
48 op cit) lie in an intersubjective ontology, which means acknowledging that we are always in
49
50 relation with Others: other people, communities, history, language, culture, our environment
51
52 through a “reciprocal insertion and intertwining” (Merleau-Ponty, 1964, p.138). Intersubjectivity
53
54 requires thinking about our self-Other relationships in radically-reflexive ways (Pollner, 1991),
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ways in which we see ourselves as embedded within – and constituting – our social and material
4 world as we talk, interact, and act *with others*. As such, we shape our understanding of reality “out
5 of many possible realities we potentially can create” (Dieleman, 2017, p.172). This way of
6 understanding means that we are not detached academics but engaged participants with others in
7 generating knowledge. Indeed, Burawoy (2004) argues that Public Sociology involves reciprocal
8 engagement, academics working with multiple communities and counter-communities^v (e.g., local
9 neighborhood organizations, activist groups) in unmediated dialogue to discuss the nature of
10 society and the kind of world we want to live in. Thus, while a Public OMS and Mode 2 applied
11 research are both problem-driven and participative, we argue the former goes beyond Mode 2
12 which is often based on academic forms of knowledge and a differentiation between theoretical
13 and practical outputs (Guerci, Radaelli & Shani, 2019). Reciprocal engagement in Public OMS
14 means drawing on an intersubjective ontology to collaboratively develop new
15 methodologies/theories/knowledge in generating solutions to public issues. In doing so, we shift
16 from academically-oriented knowledge to a knowing-from-within (Shotter, 1996) – a pre-
17 conceptual and sometimes deeply embedded contextual understanding that is often implicit.
18 Knowing-from-within occurs at the intersection of experience, tacit understanding, and explicit
19 knowledge and may be surfaced and articulated through reflexive dialogue that draws upon a
20 critical social conscience. Public OMS therefore recognizes the need to address not just the bottom
21 line and economy, but also issues of poverty, social justice, community and environmental
22 wellbeing.

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 While this is a hotly debated topic in sociology, with critics as well as supporters, we
50 suggest a Public OMS merits attention because of current academic interest in relevance and
51 impact, the influence of business and now the global pandemic which is impacting vulnerable
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 communities and magnifying inequalities. For example, Lumpkin and Bacq (2019) illustrate the
4 need for civic wealth creation through the engaged participation and collaboration of groups of
5 diverse stakeholders who voluntarily and specifically create activities for positive social change.
6
7 By embracing an intersubjective ontology, knowing-from-within, and a critical social conscience,
8 a Public OMS foregrounds emergent and plural forms of knowledge and knowing and an ethical
9 intention to live well “with and for others” by building ‘just’ organizations and societies (Ricoeur,
10 1992, p.172). Thus, the moral stance of Public OMS is a communitarian one – based on the belief
11 that we are diverse social selves working and living in organizations and communities and
12 therefore dialogue around what constitutes the public good needs to recognize a plurality of views.
13
14 Research agendas are created between academics and research participants, knowing is generated
15 collaboratively and in dialogue with ‘others’ interested in addressing and solving everyday
16 experienced problems.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Because Public OMS embeds the discipline in everyday life, in community and
32 organizational issues (e.g., human rights, injustice) and social and environmental problems (e.g.,
33 sustainability), academics become actors in civil society (Burawoy, 2004), not as detached
34 spectators but collaborators engaged in deliberative dialogue. Theorizing within this form of OMS
35 is not the Professional OMS abstracted approach, where issues such as inequality and poverty are
36 objectified, categorized, modeled and conceptualized, but takes the form of ‘engaged judgment’
37 (phronesis) with the lived experience and embodied agency (ability to act in circumstances) of
38 people (Shotter & Tsoukas, 2014). Generated inductively or abductively, knowing-from-within is
39 developed through collaborative dialogue in which ‘theory’ may take the form of action guiding
40 anticipatory understandings (Shotter, 2008) that shape participants understanding of what is going
41 on around them, offer insights, resonances and ways of moving on or guides for action.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Consequently, relevance is defined in terms of impact on social problems and ‘findings’ are
4 presented in ways that are accessible and meaningful to diverse audiences.
5
6
7

8 Public OMS therefore differs from the other three forms because it is based on a
9 democratization of knowledge and an intersubjective blurring of self-Other in which knowledge
10 and expertise is not just the purview of academics but also the many actors within civil society. It
11 recognizes that knowledge/knowing is embedded in social and local contexts and sensitive to a
12 heterogeneous audience. Consequently, this opens up possibilities that knowledge is also
13 transgressive (Nowotny, 2003), contestable across the various forms and open to different
14 interpretations and modes of construction by different ‘knowledgeable’ participants (academics
15 and practitioners). As such, Public OMS can be the conscience of Policy OMS (Burawoy, 2004).
16 Academic expertise becomes one form amongst many, and academics become accountable to a
17 wider audience in terms of the process of knowledge creation and the impact of their work.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **EPISTEMOLOGICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

32
33
34 Burawoy (2017) argues that the university, and its associated business school, is a
35 battleground “of competing real utopias, harboring alternative visions of its future, visions that are
36 rooted in real tendencies” (p.141). These utopias influence and legitimize particular forms of
37 knowledge that are reflected in Professional, Critical and Policy OMS: the cloistered university
38 educating the mind, the critical university questioning society, the marketized university
39 commodifying knowledge. The fourth tendency, he argues, is rooted in civil society and becomes
40 the foundation of a Public OMS, where the real utopia of the university involves a deliberative
41 democracy that embraces more pluralist forms of knowledge and research – forms that are
42 outwardly focused (not self-referential), emergent, situational, dialogic, and engaged. We now go
43 on to explore the question we began with: *How might OMS begin to address and make an impact*
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *on social, economic and human inequalities, and environmental problems in the world today?* by
4
5 examining the epistemological and methodological considerations of a Public OMS through two
6
7 research streams.
8
9

10 *The Nature of Knowledge and Knowledge Generation*

13 Public OMS means moving beyond an either/or (self-other, theory-practice) dichotomy to
14
15 explore how *we* may create, intersubjectively, socially robust knowing-from-within in a rigorous
16
17 and practical sense, in which both *means* and *ends* are considered. Nowotny (2003) defines socially
18
19 robust knowledge as “a relational term... [which] describes a process not a product” (p.155). The
20
21 process – dialogue between academics and community members about social issues and where
22
23 differing agendas are debated and explored – is as important as the outcome because it involves
24
25 bringing together pluralistic and more socially distributed forms of knowledge/knowing and
26
27 expertise in the pursuit of change. We suggest this connects strongly to Mills (1959) notion of the
28
29 sociological imagination in that it embodies the intellectual, moral and political tasks of social
30
31 science and shifts research sites to the intersection of personal troubles and public issues as
32
33 academics, community members, government and business can come together to resolve social
34
35 issues through deliberative debate. Public OMS differs from the other forms by calling upon us to
36
37 go beyond academic definitions of knowledge and theory to knowing-from-within (Shotter, 2008),
38
39 a pre-conceptual practical moral form of knowing in which we are morally obliged to treat people
40
41 as participants in meaning-making. Drawing on an intersubjective ontology, Public OMS research
42
43 is inherently relational, where knowing, action and change are created between people – not by
44
45 negotiating across self/academic/theory and Other/practical/action interests, but by working
46
47 together to create new ways of seeing, doing and knowing. Theories, fixed roles, techniques and
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 exchange relationships are put aside in order to focus on change related to the moral obligations
4
5 of the context, i.e., a critical social conscience.
6
7

8 The Public Science Project (PSP) at The Graduate Center of the City University of New
9
10 York, offers an example of deliberative democracy and critical social conscience, where a coalition
11
12 of activists, researchers, youth, elders, lawyers, prisoners, and educators work on projects relating
13
14 to “educational injustice, lives under surveillance, and the collateral damage of mass
15
16 incarceration”^{vi}. PSP projects are situated in schools and/or community-based organizations
17
18 struggling for quality education, economic opportunities, and human rights and are thus based on
19
20 the premise of having an impact in and on these issues. Deliberative democracy also equates with
21
22 Flyvbjerg’s (2001) notion of phronetic (as opposed to scientific) knowledge, which aims to
23
24 contribute to “society’s practical rationality in elucidating where we are, where we want to go, and
25
26 what is desirable according to diverse sets of values and interests” (p.167).
27
28
29
30

31 Because making our work matter is about having an impact by thinking more broadly
32
33 about the relationship between organizations, communities, society and the environment in a
34
35 critical and inclusive way, how we generate knowledge within a Public OMS requires us to blur
36
37 boundaries between disciplines, and between disciplines and community members. As early as
38
39 1985, theoretical physicist Nicolescu urged us to move beyond interdisciplinarity (which mainly
40
41 involves the transfer of methods across disciplines) to transdisciplinarity, which “*is at once*
42
43 *between the disciplines, across the different disciplines, and beyond all disciplines*” (2008, p.2,
44
45 italics in original). At the heart of transdisciplinarity lies a concern for a socially responsible
46
47 science that facilitates problem solving and social change by acting *in* the world and engaging with
48
49 Others to invent ‘new science’^{vii}. This means developing new methodologies collaboratively to
50
51 integrate knowledge and to act in the world by working at “the intersection of [our] respective
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 fields” (Gray, 2008). Given young climate activist Greta Thunberg’s rebuke of world leaders at
4
5 the UN for continuing to talk about ‘fairytales of eternal economic growth’ while ‘entire
6
7 ecosystems are collapsing’^{viii}, business schools need to catch up in terms of adopting
8
9 transdisciplinary approaches to research. Research in Professional, Policy and Critical OMS is
10
11 mainly disciplinary-based, sometimes interdisciplinary, but rarely transdisciplinary, because as
12
13 Parker (2018) notes, even interdisciplinarity is a problem because of the way universities are
14
15 organized, and evaluate and train faculty.
16
17
18

19
20 *Public OMS Research: From Spectatorship to Engagement*

21
22 “All human beings are [...] researchers, since all human beings make decisions that require
23
24 them to make systematic forays beyond their current knowledge horizons”

25
26
27 (Appadurai, 2006, p.167).
28

29
30 Public OMS epistemology is participative, relational, dialogical and reflexive, in which the
31
32 researcher moves from spectatorship to engagement. As socio-cultural anthropologist Appadurai
33
34 notes above, we are all researchers. He offers an example of his own involvement and intervention
35
36 in a project in Mumbai, India, in a small organization of early career researchers (sociologists,
37
38 architects, journalists, teachers, business people, etc.) *Partners for Urban Knowledge Action and*
39
40 *Research*. Together they created rigorous and socially robust knowledge by documenting,
41
42 analyzing and communicating social issues. Documenting involved writing, photographing and
43
44 filming one’s personal experience of living in the city, as a means of gathering data about issues
45
46 such as housing, sanitation, and safety – an initiative that captures the essence of Mill’s
47
48 sociological imagination by connecting intimate personal experiences with broader public issues.
49
50 This project also exemplifies community involvement and impact by drawing on an intersubjective
51
52 and relational way of generating knowing-from-within around social problems. Public OMS
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 therefore encompasses historical and situated perspectives, including “wider communities of
4 discourse, from policy makers to subaltern counter-publics” in ways that promote public reflection
5 and inquiry (Burawoy & Van Antwerpen, 2001, p.2).
6
7
8
9

10 Within OMS, one example of intersubjective relational engagement is Burns et al’s (2014)
11 participatory organizational research study of the treatment and mistreatment of older people in
12 UK care homes, where groups of residents, their relatives, and researchers collaboratively defined
13 the research problem and the research design and worked together in data collection and analysis.
14 The dialogic and reflexive relationship between academics and community members is also
15 illustrated in Cunliffe and Scaratti’s (2017) account of a research project in an Italian nonprofit
16 therapeutic community experiencing problems with displaced Romany people to whom they had
17 offered shelter. Rather than going into the community to study the dynamics of conflict
18 (Professional OMS) or to offer a solution (Policy OMS), the researcher aimed to help community
19 stakeholders solve the problem relationally through reflexive dialogue (Public OMS). The
20 methodology was “situated, collaborative, interpretive and fluid – requiring an ethical
21 responsiveness on the part of the researcher in seeking multiple, embodied and agentic accounts
22 of all involved” (Cunliffe & Scaratti, 2017, p.41). Findings were disseminated through jointly
23 organized public events, at academic and practitioner conferences, and through a peer reviewed
24 journal (Scaratti, 2014).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 As these examples indicate, the intention of Public OMS research with a critical social
46 conscience is to generate a knowing-from-within by participants reflexively surfacing, articulating
47 and questioning taken-for-granted assumptions and practices. Outcomes are therefore not
48 necessarily theorized articles about practice, as in Critical and Professional OMS, but shareable
49 learning, methods (ways of addressing problems collaboratively), provocations to public reflection
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and reflexivity around resolving specific social and environmental issues, and creating action
4 strategies. Public OMS therefore focuses on both means (socially robust forms of knowing-from-
5 within) and ends (action), and foregrounds alternative forms of knowing.
6
7
8
9

10 The argument against Public OMS is that it will somehow erode expert scientific
11 knowledge, distort ‘objectivity’, and result in the discipline becoming politicized and moralized.
12
13 Turner (2005), in his critique of Burawoy, argues that “The problem with incorporating the ideas
14 of a social movement into the corpus of a discipline is that the justified moral zeal and outrage of
15 those in the movement become a part of how sociological inquiry is conducted” (p.35). If scholars
16 become advocates or activists then the integrity of the profession is impacted because, Turner
17 argues, we retain our legitimacy only if we present scientifically valid and objective data and
18 theory. And yet, as we have indicated in Tables 1 and 2, no form of knowledge is ideologically
19 neutral because credibility is based on the deep commitments of each and therefore inherently
20 subject to political dynamics (Epstein, 1996).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 We are arguing for greater pluralism and a greater acceptance of a Public OMS within this
35 pluralism which can supplement ways in which we make our work matter by introducing more
36 pluralistic forms of knowing. *Within* OMS we need to recognize that these different forms of
37 knowledge are equally valid and each has something to contribute to our understanding of
38 organizations and society. We suggest that each form of knowledge is distinct, legitimating itself
39 and contributing in a particular way. Professional OMS develops knowledge and techniques that
40 improves effectiveness and efficiency; Policy OMS utilizes knowledge to resolve organizational
41 problems and inform policy, and Critical OMS can be the reflexive conscience of these forms,
42 examining what might be taken for granted in policies, practices and social and moral values that
43 might impact both ‘personal troubles’ and ‘public issues’. Rather than defending one form and
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 contesting others, a dialogue *between* forms, especially in relation to issues such as eliminating
4 human inequalities or improving social sustainability, could lead to new perspectives and more
5 expansive, innovative and relevant solutions.
6
7
8
9

10 To illustrate, we use the example of international management, a growing sub-discipline
11 within organization studies. Professional OMS focuses on the structures, mechanisms and
12 dynamics of international organizations and relationships (e.g., Xiao et al, 2013). International
13 Critical OMS scholars pay attention to how the historical, social and geopolitical processes related
14 to colonialism and globalization can perpetuate exploitative relationships of local experience (e.g.,
15 Frenkel, 2008; Gopinath & Prasad, 2013). In Policy OMS, international management scholars and
16 consultants may work with multinational organizations or advise policy makers on issues such as
17 offshoring or emerging markets. It is difficult to find examples of Public OMS approaches to
18 international management, in which researchers are sensitive to community and indigenous forms
19 of knowledge and work with local people to understand their lived experience. However, one
20 example is McCarthy and Muthuri's (2018) study of gender and power in the Ghanaian fair trade
21 cocoa value chain using visual participatory methods to engage 'fringe stakeholders'. While OMS
22 scholars within each form often work independently, an understanding and recognition of the
23 issues addressed by others, or a 'multiple-form' transdisciplinary research team, and a multifaceted
24 analysis and acceptance of different forms of theorizing/acting, could enhance the relevance of our
25 work for organizational and social problems.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **MOVING FROM SPECTATOR TO ENGAGEMENT: IMPLEMENTING A**

48 **PUBLIC ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT STUDIES**

49
50
51
52

53 A Public OMS requires scholars to become activists in various ways in order to participate
54 in the process of social change. Turner's (2005) claim that the discipline will become moralized if
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 scholars become activists assumes that academics should stand above issues of right and wrong
4 and not be concerned about the uses to which their research and their theories may be put. The
5
6
7
8 2013 Francis Report on the UK's Mid Staffordshire National Health Service Foundation Trust
9
10 scandal contradicts this stance, finding that one of the main factors leading to high needless patient
11
12 death rates was management thinking dominated by financial control and statistical targets which
13
14 led to a focus on the means (information systems, budgetary controls and performance
15
16 management systems), rather than the ends (patient care and well-being). The concern for scientific
17
18 measurement excluded the moral and very human responsibilities of the organization and its
19
20 managers – an illustration of Ghoshal's (2005) critique of the pathology of Professional OMS.
21
22
23
24 Indeed, this very issue is being debated currently by nations at the height of the Covid 19 pandemic.
25

26
27 One argument against making our work matter and against adopting a Public OMS is that
28
29 Business Schools should be concerned only with the utopia of the Marketized University, focusing
30
31 purely on economic growth and organizational efficiency, and that issues of poverty, human rights
32
33 and social justice are the purview of other social science disciplines. But as Tsui (2003) notes,
34
35 Business Schools have been criticized for being self-interested and doing more harm than good in
36
37 society. Numerous cases of the negative impact of corporations on communities and the
38
39 environment reinforce the danger of separating business and society, personal troubles and public
40
41 issues. The recognition and active support of the interrelated nature of self-Other relationships, of
42
43 academic/community engagement in addressing social problems and collaborating in creating
44
45 socially robust knowing-from-within, lies at the heart of a Public OMS. The grand challenges of
46
47 social justice, human rights, sustainable environments and healthy societies are global, they require
48
49 blurring the boundaries between self-Other at many levels, along with fluid forms of knowledge
50
51 and collaboration that contribute in different ways to their resolution. That is, in making our work
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 matter we need to go beyond the question of whether we have anything meaningful to *say* that is
4
5 of relevance to others, to whether we can *do* something meaningful to contribute to a better world:
6
7
8 to move from spectator to engaged activist.
9

10
11 This requires us to move beyond the drive to solely publish theoretically and
12
13 methodologically-driven work in ‘high quality’ journals and recognize our political and moral
14
15 tasks as scholars (Mills, 1959). To do so means not just ‘talking to ourselves’ but ‘talking *with*’
16
17 Others. It also means accepting and rewarding multiple ways of working and a variety of
18
19 academic/scholar identities – for example, as researcher-theorist, educator, administrator, public
20
21 intellectual/expert, citizen and community member, and activist (Cheney, Lair & Kendall, 2013,
22
23 p.72-3). We conclude by offering suggestions and examples of how we can make our work matter
24
25 through a Public OMS.
26
27
28

- 29
30 1. The first issue is to generate debate in our academic and professional institutions about the
31
32 roles and responsibilities of academia for addressing *and acting upon* society’s grand
33
34 challenges. It requires asking the question: relevance to what purpose? If we accept that
35
36 business schools have a social responsibility, then they need to develop research strategies
37
38 around the grand challenges that draw on broader notions and incorporate interdisciplinary and
39
40 transdisciplinary collaborations. This is beginning to occur in the UK and Europe, where some
41
42 European Research Council (ERC) and Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC)
43
44 funded projects require international and transdisciplinary collaborations. This has
45
46 incentivized universities to re-examine their research strategies and the allocation of resources
47
48 also requires “critical reflection and a profound self-examination” of the purpose and role of
49
50 Business Schools in society (Losada, Martell & Lozano, 2011, p.163) because systemic change
51
52 is needed for academia to value relevance. Such a change will require “adaptations of culture,
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 people, and more” (Vermeulen, 2005, p.980), including the criteria used to evaluate and reward
4 academic performance. We suggest that perhaps an identity crisis is needed within OMS, to
5 force reflexive debate about what and who we – the Academy – are. Such a crisis may be
6 necessary – and indeed is upon us - because, as Ray Anderson, Chairman of Interface observed
7 in relation to sustainability, the Academy “changes so slowly, so ponderously, clinging to the
8 opiate of the *status quo*” (2009, p.xxii).

- 17 2. Formal recognition needs to be given to the various forms of OMS, recognizing the multiple
18 positioning of academics within and across each form and the various roles academics can play
19 in making their work matter. This means not only rethinking the gatekeeping activities of
20 journals, but also the redesign of Ph.D. and early career researcher programs to include debates
21 around how philosophical considerations (ontology) influence knowledge generation, research
22 designs and goals – surely fundamental to the Doctor of Philosophy degree. Participants can
23 be exposed to different forms of knowledge, and a dialogue created between each, so that one
24 doesn’t dominate the others. A fundamental rethinking of the self-Other relationship can help
25 broaden understanding of the nature and various forms of knowledge, open students to the
26 possibilities of research and to choices about their role in the Academy and society, and help
27 address Tsui’s (2013) concern for the ‘terrible life of young scholars’.
- 33 3. We need to engage with multiple definitions of ‘relevance’ and ‘knowledge’ that consider not
34 only knowledge transfer models but also various approaches to knowledge generation that
35 include knowing-from-within, i.e., research *with* practitioners and community members
36 drawing on their understanding. Kieser and Leiner (2009) argue that collaborative research
37 (especially action research) between practitioners and academics is impossible because
38 acceptable research methods, preferred outputs, success criteria, and discourses are different.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Scientific knowledge can only be produced if practitioners are trained in academic research
4 methods and if business schools have two faculty teams (one for rigor and the other for
5 relevance). But this privileges self/theory over Others/knowing-from-within and is not easy to
6 implement. Wood (2017) talks about the tensions between applied and scientific research
7 centers in a Brazilian Business school, highlighting that applied research involves a different
8 set of interests and competencies to academic research. For example, applied researchers need
9 to be able to establish partnerships and mobilize interest groups including social, political and
10 community actors, and disseminate knowledge in different and widely accessible ways to
11 scientific research. Torre et al. (2012) argue that ‘deep participation’ through critical
12 participatory action research is one way of connecting academics and community activists to
13 address social justice issues and can concomitantly build theory, contribute to social policy,
14 share data, and provoke collective action. One example within a Public OMS of using
15 participatory action research to build knowing-from-within is the co-creation of a narrative
16 ethical charter in an Italian Blood Donor organization (Cunliffe & Ivaldi, 2020). This was done
17 through reflexive dialogue between employees, managers, researchers, volunteers, and donors
18 and the charter was designed to generate reflexive dialogue around ethical issues.

- 19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40 4. We need to explore alternative forms of self-organization around social change and academic
41 activism. One such example occurs within the field of radical geography, where the
42 AntipodeFoundation, a registered charity with eight academic trustees, aims to promote
43 research, education and scholarship. It produces a peer reviewed academic journal, offers
44 grants to support workshops, etc., and gives scholar-activist awards to promote academic and
45 nonacademic (think tanks, grass root community organizations, social movements, etc.)
46 collaboration around research and various forms of co-enquiry. Support is given for innovative
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and original work that goes “beyond the boundaries of established academic practice” and
4 carries the purpose of improving society^{ix}. Maxey (2004) argues that we can negotiate
5 engagement in various ways, by taking initiating (starting and running activist groups),
6 supporting (contributing to grass root activities) or peripheral (sporadic support) activist roles
7 depending on situational issues. Academics from the natural sciences are also becoming
8 activists and finding alternative ‘outputs’ by blogging on various local and global issues such
9 as fluoridation, climate change, pollution, and genetically modified foods. Albert Einstein
10 himself was a vocal political activist on a number of issues including the control of nuclear
11 weapons (Rowe & Schulmann, 2007).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

- 24 5. Learn from the ‘best practices’ of other disciplines. Collaborative forms of knowledge
25 production directly impacting social change are less valued in OMS than in other disciplines
26 such as education and communication (e.g. Galletta & Torre, 2019; Phillips et al., 2013; the
27 University of Birmingham has an MA Education in Social Justice); sociology (e.g., Queen
28 Margaret University in Scotland has an MSc in Public Sociology); geography, political science
29 and psychology – where feminist scholars in particular work with disadvantaged communities
30 and groups (e.g. McKay et al, 2011; Nared & Bole, 2020). Within OMS, there is a form of
31 intellectual activism (Contu, 2018) through an association of critical scholars (VIDA^x)
32 supports the work of women and queer, trans, non-binary people in business schools and
33 academia struggling against discrimination, harassment, marginalization and exploitation
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 6. The Health Sciences have also formally addressed the need for different forms of making their
48 work matter, for example, through the US Community-Campus Partnerships for Health^{xi}
49 which promotes health equality and social justice through forums, conferences and supporting
50 community-based participatory research; the Institute for Community Engaged Scholarship in
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Canada which supports collaborative university-community partnerships; and community-
4 based participatory research organized to improve health (e.g., London et al, 2020; Wallerstein
5 & Duran, 2010).
6
7
8
9

10 Many of these examples are not about knowledge transfer, nor involvement in service
11 activities (which usually do not include research), but transdisciplinary partnerships with other
12 disciplines and with community members – a partnership in which all participants are equal – to
13 generate knowledge and action around social issues. As business school academics, we should be
14 ideally positioned to engage in these activities because our profession and our research interests
15 transcend local and national boundaries, but this requires us to understand “the intimate realities
16 of ourselves in connection with larger social realities” (Burawoy, 2005a, p.15): i.e., to narrow the
17 self-Other boundary and acknowledge the interrelationship between ourselves and others. As
18 discussed above, this requires change at many levels. The prevailing career narcissism in Business
19 Schools, based on where one has published and how much one is cited displaces and elides
20 alternative definitions, raising the question of how many schools will “be comfortable with faculty
21 taking public stances on controversial issues or will necessarily be proactive in rewarding faculty
22 who are critical of the status quo” (Bridgman, 2007, p.437). But if we do nothing, we are in danger
23 of becoming irrelevant.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 To conclude, what differentiates Public OMS from other forms is that it is rooted in an
44 intersubjective ontology, engages a critical social conscience, draws upon knowing-from-within
45 of all participants, and utilizes situated, collaborative, dialogic, relational, and plural forms of
46 knowing. As such, it is concerned with addressing social and environmental issues with
47 communities and counter communities. Our intention is not to revisit the longstanding rigor-
48 relevance, scientific/academic knowledge versus practice debate, but to call for the development
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of forms of knowing and researching rarely used in OMS that can help generate public dialogue
4 and action. Given current social and moral challenges such as the pandemic, social inequalities,
5 and climate change, the need for pluralism and more organic and situated forms of research and
6 knowing is acute.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **References**

18
19 Adler, P. S., Forbes, L. C., & Willmott, H. (2007). Critical management studies. *Academy of*
20
21 *Management Annals*, 1, 119-179.
22

23
24 Aguinis, H., Cummings, C., Ramani, R. S., & Cummings, T.G. (2020). “An A as an A”: The
25
26 new bottom line for valuing academic research. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 34,
27
28 135-154.
29

30
31 Anderson, R. (2009). Forward. In P. Docherty, M., Kira, & A. B. Shani, (Eds.) *Creating*
32
33 *sustainable work systems: Developing social sustainability*. (pp.xx-xxii) Abingdon, UK:
34
35 Routledge.
36
37

38
39 Appadurai, A. (2006). The right to research. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 4, 167-177.
40

41
42 Bapuji, H., Patel, C., Ertug, G., & Allen, D. (2020). Corona virus and inequality: Why
43
44 management research needs a societal turn. *Journal of Management*, 46, 1205-1222.
45

46
47 Bartunek, J. M. (2011). What has happened to Mode 2? *British Journal of Management*, 22,
48
49 555–558.
50

51
52 Bartunek, J. M. (2020). Accomplishing impact by performing our theories: It can be done,
53
54 though not easily. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 56, 11-31.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Bartunek, J. M., & Louis, M. R. (1996). *Insider/outsider team research*. London: Sage.
4
5
6 Beech, N. & Anseel, F. (2020). COVID-19 and its impact on management research and
7
8 education: Threats, opportunities and a manifesto. *British Journal of Management*, 31, 447-
9
10 449.
11
12
13 Brès, L., & Gond, J-P. (2014). The visible hand of consultants in the construction of the markets
14
15 for virtue: Translating issues, negotiating boundaries and enacting responsive regulations.
16
17 *Human Relations*, 67, 1347-1382.
18
19
20
21 Bridgman, T. (2007). Reconstituting relevance: Exploring possibilities for management
22
23 educators' critical engagement with the public. *Management Learning*, 38, 425-439.
24
25
26 Burawoy, M. (2004). Public sociologies: Contradictions, dilemmas and possibilities. *Social*
27
28 *Forces*, 82, 1603-1618.
29
30
31 Burawoy, M. (2005a). For public sociology. *American Sociological Review*, 70, 4-28.
32
33
34 Burawoy, M. (2005b). Response: public sociology: Populist fad or path to renewal? *The British*
35
36 *Journal of Sociology*, 56, 417-432.
37
38
39 Burawoy, M. (2007). Public sociology: Mills versus Gramsci. Introduction to the Italian
40
41 translation of 'For Public Sociology'. *Sociologica*, 1.
42
43
44 Burawoy, M. (2017). The public university: A battleground for real utopias. *Southeast Asian*
45
46 *Social Science Review*, 2, 139-173.
47
48
49 Burawoy, M., & Van Antwerpen, J. (2001). *Public sociology at Berkeley: Past, present and*
50
51 *future*. Unpublished paper. <http://burawoy.berkeley.edu/PS/Berkeley%20Sociology.pdf>
52
53 (accessed April, 2020)
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Burns, D., Hyde, P., Killeth, A., Poland, F., & Gray, R. (2014). Participatory organizational
4 research: Examining voice in the co-production of knowledge. *British Journal of*
5
6 *Management*, 25, 133-144.
7
8
9
- 10 Cheney, G., Lair, D. L., & Kendall, B. E. (2013). Making organization matter: Looking back
11 and looking ahead. *Organization*, 20, 67-77.
12
13
14
- 15 Contu, A. (2018). ‘... The point is to change it’ – Yes, but in what direction and how?
16 Intellectual activism as a way of ‘walking the talk’ of critical work in business schools.
17
18 *Organization*, 25, 282–293.
19
20
21
22
- 23 Corley, K. G., & Gioia, D. G. (2011). Building theory about theory building: What constitutes a
24 theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review*, 36, 12–32.
25
26
27
- 28 Cunliffe, A. L. (2011). Crafting qualitative research: Morgan and Smircich 30 years on.
29
30 *Organizational Research Methods*, 14, 647-673.
31
32
- 33 Cunliffe, A. L., & Ivaldi, S. (2020). Embedded ethics and reflexivity: Narrating a charter of
34 ethical experience. *Management Learning*. doi.org/10.1177/1350507620960014
35
36
37
- 38 Cunliffe, A.L., & Scaratti, G. (2017). Embedding impact: Developing situated knowledge
39 through dialogical sensemaking. *British Journal of Management*, 28, 29-44.
40
41
42
- 43 Deetz, S.A. (1996). Describing differences in approaches to organization science: rethinking
44 Burrell and Morgan and their legacy. *Organization Science*, 7, 191-207.
45
46
47
- 48 Dewey, J. (1908/1996). *Theory of the moral life*. New York, NY: Irvington Publishers.
49
50
- 51 Dieleman, H. (2017). Transdisciplinary hermeneutics: A symbiosis of science, art, philosophy,
52 reflective practice, and subjective experience. *Issues in Interdisciplinary Studies*, 35, 170–
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Doh, J., Tashman, P., & Benischke, M. (2019). Adapting to grand environmental challenges
4 through collective entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 33, 450-468.
5
6
7
8 Edwards, P. K. (2017). Making ‘critical performativity’ concrete: Sumantra Ghoshal and
9 linkages between the mainstream and the critical. *British Journal of Management*, 28, 731–
10 741.
11
12
13
14
15 Epstein, S. (1996). *Impure science: AIDS, activism and the politics of knowledge*. Berkeley, CA:
16 University of California Press.
17
18
19
20
21 Faubion, J. D. (2009). The ethics of fieldwork as an ethics of connectivity. In J. D. Faubion & G.
22 E. Marcus (Eds.) *Fieldwork is not what it used to be: Learning anthropology’s method in a*
23 *time of transition* (pp.145-164). Ithica: Cornell University Press.
24
25
26
27
28 Fisher, G., & Aguinis, H. (2017). Using theory elaboration to make theoretical advancements.
29 *Organizational Research Methods*, 20, 438-464
30
31
32
33 Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making social science matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can*
34 *succeed*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
35
36
37
38 Fournier, V., & Grey, C. (2000). At the critical moment: Conditions and prospects for Critical
39 Management Studies. *Human Relations*, 53, 7-32.
40
41
42
43 Frenkel, M. (2008). The multinational corporation as a third space: Rethinking international
44 management discourse on knowledge transfer through Homi Bhabha. *Academy of*
45 *Management Review*, 33, 924-942.
46
47
48
49
50
51 Galletta, A., & Torre, M. E. (2019). Participatory action research in education. In G.W. Noblitt
52 (Ed.). *Oxford research encyclopedias: Education* (pp.1-30). New York: Oxford University
53 Press USA.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Ghoshal, S. (2005). Bad management theories are destroying good management practices.
4
5 *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 4, 75-91.
6
7
8 Gibbons, M. L., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P., & Trow, M. (1994). *The*
9
10 *new production of knowledge: The dynamics of science and research in contemporary*
11
12 *societies*. London: Sage.
13
14
15 Gopinath, C., & Prasad, A. (2013). Toward a critical framework for understanding MNE
16
17 operations: Revisiting Coca-Cola's exit from India. *Organization*, 20, 212-232.
18
19
20
21 Gray, B. (2008). Enhancing transdisciplinary research through collaborative leadership. *American*
22
23 *Journal of Preventative Medicine*, 35, S124-132.
24
25
26 Guerci, M., Radaelli, G., & Shani A. B. (2019). Conducting mode 2 research in HRM: A phase-
27
28 based framework. *Human Resource Management*, 58, 5–20.
29
30
31 Harkavy, I. (2006). The role of universities in advancing citizenship and social justice in the 21st
32
33 century. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 1, 5-37.
34
35
36 Hartman, R. K. (2014). Subversive functionalism: For a less canonical critique in critical
37
38 management studies. *Human Relations*, 67, 611-632.
39
40
41 Hodgkinson, G. P., & Rousseau, D. (2009). Bridging the rigour–relevance gap in management
42
43 research: It's already happening! *Journal of Management Studies*, 46, 534-546.
44
45
46 Hodgkinson, G. P., & Starkey, K. (2011). Not simply returning to the same answer over and over
47
48 again: Reframing relevance. *British Journal of Management*, 22, 355–369.
49
50
51 Hodgkinson, G. P., & Starkey, K. (2012). Extending the foundations and reach of design science:
52
53 Further reflections on the role of critical realism. *British Journal of Management* 23, 605–
54
55 610.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Kieser, A., & Leiner, L. (2009). Why the rigour–relevance gap in management research is
4 unbridgeable. *Journal of Management Studies*, 46, 516-533.
5
6
7
8 Kieser, A., Nicolai, A., & Seidl, D. (2015). The practical relevance of management research:
9 Turning the debate on relevance into a rigorous scientific research program. *The Academy of*
10 *Management Annals*, 9, 143–233.
11
12
13
14
15 King, B., & Carberry, E. (2020). Movements, societal crisis, and organizational theory. *Journal*
16 *of Management Studies*, doi:10.1111/joms.12624.
17
18
19
20
21 King, D., & Learmonth, M. (2015). Can critical management studies ever be ‘practical’? A case
22 study in engaged scholarship. *Human Relations*, 68, 353-375.
23
24
25
26 London, J. K., Haapanen, K. A., Backus, A. Mack, S.M., Lindsey, M., & Andrade, K. (2020).
27 Aligning community-engaged research to context. *International Journal of Environmental*
28 *Research and Public Health*, 17, 1-25.
29
30
31
32
33 Losada, C., Martell, J., & Lozano, J. P. (2011). Responsible business education: Not a question
34 of curriculum but a raison d’être for business schools. In M. Morsing & A. S. Rovira (Eds.)
35 *Business schools and their contribution to society* (pp.163-174) London: Sage.
36
37
38
39
40
41 Lumpkin, G., & Bacq, S. (2019). Civic wealth creation: A new view of stakeholder engagement
42 and societal impact. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 33, 383-404.
43
44
45
46 Marcos, J., & Denyer, D. (2012). Crossing the sea from they to we? The unfolding of knowing
47 and practising in collaborative research. *Management Learning*, 43, 443-459.
48
49
50
51 Markman, G. D., Waldron, T. L., Gianiodis, P. T., & Espina, M. (2019). E pluribus unum:
52 Impact entrepreneurship as a solution to grand challenges. *Academy of Management*
53 *Perspectives*, 33, 371–382.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Maxey, L. J. (2004). Moving beyond from within: Activism and critical geographies. In D.
4 Fuller & R. Kitchin (Eds.) *Radical theory/critical praxis: Academic geography beyond the*
5 *Academy?* Praxis (e) Press. (158-169).
6
7
8
9
10 McCarthy, L., & Muthuri, J. N. (2018). Engaging fringe stakeholders in business and society
11 research: Applying visual participatory research methods. *Business & Society*, 57, 131–173.
12
13
14
15 McKay, S., Veale, A., Worthen, M., & Wessells, M. (2011). Building meaningful participation
16 in reintegration among war-affected young mothers in Liberia, Sierra Leone and northern
17 Uganda. *Intervention*, 9, 108–124.
18
19
20
21
22
23 Merleau-Ponty, M. (1964). *Signs* (R. M. McCleary, Trans.). Evanston, IL: Northwestern
24 University Press.
25
26
27
28 Mills, C. W. (1959/2000). *The sociological imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
29
30
31 Nared, J., & Bole, D. (Eds.) (2020). *Participatory research and planning in practice*.
32 Switzerland: Springer.
33
34
35
36 Nicolescu, B. (Ed.) (2008). *Transdisciplinarity-theory and practice*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton
37 Press.
38
39
40
41 Nichols, L. T. (Ed.) (2007). *Public sociology: The contemporary debate*. New Brunswick, NJ:
42 Transaction Publishers.
43
44
45
46 Nowotny, H. (2003). Democratising expertise and socially robust knowledge. *Science and Public*
47 *Policy*, 30, 151-156.
48
49
50
51 Pavlovich, K. (2020). Quantum empathy: An alternative narrative for global transcendence.
52 *Journal of Management Spirituality and Religion*, 17(3), 333-347.
53
54
55
56 Phillips, L., Kristiansen, M., Vehviläinen, M., & Gunnarsson, E. (2013). *Knowledge and power*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *in collaborative research: A reflexive approach*. New York, London: Routledge.

4
5
6 Pollner, M. (1991). Left of ethnomethodology: The rise and decline of radical-reflexivity.
7
8 *American Sociological Review*, 56, 370–380.

9
10
11 Prahalad, C. K. (2011). Can relevance and rigor coexist? In S. A. Mohrman, & E. E. Lawler,
12
13 (Eds.) *Useful research: Advancing theory and practice* (pp.137-145). San Francisco, CA:
14
15 Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

16
17
18 Prasad, A. (2015). A rebel without a cause? (Re)claiming the question of the ‘political’ in
19
20 Critical Management Studies. In A. Prasad, P. Prasad, A. J. Mills, & J. H. Mills. *The*
21
22 *Routledge companion to critical management studies* (pp.80-90). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

23
24
25
26 Ricoeur, P. (1992). *Oneself as another*. Trans. K. Blamey. Chicago: University of Chicago
27
28 Press.

29
30
31 Reedy, P. A., & King, D. R. (2019). Critical performativity in the field: Methodological
32
33 principles for activist ethnographers. *Organizational Research Methods*, 22, 564-589.

34
35
36 Romme, A. G. L., Avenier, M. J., Denyer, D., Hodgkinson, G. P., Pandza, K., Starkey, K., &
37
38 Worren, N. (2015). Towards common ground and trading zones in management research and
39
40 practice. *British Journal of Management*, 26, 544–559.

41
42
43 Rowe, D. E., & Schulmann, R. (Eds.) (2007). *Einstein on politics: His private thoughts and*
44
45 *public stands on nationalism, Zionism, war, peace, and the bomb*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton
46
47 University Press.

48
49
50
51 Rowlinson, M., & Hassard, J. (2011). How come critters came to be teaching in business
52
53 schools? Contradictions in the institutionalization of critical management studies.
54
55 *Organization*, 18, 673-689.

- 1
2
3 Rubião-Resende, A., & Zilberberg-Oviedo, L-E. (2020). La ‘universidad participativa’: Una
4 alternativa al ‘Modo 2’. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación Superior*, 11, 105-117.
5
6
7
8 Sá, E., Dias, D., & Sá, M. J. (2018). Towards the university entrepreneurial mission: Portuguese
9 academics’ self-perspective of their role in knowledge transfer. *Journal of Further and*
10 *Higher Education*, 42, 784-796.
11
12
13
14
15 Sannino A., & Engeström Y. (2017). Co-generation of societally impactful knowledge in change
16 laboratories. *Management Learning*, 48, 80-96.
17
18
19
20
21 Scaratti, G. (2014). The rear windows. A project for a screenplay on the welcoming of Roma
22 families. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20, 193–202.
23
24
25
26 Scaratti, G., Galuppo, L., Gorli, M., Gozzoli, C., & Ripamonti, S. (2017). The social relevance
27 and social impact of knowledge and knowing. *Management Learning*, 48, 57–64.
28
29
30
31 Sealy, R., Doldor, E., Vinnicombe, S., Terjesen, S., Anderson, D., & Atewologun, D. (2017).
32 Expanding the notion of dialogic trading zones for impactful research: The case of women on
33 boards research. *British Journal of Management*, 28, 64–83
34
35
36
37
38 Shotter, J. (2008/1993). *Conversational realities revisited: Life language, body and world*.
39 Chagrin Falls, OH: Taos Institute Publications.
40
41
42
43 Shotter, J. (1996) Living in a Wittgensteinian world: Beyond theory to a poetics of practices.
44 *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 26, 293-311.
45
46
47
48 Shotter, J., & Tsoukas, H. (2014). Performing phronesis: On the way to engaged judgment.
49 *Management Learning*, 45, 377-396.
50
51
52
53 Starkey, K., Hatchuel, A., & Tempest, S. (2009). Management research and the new logics of
54 discovery and engagement. *Journal of Management Studies*, 46, 547–558.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Starkey, K., & Madan, P. (2001). Bridging the relevance gap: Aligning stakeholders in the future
4 of management research. *British Journal of Management*, 12, S3–S26.
5
6
7
8 Suddaby, R., Hardy, C., & Huy, Q. (2011). Where are the new theories of organization?
9
10 *Academy of Management Review*, 36, 236-246.
11
12
13 Torre, M. E., Fine, M., Stoudt, B. G., & Fox, M. (2012). Critical participatory action research as
14 public science. In H. Cooper et al. (Eds.) *APA handbook of research methods in psychology*,
15 Vol 2. (pp.171-184). Washington, DC: APA.
16
17
18
19
20
21 Tourish, D. (2019). *Management studies in crisis: Fraud, deception and meaningless research*.
22
23 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
24
25
26 Tsui, A. S. (2013). On compassion in scholarship: Why should we care? *Academy of*
27
28 *Management Review*, 38, 167-180.
29
30
31 Turner, J. H. (2005). Is public sociology a good idea? *The American Sociologist*, 36, 27-45.
32
33
34 van Aken, J., & Romme, G. (2009). Reinventing the future: Adding design science to the
35 repertoire of organization and management studies. *Organization Management Journal*, 6
36 (1), 5-12
37
38
39
40
41 Van de Ven, A. H. (2007). *Engaged scholarship: A guide for organizational and social research*.
42
43 Oxford: Oxford University Press.
44
45
46 Van de Ven, A. H., & Johnson, P. (2006). Knowledge for theory and practice. *Academy of*
47
48 *Management Review*, 31, 802– 821.
49
50
51 Vermeulen, F. (2005). On rigor and relevance: Fostering dialectic progress in management
52 research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 978-982.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Wallerstein, N., & Duran, B. (2010). Community-based participatory research contributions to
4
5 intervention research: The intersection of science and practice to improve health equity.
6
7 *American Journal of Public Health*, 100, S40-S46.
8
9
10 Wickert, C., & Schaefer, S. M. (2015). Towards a progressive understanding of performativity in
11
12 critical management studies. *Human Relations*, 6, 107-130.
13
14
15 Williams, A., Whiteman, G., & Parker, J. N. (2019). Backstage interorganizational collaboration:
16
17 Corporate endorsement of the sustainable development goals. *Academy of Management*
18
19 *Discoveries*, 5, 367–395.
20
21
22
23 Wood, T. (2017). Resisting and surviving the mainstream scientific model: Findings on social
24
25 relevance and social impact in the tropics. *Management Learning*, 48, 65–79.
26
27
28 Yeo, R. & Dopson, S. (2018). Getting lost to be found: the insider–outsider paradoxes in
29
30 relational ethnography. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*, 13, 333-
31
32 355.
33
34
35 Xiao, S. S., Jeong, I., Moon, J. J., Chung, C. C., & Chung, J. (2013). Internationalization and
36
37 performance of firms in China: Moderating effects of governance structure and the degree of
38
39 centralized control. *Journal of International Management*, 19, 118-137.
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 ⁱ We use organization and management studies (OMS) because the issues refer to both.

47 ⁱⁱ <https://inequality.stanford.edu/research> (accessed June, 2021).

48 ⁱⁱⁱ <https://humancommunication.asu.edu/research-and-initiatives/center-for-strategic-communication>
49 (accessed January 2021)

50 ^{iv} <http://www.esrc.ac.uk/about-esrc/mission-strategy-priorities/index.aspx>.

51 ^v Which Burawoy (2005a: 7) terms ‘counter-public’.

52 ^{vi} [https://www.gc.cuny.edu/Page-Elements/Academics-Research-Centers-Initiatives/Centers-and-](https://www.gc.cuny.edu/Page-Elements/Academics-Research-Centers-Initiatives/Centers-and-Institutes/Center-for-Human-Environments/Research-Sub-Groups/Public-Science-Project-(PSP))
53 [Institutes/Center-for-Human-Environments/Research-Sub-Groups/Public-Science-Project-\(PSP\)](https://www.gc.cuny.edu/Page-Elements/Academics-Research-Centers-Initiatives/Centers-and-Institutes/Center-for-Human-Environments/Research-Sub-Groups/Public-Science-Project-(PSP))
54 (accessed June, 2021).
55
56
57
58
59
60

vii The International Center for Transdisciplinary Research http://ciret-transdisciplinarity.org/index_en.php

viii <https://www.bbc.com/news/av/world-49795221/thunberg-if-you-choose-to-fail-us-we-will-never-forgive-you>. (accessed June 2021)

ix <http://antipodefoundation.org/scholar-activist-project-awards/> (accessed March, 2020)

x <https://criticalmanagementvida.wordpress.com> (accessed June, 2021)

xi <https://www.ccphealth.org> (accessed June, 2021)

Ann Cunliffe (ann.cunliffe@fgv.br) is Professor of Organization Studies at FGV-EAESP, Brazil. Her current research interests lie around leadership, ethics, qualitative research methods, embodied meaning-making, and reflexive approaches to research and practice.

Kathryn Pavlovich (kathryn.pavlovich@waikato.ac.nz) is a Professor of Strategic Management and Entrepreneurship at the University of Waikato Management School, New Zealand. Her research explores flourishing through entrepreneurship and relational forms of organizing.

TABLE 1

Overview of Forms of Organization and Management Studies (OMS)

(Based on Burawoy, 2005a, p.9-10)

	Professional Organization and Management Studies	Critical Organization and Management Studies	Policy Organization and Management Studies
Associated Ontology and Self/Other relationship	<p>Objectivist</p> <p>OMS for ourselves.</p> <p>Bounded and distant Self-Other relationship.</p> <p>Expert, neutral spectator.</p>	<p>Objectivist/Subjectivist.</p> <p>OMS for ourselves and maybe others.</p> <p>Separate Self/Other relationship, politicized 'other'.</p> <p>Critical, interrogatory spectator, sometimes engaged.</p>	<p>Objectivist/Subjectivist</p> <p>OMS for others. Clients may be businesses or government.</p> <p>Expert Self, advising a receptive Other.</p> <p>Spectator/engaged.</p>
Moral Stance	<p>A normative stance based on a generalized instrumental rationality.</p> <p>Value determined by contribution to theory.</p>	<p>De-privileging one moral position over any other.</p> <p>Identifying situated moral ambiguities and contradictions.</p> <p>Questioning values underlying society & organizations.</p>	<p>Moral instrumentalism and pragmatism: value determined by successful problem resolution in a particular context.</p>

	Accountability to academic peers.	Accountability to critical peers. The reflexive conscience of Professional OMS.	Accountability to the client.
Purpose	Research studies designed to develop and extend theory via scientific methods. Performativity: theoretical/technical knowledge in the pursuit of theories of organizational and managerial efficiency and effectiveness. <i>Legitimizing the discipline.</i>	Critical investigation of the purpose and normative foundations of knowledge. Anti-performativity: uncovering oppression, exclusion, injustice. Potentially emancipatory through activism and intellectual activism. <i>Destabilizing the discipline.</i>	Client defined goals. Performativity: providing a service to the client through the provision of data, the solution of organization problems, addressing business issues, making policy recommendations. <i>Relevancing the discipline.</i>
Legitimizing epistemological strategy	The formulation of rigorous, valid and prescriptive models, theories, frameworks, etc.	Questioning the assumptions, silences, and un/intended purposes of mainstream OMS.	Developing knowledge that can be used in practice, by practitioners and policymakers.
Theory	A priori theory development or elaboration.	Philosophical reflexive situated critique. Revealing tensions.	Applied models, techniques, and principles.

	<p>Grand theory and abstracted empiricism.</p> <p>Regularities. Explanatory concepts, causality, often deductive.</p> <p><i>Theory 'of'.</i></p>	<p>Heterodox theory.</p> <p>Abductive, retroductive.</p> <p><i>'Anti-theory theory'.</i></p>	<p>Practicality of theories.</p> <p>Deductive and/or inductive.</p> <p><i>Applied theory.</i></p>
<p>Definition of Relevance</p>	<p>Developing knowledge and theories that may inform practice.</p> <p>Relevance based on peer review.</p> <p>Impact on knowledge, education and practice.</p> <p><i>Knowledge transfer.</i></p>	<p>Relevance based on opening up debate through canonical critique, critical performativity and subversive functionalism.</p> <p>Impact on knowledge, education, sometimes practice.</p> <p><i>Knowledge transfer?</i></p>	<p>Client satisfaction. The resolution of business problems and input into policy making.</p> <p>Impact on/in practice, theory implications.</p> <p><i>Knowledge transfer/generation</i></p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

TABLE 2: Public Organization and Management Studies	
Associated Ontology and Self/Other relationship	<p>Intersubjective.</p> <p>OMS with others and ourselves.</p> <p>Engaged and interwoven Self/Other relationships.</p> <p>Dialogic and reflexive collaborators.</p>
Moral Stance	<p>A values-driven, communitarian-based morality. Plurality of views and consensus around the public good through deliberative democracy.</p> <p>Accountability to and with others in public dialogue.</p> <p>Critical social conscience.</p>
Purpose	<p>Addressing problems and challenges in society, the economy, business and organizations to generate change through situated and emergent knowing-from-within. An agenda created between academics and practitioners. Presenting findings in accessible ways for multiple audiences.</p> <p><i>Embedding the discipline.</i></p>
Legitimizing epistemological strategy	<p>Utilizing a sociological imagination – connecting personal and social interests and issues. The collaborative generation between academics and community of socially robust knowing-from-within. Dialogic, reflexive, relational, participatory.</p>
Theory	<p>Generating insights and provocations to public reflection/reflexivity. Situated practical theories. Phronesis. Action guiding anticipatory understandings.</p> <p>Inductive or abductive.</p> <p><i>Theory 'in'.</i></p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Definition of	Academic activism and social change at community and global levels.
Relevance	<i>Collaborative knowledge generation with transformative outcomes.</i>
	<i>Impact in</i>